

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 3rd November, 1964.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 o'clock p.m., today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade, Labour and Social Security*); Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Communications and Works*); Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. C. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. E. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Development*).

Prayers were read.

Messrs. HOLDER and BOXILL entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting which was held on 20th October, 1964, have been duly printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and if there is no objection, I will declare those Minutes to be read and confirmed. (*After a pause*). There being no objection, I now declare those Minutes to be duly confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Quarterly returns of transactions in rum to 30th September, 1964.

The Financial Rules, 1964.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay a Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 31st August, 1964.

Mr. SMITH entered the House and took his seat.

PETITION

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a Petition from the St. Lawrence Hotel Company Ltd, praying the House to pass a Bill authorising them to construct a groyne with or without seawalls in the sea opposite their Hotel.

The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

The Petition was taken as read.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$3,941 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65, Part I Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate No. 36 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

On my own behalf, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours' Act, 1960, the sum of \$44,270 required to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1964-65 as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to amend the Transport Board Act, 1955.

Mr. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

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 has just been given.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I also propose to ask hon. members since we have a very small Agenda under Government Business today - as a matter of fact, there is only one Item under Government Business - to agree to the suspension of the appropriate Standing Orders, if they so desire, so that we can deal directly with this Item under Government Business and adjourn on the completion of the item. I am quite sure that hon. members are not averse to a short sitting of the House in order that they can devote a little more time to their own personal business. I therefore beg to move that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be now suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, there is a Resolution under Private Members' Business standing in my name and it is a very important matter. It deals with the Inspectors of the Department of Highways and Transport.

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the fact that the motion for the suspension of certain Standing Orders has been agreed to, perhaps the hon. member.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in so far as we are concerned, we are quite willing to allow the hon. mem-

ber to proceed with his Resolution at any time he so desires. My only reason for moving the suspension of these Standing Orders is that no hon. member appeared to want to take advantage of his time and there was no Reply laid to any Question. I therefore thought that we could dispose of the item under Government Business and then proceed with the adjournment. However, Sir, that is in no way to inhibit any hon. member who desires to take advantage of his right to discuss any business which he has standing in his name on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business. If hon. members so desire, at the conclusion of Government Business we could make a motion that Private Members' Business be taken.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to authorise the St. Lawrence Hotel Company Ltd. to construct a groyne with or without seawalls connected with or attached thereto.
2.55 p.m.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a Report of one Committee which will be available in a short while, but which is not instantly ready. I will give permission as soon as that is ready for it to be presented.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Transport Board Act, 1955, be now read a first time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to authorise the St. Lawrence Hotel Co. Ltd. to construct a groyne be now read a first time.

Mr. SEALEY: I beg to second that.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Private Members' Business Time and the first Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite ready to do that Order, but I hope to do it very shortly.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 7 standing in my name under Private Members' Business be the first Order of the Day.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION re INCREASE IN NUMBER OF INSPECTORS IN HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 7 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael to move the passing of a Resolution relating to inspectors at the Department of Highways and Transport.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution reads as follows:-

WHEREAS there has been a steady increase in the flow of traffic over the past five (5) years in this Island,

AND WHEREAS the staff at the Department of Highways and Transport appointed to inspect and test motor vehicles is hard pressed and cannot keep up with overwhelmingly large increase in vehicles in this Island;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to increase the number of posts of Inspector, Highways and Transport to double their present complement.

You will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that fifteen years ago the amount of vehicles in the island could not be 5,000. In those days inspection of motor vehicles used to be done by two men from the various Police Stations. Inspection of vehicles in the City and St. Michael was done by two policemen from the Central Police Station; District "B" carried out the inspection of Christ Church and St. John, District "D" for St. Thomas and St. James, District "F" for St. Andrew and St. Joseph, and District "E" for St. Lucy and St. Peter. At that time we had a Commissioner by the name of Colonel Dickens who brought all the vehicles for hire or trade under the jurisdiction of District "A" of which your humble servant was one of the inspectors. Finding that the number of vehicles was increasing at a fast rate, he created the Transport Board which was housed at the time at the railway in Probyn Street. As time moved on he discovered that the railway station at Probyn Street was bursting at the seams, and it was transferred to the Pine.

Mr. Speaker, In spite of the increase in traffic which has come into the island within the last five years, we still have the same two Transport Board inspectors carrying out the bulk of inspection in the island. Formerly, Sir, we had no Leyland buses or buses carrying 42 passengers which take about four times as long to inspect as it would take to inspect an ordinary motor car. This year inspections started from 1st January when the law says that they should start from 31st May in every year, and if you carry in a vehicle now for inspection, it could not be inspected for another five weeks. These two inspectors also have to attend accidents throughout the island, attend the Police Magistrates Courts and give expert, mechanical evidence throughout the eleven parishes, and very often vehicles remain uninspected because there is no person there to carry out the necessary inspection. In addition to all this, there are now such heavy vehicles as the Barber Green machine and the fire engines.

I am therefore asking the appropriate Minister to come to the rescue of these two gentlemen and appoint at least two more inspectors since the number of vehicles in the island today is over 14,000, and they have over 7,000 inspections to do apart from rejections, as sometimes one vehicle is rejected four or five times. This leaves the inspectors with no time to themselves morning, noon or night, and I am asking the appropriate Minister to come to the rescue and help these poor men.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, in supporting this Resolution, I would say that the situation has been very ably demonstrated.
3.05 p.m.

There is a number of reasons why we should have greater efficiency than we have today. We have so many inspections to be ready during that period of a year, especially today when the Treasurers of the Councils are not permitted to issue a licence until your vehicle is certified.

I go further. If you have not got your licence, where do you stand with the insurance company? If you do not have your certificate in order from the Highways and Transport Department ready, you are unable to get your licence, therefore you either have to take your vehicle off the road or drive with the risk of being reported and as you know many persons are depending on their truck for their livelihood. Therefore, they run the risk of being prosecuted by the police if they do not take it off the road.

In recent years I notice that later and later it gets before the police take action to inspect motor vehicles. It is only last month that motor vehicles inspections were made by the Police Department and it is for the simple reason that they knew fully well that all the inspections had not been completed, therefore, they could not justifiably ask for the licence.

Sir, I have great pleasure in seconding the Resolution.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to add my quota to this debate. I commend very highly the hon. senior member for St. Michael who introduced this Resolution and the manner in which he made his points as he went into the reason why this House should approve of the Resolution. I also compliment the seconder of the Resolution, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, for the manner in which he spoke on it.

This is a matter of road safety and protection of the travelling public. If there are only two men to do the job of inspectors, it means that hackney cars and such vehicles would have to wait for long periods before they can be deemed road worthy. That means that the public would at some time or the other have to suffer. Another thing is that the owners of these vehicles would in the mean time be losing trade because their business is to serve the public.

That is one side and there is another very obvious point.

The two Inspectors who are now engaged are working under great strain. They have to work on Sundays and bank holidays also, and if these two men are suffering from undue strain, they cannot perform efficiently.

The third and last point is the question of accidents on the road. If there are only actually two men who have to be on the spot as early as possible after an accident takes place - and that goes for bank holidays and festivals also when they will be called out to any part of the Island and there are instances where one man may be on the job and before he is finished he is called to another - routine matters must be held up. I know what I am saying on this subject. This thing can be very tiring especially at night. I know of an accident which took place around 8.00 o'clock a Sunday night and the Inspector did not get on the spot until 2.00 o'clock in the night because he was busy otherwise. That is the sort of thing which happens pretty regularly in Barbados. The Christmas holidays will be soon upon us and you can always rely on accidents repeating themselves around this time because there is the question of one indulging in the extra drink and as a result something happens.

I repeat, if these two Inspectors work under a strain, they cannot give of their best and if inspections cannot be done more frequently than they are, and, if people have to wait on the roads long hours after accidents, that is not a good thing. The vehicles which are involved in accidents sometimes are road obstacles, unsightly and sometimes they hold up other vehicles for unduly long periods. With those three points, I heartily support this Resolution, and I hope that hon. members will see fit to vote for it.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I think that I would be lacking in my responsibility to the public if I did not speak in support of this Resolution. I feel that all hon. members, Mr. Speaker, who have the interest of the travelling public at heart and who have any knowledge of the matter of motor vehicles in this Island, would have absolutely no hesitation in supporting a Resolution of this sort. I strongly back the hon. senior member for St. Michael who brought in this Resolution because it is quite a long time that these Inspectors have been complaining of being over-worked.

Sir, I remember years ago when these men were appointed Inspectors of motor vehicles that you started around the month of March to make inspections and these inspections ended in May. That means that there were three months' time in which owners of vehicles had for inspec-

tions of their vehicles before they paid for them in June. Today, as the hon. senior member for St. Michael pointed out, inspections on motor vehicles start in January and I assure you that some of these vehicles are not finished inspecting until the month of October, although the rates for these vehicles are to be paid by June. Unless a certificate of inspection is issued you, you cannot go and pay your rates. Therefore, it makes it difficult for the vehicle owner who cannot get his inspection before that time. Not only you cannot pay for your vehicle but in the case of a motor omnibus you will lose trade and the travelling public will suffer as a result because whenever a motor omnibus has to go on another route, the owner has to get special permission from the Department of Highways and Transport and the Department would not issue a permit for a motor omnibus to go on another route until it is licensed. You have to get inspected by 31st May, to get a licence but today, you are telling me that while you must get a licence by the 31st May, you cannot get your motor omnibus inspected until all down in October. That is the time when agricultural tractors and lorries are being made ready for inspections by the month of December.

What is more, Sir, you have a line of vehicles in the yard of the Highways and Transport Department, and you get one inspector who has gone to the Court and the other is attending to an accident, or perhaps, to accidents because as soon as he leaves one you often find that he has to go to another.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it needs me to be very lengthy in this debate because I feel sure that all hon. members in this Chamber who have the interest of the travelling public at heart would support a Resolution of this sort.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution which I feel would have the support of the Government. I am sure that all hon. members on that side will support this.

3.15 p.m.

