
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 10th March, 1964.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*) and Mr. N. W. BOXILL.

Prayers were read.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Messrs. L. E. SMITH, J. B. YEARWOOD, and F. C. GODDARD entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to inform the House that the Minutes of the previous meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Report on Population Census of Barbados, 1960, Vol. II.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise receipts for the eleven months ended on the 29th of February, 1964.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve the appropriation of the sum of \$192,000, being a grant of a Colonial Development and Welfare Scheme, for the financing of the construction of the New General Hospital.

Resolution to place the sum of \$1,200 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part I Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64 No. 55 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill relating to the disqualification attaching to membership of the Legislature on the ground of the holding or acceptance of an office of profit or emolument under the Crown and matters connected therewith.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on my own behalf I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$1,275 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part I Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64 No. 53, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD entered the House and took his seat.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of a parcel of land at Oistins, Christ Church, for the building of shelters and for providing other facilities for the fishing industry.

Also,

A Bill to amend the Companies Act, 1910.

Mr. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$1,500 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1963-64, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64, No. 54, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee of a parcel of land, known as the Bagatelle Quarry, to Quarry Products Ltd.
12.25 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the money Resolutions of which notice was given today.

I am also giving notice of my intention to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16 and 18 in order to deal with the fairly large number of matters standing under Government Business today. As hon. members are aware, we have to deal with the Estimates shortly. Notice in connection with the Appropriation Bill should come before the House at its next meeting, and since most of these matters on the Order Paper under Government Business deal with matters of urgent constitutional importance, the Government would like the acquiescence of hon. members and their permission in getting rid of these items on the Order Paper today.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out to the Hon. Leader of the House that as certain of the Bills to which he has referred, if not all of them, have not yet appeared in the

Official Gazette, it would be necessary for him to move the suspension of Standing Order No. 40 (1) in order that we may proceed with these Bills today, as they have not yet appeared in the *Official Gazette*?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am grateful to Your Honour for pointing that out, and I should like to give notice now of my intention so to do.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that the House view with grave concern the great loss to the Island's economy resulting from the continuous burning of sugar canes,

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House request the Government to set up a commission immediately including Plantation owners and Insurance Companies, so as to devise ways and means to prevent further burning of canes in the Island."

Also,

"WHEREAS the operation of the Deep Water Harbour has resulted in increased efficiency in the handling of goods and lower costs;

AND WHEREAS sufficient time has elapsed since the start of its operation for Government to ascertain the effect which these savings can have on the high cost of living;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Government take steps to pass on the benefit of the reduced landed costs of goods to the consumer and general public of this Island."

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

"WHEREAS the people living in Dukes Tenantry and Rock Hall Tenantry in the parish of St. Thomas have to travel far distances to fetch their water;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government set about laying water mains in the said areas in order that the people of those districts might be better accommodated and be able to get an adequate supply of water."

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

"WHEREAS the letters "M.C.P." used to designate Members of the General Assembly connote a status of colonialism which has happily now ceased to exist;

AND WHEREAS the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association invariably designates Members of Parliament within their jurisdiction by the official title of the body to which they belong, and specifically refers to members of the General Assembly in Barbados as "M.H.A.";

BE IT RESOLVED that members of the General Assembly of Barbados from this date forward bear solely the official designation "M.H.A." (Member of the House of Assembly) in respect of their membership of this Chamber."

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

"WHEREAS the extremely severe incidence of cane fires has resulted in great loss of property to small villages and occupiers of plantation tenancies;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to ensure, by way of legislation or otherwise, that the crops from fields adjacent to plantation tenancies

or small villages be reaped in priority to all other crops being harvested in future crop season."

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. Edwards, a Bill to amend the Companies Act, 1910, was read a first time.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill relating to the disqualification attaching to membership of the Legislature on the ground of the holding or acceptance of an office of profit or emolument under the Crown and matters connected therewith, be now read a first time.

I should like to inform the House that copies of this Bill have been or are being circulated. It is a very simple measure being a consequential amendment relating to advanced political status, and the Government proposes to deal with this measure with the approval of the House later in today's sitting.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18 and 40 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

12.35 p.m.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY *re* HUGH DUNCAN BLACKMAN

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, before we proceed with the business of the day, I should like, as is customary, to make reference to the passing over the week-end of a former member of the General Assembly and a Public Servant who, by his example and devotion to duty, has left a mark which other Civil Servants might do well to copy. I refer, Sir, to the death of Mr. Hugh Duncan Blackman who was a member of the Assembly from 30th November, 1944 to the 25th November, 1948, and a member of the Executive Committee from the 26th November, 1946 to the 21st December, 1948.

The late Mr. Blackman was, as I said earlier, a retired Civil Servant who served mainly in the General Post Office of this Island where he rose to the position of Acting Postmaster-General for a considerable period of time. He was highly regarded in the Service, and after his retirement he entered politics, successfully contesting a seat in the parish of St. John in the General Assembly. He brought certain qualities to bear in the performance of his duties in the Legislature, and the experience which he gained as a member of the Public Service over a long period of years and in a responsible position was of considerable assistance to him in the discharge of his duties in the General Assembly.

Temperamentally, he was a gentleman of extreme tolerance, and I think he succeeded quite easily in attracting the respect and admiration of all those with whom he came into contact. He was what might be referred to as a member of the "old school" in that he was more or less basically conservative in his outlook. I am not referring to his politics; I am just making reference to his general attitude towards life. I think it may be said that he was possessed of a truly great soul, and he was a man who could walk with kings and not lose the common touch. According to his experience and the principles which he cherished, he made a contribution to the General Assembly while he was a mem-

ber of it and his constituents must have been satisfied with him that he was returned after his first election.

The late Mr. Hugh Duncan Blackman leaves two children, one in Trinidad - an outstanding athlete - and another a highly respected member of the community who in her way is making a contribution towards the country.

Sir, I record with profound sympathy the passing of the late Mr. Blackman, and speaking for myself as well as for the other hon. members, we deeply regret his passing although it is true to say that he lived to a ripe age - the middle eighties. He has left a mark on the period in which he lived.

Sir, if I may now read the Resolution of Sympathy, it is as follows:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House place on record its profound sympathy with the relatives of the late Hugh Duncan Blackman, a former member of this Assembly, on the occasion of his death;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to his widow and next of kin."

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, we, on this side of the Table, would like to join in support of the Resolution moved by the Hon. Leader of the House, and in doing so, I am seconding the passing of it in respect of the passing of Mr. Hugh Duncan Blackman.

As the Hon. Leader of the House has said, the late Mr. Hugh Blackman made his contribution not only to the Public Service of this country, but when the day came for him to lay down the great office which he held as a Public Servant, he was not contented to go home and sit idly by; he again offered his service to the colony and he was successful in being elected a member of this Assembly in which he served as a member of the then Government.

The late Mr. Blackman was a son of a late schoolmaster; and although he may be described as a Victorian gentleman, he was a Barbadian who could see the handwriting on the wall and was always willing to move with the times. It can be truly said of him that he was a great son of the soil and that he made a real, worthy contribution to this country. Few men are given to pass the allotted span of life, and at the same time able to give service to the country in which they are born up to a retiring age, and then successfully contest a seat in the law-making body, thereby making a further contribution and giving of their valuable experience of the past in the service of their country. 12.45 p.m.

Mr. Hugh Duncan Blackman was one of those rare individuals of whom I think we can justly be proud. Without saying much more, I would like to say that on behalf of my Party we associate ourselves with the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the House and hope that this Resolution, which is a token of our sympathy, will go a long way in allaying that grief which his widow and children will be called upon to bear. I have much pleasure, although it is not a pleasure in the strictest sense, in seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution and that a letter be sent to the relatives of the deceased expressing the contents of this Resolution passed in this House today.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my Party I, too, associate myself with the remarks which have been made here today with regard to the passing of Mr. Blackman. The late Mr. Blackman was one of those conscientious and hard-working Civil Servants. I can remember him working as a Clerk at District "F" Police Station and at the time I was a boy going to school. I can well remember when Mr. Blackman used to live just underneath the Police Station in Parks House. We did not have any motor cars in those days; in fact, Mr. Blackman was not able to buy one; he had to use a pony. From then on I knew Mr. Blackman and he worked very hard and conscientiously in the Post Office. As one hon. member has said, he rose to the height

of Acting Colonial Postmaster on more than one occasion. I use the words that Mr. Blackman was very honest, because inasmuch as he was never able to catch the eyes of the authorities who were responsible for appointing him as Colonial Postmaster, he still acted honestly in that post and that never encouraged him to falter for one moment. He worked up to the end and then he also became a politician. In that capacity he also worked conscientiously on the side of his people. I know, Sir, that it is very hard to find people with the calibre of Mr. Blackman. There are some people who would have faltered and who would even have tried to refuse to act as Colonial Postmaster after it was not seen fit to appoint them as Colonial Postmaster. Up to that time I have known the late Mr. Blackman to be very honest and intelligent in all that he went to do. I sincerely hope that his family will, at all times, be able to walk in his footsteps as far as honesty is concerned. I know that he was a very honest father to his children. With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish that he will rest in peace.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the late Mr. Blackman, whom we are eulogising today, was a Victorian in every sense of the word. He was born in Barbados at the time when the Victorian era of individualism was paramount, and he exhibited the life he had of that era in which he was born. He was sensible enough to see that changes were coming about and he aligned himself with the new changes. It was a very happy sign to see that a man who was real Victorian had found himself associated with the new progressive elements which came along during his lifetime. He had the privilege of living a long life and of seeing many changes in this island. He made his contribution. Unfortunately, when he came to this Chamber, he came here at the evening of his days when he could only reflect that in which he believed. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Civil Servants had not been released until they were 65 years old, and in these tropical climates it is unfortunate to ask a human being to exhibit any strength intellectually or physically or any strong intellectual or physical power for the purpose of prompting the cause in which he believed.

The late Mr. Blackman did what he could in the evening of his days to the best of his ability. He associated himself with the progressive elements which existed at the time. It was fortunate indeed that we could find a man who was sensible enough to realise that the progressive forces were the best for the community. Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in associating myself with the sentiments of those who have seen in Mr. Blackman something which the Civil Servants in the future can admire.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am privileged to associate myself with the tributes which have been paid to the late Hugh Duncan Blackman with whom I had the pleasure to be associated as a Member of this Chamber during his complete tenure of Membership in this House as an hon. member for the parish of St. John. Mr. Blackman was one of the Victorian type, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, a man of great personal charm and a speaker of great conciseness, yet with all great lucidity. I would not say, "Would that more were like Mr. Blackman," but I would say that the late Mr. Blackman made his contribution in this House, as he made it in the Public Service, before he became a Member of this House. My only source of concern is on account of my complete inability to have been present last Sunday afternoon when he was interred. I will ask hon. members to rise for two minutes in order to indicate their concurrence in the passing of the Resolution which has been moved by the Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. members stood in their places for two minutes at the request of His Honour the SPEAKER.
12.55 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will direct that a letter be written to the relatives of the late Hugh Duncan Blackman in accordance with the Resolution which was unanimously passed.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Your Honour will recall that one the last occasion when we met, Government had ready

almost all the outstanding Replies to Questions which had been tabled by hon. members during the Session. Unfortunately a few hon. members were not present, and one or two who were present absented themselves during Question Time, and therefore the Replies were not given. I propose, Sir, to deal with those Replies first to get them out of the way, in view of the fact that one never knows when hon. members who have asked them may not give us the pleasure of their company during the sitting.

I therefore beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MILK SUPPLY TO PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 40 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter whom, I observe, is not in his place.

DISSATISFACTION AT DEEP WATER HARBOUR

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 69 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:- To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is it a fact that grave dissatisfaction exists among the Staff at the Deep Water Harbour, due to alleged delay in making the appointments necessary for the complete establishment of the Port?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"There was some delay in filling a number of posts on the establishment of the Port Department, and it is possible that some dissatisfaction may have been held by employees who were holding such posts on a temporary basis."

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member.

DEDUCTIONS FROM TAXABLE INCOME

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 86 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:- To enquire of the Premier and Minister of Finance:

Is Government aware that the Income Tax Act of Barbados does not authorise or permit deductions from the taxable Income of a taxpayer of payments made for alimony or maintenance under an Order of a Court of competent jurisdiction?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Government introduce amending legislation as a matter of urgency to permit such deductions to be made?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"The Government is aware that the Income Tax Act, 1921-6 does not specifically provide for deductions in respect of alimony or maintenance payments under an Order of Court of competent jurisdiction.

2. There is no urgency to introduce amending legislation as it is established revenue practice to allow such deductions."

If the hon. member would like the second paragraph read again, it is as follows:-

"There is no urgency to introduce amending legislation as it is established revenue practice to allow such deductions."

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is the hon. member aware that there are a number of persons who do not benefit by this practice?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: My information, Sir, is that the practice is to allow the full separation payments. The hon. member enquired whether the Government was aware that the Income Tax Act does not authorise or permit deductions from the taxable income of a taxpayer or payments made for alimony.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is Question Time an occasion for debating the relevancy of the question or is it for answers to be given to questions?

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the Leader of the House is answering a supplementary question, and is clarifying his answer.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: This is Question Time and the hon. member is entitled to ask supplementary questions, and therefore I am entitled to answer him, and I answer him the way I think best.

Mr. WALCOTT: Nobody is entitled to read the question over. The hon. member asked a question to which a reply was given. Why should he waste time reading it again. We do not debate questions.

Mr. SPEAKER: In answering the supplementary question, I understand that the Leader of the House is clarifying his original answer which apparently, in his view, is not sufficiently clear to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. 1.05 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not like the remarks made. I have never appealed to anybody to define anything for me, Mr. Speaker. I am entitled to ask three supplementary questions, and I am going to ask all three of them. I do not want anybody to interpret what I understand or what I do not understand. My supplementary is quite a clear question. If my supplementary question was out of order, I think that Your Honour would have ruled it out of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, what I said was that the Minister's reading over of the answer was a waste of time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Leader proceed to answer the supplementary question.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: So far as I understand, we have only one Speaker and I am prepared to follow that one.

The position is this. The Hon. senior member for the City enquired whether it was the practice to make these deductions and I am telling him that it is the practice to have them deducted.

(Loud Asides by the hon. senior member for St. Peter.)

