

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 30th November, 1954.

Pursuant to adjournment the House of Assembly met at 3 o'clock p.m. to-day.

PRESENT:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*), Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*), Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works & Housing*), Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*), Hon. R. G. MAPPE, (*Minister of Trade, Industry & Labour*), Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of the Opposition*), Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands & Fisheries*), Mrs. E. E. BOURNE and Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc.

Prayers were read.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS and Mr. ALLDER entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 16th November, 1954, were taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,— I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor to lay the following papers:—

The Fishing Boat (Loans) (Amendment) Regulations, 1954.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government notices were given as follows:—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$30,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55, Part I, Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1954-55 No. 7 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the law relating to the civil liabilities and rights of the Crown in right of its government of this Island and to civil proceedings by and against the Crown in right

of its government of this Island to amend the law relating to the civil liabilities of persons other than the Crown in right of its government of this Island in certain cases involving the affairs or property of the Crown in such right and for purposes connected with the matters aforesaid.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to generalize and amend the law relating to the limitation of actions in respect of persons acting in execution of statutory and other public duties and matters connected therewith.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Notice of his intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the Money Resolution of which notice had been given.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On separate motions of Hon. G. H. Adams seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox.

Bill to amend the law relating to the civil liabilities and rights of the Crown in right of its government of this Island and to civil proceedings by and against the Crown in right of its government of this Island to amend the law relating to civil liabilities of persons other than the Crown in right of its government of this Island in certain cases involving the affairs or property of the Crown in such right and for purposes connected with the matters aforesaid.

Bill to generalize and amend the law relating to the limitation of actions in respect of persons acting in execution of statutory and other public duties and matters connected therewith, were read a first time.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Dr. Cummins: to move the House into Committee of Supply.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS moved seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

The question was put and agreed to and the House went into Committee of Supply Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Resolution for \$20,000 for Tenantry Roads

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the first Resolution is for the sum of \$20,000 to further allo-

cate sums for the improvement of tenantry roads in this island. I think it is since 1947 that the Government agreed on principle, that sums should be voted for the purpose of constructing tenantry roads. As the Addendum explains, there is an accumulated saving of \$24,550 over the last few years.

The Director of Highways and Transport has said, that he can do with another \$20,000 within now and the end of the financial year to spend on roads; and I am therefore asking this Committee to agree to vote the sum of \$20,000 from that accumulated surplus, for the purpose of carrying out this work. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to see that there is an amount of \$20,000 being brought by the Government for such a purpose. It has been internationally accepted that public works is the most important means for the production of employment, and sir, among public works, roads are the most important of all as a means of finding work, because roads employ more people than any other type of public works. The reconstruction of old roads, the maintenance of existing roads, and the construction of new roads are one of the greatest means whereby any Government in Barbados can reduce the chronic seasonal unemployment which all of us now so deeply deplore.

Sir, what I would like to see the Government undertake in its next budget is the trebling of the allocation of the usual sum granted for road construction in this island; because, it is one of the sure means of employing the people who are employed in agriculture, and who are not employed outside of the crop season. This year, because of the drought, agricultural workers have only been given two days work per week. It is the most that has been given to plantation labourers; and as I have said, road work has always been one of the means of relieving unemployment during these times, or what is properly known as the hard times. I am sorry to say, that the construction of roads during the out of crop season has not been undertaken by the Government as a conscious policy for the relief of unemployment; but this is how I would like to see it been undertaken. I would like to see voted every year, a substantial allocation for road repairs because I know it would be a purposeful means for the relief of unemployment. Government has it in its power with the surplus it has been obtaining in the past seven consecutive years, to take a bold step and embark on a large undertaking of road construction.

Despite the road work that has been undertaken throughout the colony for the past few years, there yet remain roads that are constantly used and which are out of repair; and I am speaking especially of tenantry roads which are in many cases in sad need of repairs. Sir, it is not for the lack of bad roads that greater work on roads by Government cannot be undertaken. Bad roads can be found all around the country.

Sir, I will again call the attention of the Government and ask Government to consider the construction of new roads seriously. When I speak of the construction of new roads, I would like the Government to remember the construction of the East Coast road that has been discussed time and time again, as a means of relieving unemployment in the neighbouring parishes. Sir, I am dealing with road repairs as a conscious Government policy for the relief of unemployment, and not merely as a means of getting better roads. Sir, there are certain functions in the colony which though they may call for

greater cost, are absolutely necessary to be done to help the social cause. If they are undertaken the social cause would be far more beneficial. For example, there is mechanical equipment for the mixing of cement, and you know it is cheaper to use that mechanical means for mixing cement; but if that engine is going to replace the labour of say, forty women whom it is not possible to employ otherwise, and for whom there is no employment, socially speaking, you have got to forget the women and employ them. We know that it is going to cost more per mile to employ those 40 women, but ultimately, it must prove economical, because by so doing, you are making a livelihood for forty women who would not be able to be employed otherwise.

In big countries, unemployment is not a serious problem; therefore, you can always undertake mechanical labour saving means. However, in Barbados where the land is concerned, there is certain machinery which is invaluable in the resultant production of the land, but that cannot be said to be so in the construction of roads. It is a fact that certain machines are essential for land production, which could not by any means be replaced, if labour were used. Let us take for example the machinery for the deep plowing system. That machinery is so invaluable that it cannot be replaced by the employment of labourers. The result from the deep plowing system far out-weighs the economic value of the employment of a few more men. Again I say that is not so in road construction. You can save some dollars by using certain machinery, but in saving those dollars, you might be keeping hundreds from out of employment.

3.35 p.m.

We are not like the big industrial countries where mechanical devices render a real saving. We are still a backward agricultural community where mechanical devices without certain labour, means that you are robbing the livelihood of several hundreds of individuals. That is how you must regard the position. Unemployment is becoming too serious a problem only to be influenced by what is merely mechanical. In certain places labour saving devices are not economical at all; if you are saving a few hundred dollars or a few thousand dollars by that saving, you are ultimately preventing families from earning a livelihood. In a country like this such a policy is not the best one. In the United States, Great Britain and Western Europe the use of these mechanical devices is not robbing anybody out of a livelihood; but in places like Barbados, the use of these mechanical devices can certainly do that. The Government must therefore take into consideration what I have pointed out. Wherever we read of reconstruction, wherever you are employing people and using mechanical devices, it will pay that country to do so. We have got to look upon reconstruction in this island as one of the essential means of finding employment for people who cannot find work otherwise.

Mr. HAYNES: Like most honourable members, I have read this Resolution and I know the need for these tenantry roads in this district. There is only one point which is worrying me, and it is the question of the maintenance of these roads. We have noticed that roads have been done under the tenantry road system and those roads are allowed to deteriorate. I am told that there is no regular fund for maintaining these roads as is in the case of the main roads. In some cases, grass is growing in these roads, and in others there are big pot holes which are dangerous to traffic; and I am wondering if the Hon. Minister of Communications has considered this matter, or whether he will consider it in the future; otherwise we will not be getting

anywhere by putting fresh roads in order while the old roads are going back to their former condition.

Another thing which is happening, especially in the parish which I have the honour to represent, is this: a road is made and then an extension of the water supply is asked for, and that is granted. Loose stones are then put back in the track, nothing more is done and a gutter is formed, and the road gradually deteriorates. That is happening in at least two or three tenantry roads in the parish of St. Andrew. I am asking the Hon. Minister for Communication to give these two points his serious consideration. As regards the replacing of the surface of the pipe track, there is a sum of money granted for that purpose and it is only for the Road Board to call for it. I am hoping that this matter will be looked into. I too join the honourable junior member for St. John in the hope that a start will be made with the East Coast Road at the Corbin's end and go right on. If a start is made with this road, there is no reason why a little bit cannot be done during the year.

Mr. BARROW: In this Resolution the hon. senior member for St. Michael asked the House to vote \$20,000 for the extension of the programme for tenantry roads, but I am sure that hon. members would like to know what the programme is and where these tenantry roads are. Hon. members would like to know whether the term "tenantry road" is restricted to St. Michael, or whether the constituents in other parishes will benefit under this vote which is being asked for today. I suggest that \$20,000 can be expended on the tenantry road programme, and we know that \$2,000 can be extended on such a programme if we know what the programme is; but we are not treated to a disclosure of the works which are being carried out by the department of Highways & Transport as to the allocation of the various amounts in the various parishes. I hope that on some future occasion, the hon. senior member for St. Michael would be able to treat us with such a disclosure. Of course if he had got the information now, I would be glad if he would supply it; because, I would certainly like to know what work is being carried out in the parish of St. George, and hon. members likewise *vis-a-vis* their respective parishes.

I wonder if hon. members are aware of the fact that about three weeks ago 60 employees were summarily laid off; I do not know if I could say that they were suspended or dismissed. In view of the fact that no reason was given for the laying off of these workers, I am hoping that the hon. senior member for St. Michael or the Minister of Communications as he calls himself, will be in a position to explain why 60 members of the department of works should have been laid off on Monday three weeks ago. Sixty more workers are allowed to swell the unemployment army. Many of these people in the department who have been affected, have been employed in the department for 15 years or more; and so enlightened is the Press in this island, that it is only after applications are made to the Poor Law Guardians who are conservative people, it is only when such applications are made for Poor Relief, that members of the public are made aware of these rather unfortunate conditions which prevail in our midst.

3.45 p.m.

I hope that these employees have now been reinstated after some investigations and enquiries were made to satisfy the authorities concerned that there was no misdemeanour and culpability on the part of the employees. If that is so, I am suggesting that it could only be due to a shortage of funds, or the incompleteness of the programme, (if pro-

gramme there was at all), and the lack of proper planning over the financial period.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I must comment on what appears to be the bad policy of Government or no policy at all, as regards tenantry roads. At one time legal argument is brought up in respect of certain tenantry roads in certain districts, and at another time in other places, the same argument is not brought up. In St. John the hon. senior member for St. Michael as Minister of Transport, has refused to give permission to the Road Commissioners to complete the important bit of road which leads to a large tenantry in that parish. I speak specifically about a road in Welch Town.

Now, sir, there is a large peasantry in that area, and much cane is brought out during the crop season by lorries and other vehicles. Peoples have been demanding that this road be put in proper repair for some considerable time. The Road Commissioners were given permission to carry out repairs to, and extension of, this road. They constructed a road until they reached a peasant proprietor's land. Such an area is about 200 yards long and would connect this important village to another important road called Pot House Road which is also connected to the East Coast Road, and would give convenience not only to the peasants living in the tenantry, but to the public generally.

We asked the Minister of Transport to come up and see the road so as to get his sanction for the road to be made continuous on to the other main road. The objections which the hon. member made were, that the law does not permit roads to be constructed which run through a private person's land. As I said, sir, I think the hon. junior member for St. Andrew knows about this road and district. I am told that he had something to do with it some years ago. The position is, that dozens of peasants live in that village, and the main road comes down from Pot House near St. John's Church and leads down to the East Coast Road. This road which is partly cut out by use over a period of time, just needs resurfacing and seal coating to make it a complete highway to bring you from St. John's Church right down to Pot House and out Welch Town, butting you on the road leading to Codrington College or on the road leading to Martin's Bay and elsewhere.

The area which the Minister refused to give permission to reconstruct is about only 200 yards in length; but if that road were done, it would facilitate very much the convenience of the peasants who are hoping, that they would have been able to bring out their crops with greater ease.

Now when I compare what the Minister for Transport said on that occasion, and when I look back and see that Drax Hall Plantation is a tenantry about nearly two miles from St. George's main road, and that the same Government went and did a highway over a mile in length which also runs between plantations, land, I am afraid to say that the policy which the Government has adopted as regards tenantry roads is very inconsistent. The Hon. Minister will know what I am talking about, and the hon. members for St. George will also know.

If you really want to help peasants by constructing proper tenantry roads it is a waste of time to spend thousands of dollars to do more than three parts of a road, and then to stop because some small peasant holder has a plot on both sides of the road. What I feel is, that the Government should be interested in the convenience which they would be offering to the peasants who live in the particular area. I hope therefore, that the Hon. Minister and the authorities concerned, will reconsider the de-

cision which I assume was made by the Hon. Minister of Transport, and that the latter will realise, that unless you put a whole road to help those peasants to get out their crops you are only wasting time.

Of course the Hon. Minister claims that members have to beg them if they want anything done. I am not begging them for anything; I am just bringing it to their notice because I feel that as a Government, it is their duty to serve the island and not any particular area which has done them a favour or otherwise.

I also deplore the long delay in carrying out Government schemes. We are sure that we have the money. As the hon. junior member for St. John has said, we have surplusage year after year and we have not been using them for the improvement of the colony. Rather, we have exported this surplusage; and therefore made it more difficult for the colony to be able to bear the burdens which fall upon it. If you have surplusage and you have the money, the only thing to do is to give greater allocations; and in view of the fact that the workers are only employed for three or four months in the Sugar Industry, quite apart from the thousands of unemployed who do not get work the whole year round, if you have this surplusage and you have the machinery at Highways and Transport Department, you should allocate more money so that the work can continue and also make sure that the people get an opportunity of obtaining jobs.

