

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 15th March, 1955.

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

PRESENT:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M.J., (*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. MAPP; (*Minister of Trade, Industry & Labour*), Mr. T. O. BRYAN, Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES B.A., Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands & Fisheries*), Mrs. E. E. BOURNE.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meetings held on the 1st, 8th and 15th February, respectively having been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, unless there is objection they will be taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. LEWIS: At the bottom of page 4, of the meeting of the 1st February I would like Your Honour to ask that an amendment be made to the paragraph which reads that Mr. Deputy Speaker drew Hon. G. H. Adams' attention to the fact that the Regimental Band was disturbing the proceedings of the House.

It would be more correct to say that it was the wish of this House that the Deputy Speaker report to Your Honour that the Regimental Band disturbed the proceedings of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will give the necessary instructions for a correction to be made accordingly.

There being no objection the Minutes of the meeting of the 1st February as amended and the Minutes of the meetings of the 8th and 15th February, 1955 were then taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: On behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor to lay the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1955.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: On behalf of the Hon. Premier I beg to give Notice of the following:—

"Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1955."

PRIVATE NOTICE

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give Notice of my intention to move the following Resolution: *Resolved*

That this House offers to the Hon. T. A. Marryshow C.B.E. of Grenada, its warmest congratulations on his thirty years continuous membership of the Grenada Legislative Council, and on his great contribution to the cause of West Indian Nationhood within that time.

Resolved further

That a copy of this Resolution bearing the Signatures of Mr. Speaker and other Honourable Members be despatched to Mr. Marryshow.

Mr. Speaker, with Your permission I am asking leave to proceed with this Resolution later in the day.

STATEMENT**Re: Generators at Six Cross Roads**

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the business of the House, I wish to say that hon. members will remember that during the consideration of a Resolution to provide for funds for the removal of three Generators from the Admiralty property in Six Cross Roads, it was decided to tell the House what the Government proposed to do with the two remaining Generators should be sold. The Government has already decided that the other one should be called at Seawell Airport as a stand by.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member putting in that slip of paper as a document of the House?

Hon. M. E. COX: Yes Sir.

ESTIMATES

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask leave to suggest that we go on with Order No. 2: to resume Committee on the Estimates, and postpone the motion above Government Business with respect to the question of filling the Post of Messenger and Library Attendant until next Tuesday; and of course, Order No. 1. With respect to the vacancy of the post of Messenger and Library Attendant, the position is that this House has not the full number of members at the moment, and the Hon. Premier who is in charge of the Order is absent and I do not know much about it.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Order of the Day is to resume Committee of Supply on the Estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Estimates Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Head XXXIII—Civil Aviation

Head XXXIII—Civil Aviation—was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that the sum of \$90,495, be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. LEWIS: I think that there are one or two Items under this Head which might be explained. It seems to be rather a lot of money to be voted for the upkeep of the Runway; is this money to be voted under Civil Aviation or under the Highways and Transport Department? Does the Department get any money in connection with the upkeep of the Runway? I should like to know why there is this decrease of \$10,000 under this Item; I must compliment them if they can spend \$10,000 less. I must say that the Note to this Item is not very satisfactory, and I wonder whether the Hon. Minister can augment it a bit as to what is happening with respect to the upkeep of the road and the Runway up there. The Highways and Transport Department is mentioned, and if it is that the spending of this \$40,000 has put the roads in such a condition that you are spending \$10,000 less this year, then I accept that; but I will like to know what the position really is.

Mr. MILLER: The Hon. Minister should give us a little light on Item 14 "Marking and Signs for Runway etc." The Note explains the matter to some extent but it does look to me as if you are spending quite a lot of money there. The amount is \$3,000.

Hon. M. E. COX: In answer to the first question, I think that the hon. junior member for the City has answered himself. That part of the Runway which is mentioned in the explanatory note is in a much better condition now than it was last year, therefore we do not need as much money for it this year as we needed last year. As to the question asked by the hon. junior member for St. George, the explanatory note points out that you have to carry out these markings. In fact we are doing now more than we have done in the past; these markings have to be carried out according to international standards. The long red strips have to be kept up to date so that they can be visible almost under any conditions.

Mr. LEWIS: I know that the markings must be expensive. Now I wonder whether the Minister can enlighten me as to the kind of box which is being built at the Airport for people to work in. It appears as if extreme privacy is needed and the box is being built in the centre of the room where the Airways Company have their office. It is an enclosed room and "Pimple on the face of progress" has been the description given to it by a friend of mine

All over the world the office of the Airport is as visible as ever. I understand that money was lost, but I do not think you have to build a box like that in order to put a safe there; I think that what has been done by the stores in Bridgetown is all that is needed; but at the Airport this is a most costly thing. I do not know if the Hon. Minister of Communications has sanctioned it; I do not know what is the reason for it, and I would like to ask him if he has seen anything like it during his visit to other Airports.

Mr. MILLER: I am unhappy about it myself. It has been explained to me that they wanted to keep in line with the area; it is in line with Abercrombie Street in Port-of-Spain but not Piarco. I am not convinced that they require any special privacy; my opinion is that the amount of business done is so little as compared with that done at the City office, that I do not think it would necessitate an enclosure of that type. The whole thing appears more hideous if you look at it in comparison with other offices at the same Airport.

I hardly think that an explanation from the Minister, unless he was very concerned about it, would do anything else but bring him to his feet a second time. I am wondering if he can ask the company for the sake of uniformity or regularity to cancel this idea. It is unsightly and I do not think that we can be satisfied that it is necessary. It is not done like that at Piarco, Trinidad.

12.35 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: I know that at Airway offices you have someone at the counter, and then you put certain things through a slot as if you were posting a letter. It is dealt with in a most extraordinary manner because you do not see what is going on behind there. When you come to the Airport itself to check in, they are expecting you and you should have an opportunity to be free and open. It is a wonder that the Government does not stand to lose something by this enclosure up there. I am sure that the Minister of Communications must have seen it, and the company must have asked Government's permission to build that thing there. I can only call it a thing. When you go to wait for your plane you do should have someone pushing something behind there in some extraordinary way. What is it? Is it a secret police place?

Barbadians are known for enclosing their houses with iron rails. Even the Cemetery has iron rails, as if to prevent those who are outside from going in, and to prevent those who are inside from coming out. This thing at the Airport looks unnecessary. I hear that money has been missed from some safe up there. This will now encourage people to steal, because it would be perfectly private to open the safe behind the thing.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the Minister replied so early just now to a question on Item 24, because there was something else I wanted to know with respect to both Item 24 and Item 25, "Upkeep of Roads and the runway" and "Air Traffic control." I notice that in connection with the upkeep of roads and the runway we are to spend \$10,000 less in the next financial year than in the current financial year.

I want to know the Government's policy in connection with the proposed Agreement which is to be signed with BWIA; if the concessions that we are giving to that company will necessitate a further expansion or whether what is contemplated here will do for both. What is the policy? Will we have to spend more on a subsequent occasion to a commo-

date the new and bigger planes or will what we are voting now be sufficient?