I do not think that any Government should sit in office and allow laws to be broken, although not wilfully or by design, but they may be broken nevertheless. All that has been said about the need for Inspectors is absolutely true; two Inspectors cannot possibly carry on this work today. As the hon. mover of the Resolution has said, the law says that during the month of May these inspections should be carried out. As time went on this Department did start to work in January. I am in a position to say that between June and October there are dozens, if not hundreds, of vehicles on the highway which have not been licensed. The reason for that is not at all the fault of the owners of these vehicles because they must present to the Licensing Authority a certificate from these Inspectors, who are the legal authority, before they can operate their vehicles. That must be done as long as you have a heavy goods vehicle. As you know, Sir, as the law as it now stands, and the case which has been cited in this country is that if a man takes out a licence in 1910 there is no authority to give his licence number to anybody else. That law stands today, but during the months of May and June when a man must license his truck, he prepares it in the month of January and he is given a date in October for this inspection, not in June. It is no fault of the Officers inasmuch as it is a physical impossibility for them to carry out this work as the position now is, and therefore a man must go on working his vehicle otherwise hundreds of people will be out of work.

The Police must wink their eyes under these conditions. In the month of February the Scavenging Department applied to the Department of Highways and Transport for permission to have their trucks licensed and there were no dates until after June. They could not give them any date until after June, but you are not authorised to run your vehicle after June without having a licence, because if the Police were to report you then you are in trouble. If we were to decide that these lorries should remain in the yard then you may have an epidemic. The position is as simple as that. I think, Sir, that the staff of Inspectors at this Department should be more than doubled. Not only must these Inspectors go on the spot to inspect these units but at night

they are called out to accidents after they have been working all day. It takes any time between half an hour and an hour to examine these large vehicles. I am absolutely certain that a reasonable Government, a Government which has the interest of the people at heart, a Government which wants to see the law observed in the fulfillment and not in the breach, will certainly give this matter very high priority. If you did not have the Police who would listen to reason, we said: "Of course, we had twelve trucks on the road." The Treasurer cannot take the money because the Inspectors cannot find the time to examine these vehicles. Of course, they were breaking the law; they had no right being on the road after the 30th June without being licenced, but the stuff could not remain on the streets. You must present a certificate of fitness for your heavy vehicle to operate on the road.

I think that this Resolution should have the unanimous support of this Chamber because it is one of those things which, if you do not implement, you are ultimately only playing ostrich, hiding your head in the sand. I cannot see any responsible member of any Government not paying attention to this matter. I look across at the Minister of Communications and I am quite sure that he will appreciate what I have said. Recently, I had to deal with a matter in which a man was given a date in October for the inspection of his vehicle, but through some slip his number which he had for 15 years was given away. There was some sort of confusion. It was not that this man could not pay his taxes. Another thing is that a man is deprived of the right of paying this money in half-yearly instalments. Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this Resolution and I hope that the Government will give it priority. I hope that 4, 5 or 6 Inspectors will be appointed so as to expedite this matter.

Mr. SMITH; Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is one which is long overdue. Now, Sir, the last hon. member who spoke has said that we want an increase by about six Inspectors, but I would go further and say that it will require an increase of about a dozen, if you are going to take this matter seriously and think about the lives which are exposed to these vehicles. It takes some time to inspect a motor vehicle. You just cannot look at a motor vehicle, you just cannot put a motor vehicle on a hoist and okay it like that or turn it down like that. I repeat, Sir, that it takes some time in order to inspect a motor vehicle. You just cannot turn it down like that.

3.25 p.m.

There are certain parts that the inspector must touch, handle or shake to see that they are in order, and this takes him some time. In my opinion, one inspector can inspect no more than about six or eight vehicles per day properly. He may try to do more, but I cannot see it, especially when he has these long buses of which I believe he can only inspect three per day. These inspectors do not only make inspections as the various speakers have said, but they have to attend to court, they have to make out reports and make up their books, and as a result they have to take home the books at night, and they are called upon during the night to go to accidents. Now, Sir, we are asking too much of these inspectors, and they cannot do their work properly. I have known instances where a vehicle was taken for inspection and one part was found out of order. After that was fixed and the vehicle was taken back, it was turned down again for something else, which means that that vehicle was never properly inspected in the first instance, but on going back the second time the inspector discovered something else wrong. That alone tells you that the work is too much for them, and they have to find ways and means to get through with the work.

It is not fair, Sir, to call on a Civil Servant or any servant to take home his books after putting in a hard day's work. At night when he should be resting he has to make up his books in order to finish the job, and he is not getting overtime for that, nor is he getting remuneration for the current which he uses. After taking his dinner and settling down to another day's work during the night, the telephone rings and he has to go ten or fifteen miles in the country to another accident, and as soon as he gets back home, there

is a message for him to go somewhere else, I would therefore say that you need more than two inspectors; you need maybe a dozen.

Whilst we are on this point, we are thinking about the lives of the travelling public and pedestrians as a whole, and we have to pay attention to the competence of the brakes on these vehicles. If you have, say, 24 vehicles on the road of which fourteen are private and ten are goods vehicles, you inspect the goods vehicles' brakes to see that they are in order, but the other fourteen vehicles are not inspected. I wonder if the Government thinks it is good enough that private vehicles should not be inspected to see that the brakes are in order. That is one of the points which the Minister should take into consideration. It may be a bit touchy, but we have to protect people from themselves.

There is another point which I want to draw to the Minister's attention, and it is about third party insurance. According to how you insure, you can lay claims for the other person, but the third person in the true sense of the word is only if anything happens to human beings. I know of a case where a poor man bought a motor car to do some speculation. That was inspected because it was a goods vehicle, but what happened in this particular instance is that he was going around a corner and collided with another car, and it was proved that he was at fault. After the man sued him and got judgment, his house was sold over his head to pay the damages, and he had to go and rent a home for himself and his family. We have to be more serious about things like that and try to protect those people by seeing that insurance is taken out to that extent, because people have to make a living one way or another. Every honest human being tries to make a living though sometimes in the wrong way, and a little bad luck steps in and everything goes overboard.

Mr. SPEAKER; I think the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has made his point well and succinctly about third party and other insurance, but I am afraid that does not come within the scope of this Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: I know that, Sir, but I was only trying to draw to the Minister's attention that whilst going into this question about the inspectors, that the matter of motor vehicles is a very big one. There are several people on the road, and everybody must be protected. I do not see why the Transport Board should turn down a motor truck for the lack of paint. Paint cannot stop a truck or move it off, and so long as all the working parts and the brakes are in order, that is what we must concern ourselves with.

3.35 p.m.

If he gets along and tries to comply with these demands and after complying he finds himself short of cash to buy some paint or to have his vehicle painted, I do not think that he should be penalised and turned down. Everything is in order, all the mechanical parts and brakes are in order and you turn him down only because the vehicle is not painted. That is something which wants looking into.

As regards the upholstery and things of that sort, I think that that is a matter for the owner because if I had a hired car and I did not keep it in good order, it means that I am not going to get a job, therefore, I am forced to keep it in order so as to do that job. I do not see why the Highways Authorities should try to force that on the owners. I do not see why the truck man who wants to take up a load of lumber from a lumber yard or who wants to go into the country for a load of sand so as to make a living for himself and his family should be asked to have his vehicle painted. A coat of paint does not do the job because you can paint your vehicle ever so prettily and if the mechanical parts are not in order, you are not any wiser, therefore I feel that it is time that the transport authorities should go into this matter. So long as the mechanical parts are in order, you can leave out the painting. I know as a garage proprietor that after you have tried to put the mechanical parts on your vehicle in order that very little is left in your pocket.

Let us go ahead and try and get these vehicles on the road by increasing the Inspectors. What is the good of trying to keep your vehicle in good order and road worthy by way of having proper brakes and you have another fellow driving his vehicle along the road without proper brakes just because he is not affected by that order. That is another point which the Hon. Minister must take up. We are only concerned ourselves with good and proper brakes for public vehicles. Only this morning, Sir, I was driving to my place of business. I was on the main road and another car was on the cross road. When he applied his brakes, he had everything except brakes. It is a good thing that I had brakes, if not both of us would have been in a head-on collision. If I did not have good brakes, both of us would have been gone. He should have had good brakes but he is not called upon to have his car inspected. We must go into all that and see that every motor vehicle is fitted with proper brakes when it is on the road. You safeguard the travelling public by so doing. If you are driving a motor vehicle with good brakes and another chap comes along driving his car without good brakes and strikes your car, well then, you may go on to the other side leaving a wife and children behind. Therefore, you are protecting the travelling public when you see to it that proper brakes are on all vehicles which are using the road. The same way that you must have third party insurance taken out to be on the road, you should be required to have proper brakes on your vehicles.

I know that it will require an amendment to the law so that private vehicles should be inspected in order to take out a licence.

Mr. SPEAKER: As regards the hon. member saying that the 31st May, is the last day, as the law stands, if anyone uses a motor vehicle on the road after midnight on the 31st May, he is liable to be charged.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure hon. members who have spoken that the Government, so to speak, feels that this is a matter which has been overlooked and which is long overdue and merits immediate attention.

I must say that I congratulate the hon. senior member for St. Michael for bringing forward this Resolution but I want to assure him that long before this Resolution was debated, proper action had already been set in motion whereby relief and the necessary assistance will be granted in order that the two inspectors would be relieved from the onerous job which they have been performing so meritoriously over the last years.

I can assure hon. members that the matter has been dealt with and recommendations have been forwarded to my Ministry. Recommendations have been dealt with and they are now in the hands of the Establishment Branch, therefore, hon. members can expect some results in the foreseeable future by way of establishing more posts of inspector.

Hon. members who spoke have made very valuable contributions to this debate. I have made note of the salient points which they made, more especially those by the hon. senior member for the City and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. All those points have been noted and they will be examined very closely. It is correct to say that the volume of vehicular traffic has been increased by 100 per cent over the last fifteen years.

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph pointed out that the number of inspections could not be determined only by the number of vehicles because one vehicle may be inspected and examined on three or four occasions before it passes the final test. In effect, what he means to say is if there are 10,000 vehicles, it does not necessarily mean that there are 10,000 inspections.