I also deplore the argument put up, that if you construct a good road in a district it carries up the value of the land owned by people in the area. That policy is shortsighted; because, when improvements of roads are carried out, the result is increased taxable value in the area, which means more revenue every year.

3.55 p.m.

So, the argument that because a new road would carry up the value of property owners in this island, is shortsighted. That is what Government should do wherever possible and when ever convenient. It should do the things which would (1) give greater accommodation to the people in the area, and (2) assist property owners to increase the taxable value of their land so that in time to come Government would get increased revenue from them.

There is another point. Many roads have been done in the country districts but the Government has been so parsimonious in granting funds for that purpose, that the Road Commissioners in the respective parishes have not been able to complete such roads. I know of cases where Road Commissioners are only able to dig out the road under repair, and to put in stone and crush it down, and finish without being able to seal coat it. The Road Commissioners are obliged to stop work on that road because according to what they say, Government does not give them sufficient funds to seal coat. Therefore, when the rains come, the stones which are crushed down in those roads are unearthed, particularly if the roads which are repaired are on hills. Therefore, within a short space of time more money has to be spent on the repairs of those same roads. I think it would be a good policy when a road is to be done, that the estimate for it should be one to finish it and seal coat it; and if that estimate falls short, more money should be granted to complete it by seal coating it. I say that because I know when a road is properly done, it takes many years before you need to go back to it and repair it. We have roads in St. John that have not been repaired for many years, and now the Road Commissioners of that parish are asking for

money to put them back in a proper state of repair.

I am told that the East Coast Road has been started; at least in some small measure. I deeply deplore any decision of the Government to construct only as much of that road as to satisfy a particular representative of a particular constituency. I am told that of the big East Coast road, only a quarter of a mile has been started from the St. Andrew side. If that is all which is going to be done it is a waste of time. We have that railway track of road which runs from St. Andrew to Bridgetown and some days ago, there were letters in the Press which stated that a proper highway should be built on that part of the railway track; because, it will not only be a means of bolstering up the tourist trade, but it will also be a means of decentralising the population from the Metropolitan areas. It will also be a means of assisting as Government has been saying, in relieving agricultural lands which should only be used exclusively for the planting of food, by bringing into the forefront those areas which are now non-producing, for the purpose of building houses. Construction of the East Coast road would allow people to build houses alongside that road, and to live on the sea-coast which would not only be healthier, but would also assist in releasing agricultural lands which could be used for the production of foods.

Mr. Chairman, just to say that you have started to construct the East Coast Road and you are doing a quarter of a mile, is not good enough. As the honourable junior member for St. John, my colleague has said, not only is road construction important, but it brings about employment of the people. I must repeat, I hope the Department of Highways and Transport will consider its decision which it appears to have made in connection with the Welch Town Tenantry Road. I hope that the Department will realise, that the money which it would take to complete that road leading from Pot House in St. John, right through to Welch Town and to Coach Hill which leads to Codrington College, will be money well-spent. What is more, sir, the difficulty is not in finding funds for that purpose; because, the Highways Commissioners said that they have sufficient funds to finish that road, but they cannot do so without the permission of the Department of Highways and Transport. In view of that fact, I would like to remind the honourable senior member for St. Michael if he did not have the opportunity of listening in to that matter when it was discussed, that similar things were done elsewhere in the Island. I hope now that I have reminded him, he will do what I think should be done in this particular case.

MESSRS. BRYAN, E. K. WALCOTT and E. D. MOTTLEY came into the Committee and took their seats while Mr. ALLDER was speaking.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Before the Hon. Minister replies, I think I should ask a question on tenantry roads in the City of Bridgetown. It might appear as if we are ambassadors who are trying to single out particular areas in our own constituencies, but I must do so. Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister for Communications has just vacated his seat; I do not know for what reason has he left, but I would like to speak in his presence. I think that it is not the best taste that a Minister should leave his seat when an honourable member is speaking on a matter which is connected with the Minister's portfolio. He should wait to see if there is anything for him to answer.

4.05 p.m.

I hope that it was not disinterestedness in the Hon. Minister of Communications leaving the House

when I was speaking; but I can see from the attitude of the Hon. Minister of Social Services, that it was not so. However, in this matter of tenantry roads, I should like to say that there has been some good going quite recently. Although I have had to speak with the Hon. Minister of Communications in connection with these tenancies, (and I believe he made some sort of promise that he would look into the matter,) yet there is the question of tenancies like Kensington where there are some 1,500 houses. Whatever might be argued about the Bay Estate which was taken over by the Government, the people in that area cannot lay claims to any greater contribution of taxation than the people of Kensington area. On the contrary, they can lay less claims of the contribution of taxation; because, there are a majority of people at the Bay Estate who are not taxable as against several hundreds of owners of land in the Kensington area who had been clamouring for some time now, to have the roads in this area repaired. It is now about ten years since the land in this area had been owned by free-holders; and I am making the suggestion to the honourable members, that although it might seem strange that Ministers of the Government seem not to want members of the Opposition to take them out to the various areas, they are members of my Party who are of that opinion. I cannot say that for myself yet; but I am offering my services to them, and I am only too willing to take the Hon. Minister of Communications to the tenantry of New Orleans. No Party can prevent me from doing my duty to my constituents; and I am making the bold offer to take the Hon. Minister to this area just as he goes around to other areas in his constituency. After all, the big question of sanitation and roads must affect the areas where there is density of population greater than where there is a few acres of land sold out, merely for the purpose of peasants proprietorship. In such areas like Haggatt Hall and the like, while it is rather encouraging to have those roads done so that people will be able to get out their produce and so on, on the other hand it is of very much greater concern where you have 1,400 or 1,500 houses with several thousands of people living there, and not being able to come out in the case of rain more especially.

The tendency has been for Ministers to reply to honourable members and ask, who made money from land and who did not make any money from land. I suppose that that is now an outworn policy so much so, that there is no sense in Ministers making use of such assertions. The fact remains that people live in city areas, and it must be obvious to the Hon. Minister of Communications that people prefer to live in these areas because of the greater access to their work; they have not got to pay any bus fares, and that cheapens the cost of living for them. To live in these areas is the real desire of the working-class people, and I do not think that greater interest should be taken in any one section than in another; at least it should appear to be so. About the time that the Government took over the Bay Estate, every possible thing was done and rightly so, to give proper roads to that area. Just about the same time people acquired land in the New Orleans and the Kensington areas, and I think that it is high time that some attention be paid to the roads up there.

I said on one occasion that I knew of roads which had become freehold roads since the Kensington area has been acquired by people, and those roads were taken over and repaired. I have never subscribed to the idea that it must be a question of the length of time that people actually own the land for the roads to be repaired. As a matter of fact, I agree with the Government that it should be a question of density and the number of people who would benefit. If it is

a question of 40 houses in an area, or if there is a density of 1,400 houses in an area, I cannot see the Government using the argument in one respect of the roads which have been recently made of the density of area and then in the same breath, use the argument about the question of time. I say finally, that it is my duty to draw the matter to the attention of the Hon. Minister in charge of this Resolution. I have done so privately and I now do so publicly. It is my offer to take the Minister at any time to this area at Kensington or New Orleans, lest it be said that I am neglecting my duty. It is one of the worse areas in St. Michael; and these people living there are entitled to some consideration. Year after year we have been voting money for the purpose of repairing tenantry roads, but you cannot concentrate on any one area or in any one parish. I have observed that the Bay Estate is now in firstclass condition. I observe further that last but not least, even in Cave Hill which has been brought just yesterday, they are putting roads up there.

4.15 p.m.

Roads are being built in Cave Hill for houses that are not there yet. Let me remind this Chamber that in connection with the last Resolution of this kind, there was a statement to the effect that houses had already been removed from slum areas to Cave Hill. I had the fortune along with my colleague, to enquire into the accuracy of that statement; not that I needed to make any enquiry, because I knew the statement was incorrect. However, Sir, my colleague and I enquired from the Manager of the Housing Board and he told us, that he knew nothing about any houses being removed to that area. I am saying that it would be well for the Minister to get these statements correct which appear from time to time in Resolutions. Such statements are rather misleading when they come before this Chamber, and they influence honourable members one way or another. I am not accusing the Hon. Minister of putting that statement in the Addendum, because I know that these statements are prepared by various departments. But he should see to it that they are correct.

Certainly, Sir, no one could agree that we should go and spend money at Cave Hill, four and a half miles from Bridgetown, and where there are no houses yet, while people are clamouring and begging from day to day to give them passable roads. If the Hon. Minister is going to use the argument about owning land and selling it out, I would say that when the Government bought Cave Hill they found certain conditions, and they put the area in order. As far as the policy which I have heard enunciated by Government that where priority is concerned, it is a question of tenancies that were sold out longest and a question of density of population, I agree with it. Is it a question of Haggatt Hall being sold out first, or a question of a road leading for a mile to Three Houses as against a road serving 1,500 houses?

Finally, Sir, I say that party or no party, political clashing of views or no political clashing of views, this is my duty and I offer my services lest it be said, (and I know there are some who would say) that there are those of us not in the Government's party who are never willing to go and see the things which we speak of on the floor of the House. As long as the Ministers occupy their positions and I occupy mine on the Opposition, it is my duty to represent my constituency at the Minister's convenience. They happen to be in power.

Finally, I offer to the Minister to take him to New Orleans and Kensington New Road, and to show him the deplorable conditions which exist there,

and ask him not to continue spending money on other areas and leave this area as it is.

Mr. LEWIS: Before the Minister replies, I would like to say that I am interested in hearing whether there is a programme that resulted in this sum of money being asked for in this Resolution. I would like to mention to him, that persons from parts of his own constituency have told me of two roads that I will mention to him; that is, Richmond Road leading to Richmond School or around there, (he may know that better than I do) and another road below the Westbury Cemetery. Residents of those districts have recently asked me if I could do anything about these districts. I explain that a certain programme is laid down and that money is voted for that programme. I told them that this year was not yet ended, and that perhaps they might see something done before the end of March.

From this Resolution it appears that the money has run out, and there is still more work to be done. I am interested in knowing if a programme of work has been taken into consideration and then the money asked for, rather than persons getting together and thinking of a number and the number that the majority agreed upon was \$20,000. I do not think it should be done in that unbusinesslike way. I would be glad to hear that there is a programme of work and that the roads in the districts that I have mentioned are in the programme. I am not saying that those roads are in more urgent need of repair than some others. I am merely speaking of a request that has come my way.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will begin by answering the last honourable member first. I must tell him that I regret to announce that this Resolution was more or less got up hurriedly, on information given by the Director of Highways and Transport. The programme of work has not yet been arranged. The Director said that he could spend an additional \$20,000 based on experience of the progress of work on tenantry roads started this year.

As regards the two roads in St. Michael, one in particular is in one of the tenancies which was recently sold out, and therefore cannot have priority at his time over other roads or tenancies which were sold out many years ago. The honourable senior member for the City spoke about roads at Kensington. Sometime this year, soon after the inauguration of the Ministerial Status, the honourable member came to me concerning these roads. I pointed out to him at the time that there was no record to show that those roads were ever given over by their owners. I pointed out that under the Highways and Transport Act, before any road could be taken over and repaired by Government, the owners would have to present a petition to the Government through the Director of Highways and Transport giving up the roads to the Government. According to the Act, three months after, the Government could repair it.

We have not stuck to that policy in the case of Carrington's Village; but in the case of Kensington, after it was drawn to my attention I checked up and found that those roads were not given over. I think that the honourable member must have read the Press release suggesting to the owners that they must first comply with the requirements of the Act before anything could be done.

4.25 p.m.

Two of those roads are included. Unfortunately, the honourable senior member for the City did not get in his petition before those allocations were made; therefore, he will wait until the following year's programme is more or less arranged.

If I put this by way of an apology to the honourable member, he has just referred to part of an Addendum of a Resolution for \$72,000 which was passed by this House recently. It was in connection with something the Manager-Secretary did. I must apologise to the honourable member by saying that I knew nothing about it. The statement to which the honourable senior member of the City referred, came from the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board and was incorporated in the Addendum to the Resolution; so what the honourable member said is not strictly correct.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—I never said that no houses were removed. I said, that no houses up to then were moved from any slum area, and that is a fact. I referred to the removal of houses at Cave Hill. I asked the question "Can you tell me how many houses were removed from slum areas to Cave Hill?" I remembered my colleague said that no houses were removed, and as far as I know none has been removed. I will still say now up to that date, no houses were removed from slum areas to the Cave Hill area. I am not saying that no house has been removed in that area. Houses were decanted at Cave Hill to another part; that is to say, houses were removed from one part of Cave Hill to another part; but that is not removing them from a slum area. We know where the slum areas of Barbados are situated.