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, consideration of the Estimates usually gives an opportunity to Ministers to explain their policy in full; that is what we have come to look forward to. From the day that we first decided to build an Airport in this island the theory which we advanced in those days, was that in the transport of the future was aviation. We would like to know the Government's policy on aviation. Are they stagnant, monopolistically stagnant, or are they far seeing and expensive?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must address the Chair.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I was doing that. If I were not looking at you directly Sir, it is because you have a little light behind your head which makes it difficult to look at you closely. You will be surprised to know how little we can see of you until the window through which that light comes is closed.

I think it is opportune now sir to debate whether Government's policy on aviation is right or not. In addition to that we will be able also to be told what is our deficit, if any on the upkeep of the Airport, and if there is a deficit how far is it regarded as beneficial to the country that there should be a deficit, in that the planes which are landing here should not pay a proper cost, and or there will be provision for making it, if not a paying proposition, perhaps a less expensive proposition. Those are the things we want to know.

If on the other hand the idea is to reserve a little spot in this little island for this little Airline, let us get it flat as a question of policy if you want to restrict the persons who would come here by telling them that they must change planes once or twice before they get here; you are bound to hamper your tourist industry which the Government now admits to be Government's policy (and a correct Government policy to support). There is no man who is going to travel half way across the Atlantic, or that part of it occupied by the U.S.A., and then change from one plane to another and then change at Bermuda to get here. No one would be satisfied to go to Antigua and then change plane to get here, nor will anyone be satisfied to go to Trinidad and change planes because he will stop at Antigua and Trinidad, and the propagandists at Trinidad will soon intimate to him the advantages of that lovely island as compared with this.

Those are the things we want to hear about. I do not know if very much was said in that connection when the subsidy to this company was debated in the wee small hours of the morning when most men who have happy homes and comfortable families are asleep, and only the wanderers on the face of God's earth are keeping late hours. If it was said then, would the Government mind repeating it now? Perhaps they were all asleep and did not even know what they were saying; and they would therefore like to tell us, now that their minds are fresh, what is their policy on Civil Aviation.

By the way Sir, I notice that the Ministers are moving that such and such a Head stand part. You cannot move the Head. You can move that the Appropriation Bill be passed, but you have to move that the sum of so and so be voted under Head so and so.

It is the general practice on the moving of the amount to be voted under a Head, that it is usually followed by some explanation especially where it comes to an important matter like Civil Aviation and the question of policy and how you intend to pursue it. I hope that what it would cost to induce other airlines to come here and how it would affect the

present traffic which comes here would be explained. 12.45 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I must apologise to the hon. junior member for the City for not having the information relative to the erection of this partition. I promise the hon. member that I would go into the matter immediately; and if it is the feeling of this Committee that no further work should be carried out I will see to it that that is done. If it is the feeling of this Committee that it destroys the symmetricalness of the place we can have it removed.

In respect of the question by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, I would like to tell him that the amount proposed to be spent on this item is the usual amount. We do not anticipate any further amount being spent on this particular area, except as was hinted some time back by the Hon. Premier that at a later stage we might be adding on another story to the Terminal Building.

So far as the runway is concerned, it is proposed to increase its length by another 1,000 feet in order to accommodate larger airliners, and not specially to accommodate B.W.I.A. Now, the hon. junior member for St. James enquired of the revenue and expenditure. The visible figures of revenue and expenditure at present (I say visible, because hon. members will appreciate the fact that people come into the island and spend handsome sums which are not directly seen; but indirectly we see the results from those sums) which is brought in is \$39,139 as revenue and the expenditure is \$122,000.

As I have said, we cannot regard that as a loss; because we know that tourists come here and spend considerable sums in the island. As regards the policy, I think the House is well aware of the fact that this Government is against any monopolistic undertakings. Perhaps that poses the question of Pan-American; but before I touch on that, I shall like to tell hon. members that no agreement has been signed with the B.W.I.A. The draft which has been handed to members contains proposals which have been put to the Government, and must be considered before agreement is reached. I agree to do what we propose to do, because that Company wants the Governments concerned to give them all the concessions as far landing fields and things like that, and this Government will never agree to that. We do not know if they will agree to what we propose to give them as a token of appreciation and to convince the other Governments that Barbados is not a fly in the ointment; and that we are showing our willingness from the point of view of Federation, that we are willing to join in any scheme of co-operation so far as our financial resources would permit us to do. When it comes to the proposals to put Vickers Viscount Turbo Jet Aircraft on the run which would take people from Barbados to the United States, we know that people are annoyed and feel disgusted at having to fly to Trinidad, Puerto Rico, Antigua or other West Indian Islands before they can get to the United States. That is what the hon. junior member for St. James has said, and that is why the Company is making provision for Vickers Viscount Aircraft. I understand that this type of Aircraft will accommodate about 45 passengers; the route being Barbados to Bermuda and from Bermuda to the United States. On the face of that and many other things, we feel that hon. members will agree that if one can get in a plane from the United States and come to Barbados, you are more likely to get tourists coming to this island than if they have to come via Jamaica, Trinidad or some of these places. I would however reiterate that we are not prepared

to have any monopolies; our policy is against a monopoly.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister of Communications will readily appreciate how I enjoyed that statement of policy, because they wanted to report me to the Secretary of State for the Colonies because I refused to grant a monopolistic agreement to the B.W.I.A. Ltd. in 1942; and because the other islands by they being Crown Colonies had to sign the agreement. I am glad to say that the Hon. Premier on that occasion stood behind me although so far I did not want any assistance. It is a great pleasure to hear that he is truly consistent in not abiding to an agreement which claims to be a monopolistic company agreement and scheme.

The Hon. Minister would not be able to tell me that the \$39,000 which he claims is a feasible revenue is really that, because if he takes the \$10,000 which he is going to pay out under another Head as a grant-in-aid to the B.W.I.A. from that amount, he can see that would only be \$29,000. Although I do not like the way how Government sets out its assets and liabilities, I do not mind how they make them up so long as they get them right. What I want to know from the Hon. Minister is, when he says \$39,000 is the feasible revenue, is that the amount after he has deducted the \$10,000 that is going to be granted to somebody?

The next thing is this: I am very glad to hear that B.W.I.A. will be putting into service Vickers Viscount Aeroplanes which will travel from here to New York stopping at either Bermuda or Puerto Rico; and you cannot stop them from doing that under the International Agreement. However, getting back to the history of this Company when Great Britain found that the Barbados House of Assembly was refusing to sanction the monopolistic agreement in 1942 they used the International Laws which they have the right to enforce, to prevent K.L.M. and other Airlines from coming in here, demanding that they get equivalent rights. Since then, this matter of agreement has been concluded. The Hon. Minister probably will be able to tell us whether K.L.M. or other Airlines can come here now.

12.55 p.m.