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. senior member for St. Peter not to let his sotto voce remarks be so audible.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. senior member for the City also asked if there were occasions when these deductions are not allowed and I am telling him that I do not know of any of those occasions.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is the Hon. Minister saying that there were not such occasions?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member asked if I were aware.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I asked if Government was aware.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member asked if Government was aware that there are occasions when these deductions are not allowed and I am repeating what I said that it is the practice to make these deductions. It is the practice to allow these deductions. If the hon. member can give us cases in which there are not occasions, then, he can say.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister in his reply said that it is not within their knowledge, and it is the custom to make these deductions. I ask the Hon. Minister if he is aware that the Income Tax Commissioner sticks rigidly as far as possible to the law which does not allow him to do this, and for which no Government can authorise him to observe the law in the breach.

Mr. WALCOTT: Is that a question? The hon. member is arguing that the law does not allow the Income Tax Commissioner to do this.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The position is that that is not my information. The Reply is to the contrary. It specifically states that it is established revenue practice to allow these deductions, and it was felt by the legal advisers to the Government that since it was established practice, there is no need to make it legal.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like this question to be deferred until a later date.

Mr. SPEAKER: That cannot be allowed.

DISSATISFACTION AMONG PARENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next is Question 14 which stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:

Is Government aware of the widespread dissatisfaction existing among the parents who have to contribute through direct and indirect taxation to the free Secondary Education and school meals, and yet have to pay for their children fully to be educated at other private schools?

2. Will the Minister state if it is the intention of his Government to help those children along the same line as those children who are enjoying free education at the Government-aided schools; and if not, why not?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:-

"The Government is not aware of there being widespread dissatisfaction in this matter. Government has assisted approved Private Schools by exempting educational apparatus and material from duty and by offering private school teachers opportunities to take suitable training courses, Government has decided to establish a system of refunds of fees to successful examinees of private schools.

2. Yes Sir; it is Government's intention to help these children along the same lines as those enjoying free education at Government Secondary Schools, first, by increasing the number and facilities at these schools maintained and aided by Government; secondly, by establishing schools directed towards the needs of the community, whose curricula will include craft and other vocational subjects; thirdly, by continuing to afford to the private schools the concessions they now enjoy, including exemption from duty for educational material and the provision of induction or other training courses open to their teachers; finally, by continuing its efforts to reach agreement with the representatives of those schools in order to relieve the burden on parents of children attending the private schools, while ensuring that each child has the opportunity to benefit from the kind of instruction for which he shows the greatest aptitude."

Mr. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

INADEQUACY OF FENDER PROTECTION AT DEEP WATER HARBOUR

Mr. SPEAKER: The next is Question 16 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church.

Mr. GODDARD: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:

1. Is Government aware that large ships of the ore-carrying type have lodged complaints re the inadequacy of fender protection at the Deep Water Harbour?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is in the affirmative, will Government investigate the said complaints with a view to remedying the same as soon as possible?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The Replies are as follows:-

"(1) Yes, Sir.

(2) Steps are being taken to improve the fendering at the Bridgetown Harbour."

Mr. GODDARD: Can the Minister state what steps are being taken, and how soon?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member will be pleased to learn that the Government has approved the proposal for a two-year proposal for fendering and for which provision is made in the Estimates for 1964-65 in the sum of \$6,200.

Mr. GODDARD: I thank the Hon. Minister for that answer.

QUESTION re STATEMENT THAT CIVIL SERVANTS SHOULD GO HOME

Mr. SPEAKER: The next is Question 121, standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Hon. Premier:

Has the Hon. Premier anything to add to his statement in the House that at least five Civil Servants should have gone home in connection with the award of a Government contract?

2. Will the Premier state the Ministry concerned, and if the contract was awarded with the approval of the Minister?

3. Will the Premier state why, in his opinion, the Civil Servants should have "gone home"?
1.15 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Reply to the hon. member's Question is as follows:-

1. I have further to state the background to the statement to which the Honourable Member refers and which was made in the course of a debate on the 12th day of March, 1963.

On the 11th day of November, 1961, the Department of Education invited tenders for the supply of fresh cows' milk to the primary and secondary schools in this island.

Tenders were to reach the Ministry of Education not later than Saturday 20th January, 1962.

On the 22nd January, 1962, a tender for "milk similar to cows' milk" was received from Miller Bros. Electrical Works, Tudor Street.

Four other tenders were received for the supply of fresh cows' milk.

The Tenders Committee never met to consider these tenders, but it was recommended by members of the Ministry's staff that Miller Bros. be awarded a contract to supply eighteen schools in St. Michael with this product and that four other applicants be awarded contracts to supply fresh milk to a total of eight schools in various parts of the country.

2. The Minister of Education formally approved the recommendation which had been individually endorsed by members of the Tenders Committee. It was not however demonstrated at that time to the Minister that the tenders had not been opened in the presence of the Tenders Com-

mittee or that any tender had been received after the closing date.

3. I have since discovered that the procedures carried out on this occasion had become standard practice prior to the assumption of office of this Government and indeed in one case a tender had been opened as early as four weeks before the closing date.

4. In view of the acceptance by the last Government of these procedures I do not consider it in the public interest that any action should be taken against the officers concerned.

I have given instructions that all tenders must be opened in the presence of all member of the Tenders Committee that no tender received after the closing date should be accepted for consideration, and that in all cases where the Tenders Committee may be disposed to accept a product different in nature and quality from that specified in Government Notices, that fresh notices should be issued in the Press inviting tenders for such supplies.

Mr. SMITH: I thank the hon. member for his Reply. *(Laughter).*

PLAYING FIELD FOR ST. PETER FROM
LABOUR WELFARE FUND

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Question ready to be dealt with is Question No. 123, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. WALCOTT: To enquire of the Minister of Social Services:

1. Is the Minister aware that the residents of the parish of St. Peter have not yet been given a playing-field or social centre from funds allocated from the Labour Welfare Fund?

2. Will the Minister state the reasons for this unreasonably long delay?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The Reply to the hon. member's question is as follows:-

1. Yes.

2. There has been considerable difficulty in finding a suitable site in the parish of St. Peter. However efforts are being continued.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, as a Supplementary Question: Is the Hon. Minister in a position today to state what those efforts have revealed?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In the first case, a site was selected which, in the opinion of the Town and Country Planning Officers, was not the best site and which the owners were not willing to release at the time; but they have recommended another site which, in the opinion of the Ministry was unsuitable because it was not in the parish of St. Peter at all; it was on the border of St. Lucy and the idea was to provide a playing-field for the parish of St. Peter. Subsequently, the Town and Country Planning Officer has assumed to take the matter into his own hands and he has recommended a site which I have to visit tomorrow.

Mr. WALCOTT: As a further supplementary: Is the Hon. Minister prepared that this site recommended by the Town and Country Planning Officer, be made known to persons other than the Ministry for their comments or approval?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. When visits are made to these sites, all parties concerned, including the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Communications, Works and Housing are brought in, so that the opinion of all the authorities would be given during the visit.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thank the Hon. Minister.

QUESTION TO BE EXPUNGED FROM THE
ORDER PAPER

Mr. SPEAKER: In respect of the next Question, Question No. 158, standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, even if Government's Reply is ready, in view of the Ruling which I have given, as recently as last week, it is my view that this Question is not in order, therefore even, if the answer has been laid, I am not permitting the hon. member to put that question. I therefore direct that it be expunged from the Order Paper.

DAMAGE TO VIOLA FARMER'S HOUSE BY
HURRICANE "FLORA"

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Question ready to be dealt with is Question No. 161, standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:

Has it been drawn to the Minister's attention that the house of Viola Farmer of St. Bernards Village, St. Joseph has been extensively damaged by the hurricane "Flora" that passed the Island last year?

2. Is the Minister aware that, inasmuch as she is not in a financial position to make the house habitable again, she is forced to live in circumstances that are inadequate?

3. Is it the intention of Government to come to the assistance of the several poor of the Island whose homes have been damaged by the same hurricane?

4. If the answer to question three (3) is in the affirmative, will the Minister instruct the Manager of the Housing Authority, or the other appropriate authority or authorities, to replace Viola Farmer's home, and also to go to the assistance of the others who were struck by the same hurricane and are in need of help?
1.25 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"The Minister has been informed that Viola Farmer's house was blown from its groundsel by high winds on the night of 24th September, 1963, but that it was beyond repair before it fell.

2. No Sir.

3. It has been decided to effect repairs to those houses damaged by high winds on the night of 24th September, 1963, which were at the time occupied by their owners provided that repairs have not yet been effected and that a claim has already been submitted.

4. The Housing Authority has been requested to repair those houses which qualify under paragraph 3 above."

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I could not understand the Minister too clearly since he replied a little too quickly. I should however like to inquire whether it is the intention of Government not to help Viola Farmer. Is that what he means to say?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: What I said, was that the Government had decided to effect repairs to those houses damaged by high winds on the night of 24th September, 1963, which were at the time occupied by their owners, provided that repairs had not yet been effected and that a claim had already been submitted. Therefore, Sir, providing that Viola Farmer's case qualifies under these provisions, the house will be repaired.

Mr. SMITH: Is the Minister in a position to tell me if Viola Farmer was occupying the House at the time?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member himself tabled this question about Viola Farmer, and the Government assumed that he had information with regard to whether or not she lived in the house and whether or not it was occupied at the time of the storm.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister said the Government is going to help those people who were occupying the house at the time. I wanted to know from the Minister if Viola Farmer's house was occupied at the time, I know.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If the hon. member knows where she was, so does the Government. *(Laughter)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 170 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter who is not in his place.

I understand those are all the answers which have been laid and which are ready to hon. members' Oral Questions; therefore Question Time may be deemed to be concluded. Will the Hon. Leader of the House intimate what next he proposes to do?

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House; to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the House while in Committee to deal with the money Resolution for \$1,275 of which notice was given today, and of which I informed hon. members it was our intention to request their permission to deal with during today's sitting.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1963-64 No. 52

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, before I go on with the Resolution, I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that there is a slight error in an item, and when we get there we will ask to change the figure \$1,739 to \$1,759. In consequence the total amount for which we are asking will be \$177,238 instead of \$177,218. When we get to that item we will make the amendment then.

Head 1 - Governor - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 1 - Governor - stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 10 - Accountant General - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 10 - Accountant General - stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 11 - Pensions - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 11 - Pensions - stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 12 - Charges of Debt - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 12 - Charges of Debt - stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

1.35 p.m.

HEAD 13 - CUSTOMS

Head 13 - Customs - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Head 13 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 17 - Premier - Home Affairs

Head 17 - Premier - Home Affairs - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Head 17 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 18 - POLICE

Head 18 - Police - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Head 18 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 24 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, LANDS AND FISHERIES

Head 24 - Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, as I explained earlier, I wish to make an amendment to Item 108, Refrigerating Plant. The amount to be voted should be \$1,759 instead of \$1,739. With that amendment, I beg to move that Head 24 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 25 - MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND HOUSING

Head 25 - Ministry of Communications, Works and Housing - was called.

2149

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Head 25 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 27 — PUBLIC WORKS

Head 27 — Public Works — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Head 27 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 33 — CIVIL AVIATION

Head 33 — Civil Aviation — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Head 33 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 36 — MINISTRY OF EDUCATION ERDISTON COLLEGE

Head 36 — Ministry of Education — Erdiston College — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Head 36 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 39 - MEDICAL (3) MENTAL HOSPITAL

Head 39 — Medical (3) Mental Hospital — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Head 39 Medical (3) stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 39 - MEDICAL (5) DISTRICT HOSPITAL SERVICES

Head 39 — Medical (5) District Hospital Services — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Head 39 (Medical) (5) stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 45 - LABOUR

Head 45 — Labour — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Head 45 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution as amended for the sum of \$77,238 do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1963-64 No. 53

TEACHER TRAINING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this Resolution which has been circulated today for the sum of \$1,275 is to supplement Head 35, Ministry of Education, Item 33, Teacher Training. Hon. members will notice that the sum of \$77,312 was voted in the current financial year for the purpose of Teacher Training. However, it has been found necessary to supplement this amount due to the fact that before the current academic year began, the Ministry had to introduce an expanded induction course for young teachers. I may say at this point that it was not only designed for young teachers entering the Government Service, but it also provided facilities for the training of teachers from Private Secondary Schools, and in consequence of that, there was a large number of applicants for this course. Consequently, the facilities for carrying it out had to be expanded and to make provision for this, it was necessary that the original vote be supplemented.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statement made by the Hon. Minister of Education, but there are one or two things which I would like to get clear. I would like to know if this Teacher Training Course is carried out at Erdiston, or if it is for the vocational Teachers Training Course. I want to know if this is for the Certificate "B" training course carried on at Erdiston, and, as the Hon. Minister has said that greater advantage has been taken of this course by teachers of Private Secondary Schools than was anticipated, I want to know if these teachers from Private Secondary Schools have the same facilities offered to them as those from Government schools. I know that the teachers from Primary and other Government schools are paid salaries, and that an amount from that is deducted for their board and lodging, and so on, I want to know what is the position with those teachers from Private Secondary Schools as approved by the Ministry of Education as regards to if they have to pay for their upkeep or if they are allowed that free. I want that position made clear to me so that I can explain it. I was not able to get the Hon. Minister when I was apprised of the point.

Of course, Sir, I do not expect you to pay salaries to those teachers from Private Secondary Schools whom you approve of, I say those 'whom you approve of' because I do know that there are certain teachers of those schools who could not benefit from this course because they have not got the foundation to benefit from it; but to those whom you approve of, I wonder if you have thought of giving them their ration or board.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I must explain the position to the hon. member. Certificate "B" course is the qualifying examination for entry into Erdiston College. In other words, you cannot get into Erdiston College to do professional training unless you have Certificate "B", except in the rare case of experienced teachers who go for the one-year course; and even with those experienced teachers, you would find that they were graduates of the old Rawle Training Institute.

The classes which we put on for Certificate "B" are free.
1.45 p.m.

As a matter of fact, last August, or September, we found that there was such a wide demand not only for people wanting to enter the Government schools but also teachers who wanted to take courses, that we held classes for three Saturdays. The former Minister of Education gave us of his assistance and he has been very successful, as a Teacher himself, in bringing things up-to-date. We cannot pay him too much tribute in this respect.