As regards the question of the inspectors working overtime, and attending Courts and working on nights, all those points have been noted and, as a matter of fact, most of those points which have been raised today are matters

which I have entertained already. It is true to say that by pointing out of those matters today they have inspired me into going forward in that they have corroborated the points which have been examined in reviewing the plight of those two inspectors who have been very heavily overworked, who can no longer cope with the situation and who need immediate assistance and relief. As I have said already, the question of overtime is being examined and if that is considered feasible that would be looked into. The point raised by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph with respect to privately owned vehicles being tested for good brakes would also be carefully noted. Public vehicles are required to conform with certain standards. The hon. member referred to motor trucks carrying sand should not necessarily be called upon to be painted.

3.45 p.m.

I may say that the entire question of licensing is being looked into and the time will not be long when a new Licensing Authority will be set up in order to take place of the old licensing system as has been existing in this country. The Resolution which is being passed here today is in that connection and it is already being implemented in its terms. It is receiving the full attention of the Ministry and the proper Government Department which will have to establish more posts in order to grant relief and assistance to these two inspectors who needed this assistance not only in 1964, but five years ago or even longer.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no other hon. member who wants to contribute to this debate, the hon. senior member for St. Michael may exercise his right of reply.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the Hon. Minister for the good thoughts and ideas which he has expressed on a Resolution of this kind, I hope that he will be as co-operative in the future as he has been today.

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

RESOLUTION re BUS SHEDS FOR DISTRICTS IN ST. THOMAS

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that Order No. 5 under Private Members' Business be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave that Order No. 5 standing in his name under Private Members' Business be taken as the next Order of the Day. Unless there be any objection, leave will be granted the hon. member. *(After a pause)* There being no objection, leave is granted.

This Order is to move the passing of a Resolution relating to the inconvenience suffered while awaiting transportation, by persons in Arch Hall and Porey Spring districts, St. Thomas. The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is a rather simple one in that hon. member of this House are quite familiar with the areas which have been referred to in the Resolution. The people who live in these districts are experiencing much inconvenience because of the lack of proper sheltering facilities while awaiting transportation and in addition to that, they have approached me about the matter. I do think it would be a good thing if the Government would pay some attention to this matter. This Resolution reads as follows:-

WHEREAS the people living in the districts known as Arch Hall and Porey Spring in the parish of St. Thomas do encounter much inconvenience while awaiting transportation due to the lack of proper sheltering facilities, especially during the rainy season;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government pay some attention to such a grievance with a view to accommodating the said districts with bus sheds in the not too distant future.

Hon. members will notice from the text of the Resolution that there are two districts referred to, namely, Arch

Hall and Porey Spring, and these districts are those which passengers traverse regularly. They experience much inconvenience in getting buses, to say nothing of the inconvenience which is experienced during the rainy season. There are not many houses in the areas referred to, and at the actual spots to which people go in order to catch a bus, proper provision should be made for the establishment of bus sheds. The people in these areas do require the provision of bus sheds so that they can wait for the buses in a much more convenient manner than in allowing themselves to be exposed to the rain.

I am appealing to the Hon. Minister of Communications to see about the possibility of implementing the terms of this Resolution and have these bus sheds provided. I know that the provision of these bus sheds will serve a useful purpose not only in respect of the people who are residents in the area, but also in respect of other parishioners. The people who are travelling to the parishes of St. Joseph and St. Andrew and who wait at these junctions for buses, will also be accommodated. I am thinking in terms of many people who use the same spots or junctions to catch buses, and not necessarily the people who reside in the parish of St. Thomas. It would be a good thing for the Government to have such bus sheds erected. I do not think it is necessary, Mr. Speaker, for me to say anything more on this Resolution because hon. members are quite familiar with what is requested in it. I therefore have much pleasure in moving that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution for the sake of asking the hon. mover to withdraw it. (*Laughter*). (*ASIDES*). Mr. Speaker, the reason why I am seconding this motion cannot be questioned. As Your Honour would have seen, the colleagues of the hon. member were a bit reluctant to second the motion and I therefore volunteered to second it. That being so, it only shows how favourable this Resolution goes down with people.
3.55 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. senior member for St. Peter does more than justice in that no one is able quicker to catch the eye of the Speaker than the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is why I am doing it, because the hon. senior member for St. Thomas really did not read the text of the Resolution which he wanted passed. However, I will proceed to read it for him and for the benefit of members: It reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS the people living in the districts known as Arch Hall and Porey Spring in the parish of St. Thomas do encounter much inconvenience while awaiting transportation due to the lack of proper sheltering facilities, especially during the rainy season;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government pay some attention to such a grievance with a view to accommodating the said districts with bus sheds in the not too distant future."

Mr. Speaker, this is predominantly a parochial Resolution, and we should not be asked in this Assembly to pass a Resolution of this character. We would agree if the hon. member were asking the Government to erect bus stops or institute shelters all over the Island where we would see it is an inconvenience, but why should we be asked to pass a Resolution to provide bus shelters in Arch Hall and Porey Spring? I feel that this is a matter which the member should take up with the Minister since it is so parochial in character. This is just like my coming in here and asking the Chamber to pass a Resolution to put a light in Mile-and-a-Quarter or a stand-pipe in Indian Ground because I am the representative for that constituency. I do not feel I should do that, because a Resolution in my humble opinion should be wide or national in character like the Resolution we passed earlier dealing with the inspectorate of the transport services. That was not done for St. Thomas, St. Andrew or St. Michael. When you do something like that, it is something the whole Island can speak about, but really and truly what do we know about the situation in so far as bus

shelters in Arch Hall and Porey Spring are concerned as distinct from other districts in the Island?

My idea, Mr. Speaker, is that it is wasting our time to ask Government to put a shelter in a parish. Next you will get these things exploited and somebody will ask you to put up a cow shed in the Lower Green or a horse shed for the few horses that come to town with provisions. I feel I cannot advise the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, but since I see that he has got the inverse advice from his colleagues who do not support this Resolution..... (*A VOICE: You cannot say that!*) Now there are two members, other than members of the Cabinet, and they took so long to second this, that rather than have any embarrassment I got up and seconded the Resolution. If the Ministers say they are willing to support this, I will admonish all the members on this side to vote against it, because this is the kind of Resolution that would set a bad precedent. If you once pass a Resolution like this, what is going to prevent all of us from bringing in our half-cent Resolutions asking the Government to send a Waterworks van to fix a burst pipe as somebody did not get water the night before? The member should ask in a question whether the Minister is aware that there is inconvenience suffered by the people in Porey Spring and Arch Hall districts and ask him to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, there must be two ways of doing your Parliamentary duties: one is by questions, and the other is by Resolution in which you invite the whole House to give support, because when we pass a Resolution in here, it is something you cannot ignore. I will ask members not to join in supporting this Resolution, because it would set a bad precedent. It is more appropriate to ask a question, and the hon. member should take that as blunt, harsh but sincere advice to ask a question of the Minister rather than ask us to pass a Resolution concerning Arch Hall and Porey Spring. I was in St. Thomas this week; so I know something about it.

Mr. SMITH and Mr. MOTTLEY rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition caught my eye first.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, senior Parliamentarians must not at times be too brutal in their criticism of junior members of this House, even though they may be in the opposite Party, when on the face of it it appears that they do mean well. The position here is a very simple one, and what the hon. member who has just sat down said is that he seconded the motion for the sake of getting the member to withdraw the Resolution. I do not know how seriously members of the Government took it, but you will agree with me, Sir, that there is a tremendous lot in what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said. During the debate someone said that the members on the other side were not supporting this, and it was asked how did we know. We can only know these things from commonsense, and I assume that the members on the other side must have commonsense. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is an old Parliamentarian, and I was even going to make a suggestion to him, as we must learn to be kind. If I had to do this Resolution, I would get around it in such a way that I would defy the hon. senior member for St. Peter offering criticism on the grounds that it was purely parochial, but you can see that the hon. member has his interest pinned down in St. Thomas.

You will agree with me, Sir, that the wording "WHEREAS the people living in the districts known as Arch Hall and Porey Spring" is parochial, and when you are a backbencher or a member of the Opposition, it is more appropriate in a matter of this sort to ask a question, but if you have to bring a Resolution, you have to know the tricks of the game and how to get around it. Under the circumstances, therefore, I am appealing to the member to postpone this Resolution, and I am sure that the hon. senior member for St. Peter will be kind enough to say that that is the correct way. The member's colleagues in Government should also agree unless they want to make themselves look stupid to the general public who understand what they are doing.
4.05 p.m.

I say that with the kindest feeling towards my honourable friend because I know what it was when I first came to this House without the experience and guidance therefore, I am appealing to hon. members. We realise that the hon. senior member for St. Peter can be really brutal when he wants to criticise you.

Mr. SPEAKER: That remark by the hon. member is close to the parliamentary border line of being offensive.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It may be close enough but I am not attempting to touch the crease.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the word "severe" would be a better word to use.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Well, Sir, I do not think anybody would raise objection to what I said.

However, Sir, I beg to move that this Resolution be postponed for further consideration.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown was talking about a break. I do not know if he means the tea break or not. Hon. members speaking on this Resolution seem to be making fun, but to me, it is a very serious Resolution. First of all, this Resolution comes from a member of the Government. I was at one time a member of the Government in power and when my party was in power floor members of that party had to forward all Resolutions and Questions and things of that sort to the party and Ministers concerned, and, if the Minister concerned did not agree and did not think that what we were bringing forward was good enough, we had to leave it out. I take it that the same thing must be done by members of this Government because I do not think the hon. senior member for St. Thomas would have taken it upon himself to draft a Resolution without the knowledge of members of his party or the Ministers concerned. I feel that was so, knowing the hon. member as I do and it seems to me that it must have been agreed to by the members of his party, otherwise they would not have allowed him to carry on.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. junior member for St. Joseph not to labour that point too much because it is a question of party discipline.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I am not laying the blame on the hon. member but here it is the Resolution reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS the people living in the districts known as Arch Hall and Porey Spring in the parish of St. Thomas do encounter much inconvenience while awaiting transportation due to the lack of proper sheltering facilities, especially during the rainy season;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government pay some attention to such a grievance with a view to accommodating the said districts with bus sheds in the not too distant future."