Even if you want to draw visible revenue it is not the only thing you get from Civil Aviation; the great thing you get is the tourist industry and you have to please and suit the tourist to bring them here, and the ones you make most money from are the Americans and Venezuelans. You have to suit yourself so as to suit them. England would not allow American planes to go over territories except by agreement. Whether it be K.L.M., Pan American or some other big Airline coming here, they all like to travel by the United States route to the New York airport and then come here. I take it that that cannot be done. If the Hon. Minister cannot help me on this point I will have to be satisfied, but I hear that monopolistic agreements will not take place. Do not let us fool ourselves that we will be able to increase our tourist trade and make a really successful industry here; the Hon. Minister knows that we are not going to get them to agree to change at Bermuda even from one plane to another plane if they can get one of the Pan American or K.L.M. planes and go straight off to Antigua or wherever they want to go.

I have been a member of the Publicity Committee; I do not have the time to attend the meetings, but it is one of my great beliefs that this little island really has no other big industry that it can do without the tourist industry. We used to meet with great opposition, and now it seems that day by day we are realising more and more that the tourist industry

is something out of which you can make money; and therefore we should grant it every facility that we can. We are British and we would much sooner support our Mother Country (whether we choose to call it so or not) but we cannot support Britain to our own detriment. Therefore if the Government does not agree with a monopolistic idea, I think they will have a method in which they might give an advantage to that line which carries the Mails and which is British, and you may get advantages in certain other respects. But do not let us give advantages to such an extent that you prevent us from getting the benefit or hamper our getting the benefit of having an industry which I believe will be not only good, but which could well help us to deal with the difficulties which we are likely to encounter in the days when sugar prices fall in the markets of the world.

Hon. M. E. COX: In reply to the question as to whether this \$10,000 was deducted from the \$39,000, we could not do that because we did not know whether the House would have agreed to that vote and therefore we left it as it stands. I would like to tell the hon. member that when these new planes come in we should get more revenue in view of the fact that they are heavier planes.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I thank the hon. member. The Viscount is supposed to be a particularly good plane. I say with some sorrow, that there is no English plane which can cross the Atlantic; you have to use an American plane. You can use the Viscount down here but there is no English plane that can cross the Atlantic, not even the Comet, because the Comet had these disasters because of bad workmanship. You will see that when you want to bring a Princess here you will use an American plane, and they are now increasing the runway by one thousand feet because they want to use an American plane. I have travelled on an American plane; I am most uncomfortable in a plane because I have not grown my wings yet. Although some people want me to go I am not in a hurry to go! The man who says he feels comfortable aloft is either a liar or a brave man (*Laughter*). One thing is indisputable and it is that if you want to bring Her Royal Highness here, you have to use an American plane except you are using pleasure yachts. When they reduce the fares to bring students out here much to my delight they used a Constellation which is another American plane. I have never understood why they can use certain planes to come here and we cannot get down to rock bottom and say "Let us bring these people here." We need them; Trinidad is getting them just as she likes and we have been starved out. Trinidad as I said in 1942, went one further than Barbados because they agreed never to let them come in until we agreed and then they let them come in. Now that I hear the Hon. Minister of Communications say that they are not going to have any monopolistic concern in respect of Airways, it should be easy to arrange to give preferential treatment to British goods as you do in the Customs and as you do in the mails, but still encourage the K.L.M., the French lines and the American lines, Pan American, or anybody else to come here.

1.05 p.m.

The Minister will know, (because I believe he is interested in tourism now) what I mean when I talk about package tours. You cannot arrange a package tour with a line that cannot fly straight from the U.S.A. here. You have to arrange a package tour to bring people here by a line that is using American planes that are connected up with the Airline concerned. As you know sir, people do not have to pay all their fares in advance. You can arrange a passage on the instalment plan. These big lines can

therefore bring people who would not be able otherwise to travel.

Such people will be able to live here more cheaply than in the United States. As has been told to the Government by Sir Miles Thomas, our hotel rates except when you get to the "Platinum Coast" (which I am told for certain reasons are a little high) our rates are still cheap as compared with other countries which have pleasures that we have, including those found on the St. James coast! But we will not succeed in attracting these people if we give preference to the English lines only as we are doing.

I wholeheartedly agree that they should be given some preference, but you should also do all you can to encourage planes from Venezuela, the French Lines and the American Lines etc., which can bring tourists in quantities to this Island especially in respect of package tours. Now that planes are able to compete and compete successfully with the steamship lines, in view of the fact that they only take 24 hours or less to land here and carry you back, now is the time that tours can be enjoyed by the person who only has two or three weeks' holiday to spend, and therefore has two weeks less two days to visit places like this.

We should not forget that the other islands are in competition with us. We will have to compete against Antigua which is getting better and better whether we want to agree with that or not. We also have to compete against Trinidad which can offer many things that we cannot offer; and now we have Grenada with Grande Anse beach and the Santa Maria hotel.

In these circumstances we must consider what is Government's policy. We have to consider whether the Government regards the tourist industry as a real industry and one that needs great care and attention. You have got to prevent the lunches which you give to people who come here, from making you blind to what is in the best interest of this island. I know it is difficult to dine with a man and to realise that he is selling you his goods instead of buying yours.

It was the attitude adopted by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph in 1942 that got me into trouble with the then Governor. As far as I am concerned, I am not only an unrepentant sinner in that respect but I am more convinced than ever that we have been injured from that day to this by the Regulations which prevented other Airlines from coming here. Now that we have the power in our own hands, I hope that without doing any injustice to our Mother Country's lines or any other lines we will rectify the situation.

If we federate soon and we spend more money than we should on a proper federated line that would be an entirely different matter, because that would be an internal matter. In that case alone I would not mind giving up the idea of what is a monopolistic tendency, seeing that it would be our own line which we would have to cater to to make it pay. Do not tell me that you are going to pay now to get little planes which hover like leaves in the wind and expect people to travel by them, when you can get big and comfortable planes which do not cause discomfort and fear to those who are timid whenever they take to the air, whether they are pilots or passengers.

Mr. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I do not want any controversy on this matter. In the speech of the hon. junior member for St. James he disclosed some very startling facts. As regards what he said about federation, I have no doubt that the federal units of the area will have to consider the question of Civil Aviation. He talked about the inability of

the British Aircraft to cross the Atlantic; I would like the hon. member to realise that the British Government at that time could have used a pilot from England, but it was in the interest of the trip that they selected a Canadian pilot.

I do not know if the Minister can explain this: (perhaps the hon. junior member for St. James can shed some light on it.) is it a question of voluntary liquidation by B.W.I. and the same name will be the name of the operating company, or will it be B.O.A.C.? There is no question of not flying in safety with B.W.I.A.; I believe that few companies enjoy the safety record that B.W.I.A. has. I have reasons to complain about the service, but in another respect. I had to complain because in one of the French islands I was forced to stay in a hotel at \$15 a day for 10 days because of that company. I am not embarking on Government's policy on Civil Aviation at this stage.