Mr. MILLER came into the Committee and took his seat.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I appreciate what the honourable member has said. The honourable member has said that the Government has bought Cave Hill only recently, and already it is constructing roads there. He is also saying that Government should not repair those roads there before it repairs others. All I was about to say is that after Government purchased the area, it had to be developed and that had nothing to do with the usual work to be carried out. In that area an Aided Self-help Housing Scheme is to be carried out; and therefore, it necessitates the removing and siting of houses on the particular area, in order that you can put new houses there. The developing of that area has nothing to do with tenantry roads. That is a scheme which is separate in itself. One thing I would like to add and that is, that the Government might have purchased it at six cents per square foot, but I know the honourable member might agree with me when I say that it was not purchased at more than six cents per square foot.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable senior member for St. John spoke of the refusal by me to allow a tenantry road to be continued in its construction from Pot House to Welch Town in St. John. From its inception in 1949, the definition of a tenantry road for repairs by the Government was given as a road along which persons in that area owned the land on which they lived. It was not a road which passes through a plantation; and the road which the honourable member is making mention of is in truth a road which passes through land owned by a plantation. The honourable member and the Highway Commissioners of St. John have asked for an additional sum to that which is allocated; they have encountered difficulty in the construction of that road by blowing and blasting stones; therefore, they want a certain amount to finish it. They have claimed that originally they estimated for the whole length of that particular road, but unforeseen circumstances have caused them to overstep the vote I am going to say now that the Highway Commissioners of the various parishes (and I am excluding none) have not been co-operative; they have never

worked satisfactorily and they have never spent money, (to put it mildly) as the Government would like. That statement serves for the parishes of St. John, St. James, St. Philip and others. It is a fact that few of those parishes could not give an account of the money they spent on tenantry roads when tests were made. Quite a lot of money apparently went down the drain.

When the Commissioners of the Parish of St. John asked for the original amount, I was asked to make a tour of the site; and if the honourable senior member for St. John expected that I would have done it he might not have invited me. The honourable member talked of 200 yards more of that road, is what is necessary to be done. His calculation is different from mine and I believe from many others. I believe I know how much is 200 yards at any rate. What I want to tell him is that any road which belongs to a plantation cannot qualify for money for its repair, from what Government have allocated to be spent on tenantry roads; because nobody who lives on either side of that road owns the land. It is on those grounds that I said that it could not be allocated out of Government's vote for tenantry roads. However, I told the Highway Commissioners of that parish if they wanted to repair it they could do so out of their own funds; that is to say, the funds which they collected from the parish. It is true to say that the road runs through Welch Town and connects to other roads; however, I am sure no harm can be done to any of the tenants in that area if that road is not put in proper condition. 4.35 p.m.

I want to tell the hon. member here and now, that I cannot consider that. The hon. member has referred to some road in Drax Hall which he says is on all-fours with this particular road. While I will have to check up on that matter I am almost sure, that not one cent of Government funds was spent on this Drax Hall road out of tenantry road funds. As a matter of fact, I knew this Drax Hall Road for years before any tenantry road programme came into existence; that is before 1947; and the road to which the hon. member refers was there long before then, and it should not therefore be treated as a tenantry road. I believe that the Highway Commissioners kept this road under repair.

The hon. senior member for St. George in his usual fashion wanted to find out, whether this money is voted in respect of a programme and whether the money is in respect of the parish of St. Michael alone. The hon. member is always trying to make people believe that great concentration is made on St. Michael and nothing is done with regard to the other parishes. Before I came here today, I was trying to get correct figures in so far as the number of miles of tenantry roads is concerned, the number of these roads which was originally put up by the Governor, the number of miles which has been repaired, and the number which is standing in the various parishes; because, I anticipated the hon. member asking these questions. The department was working on these matters for sometime now; I have been unable to get those figures, but I promised the hon. member that I shall get them for him and pass them on for the information of the House by next Tuesday.

The hon. member also made a point about sixty permanent employees being laid off a week ago. I think he said—(Mr. BARROW: I said three weeks ago.) I do not know if I understood the meaning of a permanent employee. If I understand the meaning of a permanent employee, he is a pensionable employee; and unless the Government is giving that man a holiday or is "sacking" that man, he is not laid off. You cannot tell a permanent employee that you have

not got any work for him to do this week; you can look up the Act and see what a permanent employee is. Even if a permanent man is laid off, he would be asked to take his two weeks' rest and he would be paid his money. If there are any employees who were laid off I take it that they were casual employees that were laid off; and I might say, that this is the first time that I have heard anything about this matter.

However I have made it clear to the Director of Highways and Transport that especially during this period, people should be taken on rather than laid off. In any case, I will investigate the hon. member's statement and get the matter straightened out.

The hon. member also questioned what has been done in St. George. I am sorry that he really does not visit the parish as much as he should, otherwise he would see what is being done. The hon. junior member for St. Andrew also spoke about the maintenance of these roads, and I am glad that he has raised the question. I quite agree with him, that roads are being prepared from time and they are not well maintained, and that they are inclined to fall back into the same state of disrepair as they were before they were repaired. I want to assure the hon. member that I have taken up that point with the Director of Highways and Transport. I have at least taken him to three or more roads and showed him how they are deteriorating, and that it is best to keep them in order. As regards the reinstatement of pipe tracks, the question which was raised by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, I should like to say that in this case it is a question of equipment. Any kind of roller cannot be used in reinstating a pipe track, and therefore, it takes a longer time to get around to these pipe tracks than it would take in normal circumstances, if we had similar rollers for doing this job.

The question of the East Coast Road should not have been drawn into this debate. While it is true that a slight extension has recently been made to the road proceeding beyond Lakes Bridge, that extension was merely done not to help any member as was suggested by the hon. senior member for St. John, but to help people to go picnicking on holidays. The Director of Highways and Transport has pointed out to me that these people found it very difficult at times to get down to this area to picnic, and in view of the fact that they are not so many spots where people can go and picnic, I decided to have small extensions of this road in order to facilitate those persons to go to that area for picnicking. This is not a question of extending or even constructing the East Coast Road; because as I have already said, we are waiting on the soil conservationist to give us his views on the whole of the Scotland area in constructing the East Coast Road. I do not think that Dr. Buie has yet sent in his Report. 4.45 p.m.

The East Coast road therefore cannot be taken into consideration at this stage. Again I promise honourable members that I will get a complete breakdown of the number of miles of road which each parish sent in originally, and the number of miles repaired as well as the cost, so that honourable members will see whether St. Michael was treated out of proportion to the other parishes.

Mr. BRANCKER came into the Committee and took his seat while Hon. M. E. Cox was speaking.

Mr. ALLDER: The honourable senior member for St. Michael has said in his usual authoritative style that he is not going to grant permission for

funds to be given to the Highway Commissioners of St. John to complete the road to which I have referred. Of course if the honourable member feels that he should allow his spite to reduce his competence as a Minister—

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I must object to those cheap nasty remarks. What spite is the honourable member talking about? I have already said that the road does not qualify for what he is asking. It is owned by a plantation on both sides. What spite could there be in that?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is objecting to being referred to as being spiteful.

Mr. ALLDER: I suggested to the honourable member not to allow spite to reduce his competence. I did not say that he is spiteful.

Hon. M. E. COX: If the honourable member thinks that he is talking to little stupid children, it is a matter for him.

Mr. ALLDER: I do not think that the word 'spite' is unparliamentary; and in any case, it is not as unparliamentary as the words 'cheap' and 'nasty'. What I am trying to point out to the honourable member is—

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I objected to the honourable member's remarks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the honourable senior member for St. John to withdraw the word 'spite.'

Mr. ALLDER: I do not see why I should be asked to withdraw it. I did not accuse the honourable member of being spiteful. I only warned him against a future happening. If the honourable member is suggesting that I withdraw a mild word like spite, I will say again that he used words which are more unparliamentary, — the words 'cheap' and 'nasty.'

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable senior member for St. John also objecting to the words used by the honourable senior member for St. Michael?

Mr. ALLDER: I thought that the Chair would have objected, sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable senior member for St. Michael is objecting.

Mr. ALLDER: I will withdraw my remarks if the honourable member wants me to. I will still caution him about the pending danger. If he wants me to withdraw the word I will do so; but on the condition that he withdraws the phrase "cheap and nasty."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. Minister to withdraw his remarks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the Hon. Minister the Chair.

Mr. ALLDER: In Haggatt Hall which is in St. Michael, tenantry roads have been done with funds allocated by Government for the purpose; and some of those roads, pass through land which was owned by one and the same person. The Hon. Minister knows that, and many of the members of this House know it also.

I will further emphasize that Drax Hall tenantry is situated about a mile or over from the main road which leads to Greens or Ellerton. That road has been done about a year ago, and it actually passes near the greathouse of Drax Hall plantation. That road was formerly owned by Drax Hall Plantation. In recent years some plots were sold out and some of the people who were living on Drax Hall tenantry, are still living on Drax Hall land and are paying a weekly rental for same. The Government has permitted a tenantry road to be constructed right through the lands of this Estate, and no objection was raised.

In the particular case to which I am referring, I do not know if the Hon. Minister wants to suggest that because a man owns five acres of land, he ceases to be a peasant proprietor. If he says that because one man owns land on either side of a road, that prevents him from giving permission for that road to be carried right through, then I can only say that you will have to further define what is a peasant proprietor and what is a plantation owner. The land has recently been sold out, and the honourable junior member for St. Andrew has something to do with it. Plots were produced which showed that a right-a-way was left leading from the tenantry to Welch Town and to the main road which was called Pot House road. It is a road in common. Before the Government gave permission to repair the Welch Town road people used that road all the time to get out their crops.

The Hon. Minister was told by the Highways Commissioners that they had a balance left over from the construction of the same road, and that they only wanted him or his department to give them permission to continue with the road. The Hon. Minister claims to know everything about measurements; but on a rough estimation I am still of the opinion that it is about 200 yard of road to be completed. This is no road which has to be cut out. It has already been cut out by natural use which has been going on before. What the hon. member needs to do, is to assist the Commissioners if they want a little more money with what they have, or give them permission to use what money they have left from work on the same road, so that they could just drop the stones and level them off and seal coat the road, and produce in that area a proper highway which would be a credit to the hon. member's Ministry.

If the Hon. Minister is accusing the Highway Commissioners of not giving satisfactory service, must he as a Minister, and supported by a big Government, sit back and every time that money is to be released to relieve the people of bad roads, say that the Government is not satisfied with how the money is being spent in those parishes? The hon. senior member for St. Michael has in my presence, been shown an itemised list of how the money was spent on that particular road. Let the hon. member get up and say that that is not true.

4.55 p.m.

I think his Ministry was presented through him, with a statement of expenditure of that road; and I, in his presence, was presented with a copy of that statement. The honourable member did not say that he disliked the way in which the money was spent on that particular road, nor did he accuse the Highways Commissioners of that parish, (at least not in my presence) of not spending the money satisfactorily. What the hon. member did say, was that he accused the Highway Commissioners of other parishes in the presence of the Highway Commissioners of St. John, for not spending money allocated to tenantry roads satisfactorily. That is beside the point. If the honourable member is truly a Minister for Highways and Transport, all he needs to do, if in his opinion the money allocated to tenantry roads is not properly spent, is to take over those roads from the Highway Commissioners of that parish; or send them assistance by way of a technical adviser to assist them in the carrying out of the repair of those roads. I have observed that when something is brought to the notice of the Hon. Minister, he gets up in an arbitrary manner and says things as if somebody is asking him for a cigarette. He feels that it is his duty to say what sort of road should be done, whether it should not only be the Bay Estate,

the Bay Land, Cave Hill but the whole island. I would repeat that the honourable member seems to feel, that whatever he does by virtue of being a Minister is some thing that comes from him. I would end by saying "power corrupts as it destroys."

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to say anything on this Resolution but the remark made by the Hon. Minister in connection with the mis-spending of funds by Highway Commissioners has caused me to rise. I am fully aware, that you have ugly discrepancies from time to time by various Boards; but I had hope that with the advent of the advance constitution of this island and the various Ministers, that this sort of thing would have ceased. I think the Ministries should make use of the law to avert a repetition of this sort of thing. It is unfortunate to repeat in this Chamber that there has been mis-spending of some of those funds; and according to the Hon. Minister, some money seems to have gone down the drain. I would therefore like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister, that he has the force of the law behind him and he should make use of it.

I would like to take this opportunity to say, that from the speeches made by the honourable senior member for St. John as well as the Hon. Minister of Communications, they lack enlightenment on the roads of St. George. The road at Drax Hall cannot be regarded as coming within the definition of a tenantry road. It is a mile and a quarter in length and it is a plantation road. To the best of my knowledge, the repairs of that road have always been handled by the plantation owner; I do not think that the Department of Highways and Transport has ever handled the maintenance of that road. As a matter of fact, it would not classify for maintenance by that department.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I do not think we should live in dread of money being mis-spent by Commissioners of the various parishes; nor should we live in dread of Commissioners who are not willing to co-operate with the Government. I do not think we should put up with a condition of this sort. I think we have long passed the age of "Bu-ball" where you have a question of public funds going down the drain, because for some reason or the other, they are being mis-spent. With these few remarks I give the Resolution my blessing.