Sir, am I to believe that there are only the people in Porey Spring and Arch Hall who come to town and use a bus? What about the people in Welchman Hall and Fisher Pond? Fisher Pond is a place from where you have to travel a half mile before you get to a bus stop and if there is one place which needs a bus shelter for the people, it is Fisher Pond. When you leave Fisher Pond Tenantry, you leave by a road which has canes on both sides but when you live in Arch Hall, there are two shops and other houses in that district at which you can get shelter. In Porey Spring there are houses on both sides of the road but there are no houses in Fisher Pond. Well, Sir, it varies in Welchman Hall and some parts of Hillaby. When it comes to Dunscombe, the people who live there do a day's work when they come from there to reach a bus.

Sir, I cannot understand this Resolution. I know that there are some good people living in Arch Hall, but I would have to term this Resolution to be a very selfish one because there are other places in St. Thomas than Arch Hall and Porey Spring where people live and come from which

need a bus shelter. Before hon. members of this Chamber can agree to this Resolution today, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas would have to agree to an amendment to it to put bus shelters in other parishes wherever there is a bus stop, because you cannot say to put one for the people of a particular district because when you stop at a bus stop and the rain comes down, obviously if there is no bus shelter you will get wet.

Sir, I feel that hon. members should not support this Resolution as it stands because it is a selfish one. I would be forgetting the people in my constituency and other hon. members will be forgetting the people in their constituencies if they agree to this Resolution as it stands. Hon. members over on this side cannot agree to it as it stands and, Sir, you will be having a say too because you would have to put the question against your people in St. Lucy.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is a tie, I would be called upon to exercise my casting vote.

Mr. SMITH: I am going to appeal to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to withdraw this Resolution and let us finish with it.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I did not expect that this Resolution would have generated so much heat. I am going to make a further amendment to this Resolution which my colleague brought in. I really cannot understand the attitude of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph when he talked about the hon. senior member for St. Thomas bringing in a selfish Resolution, because I have been in this Chamber on more than one occasion and heard the hon. junior member for St. Joseph questioning members on this side about giving somebody money to get a house.

There is absolutely nothing wrong in my colleague bringing in this Resolution. It is just a question of his being over zealous by mentioning districts of St. Thomas alone. It is true to say that we in this Chamber represent the Island as a whole but it is also true to say that it is the people of St. Thomas who gave my colleague that privilege, therefore, it is nothing wrong in his asking for something for the people of St. Thomas. Each and everyone of us in this Chamber ask for something for people in the parish which we have the honour to represent in order that the people may back us. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph cannot fool me. I believe I have far more experience than he has. He is trying to make capital out of my colleague bringing in this Resolution but if we on this side were like the hon. member on that side, there is a lot of things which we could get up and object to, but we see things in a different way.

4.15 p.m.

I am quite sure that my colleague would be quite willing to accept this amendment for the specific reason which the hon. senior member for St. Peter has mentioned, that is to say, that he will admonish the members on the side of the Opposition not to support this Resolution because it is a Resolution with a parochial tint. However, Sir, on more than one occasion I have seen hon. members bring forward Resolutions in here and they were of a parochial nature. I have heard questions brought forward in here dealing with parochial matters. I have heard questions brought forward in here in connection with roads and standpipes, and I would say that each and every one of us has come in here with parochial matters. Sometimes people meet me in the street and tell me: "I did not hear you say anything in the House." I have to remind them that this is not a Pente-costal Mission where each and every one of us must get up and speak. We all have to stroke the village pump. I should like to say that I know as much about international politics as anybody else, but no matter how much an international politician you may be, you must stroke the village pump at some time or other because you want the people to see or to hear what you have said on their behalf.

When the hon. junior member for St. Joseph asked my colleague to withdraw this Resolution or asked that it be held over, I would not agree with that at all. The hon. se-

nior member for St. Peter has said that it appeared to him that nobody on this side of the House looked as if he wanted to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution, I would like to tell the hon. member that that is his opinion and an opinion is not a fact.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas looked around at somebody and asked him to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution. (ASIDES)

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, how many Speakers have we got in this Chamber?

Mr. SPEAKER: One only.

Mr. BOXILL: Well, Sir, will you ask the hon. member to keep quiet?

Mr. SPEAKER: I only heard one member speaking.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the hon. member does not want to hear me, well, let him go outside.

Mr. BOXILL: I would ask the hon. member to keep quiet.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You can go outside if you do not want to hear me.

Mr. BOXILL: The hon. member must leave, I am not leaving.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. junior member for St. Thomas still addressing the Chair?

Mr. BOXILL: I am addressing the Chair, and I am moving an amendment to the Resolution. The amendment reads as follows:-

WHEREAS there is need for more bus shelters throughout the Island;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government, as soon as circumstances permit, take steps to provide more bus shelters throughout the Island.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Government pay special attention to the urgent need of Arch Hall and Porey Spring in the parish of St. Thomas.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That wording changes the entire tenor of the Resolution as introduced by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. That is not an amendment.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not rule that it is not an amendment and therefore it may be proceeded with as an amendment. If it were not an amendment, then the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would not be entitled to speak on it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am asking Your Honour to rule now.

Mr. SPEAKER: This amendment has not been seconded and therefore the Hon. Leader of the Opposition may not speak unless this amendment is seconded.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is Your Honour ruling that it is not an amendment?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. George has caught my eye.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the amendment.

Mr. LYNCH: I rise to second the motion which has been made by my colleague, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I really thought that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas was rising to say that

something which we had done was wrong but what he said was that it does not matter what you know about international affairs. It is not anybody's fault if one does not know about international affairs. What I do know is that the hon. member has so emasculated and transformed the Resolution moved by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas that another hon. member found it difficult to second it. I do not know, Sir, if this is not an indirect challenge to the very structure of the original Resolution. The hon. member said that he has seen things brought in here of a parochial nature. Yes, that is so. We have the road leading to Seawell International Airport and an hon. member has asked the Government to straighten a bend on the highway, because that bend is in a place where you can do it.
4.25 p.m.

In this Resolution, the hon. member is asking the General Assembly of Barbados to pass a Resolution to erect bus shelters in Arch Hall and Porey Spring. The hon. member is asking me to say "yes" to a Resolution in which he is asking the Government to put shelters in these districts whether or not I know if it is a national problem, and I must therefore exhibit myself as some monumental idiot. He wants to do parish pump politics, and I must aid and abet him so that my constituents would look at me like a glorified parish pump politician who is here to aid and succour all those who bring such Resolutions. Like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, if members knew that their colleague had a Resolution that was so badly worded that it needed this complete surgery, why did they not tell him to postpone it as I did? Stubbornness in politics or in Parliament is only an exhibition that you are ignorant. What we on this side were asking the hon. member to do was to withdraw the Resolution and bring in one of a general character. If you say that the whole island is in need of bus shelters when it is raining, that is something of a national character, and we would be able to say that this is something that is needed; but you are asking us to give a full dress debate on something for Arch Hall and Porey Spring. Why isn't there the need for a bus shelter in Welchman Hall? We are not charging the hon. member for not being ready to represent his constituency because the people there sent him here, but we are asking him not to place the General Assembly in this tradition.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the House came here today and asked members to pass a single Resolution and let us adjourn quickly. Why didn't the Leader of the House say to his own party member that he was asking members on the other side to concede to that request? The persons who have taken up the time are not members of the Opposition, but members of his own party, when all of us had decided that we would do the Government Resolution. After making a concession for one member on this side of the House, a member of your Party should be the last to want to waste time. Members should be told that charity begins at home and discipline starts at home.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the other side of the House there are two seasoned parliamentarians, and quite frankly it is unfortunate and sometimes unkind to have to indulge in a debate of this nature..

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is now speaking on the amendment.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is exactly what I am doing, since you have ruled that it is an amendment. First of all I tried to be kind by asking the member to postpone the Resolution without discussing the policy, and I think I was quite calm in the matter. What the hon. member has now agreed to is that the Resolution before us should be postponed or radically and drastically amended. I must now ask the Clerk to give me a copy of the amendment, because the Resolution has been so radically and drastically amended that I cannot vote unless I have such a copy. The first Resolution dealt specifically with one parish, and the amendment now deals with the entire island with special reference to some place. How can I stand up on the floor of the House and make myself such a fool as to vote for it without having a copy?

Mr. SPEAKER: I can have the amendment read now by the Clerk of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would like a copy of it. That is what I am entitled to.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no Standing Orders which provide for copies being made available.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is a peculiar ruling to give.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said I know of no Standing Order. Perhaps the Hon. Leader of the Opposition might refer me to the number. I am always willing to learn.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is for you to guide.

Mr. SPEAKER: Where guidance is necessary.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is absolutely necessary in this case.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no Standing Order for copies to be made available. I know the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would never, other than inadvertently, break a Rule.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I never even break them inadvertently. If I break them, it would be more by design, and not when Your Honour is presiding.

What the hon. seconder of the Resolution said is that this is wrong, and the Resolution has been changed to deal with the entire Island. What I am saying is that the Resolution should be postponed. I do not know the wording of the Resolution, and I am surprised that Your Honour has said that you know of no Rule which says I am entitled to a copy of the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not when it is amended in the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If Your Honour rules that it is an amendment, I am not questioning Your Honour's ruling. I accept it as an amendment, but this is an absolutely different Resolution altogether. I do not want to be harsh on this, because I can be more rash than the hon. senior member for St. Peter. The Resolution in front of me reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS the people living in the districts known as Arch Hall and Porey Spring in the parish of St. Thomas do encounter much inconvenience while awaiting transportation due to the lack of proper sheltering facilities especially during the rainy season;"
4.35 p.m.

What does that deal with? It deals with Arch Hall and Porey Spring. Your Honour has allowed an amendment which deals with the entire Island. Ask the hon. member what the preamble to it is. It is absolutely different from that of the Resolution. The Resolution reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS the people living in the districts known as Arch Hall and Porey Spring in the parish of St. Thomas do encounter much inconvenience while awaiting transportation due to the lack of proper sheltering facilities, especially during the rainy season;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government pay some attention to such a grievance with a view to accommodating the said districts with bus sheds in the not too distant future."