I would like to know whether this subsidy is given to B.W.I.A. and whether B.W.I.A. is going to work in conjunction with B.O.A.C. I am asking this question in earnest and, as a matter of fact, I am in search of some enlightenment on the matter from the Hon. Minister. What is the idea of the Government? Is it considering a subsidy to the Company by a redemption of some of its landing dues, or is Government going to give this subsidy by way of paying it out of the Treasury and as long as the service is provided? I am really a bit anxious over this matter. I would also like the Hon. Minister to explain something about the Vickers Viscount turbo-jet aircraft which this Company proposes to use.

1.15 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I have been promised by the Hon. Minister of Communications that he would look into the matter of the putting up of that box by the department at Seawell, and I therefore take it that he was not consulted when it was being put up.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is an Item which looks to me like a new Item because the entire amount is an increase over last year's expenditure. It is Item 30, with respect to transportation to and from the Airport. I would like to know who is sharing in this transportation. I know that some people who are working there live quite far from the Airport and I also know that they can only afford a bicycle to get them to and fro, and at least the Government should assist them in getting a motor cycle. Can the Hon. Minister tell me something of this transport business? The Note does not fully explain it.

I am going back to Item 24, Upkeep of roads and runway, and there is the statement that it includes cost of maintenance of grassed side strips, grassed areas and all land standing and drainage system, upkeep of car parks and other roads at the Airport. Provision is made for surface dressing the western half of the runway, under the control of the Department of Highways and Transport. Includes wages of full-time tractor driver paid at key scale rates. That is a bald statement. At least, that is how I take it. Can the Hon. Minister tell me whether it is a fact that the night work at Seawell is restricted to four hours? I ask that question because the Government has said that they will only pay out for four hours of overtime. I have heard that matter mentioned in a way as to cause me to be 50 per cent. on the side of the Government, but I am wondering if the people up there will take longer to do that work. If it is going to take eight hours, the worker is not going to benefit by that declaration by the Government. Is the Government paying certain people overtime to the

extent of four hours only, only for some work there? I would like an explanation.

Item 32 concerns equipment and the Note to it reads very peculiar; it says: "To purchase three sets of tools for servicing standby Diesel generating plants, vehicles and electrical installations; also to purchase of a stove."

Now, Sir, do you mean to tell me that these diesel plants were put up there without any tools, or has these tools been worn out? You are saying that you want three sets of tools now which means that you want a set for each plant. It seems to me that an explanation is necessary for that item. What has happened with the tools? Have you never had any tools and you are now buying some?

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I naturally feel diffident about speaking so soon after the honourable junior member for St. George on a matter of aeroplanes because the honourable member was the manufacturer of the first plane to fly (if for only a few hours above the ground) in the Caribbean. However, as a layman, I hope I will be permitted to discuss under this Head two items; and the first is with respect to the question of the upkeep of roads and the runway. Item 24. The question of the upkeep of roads and runway is to provide for the best and a faster type of planes. I cannot imagine with that provision we will be denied at our Airport the landing rights of Pan-American planes. There is no reason why Antigua, (not to mention Jamaica and Trinidad) should have the inestimable aid of the best commercial planes landing on their airfields while our airfield is being deprived of it. As a matter of fact, nothing would be more helpful to the tourist industry than if Pan-American planes were allowed to fly in with American tourists; it would improve the tourist industry. I think the two things that and the Deep Water Harbour are practically on all fours. Even if it means a question of give and take in return for Pan-American Airlines to be allowed to land in some American place, we should do it. The people of this country should not be deprived of advantages possessed by other West Indian islands. If Pan-American Airlines did not ask to come here, I presume it is because they have been told that it is no use your asking because it would not be granted.

Sir, I think you will remember that we passed an Address in that respect. I remember very well that the motion by the honourable senior member for the City which referred only to Pan-American Airlines was amended to make provision for other Airlines. I have not heard of any reply being given to that Address and I am wondering what has become of that Address. Did it ever leave Barbados and has the reply come back to this country?

Sir, the people of this country do not want to have only the best airport in these parts, but the opportunity of the best available planes coming here. We do not feel that we are less worthy than Antigua, Jamaica or Trinidad.

I will now deal with the employees of the present air service. We must have observed the discrimination with regard to the employees of B.W.I.A. I am told that no coloured girls are considered suitable for a job as stewardess in that air service and one cannot help noticing it. That Company is now about to receive a subsidy from the taxpayers of this colony and yet we cannot see one coloured stewardess on any of the planes of that Company. Is it suggested that our coloured girls are not intelligent or attractive enough, or is it a stated policy of the B.W.I.A. not to employ coloured girls? It is a fact that the fares which we pay for passage on that ser-

vice are high and we are also spending \$90,000 on our Airport merely to assist in bolstering up what is purely a British monopoly, which like all monopolies treat us like how we are treated by the Electric Company. Sir, I wish to say that this matter of air accommodation at Seawell should receive further consideration.

I must urge the Hon. Minister of Communications to try and let us know something about the fate of that Address which was passed by this House in connection with the opening of this Airport to lines other than the present one. If no reply have been received we will know how to act upon it; if the reply is received let the honourable member lay a statement on the table of the House.

1.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: In reply to the question asked by the honourable junior member for the City as to whether work is restricted to four hours, there is no truth in that at all. What happens is that when the cement slabs are put down, you have to give them a reasonable time to dry so that when the planes come in on the morning, the surface would be hard enough to accommodate the plane. We have been trying to get three days a week for this work but we have found it impossible to do so up to now. We have never been able to get any more time.

The item "Transportation" is a new item. Honourable members will remember that Sir Errol Dos Santos recommended that transportation be provided for the employees at Seawell and we have agreed to come down with this item. I must apologise to honourable members for not putting in the word "new" after the word "Transportation." We have decided to call for tenders to transport employees to and from Seawell as the case may be. The suggestion of supplying these individuals with motor cycles has not been put up to us; as a matter of fact some of these people would not have qualified for travelling allowance. As far as the item "Tools" is concerned, I have not got the information about that. As to the question raised by the honourable senior member for St. Lucy in connection with the Address which was passed by this House some time ago, I promise him that I will take up the matter and bring it before the House.

Mr. LEWIS: With regard to the question of landing rights, I take it that if we federate and Trinidad has been granted permission for Pan-American planes to land there that there will be a landing right for the federated area. We have to make a common contribution and therefore the planes which are landing at Antigua or Trinidad will have to come here as being in the federated area.

The question that the sum of \$90,495 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXXIV — Electrical Inspection

Head XXXIV—Electrical Inspection was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Head stand part.

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

Mr. LEWIS: I do not want to make it appear say that I agree with the honourable junior member for St. James that the motion should be that so much money be voted under this Head. When we come to the final Head I will ask how much money was voted under this Head; because we criticised the Estimates as they were made up last year and they have come back here wrong again this year. They are certain Heads under which you cannot tell how much money you have

voted; such Heads are Heads like "Charges of Debt", and "subsidies and Grants."