Mr. BARROW: The honourable senior member for St. Michael said that I in my usual style, wanted to know if there was any programme. He said that after he said that there was no programme. I would therefore like to ask the Minister of Communications, as he calls himself, what is improper in what I said, if I said so after he had admitted that he had no programme. If I had not asked that question, the Hon. Minister would not have made the disclosure he was forced to make. Of course, if one associates with Ministers, or criminals, or lunatics, or people of that like, one would become a Ministerial or juvenile delinquent as the case may be; so I can expect every time a Minister gets up he will make that reference. I will countenance the Hon. Minister, (if he wants the respect of the people of this island,) rather than to get up and imitate some of his malefactors, to imitate the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries.

The Hon. Minister did not answer the point about the sixty members of the Highways and Transport, who were dismissed Monday three weeks ago. If he wants to know the date and he cannot find it out himself, he can get somebody to do the little subtraction for him. Sixty members of that department were laid off Monday three weeks ago. They did not commit any breach of duty, nor were

they guilty of any mis-conduct or of any inefficiency which would justify their suspension; therefore I ask the Hon. Minister to enquire into the reason for their suspension.

5.05 p.m.

They are casual workers and I say that they are entitled even in that case to holidays with pay, because they have been working there for a period of 15, 17, or 19 years. If they are not permanent employees, I do not know what they are. As far as I can see, the only thing which is permanent in Barbados is unemployment. If you work at a place for 15, 17 or 19 years and you are not considered as being permanent, when will you be permanent? I am not suggesting that they are entitled to pension; in the fullness of time they will be entitled to pensions anyhow. It must be due to a lack of planning on the part of the Department, and the Minister of Communications must hold himself responsible for that. We do not want any Christmas presents in Barbados by the way of two-day jobs; we want permanent employment. We want to see that people who have given the Government service for 15, 17 or 19 years, are not laid off without the courtesy of an explanation. If these workers had been informed by the Hon. Minister who is completely ignorant of the matter, that the Department had run out of money and that in the very near future something would be done to see that they were re-employed, then they would have been given an explanation; but they had not been given any explanation. Some of these workers went back to work yesterday, but the Hon. Minister does not know that; and they probably went back on the strength of our voting this money under this Resolution. However, the next time that the Minister comes here for money, let him put a plan before the House; do not let him bring in anything about mileage to honourable members. Since he has imbibed a radified atmosphere, he knows about so many standpipes for so many thousand people; but that does not mean a thing. We want to know how many more tenancies were looked after in St. Michael than in St. George or in St. John or in St. Philip. I want the honourable member to know that when I ask the question I want a straightforward answer; I do not want any dodging around. The honourable member should take some private lessons from the Hon. Minister of Agriculture on this question of Parliamentary procedure, and the manner in which he should conduct himself.

Hon. M. E. COX: Lest any honourable member think that these people were laid off because the money had run out, I want to say here and now, that is not correct. Under the Five Year Plan we have an amount of \$480,000 for tenantry roads. We were in the habit of voting \$128,000 every year; this year we voted \$132,000 and that money has not yet been expended. There is still a fairly reasonable part of it to be spent. I merely told the Committee that the Director of Highways and Transport said that he could speed up this work if he gets an addition to this money. That is why I am asking the House to vote this money. There is an account which sets out the amount of money voted in the Estimates, the amount spent in a particular month, and the particular percentage which everybody can see, and so on, and none of these heads has been expended already. I do not want anybody to get the idea that people are being taken on with the hope that this \$20,000 will be passed. This additional amount can be expended before the financial year is ended.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I want to reply to some of the suggestions or observations which the Hon.

Minister made, as a result of the suggestions which I made with regard to the roads in Kensington. I know the hon. member has one of the most popular portfolios in the Ministry because of the necessity for repairing the roads in this country. For the hon. member's benefit, I should like to remind him that I happen to be in the forefront in the preparation of statistics for the taking over of tenancies in this country. As far back as 14 years ago, I actually started the ball rolling, and I prepared statistics which I presume the Government is still working on. I cannot understand the hon. member when he says, that there has been this policy of not taking over roads unless they have been given over and what not. I just want to remind him that I know as a fact, that after the Commissioners of Highways became defunct and the Commissioners of Health did part of the work, statistics were obtained and forwarded to the Government in respect of all the existing tenantry roads in St. Michael. At one time, it was said on the floor of this House, that they would be taken over having regard to priority; but they now appears to be double talk and the policy seems to have changed. I am quite confident that I myself did prepare a petition which I actually sent around and got everybody to sign. If that petition has been pigeonholed, thrown away, or laid aside, or anything like that sort, the fault is none of mine.

That the petition came from the Commissioners of Health, is an absolute fact; I spoke to the hon. member about that petition having been sent in, and he said that as far as he knows, there is no petition there. If the department cannot find that petition I repeat the fault is none of mine.

5.15 p.m.

On the other hand let me make the position quite clear. The Hon. Minister has come for this money to-day and there is no programme in front of us. He has to formulate policy, not the Director; and the Minister cannot deny that the area to which I referred is a very thickly populated one with very bad roads. The honourable senior member for St. John has suggested that the Minister should not appear to be motivated by spite. I am not suggesting that at all; but I would say that it should not appear that he is motivated by a lack of interest, because the particular matter is not one that affects his constituency.

I remember before Ministerial Status actually came about, the Government asked to have an estimate of the miles of road the parishes made. All those statistics are supposed to be there. Now that we have Ministerial Government and the policy is said to be the greatest good for the greatest number, and you have a tenantry with several hundred houses, you cannot say that because an application was not put in or because the residents of a particular area do not comprise the great majority of your constituents, you will not do anything about that area. I am not saying for a moment that that is what is in the Minister's mind; but you cannot prevent people from feeling so.

If you consider the point of view of highway taxes, the taxes paid by people in St. Michael and Bridgetown are more than those paid by people in all the other parishes put together. I cannot understand this double talk.

I do not want to go in for any controversy on this matter. I must emphasize, however, that this petition was put in. If the Minister is going to argue that it was not put in, I am prepared to go further and see that another one is put in. As regards the policy of taking over a road in common, they had a standard form. By that form an owner

would agree to give up a portion of land free for the purpose of straightening up the road.

I have to draw it to the honourable member's attention that I know as a fact, that policy existed; and since the inauguration of Ministerial Status, or as a matter of fact, immediately before, that policy has been changed; and rightly so. I do not feel that this is any question of how long a particular tenantry was sold out, but a question of how many people would benefit from the road. As I have said before, the Minister is responsible for policy. The Director can say that he can do some more roads, and how much money would be needed; the policy is that of the Minister. The Minister has said that the policy was not followed in the case of Carrington's Village. There was an impassable road running through Carrington's Village. Throw convention to the winds. It is not law. When the Government decided to throw convention to the wind because of the conditions in Carrington's Village, imagine someone telling the Minister that it was a wrong policy because Carrington's Village was only sold out ten years ago. I commend him on the policy adopted as regards Carrington's Village. Do not let the Director tell you, that the Government in 1950 laid down some regulation that we should do so and so.

I am asking the Minister to throw conventions to the winds in the case of New Orleans as he did in the case of Carrington's Village; because, there are hundreds of people in New Orleans who cannot get out when the rains fall, and it is necessary to do something there. If they cannot find the petition it is nothing strange, because in several Government departments you cannot find things. Some cannot be found conveniently and others stray. If the Hon. Minister agrees that the Government's policy should be the greatest good for the greatest number, I am appealing to him to do something in respect of Kensington.

I repeat, that it should not appear that the Minister was acting a certain way because of any favour that has been done or not done, to this Party by the people of a particular area. You cannot prevent people from thinking so; and that is not the way to win people to you. If the honourable member says that the petition was not put in, how can he account for one of the roads being done? That was part of the petition that went in.

5.25 p.m.

I feel sir, that you can and that you should in the absence of any programme, vote this money here to-day. There is nothing to prevent the Hon. Minister of Communications from repairing with part of this money, one or two of those roads which I have mentioned. Mark well, this sum of \$20,000 is received from the people of Barbados, and if your policy is to spend it on the repair of tenantry roads you can forget the convention that these roads are done in priority. I hope the Hon. Minister will do his best to see that part of this \$20,000 which is to be spent on the repair of tenantry roads up to the end of the financial year, will be spent on one or two roads in the New Orleans; because, it will show his willingness to do something for the people of that area.

Hon. M. E. COX: Apparently the honourable senior member for the City was not listening when I spoke on this question. I said that in view of the fact that the residents of Kensington did not send in their petition until, allocation of this money was made that it was not possible to do those roads in this financial year. If the honourable member does not know that a petition came in from residents of that area, I will tell him that one did come in. I also

told the hon. member that the roads in that area would be put in order during the next financial year. I did tell him that the petition from the residents in the Kensington area came in after the allocation of those funds. (A VOICE: After which allocation?) This year's allocation.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: For the Hon. Minister's benefit, I was talking about the petition which went in long before there was Ministerial system. It is no fault of mine if the Hon. Minister cannot find the petition of which I am making reference. The Hon. Minister may be talking of a petition which was sent in from residents of the Kensington area since he was a Minister. It appears as if the Department of Highways and Transport has been working on these petitions in chronological order. There is no petition sent in since the honourable member was a Minister. I know that well enough, because everyone of those petitions has been typed in my office.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I told the Hon. Minister that I was very interested in the programme; and in reply he said that last year the House voted \$128,000 for tenantry roads. That is quite true; but \$19,167 was voted during the year in Supplementary Estimates, and at the end of the year another \$40,000 was added to pay back pay. The question is, Government should say what is the policy Government is adopting in the repair of tenantry roads; you have voted \$128,000 and then you have made it \$132,000. Is that the spending capacity of the department for this year? How can you vote \$20,000 more now? You must have had some programme. How is it that you can supplement the amount of money you have already voted, without saying what is your programme, and bearing in mind that the money you have already voted has not been exhausted? It is not even in the position where you can come and say, you want so much to supplement it. With all of that, you come to-day and say you want \$20,000 more. You have opened yourself to the charge that during the bye-election, you have come and asked for \$20,000 more to employ people for Christmas. I feel that the proper thing which should be done with this request for \$20,000 more for the repair of the roads, was for you to come in and say that up to the present time, we have done so much of the programme and we have time to do so much; and if we get \$20,000 more, we intend to deal with this road or that road. If we do that, you will give convincing proof to this community that you are not voting money just for so, but that you have a relative method of work. You come in here and you cannot say one single word as to how you want to apply this money. It is not businesslike; therefore, if the Hon. Minister opens himself to a charge of that sort he must accept it.

The people of St. Michael including the City of Bridgetown, pay sufficient highway taxes to enable them to have good roads; so I do not think it is sufficient to say that in St. Michael roads are done. I have heard persons who should know, say that the highway taxes collected in St. Michael are not spent in any year on the roads in St. Michael. You would expect that because, there are more houses in St. Michael than in any other parish. I really feel that the people of St. Michael have a claim of having the money which they pay for highway taxes, spent on their roads. I think the Hon. Minister should say we have such and such request, and this is what we intend to do with this money which we are now asking to be voted. Sir, it is not good enough to come next Tuesday with something prepared as to the way in which you intend to spend this money. You should have had this statement

before this money was asked for. You should say what you intend to do with it.

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox Mr. Chairman reported the passing of the Resolution in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. M. E. Cox seconded by Hon. C. E. Talma the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

The motion was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.
5.35 p.m.

On re-assembling,

VESTRY BILL GIVEN NOTICE OF AND READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to give notice of a Bill of which I should have given notice of earlier in the day, but it arrived late.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to give notice of a Bill intituled an Act to provide for the continuance in office of vestries and other local bodies until the coming into operation of the Local Government Act, 1954, and to limit the appointment of officers until such time.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this Bill be now read a first time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

The motion was put and agreed to.

BILL TO PROVIDE FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF WAGES COUNCILS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour: to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the Establishment of Wages Councils.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, in 1943, the Legislature passed an Act to provide for the establishment of Wages Boards, particularly as a result of recommendations made by the West Indian Royal Commission of 1938—1939. Since then, with the growth of trade unionism and the fixing of wages and other conditions of work by means of collective bargaining, it has not been found necessary to use such statutory provision to any great extent in this island. Owing to the fact that industrial relations have been good, Wages Boards have not made much appeal, or have not caught the imagination of the public to any great extent. But even so, it is a fact that in spite of the fact that the Barbados Workers' Union is well established, in spite of the fact that much has been achieved, it is still true to say that there is need for this kind of tripartite machinery in cases where it is difficult to organise workers, or in some cases impossible to organise them in order that some kind of bargaining or wage fixing can take place. We consider, however, that it has long been felt necessary that we should have a Bill of

this sort which is wider in scope than the present Act and which takes the place of the Wages Board Act. That is the reason for the introduction of this Bill and my motion for its second reading.