I am submitting here and now with the greatest respect to Your Honour's ruling that the amendment is a complete change of the Resolution. I am going to say that and I will say it at any time. The preamble to the one which I have before me reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS the people living in the districts known as Arch Hall and Porey Spring in the parish of St. Thomas do encounter much inconvenience while awaiting transportation due to the lack of proper sheltering facilities, especially during the rainy season;"

Now, Sir, listen to this amendment!

"WHEREAS there is need for more bus shelters throughout the Island;"

"BE IT RESOLVED that Government as soon as circumstances permit take steps to provide more bus shelters throughout the Island;"

"BE IT RESOLVED that Government as soon as circumstances permit take steps to provide more bus shelters throughout the Island;"

Mr. Speaker, as an experienced lawyer, parliamentarian and Speaker of this House, would you not say that that is a complete change to the preamble of the Resolution? What members of the Government really should do is to agree to the postponement of this Resolution and let the hon. senior member for St. Thomas take back his Resolution and have it worded properly. He knows that it would have our support when he brings it back in. I well remember when I came in here that I came in here with zeal to have things done for the City of Bridgetown but I had to learn. Stubbornness in politics never pays. What is the point of becoming stubborn?

Mr. Speaker, take the Resolution before us and then take what is written down here by the Clerk as an amendment to it. It is a complete change of the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is really serious, I am surprised at him. Is the hon. member questioning my ruling? The hon. member is only entitled to speak on the amendment.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am raising the question that this amendment is so completely different from the original preamble that I am sure if Your Honour had it in front of you, you would come to no other conclusion than that it is not an amendment to the Resolution. But, Sir, having ruled it as an amendment, I must accept it as an amendment.

Even although the hon. junior member for St. Thomas at the last moment attempted to pull his colleague out of this in this manner, I suggest to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas that the entire debate would be saved if he would only just postpone this Resolution and then come back and word the Resolution just as it is now worded by the amendment. When he brings it back so worded, I am certain that it would be passed without any possible debate.

The amendment which Your Honour has accepted takes into account the entire Island. Mr. Speaker, you have ruled but how can you amend something for a parish for the whole Island? I still feel that this matter should be postponed. That is my opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I say this. There are innumerable precedents for amending a Resolution which specifically deals with only one parish in order to include the entire Island. I have on more than one occasion witnessed when an hon. member brought in a Resolution for standposts to be erected in one district of the parish from which he derives his support in the House that there was an amendment made to it whereby instead of dealing with the part of the parish which he asked that the Resolution include the whole Island. I know that such amended Resolution conforms with Standing Order No. 21 which says that when any motion or Bill is under consideration in the House or a Committee thereof, an amendment may be proposed to such motion or Bill if it is relevant to the question or matter then under discussion.

The amendment is in my view relevant to the question and accordingly the amendment was accepted as valid.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the original Resolution as tabled by my colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, while it may appear on the face of it to be parochial, as Your Honour has rightly pointed out, it is the type of Resolution which we, in this Chamber, have been

putting forward and making amendments to for the last fifteen or sixteen years. In reality that is the type of Resolution to be expected to come from a young member of this Chamber. The first dream of a young member is to try his utmost to do something for the people of his particular constituency, therefore, you can realise the temptation he has in moving a Resolution of this nature in order to get something done for his constituency even if he goes so far as not to comply with his party rules by not submitting the Resolution to its proper source.

The terms of this amended Resolution are in keeping with the Government's policy. Hon. members will recall that we had a report recently of the Transport Committee which was set up. That report was tabled here in August this year and the various recommendations are now being considered one after another as we see fit. This is only a corollary to the recommendations of the Report of the Transport Committee which was tabled here in August this year. The question of setting up bus shelters at various points throughout the Island is at present receiving the attention of my Ministry and hon. members will be pleased to know that in this matter Government is quite willing to accept the assistance which has been offered by the Lions Club in implementing this policy.
4.45 p.m.

The Lions Club have made efforts to assist in this direction because they wanted to do something of a public nature. They have applied for the use of certain Government lands in a certain area, not in the parish of St. Thomas but more along Route 13. You will find a shelter at Rockley — I am speaking now of land which is owned by the Government. You will find one by Blue Waters Hotel, one at Top Rock and may be one at Oistins. The Lions Club may be assisting in the erection of certain bus shelters. This matter, simple as it looks, has to be very carefully examined because the question of liability and ownership is involved. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas will be pleased to hear that this matter is already receiving the active consideration and attention of the Government and we hope to erect these bus shelters. We cannot put down these shelters anywhere; we have to get the recommendations of the Transport Committee and the fare structures have to be examined in order that we can erect these bus sheds.

Hon. members will realise that at the end of the fare structures you will find that people will be accumulating and waiting for buses; therefore, it is at these points that these bus sheds are needed. It is part and parcel of the Government's policy to erect bus shelters and bus stands island wide and not merely in St. Thomas in the Arch Hall and Porey Spring districts or even in the area which the Lions Club have selected; it is the Government's policy to have these bus sheds erected in the entire island. It is the intention of the Government to see that the necessary facilities by way of bus sheds are erected. Speaking for myself, I think that the Resolution, as amended, is a very good one. (Hear! Hear!) I think it will serve a very useful purpose. I must be magnanimous enough to the hon. member on the other side, who made an attempt to have this matter deferred, because his attitude was to try to avoid too much debate. However, Sir, we do not want the wrong impression to go out, the impression that the Government is voting against the erection of bus sheds. We are asking whoever is willing to assist us in the manner like the Lions Club, to come in and help us and let us grant this relief and assistance for which the people have long been waiting and which it is the intention of the Government to grant.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on the amendment to the Resolution. It all boils down to something which I said just now. Here it is you have the Permanent Secretary to the Minister of Communications and Works moving an amendment to this Resolution which has been introduced by his colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, when, as has been indicated, the Government already has this matter under consideration. Mind you, Sir, this is not a backbencher in the Government Party, this is the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Communications. The Hon. Minister sat down there in his place and allowed his Parliamentary Secretary, who is closely connected with his office, to move this amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister could not have stopped him.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order. The hon. member who moved this amendment is the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, and the matter is one which intimately affects the people of St. Thomas and it is also an island-wide matter. I could not inhibit the hon. member from representing his constituency.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Sir, the Hon. Minister could not have stopped the Parliamentary Secretary, but he could have asked him to second the motion made by his colleague. I should like to ask this question: what purpose will the amendment, moved by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, serve now when we have heard from the Hon. Minister that the Government is already actively working on the erection of these bus-sheds over the entire island? If the hon. member wanted to get along with the work, and the suggestions for the postponement of the further consideration of the Resolution had been agreed upon — that could have been done and we would have finished the work this afternoon. The Government might have come down here next week or next year seeking permission for the erection of these bus-sheds or, it may be, they might never come here for permission to erect these sheds; but now the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has tried to shift the position by making an amendment which must be included in any decision to erect these bus-sheds throughout the island, the suggestion being that priority must be given to these two districts in the parish of St. Thomas, namely, Arch Hall and Porey Spring. Those are the same two villages in which the hon. member has asked in his Resolution that these bus-sheds be provided, because the people in these districts suffer much inconvenience while they are awaiting transportation owing to the lack of proper facilities for sheltering.

Mr. Speaker, I regard this as a matter of little children making sport. It is a matter, I repeat, of making sport and at the same time it is taking up the valuable time of hon. members.
4.55 p.m.

Now if it were the hon. member that seconded the motion for the amendment, I would not say anything, because he is in the dark. I am sure that if he had known what was happening behind the scenes, he would never have seconded the motion, because knowing him as I do, he would ask what is the use of doing this when we are already working on something for the whole island. He did not know it himself, but is now trying to pad it up. So long as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph knows, it is exposed already; so no matter how you cover it up now, we on this side know that not such a thing is being studied yet. He is now trying to save face.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, the hon. member said they know that no such thing is being done. As far back as June, 1962 this matter was brought up, letters have been written and the necessary arrangements were attempted to be made by the Lions Club. I have dealt with the matter only recently with regard to the erection of these sheds on Government land and the maintenance of them, as well as who would be liable in case anybody got injured. Only recently has this matter been reviewed and the question of liability settled on the grounds that they would have to be comprehensively insured in order to indemnify the Government in case of damage or anything. It has been settled that the Government would take out a comprehensive policy to cover these sheds so that in case of any injury, the Government would be liable in the first instance, but they would be re-indemnified by the insurance. It is a legal point which held it up for months, but it has not been resolved and the matter is proceeding apace.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to believe all the Minister has said. This Resolution was before us now for about two weeks. Could someone from the Government Party not tell the hon. member that they were working on this matter and ask him not to worry with the Resolution? Today the Hon. Leader of the House wanted to speed up Government Business, but in order for the hon. senior

member for St. Michael or myself not to say that he wanted to muzzle us from doing Private Members' Business, he allowed the hon. senior member for St. Michael to do his Resolution. Could he not tell his colleague not to worry with his today?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that when I asked for the suspension of the Standing Orders I had some special ulterior motive in mind with regard to inhibiting hon. members on that side from going on with the business on the Order Paper under their names. I especially said, Sir, that I merely asked for the suspension of the Standing Orders, because in case no member wanted to do Private Members' Business, we would not have been held up from going on with Government Business during the time normally allotted to Private Members' Business. I further said that my motion did not inhibit any hon. member who so desired from proceeding with the matter standing in his name so that any member on that side or on this side was perfectly entitled if he wanted to go ahead with any matter standing in his name. It is not true, therefore, that I had any special desire to prohibit any member on that side or on this side from doing Private Members' Business today.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that. I do not know if the hon. member was getting a nod and woke up. I said that in order to prevent us over here from feeling that he wanted to muzzle us from doing Private Members' Business, he allowed the hon. senior member for St. Michael to carry on. I did not say he had ulterior motives, but he is so much accustomed to jumping up on points of order, that he just cannot help.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I object to that statement. The hon. member does not understand what he is saying.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member risen on a point of explanation or a point of order?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I replied specifically to the point made by the hon. member with regard to the Standing Orders, and I repeat that the remark made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was not in keeping with the facts.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there must be some reason why he wants to suspend the Standing Orders. Now the hon. senior member for St. Michael finished his Resolution. The hon. member is a member of the Cabinet, he is the Leader of this House and Deputy Premier; he is most man now. He knows it is the intention of the Government to erect these bus sheds all over the island. Could he not turn to his colleague on his left and say that it is their intention to do this and save time? If they are trying to save the situation and agree to postponement or to the withdrawal by the Hon. Introducer, could they not allow him to do that and stop there? Now they have tried to throw a spanner into the works by allowing the Minister without Portfolio or the Parliamentary Secretary to come in with a Resolution that means the same thing, and I can only think they are trying to make us over here look as if we are not representatives of the people. The Resolution is now worded to cover the whole island but with special emphasis on Arch Hall and Porey Spring. Why must Arch Hall and Porey Spring have priority more than anywhere else in St. Thomas? I am representing St. Thomas now and not St. Joseph. Why not bus sheds for Welchman Hall, Fisher Pond, Walkers Spring, Farmers, or Airy Cot? There is a place called Blunts where you have to walk about a mile before you get to houses. In Arch Hall and Porey Spring, there are houses on either side of the road, and if the rain comes down, you can get a shelter, but when you leave Airy Cot there are no houses for about a mile.
5.05 p.m.