In respect of non-Certificate "B" people, — these are very young people who have just left school and who manifest an interest in teaching — we thought it proper, before we let them loose on the schools, to give them a two months' or three months' course in teaching methods, and then, in another few weeks, to let them observe teaching methods in a school before they are actually appointed as Relief or Supernumerary Teachers. The answer to the hon. member's question is therefore that there is no question of allowance arising in the case of people who pass Certificate "B" Examination. That only arises if they show a desire to enter Erdiston, and I believe that Teachers from the Schools would apply for entry into Erdiston on the strength of the Certificate which they now have. When they enter Erdiston, whatever is customary for people even for the one-year course, even if they do not want to live in, I would recommend to the Cabinet that the same provisions should hold good for them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the hon. member. This is a course which is offered during the vacation.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: And, of course, on afternoons after school.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I further thank the hon. member for the hint which he has given. I think it will meet with great appreciation from the Heads of the number of Private Schools, that the Minister will recommend to the Cabinet, that similar treatment be given to teachers from these Schools, teachers who have taken this Certificate "B" and who desire to enter Erdiston. The Hon. Minister will recommend the same service for these teachers as if they were in the Public Service at Government Schools.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1963-64 No. 55

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Hon. members would have before them now the third Resolution which was circulated a short time ago. This Resolution is for the purpose of providing additional sums for expenditure incurred with regard to the supply of electricity for traffic lights. If hon. members would read the Addendum to the Resolution, they will see that as from August, 1963, the Barbados Light and Power Company Limited increased their charges which came into effect for the consumption of electricity by the then existing fifty banks of traffic lights and by the filter lights and pedestrian crossing lights. Furthermore, additional traffic lights came into operation in December, 1963, at the Marhill Street and Bridge Street junctions and this entails an addition of nine banks and eight pedestrian crossing lights. The additional provision, which is required to pay for the supply of electricity in respect of these additional installations, is \$1,200. This provision is found to be necessary to meet expenditure up to the end of the current financial year. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that any of us will offer any objections to this Resolution, but there are one or two things which hon. members would like to know about the supply of this electricity. I would like to know, and it is my business to know as well as the business of other hon. members, how these charges are being made by the Barbados Light and Power Company to the Government for these lights. We want to know about this matter and I hope that the Hon. Minister has these figures there.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Would the hon. member repeat his question?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am asking how are these charges made; that is to say, how much is the cost per unit, whether it is five cents, seven cents, twelve cents or what. There cannot be anything secret about the matter, and I am sure that the Government will give us this information. As the Central Government and Local Government are big consumers of electricity, I feel that we should have some reduction in the charges. We have a responsibility to the community and that is why I am asking these questions. We are now dealing with the Barbados Light and Power Company Limited in this matter. We feel that, as large consumers, we should have some sort of concession, so to speak. It is a question of business. If you are a big consumer, as hon. members will know, you will get a better concession than if you are a small dealer. The Addendum to this Resolution says this:

"As from August, 1963, increased charges came into effect for the consumption of electricity by the then existing 50 banks of traffic lights and the filter lights and pedestrian crossing lights. Furthermore, additional traffic lights came into operation in December, 1963, at the Marhill Street and Bridge Street junctions and this entails an addition of 9 banks and 8 pedestrian crossing lights....."

You are telling us that the Barbados Light and Power Company Limited have begun to charge you more for electric current from August, 1963, and, furthermore, that additional traffic lights came into operation in December, 1963. All I want to know is about this matter of charging you more. I believe that I am expressing the view of every hon. member of this House. We do not remember that we were charged more for electricity from August, 1963. The Addendum says that, as from August, 1963, increased charges came into effect for the consumption of electricity, 1.55 p.m.

Why is it that in August, 1963, you had increased charges? In other words, if you were paying 6 cents, you had to pay 7 cents. We appreciate that you have more traffic lights, more crossings and so on, but we should like to know what you were paying in relation to what you are paying now. You have an additional nine banks and 8 pedestrian crossing lights, and you must expect that your lighting bill would be more. The Addendum states from August, 1963, increased charges came into effect for the consumption of electricity. That only means that you were charged more per unit, and the note seems wrong. Whether or not the note is wrong, I want the Minister to tell me what they are paying now and what they paid before the increased charges came into force. Every backbencher wants to know this for reasons, because we are fighting this to the bitter end.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, sometimes free enterprise collide with their own minds, and whether or not you like it, there are certain basic things in a community which should not be in the hands of free enterprise; but those who live in this community and carry on a conspiracy of silence on certain basic issues will sooner or later find themselves colliding with these vital principles. They want to harrow the Government into answering these questions which you have had today, because they are not dealing with fundamentals. If they were dealing with fundamentals a long time ago, the hon. member would not have to ask such questions today; but he cannot have it both ways. You cannot have one hand with the Conservative and put the other in the hands of the Socialists. The hon. member is now projecting a Socialist concept.

Mr. Chairman, Light and Power should be in the hands of the nation; but if you want to please those whom you serve, you will not allow light and power to remain in the hands of people who control the vital energy of any community. Why should electricity in Barbados be in the hands of private people. The incompetence of Governments we have had in the past, and the collusion we had with politicians parading this country with the idea that private enterprise was the best thing in human life, have caused light and power and telephones to be still in the hands of private people, and I will show when I come to deal with the Es-

timates what the Telephone Trust Company paid in Great Britain, what dividends they distributed and what they said about these companies. As long as we have these political inequalities existing in our own community, we are going to have this, because a conspiracy of silence produces this and will continue to produce it.

I am not worried about the price of light; I am dealing with traffic.

Despite what others have said in the past, traffic lights have come to stay, and the question of traffic in relation to its industrial importance is something we have to watch. The country is growing, traffic jams are growing and bottle necks are taking place which are likely to impede economic progress. For that reason I should like to draw Government's attention to some of these things. I do not question the wisdom of the persons concerned to put a light by Marhill Street and one at the junction of Bridge Street, but it does seem to me that they have two lights so close to each other that they should be able to devise a controlling light when you come across Marhill Street that would control the junction of Marhill Street and the one over the Bridge. In the United States and big countries where lights have been installed, if they had to put down lights on the basis or in the radius in which we put them down in Barbados, you can very well imagine what would happen in a place like New York; they would pay millions and millions of dollars for light. In laying out plans for these lights, some thought should be given to the system, because when you enter Marhill Street, Mr. Chairman, you can see the Bridge; so there is no point in erecting two lights where, at a point, you can see both. The only problem is that you would have to devise a different system for the light which gives a crossing on the other side, because there are two corners. I have visited places and have found that there are many of these intersections where there are six lanes, as in New York, for instance, and there are lights at the same point working for two different sections. Only last week I was in New York, and when you drive on the Eastern Park Way, there are so many corners going to various parts; but lights control them. I feel that the Government or authorities concerned should investigate the matter.

Mr. Chairman, I have raised this question about traffic going along the Wharf, and I feel the time has come when a proper examination should be given to that matter; otherwise sooner or later we are going to find ourselves landed with a bus load of people in the Careenage, and people will get wise after the event. The Police Department is doing a good job, and I think the public should know this. In the various roads which you have named around the Deep Water Harbour, I should like to see you make some break. There is no point in having a school on one side of Richmond, and because it is treated like a highway, motor cars come careening down without any thought for people and school children. I have seen in the United States of America where policemen or girl guides help hundreds of school children, and I should like to see other lights or some other traffic control to break the traffic running along these roads, because there is a conception among drivers and people in Barbados that as long as you are driving on a street which they regard as a major road, and you have through traffic, there is no limit to how you drive, and if anything comes across your vision, that is wrong. Near the Bus Stand, for example, sometimes people find it difficult to cross, and something should be done about the traffic; otherwise people have to wait for very long periods. I should like to see, in addition to the compliment which I paid to having lights at certain junctions, that you stop these jams. It is true it is only for an hour sometimes on evenings, but I do find in the middle of the day that traffic is jammed up in the City, and I would like to see something done about swinging the Bridge. We cannot carry on this old horse-and-buggy concept of having a man with a wheel in hand swinging the Bridge at midday or at some time when it holds up the traffic. This is the only point of coming in from south to north or vice versa, and when the Bridge is closed at 12 o'clock midday, an unnecessary delay is caused. I say that, Mr. Chairman, because in my own industrial experience some employers take it unkindly when people report for work late after lunch. Sometimes these things can be made as excuses and sometimes they are exploited, but sometimes

they cost people their jobs. I should therefore like to see a better system introduced.

Mr. Chairman, I would join forces with the hon. member if he would be prepared to state that the time has come when it should be brought home forcibly that these power companies should be brought under public control.
2.05 p.m.

I am satisfied that taking up men and putting them on Boards does not really answer the question. There are some people who want to get rich quickly and at the expense of the public. I have found out in some of these utility companies that the prices are going up, but the expansion of them is not taking place as rapidly as the prices are going up. May be it would be a good thing if these companies would come face to face with reality, and I think the course this company is adopting is a good thing to bring people to their senses. You will find that in some countries what a public utility is handling is what the Mayor would be handling. However, you cannot have it both ways.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, there are still many of us who believe in free enterprise and you do not have to look too far to see the reason why. You do not have to go to America and, as a matter of fact, many of the power companies in America are still in the hands of free enterprise. Go to St. Lucia and St. Vincent and see if you can telephone your next door neighbor - and the Government of those countries are running the service! You can say that you have a reasonably good service in Barbados. In St. Lucia and St. Vincent, one of the reasons for no development and no progress is that there is lack of communications. You will find that the Governments own the service there, and I am sure that they will have to hand it over to people who can help them run it. (A VOICE: The Government took over the service in Trinidad) Yes, that is so. The Government took it over about two years ago and now there is a long waiting list. Anyhow, we, of the Conservative Party, still feel that it is our duty, whenever possible, to let public utilities do the needy services and that is why we actually recommended a Public Utilities Board. There is no doubt about it that the owners of the present Electric Company are experts in the running of power companies. It is a Canadian Company and the management is in a better position than we in Barbados, or the Government, to run it. That is my view.

Public utilities lend themselves to Government ownership. A public utility is the first thing which the Government should pay attention to if they have the money; but this Government will be well advised to leave alone these public utilities and use its funds in other directions. We are borrowing money in London today at the rate of 6 1/2 at 95. That is to say, for every £95 which are put up, the Government has to pay back £100 at the rate of 6 1/2% and that is a big charge on the Government. That is the cost of money today, and you are thinking of taking over a multi-million dollar project in these days. It would be a good thing, the day that we come to the position where we have sufficient engineers and people with the technical know-how and we have the money to take them over. Anyhow, that is by the way.

My colleague asked a reasonable question. The Addendum states that as from August, 1963, increased charges came into effect for the consumption of electricity. We did not know that. The Addendum went on to state that furthermore, additional traffic lights came into operation in December, 1963. That emphasises the fact that there must have been a change in the rate and that is why we question that. We have asked that question in the interest of the community -- not of the Electric Company. We are realists. We would not want the Government to take over something which is successfully run. I would resist the attempt of Socialism just to have the Government take over enterprises which are well run just for the name of Government control. We have seen what has happened in those countries that have attempted it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not know what the hon. senior member for St. Peter means by that remark, because in my 18 years in this Assembly, I have succeeded in remain-

ing in here by my outspokenness, I think anybody who wants to be honest would say that you commend people who say that you should go in for free enterprise, but you do not want free enterprise to exploit you. All that we are saying is that it does not matter if you are a Canadian, Englishman or whatever you are; we believe in free enterprise; and because you have free enterprise, you have a responsibility. As the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said, it was the Party to which I belong which suggested that you should have a Public Utilities Board, because that was a means of coming in between the Company and the public to say what was reasonable. There is nothing which comes from conflict with conscience. I have never been afraid to say what I believe. I have never been afraid to say to people, whether they are wealthy or not, what I believe. I have said to the Electric Company that as far as we are concerned, if we are large consumers of electricity, we are entitled to a better price; and if we continue to be the largest consumers, we are entitled to a better price still.

Sir, there is nothing to make me find out what they are charging the Government for electricity. When you give somebody a monopoly in a country, that is all right; but I say that they should be controlled. If we are using your electricity, we ought to be given a better price; and if I had the Government to run, I would say that to them I would say that, Government being the biggest consumers, they should have a better price.

Sir, I do not know who wrote the Addendum, but it is stated that as from August, 1963, increased charges came into effect for the consumption of electricity by the then existing 50 banks of traffic lights and by the filter lights and pedestrian crossing lights.

I did not know that. That is something which the Hon. Minister must tell us first. If that is so, what were the charges before and what are the charges now? Whatever the charges are now, so long as we have more lights, we must expect to pay more money. How it is that this came into effect since August, 1963 and we are now knowing something about it? In other words, am I to believe that you were charged only, say, a small price that they could increase their charge to Government without objection? I am sure that the Government would have objected. At present you are using lights for street crossing and we of the City Council, are using lights for the purpose of illuminating the City, and so are the Districts Councils of the North and South.
2.15 p.m.

I hope that the hon. member will tell us. Nothing comes in conflict with my conscience as the hon. senior member for St. Peter may think. I am satisfied to know that not every company should be run as a private enterprise. Let this be made straight; we have never said that every possible public utility company should be run privately. What idiot today would consider that water should be run privately? He could not be in a party with me if he thought so, but we feel that you could run some services privately. We feel so because we have proved it. We see that other people are making money while you are throwing away money. When the British Government wanted to find somebody to run B.O.A.C., they looked for a man in the top bracket, a private enterprise man from the Morris Company. Never could we ever attempt to think that every possible utility should be run by the Government. We have never said so, and there are other people in this world who feel like me.

I am glad to see that the hon. senior member for St. Peter has returned to his seat. There is nothing in conflict with my conscience, I repeat; I have always felt that some things should be run by the Government. The hon. member has his views and I have my views. I do not stand alone in my view, neither does the hon. member stand alone in his view. I am going to sit down, however, and let the Hon. Minister reply. I am asking about August, 1963, when these rates went up.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, what I want to say to the hon. junior member for Christ Church in relation to the point which I made is this: I do not know where they got this bogus idea from, that when I said something could

be operated by the State, that presupposes that you will employ a carpenter or a mason to be an electrical engineer; or because something is State-owned you will take a Minister and make him the Managing Director of the business. The companies do not make their engineers; they employ the engineers and they work for them. The hon. junior member for Christ Church should know that one of the greatest national inventions in this world is that of the Tennessee Valley Authority in the United States of America. They have done something to the Tennessee Valley River which no private person could have done.

The hon. member is bringing forward the examples of St. Lucia and St. Vincent, but Trinidad has been running electricity further afield than Barbados. As a matter of fact, in Barbados you have not got electricity down in Belleplaine and the Electric Company has been here since 1906 — a period of nearly 60 years. You cannot have industrial development in a country without power, and electric power is one of the things on which the industrialists depend. The hon. member should not have cited St. Vincent or Trinidad. The hon. member is a member of a firm which has just gone to St. Vincent and they have taken over from private people. I do not want to cast any slur against anybody, but in these communities they have not yet produced the number of people who would man all of the forces which they need for progressive societies. For some reason or other we are in that position too. I do not subscribe to the idea that everybody can run a business just because he has two eyes in his head. As I say, Sir, the hon. member is a member of a firm which has taken over a business which was a private concern; therefore, do not let us believe that all the idiots are in the Government. There are those who have never been in a Government and who cannot run any business.