This Bill which repeals the Wages Board Act of 1943, is modelled principally on the English Wages Councils Act of 1945. It provides three separate methods of procedure under which the Government may make an Order establishing a Wages Council, subject in each case to certain provisions as to previous publicity and previous inquiry. Under the first method, the Governor-in-Executive Committee after complying with these provisions of publicity and inquiry, may make an Order providing for the establishment of a Wages Council if he is of the opinion that there is no adequate voluntary machinery to regulate wages and other conditions of work; and if, having regard to these wages and conditions of work, it is necessary and expedient that a Wages Council should be set up. That is the first method.

The second method of establishing a Wages Council is, that joint industrial Councils or some other organization of employers and employees which take part generally in the settlement of wages and other conditions of work, may apply jointly to the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the establishment of a Council on the ground that the existing machinery is likely to cease to exist or is likely to be inadequate. After this application has been made, the Governor-in-Executive Committee is required to refer the application to a Commission of Enquiry, provided he is satisfied that there are sufficient grounds for so doing. It might be asked, why do we follow England in this respect and speak about joint industrial councils when there are no such bodies in existence here. That question has been put to me by a trade union representative. I may say that such councils have been established in Jamaica, and we consider that if these councils can be established in industrial or agricultural undertaking in this island as they are established in Jamaica, some useful purposes will be served in achieving industrial harmony. It has been found that these Councils in Jamaica have been doing good work; and they do assist in achieving peace and harmony in the particular industry in which they are established. Although there are no existing joint industrial councils in Barbados, we are yet making this provision in case some of them are established, and in case the need for them is recognised on all sides.

The third procedure is that the Governor-in-Executive Committee may, on his own initiative, (he will no doubt do so on the advice of the Minister of Labour) ask a Commission of Enquiry to consider whether a Wages Council should be established, if he considers that adequate machinery for effectively regulating the wages and other conditions of work does not exist; or if it exists, it is likely to cease to do so, or be adequate, and that a reasonable standard of wages will not be maintained. If the Governor-in-Executive Committee is so satisfied, he can on his own initiative, set up a Commission of Enquiry. Hon. members will note that the principal difference between the first and the third method of procedure is that under the first method, the Governor-in-Executive Committee may have regard only to the current position in the industry concerned: while under the third method, it is possible for him to refer the matter to a Commission of Enquiry if he anticipates that the future conditions in the industry is likely to justify the establishment of a Wages Council.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in so far as the Commission of Enquiry is concerned, the Commission of Enquiry in this Bill consists of not more than three independent persons together with not more than two persons representing the employers, and two others representing the workers, though unconnected with the particular enquiry, or the particular industry, or the field of employment in which the Commission is enquiring.

Its duties are to make the necessary investigations, to invite representations on the matter, to consider such representations, and to submit a report and recommendations to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. If a Commission of Enquiry considers that machinery for regulating wages, or conditions of work of any workers with whom it is concerned is not adequate or does not exist, or is likely to cease to exist, or to be adequate, it can make a recommendation to the Governor-in-Executive Committee for establishing a Wages Council.

I think that the House should note that this Bill, as I have already pointed out to the representatives of the Trade Unions with whom I discussed the matter, is not even as arbitrary as the Wages Board Act. It allows for representations to be made to the Governor-in-Executive Committee before a Wages Council is set up, and before a Wages Council Order is made. If a Wages Council enquires into the conditions of work of employees and makes representation to the Governor-in-Executive Committee these representations will be made public, and workers or employers, will be free to appeal against them and to attempt to have them reviewed. That is not so under the Wages Board Act. So that this Bill is not an arbitrary as the present Act. In form and content it is even more democratic.

Now, sir, as the Objects and Reasons state, by Clause 8 of the Bill, power is given to the Governor-in-Executive Committee to vary the field of operation of a Wages Council or to abolish a Council. The Bill seeks further to provide, that application for the abolition of a Wages Council may be made to the Governor-in-Executive Committee jointly by organisations representative of employers and workers. Where such application is made, the Governor-in-Executive Committee may by order abolish the Wages Council in question, or may refer the matter to a Commission of Enquiry. In that event the steps which by Clause 7 of the Bill must be taken before the making of a Wages Council order, would have to be taken before the passing of an order to abolish a Wages Council. Clause 7 of course refers to publication of a proposed draft order prior to the establishment of a Wages Council. The provision of Clause 8 is put in, as I have said, to ensure that this Bill is even more democratic than the present Act.

It is proposed that after a Wages Council has been set up and it is found that those workers can be organised, and that they intend to form a Trade Union, or are willing to become a branch of an Existing Trade Union, they may make application to the Governor-in-Executive Committee to do away with the Wages Council; and Clause 8 provides for such a procedure, thereby ruling out any interference with the proper functions of a trade union. There can therefore be no doubt at all in the minds of workers that we are not establishing anything to take the place of a trade union, or to usurp the functions which properly belong to a trade union. We are safeguarding the interests of workers and if after a Council is established in any particular industry the workers find it to be in their interest, or find themselves capable of being organised and becoming

a branch of a trade union, they can make application to the Governor-in-Executive Committee under this clause to have that particular Council abolished; and after the matter is published, the Governor-in-Executive Committee may, if he considers it proper, abolish the Council.

I want to make it clear to honourable members and the public, as I made it clear to union representatives, that there need be no fear that trade unions are being interfered with, or that their functions are being taken over by Wages Councils. There is nothing dictatorial in the Bill; and there is no intention to trespass on the rights and preserves of trade unions.

Now as far as the composition of the Wages Council is concerned, members will see from the Bill, that a Council will be composed of members representing employers and members representing workers; and instead of having the Labour Commissioner as Chairman of the Wages Council, provision is made for an independent person to be Chairman. Labour Commissioners throughout the West Indies, met some time ago and considered that wherever possible, what is being done in this Bill should be done; because, they feel that it does not lie within the proper province of a Labour Commissioner to be Chairman of a Wages Council. This Bill amends the former procedure and brings it into line with the position in Great Britain, so that an independent person will be chairman instead of the Labour Commissioner. It is of course sometimes difficult in a small community like ours to find independent persons; but we have no doubt that they are persons who can perform such functions ably and well, and in a really independent capacity in this Island.

As honourable members will see, all appointments will be made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee and he will be guided by the Minister of Labour as regards these appointments — just as in England the Minister makes the appointments; because, after all, he is acquainted with this field of activity. In Barbados under this Bill, the Minister will advise the Governor-in-Executive Committee; and the Governor-in-Executive Committee will take his advice.

6.35 p.m.

As is stated in the final paragraph of the Objects and Reasons, these Councils will have power to make proposals to the Governor-in-Executive Committee whether it is for wages to be paid generally, or for any particular work, conditions of employment, frequency of holidays, and the minimum to be paid by way of holidays with pay.

Now, Sir, I may point out, that the scope of the Wages Councils will be broader than the scope of the Wages Board. At present, the Wages Board can do little more than to fix minimum wages. This Bill widens that scope so that the Wages Council will be able to play a greater part in other things than the fixing of wages. There is also the provision that the Wages Councils should publish their proposals, so that any recommendations which both sides may make, can be known.

The Bill contains provisions along the lines of the English Wages Councils Act, 1945, with regard to the imposition of penalties on employers who fail to observe the provisions of wages regulation order, or who furnish for the inspection of a Labour Officer, wages sheets or other records which they know to be false, and with regard to the protection of apprentices and other incidental matters.

There is not much more which I can say. I have already outlined the main provisions of the Bill. I have outlined the way in which it differs from the present Act, and there is not much more

that I can add. I may just say that I have discussed this matter with representatives of both Trade Unions and certain representatives of employers in this island, and they have agreed with the principle of the Bill. They agreed that a Bill such as this is necessary, and they are not taking any objections to it. I stressed to representatives of both Trade Unions that there is absolutely no bypassing of trade unionism with this Bill. I pointed out to them, that it has been the experience of other countries that legislation such as that which this Bill contains, assists in strengthening trade unionism; because, sometimes through this you get workers coming together who find it difficult to be organised; therefore, in a way, this Bill makes them conscious of their corporate unity as a body, and can perform a very useful function in paving a way for trade unionism in the particular industry. Therefore, far from bypassing trade unionism, this Bill can assist the Trade Unionist. Sir, that has been the experience in other countries; and Trade Unionists and representatives of the Workers' Union were assured of that point and from their attitude, they were satisfied about it. When I speak of helping workers to become conscious, I am thinking particularly of hotel workers, if I may name one branch of workers who are not organized in any trade union of this colony.

I have read a letter which was written recently to the *Advocate* and which was purported to be signed by a hotel worker. It stated that the Government should set up a Committee for hotel workers, one similar to that set up for domestic servants. In that case, hotel workers will find that a Bill of this kind is particularly up their alley and it is much better to use the provisions of this Bill, than to have a committee as the one which we set up for domestic servants. A Committee similar to that can only make recommendations, and the recommendations which that committee makes, may or may not be given legislative force. When a Wages Council is set up for a particular industry and it makes recommendations, and those recommendations are published and there are no objections to them, those recommendations would have legislative force and power behind them. Hotel workers will find that a Bill of this sort is more suited to them and more necessary for workers of that sort, than a mere committee set up such as that which is set up for domestic servants.

Honourable members will also find, that there are certain functions assigned to the Police under the Wages Board Act, and those functions will be removed under this Act from the Police to the Labour Department. It is considered to be a wrong practice that the enforcement of certain conditions of employment should be entrusted to the Police. Certainly where a Labour Department can perform these functions, it is far better for that Department to do so than to leave them in the hands of the Police. We agree that the end of all these things is to achieve industrial harmony, and if a Labour Department can achieve the aims and objects of a Bill, or if a Council or a Board set up for that purpose can achieve the same objects through its machinery, then it is far better to proceed with the carrying out of those aims through the Labour Department than by penalising the public by bringing in the Police. Therefore, unlike the Wages Board, this Bill will be entrusted to the Labour Department to see that its aims and objects are observed.

Sir, this Bill is a vast improvement on the present Wages Board Act. It brings us into line with the English Wages Councils Act, 1945, which

was an improvement on the previous Wages Board Act. This Bill will assist many workers, who today, do not belong to any Trade Union and who find it difficult to organise; and by not being able to organise, find that they are suffering from low wages, harsh conditions of employment and the other evils associated with workers who are not associated with Trade Unions. Sir, I am sure that many workers will be able to profit by this Bill. I therefore beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

8.45 p.m.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, the hon. Introducer of this Bill has endeavoured to allay any apprehensions which may exist on the part of workers, that it might possibly interfere with the normal development of the Trade Union movements. Be that as it may, what does worry me is that this Bill should be based on the English Wages Councils Act of 1945. I want to say that labour legislation like this, is continuously being amended and repealed in some way or other. Wages Council legislation like the Workmen's Compensation Act and others, are repealed or amended with such frequency, that one wonders if there has not been some fundamental change in the Act since 1945. This is now 1954, and between 1945 and 1954 there has been as we know, a Labour Government in Britain. I for one, should be very surprised if during Labours' term of office there was no amendment to the 1945 English Act. That is a point on which I should like to have some assurance; because, if we are now in 1954 establishing legislation to create Wages Council there is no reason why we should not have the most up-to-date legislation on the matter. If we are following England in this respect, there is no reason why we should follow England very far behind. I should therefore like to be satisfied by the hon. Introducer of this Bill, that there is no later English legislation on the subject, and that the Bill before us represents the most up-to-date English legislation on this matter.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker,—I was not aware that the hon. member had finished speaking. The brevity of his remarks caught me somewhat by surprise; but I may tell him that as far as I have been able to discover, this Bill includes the most up-to-date features of the English Act. It is modelled on the English Act since 1945; all that has been taken into consideration in the drafting of this Bill; it is the usual thing which is done. I do not know if the hon. member wants to know anything specific; he did not state whether he has anything in mind and therefore, I can only give a brief reply to a brief question.

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

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

The 23 Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

The two Schedules were called and agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

6.55 p.m.

BILL TO AMEND CHAPLAINS AND PRINTING COMMITTEE ACT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the second reading of the Bill to amend the Chaplains and Printing Committee Act.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to amend the Chaplains and Printing Committee Act, 1891. I think that honourable members are quite conversant with the object of this Bill. Some time in June an Address was passed by this House to His Excellency the Governor, asking him to send down legislation to grant an allowance of \$30 a month to the Chaplain of this House. The matter received the serious consideration of the Government; and in September the Governor sent a Message to the House stating, that while the Government was in sympathy with the Address, it could not see its way to accede to the Address in full.