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Under a Head certain items are laid down to be "fixed by law." In presenting the Estimates you have to present these amounts because you have to let the island know what is the total expenditure involved. Therefore, the Head is bound to have that; but in addition to what is "fixed by law," certain sums are voted in the Estimates and they are put in the column "to be voted." You cannot move that the Head stand part because the Head is nothing; it is only a Head but it is divided into two parts, one "fixed by law" and the other "to be voted." Therefore the motion is that so much money be voted under this Head.

Suppose you wanted to take off a dollar from a particular Head; you would not move that the Head be depleted by a dollar; you will have to move that some Item be depleted by a dollar. You will have to make two motions; the first as regards the Head, and the second as regards the amount to be voted so as to make it right. You are not asking that the total that is in any Head to be voted, you are only moving the column "to be voted." It only takes another ten seconds to do it right, so why not do it right?

1.35 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will accept the honourable member's suggestion and adopt that method.

Mr. LEWIS: Perhaps it would be well to remark this. It will be necessary when we get to the final vote to go back to the Heads Pensions, Charges of Debts and Subsidies and Grants and put them right, because they have not got the amounts to be voted set out properly.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that the sum of \$17,780 be voted under this Head.

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

The question was put and agreed to without division.

Head XXXV—Housing Board

Head XXXV—Housing Board—was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that the sum of \$38,637 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, sitting on my left is a member of the Housing Board. I have suggested to him to get up and tell us how the Board is getting on; he must make his little contribution now. Anyhow sir, enough of fun. The Housing Board was created in the old days when Committees and Boards use to run the Government. I notice that we are getting the tendency to deal with the Housing Board as it properly is in fact though not in law, as though it were entirely a Government Department. If the Minister is going to talk I would like him to talk first. He is only giving me an unnecessary sore throat. For busy men who have to work and who do not get sufficient to make it possible to work in here only, this is a great chance to come here and hear what the Government has done and what they hope and expect to do.

The Housing Board was framed on examples of other places. Sir John Hutson as he was afterwards, wanted me to copy the English Act which had 337 Sections. I told him no. My idea was to leave it elastic so that the Board could from time to time put up schemes in keeping with the progress and development of the island, in that any scheme could be put up by the Board and it would only have to pass the Legislature and then it could become law.

We know that it was originally intended that we should clear up the slums by decamping people from

those places and moving them on to schemes established by the Board. Unfortunately our population is increasing at such a rate, that what might have been perhaps only a fairly difficult problem at one time has become a very difficult problem now. I would like the Hon. Minister to tell us how they propose to deal with the problem, how far they have got, how much money are we losing on the building programme, how much is the cost of building Housing Board houses, how much they rent for, and how much is the equivalent of the money which would be put at interest and which is spent on these schemes. I would also like to know what sections of the community does he favour; what it is costing the country to favour one section and not the other section, and in this case to deal with the Housing Board on a commercial basis and not on a Governmental basis.

I say that because it is no use going to the public, (and as some honourable member says) advertising the fact that you built fifty or sixty houses when the situation demands that you should build 500. If you cannot build 500 because the equivalent monetary financial loss is so many hundred pounds per house, and therefore you will not be able to spend that amount, you have to build less than the situation demands; and you must build in places leaving other places to be cultivated for canes. It is not enough just to come with a scheme and ask for another \$25,000 because the Deacons Road scheme roads want repairing or Dan Springer wants a piece cut off a road and he can by contributing to some programme get a little piece more put in a tenantry than should be there. I do not know anything about it; that is what the scurrilous boys say.

We want to know how far they have tackled the problem of getting rid of the slums, and how many houses you have rid the slums of, and how many houses you have to build. Is the programme affecting your slums, and how do you propose to deal with it from the housing point of view? Are we benefiting in any way? How much money have we spent over the period that we had these schemes, and would it be possible for the Minister to tell us how much money we have spent over the last five years? All those are interesting things. Our two real difficulties are unemployment and over population. Unemployment is a very serious problem, and I will say now what I have said on political platforms—that everyone has got to help those who have to deal with that problem.

As regards over population, our population has moved from 190,000 to 225,000. How are we proposing to house them? You cannot house them by building 50 or 60 houses or by taking 10 out of one house and then find that the population has so increased again, that you have to put back 10 in a house of the same size. This is not a criticism; it is merely an enquiry. How are you meeting the difficulties which will give whatever Government takes over a proper headache? The difficulties have got to be met, and only God can help them; or they must have seen Daysh, J. A. Mahon, V. C. Gale, Dr. C. H. St. John. that we are going to get a lot of money as surplus income.

1.45 p.m.

In addition to that, if you find that you are not getting what you should get from out of the Housing Board, now that you have Ministerial System and you find that this country is being handicapped in the preparation of schemes and the building of houses, then of course, the obvious thing to do is to let the Minister of Housing take it over completely; so that at the election time he could be

challenged for the insufficiency or the inefficiency of the steps taken to remedy the defects. I merely asked for the information because I am tired of hearing the members of the Housing Board telling us what they have done. Of course the Government is in the happy position of having people to take the blame for inefficient housing, and one of the very people is sitting on my left pensively. That is more reason why the Government should take it over and because we do not want recriminations in this House between members of the Board. We do not want the hon. senior member for the City to tell us that he cannot get the other members to do so and so. I am asking for information, and I see that the present attitude of the Hon. Minister is that he is an expert in explaining that the little which was done was probably all that could be done.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY : Mr. Chairman, I too under this Head seek a little information from the Hon. Minister responsible for this Portfolio. On this question of Housing I am continually assailed by people in the country districts for help for the repair of their houses. I refer to people who are not agricultural labourers. Only yesterday I was assailed by an old man who is receiving Old Age Pension; his house has actually become inhabitable and he is not in the position to repair it. I want to know what is the policy of the Housing Board with regard to the repair and building of houses for people in the country districts. Of course, I have made a query and they said that it is not their business, it is the business of the Central Government. I would like to know from the Hon. Minister in charge what can be done to help these old people. This old man to whom I made reference, is not the only person as I have said; I have been assailed by many old people. I hope the Hon. Minister of Housing would be able to give me a little idea so that I can tell those people what really is the Government's policy in the matter of these unfortunate people who have no resources to repair their houses other than the Old Age Pension which they get.

Mr. VAUGHAN : I have to endorse the remarks of the last hon. member who has spoken, because there seems to be a general attitude of unconcern by the Housing Authority in this matter. I would not put it harder than that where country slums are concerned. People seem to have the idea that slums only exist in the town area, but Barbados can be regarded in this instance as one large town. In the country districts you have slums and dilapidated houses as any that you have in Bridgetown. In the northern parish of St. Lucy as well as in St. Michael there are self-help housing schemes, but I am not aware that in any other parish or in the parish of St. John where the need for housing is as great, is there any such housing. There is a lot of talk in St. John by people of their inability to get land to put their houses on; and I think the time has come when something should be done for acquisition of land by the Government.