I do not believe that every business in a community must be publicly owned and run by the Government. It might not always be possible or expedient for you to undertake in any given circumstances the running of a business as against what you could do and what other people could do. I was not at all suggesting that today or tomorrow it is the business of the Government to take over the electric supply; I was only indicating to hon. members the fact that these things are not within your control and you are faced with these problems. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is the Mayor of the City, and he realises that the electrification of the City of Bridgetown is necessary. I would like to have an analysis made of the quantity of electricity used by the local authorities, the City Council and the Government and see what it represents of the total income of the Company in order for us to determine if that is in truth and in fact not a company which is drawing a heavy revenue out of the public purse.

What the hon. junior member for the City has done in Bridgetown is bound to be caught up by others. He has given the City better lighting, and I agree with him, because a City which is properly illuminated leads to the resolving and easing of problems like theft, and so forth. Of course, there are those who do not like to have too many lights in small districts because these lights encourage people to gather around and make a lot of noise. I like to subscribe to the susceptibilities of other people because I like to be guided. (ASIDES) The hon. senior member for the city is not in the light.
2.25 p.m.

The hon. member said that because his home is not under the light, but it is a different thing when the light is shining down in somebody's bedroom; or when the old man wants to go to bed and boys are keeping noise, it is a different thing. If you can retire to the peace and quiet of your long gap, you can keep all the noise outside. Even in your house you can retire to peace and quiet and leave the noise; but I do not worry unduly about those persons who feel that way because they are in the minority.

On the question of lighting and electricity, you will find that the public in its totality and Local Government represent, so far as the Electric Corporation is concerned, a high proportion of the consumption of the Barbados Light and Power Company. It is the biggest single consumer, and

I am satisfied in my mind that when you begin to analyse these things, you pay out of the public purse in one way, and therefore there is no need to back-peddle on it, I am not dealing specifically with the questions the hon. member raised, but I raise this to show that there is room for examination of these public utilities, and I do not regard that being on a Public Utilities Board is the answer to these fundamental questions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should like to inform the Committee that the Committee did not get the approval of the Speaker of the House to debate the Resolution which is being debated now.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, when I asked that the instruction of the House while in Committee be to deal with one Resolution, I did not know then that we were going to be asked to deal with this one today. Hon. members will recall that copies were circulated when the House was already in Committee; so the matter can be rectified when the Speaker comes back to the Chair. I do not propose to reply at this stage, I think we should take the suspension, and therefore I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention that the Committee only had instructions from the House to deal with one Resolution in Committee of Supply, and then after we were in Committee, it was brought to my attention that there was another item which was a matter of urgency, and the Committee proceeded to deal with it although no instruction had been issued. I am therefore going to propose that the appropriate authority be now given before we move the passing of the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I would suggest to the Hon. Leader of the House is that he ask that it further be an instruction to the House while in Committee of Supply to consider this other Resolution as well.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that it further be an instruction to the House while in Committee of Supply to deal with the additional Resolution which was circulated today.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Automatically, when the Sitting which is now about to be suspended is resumed and the House goes back into Committee, it will be perfectly in order to continue to deal with this other Resolution, on which, I am afraid, a certain amount of discussion has already taken place when the House was in Committee.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for forty minutes.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

2.35 p.m.

On re-assembling,

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Prior to the suspension, the Hon. Leader of the House was about to address the Chair.

The question that the Resolution for the sum of \$1,200 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESUMPTION OF QUESTION TIME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before you go on further with Government Business, as Your Honour will recall, we are trying to dispose of the remaining questions on the Order Paper. The hon. junior member for St. Peter was not in his place when we were replying to Questions. He is now here and in so far as two questions asked by him - Nos. 40 and 170 - I think Sir, it would be a good thing for us to dispose of those questions now before we go to Government Business.

I, therefore, beg to move that Question Time be now resumed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COWS' MILK OFFERED TO PUPILS OF PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first is Question No. 40 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HUSBANDS: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that supplies of supposedly prepared warm fresh cow's milk offered to pupils of the Primary Schools are irregularly inspected and tested as to their hygienic preparation and chemical content?

2. Is Government aware that on several occasions pupils in these schools have refused to partake of such preparations when offered as a school meal?

3. Does Government realise the necessity of having frequent and regular tests made as to dietetic value of such milk?

4. If the answers to Nos. 1, 2 and 3 are in the affirmative, will Government see to it that regular and frequent inspections and tests are carried out at the premises where such supplies are prepared and/or at the schools where such meals are served?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:-

"No, Sir. Fresh cow's milk is no longer supplied to pupils of the Primary Schools. When it was so supplied, inspection and tests were regularly made.

2. No, Sir. Investigation and statistical examination carried out by the Ministry do not support the statement of the Honourable Member.

3. Government has always been aware of that necessity.

4. The attention of the Honourable Member is drawn to the replies given above."

Mr. HUSBANDS: Has the Hon. Minister stated that those inspections were made by officers of the Education Department?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I did not hear the hon. member.

Mr. HUSBANDS: In the Hon. Minister's reply, did he state that such inspections were made by officers of the Education Department or the Ministry of Education?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, no. What I said was that inspections and tests were regularly made.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Will the Hon. Minister state by whom were such inspections made, and, if so, were they regularly made?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Of course, I answered his question about being regularly made. I also said that when this commodity was supplied there was an obligation under the Food and Drug Adulteration Act for Medical Officers of Health as well as Government Officers, such as Sanitary Inspectors, to take samples of this commodity and that was done.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Is the Hon. Minister aware that tests of milk when it is boiled present a scientific difficulty? (*Laughter*).

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am indebted to the hon. member for letting me know that.

TOM BEND ROAD IN ST. PETER

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Question is No. 170 asked by the same hon. member.

Mr. HUSBANDS: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:-

Is the Minister aware that a tenantry road in the parish of St. Peter and known as Tom Bend Road stretching from lands of Headly to the Aston Reservoir was constructed since 1940?

2. Is the Minister aware that this road has been used as a public highway since 1940?

3. Is the Minister aware that this road has also been used as a feeder access road by peasants holding lands near and around this road?

4. Is the Minister aware that nearly all the residents in the vicinity of this road are complaining that one of their neighbours - Eleazor Turpin - is responsible for digging up a part of this road, approximately 27' x 13' removing, transporting therefrom a quantity of earth and stone, and depositing the same in nearby lands to form a semi-circular mound of 12 feet measured along the curve of its dome?

5. Is the Minister aware that such an excavation has made this road impassable to vehicular traffic to the inconvenience of the residents and peasant owners of this locality, and the general public?

6. Is the Minister aware that the said Eleazor Turpin of Tom Bend Road is claiming that he at no time did agree to dispose of, nor grant any necessary portion of his land running along Tom Bend Road to accommodate the Government and people of Barbados in order to build the Tom Bend Tenantry Road to any specified length and width?

7. Will the Minister cause an investigation to be made apropos of the foregoing questions?
3.30 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

1. Investigation has revealed that dispute over this road has occupied the attention of the Law Courts for a considerable number of years.

2. In the circumstances the disputants would be better advised to seek legal advice on the matter.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Will the Hon. Minister answer Question No. 2 or does the Minister think that he has answered that Question?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is enquiring whether the Hon. Minister thinks he has answered that Question.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I think that the Reply most accurately is applicable to Question No. 2. Since this matter has engaged the attention of the Law Courts for so long, I do not think that the hon. member is fair on behalf of either one side or the other to expect the Government to supply the answer.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Does the Hon. Minister think that this action which has been attributed to one of the residents in this area is of such public importance that some action on his part should be immediately forthcoming?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: This is a matter which, I submit, should be resolved in the Law Courts.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Does the Hon. Minister have any reason to doubt that this road was a *bona fide* tenantry road as *bona fide* tenancies have been constructed in Barbados?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: In so far as I can gather, that is one of the issues which the Law Courts have been asked to decide. (*Laughter*).

Mr. HUSBANDS: Does the Hon. Minister know the condition under which tenantry roads have been constructed in Barbados? If so, does the Minister think that the condition under which this road has been constructed is any deviation from the existing principles under which former tenantry roads have been constructed?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept that as a supplementary to the original Question asked by the hon. member. I am aware that Your Honour would not regard it as a Supplementary Question at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will remind the hon. member that when notice of this question was given through the First Clerk at the Table, I queried of him whether he could give an assurance that the subject-matter of this Question was not the subject of litigation; because it rang a bell in my ears when I heard the reference to it. It would rather appear as if that is very closely akin to the subject-matter of litigation at District "E" Magistrate's Court of which I have some professional knowledge from one side. But, of course, if the hon. member assures me that this is not the particular and identical portion of land which is the subject-matter of certain cases at District "E" Magistrate's Court, then I accept the hon. member's assurance unreservedly.

Mr. HUSBANDS: May I speak, not on the matter of a Supplementary Question now? In view of Your Honour reminding the House that at the time when this Question was asked it rang a bell in your ears, that it was the subject-matter of litigation in which you were interested, I can assure the hon. member that I am no Barrister-at-Law. I am the people's representative. When I entered this matter I was not told about any matter being under litigation. I was merely told of the public inconvenience of people of a particular area in my constituency.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I understand from the hon. member that he is one of the representatives of the people. I am sure we would like to know which one of his constituents he is representing in this particular manner.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, the language which has just been used by the Hon. Premier is not intelligible in this Assembly.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have merely asked which one of his constituents he is representing in this matter. I do not think that the hon. member's hearing is all that it used to be.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that you cannot allow that Question.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member has said that he is not aware that this matter was sub judice when he tabled the Question in this Assembly. I think that the hon. member should be informed that no less a person than the son of a former Premier of this country actually holds the papers in Court now for one side in this case. 3.40 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, that is of no interest to me; I am no lawyer's tout. That reference is quite rude and personal and impertinent to me, Sir.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Hon. Leader of the House is not suggesting that the hon. junior member for St. Peter was garnering evidence for any lawyer in the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: As there are no more supplementary questions and no other answers laid to Oral Questions, perhaps, we may proceed and resume Government Business.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now resumed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COUNCILS (VALUATION LISTS) (VALIDATION AND INDEMNITY) ACT, 1964

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to remove doubts about the dates of the coming into force of the first Valuation Lists for the rating areas of the City of Bridgetown and the Northern and Southern Districts and of the second valuation lists for the Northern and Southern Districts, to validate and confirm all acts, performed in good faith by persons in the belief that the said valuation lists had come into force and to indemnify such persons in respect of such acts.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of the Bill which is ascribed the Local Government Councils (Valuation Lists) (Validation and Indemnity) Bill, 1964.

The reasons for this submission, Sir, is that in 1959 a proclamation was not published in the *Official Gazette* stipulating the date on which the first valuation list under section 147 (1) of the Local Government Act of 1958 should come into force. The Act also provides by subsection (2) of section 147 that the second valuation lists should be prepared and come into force three years after the date of the coming into force of the first valuation lists. On preparation of the second valuation list, it was discovered that the proclamation necessary in case of the first valuation list had not been made, and therefore this Bill provides that the first valuation lists shall be deemed to have come into force on 1st April, 1959, and that the second valuation list shall be deemed to have come into force on the 1st April, 1962 in respect of the Northern District Council, and 1st April, 1963 in the case of the Southern District Council.

This Bill also seeks to validate and confirm all acts done in good faith by any person in the belief that such valuation lists had been apparently enacted.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking on this matter in the sense of the Bill, but I am taking this opportunity to speak on this aspect since it is now engaging the attention of people even in the United Kingdom. I was not one who submitted any memorandum or views to the Local Government Commissioner, but I feel that when it comes to laying rates, income tax and what not, — and I hope this comes out from the examination by Dr. Jackson — it is making a nonsense of 240,000 people in an economy like ours in having this situation in which a couple of hundred thousand dollars is subjected to the microscopic emasculation of the City Council and the Northern and Southern District Councils.

The biggest bit of nonsense that has been handed down from the Elizabethan period is that Barbados for some given reason was divided into eleven parishes because you had horse-and-buggy days, and this same horse-and-buggy mentality is prevailing today where you find, as an example in the City Council that they make a budget for \$2 million — an amount of money which one officer in the Ministry of Education is administering — and the whole island is subjected to a sort of economic juggling. I do not mean juggling in the sense that you have people playing with rates; but people arriving at something in the Northern and Southern Districts and then coming back to the Central Government and saying that they did not have enough money to do this and to do that. I have come to the conclusion that this wants scrapping. The majority of them take the money and give poor relief. In St. Michael \$2 million is collected in taxes, and I would like to know how much is being spent on anything other than what I have figures to show. These things have to be administered in a different way. Why should we have a system in this island of collecting \$2 million when the others together collect \$1 million or \$1 1/2 million, and whenever you have finished it is less than \$3 million or \$4 million, and there is a lot of machinery to collect this money? It seems to me that the time has come to have one blanket taxation policy and simplify the system, thus getting rid of this overhead expenditure you have in running the administration which, in my view, could now be streamlined.

Mr. Speaker, public health is one of the items they administer. In the City of Bridgetown the majority of money is spent on services rendered, sanitation, and other poor relief services. Why should we not be in a position today to have so much money collected? I do not like this two-tiered system. Some of the merchants in town tell you that taxation based on trade is not an equal rate; it has no relation to profit nor is it an escalator tax. It is a fixed rate, as you have fixed companies tax. The hon. member says that if it is 19 cents in the dollar, it is nineteen cents in the dollar for any house in Bridgetown in the City area. 3.50 p.m.

You do not fix the rate of property. Whatever is fixed as a rate is a rate to the property or whatever you have to be taxed. It is a sort of old time method which is involved. We are following big countries, like New York where you have the New York State, the Federal Government and the City Council where there is the Mayor and his Corporation working out something. But it is not so here. The City Council in New York is not the State of New York but it is in the State of New York which is run by Governor Rockefeller. There is State tax as distinct from Federal tax. You cannot compare the State of New York where you have 10 million people and which is the richest state in the world with another place or a place like Barbados.

I am saying that we have too many systems of fiddling around and collecting money in Barbados. I would like to see the day when we can remove some of these anomalies in our taxation system and have it simplified. Owing to Barbados being so small, I feel the time has come, when the amount of money being collected by the District Councils and the City Council and which represents such a small percentage of the total money which we are collecting in

this Island because the Government has budgeted for approximately \$30 million and you get the City Council budgeting for \$2 million, and I think the other two Councils put together do not budget for more than what is collected by the City Council — that the Government itself should evolve a better taxable system and give to those organisations money to carry out specific requirements because they are only administrative boards; they are not policy-making bodies. It is true that the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown has made the City Council a political administrative body, but, in truth and in fact, it is not a policy-making body. The hon. member has evolved that system because he was dealing with his opponents and he is now utilising a system which in itself is only administrative. When you instal lights and standpipes, those are administrative things. That is not a rigid policy of the Local Government because the Central Government is the Government to say that the country should have so many lights. That relates to New York too because it is not what Mayor Wagner feels should take place in New York.