When the Government compared the figures of increases given to the clergy from time to time with the amount asked for in the Address from the House, they came to the conclusion that \$30 a month was too great; and they felt that \$20 a month was a reasonable sum. Consequently, this Bill before us has for its object, the increasing of the allowance of the Chaplain of this House to \$20 a month. Inasmuch as the same Act made provision for the Chaplain of the Other Place, the Government took opportunity at the same time to increase the allowance of that Chaplain to the same amount.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second the motion.

The question was put and agreed to without division.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

The three Clauses of the Bill were called and agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

BILL TO AMEND CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES ACT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture: Bill to amend the Co-operative Societies Act.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is one to amend the Co-operative Societies Act, 1949, to provide for the exemption of Societies registered under that Act from certain taxes and duties. As the Objects and Reasons set out, under the law as it now stands, societies registered under the Co-operative Societies Act, 1949, may by order of the Governor-in-Executive Committee be remitted any stamp duties chargeable upon them. Such Societies remain however subject to trade tax and income tax.

7.05 p.m.
It is well that we should stimulate the growth of all co-operative Societies; and in order to do so, and to bring legislation effecting Co-operative Societies into line with legislation which prevails in some of the other West Indian colonies, we should exempt them from stamp duty, trade tax, and income tax.

The only point which one has to be very careful about, is in connection with consumers' co-operatives. In so far as consumers' co-operatives are concerned, there is provision under the modern bye-laws for such as are registered,—that of their membership, there should not be more than 25% of their business open to non-members. There is ample provision in the laws for their registration; and the approval of their bye-laws has to be made by the Registrar of Co-operative Societies. By that it means that a Consumers' Co-operatives must do 75% of its business amongst its members; therefore, the question of income tax and trade tax will not arise, because the law as it stands under the Co-operative Societies Act, 1949 makes excellent provision for such a safe-guard.

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. R. G. MAPP Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2, 3 and 4 were called separately and passed.

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox the Bill was read a third time and passed.

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER No. 12

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I ask for leave of the House to take Item No. 12 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member.

BILL TO AMEND THE HARBOUR AND SHIPPING MASTER ACT, 1909

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Harbour and Shipping Master Act, 1909.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker,—The House is aware that as was stated in the Five Year Plan, Government is well aware of the value of the Tourist Industry to the economy of the Island; and as a result, Government is taking steps and measures to attract more tourists to the island. One of the things which we can do in order to attract tourists is to provide better facilities at the Baggage Warehouse and at the Wharf. This idea is not a new one. It has been mooted in this House before, but nothing has been done previous to Ministerial Status. We feel that just as there is a booth at the Seawall Airport there should be a booth at the Baggage Warehouse for the purpose of selling things, preferably those things which are produced in this island, to tourists. Such things would give tourists an example of what this island is capable of manufacturing.

However, Mr. Speaker, it has been drawn to our attention that before we can sell anything at the Baggage Warehouse, there is a legal difficulty so far as the Harbour and Shipping Master is con-

cerned; and as a result we have brought down this Bill to amend the Act.

7.15 p.m.

This matter is a very simple one, and I feel that the House will be in sympathy with the idea. We have plans for developing the handicraft industry in this island and doing more work of the kind that Jamaica does, or has been doing. In having a booth or kiosk at the Baggage Warehouse, we would be able to encourage more girls to develop handicrafts in this island. Those hon. members who have been to Jamaica and some other countries will know that people who land at the Airports there are given free samples of rum in order to show what the particular country produces. I think that hon. members will agree that Barbados rum is as good as any other rum. Such provisions as we are supposing to make will assist the industry, and while it does not come within the framework of this Bill, the fact that we will have a stall such as this will add impetus to such attempts as are being made to advertise the products of this island.

There is nothing more that I can say in connection with this Bill, because I believe the House is in favour of this slight alteration to the Act in order to enable us to do these things and establish this booth at the Baggage Warehouse.

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

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The half-hearted manner in which the hon. Introducer dealt with this Bill, convinces me that the Government cannot be serious about it; that is evident from the very tone in which the Hon. Minister spoke. As a member of the Opposition and as a member of the Party who is doing every possible thing to promote tourism and to draw to the Government's attention in and out of season to the necessity for doing everything possible to promote tourism, I want to say, that no one would think that I would express a view which would oppose anything which, on the face of it, would make for the promotion of tourism. Let us read the objects and reasons of this Bill. As a member of this Party—(Hon. R. G. MAPP: Which Party?) The Party which has been sponsoring tourism all the time against the opposition of the Government. I am in the first place, a representative of the people of the City of Bridgetown and then a member of the Party, which is unlike the members of the Government who show their displeasure at times.

The "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill say this:—

"Section 19 of the Harbour and Shipping Master Act, 1909, makes it an offence for any person to hawk, peddle or retail any goods or to exercise the trade of a huckster, hawker, pedler or retailer, on any of the wharves, quays or shipping places of the City of Bridgetown, or in any boat or vessel alongside such wharves, quays or shipping places. It is considered desirable, however, that certain amenities for tourists should be provided at the passengers' wharf, such as a booth for the sale of local handicraft and soft refreshment, and the sale of maps, postcards and similar items by the Publicity Committee."

We all know that for years we have had in this country, certain laws at which the Police wink their eyes and allow them to be observed in the breach, because of the local setup in this colony. On the face of it, what is stated here in the objects and reasons of this Bill sounds well; but as I have said, I am a member representing the City of Bridgetown first. In the face of all the unemployment in this colony I could not be a party to supporting this Bill to-night. Of course I quite agree that this provision:

should be made at the Baggage Warehouse and other places; but the design of this Bill is to prevent the number of small peddlers who for generations have been selling their curios and other things at the Wharf, the Baggage Warehouse and the like, from doing so.

Every now and then you get some official here -- (Hon. G. H. ADAMS: What the hon. member is saying now is just the reverse). I know the Hon. Premier will say that it is the reverse. What happens to-day is this: as soon as a tourist ship is in the harbour, a number of people come alongside the boats in the carenage—and in passing let me say this: when people come from a big country like the United States of America, or Canada, or England, the idea of making everything appear that you have come from one big country to another big country is not really attracting tourists. I say this: just to be able to satisfy the whims and fancies of people who think that these hawkers should not sell their ware down there, I will not be any party to that.

A few months ago, it seemed to have offended somebody because people mixed together at the Baggage Warehouse; and the next thing you knew, was that the Comptroller of Customs was given the right to bring a regulation into operation as a result of that. Class snobbery is being practised at the Baggage Warehouse. One set of people can get tickets to enter the Baggage Warehouse while another set of people cannot get any. I am not complaining about that, because I defy any one of them to prevent me from entering the Baggage Warehouse. It is not how you treat people like me, but it is a question of how you treat some poor old woman coming from St. Joseph or St. Andrew. You have a few snobbish young men who treat people badly down there, and no action has been taken by the Minister of Communications in this respect. It is easy to prevent people from interfering with the clerks who work down there. You do not want to promote tourism at the expense of thousands of people who make a living during the tourist season. Of course, the Government will tell me that no such thing will happen; but as I see it, that is exactly the purpose of this Bill.

7.25 p.m.

Let me put it this way: what is better than that tourists should come here and see all the beverages like the mauby which our women go down there and sell. Why should those women be excluded? That is what is going to happen. Of course you should encourage tourism. But why should people selling local produce, curios and the like, be prevented from offering them for sale? This idea that tourists should come here and find things just as they are in Canada or the U.S.A. is a joke; there is no attraction in that.

This Bill seeks to take out the section in the principal Act and insert "except with the permission of the Governor-in-Executive Committee." Do you know what that will mean? The Minister of Trade will have his business to attend to, and some official is going to say that he does not like the look of the women selling mauby down there, or the look of the people selling flowers; such things should be put in one booth and controlled by one set of people.

I object to that. I will say so whether it offends my Party, the Tourism people, or the Government. I am not going to vote for this, because it means nothing but what I have said. Of course the Government has taken this unsuspectingly. As the law stands now, those women have no right to go down there and sell; but they were doing it before I was born. As soon as this Bill is passed, you will be told by some fancy official that it does not look good to

have those people down there. It is all nonsense, and it will mean that you will be putting dozens of people out of work.

Another thing is, that some of the people you have in these booths are so unmannerly, that they seem to like to answer one set of people only. I have had that complaint from many West Indians visiting here. Why do you need to have this Bill now? The Government is going to reply that as far as they are concerned, the law says now that these people cannot go down there and sell; and all that the Bill is saying is that with the permission of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, they will be able to sell. But the people have been selling down there all the time. Some fancy idiot has now drawn this to the Government's attention because he feels that it will encourage tourism.

In any country I dislike seeing youths and small children going around annoying and begging tourists, when they should be in school. But that is the fault of the Government, not the fault of the children. The Government has no right allowing that to happen. Before they start any of these foolish things, they should start a system of compulsory education right here in St. Michael. That is something that I would support. None of us like to see small children annoying tourists. To me, that is not a sign of civilisation. Every country has its derelicts and beggars, but they should not include children.

I am glad that the hon. senior member for Christ Church is back in his seat. This idea of preventing people from selling their produce because it will discourage tourists from coming here, is a joke. Of course you should provide booths at the Baggage Warehouse, Seawall, etc. But the idea of having tourists come here and finding things as they are in Canada and the U.S.A. is a joke. They should see local conditions and local attractions.

I see no reason why you should not sell soft drinks in a booth if you want to. But when a tourist ship comes here with 700 or 800 passengers, all of those passengers are not of the same mentality. Some will prefer to buy from the itinerant vendors rather than from the organised booths. The hon. senior member for St. Michael knows that a lot of people have seen him about this Bill. As a matter of fact, the Hon. Minister of Trade should know that you have made provision for excluding people from the Baggage Warehouse. I am not saying that they should be allowed to go into the Baggage Warehouse and sell. But the Government should make provision for them, just as provision has been made for the taxi people, and erect a covered place to shelter them from the sun and rain. If the Government did that, it would be to the benefit of those small peddlers who have to work hard for a living. If there is unemployment, why do something by which some official can say, that he does not see why the common people should be allowed to go down there and sell and make a few cents?

I counsel hon. members of this Chamber not to vote for this Bill. The Hon. Minister knows the number of people who go down there day after day. They are roped off in the sun and the rain, and they have to stay there. They must make a living too. No one believes that people like the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hotels alone must have a living. As I said before, the half hearted way in which the Minister introduced this Bill showed that he did not believe in what he was saying. We have not got markets and places like that as big countries have, where tourists can buy from a needie to an anchor. In the absence of that, will the Government pass this legislation to-night because they have a majority, and talk about the permission of

the Governor-in-Executive Committee? When something happens, the Governor-in-Executive Committee will know nothing about it. It may take someone who sells shark bones as much trouble to get permission, that he may never get it. He will not be able to see the officer concerned. Before he gets to Manning & Co., on the Pierhead, he will be turned back.

When it comes to legislation like this, the members of the Government should not take all that an official says or all that the Tourist Board recommends. Let the tourists see the island in its true perspective. You get a few poor women who make hot sauce, mauby, etc., and sell and now you come with this nonsense as legislation.

7.35 p.m.

I am going to vote against this Bill. If there are other amendments which the Government can put forward for the better operation of things at the Warehouse, all well and good. At least, there should be an amendment to provide for a booth for hawkers. You have decided to chase poor people from down there and from saying goodbye there to a relative or friend leaving the island. You Ministers are not puppets! You have your mothers, fathers, cousins and so on.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is not addressing the Chair.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that most of them are removed from the people. Because of that, I will say here now, that it is pathetic to see how people are inconvenienced when they go to the Customs to see someone off. They have to stand outside in the hot sun. In case there is rain, there is nowhere for them to shelter except in the latrine. Sir, the Ministers ought to be ashamed of this. I am sure if the honourable senior member for St. Joseph had someone coming to visit him, and the person was landing at the Baggage Warehouse, everybody would get a pass to go in the Warehouse. I have no grouse for myself; but I dislike how the people there treat other people. They do treat one section of the people like a bunch of pigs. You ought to be ashamed; and I am counselling you to change that regulation. You should not rope off one set of people as if they were a bunch of horses.

Sir, the design of this Bill is to prevent those people from going there and offering things for sale. The whole idea of this Bill is to get rid of them from down there. You are putting one or two booths there for certain people, and you are saying that the others should starve. That is not right. I knew when the Hon. Minister was introducing this Bill that he was not introducing it with any sincerity. I therefore am not going to support it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Sir, if the honourable member who has just sat down were a member who was not sure of his seat in the City of Bridgetown, or if there were an election around the corner, one could very well understand the reason for such a speech as that. It is the most silly speech the honourable member has made for quite a long time. He is only playing to the gallery, and it is not necessary for him to play up to voters. What the honourable member has said has not the remotest chance of happening. What really has happened there is, that the law has been broken every day and has been broken there for years. If you look at the law, (and even lawyers do not remember what the law is on every matter) you will discover that nobody has the right to sell on any wharf, any public place, or any ship. You will discover that is the law, although for years it was never observed. Is it not then the most natural thing in the world to say, what is the point of having a law which is broken every day for years?