Why not Airy Cot or Fisher Pond too? The amendment calls for priority to be given to Arch Hall and Porey Spring. I am saying that the people of Airy Cot and Fisher Pond should get it too.

Sir, I am not going any further. I have left St. Joseph and come down to St. Thomas. It is not fair to the electorate or anybody at all to be picking out a particular district. If you are going to pick out a particular district, as the Resolution stands now, I will say that you should also ask that the people of Porey Spring and Arch Hall be supplied with umbrellas and parasols too. You better ask too that the Government supply them umbrellas and parasols. The members of the Government Benches are wasting the time of the House today. This nice Government which we have is wasting the time of the House today. They have begun to back pedal. As I have said already the members of the Democratic Labour Party are back pedaling, therefore, how can they go forward?

Mr. LYNCH rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown spoke after the motion for the postponement had been moved. As a matter of fact, he, himself, seconded the motion for the postponement. Did the hon. member second the motion for the postponement?

Mr. LYNCH: I did second the motion for the postponement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Therefore, unfortunately the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown is precluded from speaking again. Unless another amendment is moved, he will have no other opportunity to speak.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the amendment--

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member spoke before on the Resolution proper. He may therefore speak on the motion for the postponement.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, what you have to realise within this honourable Chamber is that there are many instances when Resolutions were brought before us for postponement and you also have to realise that this is a Resolution by a member of the Government Party. Where postponement of this Resolution is concerned, I cannot see why we should agree to any postponement whatsoever. Therefore I feel definitely that this matter of postponement should never have arisen in this Chamber today. It is my direct intention to vote conclusively against the postponement.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have already explained that the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders did not in any way, inhibit members from proceeding with matters under Private Members' Business, so the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is quite in order in dealing with this matter. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition protested that the amended motion was not an amendment to the Resolution. The amendment merely sought to extend the scope of the Resolution.

I sat here and saw the hon. senior member for the City, when we were discussing the Housing Bill and the Town and Country Planning Bill, recommend almost different amendments from the Clauses in the Bill before us and, as a matter of fact, there were no copies for us to be guided by and he asked that his amendments be carried.

We had the hon. junior member for St. Joseph attempting to criticise the members of this party for wasting the time of the House. It was the common practice of members of his party when his Government was in power and was about to do something to wait until then and come in here and ask questions about it. The former junior member for St. Michael was famous for doing that sort of thing as well as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. For instance, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph in 1961 knew that his Government was taking action on a matter in his parish and he came in here and asked a question about it.

The hon. member was in the House when this Party was in the Government and he came in here and asked:

"Is the Minister aware that a notice has been affixed to the door of the garage at Tent Bay, Bathsheba, where

the Government tractor is housed, stating that the tractor driver is ill, and that the tractor service would therefore be temporarily suspended?"

2. If the answer is "yes", will the Minister state whether he authorised or was aware of, such notice before same was affixed?"

That is something which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph himself could have asked the Minister personally.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the hon. member rising on?

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. The hon. member is reading out things which happened in this House ever since. I had to ask that question and I would be glad if the hon. member could give that reply. I feel, Sir, that that is out of order. Is that before the House now? It happened in the last Session or for that matter it happened two, three or four years ago. Is the hon. member in order? Is that before us? Is that the Resolution dealing with Porey Spring?

Mr. SPEAKER: The first thing is that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has not made a point of order. The second thing is that it is not out of order to refer in the course of your speech to anything which happened in the previous Session. It is not out of order to reminisce in the course of your speech and that applies to any hon. member. It may be recalled that in a Trade Union debate the hon. senior member for St. Peter reminded the House that the then hon. senior member for St. Michael expressed certain views on peaceful picketing on an occasion and when the House was dealing with the matter on a subsequent occasion he recanted.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: As a matter of fact, Sir, I quote this in rebuttal of the hon. member's statement that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas if he wanted to bring in the Resolution ought to approach the Minister. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph asked that question and his Government felt it was so unworthy of reply that they never replied to him at all on the matter.
5.15 p.m.

This is the Question Book which I have here. As you know, Sir, we have the Questions on the left-hand side of the Book and the Replies on the right-hand side. They never answered his questions at all.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. I am answering now. The Minister told me himself that he did not know about the notice.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not in order for the hon. member to answer now.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: What the hon. member has said makes the matter even more nonsensical. He asked the Minister before he replied to the Question and now he has said that he had no reply but the Minister answered him. (ASIDES)

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Minister still addressing the Chair?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the members of the last Government used to come in here repeatedly and ask the Government to erect a standpost somewhere or to construct a road somewhere else. In my time, Sir, if I had a matter to bring before the House, I would decide whether to proceed by way of Question or by way of Resolution. I knew that I could not get an Address passed and therefore I would ask a Question. It is common knowledge that every single member of this Chamber has, at some time or other, come in here and did what the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has referred to as stroking the pump. I have heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter talk about the Whim Road in his constituency.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have never come in here with any parochial matter at all. I have never brought any such matter in here.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has asked a Question about the Whim Road in the parish of St. Peter and in like manner, Sir, you have asked about something in St. Lucy and I have asked about Meggs Channel in St. Philip. In the same way as we have done this, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is asking for the erection of bus-sheds for the districts of Arch Hall and Porey Spring which happen to be in the constituency which he represents. The hon. senior member has further stated that the people of those areas have approached him about the matter and therefore he has brought forward this Resolution here. The hon. member represents the parish of St. Thomas.

Mr. WALCOTT: Why could he not ask a Question about the matter?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: It is a matter for the hon. member as to whether he will ask a Question or bring forward a Resolution. He decided to bring in a Resolution which was accepted as being in order to be placed on the Order Paper and it was proceeded with. I remember bringing in an Address asking for the erection of bus-stops all over the island. I never did that on any parochial basis, but there is nothing wrong in the hon. senior member for St. Thomas bringing forward something which deals with the parish of St. Thomas. If you were to refer to the Order Paper, you will see that the hon. senior member for St. Michael has been asking for the laying of water mains, the construction of roads and the erection of bus stops in the parish of St. Michael; he did not ask for them for the parish of St. Joseph.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I should like to point out to the hon. member that when the House passes a Resolution, it is a different thing from when an hon. member puts a Question to a Minister. The passing of a Resolution places the Government in a difficult position when the Government does not adhere to the Resolution, but, on the other hand, the Government can answer a Question in a manner which it deems to answer it. When we commit ourselves to a Resolution, we cannot just leave the matter there.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, if I thought that a Resolution committed the Government to a line of action which we did not endorse, then I would not agree with it. I intended to take that same stand in connection with another matter if it had come up for consideration today. It is a question of where you will erect these bus sheds as soon as you have the places and the money to pay for them. I should like to say that every hon. member of this House including Your Honour and myself, have tried to satisfy his constituents that he is working for them; therefore, there is no crime being committed if the same principle has been adopted by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas or anybody else.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no other hon. member who wishes to add his contribution to this debate, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas may avail himself of the opportunity to reply. Before the hon. member avails himself of that right, will he intimate whether he accepts the amendment, which has been moved by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, or not?

Mr. BATSON: Yes, Sir, I accept the amendment. I sat here and listened very carefully to the remarks which have been made by hon. members on the other side of the House. I should like to say, Sir, that before I was a member of this House I used to sit in the gallery and listen to these very hon. members who used to display themselves and their stupidity to the gallery. I have heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the hon. senior member for the City and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph as members of this House bring forward in this Chamber Questions and Resolutions relating to the interests of their constituents.
5.25 p.m.

It is a familiar practice of some hon. members of this Chamber who have had the privilege of being members for over ten years to come in here and try to vilify members who have been here for only a short period.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas must be careful less he breaks Standing Order No. 26 (5) which states that it shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about members of the House. I am referring to the question of "vilifying". Let the hon. member avoid such.

Mr. BATSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should withdraw the word "vilify", because none of us who spoke on this matter attempted to vilify the hon. member if I understand what "vilify" means. There was no vilification. All we said was that the Resolution should be of a general character.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas substitute a word for "vilify"?

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, some of those members tried to criticise the Resolution in their way. I am sorry that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has left. Some members of this Chamber believe that they have more knowledge than other members, but I would like the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to understand that I am capable of defending any charge laid against me. It is true that I am of a cool nature, but I am issuing a warning now that they have a big task when they try to make certain Resolutions and questions which I bring in this Chamber appear to be nonsensical. They come in here to dot the "I's" and cross the "T's", but I have sat in the Chair as Chairman of Committees and heard hon. members make speeches which have shocked my modesty, all the time looking around the Gallery to see who is watching them. It is regrettable that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has left the Chamber, but it looks as though he stirs up trouble and then disappears.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member be wary of infringing Standing Order No. 26 (7) which states that no member shall impute improper motives to another member. If the hon. member is not present, let it be presumed for good reasons that he is absent.