I feel that the time has come from the point of view of streamlining taxation that you should have one system of collecting taxes, and you will relieve a lot of people of unnecessary double taxation. You should stream-line taxation and bring to the minds of people generally that they must pay their taxes, and do not say, as some of the District Councillors and other demagogues have said, that you can have things without taxation. How can you have better class rooms, better teachers and all those things and they would not cost you any more money? Do you think that the teachers and everybody else would live on the same standard but it would not cost anybody more money? I think that is false and stupid when people say so, but we have to live with the people with whom we are living. What we are suffering from is that the quality which makes up Government at this level is not fitted to the task required and, unfortunately, we are labouring under too many misfits. Those who are in the community must pay the price; and for this reason, the Government must come full blast in relation to taxation and streamline this whole system into one which is suitable to a community of our size and a country which is aiming towards the goal of independence. It should drop off this idea that Barbados is "Little England" and because of that it should have a system like that in England 300 years ago and which is not in keeping with the present age.

I am not a business man, but I do not see any reason why you should have a system in business for which a man is subjected to taxation on trade and then another tax on premises, then you have to pay income tax to rationalise the income required of you by your community. If a man has to pay tax, you should arrive at something to cover his whole taxation. Do not have it that a man has to pay 40% income tax on the profits of his trade, and then he is required to pay another taxation for carrying on his trade. It is true that some of the smaller businessmen ask for relief from trade tax because some of them never believe that they should be paying a different taxation to what they have to pay for a licence. Some of the rum shop keepers feel that trade tax is an imposition on them.

Sir, I feel that you should have a licensed system for everybody who carries on business. I feel that all businesses should be licensed. If you are keeping a pub, a grocery, a rum shop or a barber shop, you should pay a licence fee; in fact, every business is a trade and you should license all. I feel from the financial point of view that this system of taxation should be revised. The hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown is a real estate broker, and he should be paying a licence for carrying on real estate business. If his colleague is in the business which he is carrying on, he should be also paying a fee. All business should be licensed. You should not only license rum shops. My idea is that you will have to revamp your whole system of taxation and streamline it into a system where you collect all the taxes and then you can give back to Local Government the amount of money which they require to carry out certain administrative duties.

4.00 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is tending to range rather far afield.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am only dealing with the question of valuation. Your Honour is a resident of the parish of St. James; why should we have these disparities? Why should a man pay one rate in St. James as against what another pays in St. Michael? These iniquities exist in a place like Westchester. Westchester is outside the five Boroughs and that is why they pay a fancy rate up there. From the point of view of taxation, how many people put money into the Treasury for what they possess? If you are dealing with St. James you have one rate; in the parish of St. Michael you have another rate and in these eleven parishes you have this sort of peculiarity. I do not mean the matter of parish by parish, but the Northern District Council, the Southern District Council and the Bridgetown City Council are the three areas.

I am convinced, Sir, that the amount of money involved does not require the same old system. Without knowing what Dr. Jackson will recommend — I did not go to the Local Government Commission Enquiry because I was busy otherwise; however, Sir, I feel that the time has come when I would like to see a complete change in the system of valuation, but I know that it would be a difficult thing to ask the Government to make any pronouncement in this matter now. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is a strong Local Government man, but he, too, must see that in a community like Barbados where the density of population is in the metropolitan area — you have one 100,000 people out of 240,000 residing in the metropolitan area, but the total amount of land is outside. It happens that the wealthiest single entity is an entity in itself; but when you compare the other lands where the poor houses are, you have an uneven distribution of other things. I have come to see that in St. Michael they are more liberal with the things which they have to administer. It is not a question of their squandering things and make "unemployables" of people, because the sort of money which they pay out cannot make anybody unemployable. One dollar or two dollars a week.... (Asides) I have seen from the report that one parish was paying out 75 cents a week, (Asides) I meant two dollars a month; I say that that amount cannot make anybody unemployable. You cannot make anybody unemployable with that sort of money.

I do not deal with money with which you pay people salaries and wages. Scavengers, for instance, are paid for the work which they are doing; but when you come to what these bodies have to provide — well, Sir, if the Government has to provide for scavenging, then they will have to pay for it. Somebody has to carry out the matter or the duty of keeping the City clean; but this differential in rates is not good. I am not suggesting that it is an easy matter overnight to take over this scheme and introduce a new scheme. We have been with this scheme for a long time, and we will find it difficult to change it; but there can be a means of having these changes effected.

I am not here to deal with businessmen, but it is illogical that we should have this sort of differential existing in order to arrive at what taxation a man should pay. When a man pay his rates in Bridgetown, it is not only the people in Bridgetown who benefit. When, for instance, the streets in Bridgetown are kept clean, that helps the people from St. Andrew as well. Whatever you may contract in the City of Bridgetown if it is not kept clean, you take to St. Andrew or to St. Lucy. If a man eats a banana in Bridgetown he does not carry the skin to St. Andrew and place it in the stuff bin down there. The City of Bridgetown carries the greater burden of social amenities for the whole community; so it is in England and the United States of America.

I am not opposed to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition being in the centre of things. If he is utilising the centre, then all the credit must go to him; but we must devise ways and means of changing the system of our taxation in the best interests of the community as a whole. I am not out for killing anybody; I am still convinced that the

situation as regards taxation in Barbados *vis-a-vis* Local Government as it stands, is not, by any means, a progressive system. In my view, there should be a system of modification in order to suit modern trends. That is my view.
4.10 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I notice that you said the hon. member has been a little far off the mark. I do not propose to crave that indulgence at all, but I should like to say that it is difficult for people to get me to disagree with the hon. member when he pontificates on Trade Unionism, because I respect his knowledge on this matter. Dr. Jackson, who has recently been here, has been a threat to some people, but he has left me still remaining outside looking in and not inside looking out. However I should just like to draw one point to the hon. member's attention. Let us forget New York, Los Angeles and Chicago, and let us take London and Greater London. I have never had the time to read all the literature on Trade Unionism, but certainly on Local Government I did what little I could to equip myself fully when I realised that such an able and distinguished man was coming here. In London where there is Greater London and London, there is a difference in valuation on property, and I believe that if he looks it up he will find it is so. I am not in any way worried about this matter, but I will draw to his attention that there must be a difference in valuation on property in this country.

Mr. Speaker, this matter deals with the question of property. There is a question of rates and that of taxes, and this is dealing with rates on property which means land, chattel buildings and chattel houses. If I take, for example, a place like The Whim in the hon. member's constituency, does he think that anybody would be so stupid to pay the same price per square foot for land there or the same price for a property as he would pay if it were at Gibbes Beach? Human nature is human nature all over the world.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I want to make it clear to the hon. member that I never suggested that; and if he were listening, he would have heard me say that the question of having the system re-examined in England is taking place now. What I spoke about was the rates, and that is why I said there should be a single system. I am not dealing with the value. Income tax is one rate, but you have different incomes. I am not suggesting that there should be any differences in the value, but what we find is that some people pay 21 cents in the dollar and others 10 cents in the dollar in a community which is as small as ours.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the hon. member has studied Local Government, he would see that this happens all about, because it depends on the needs of the particular area. In some places in England it might be fifteen shillings in the pound or ten shillings in the pound, and as the hon. member has said, he has realised that in the Municipality there is that need to carry a greater burden. I am not going to say anything about this matter because Dr. Jackson's Report is being awaited by many.

This Bill seeks to remove any doubt of the coming into force of the first Valuation List. The hon. member and his Government has spotted something which the former Government did not, that is, the non-publication of the date, and we know that valuation is fixed for a certain time. This now removes any doubt from the minds of anybody and legalises anything which has been done. A new valuation has taken place, and I am drawing to the Government's attention that it is causing some anxiety among people. When the first Valuation List came about after the coming into being of the Local Government Act, I remember mentioning to the Government then in power that as a result, under the Waterworks Act, people would be called upon to pay higher water rates because of a higher valuation on property; but it would appear as though this particular Government or the present Local Government has brought this into being, when in actual fact that was the law from the time the new valuation came into being. It means therefore that from 1959 these water rates could

have been and should have been increased in keeping with the law, but for some unknown reason this increase was only made late last year and was done retroactively to the date of the increase on people's property. The new valuation, Mr. Speaker, has further increased the value of property. There are two or three methods which you can use in Barbados. You can have valuation on rental value which would be normal, or there are other methods which possibly could not apply here; otherwise everybody would go under.

I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if it would not be better to devise some other means of charging water rates rather than have it based on the number of people occupying a house, because much criticism has been made against the present Local Government and the Government in power as the persons who put on this tax. I think the Premier should have this made abundantly clear. If you go to pay your water rates now and carry in your tax bill from 1959, they look back and see what it is, work out the amount and tell you what you should have paid for the quarter. I think Government should make it clear that this is nothing they have done, because I have told people that this is nothing the City Council has done, and I believe that every Councillor has been doing that too. I quite see that you have to bring this up-to-date and make legal what was a slip by somebody, in my opinion; and I believe that you are going to work on the new rates for 1964-65. I am suggesting to the Premier to make a pronouncement as to whether a different method should be adopted, because this new valuation will increase the rates again. The present system does not seem a fair way of collecting taxation on water rates. The size of a house or its valuation gives no indication of the amount of water used. When the water-borne system of sewerage was introduced in this country and people started putting down wash basins in rooms, the then Government thought that they should pay for every basin, but the Manager of the Waterworks pointed out that that would be stupid, for the simple reason that you could only use one at a time.
4.20 p.m.

I support this Bill very strongly, and I do not propose to go into the method of taxation as has been done by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I am perfectly willing to discuss that privately with anybody. However, Sir, I think the system of Local Government in a democracy is a very good system, and I think that it is only a matter of bringing this system of ours up-to-date and removing any doubts from the minds of people.

Now, there are two Valuation Lists, and I know that the Northern and Southern District Councils are somewhat relieved as regards the second Valuation List, because that was somewhat worrying them. There is valuable land other than arable land, and that land, valuable as it is, was out of valuation. I said so and I was backed up by a big landowner in the person of Mr. Julian Mahon. I say that the North and the South are somewhat relieved as a result of this Bill. That land can carry a valuation, not from the point of view of producing cane, but it has an actual valuation.

Sir, I am supporting this Bill. As a matter of fact, there is nothing else which you can do but to support it. This should have been advertised since 1959, but I am going to counsel the Hon. Premier to make it clear about water rates because it was a burning issue of the day owing to the thousands of people who have water turned into their premises and what they are paying now. I wonder if the Hon. Premier can devise some other means to lay water rates. I think the hon. member can get that information. Sir, again I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill as it stands, because it must be supported.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with this Bill as it stands before us today. We have had this change over from the Vestry system to Local Government throughout the Island of Barbados. In the various parts of this Island we have lands of various types and qualities, and I am sure that, before the Local Government came into force, all of the land in Barbados was rated and was paid for. Since Local Government came into force, rab land in the

various districts has not been paid for by people owning it, and rab land is more valuable than arable land. As you gaze, Mr. Speaker, through the various districts from the Southern District right across the Island through St. James to St. Lucy, you will see that people are buying rab land at \$3.00 a square foot, and I have never heard in all my life that arable land has ever cost \$3.00 a square foot. People today are buying rab land at \$3.00 a square foot, and I want all the people of Barbados to realise that the two most valuable things in the world are land and time. There is nothing more valuable than land and time.

Sir, you will be told today as you go to the several estate owners that they are glad that the Vestries have gone out of existence because they are not paying for rab land. That same land which is exempted from taxation nowadays is the most valuable land which you can think about. You are getting clay from it and making clay bricks to build valuable houses. You are getting sand and stone which also are for the purpose of building valuable houses and for the purpose of sheeting roads and making all kinds of roads. That is the same land which is exempted from taxation.

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that until there is a re-survey throughout the whole Island of all land and properties, this Government will not be able to survive as it should. With all the valuation which you are talking about today, think of the City of Bridgetown. You will meet people from all over the Island coming to the City of Bridgetown with their bundles on their heads and shoulders. Why are they coming to the City of Bridgetown? They are coming to the City of Bridgetown because they understand that they will get better public assistance from the City Council than from any of the District Councils in the country areas. From the time we changed from the Vestry system to Local Government, the poor people in the parish of St. Andrew were getting 25 cents public assistance for children and 50 cents for adults. They have not got anything more because we were warned that we could not give them one cent more. We would have to wait on the Government. That is what the last Government wrote telling us. We of the Northern District Council can do nothing about it. We are suspended; we cannot do anything more; we cannot go up nor can we come down. We are waiting on the Government, and I am hoping with this change of valuation that some better condition will be granted to the poor people throughout the Northern area. This is a small country with 166 square miles of land, but it is divided into very many small parts or sections. I hope that when Professor Jackson's Report comes back, it will come back with a recommendation to centralise the three Councils into one body, and as a result there will be a unified system of public assistance throughout the Island of Barbados. That is to say, all the food will be cooked in one pot, and each child will taste the sweets. I remember that in the parish of St. Andrew there was a man who married a woman who already had had children because she was married previously. He said that the children's food should not be cooked with his own because they should not taste the sweets of his own.

4.30 p.m.

He thought within himself that the children's food would take in the substance of his own food, and therefore he would not allow the children's food to be cooked with his own. You have men and women running to Bridgetown because they say they will go to Bridgetown since "Uncle Mottley" is there. I asked them: what about "Uncle 'Home'ie" and they said "No, we will go to Bridgetown to 'Uncle Mottley.'" They will come down to Bridgetown to see if they will get a dollar instead of fifty cents and, of course, they hear that bedsteads and so on are being given out down here in Bridgetown. Sir, I want to see the amalgamation of public assistance. I cannot see how people who have assisted in building up the economy of this island cannot receive what is due to them. When this Valuation List is revised, I know that every man will carry his own rate.

Mr. Speaker, I hear people talk about the water rate and of the valuation of land. As to the valuation of land, I always say that land is valuable wherever it is in Barbados. As to the East Coast Road, hundreds of people are

running about the mountains and asking to be sold a spot of this land. I repeat that land is valuable and therefore it should be taxed, whether it is grass land, rab land, sandy land or otherwise. Nobody should be exempt from taxation; every man should be paying for land in Barbados because land of every kind is valuable. I am hoping that I will live to see this Government make a direct change and have things under control so that every human being will be able to survive.