It is impossible to have any housing scheme without a land policy; acquisition of land has to be a positive policy of the Government. I must emphasise that I am distressed almost every time I go to St. John and see that there are open lands which would have made some excellent housing sites, but which have been recently bought by some person. I think that has been drawn to the attention of the Hon. Minister.

Sir, if we must build houses, we must have land and we must not pay too high a price for that land. I want to see this Government take a similar step as in other West Indian colonies in the acquisition of land for the putting up of houses for the people immediately.

There is another matter which I have talked on before and which I will mention again. I do think that houses can be built cheaper than the price for which they are built now; I do not think I have to be a building expert to realise that. Recently, I came across a housing programme in Surinam where houses of three bedrooms, drawing and dining room, or both together, etc., were built for under 3,000 West Indian dollars in that colony. I think a similar house as far as my experience goes, will cost twice as much here. There must be some fundamental lack either in the production of materials or in the machinery of erection or something like that. The Hon. Minister of Housing visited Jamaica some time last year, where he should have seen some Housing Schemes and where he should have gathered some knowledge in this respect. I understand that the houses which are built by the Government at the Bay Estate are superior to most of the houses erected in the other West Indian colonies; but at the same time, I must say although that must be so, I am still convinced about what I read — that the houses we are building here are built at too exorbitant a price. If that price is to continue I can see very little progress being made, because you will have insufficient funds for that purpose. In conclusion I will say that we must have a land policy in order to have any Housing Scheme at all in this country, and we should explore every possible avenue in order to build the same size house that we are building now at a cheaper rate.

1.55 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX : Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to thank the hon. senior member for St. James who raised the point about giving the House some information as to what happens as to the functioning of the Housing Board. As a matter of fact, two weeks ago I pressed that a prepared statement should be presented to members of this House either quarterly or annually, from all the departments under my control.

I have prepared sir, a brief review of the operations of the departments with which I am directly concerned. Up to the end of the financial year we have collected \$138,484 in rent and the arrears to date are \$8,621. For eleven months the number of houses removed and resited is 100. Altogether we have removed and re-sited 724 houses. The average number of people employed for 1954—55 is 360 and the average wages paid is \$58,552. Of course the Department of Highways and Transport carried out the construction of the roads up there. In so far as Aided Self-Help Housing is concerned, the actual amount expended to the end of February in 1953—54 is \$12,976 and for 1954—55 the amount is \$54,207, which makes a total of \$67,183. In connection with the Clinkett's Scheme there are 15 houses at an average of \$1,166 per house; then we have 30 houses under construction at the Bay, 30 at Cave Hill, 15 at Sayers Court, (Christ Church), 30 at Six Roads. St. Philip making a total of 120 houses with an area of 396 square feet for each. The cost of the four-room houses at the Pine with bedrooms, kitchen and private latrines is \$2,490 each or \$9,960 for four unit houses. A ground flat has been converted into a shop at a cost of \$2,550. To date 317 new houses and flats have been erected for rental. I remind hon. members as well be seen from the Estimates, that we propose to increase the number of houses which are to be constructed this year.

As regards the question of housing generally, hon. members would remember that just a short time before the prorogation of the Legislature I laid on the table of the House a White Paper on the housing policy of the Government. That White Paper was published in all the newspapers of this island. Hon. members will also remember that last month a Bill was introduced in this House which proposes to carry

out the policy as laid down in the White Paper. It would be out of order to discuss a Bill out of its turn in the House and therefore I do not want to comment on that Bill; but I want to say in a general way in answer to the question raised by the hon. junior member for St. John, the hon. junior member for St. Philip and the hon. junior member for St. James that the Government intends to institute a Housing Authority for the purpose of looking after Housing throughout the island. That authority will take the place of the Housing Board and will deal with all phases of Housing. Under the present set up, it is known that the Labour Welfare Funds are for making loans to persons engaged in the Sugar Industry, and that those who do not work in the Sugar Industry, cannot qualify for loans. Therefore the Government has in its Five Year Plan allocated a sum of \$750,000 for the purpose of making loans to persons other than those who work in the Sugar Industry—people like artisans, masons, carpenters, etc. That will be carried out by the Housing Authority which we hope to institute very soon. I would therefore like to suggest to hon. members that in view of the fact that this Bill will soon be brought before the House, they should withhold any remarks which they intend to make until that Bill comes up. As I have already said, that Bill deals with the general housing policy and no longer will there be the Housing Board which just operates under an Act. As hon. members know, the powers of the Board do not permit them to go beyond Bridgetown; it is only that the Government has asked the Housing Board to act as its agent in connection with the various schemes which are carried out throughout the island.

Under the present Act it was not the intention for the Housing Board to carry out a general housing programme throughout the island. Therefore it will be necessary to await the passing of the new Housing Bill.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not want to obstruct the hon. member, but I would remind him of the Rules of the House and of the fact that it is now 2 o'clock. I do not know how long he intends to speak, but according to the Rules of the House we should adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Chairman leaves and Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being after 2 o'clock this House stands adjourned in accordance with the Rules.

2.10 p.m.

On resumption:—

ESTIMATES RESUMED

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the House was in Committee of Supply on the Estimates.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on this question of the Housing Board I do not know why the hon. junior member for St. James suggested that I should speak. He really asked the question with which the Minister of Housing has not yet actually dealt. I am a member of the Board and the hon. member inferred that it would be rather difficult for me to criticise the Board. Anyone who knows me well enough can say that when I am on a Board and I feel that there is something going wrong on that Board, I will criticise it. I will sit on it and criticise it because I will not let anyone run

me off. The whole idea of some people is to run you off so that you cannot be in possession of all the facts.

The Minister of Housing has given some data relative to the present position of the Board. I would call the Housing Board a hybrid in the sense that it is not a Town and Country Planning Board, but yet it is carrying out some of the duties that fall within the ambit of a Town and Country Planning Board.

I disagree with some of the statements made by the Hon. Minister; and I do not agree in full with the views expressed by the hon. junior member for St. James because immediately as there came into being a system of Ministerial Government, the policy of this Board became the direct responsibility of the Minister. The policy of this Board has not changed so to speak, and it is not all together a statement of fact when the Minister says that the Board presently acts as a Board and not an agent of the Government. The Board as a Board works under the Bridgetown, Speightstown and Hometown Housing Act; but it also works as an agent of the Government. As a matter of fact it does more work in that capacity than as the Bridgetown Housing Board. The fact that it is in charge of the Bay Estate and the Pine where the greater portion of its work is carried out makes it clear and obvious that it is doing more as an agent of the Government than as an actual Board, because under the Bridgetown Housing Act its powers are limited.

I may say here that I am only on the Board because I am a member of the Vestry, and any view that I express I am expressing as a member of the Board. Here I will say that I am not in agreement with the policy of the Board as a Housing Board; I am not dealing with it as an agent of the Government but as a Board. I am not in agreement with its policy as regards slum clearance. It will be recalled as the Minister said, that it came into being for the purpose of clearing slums; but it cannot be said that that policy is being continued. It cannot be said by any stretch of the imagination that it is now a Board for clearing slums; because while the Board has been building houses, they have not been altogether sticking to the policy of removing people and their houses from the slum areas.