Why not change it and make legal what is now illegal? What does the honourable member think when he keeps talking of the Executive Committee? It is true to say that we keep using the phrase "the Governor-in-Executive Committee"; but the honourable member knows that with Ministerial system, a Minister is primarily responsible for the department he controls. The honourable member knows, that a Minister can do things by himself which are the accepted policy of the Government. Does the honourable member suggest that the old-hard-hearted planters of the country did nothing to stop people from selling things in such places of Government, but since the Labour Government has come into power, the Labour Government has changed all of that. This is the first time I have heard of any people complaining of what the honourable member made mention. (A VOICE: Shame!) What do you mean by shame? Certain people may think by running to the hon. senior member for the City and telling him something, that they will get certain things done. Why can't they say, "I want you to bring to the notice of the Government such a thing." Why can't they telephone and draw to the Hon. Ministers' attention that something is happening, and that they want it remedied. The law is there; regulations are made; therefore, any Government official who undertakes of his own to do things, may act discriminatory. I will go as far as to say, that there is not every Civil Servant who likes the Labour Government; some may sabotage our work. Does the honourable senior member for the City think that this Government would move one finger to stop hawkers from selling there? The law at present says it is illegal to do so. We brought in this amendment to make it legal.

The honourable senior member for the City knows a lot of things, but sometimes he gets information from people who may have axes to grind. I know what is going to happen. After the honourable member has cooled down from this atomic explosion, he is going to say: "most of us say something like this sometimes."

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I object to that remark.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I withdraw it. No Minister is so foolish, as to tell his opponents something which in the first place is untrue; and something which in the second place, would be thrown at him from the first moment after he said it. The honourable member misunderstood me. As I have said, some people may practise discrimination. I know of certain people in the Civil Service who do not like the Labour Government, and who, if they are not watched, would try to do things which are contrary to the wishes of the Government. I am going to give a public warning: you will never see anything done by this Government merely as a matter of form, neither will you see this Government depending on any Civil Servant to do things. If I depend on any, it is because he has acted rightly on previous occasions. If it is brought to the notice of the Government that any official departs from the instructions given by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, (either in the nature of doing things in a discriminatory way, or to attempt to forget that only the Executive Committee can say who can come in or not) I give this House this assurance, that I would draw it to the notice of the Governor of the colony and will ask that a black mark be put against his name; and if it is a bad case, we will ask for his resignation.

7.45 p.m.

We have our eyes on a few people who might do things to cause embarrassment to the Government. I repeat, no human being will see me defend any civil servant who has done anything wrong, unless he has

done so honestly without any ulterior motive. We have not got the power over civil servants which English Ministers have, but we will eventually lead up to that. I say that it is an excellent thing for civil servants to feel that they are outside of politics, and that they will get a square deal from whatever Government is in power; but when the Government is faced with possible causes of friction taking place all day long, it is the duty of a Minister to see that a civil servant "goes" if his offence warrants so grave a punishment. However, when the honourable senior member for the City in his flamboyant style (I withdraw the word "flamboyant" because it is only to two eminent West Indians that this word normally applies) but when the honourable member in his heated style suggests that this Government would do something which it has always preached against, (that is to allow racial discrimination to operate,) I do not think that the honourable member in his saner moments would believe that. As soon as any attempt to show discrimination is made, it will be seriously dealt with.

In making these remarks, I hope that I am not giving the impression that I am answering for the Hon. Minister in charge of this Bill; because the Hon. Minister will answer for himself. I rose merely to point out, that no civil servant can usurp the functions of the Governor-in-Executive Committee; and it is more than advisable to amend this Act in this way, so as to state explicitly by law that the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour will be responsible for the efficient working of the Act in respect of sales at the Wharf, the Baggage Warehouse and the rest of it.

Mr. Speaker, just as we took drastic action to prevent steamship agents from selling tickets relative to taxis beforehand, so we will also see about this matter of discrimination. By having this power specifically put into this Act, it becomes the duty of the Minister, (whom honourable members can fire at if the slightest sign of racial or class discrimination appears on the Wharf) to see that this discrimination does not exist. I agree completely with what the honourable member says about hotel owners; does the honourable member know of any country on earth which claims to be up-to-date, which allows passengers to mingle with outsiders before their baggage is even examined? We have known of things having been surreptitiously brought into this island and passed, and we can only wait in these matters. However, if you make it the specific duty of the Hon. Minister of Trade, he can see about the proper dividing off of passengers and their friends until the Customs has been cleared. We can see that there is no mixing up of passengers and their friends before the baggage is cleared; and we can see that people buy curios at a kiosk or booth, and at the same time eliminate beggars.

I am sorry if I took the wind out of the sails of the Hon. Minister. I really rose merely to make the point that as soon as you put in the words "Governor-in-Executive Committee" in this Bill, it is incumbent on everybody who is connected with the Wharf or the Baggage Warehouse, to do nothing without any specific directions from the Minister whose responsibility it will be to look after these matters. The one sentence which brought me to my feet is, that if we use the words "Governor-in-Executive Committee" some official will come along and do something without the Government knowing it, and that we are still suffering under fancy official titles. (Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: At sometimes). We swallow that which is good and spue out that which is evil.

Mr. Speaker, I emphasise all that I have said about a Civil Servant doing anything which would

be a usurpation of the duties and functions of the Governor-in-Executive.

7.55 p.m.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker,—I first interpreted this Bill in one way; but when the Premier began to speak I re-read it, and I now interpret it to mean that section 19 of the principal Act is being amended so as to make competition inside the Baggage Warehouse legal. (A MEMBER: No.) I interpret it to mean that the Minister will have power to give permission to someone to establish a booth in the Baggage Warehouse to compete with those lucksters who now sell various curios. Interpreting it like that, I disagree with it. I want to know if my interpretation is right.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker,—There is a point which I would like explained. I do not think that the hon. junior member for St. John is right. I note that there is the question of selling soft refreshments. I am wondering if permission will be given for advertising companies to give away samples of Barbados rum in such a booth. In Jamaica Mr. Nicholson who is I think engaged by the Secretariat, took me to a booth in the Customs where some people were very anxious to give you a sample of Jamaica rum. I did consider that it tasted more like a mouth gargle than like what we call rum; and I was told by the lady in charge that as a result of the giving away of those samples, good business was done.

I would like to know if there would be any possibility of doing something similar here. I do remember that on one occasion Mr. Speaker came from Holland with some bad tasting gin given him as a sample there. I think that such a step would provide us with some potential advertising.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—One can only interpret a Bill by what is written in the objects and reasons; and as far as I can see from the objects and reasons, this Bill does not seek to change the old Act in the true sense. The Objects and Reasons are as follows:—

"Section 19 of the Harbour and Shipping Master Act, 1909, makes it an offence for any person to hawk, peddle or retail any goods or to exercise the trade of a huckster, hawker, pedlar or retailer, on any of the wharves, quays or shipping places of the City of Bridgetown, or in any boat or vessel alongside such wharves, quays, or shipping places. It is considerable desirable, however that certain amenities for tourists should be provided at the passengers' wharf, such as a booth for the sale of local handicraft and soft refreshment, and the sale of maps, postcards and similar items by the Publicity Committee.

This bill therefore seeks to amend section 19 of the Act so as to exempt from its provisions any person who obtains the permission of the Governor-in-Executive."

What I gather is, that this amendment has only been brought here because the Governor-in-Executive Committee wants to give someone a lease in the area of the Baggage Warehouse, a lease to sell all these things. It is not that the Government wants to help the people who now sell these curios etc. One must also remember that if according to this Bill you must apply to the Governor-in-Executive Committee for permission, an individual firm or firms will be given that permission; and because, Mr. Speaker, the Act makes it illegal for the curio vendors to sell in the area, what one will see is that the police will chase from the area the vendors who now go there. If the Government gives permission to a firm to establish a department store there, the store will not want competition from the street vendors.

I feel that when legislation of this sort is being discussed at its source, the Minister who is responsible should have vision enough and sympathy enough, to see that any decision reached does not make it difficult for people who have been accustomed to selling their wares in the area of the Baggage Warehouse when tourist ships come in.

We all know that due to the Housecraft Centre and the teaching of various arts and crafts at the schools and in the villages, many young girls are making fancy baskets and different kinds of curios. But they find it difficult to dispose of those things. The stores in Broad Street refuse to purchase all; and I presume that they could not purchase all. The Self Help refuses to take those things, unless they come from certain homes and from members of that Association.

It was suggested sometime ago that the Government, (and I think that the hon. junior member for St. Michael has raised it on several occasions) should acquire some quarters on Broad Street and convert them into a place for the display of those fancy articles made by the people in the villages.

8.05 p.m.

This is an opportunity for the Government to do something, Mr. Speaker. Instead of the Government leasing that area around the Baggage Warehouse to any Broad Street firm, they should set up a show room and run it themselves for the benefit and convenience of those young women in the village who make fancy baskets and those things which tourists purchase. Do not go there and say: "Cave, Shepherd & Co., we are leasing you this area, you must display up this, that and the other thing; you must display such and such a thing, and we will lease you the area for a pepper-corn rent as is usually asked for in such leases." Let the Government undertake the venture themselves. Let the Government encourage young girls to make fancy baskets and those things which tourists purchase. Let those young girls know that when they have made those things, that this particular concern which the Government is managing is willing to take over those things which are made by them; either by purchasing them directly, or by taking them over on consignment and selling them in their interest. Do that instead of allowing a big firm to come in and compete against vendors who sell things which tourists purchase. If you build an attractive looking shed somewhere near the Information Bureau, tourists would go into it and buy some of the things they see. Do not lease an area in the Baggage Warehouse to somebody who is well-to-do to cause these vendors to drift about. I do not know if the Hon. Minister is listening to these suggestions, but I am sure, regardless of what is said, that as soon as some firm is given permission to put up a refreshment booth at the Baggage Warehouse and to sell things to tourists, that the Police is going to take it upon themselves to keep the area cleared, and they will have the law to back them. It is a waste of time to say that certain laws were in existence for a long time, but they have been observed in the breach. As I have said, any police whenever he feels like it, can clear the whole area even although the Hon. Minister may not want it to be done. I say again: don't let us lease any area of land at the Baggage Warehouse to any firm or individual. Use it in such a way that all curio dealers can assemble there in orderly formation and display their ware in such a manner, that tourists will buy from them. If any one wants to cater exclusively to tourists, let them go up to the Aquatic Club or any of the legal hotels. I warn you not to give a monopoly to any firm or individual. If you do so, the people who now sell there will be chased from the

area. As a matter of fact, no businessman is going to lease part of that place and put himself to the trouble to putting up a building, while pedlars are allowed to traverse the area with similar wares. As soon as a businessman gets a lease of that area and puts up a building on it, he is going to claim the protection of the Government; and the Governor-in-Executive Committee is obligated to protect him, due to the fact that they have leased him the area. Whoever he might be, he will use his influence on the police to get them to keep pedlars from the area.

As I have said, sir, I feel that such suggestions are worthy; and the Hon. Minister should have been mindful at the time about these other alternatives, which are more beneficial to the people whose business calls them to be there. I am now hoping that he will accept the motion for the postponement of this Bill with a view to having it changed. It serves no useful purpose as it now stands. It is too restrictive in its form. I am appealing to the Hon. Minister of Trade to accept the motion for the postponement of this Bill.

8.15 p.m.