Sir, you have these three bodies — the Bridgetown City Council, the Northern District Council and the Southern District Council — and in each of them you have three different rates of taxation. What is worse, Sir, is that we do not need but one body set up to run Local Government. We want to have one uniform rate for public assistance throughout the whole island. In that case, those who are living in Bridgetown will have to remain in Bridgetown and those who are living in any other place will have to remain there, because there will be one common amount of pension. That is what I want to see. I want to see this matter of valuation revised. There are some big men who are paying less taxation than what the little men are paying; that is so, because the big man is underrated and the small man is overrated. Some people will tell you that they used to pay \$7,000 per year and now they are only paying \$5,000 per year because the land which they own is rab land. Mr. Speaker, I cannot too often say that rab land is most valuable; it is bringing in more money than the land which is providing the food. That is why I maintain that every piece of land in Barbados should be taxed.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

On the motion of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Preamble was postponed.

Clauses 1 to 3 of the Bill were called and passed.

The Preamble was called and passed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

4.40 p.m.

THE GOVERNOR'S (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1964

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Governor's Act, 1890.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill is a relatively simple one, and it is to increase the duty allowance of the Officer administering the Government of this territory from \$7,200 per annum to \$9,600 per annum.

The background to this, Mr. Speaker, is that there has been no increase in the substantive emoluments of the holder of that office for a considerable number of years. When the Overseas Service Aid Scheme was introduced where the emoluments of ex-patriate officers were supplemented to the extent of some 30% by the Department of Technical Corporation, the Officer administering the Government of this territory did not elect to be designated as one of the Officers. He asked that his name be taken off the list; so there has been no increase in his emoluments. But the number of visits of ships of Her Majesty's Navy and the Navies of other countries, the number of visits of Ministers from surrounding territories, members of the Royal Family and matters of that kind have considerably increased during the past two years, and the Governor now finds himself in a position where there is some substantial loss in his emoluments.

About twelve or fifteen months ago, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State sent down and drew to the attention of Government that there had been no increase in the Governor's emoluments, and asked that it be considered. The Governor himself said he would prefer that it should remain as it is in view of the colony's finances; but there has been a considerable drain on the entertainment side of his office, and the object of this Bill, of course, is to rectify that defect.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Governor's Act, 1890, and to increase the Government's duty allowance from \$7,200 to \$9,600. The Premier gave an explanation as to why the Governor's name did not appear on the list, but he now finds it necessary to increase the duty allowance. Since the Governor's salary does not appear on the list and standards have increased, I wonder if it would not be in better grace, if we are satisfied that the Governor's salary should be increased, to recommend that such be done. One can imagine how his duty allowance is utilised. It is not reasonable to expect the Governor to ask for his salary to be increased, but we would be expected to increase the duty allowance to cover every purchase he would be expected to make. It is correct to say that we have been having a number of visits, but is it true that we have been having more than in the last five or six years? Whether or not the Governor says he deserves an increase, we would not want him to exist on a salary other than what would be reasonable for him to live on. Standards have increased all around, and you are taking this allowance from \$7,200 to \$9,600, which is an increase of \$2,400. That could be regarded as considerable, and I wonder if the Hon. Premier would be in a position to give us some idea as to what his private expenses are and what the increases are like. He is usually very sympathetic in giving all the relative information, but this is a jump of \$2,400 which is an indication that he must be spending considerable sums. We have had a number of meetings here and a number of people calling on the Governor, but this is a tremendous sum. We are not criticising the amount, and if he needed more, I would like the Premier to feel free to ask for it; but I wonder if he could give a little information as to where the entertainment has gone up, just for the information of Parliament. I do not necessarily want a close breakdown, but some idea because it is indeed a big jump.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who desires to speak before the Hon. and Learned Premier replies? Apparently there is none; let the Hon. Premier proceed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I think I should perhaps give a little more detail on this matter. It has been pointed out that this is a situation which has existed for a couple of years, but the way it was handled last year, although the situation existed and was known by me and by the Ministry of Finance at that time, was that the Governor found himself forced to cut down on a lot of entertainment which he normally should have given. I have given some reasons already, Sir, but in addition, I will give

you some more. The tourist season of 1962 was bigger than ever before, and in 1963 the increase has been, I believe, some 6,900. Over 50,000 people, I believe, by 31st March would have visited this Island as compared with that of 43,000 last year; the number of ships now averages between 14 to 20, which is a frequency of almost 2 per month. The Senior Officers commanding these vessels frequently stay at Government House, and the Officers and members of the ships are entertained at public functions at Government House. The Deep Water Harbour has lent to the increase in American and French war ships in addition to an additional number of cruise ships, and all this usually leads to official entertainment.

The establishment of the Liberal Arts College in Barbados means that there is a constant flow of University personnel visiting Barbados. Quite apart from all that, there is the fact, and I must admit to it, that the Government itself has called upon the Governor to use Government House for having functions where normally — and I hope I do not get into trouble with the catering industry at the hotels for this — we would have had to use the services of hotels on many occasions.
4.50 p.m.

The reasons for this is because we find it somewhat expensive, and knowing, too, how reluctant members of this House are to give supplementary provision to the Head "Governor". We find it therefore convenient and economical to have certain public functions held at Government House other than elsewhere. That is another reason; on these occasions we do use a substantial part of our hospitality vote, but there is, of course, still some considerable drain on the resources of Government House. We did supplement the vote by staging some of the functions at Government House.

The hon. junior member for St. George said that it would be better to increase the Governor's salary. There is very good reason why we have not increased this salary. A lot of work which formerly used to be done under previous Governments by the Colonial Secretary is now being done by the Ministers themselves. In other words, the work-load on the Governor of the territory by virtue of his office of Governor and Administrator has decreased; but at the same time the ceremonial aspect of his office has experienced a considerable increase with an attendant increase in expenditure. I think that is the answer on which the hon. member would probably settle his mind. It is true that there is a considerable work-load on the Governor as Chairman of the Regional Council of Ministers, but that is another matter altogether. As far as Barbados is concerned, the Governor is not now expected to sit in as a member of the Executive Committee; and although he is entitled to see the Cabinet papers, he does not have policy-making functions to exercise as he had to exercise before.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I rather that the Premier would not turn the idea of what I said. The work-load has considerably decreased, but I would not like to use that as an excuse for not increasing his salary.

Mr. SPEAKER: I gather that the hon. member has risen to elucidate a point.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: To exercise my prerogative, it would not be proper for me to come to the House to ask for an increase of the Governor's salary when in truth and in fact the work-load on the Governor has been decreased and the situation which exists now is due to increased expenditure on entertainment. Hon. members have to bear in mind that the Governor is not supposed to use his salary to entertain people; therefore, if we increase his salary, we would first have to justify the increase and then say what we are going to do as regards his increase in expenditure.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Hon. Premier made his reply, I looked around to see whether there was any hon. member desirous of speaking, and I allowed a reasonable time to elapse and no member declared his intention of speaking.

Under Standing Order No. 27, I am afraid that no hon. member can speak at this stage. However, the hon. member may do so when we go into Committee on the Bill.

Mr. SMITH: I am not saying anything against the Bill. The Hon. Minister said he wanted to emphasise something more.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, I think that you better explain to the hon. member that what you were telling him about was the penultimate occasion.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, speaking on Clause 2, I do not want to be long, and I have only risen due to the fact that I would like the Ministers whenever they are bringing down these resolutions and bills to make them a little bit more clear because they are asking us to increase this duty allowance to the Governor by something in the vicinity of \$2,400. The Hon. Premier gave his reason which I have approved because with the increased load of visitors which the Governor has to entertain, I would expect that this entertainment expenditure would have to be more. I would not like the Officer Administering the Colony to invite people to Government House and offer them a Ju-C and a cutter. I would like the name of Barbados to stay at its highest standard, and when the Officer Administering the Colony has to entertain a friend, he must entertain him to the best of his ability.

The Hon. Premier said that this thing was hanging fire for a long time, and that would mean that the Officer Administering the Colony was either out of pocket all that time or that he was playing pepper and dodging people because he did not want to be out of pocket. Because it has happened for so long, the Hon. Premier should have been able to tell us this afternoon how much money the Officer Administering the Colony had to spend out of his own pocket or how many visitors he had to curtail. This is the last month of the financial year, and the Hon. Premier should be in a position to say that that amount which is given for entertainment allowance has gone already, or that it went before Christmas, and as a result the Officer Administering the Colony could not invite anybody during the Christmas festivities. That might have merited us to increase the amount to \$3,000. We do not know now if it should be \$1,200, \$1,800 or \$2,400. We are still in the dark, and I am always saying here that when one wants to draw money or if one has to sign a cheque for money, before he signs his name at the bottom he looks at what he is signing for. 5.00 p.m.

We should know about what time of the year is affected, what results, and things of that sort. This thing would make me believe that the figures of £500 are very easy to insert and they have been inserted. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that after the Hon. Premier went into the figures thoroughly, he was convinced that more than \$2,400 was

required for this allowance! I am submitting that, for the Hon. Premier to say that the number of people visiting Government House has been increased, is not sufficient; that is not good enough. The Hon. Premier must be clear; if his office messenger were to draw money from him, he would want to know how much this thing costs and how much that thing costs. He would not just take it like that, because his Office Messenger would push his hands far enough into his pocket; and if the Messenger went on like that, his hands would go a long way and too far. I would like the Hon. Premier to explain the matter more fully. If I were to go outside and were asked how much was spent last year or in the year before, I will have to say that I do not know, but I voted \$2,400. That is not good enough for one who has not got much understanding like me.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member would like me to make things clearer for him than I have done. I thought that I had made the position quite clear, but perhaps the hon. member was not concentrating on what was said at the time. I could give him quite a lot of figures going all the way back. However, Sir, one thing has to be borne in mind, and it is that the Governor has to pay a certain amount now for the employees who are the domestic workers, and so on, who have been placed on the Unestablished Staff. He has to make a contribution towards their wages out of this allowance and that contribution is in the vicinity of \$1,500 a year. *(After a pause)* Yes, Sir, I understand that in the Estimates it is demonstrated that the Governor has to pay this amount of \$1,500 a year towards the wages of the Staff at Government House.

In the first year we found that, as the result of the Staff having been placed on the Unestablished Staff, the Governor had to pay \$2,000 and he has had to pay more than he would have had to pay before these people were paid at these rates. Quite apart from that, Sir, there is the question of entertainment. I really cannot give the hon. member any breakdown in figures. I know that for one year the amount of food and drink at Government House cost \$9,000, and a certain amount of that was calculated on what the Governor was expected to spend of his own commissary, as it were; but as to the present situation, where this matter is concerned, we are amending the Act and this will come into effect from the 1st April, 1964. This is not a question of any supplementary vote dating back to the 1st April, 1963. When the Governor's Secretary, or whoever is in charge of looking after his household, discovers that the vote has been expended, the Governor just has to entertain people out of his own pocket. Looking at the trend from 1957, with the rise in the number of official visitors, I am submitting that an additional \$2,400 should be enough to cover the kind of entertainment which we would expect the Governor would have to do during the forthcoming financial year. This is nothing to do with the present financial year; this is the closest we can get in this matter. Even in my own house, Sir, I cannot keep accounts as to how much I spend on dinner or drink; that would be a very difficult thing for me to do. I am sure that the hon. member would be in the same position as anybody else.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, looking back at the Bill, I myself thought that the Hon. Premier had made the position crystal clear. There is to be an excess of \$2,400. The Governor's duty allowance goes from \$7,200 per annum to \$9,600 per annum. In that the Premier is quite right. As a matter of fact, this proposed increase comes into effect from the next financial year. I am wondering if, in view of the observation that there has been an increase already, if it is not due to the 31st March this year. In other words, I wonder if His Excellency the Governor has not expended more than what was provided in the 1963-64 vote with regard to duty allowance. It is crystal clear that this allowance is to be increased from \$7,200 to \$9,600 per annum.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph, during the course of his remarks, said that he wanted to have a breakdown of the matter and the Hon. Premier has said that he thought he had made the position crystal clear; but now when I cast my mind back and I see that the duty allowance is to be increased from the next financial year, I want to

make sure that the vote has not been over expended this year. Should we reimburse the Governor with anything which has been overspent by the 31st March this year?

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I did not hear what was said by the Hon. Premier and I do not care either. What I am saying is that you do not ask for a breakdown in respect of a duty allowance. If you have a mean Governor and he decides that he will not have as many people at Government House as his predecessor in office used to have, the duty allowance goes to the Governor.

5.10 p.m.

It is nothing the Treasury can hold on to and ask, if you have not spent all, to give back the balance. This is just like when you send a member of this Chamber overseas and you give him a subsistence allowance. It is not in his place to come back and tell the Minister or the Treasury he bought a rum at a hotel for 18 cents and something down the road for 10 cents, making a total of 28 cents and to subtract that from the amount you gave him. If you spend all the allowance in a day, that is your business. I have had the sad experience of being in Caracas during a revolution at the invitation of the Government of Venezuela, and I had in my possession \$80 U.S. The Venezuelan Government was going to pay and I was given \$80 to "cool breeze". My unfortunate position is that I had to go to another city because the revolution did not allow me to reach Caracas. I could not ask what were the hotel fares, and when I realised I could not get to Caracas and they charged me \$40 a day, the first thing that came to my mind with my \$80 disappearing, was to look for the first shop from which to buy a tin of corned beef to put in the refrigerator.