Consequently its policy of decanting people from the slum areas has been very limited. It will be recalled that they had the Belfield Scheme and then the Bay Estate where persons were allowed to remove their houses. Those were so to speak decanting schemes, the Board providing land with water, roads etc. Only recently I remarked that I did not agree with the policy in Barbados. I hope the Minister will know that areas are created slums because of the density of the population and the type of house.

2.50 p.m.

If you go to New York, you will see in some places in areas which were considered slums twenty five or thirty years ago that those houses are dragged down and better houses are built on the same sites and those areas can no longer be called slum areas. I have not mentioned that only now, I have mentioned it to the Housing Board already. In any community where a Government decides to erect houses for the working class people, it must bear in mind the economical position of the people, especially in regards to general transportation for their getting to work. I happen to be a member of the Housing Board and one of those who are on the selection committee for houses, and I think the Hon. Minister of Housing who was also a member of that committee would agree that even at present you cannot enthrone the

people from the actual slum areas to go to the Pine Housing Scheme. The Board has much difficulty in getting those people to move there. That to my mind is an indication that what I have been pressing for a long time is feasible; that is, that the Government should change its decision and carry their housing schemes in those slum areas in Bridgetown like Chapman's Lane, where you have a tenantry already rented out. That area is considered a slum area, but although that is so, because of its easy proximity to business places and the like, people would always like to live there and would always flock there. As a result, the few land-lords who have small hovels such as those in Chapman's Lane, can always exploit those sort of people. Sir, that not only happens in that area but also in the Hunte Street area where there are small houses on top of each other. I draw that to the attention of the Government because it is my considered view that while you are going out to St. Lucy, St. John and St. Philip to build houses and to implement the Self Help Housing Scheme, what is staring you in the face is slum areas within easy proximity of the City of Bridgetown and you are doing nothing to erase them. The honourable junior member for St. John referred to our having slums in the country. Let me say that there is no such thing as slums in the country; there may be small houses, but you do not have slums like what you have in Chapman's Lane, Bulls' Alley and other places like those where houses are on top of each other.

I repeat that the people love to live in those areas because of the easy proximity to their work. In all countries where housing schemes have been tackled they have been tackled with the foremost view of clearing slum areas.

I suggest as the honourable junior member for St. James has stated that behind the whole idea of appointing the Housing Board was the idea of clearing the slums around Bridgetown. What is happening now is that the Housing Board is building forty or fifty houses annually, but it is not carrying out the policy for which it came into being. I am saying further that the present Housing Board has built forty or fifty houses at the Bay and Pine Estates and what it is doing, is selecting persons from overcrowded areas which is something worthwhile, to live in those houses but the policy is something to the opposite of the creation of the Housing Board. What the Housing Board is doing now is selecting people from all over the parish of St. Michael to tenant those houses.

As the Hon Minister of Housing has said, the present Housing Board should not function out of the City of Bridgetown. I think that must have been a slap to him because he has been on that board and he would agree that in dealing with thirty applications for housing in Government's houses, you will find that three of the applicants would only come from Bridgetown and that number will be the most you can get.

Hon. M. E. COX: What I meant was Bridgetown and the suburbs; I did not mean Bridgetown proper.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: You are dealing with the Bridgetown Housing Board and I am asking if it is not a statement of fact to say that the Board is not working within the four corners of the Act. I would say that you are not doing it maliciously; you did it because you were not acquainted with the Act. Of course, the Housing Board is an agent for the Government, and apart from the Bay Estate, when a scheme is planned by the agent for the Government you must work within that scheme. But when that

Board is doing so it is not working within the four corners of the Act.

Mr. Chairman, if you go on building houses for another twenty years continuing with this policy, you may be solving the situation with respect to houses for the growing population, but you will never be doing anything with respect to clearing the slum areas. As I have suggested that part of the policy of the Government should be not merely to have the Bridgetown Housing Board as its agent to carry out such plans as they are carrying out now, but Government should acquire one or two sites within the slum areas and construct tenement buildings on them. I think the Government's policy of building houses is something of the past. It is not economical to build houses in the way which Government builds them now because of the limited space which you have in Bridgetown. In no City you will find all the streets used for commercial areas; you will find in the immediate area homes for the people who work in those areas. In our cases we do not have houses to drag down, but we have areas of land where the people have shown that they like to live. Those areas are within easy proximity to the markets and commercial houses; it therefore should be part of the Government's policy to acquire those lands and build not single units which is something of the past, but apartment houses making provision not only for families but provision for spinsters and bachelors.

3.00 p.m.

Single units are really too expensive; you can build apartments of some sort and make provision for families, spinsters, and bachelors. I do not agree with the policy which they are pursuing in merely building houses outside; there is nothing being done by the Housing Board now to relieve any situation in the slum area.

The other point raised by the hon. junior member for St. James is how much is the Government subsidising housing. As the hon. Minister knows, I am among those—I believe I am responsible for having debated this question at great length on several occasions; Governments all over the world subsidise housing schemes; in the United States of America and in the United Kingdom the Government subsidises housing under the Housing Scheme. If a house costs the Government £500, and it brings 3% 4% or 5%—As soon as the Government borrows money they have to pay interest; therefore the Government is spending money in this respect. I digress here for a moment to say that it was a tremendous job to prevent people in those days from hiding the true state of affairs from members of the Housing Board.

When you ask the price of a house you will be told £500 and if you know what you are doing you should give the cost of the road yard, and so on. If you say that the Housing Board spends \$53,000, and you reduce the cost to \$20,000, the amount spent by the Transport Department on roads, yards and so on is not taken into account. The cost of the Transport Department should be taken into consideration when you are dealing with the cost of a house. Some years ago the Board decided that the subsidy on housing was so high that it was not fair to the general population to ask them to live in a house costing £700 with a subsidy of 85% and pay \$2.00 a week, when the subsidy would be at the rate of 4%. It took me a long time to get the facts; of course, Mr Crowe was there, he did everything and he tried to fool the Board. But it was then that the Board realised that if you are subsidising the cost of a house at the rate of 85% you had to raise the rent. There is

nothing wrong in the Government increasing the rent if they are providing the facilities. That is one stage of the matter which I would suggest to the Hon. Minister of Housing; in future he should be prepared to put forward a statement every quarter or every half year to show what they are spending and what is the position of the Housing Board. If you are spending \$65,000 and another \$10,000 by way of Highways and Transport, all that should be mentioned in the statement so that we can find out what you are actually doing. All that must be taken into consideration when you are dealing with the cost of a house.

If as alleged that I had been opposed to Aided Self-Help Housing, I would be one of those who would have the courage to stand up and say so. The scheme has my blessing but I still feel and believe that the cost of these houses could be much less.

3.10 p.m.