Mr. BATSON: When the hon. members were speaking, I did not worry to make any notes, and therefore I am speaking from memory. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph got up and asked why Arch Hall and Porey Spring. Imagine the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who has been a member of this Chamber for over fourteen years asking why Arch Hall and Porey Spring when normally if a member is a true representative of his parish, he would have a chart by which to go. You do not ask for everything at the same time; you go by stages. Last year I asked for bus sheds in Welchman Hall and Edghill, and the hon. member did not question that, but this year he is asking why Arch Hall and Porey Spring. I am a representative for St. Thomas, and therefore I will not be guided by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, because if I were representing the people of St. Thomas like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would like them to be represented, it would be no different from when we took over the reins of Government, and the name of St. Thomas was never mentioned until in the Estimates once a year. I have sat in the Gallery and listened to hon. members, but I have never had the privilege of hearing St. Thomas mentioned, and that is one of the reasons that prompted me to run for St. Thomas. Now this session you are hearing about St. Thomas and I am proud to know that I am the instigator of it. It shows that the parish of St. Thomas is truly a parish because it can generate so much heat and fire over two bus sheds.

Mr. Speaker, this House spent three hours criticising the erection of two bus sheds in St. Thomas. When the Minister informed the House that it was the Government's intention to have bus sheds erected all over the island if

necessary, members on the other side continued to waste precious time. If I mentioned other areas in St. Thomas that needed bus sheds, you would not leave here until tomorrow.

Mr. WALCOTT: You accepted the change in wording; so you are the idiot.

Mr. BATSON: The hon. member is insinuating that I am an idiot.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not heard any such remark.

Mr. BATSON: I am not like some members who ask Your Honour to ask members to withdraw certain things. Nothing hon. members say has any effect on me. What the hon. senior member for St. Peter says about me has no effect; it enters one ear and comes out the next.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member said that what I say about him has no effect. I am aware that there are some people who are impervious to any sort of reasoning, but you would think that a schoolmaster at least would always feel that what people say should have an effect, because that is how you teach people and how people learn.

Mr. BATSON: Hon. members get up in this Chamber and advertise themselves and then try to bring in one's personal vocation to establish their point, but the fact remains that I am not a schoolmaster in here.

Some time last year, Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph asked Government about a woman whose house was destroyed by high winds, but it was discovered that the House was destroyed before the high winds. I asked for bus sheds for two districts, but the hon. junior member for St. Joseph went further and asked what about Fisher Pond and Airy Cot; so he is supporting the Resolution without knowing it. He even brought evidence to show the inconvenience suffered by people in other areas. In representing his parish he wanted the Government to replace a house that was not damaged during the hurricane season, knowing that the house was not destroyed by high winds.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas is not entitled to say to any hon. member that he knew that a certain thing was not what he had made it out to be, because that would naturally constitute an infringement of Standing Order No. 26 (7) dealing with the imputation of improper motives.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am asking you to ask the hon. member to withdraw those remarks because they are not true. I am objecting.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have heard the objection raised. 5.35 p.m.

Mr. BATSON: As the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has requested, I will withdraw the remarks. They are so accustomed of hearing themselves.

I would like the hon. senior member for St. Peter to understand that he came in this House with votes and I have come in with some and I will in no way be directed by him at all. If he does not wish to hear me, he can leave. The hon. senior member for St. Peter believes that he alone has knowledge. (Mr. WALCOTT: I will have to leave now.) I am happy to know that hon. members cannot take their blows. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph have left the Chamber. I am happy because of the fact that I will not be interrupted for drawing the attention of the House to the folly which they spoke during their addresses.

This Resolution, as some hon. members try to insinuate, was a bit personal, but, Mr. Speaker, we must realise that I am supposed to be a representative of the parish of St. Thomas and, therefore, as a representative of the

parishioners of St. Thomas, I have to show my interest in them. And if they draw my attention to something which they want done, and I see that it wants doing, I am permitted to bring this Resolution so as to have it done. I feel that I am quite in order in bringing down this Resolution. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. senior member for St. Peter were forced to leave because of the facts which they have heard after they had spoken. It was disgraceful and shocking for hon. members to get up in here and express themselves in that manner.

I accept the amendment to the Resolution. If I had brought in this Resolution to encircle the entire Island, I feel that the Government would be placed in a peculiar position and would be committed to carrying out the proposals throughout the entire Island, therefore, I felt it was quite in order to stipulate two districts and to approach the matter in stages. I presented my Resolution including the two areas which I felt were badly in need of shelter. There are several areas which require these bus shelters but we cannot have all of them done at one time.

Sir, I cannot see the reason why hon. members should be so objectionable over this Resolution. However, in view of the fact that those hon. members have left the Chamber, I will not worry to say more. I accept the amendment.

The question that further consideration of the Resolution be now postponed was put and resolved in the negative, on the declaration of Mr. SPEAKER, that the "Noes" have it.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be taken as the First Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The First Order of the Day to be taken 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: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: 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 of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1964-65 No. 34

HEAD 10 - ACCOUNTANT GENERAL

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 25 - MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, 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 44 - MINISTRY OF DEVELOPMENT TRADE AND LABOUR

SOCIAL SECURITY SCHEME

Head 44 - Ministry of Development, Trade and Labour - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I think I should make these few remarks on this sum of \$3,000 which is required for the bringing into effect of the Social Security Scheme. This is a matter of considerable importance and I think that both the House and the public are entitled to a short progressive report as to what is done about these two matters.

Sir, if I were to be asked what I consider to be the three basic objectives of the Government, I would say that first and foremost is the expansion of the colony's economy; secondly, to find employment for every person in the colony who wants to work either at home or abroad; and, thirdly, to provide a certain amount of social security so that people who are no longer able to work should not have to suffer privation and want.

5.45 p.m.

This Resolution which is for the sum of \$3,000 is, as has been explained in the Note to the Estimates, for this purpose:-

The Government has announced its intention to introduce a Social Security Scheme and preparatory work on the Scheme is at present being undertaken.

It is hoped to obtain shortly the services of two experts, an Actuary and an Administrator, under the United Nations Technical Assistance Programme to assist with the launching of the Scheme. The Resolution accordingly seeks provision of \$3,000 for the payment of temporary staff, purchasing of equipment and other expenses in connection with the Scheme during the period November, 1964 to March, 1965.

Actually, Sir, one of the persons to whom reference has been made in this Resolution, is already in the island. That is the Actuary. He has been here for about three weeks and he has done a considerable amount of work in connection with these two Schemes. With regard to the Provident Fund for workers, we have come to a stage where the increase of benefits and the level of benefits have been agreed to. We know what money is available for the purpose of financing this Scheme. We know what it will cost to finance it in the first year and all that is needed now is

the approval of the Cabinet of the Scheme as approved by the Provident Fund Committee. Then the necessary legislation will be drafted and the Scheme will be put into operation. Therefore, in the very near future, the Provident Fund for agricultural workers will be in operation.

With regard to the National Scheme for Social Security itself, unless something untoward occurs, Barbados, I am very pleased to say, will be the first island in the Caribbean area to have the advantage of a Social Security Scheme for its inhabitants. The Actuary is still here at the present time but he leaves in another week. He has investigated the information which we gave him very carefully. As a matter of fact, he was very amazed at the extent of the preparatory work which had been done when he arrived. He really expected to do more work but it had already been done, thanks to the work of the Committee and the officials in my Ministry. Rather, I should put it this way, Mr. Bishop, who is attached to my Ministry, the Permanent Secretary and the Assistant Secretary have all rendered valuable services, so that when the expert came down here he found that his work had been very much minimised. When he came here, he expected to do more work and he was told that his services would have been retained until August next year. However, so much was accomplished before he came here, that he has been able to finalise everything necessary in one month and therefore he has not got to come back here next year to finish it.

He leaves with the Report for the I.L.O. Experts in Geneva. After going through it, they will recommend the levels which should take place and the categories which they think we can afford. Their recommendations will be submitted to the Cabinet and with the approval of the Cabinet, legislation will be drafted to set up a National Scheme of Social Security in the near future. The United Nations Expert has told us that the Scheme should be in our hands by the end of the year, and as long as the Government approves of it, we will be able to draft the necessary legislation for the purpose of putting through the Scheme as soon as possible. The Administrator has to come out here. He is expected to be here some time during this month and he will assist us in drawing up the plans for our Social Security Scheme. It is expected that on his arrival this part of the work will be put into operation almost immediately.

This sum of \$3,000 is for the purpose of providing some of the equipment for the office which the Administrator will require. Naturally, any expenditure or funds which is or are provided now will be utilised in the general office when these two Schemes have been set up. I cannot now go into the details of these Schemes because the Cabinet has not yet been able to peruse them. I want to repeat, however, how pleased I am at the stage we have reached because unless anything untoward occurs, we should be the first country in the Caribbean area to have a Social Security Scheme. Hon. members will be very pleased to be sitting in the Legislature when these far-reaching Schemes for the benefit of this Community will be formulated and finalised. Both the Provident Fund for agricultural workers and the National Scheme of Social Security should be put into operation in the very near future, and the amount asked for, this \$3,000 is for the purpose of assisting us in setting up the office so that when the Administrator arrives later on during this month the foundation will have been laid so that he and his staff will be able to carry on their work with a certain degree of comfort.

With those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Head stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.
5.55 p.m.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, my attention was immediately arrested by this glaring disparity in the salary to be paid the Stenographer-Typist who receives \$196 a month and the Clerk who receives \$100 a month. I do think that as this is only a temporary appointment the salary of the Clerk could be brought more in line with the type of salary which is paid nowadays to people who would have to do what the Minister has admittedly confessed is a very important work.