I was an opponent, Mr. Speaker, in the old colonial days to increasing the Governor's duty allowance. When I came to this House the Governor's duty allowance was £400, and it is carried up in £500 stages. It went to £1,000, then to £1,500 and now it is £2,000. It would be infra dig to ask for a breakdown on how much whiskey he bought and where he bought it and how much he drinks, because when I go to Government House I do not drink rum for many reasons. I remember there was a Governor who did not have a taste for good rum, and there was varnish at Government House, and one day I left with a splitting headache; so I am not going to tamper with and drink varnish. In any case, very few members unless they are inveterate rum drinkers, will drink rum there. Government House is a place for 'Scotch', and if you have not acquired a taste for it, you should not go there. If any hon. member in this Chamber invites me to his home, I feel he is able to do so; and if he is not, he should not ask me to his home and dash some cou-cou and salt fish at me as if I were eating home. I am not vexed with the hon. member for asking for a breakdown, but you should consider at this time whether it is appropriate from the reasons the Premier gave to increase the duty allowance from \$7,200 to \$9,600. I would say to the Premier that he has to look out for those who will say that he should give increases to other people also. It is true the Governor's duty allowance was not increased when the Civil Services increases were made, and I was in agreement with that. I do not believe in the nonsense that because you give the man at the bottom four cents an hour more, you must give the man at the top four cents also. If you can only increase the man at the top by four cents an hour, you are not ready to increase him at all. I do not agree with the Government in gearing Civil Servants' salaries to those of the man in the road working for \$20 a week or 18 cents an hour. I feel that when it comes to manual labourers' and workmen's wages, they have to be different because they are not on an escalator scale. This is a small island, with people of small thinking, and the Premier must look out for his opponents saying that he has increased the Governor's duty allowance by £500, and asking what about the men in the street. The present Minister of Labour was one of the biggest antagonists against increasing the Governor's emoluments, and now he is a member of the Cabinet; so do not let us think that his opponents would not reap up some old copies of the "Observer" to point out what he said about the Governor then, about giving the Governor £500 now, and asking what

he would give to the cane cutter or to the women at Seawell. You will get all that, and if an election is around the corner, you will get all the water-washed skeleton talk again.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a believer in Governors as such, but I live with the democrats and they say they like Governors. Sometimes in our changing societies, we still need people who can hold the balance, because sometimes you may get somebody drunk with power, and if you do not have a Governor or somebody strong in the middle, somebody will hold on to a point, just as some of our friends have been doing some months ago, and now that the evil of their ways are beginning to show, some of them have backed off and back-peddled saying that they did not mean it so. When the danger of their own ways begin to be magnified, they say they were not the persons. You need a monarch. The late King Paul was a good King in Greece, because he used to push away a Prime Minister and bring in another who was more tepid until he found the one he wanted. I think all Governors can play an important part, and I think the Premier knows that. Sometimes Governors can see and sense things happening in a community and can quietly and unobtrusively keep the Opposition from doing stupid things by talking to the Leader of the Opposition. He can play an astute role in a changing society like ours; so I do not envy a Governor's duty allowance appropriate to his office. At some time you may have a Governor who is a Barbadian, and I do not want you to dress down the position because he is a Barbadian Governor. You want him to entertain with all the dignity he should have on a duty allowance appropriate to a Governor in addition to his entertainment allowance. I do not want anybody to get mixed up with these two things. He has certain things to do as a matter of duty, and that is why the allowance is called a duty allowance. Secondly there are certain things he has to perform, and while on this, it is a good example in a way that the Premier is not set in his idea that Barbados and Barbadian Ministers and so forth should be Puritanical and parsimonious. People do not respect you for that anyhow. The hon. member said he went to Africa and met Mr. Obote. When Mr. Obote went from Uganda to Tanganyika, he carried his Rolls Royce over there. He did that because for some given reason he felt that when he got to Tanganyika the cars there would not be big enough; but Mr. Obote is not considered one of the flamboyant types of Africans, and it was the African concept that for the Prime Minister of Uganda to arrive in Tanganyika, he must have his brilliant, shining Rolls Royce.

5.20 p.m.

I would say this. I think that here in Barbados, our leaders have set a bad example in the image of what people in authority should have. There is this belief that people in authority should not be in possession of things which are in consonance with the office which they hold, and when they have these things somebody regards it as lining their pockets. I have said in here already that I am one of those people who believe that the office of Premier of this country is one for which the holder should have an official residence. I say that for myself, and it is not based on any Party feeling because I feel that any hon. member of this Chamber should be able to go to the official residence of the Premier. If I go to Government House, I am going to the official residence of the Governor; I am not going to his private ranch, and I accept invitations to Government House because I regard them as not a personal thing. Apart from anything, I feel that the Premier of the country should live in a house which is the official residence of the Premier, and that has been so whether we feel that we are perpetuating a colonial idea. Mr. Khrushchev does not live in his own house; he has some official residence. Although we have not reached the stage in the West Indies where Ministers are granted allowances for residence, that is so in the Mother Country, and there you find that certain Ministers are given residence and others are granted allowances in lieu of residence. I feel, notwithstanding anything which we have said in the past, that the time has come when this country should be dignified enough to have an official residence for the Head of the Government. The Colonial Secretary, when we had one, was given a house to live in.

The Chief Justice of the country is given an official residence, and I do not see any reason why the Head of the Government should be in any position different from the other Heads of Governments because *vis-a-vis* Heads of Governments, he is the Head amongst us. That is why I say that you should raise the duty allowance of the Head of the Administration and let us get away from the old time Opposition days when we used the Head - Governor - as the bulk of our criticism.

Another thing is that it should not be any question of breaking down the money so that we can find out how it was spent. I think sometimes it is below the dignity of a Minister or of any person to ask him how he spent his subsistence allowance. If I go on a visit and you ask me to give a breakdown, it would be a hard thing. I represent this country at a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meeting and the Clerk of the House went in for so much breakdown that he found that he owed me \$40. He had the breakdown for 20 days at \$20, which came to \$400, when it should have been 22 days at \$20 which is equal to \$440. Again, it would be ridiculous for the Clerk to ask me how much I spent per day because it would mean that I would have to keep my pocket laden down with hotel bills. We cannot have a situation like that, neither can we have the Head of the Administration giving us a breakdown. Of course, the Premier would have it and I am sure that the Governor's office would be keeping the accounts.

Speaking in a general way and without in any way being personal, I think sometimes that territories are very fortunate - and I think that Barbados has been very fortunate - in their Heads of the Administration so that in these changing times you can have a Head of the Administration who is modern enough to change with the times. Our Head of the Administration has set a very fine example to this community, and it was very revealing to me to see the Head of the Administration at cricket looking cool and comfortable while some of our people turned out in clothing which was not conducive to a tropical climate. I think that any hon. member who has come into contact with the Head of the Administration would know that he is one of the finest of British Administrators.

I would say that, if the Hon. Premier has advised us that £500 is appropriate for the duty allowance of the Governor, we should vote for it and put our seal of approval to it and have nothing to say of the office of Governor. Hon. members know that I am a Republican and rebellious by nature, so they would know that I am no Monarchist. I have found out that the office of Government is something which is applicable and suitable to our society and, therefore, if you find one of our administrators who is a good administrator, let us do what the Hon. Premier has asked us to do. We should grant the Head of the Administration all of the facilities which he should have.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I hope you do not forget my little question. I pointed to the fact that in as much as we understand it is a perennial business, whether we were going to reimburse the Head of the Administration for out-of-pocket expenses until 31st March, this year.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Governor's emoluments have been fixed by Acts of Parliament and that is why we came by way of a Bill. There is no question at all about any supplementary provision for increasing or reimbursing the Governor for any money which he may have spent during the current financial year. From the information which I have before me, the Governor himself pointed out in 1962, at the end of the financial year, which is the last completed year, that he had only managed to keep within the existing duty allowance by the practice which was developed of our using the Cabinet's vote for parties at Government House. Certain parties which we felt were of Government nature rather than the Governor's, we agreed to underwrite part or all of the cost for entertainment from our entertainment vote which is voted every year. We do not have any figures yet for 1963; but if the hon. member's question is "if we are coming back with a Resolution," as far as I see it, the answer is "no", because it can only be done by an amendment to the Act.

5.30 p.m.

I do not see how you could alter the Act by means of a supplementary Resolution; I do not think that that can be done. The most significant thing about the matter is that the Governor has pointed out the difficulty, but he has not asked for any reimbursement.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I thank the hon. member.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL 1964

Mr. SPEAKER. The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to continue various expiring laws.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order in the temporary absence of the Hon. Premier.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is the usual hardy annual with respect to Acts or portions of Acts which appear in the Schedule to this Bill and which will normally expire on the 31st day of March, 1964. As hon. members will see, the Schedule of the Bill contains these various expiring laws as follows:-

The Vagrancy Act, 1897, Section 11

The Emigration Act, 1904, section 2 (12)

The Volunteer Act, 1909

The Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937, section 18

The Exports and Imports (Restriction) Act, 1939

The Aliens Restriction Act, 1939

The Revenue in Aid Act, 1941

The Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank Act, 1943, section 17 (2)

The Volunteer (Amendment) Act, 1943

The Volunteer (Amendment) Act, 1946, sections 1 and 3

The Anglican Church (Partial Suspension) Act, 1955.

The title of the Bill shows that it is intitled an Act to continue various expiring laws and this Act comes into operation, as the hon. member will see from Clause 1, on the 1st day of April, 1964.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Preamble was postponed.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—

2.(1) The Acts or portions of Acts mentioned in the Schedule to this Act shall be continued until and inclusive of the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-five, and shall then expire unless further continued.

(2) Any unrepealed enactments which are temporary in their duration shall, in so far as they amend or affect any enactment continued by this Act, be continued in like manner whether they are mentioned in the Schedule to this Act or not.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, in this Schedule reference is made to the Anglican Church (Partial Suspension) Act, 1955. This Act has been in operation for a period of nine years and that is a long time. Could the Hon. Minister tell us how long are we going to have to continue in force this Act? When are we going to have it completely suspended? I think we should have something definite about this matter. Could the Hon. Minister give us any idea of the progress which has been made?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I think I can give the hon. member an assurance that not so long from now there will be an end of this matter. Discussions between the Government and the Anglican Church are now in the final stage, and I think I can say that in a very few months from now, we should be able to see finality in this matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thank the Hon. Minister very much; we should have some daylight on this matter.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The Preamble was called and passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

5.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders Nos. 5 and 6....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking that Order No. 7 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was about to inform the House that I am advised that Orders Nos. 5 and 6 have not yet been printed. Order No. 7 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier, and perhaps the Hon. Minister of Education proposes to take charge of it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am also asking leave to take charge of this Bill in the temporary absence of the Hon. and Learned Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Education is asking leave to take Order No. 7 as the next Order of the Day and also to take charge of that Order, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Let the hon. member proceed.

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL (CONSTRUCTION OF REFERENCES) ACT, 1964

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 7 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the construction of references to the Legislative Council in Acts and subsidiary legislation on the replacement of that body by a Senate.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members will be aware, one of the major constitutional changes soon to be established is the substitution of a Senate for the Other Place which now exists as the second House of the Legislature. That being so, it is inevitable that scattered here and there throughout the laws of this territory there will continue to be references in various laws and enactments to the Legislative Council. The purpose of this Bill therefore is to guarantee that when in any such statutes or subsidiary legislation the words "Legislative Council" appear, it shall be taken to mean the Senate of the Island of Barbados, and therefore the Bill seeks to provide that references in any future or current legislation to the Legislative Council shall be construed as references to the Senate which will be constituted as part of the Legislature shortly.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed, I think this would perhaps be a convenient moment for us to have a short break, and accordingly I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for half an hour.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

5.50 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Will Your Honour have the Bell rung as there is no quorum?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the Hon. Minister for drawing that to my attention. Let the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (REMUNERATION OF MEMBERS) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is Order No. 8 standing in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier: Second reading of a Bill to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker....

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to proceed with this Bill and perhaps other Bills under the name of the Hon. Premier.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Yes, Sir, as the occasion arises. This Bill is not unlike some of the matters which we have dealt with today. It is consequential to the recent constitutional changes. It seeks to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949-29, in order to provide for a precise definition of the expression "The Leader of the Opposition" and for the determination of any doubts in its application by the speaker of the House of Assembly. The amendment is based on Section 10 (3) of the Ministers of the Crown Act, 1939 (C.38) of the United Kingdom and the definition of "Leader of the Opposition" included in section 10 (1) of the said Act.

Provision is also made for the exclusion from entitlement to remuneration as a member of the House of Assembly of any member while in receipt of remuneration as a Parliamentary Secretary.

Under Section 2, 1A (1), we find that the Leader of the Opposition means "Member of the House of Assembly who is for the time being the Leader in that House of the Party in opposition to the Government having the greatest numerical strength in that House."

This Bill determines beyond the slightest shadow of doubt the hon. member of this Chamber to whom the term "Leader of the Opposition" is applicable, and it is noteworthy, setting out the process of clarification for Your Honour, that it also places the final determination of this matter in the hands of the Speaker.

Section 3 fixes the salary for the Leader of the Opposition and also goes on to make provision for any member other than the Speaker, Deputy Speaker, the Premier and any other member while in receipt of remuneration as a Minister or Parliamentary Secretary to receive a salary at the fixed rate of \$2,640 per annum.

This Bill is quite simple and none of its provisions involves any technical legalistic information.

I, therefore, beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called separately and passed.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION) BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 9 stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier: Second reading of a Bill to provide for the remuneration of Ministers consequent on the repeal of the Executive Committee (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949, 1949-30 and for the remuneration of Parliamentary Secretaries.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the object of this Bill is to make a continual provision for the remuneration of what used to be designated as Members of the Executive Committee; in other words, Government Ministers. There is also an additional provision for Parliamentary Secretaries.

Sir, you will remember the Speech from the Throne in 1961 when it was stated that it was the policy of the Government that at some time Parliamentary Secretaries would be appointed to assist Ministers in the discharge of their duties. Now that a Senate is to be established, it may be necessary to appoint one or more Parliamentary Secretaries, especially so, when we are moving forward to independence, to assist Ministers in the discharge of their duties.
6.30 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to make this clear; there is no provision made for any increase in the remuneration which Ministers now earn, but there is provision being made for the appointment of Parliamentary Secretaries from time to time.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Interpretation Act, 1949.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the object of this Bill is to amend the Interpretation Act, 1949, in order to provide for the definition of certain expressions which are desirable in view of the proposed constitutional changes with which we are now dealing. We are presently awaiting receipt of the consolidated amendments to the Barbados Letters Patent for 1964 which we hope will shortly be passed by Her-Majesty-in-Council. In this Bill we have to seek definitions, first of all, in relation to the Cabinet and, secondly, in relation to the Letters Patent which, instead of being the Letters Patent of 1914, will be cited as the Letters Patent of 1964. Since there was no provision previously made for a Senate, the word "Senate" is also defined in the new Letters Patent. Hon. members will remember that, hitherto, Ministers of Government were members of the Executive Committee and they owed their authority to the Executive Committee Act which is now being repealed; hence there is the necessity for this Bill.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the Second reading of a Bill to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1957.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is another short amendment to the Representation of the People Act, 1957. This amendment is merely to provide that the person who is in receipt of a salary or other allowance as a Parliamentary Secretary shall not be deemed to have accepted an office of profit under the Crown. 6.40 p.m.

This amendment is necessary so as to prevent a member of the House of Assembly having to vacate his seat on the acceptance of a post of Parliamentary Secretary.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 12 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier, but I understand that the Order has not been printed and circulated.