I think that the suggestions which were made are deserving of consideration by him; and therefore, it would lead him to bring about a better situation. As I said, if you give a lease to some business firm you cannot lease them this area and also permit pedlars to knock around the area. What is more, the Bill prevents people from selling anywhere around the wharf; and as soon as the individual or firm sets up this show window or show room, you will get the Police coming into play. While the Bill says that this permission has to be obtained from the Governor-in-Executive Committee, yet we do know that that does not apply to the number of people whom we see selling curios in that area. What is more, we have not been told that the Governor-in-Executive Committee intends to give every vendor permission to go down there, and enter the Baggage Warehouse for the purpose of selling these things, or to go alongside the ships and sell them, as is now practised. As I said, this Bill is only a question of legalising the intention of the Government to give a lease to some firm to set up a show room down there, similar to the lease which the Governor-in-Executive Committee gave Mr. Lamming to run a canteen at Seawell, and I am also told, similar to that given to some other firm like Thani Brothers. I warn the Government now, that if they do anything by way of giving a lease to a firm which would have absolute power and control of the area having regard to the sale of these articles, these people will not be satisfied. In a case like that, it will prove that the Government failed to give consideration to the suggestions which are being made here tonight. Every hon. member here knows, that it is the intention of the Government to give a lease to one of these Broad Street firms. (Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Which of them?) It does not matter who the firm is. I say that that is wrong; and it will make the position difficult for people to sell a couple of articles which the tourists buy when they are here. Sir, I formerly beg to move that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed, and I hope that the Hon. Minister has been following my remarks, and will therefore accept the motion for postponement.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that this Bill has produced some fear in my mind,—the fear that it would mitigate against the few chances which these hawkers now have in being able to go down at the Baggage Warehouse and sell curios so as to earn a livelihood; but after discussing the Bill with the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and

Labour, my fear has been allayed. However there are two points over which I am worrying. The first is, that it does appear to me that in providing this booth, we are creating competition against these hawkers. The next point is this: I am wondering whether the visitors to this island and the tourists themselves, will practise discrimination against these hawkers by purchasing curios from this booth instead of purchasing them from the hawkers. There is need for the protection of these hawkers; and I suggest that this protection should take the form of controlling the items which are to be sold in this booth. We should see that the nature of the handicrafts which are to be sold in this booth is not the same as that of those handicrafts which are being sold by the hawkers outside. I consider that this is a golden opportunity for the Government to assist those girls who are now engaged in the making of handicrafts, and to ensure for them a means of earning some sort of livelihood out of it. These items could be displayed and put before the tourists. I would prefer to see a scheme of that sort embarked upon rather, than have a lease being given to any particular firm. I ask the Hon. Minister to take note of the points I have made with regard to the protection of these hawkers, and with regard to the nature of the goods sold inside the booth as against those which are being sold by the hawkers outside.

8.25 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, with one object of this Bill I heartily agree. Some facilities should be made available at the Baggage Warehouse for tourists who are waiting, particularly on their return, to get some sort of refreshment. But that is as about as far as I would go.

I will state now, however, that just as I would not wish any concessionaire down there to compete with me on Broad Street in selling rum, perfume, clothes or any of the luxuries that tourists buy, so the people selling curios and fancy articles would feel that they should not be so jeopardised. We are going to have the same complaint from these hucksters as we had from the taxi people. When all is said and done, the Marine Hotel has done a better job for the taxi men than Seawell has done. As a matter of fact, we are told that the directors of the Marine Hotel discriminate against Mr. Paravicino and such people. We throw it open to everyone.

These pedlars sell curios and such things, and the tourists like to see them. They should not be pushed out by undue competition. What I would strongly suggest, is what has been thrown out by the hon. member for St. John. We are about to erect a market in the back of the Highways and Transport Department in the near future; everyone who has travelled will support me when I say, that tourists invariably go first to the market to see the produce of the country, even if they do not buy. The Government should erect some sort of place for the sale of handicrafts, and to make it a co-operative venture under the Co-operatives Officer; and any Barbadian who makes a basket or dives a conch shell and polishes it, would be at liberty to offer it for sale. It would be a double facility — one to the tourists and the other to the island.

This matter does not affect me personally; but I am thinking that in the same way I would not want competition down there, the small curio vendors would not want any either. As far as the sweet drink selling is concerned, if a private person would not run it (because I do not think there is any money in that) the Publicity Committee can run it.

I would not like to vote against the Bill because it contains something very desirable; but to vote for it, I would be permitting something that we have always wished not to happen—restricting trade, whether in Bridgetown or in any part of Barbados. On the surface, this Bill seems harmless. It is true that you may be permitting a concessionaire to sell only certain items; but he can get down there and book a lot of orders, and if you happen not to be in with him, you are lost.

The Publicity Committee is a government organisation and if they were running this booth I would agree. If a concessionaire is going to run it, I cannot agree. Unfortunately I was not here when the Bill was introduced; so I can only hope that I will be told that the Publicity Committee will be running the booth and not a concessionaire. I was told outside that it would not be run by the Publicity Committee.

The debate so far has done a lot of good. If the Government is not sure of the position let them postpone the Bill. If I am told when the Hon. Minister replies that it is the Publicity Committee, I will know how to vote; but until that happens, I will second the motion for the postponement. If I did not do that I would be taking a chance. I therefore beg to second the motion for the postponement.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, if any other hon. member wants to speak I would prefer that he do so now. When I introduced this Bill, I assumed that members had read it and that they would not read into it anything which is not in it. I did not reckon with the hon. senior member for the City, who is always ready to assign motives of one kind or another to members on this side of the House. He is an expert at that.

There is no more ardent and faithful defender in the Executive of the rights of hucksters in Bridgetown, than the hon. senior member for St. Michael. The hon. senior member for the City assumes that the Ministers of this Government who protected the hucksters when the Police wanted to get them off the road, will now allow the Police to move them from off the Pierhead. When you consider those arguments and the stupidity is uttered by the hon. senior member for St. John, you are astounded to know the conclusions this House can come to.

The present Act is clear. Section 19 says that no person shall hawk, peddle, retail any goods, chattels, wares, merchandise or other articles, or exercise the trade or business of a huckster, hawker or pedlar or retailer on any of the wharves, quays, or shipping places of the City of Bridgetown, or in, or on board any boat or vessel alongside such wharves, quays or shipping places. That is clear.

The Leader of the Opposition is saying to leave it to the Publicity Committee. If they want to sell these things it is all right with him. But today the Publicity Committee should not even sell stamps. When they sell even stamps they are breaking the law. But the hon. member is saying let them sell refreshments.

The hon. senior member for St. John has made a plea for the girls who would sell baskets in town. I started off by saying, that it is because we want to encourage handicrafts and to provide employment for these same girls and to encourage the industry, that we are making it legal for these things to be sold in the area of the Baggage Warehouse; but the hon. member would deny those people that opportunity by allowing the law to remain in its present form.

What alternative is there to this Bill? Must we leave the law in its present form and shut our eyes to the activities going on down there?

I see a member taking notes. The House has descended to the level where members wait for a Minister to reply before speaking, and then you will probably get some twisted account of what I have said coming from the other side of the House.

8.20 p.m.

You will have to restrict the activities which go on there now. There should not even sell stamps. The honourable senior member for St. John said in one breath, let us help those girls by building a booth there and let the Government run it, and he then said, do not change the Act. The honourable member cannot blow hot and cold at the same time. If he want to assist the girls, he can only assist them by agreeing to this Bill. It is very obvious that you cannot have a situation there where you cannot control the persons who are assembling there. You must face facts. Either let us shut our eyes to the law as we are doing now and restrict the trade to what it is, or let us extend the trade by doing this. By our saying Governor-in-Executive Committee, we put it in the hands of the Opposition, if something is done to hinder those hawkers, to come in here and throw it at us. They can say, look what you are allowing the police to do with those people.

I will tell the House something more. So aware was I of the difficulties which would be caused when we made the provision in this Bill, that I said we would have to advertise for tenders. As was suggested by the honourable junior member for St. Michael, we intend to see to it that the products sold there, the price lists to them, the nature of the articles and so on will have to be approved by the Minister of Trade first, in order to make comparison with similar articles which are sold outside. I can assure honourable members that we have thought of many things to safeguard the small hawkers. We are going to see that everything is above board. I put it to the House that if we want to assist these girls, we must pass this Bill; we should not postpone it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the honourable Introducer of this Bill has said, that in most parliaments, the practice is for the Opposition to speak and then allow the Minister concerned with the matter to reply finally. He should have gone further. He should have said, that in most parliaments, except in Patagonia, Lithuania and other obscure European republics, you have Ministers who are capable of understanding what the Opposition says, and having Ministers who are capable of understanding what the Opposition says, then you can afford to speak before he replies finally. In Barbados, Sir, where a few, if any of the Ministers are capable of understanding all that is said in the House, it must of necessity follow that they are times when the Opposition must speak after the Minister had spoken. Nobody in his right senses would say that the Honourable Minister of Trade understands what was said tonight. Imagine that he is saying, that the honourable senior member for St. John does not want the Act amended at all. I have never heard such a thing in my life. What the honourable senior member for St. John said was, that as the Act stands at present, anybody who sells there is breaking the law, and that you are amending the Act for anybody to get the permission to sell down there. What he also said was this: "Rather than to allow the Publicity Committee or any special

Concessionaire to have the sole right to sell down there, the Government itself should buy and sell articles which tourists buy from those people, or put up a booth there and make those people sell them there." Anybody with the slightest particle of intelligence would not say that the honourable senior member for St. John does not want the Act amended. The Hon. Minister of Trade is absolutely incapable of understanding what is said.

The honourable senior member for the City said, by this Bill this concession to sell down there will be given to the Publicity Committee and the Honourable Minister of Trade said that it not so, Government will advertise for tenders. The objects and reasons of the Bill says—

Mr. SPEAKER: I have never heard the honourable senior member for the City to say that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the honourable member did not say it, the objects and reasons lead you to believe he would say it. This is what is stated in the objects and reasons of the Bill: "It is considered desirable, however, that certain amenities for tourists should be provided at the passengers' wharf, such as a booth for the sale of local handicraft and soft refreshment, and the sale of maps, postcards and similar items by the Publicity Committee."

The objects and reasons states that; and the honourable senior member for St. Joseph in an aside said so too. The Honourable Minister for Trade says that Government would advertise for tenders. It appears to me that neither one of them knows what the Bill wants to do.

8.35 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If the honourable member cannot read English or understand it, I cannot help that; however, I must correct wrong impressions. Where does the honourable member see in the Objects and Reasons of this Bill that the Publicity Committee will be running this booth? (Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Read the "Objects and Reasons.") It says this: "It is considered desirable, however that certain amenities for tourists should be provided at the passengers' wharf, such as a booth for the sale of local handicraft and soft refreshment and the sale of maps, postcards and similar items by the Publicity Committee." There is a comma at refreshment and the words "and the sale of" are repeated. The Publicity Committee will have nothing to do with the booth.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister has given a long explanation.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: There are people who read objects and reasons and know little about English.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member knows nothing about punctuation. Presumably the honourable member has had some hand in the drafting of this Bill, and he knows what he has in mind; but when he wants to introduce it in the Legislature, he should do so in such a manner that every honourable member can understand what he means. As the matter stands here now, even an infant like the honourable senior member for St. Thomas would have to admit that the only construction you could put on it is the only one which I have placed on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it is time that I should stop the honourable member from making remarks which might be taken as a reflection on another honourable member. To refer to an honourable member as an infant may be considered, or insinuated, as casting some reflection on that honourable member.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I can leave the point if Your Honour so desires. The suggestion has been made that the Government itself should put a booth there and provide the handicrafts and let the people who make handicrafts put their wares there. The honourable senior member for St. John has made a very reasonable suggestion; rather than give this business to some concessionaire, presumably some merchants in Broad Street or leave it into the hands of the Publicity Committee, the Government itself should buy these handicrafts from the people who make them, or, let the Government put the booth there and let the people go there and sell them when the tourists come in; otherwise the people who have these things to sell, will sell nothing and all the sales will be done at the booth. That is beyond the conception of the Hon. Minister of Labour. The moment you make that suggestion you are opposing the principle of the Bill. What is really happening is this: the Government reminds me of one of those criminal sinful people who at 75 or 80 years of age, gets converted to christianity and then makes out religion to be a matter which you have to follow very closely if you want to get to heaven. The Government has now become converted to tourism, but they made all kinds of insinuations when they could have supported tourism. They saw all kinds of difficulties, and now that they have brought forward a half-baked Bill without any mature consideration, without giving any thought to its full significance, without at all realising the possibilities of what they are doing, therefore they are incapable of seeing a suggestion which has greater advantages in it than what they are proposing to do. That is their position; the hon. senior member for St. John knew what he was talking about; and he has given more consideration to this Bill at a moment's notice than the Hon. Minister of Labour who has had to do with it. Up to now he does not understand what he wants done in this Bill. I suggest that the Government should consider whether they should not buy these curios and put them in this booth for sale, allowing everybody who makes handicrafts to sell them, or put up an establishment so that anybody who wants to sell handicrafts can go there and sell them; otherwise a concessionaire will buy these handicrafts cheaply and sell them to the tourists for twice the price at which he bought them; and the people who make these

handicrafts will get little or nothing for them. The Hon. Minister cannot see that; that is entirely beyond his conception.

I am not surprised at this Bill; I expect anything of this sort so long as the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is the Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour. But at some time or other, we will get a Minister for Labour who will be capable of understanding what the hon. senior member for St. John has suggested and who will act according to that suggestion.

The question that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: MESSRS. CRAWFORD, VAUGHAN, ALLDER, E. D. MOTTLEY and GODDARD—(5).

Noes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, MESSRS. BRYAN, MELLER and BRANCKER—(9).

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

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

The two clauses of the Bill were called and agreed to.

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

On separate motions of Hon. R. G. MAPP seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS moved seconded by Hon. M. E. COX that the House do now adjourn until this day week at 3 o'clock p.m.

The question was put and agreed to without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
9.00 p.m.