The point that Barbados should be proud of having the first of these schemes in the Caribbean area is quite easily explained when we know that Barbados needs it more than anybody else. Any time you have an island of 166 square miles with 240,000 people scrambling for existence, who needs a social security scheme more? Needs must when the devil drives. To return to the first point I made, Mr. Chairman, I do think that if the Stenographer-Typist is going to be paid \$196 a month, the Clerk in the office should receive rather more than \$100 a month, particularly as the appointment lasts for a period of only five months.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sure, Sir, that on this particular item the Government would have no cause for fear by any particular Party in this country, because I think everyone recognises that the passage of legislation providing for social security is about the best bit of legislation that has been passed in democracies within the last century. This is found in the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada, and I am very happy to think that such legislation is going to be passed here, because those of us who lived through, let us say, the roaring but hard and depressing Twenties appreciate what this must mean, and social security which embraced only a limited number of workers has been so extended and expanded to embrace some of the most skilful and professional men in the world. Where men and women would otherwise normally have to eke out an existence after passing 60, 65 or 70 years even in the noble profession of medicine, they can today be provided for in big countries by social security.

I hope, Sir, that the Government will use every possible means to make it clear to the people of this country with a tremendous lot of unemployment and under-employment, that social security can become a tremendous burden, and it is not unemployment insurance. I hope the Hon. Minister who I know is rather *au fait* with the scheme of social security as against unemployment insurance — something which operates in the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States — will explain that social security is contributed to by the employers, the workers and the Government.

I do not want to say anything more on this matter except that those who represent our political point of view give this our best wishes, because we realise that poverty anywhere is a blot upon prosperity everywhere, and therefore in this country we welcome the ushering in of social security, and hope that the younger generation will appreciate what it means, how it works in other countries, and readily make their contribution in one and every respect. I appreciate that it has taken a great amount of work to get it to the point where an expert will be coming to Barbados to work on it. When I first came in here, an expert came from the Colonial Office, and we started to think about social security around the Friendly Societies. I do not remember the name of the expert, but it was a preliminary research, so to speak, and we heard nothing more about it. We got the reports as to what could be done around the Friendly Societies, but various changes have been made in this country, and we are now on the threshold, so to speak, of ushering in this very laudible and noble bit of legislation.

If I were to say that no socialist can lay claim to this very laudible bit of legislation, maybe my friends on the other side would want to say that I am trying to tarnish their political philosophy. Far be it from that, but I must express what is an absolute fact that it is not merely a socialist philosophy, but in an enlightened country people must realise that human beings are entitled to better consideration and treatment than were their forefathers. I therefore welcome this Resolution for \$3,000 to provide for this Administrator on behalf of my Party.

Like my colleague, I too must mention the disparity between the salary of the Clerk and that of the Stenographer-Typist, although we do agree that there is difficulty in getting a proper Stenographer-Typist in this country today even at the salaries which you offer. A proper Stenographer-Typist means someone who is not only a good typist or good note-taker, but one who is very good at English to

correct those of us who would have other business to attend in our daily lives.
6.05 p.m.

While that is so, my colleague should not be thought to be singing a solo in saying that the disparity in salary between the Clerk and Stenographer-Typist is too great. May I draw to the attention of hon. members that the salary of a Clerk is at the rate of \$100 a month and that is merely asking for a boy or someone who has just left school. I know that this is not the scheme, but the Hon. Minister knows that when you are paying a salary of \$100 a month, you are only asking for someone who has just left school. In this important office, I do not know but it may be difficult to get somebody who would understand.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Personally, I agreed with the salary allotted for the stenographer-typist to be at the rate of \$2,352 per annum because the stenographer which we are looking for has to be a very capable person. Hon. members know there is a scarcity of stenotypists. The Clerk will be taken from someone in the Public Service. I may point out that this is not for the scheme itself. The Administrator has come and we are doing some preparatory work. The Clerk is to be paid at the same level as that which Clerks get in the Government Service. As I have said, we did recommend a higher remuneration for the Stenographer-Typist because we want a good one.

As regards what the hon. junior member for the City said as regards the Conservative taking credit for the introduction of social security in Great Britain, I do not agree with him at all. While it may be true that the national scheme was introduced by the Conservatives, the Labour Party was responsible for working out the scheme.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I said was that credit for the scheme cannot go to the Socialists alone.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: It is true to say that the Tory Government under Sir Winston Churchill was the Government which brought in Britain's National Insurance Scheme and the Tories wanted to claim some credit for it. The point is that the entire initiation of the scheme came from the British Trade Union.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We are not bandying words together, but surely, the hon. member does not want to say that. It is one of these things that a section of the community has to realise what happened.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The scheme was set up during the term of the Tory Government under Sir Winston Churchill. I think when Sir William Beveridge went into the House of Commons he had run for Oxford or one of the University seats and was not successful and then he won in the next elections.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not going to entertain any of this cross talk any longer.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am speaking on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members sit? I am not entertaining any more cross talk.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, if you shout at me, I will shout at you. You are talking nonsense.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Hon. Leader of the Opposition take his seat? I would like the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the remarks which he said about talking nonsense. (A pause.)

Is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition willing to withdraw his statement which is detrimental to the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What is detrimental to the Chair?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You suggested that members are talking nonsense.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Can something be detrimental to somebody who is talking something sensible?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You said that the Chair is talking nonsense.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Did you hear me say that you are talking nonsense? If you feel that you are talking nonsense, that is a matter for you. I said that I was not going to be satisfied with any nonsense. If you want me to withdraw that, I will withdraw it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Earlier the hon. member talked of how much strategy you possess. I am just asking the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to withdraw that detrimental statement.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What is it?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You said that the Chair is talking nonsense.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If you want me to withdraw it, I will withdraw it but please do not talk any more nonsense.

Mr. BOXILL: That is not fair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If it is not fair, come and put me out.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am still asking the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to withdraw those words in a decent way.

A VOICE: Withdraw the remarks and let us get on.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the Honourable Chairman wants me to withdraw those remarks, I withdraw them.
6.15 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I should like to say a few words in reply to the hon. junior member for the City. The hon. member said that in a community like this with a population of 240,000, it is a question of the population which makes us think of having this Social Security Scheme. I want to inform the hon. member that we have had this pressure of population for all of these years and we did not have any Social Security Scheme. I do not know where the hon. member has got it from that, because of the question of population, we are having this Scheme. It is not at all a question of the pressure of population but it is a question of the level of development reached by the community and the interest which the Government has in the community. When the Conservatives were running this community, we had this population pressure and we did not have any Social Security Scheme. I am saying, Sir, that it is a question of a deeper interest which we are having now in the development of the people of the country. I do not know if the hon. member would suggest that, if the Conservatives were in power with the same pressure of population, this Scheme would have reached the stage which it has now reached. While I know that hon. members on the opposite side of the House have the same desire as we have to see this Scheme implemented, I do not want anybody to go away with the idea that it is merely a question of the pressure of population that will cause Barbados to have a Social Security Scheme. It is not that at all.

MEMBERS: Question!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that this Resolution....

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I should like to inform the Hon. Leader of the House that I would be the last person who would try to suggest anything of the sort suggested by him. I am sure that the Hon. Leader of the House will notice that the Conservatives were in power for 13 years and they received a salary of £1,750 a year. Labour has now been in power for less than 13 days and one of their first moves was to increase their salaries to £3,000 a year and the Ministers receive £9,000 a year. I would be the last person to attack people for improving their position.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, these statistics have nothing to do with the matter before the House. When the wealthy Conservatives could afford to serve the country for almost no returns, they did it. You would not expect a coal-miner to leave his home in London and have to support two houses with the same remuneration. What the Conservatives did was this: one of the first things they did when they got into power was to remove the "freeze" of rents so that very quickly.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, how does that come into this Resolution for \$3,000? And the Hon. Minister knows that he has to sit down when I have risen on a point of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD took his seat.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Resolution before us is one for the sum of \$3,000 and how does what the hon. member is saying affect this Resolution?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown raised the question and the Hon. Minister is trying to answer it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If the Conservatives got returns from profits and so on, they did not have to receive big salaries. When the Conservatives got into power the first steps they took were to enhance their position.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member speaks as if all Conservatives are land-owners, but all Conservatives are not land-owners. The hon. member knows, as well as I do, that all Conservatives are not land-owners. Some of them are very poor people. Another thing is that four out of every ten persons in England voted for the Conservatives.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Whatever you may think of the Conservatives, they have enhanced their own financial position, Mr. Macmillan..... (ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I was about to put the question.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, for the enlightenment of the hon. member I would like to say that the Conservatives need not have any reasonable level of salary because they benefit in other directions.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I really rose to congratulate the members of Parliament for what they did as soon as they got into power. Therefore, there is no argument between us. It is only a few days that they got into power and they looked after themselves very well.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I can throw some light on that. A Socialist Government got into power in 1961 and now in 1964, three years afterwards, we have not asked for a single cent by way of an increase in our salaries.

The question that Head 44 - Ministry of Development, Trade and Labour - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I now beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of \$13,660 do now pass.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee, and Mr. 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 Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, I hereby beg to present the Report of the Committee appointed to investigate the programme for the arrival of H.R.H. the Duke of Edinburgh for the 13th and 14th of this month in Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in view of the arrangements made for the joint meeting of this Chamber and the Other Place on Saturday, 14th November at 10.30 a.m. in order to receive H.R.H. the Duke of Edinburgh, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Saturday, 14th November at 10 a.m.

Hon. members are aware that we expect to receive H.R.H. at 10.30 a.m. in the Other Place, and then we will return here after the ceremony in order then to move the adjournment until the following Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member care to give an intimation to hon. members in respect of Tuesday, what time he will move that the meeting adjourn to, so that they will be able to make their arrangements in advance?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Normally, Sir, we set the time of the meeting at the adjournment, but I did previously say at 2.30 p.m.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: May I before members leave inform them that this morning the representatives of the Barbados Branch of the C.P.A. which comprised His Honour the Deputy Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. James, and the First Clerk at the Table, left Barbados for Jamaica. Through a most lamentable and unexplained error, letters which were prepared for hon. members notifying them of the day and time when the Barbados delegation would be leaving Seawell are yet unposted, and this Chamber was represented only by myself and the hon. junior member for St. John, but hon. members explained that had they known, they would have made every effort to be there. It was through no fault of the present Clerk at the Table that more hon. members were not there to see them off other than those whom I have mentioned, but I assured the members of our delegation that they had the good wishes of all the members of this Branch.

Before I formally announce the adjournment, will hon. members be sure that they are punctual as I may not be able to allow the normal fifteen minutes' grace.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Saturday, 14th November, 1964, at 10 a.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
6.45 p.m.