THE MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1964

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 31 stands in the name of the hon. Leader of the House: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend Section 8 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937 to substitute an amendment providing for the increases in fees chargeable for identification marks to be attached by garages to vehicles. It also seeks to allow the number of identification numbers to garages to be a maximum of six instead of three for each garage. Representations have been made to the appropriate Ministry that the number of identification marks at present available to garages is insufficient, and this Bill seeks to double the number of identification marks.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE LEGISLATURE (OFFICES OF PROFIT)
(EXEMPTION) ACT, 1964

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill relating to the disqualification attaching to membership of the Legislature on the ground of the holding or acceptance of an office or profit or emolument under the Crown and matters connected therewith.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is the Bill circulated this morning, and at the same time we gave notice to hon. members that we intended to deal with it today. This relates to the disqualification relating to members of the House of Assembly whereby a member is required to vacate his seat therein on his acceptance of an office of profit or emolument under the Crown, and you will notice, Sir, that the disqualification.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member should ask that this Order be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: As Your Honour pleases.

I beg to move that this Order be taken as the next Order of the day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

6.50 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: As I was saying, this Bill sets out the manner in which a member of the House is disqualified from retaining his seat in the House of Assembly or the proposed Senate if he accepts or takes an office of profit under the Crown. Section 2 makes it clear the manner in which a person is not regarded as having accepted an office of profit under the Crown. It also provides that a person is not to be regarded as accepting an office of profit or emolument under the Crown by reason only that he is in receipt of remuneration in respect of any other office which the Governor-in-Executive Committee declares by Order not to be a disqualifying office for the purpose of section 89 of the Representation of the People Act, 1957, 1957-50.

Now, Sir, section 3 makes provision whereby a person is not to be regarded as holding an office of profit or emolument under the Crown by reason only that he is in receipt of remuneration in respect of any office from time to time included in the First Schedule, which Schedule may be amended by Order of the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

What we have done is to attach to the Bill a Schedule defining the organisations or statutory boards in the country to which membership would not disqualify you from

a seat in the proposed Senate, and the Schedule can be extended from time to time in order to add to it any organisation or statutory body.

Sir, you will see in the Schedule the lists of Boards which it is proposed to include. They are: the Natural Gas Corporation, the Public Utilities Board, the Barbados Development Board, the Transport Board, the Housing Authority, the Board of Education, the Tourist Board, the Board of Management of the Agricultural Credit Bank, the Marketing Corporation, the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and it is also proposed to add the Scotland District Soil Conservation Board.

I therefore beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not altogether quite clear on this matter before us nor did the Minister make it so clear. He knows that he has to make things crystal clear for me. I take it — and I hope that if I am wrong that he would stop me. — that if you are a member of this House you also now will be eligible to take another job. You will be able to be a member of this House and to be a Parliamentary Secretary drawing money. You will be eligible to sit down on all sorts of various Boards whether the offices are remunerative or not.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I do not think the hon. member is going too right.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. junior member for St. Joseph continue.

Mr. SMITH: As I have said, I would like the Hon. Minister to stop me if I am going wrong. A member of the House can also accept any office of profit under the Crown; in other words, he can be a member of the House and accept an office which would permit him to draw money somewhere else.

I am wondering why out of the blue, so early or so late now, when it is drawing near to election time that a bill of this sort should be discussed so hurriedly.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The particular matter which he should have raised that matter under, has been dealt with long ago. This Bill has nothing to do with a member of the House or with an additional Parliamentary Secretary.

Mr. SMITH: That is one point on which the Hon. Minister has stopped me; but as far as I see it, this Bill seeks to make provision with regard to the disqualification relating to membership of the House of Assembly and whereby a member is required to vacate his seat on his acceptance of an office of profit or emoluments under the Crown. I take it that I am a member of the House and that you are protecting me, should I take another job of profit under the Crown. I will be glad, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you will put me right if I am wrong. In other words, this sort of thing could not happen before. In other words according to my little boy at school, I would be drawing two monies. When I give my little boy two ten-cent pieces, he tells me that I am drawing two monies.

As I was saying, Sir, I am wondering why this has come about so hurriedly now, when it is so near to election time, when we cannot tell what Government would come into power, so that we are protecting ourselves or the next Government by making it possible now at this late hour to be providing two jobs for one person. I cannot understand it.

According to the Objects and Reasons, this Bill seeks to make provision with regard to (a) the disqualification relating to membership of the House of Assembly whereby a member is required to vacate his seat therein on his acceptance of an office of profit or emolument under the Crown;

(b) the disqualification which will relate to membership of the proposed Senate whereby a person will be disqualified from being appointed or holding office as a Senator if he holds an office of profit or emolument under the Crown.

In relation to (a) Clause 2 seeks to make it clear that a person is not to be regarded as accepting or having accepted an office of profit or emolument under the Crown by reason only that he is or was in receipt of remuneration in respect of any office for which remuneration is provided by the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949, 1949-29."

Now, Sir, I would not go further. The bill goes further; but from what I read, you will be able to see that if you are drawing money from a particular office under the Crown, it will not prevent you from being a Senator. In other words, I will be drawing money from another place and will be a Senator too.

A VOICE: That is not so.
7.00 p.m.

The disqualification which will relate to membership of the proposed Senate whereby a person will be disqualified from being appointed or holding office as a Senator is if he holds an office of profit or emolument under the Crown. This is what I am saying: If one is holding an office of emolument under the Crown, as it stands now, he cannot be a Senator. This Bill provides that he will not be disqualified; he can hold office and still become a Senator. If I read it correctly, that is so. Why do you make these provisions? If you want to be a big shot, you should either give up the job and become a Senator or hold your job and let somebody else be the Senator. That is my point.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I appreciate the hon. member's difficulty, even with this latitude, because the hon. member has not received this Bill until today. The hon. member did not have the opportunity of having this Bill for three or four weeks because, in that case, he would have been more *au fait* with it. It is therefore unreasonable to ask the hon. member to absorb these two provisions at such short notice. The present position is that the hon. member and the rest of us may be liable to have our positions challenged right now; because the position in Barbados is that when we introduced the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Bill we did not apparently think it necessary to make it clear, or, as the hon. member would go so far as to say, to make it abundantly clear or to make assurance doubly sure, that the mere fact that we were paying members of the House of Assembly by virtue of their being members of the House of Assembly, would not disqualify them from being members of the House. If payment of the members of this House would disqualify persons from membership of the House, it means that the Bill disqualified anybody from sitting as a member of this House.

From 1949 when the question of remuneration of members was first introduced in this House, there was no provision in any law in Barbados relating to the holding of an office of profit under the Crown, but in all other Crown Colonies there was such legislation. The mere fact that a Minister received a car loan in Trinidad was challenged in the Law Courts because there was statutory provision against a person who held a seat in the Legislative Assembly receiving any kind of remuneration under the Crown, whether it was by way of a car loan, salary or otherwise; but salaries were exempted whereas car loans were not. We did not make it clear that because we are members of the House we are not disqualified from membership of the House, because of the receipt of remuneration. We are now making it clear that we are not disqualified because we sit in this Assembly and receive some kind of remuneration for the duties which we perform. I say that we were fortunate in that we were not challenged as to the position.

There is another Chamber in the Legislature of this colony which is referred to as the Other Place. The members of that Other Place are nominated by the Governor by virtue of the authority which is vested in him by the Letters

Patent and the Royal Instructions. There is no limit to the number of persons who can be appointed to that Other Place, but by convention there is the number of 15. These members of the Other Place receive no remuneration. Members of the Other Place sit as members of Statutory Boards. There is no legislation necessary for that in view of the fact that they do not come under the Representation of the People Act; there are no qualifications except the disqualification of the attainment of the age of 75 years. Her Majesty the Queen vicariously through the Governor can appoint anybody to the Senate where persons are over 21 years. As far as I can remember, there is no question as to the qualification for membership of the Other Place; but there is the disqualification if a person holds an office of profit under the Crown.

The members of the Other Place receive no salary; they are nominated by His Excellency the Governor and they sit on Statutory Boards. As a matter of fact, some of the members of the Other Place are strictly Civil Servants, such as the Attorney General, and there is no better criterion of a person who is receiving profit under the Crown than if you are a member of the Civil Establishment. At one time there were the Financial Secretary and the Attorney General sitting as members of the Other Place. This Bill does not make it possible for members of this House to sit on Statutory Boards other than Boards like the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank, which is not a Statutory corporation, but a Board on which four members of this House by law have to sit. These members have been, from time immemorial, receiving compensation for their attendance at meetings. In the Schedule to this Bill, the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank is not included because some members of this House are members of this Board. We have set up certain statutory corporations, and there is some opinion that receipt for attendance at meetings of these corporations may be deemed as receipt of profit under the Crown. Some of the Chairmen of the corporations receive fixed fees or compensation, while others receive fees according to the number of meetings which they attend — so much per meeting attended.
7.10 p.m.

It is not felt desirable that members of Statutory corporations should be debarred from membership of the Senate, because there are members of the Other Place now who are members of Statutory Corporations. The purpose therefore of Clause 3 is to make it abundantly clear that the mere fact that a member of the Senate receives any remuneration, fee or allowance in respect of his tenure of any office on any of these statutory corporations set out in the Schedule only, in addition to the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank, does not disqualify him. In other words, a member of the Senate will be substituted for a member of the Other Place in respect of membership of the Barbados Sugar Agricultural Bank, not the Agricultural Credit Bank. Apart from that, the other statutory corporations are listed, and we have added to them the Soil Conservation Board in the Schedule. Membership of any of these Corporations will not be a disqualification from being a member of the Senate.

It is a bit involved, Sir, to put in simple language in a few short moments, but I hope I cleared up the position that has confronted the hon. member with so much difficulty. What I should like to repeat is that the purpose of this Bill is not to make it possible for a member of the House of Assembly to be a member of a Statutory Corporation or Board, but only for members of the Senate to become members of Boards or to remain as members of Boards, because for all we know there may be some members of the Chamber now who may be members of the Senate who are members of Statutory Corporations. There may be people who are not now members of the Other Place who may become members of the Senate, and in view of the fact that there will be a shortage of Ministerial representation in the Senate when it comes into being, it is felt highly desirable that there should be in as many cases as possible representatives of statutory corporations in the Senate to answer questions. The members of the Senate would not be interested in any pay except in so far as they may become Parliamentary Secretaries or Ministers, but in other

respects, they will not be receiving remuneration in the same way that floor members of this House receive remuneration for their services.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I understand the Premier quite well and I am glad to see that he is looking through.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not want to curb the hon. member, but he cannot make two speeches on the second reading.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I gave way to the Hon. Premier.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member did give way to the Hon. Premier, too.

Mr. SMITH: He wants to muzzle me all the time and he must not do it. He knows that I gave way for the Premier, too.

As I said, Sir, I thank the Hon. Premier for his explanation, and he is looking through the right glasses this afternoon. He does not have on the dark ones; so he is seeing clearly. I only took up this Bill just now and had no time to read it. I was going to object to it, but I did not want it to be said that I did not want Government to get through with the job, though we do not have any right dealing with this this afternoon. However, Sir, I never said that no member of this House should be a member of the Senate too. I raise my argument on Clause 2 relative to a Senator. You did not want to disqualify him from being a Senator while receiving emoluments under the Crown. My argument is that if you want to be a Senator you should be a Senator; but if you are on another Board, we have quite a lot of people.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, is the hon. member referring to Clause 2 or Clause 3? He had better look at the Bill because the part dealing with the Senate is Clause 3, and the reason why I took so long to answer the hon. member is because I could not follow if what he said was in Clause 2 which referred to the Senate. Clause 2 deals purely with the first point I made that being a Minister or member of this House does disqualify you from sitting in the Senate, and Clause 3 is a different level altogether. Merely being a member of a statutory corporation does not disqualify you from being a member of the Senate, but they are not reversible; that is, a member of this House is still not entitled except in so far as laid down by the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank or in similar legislation to be a member of a statutory Board and receive remuneration for it.

Mr. SMITH: I did not go into the Bill at all, Sir. I was dealing with the Objects and Reasons in making my point. I will be very short because I will not object to the Bill. I am glad that the Premier sees with me in these blunders because I had no time to read the Bill. I was, however, dealing with paragraph (b) of the Objects and Reasons and I will read it for the second time. It reads as follows:-

"The disqualification which will relate to membership of the proposed Senate whereby a person will be disqualified from being appointed or holding office as a Senator if he holds an office or profit or emolument under the Crown."

This Bill now safeguards that person, but I am saying that there are some people who are not interested in the people or even in the particular Government; but when they see that they can get a "berry" from any particular Board and still be a Senator, that will be their intention. I am not blaming this Government for that because it will happen in any Government; nor would I say that this Government is trying to protect its friends, because they are not going to be in power for ever, and when they come out the next Government can see for their friends too.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member would give way, all the Bill seeks to do is

to give the proposed Senate the same position which now is occupied by the Other Place. There are members of statutory Boards drawing emoluments attached to membership of these Boards who are now members of the Other Place. Therefore all those members of the Development Board who draw the fees attached to membership of the Board can be now members of the Other Place at the same time; so it would be rather strange to have a Place come into existence for the Other Place and not to attach the same privileges to it which are attached to the existing Other Place. Membership of the Development Board or the Tourist Board has never precluded members at the same time from the Other Place; so why should it from the proposed Senate?

7.20 p.m.

If the hon. member will just cast his memory back, he would see that this Bill seeks to do nothing which is not done now.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are changing now from the Legislative Council to Senate and I am deciding how they should change. It has nothing to do with what we have been doing before. I have been trying to point out to the Hon. Minister that there are some people who are not interested in other people or a particular Government, but they will just feel that they can be a Senator and they will do all that they can do to be a Senator so that they can get a berry too. That is all that they want. I am not blaming members of this Government for it because if they go out of office and I come in it will happen to me too. You will get some people who may hate me politically, but still want to be a big shot in the Senate. That is the point which I was trying to make. You can never tell what Government will be in power. No one Government can be in power all the time and that is why I am a little bit puzzled why this Government is pushing this Bill now. I am saying that if you are made a Senator and you were on a Board, you should not be working in a dual capacity when there are lots of people in this country who are quite willing to give their services freely and conscientiously. The Governor may nominate, but he may nominate on the advice of somebody else.

Sir, I am saying that if you are receiving emoluments from an office under the Crown, you should not be a Senator. We have a lot of people who are interested in the country and who would give their services honestly and conscientiously. Therefore, we should not encourage a thing of this sort anymore.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive were called separately and passed.

The First Schedule was called and passed.

The Second Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until next Tuesday, 17th March, 1964, at 12.00 o'clock (noon).

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before you put the question, may I be permitted to inform hon. members that we propose to bring the Estimates and Appropriation Bill next Tuesday and then to come back

later the same week -- may be Thursday 19th and Friday 20th -- to deal with them.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

7.30 p.m.