Now I think the Minister said that each of these Aided Self-Help Scheme houses in St. Lucy cost \$1,160. That I believe represents material and supervision. Judging from the size of the house and considering that you had to spend nothing on labour so to speak, I would say from my experience that the cost could be reduced and should be reduced. But I believe that in all these things you should allow sometime for improvement. I am hoping that when the next lot of houses have to be built we will hear that the cost is reduced.

I believe that it is a recognised fact to-day that with present conditions—Years ago labour used to be one third of the cost of your material; to-day it is practically on a par. As far as these houses are concerned I am sure that if you get plans and select the right sites, the overall cost of material should not exceed \$900. I am not taking second place to anyone when I say that.

I say that I know it is very difficult to criticise a Board that you are a member of. This is no criticism of the staff, but I will say that although all these Items are to be voted and none are fixed by law, I believe the time has come when we should realise that this department as a department has come to stay, and the officers employed in it should know exactly where they stand and should have some security. There is no reason why the Minister should not see to it that the laws are so amended that these officers of the Housing Board can have some security of tenure; the Manager-Secretary, the Planning Officer etc., should know where they stand. With the programme and the scheme of housing which the Government has, I am sure that in the other departments those officers are there to stay.

I know sir, that there is a tremendous lot of jealousy in some departments of the Service when it comes to asking about salaries and conditions of service of officers in other departments where those officers did not come into the Service from the bottom. I want to make my position quite clear on that and say that there are a lot of those people whose experience and skill make them good enough to be considered in the same light and in the same category as persons who left school and went into the Service at \$40.00 or \$50.00 a month. These officers have quite a lot of experience which they bring to bear on their job in dealing with housing in Barbados, and I am suggesting to the Minister that he should not come here with next year's Estimates with these amounts to be voted, leaving these officers to the whims and fancies of the House.

I hope that the Government will change its policy relative to slum clearance and let this Board operate again in the true sense of a Board for slum

clearance, so that we will know that after 20 or 30 years working we will be relieved of our slum areas. To-day our slum areas are the same as they were 20 years ago, unlike the case of a Housing Scheme in any part of the world. I know that the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board after his return from England put up that suggestion to the Government and since the Housing Board was established we should be able to point our hand in Bridgetown and say that this or that area was once a slum, but to-day decent buildings are on it. A site cannot be a slum in itself; it is the type of houses on it that makes it a slum.

I hope that my observations today do not fall on deaf ears. I hope the Government will not be telling us that they are waiting on the Town and Country Planning Bill; I remember when that Bill came here six years ago I said it was too ambitious for Barbados; it was discovered that it was too ambitious for London. It had the blessings of the Attorney General and a few others and we were told that we should not even comment on it. Just as you can go into Christ Church and buy an area of land, just as you can go into St. Lucy and buy an area of land, just as you can go into Cave Hill and buy an area of land for Housing (of course they will say that is Labour Welfare money) I am not saying this as any Ambassador would say it, but any representative of this House whether he is from St. Lucy, St. Andrew or St. Philip must see that the slum areas are in the urban parish. When you drive through say St. Joseph, you do not see slum areas. What you see are small houses, and you may say bring those people out to better areas where they can enjoy amenities like water. It is when we come into the City that we see the real slums.

No housing scheme has been started by this present Government. What I want to emphasise strongly is that it is not good enough to say build some houses at the Bay and take people there from all over the parish. It may be very admirable, but it is not good enough for a housing scheme merely to take people from outside the slum areas. The Government should concentrate on a scheme or plan to immediately relieve the slum areas. You can only wipe them out by acquiring lands where people like to live. People like to live in those areas which are now slum areas, and if you remove the broken down houses etc., they will be no longer slum areas. Most of these areas do not have any expensive buildings, and most of the land can be bought at a cheap price.

I hope that the Government will review their policy and in the very not distant future will come down with a scheme by which they can clean up the slum areas once and for all, by buying out the lands and putting up such buildings as will go down to the credit of Barbados and this Government. I could use strong language on this, but you will observe that my speech is reasonable. If I wanted to, I could inflame the passions of the people like anybody else; but I am reasonable because if I see that people are willing to do something I will sit and watch; but if I see that they become obstinate I can play politics as well as anyone else can. I can speak as well on a platform as any other member of this House.

3.20 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: Like the hon. senior member for the City I am also a member of the Housing Board although I should say I share an entirely different view from his. The very first meeting I attended of that Board I asked the Board to ask the Hon. Minister to make some statement of policy with regard to some form of housing. I did so because I believe in re-

sults and I like to feel that I am working on something which will give results. With the advent of Ministerial Status, to my mind the Housing Board is just a sinecure or token committee. The Housing Board should not be looked upon as just a building committee of laymen; and members of that Board would like to humanise the Board. I am appealing for this Board to be given a policy; it has been reduced to a joke. What I have been hearing is, that it is either of first or second importance a political Board. You will find that at every meeting you attend you get something on the Agenda with respect to a tenant who owes \$100 rent and in the course of what you should do with such a tenant, you are told that that person is a good canvasser. That Board reeks with the odour of politics; and I do not think that that was the intention of any member of this Government or member of that Board. Will the Hon. Minister of Communications continue to let that Board function in such a manner where it cannot even serve in the person of an Advisory Committee?

On the question of dilapidated buildings, it is not only that which a slum constitutes. It is in dilapidated buildings that you find happy families; but that is not the cause of a slum area; and I hope that my colleague would appreciate that statement in its fullest light. I feel that in the City area some changes should be brought about and some new erections should be put up to house families.

Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of carrying on this debate on housing, but I want to forcibly get across to the Hon. Minister of Housing that I wish him to create and devise some plan which can be regarded as a policy for the Housing Board to function on; so that when members of that Board attend meetings we will be acting on something more than that of only a Tenement Committee which it is now. I do not think the Hon. Minister would like to think that I am wasting valuable time, but I would be employed in a better way making thimbles or match sticks during the time I attend meetings of that Board. I think the present Board is really interested in housing problems and I think we can make a success of the policy of Government Housing, but at present we have no policy we are just making sport. I am appealing to the Minister of Housing to give us the opportunity of serving the country in the best possible way.

Mr. BRYAN: I really did not intend to take part in this debate, Mr. Chairman, because I honestly believe that some of the criticisms which are levelled against the Housing Board should have been kept until the House was discussing the Bill which the Hon. Minister of Communications has given notice of. Sir, I must agree with one view put forward by the honourable senior member for the City and that is when he made reference to the position as it stands to-day in so far as slums in the City are concerned. However, unlike him I feel that the Government can with pride point its fingers to the various housing schemes which it has put into being since the inception of the Housing Board, such as the Deacons Road, the Bay Estate, and the Pine Housing schemes. It is necessary, if we are to continue on the road to progress, that such schemes should be brought about within the City area because until then, it will be very difficult to remove the slum areas like Cats Castle and Jordans Lane. As the honourable senior member for the City has said, although application forms have been sent to people who live in slum areas for Government houses, they have expressed their reluctance to come out of houses which

they actually live in places like Jordans Lane where they can carry on their own business.

Mr. Chairman, if you take up the list of applications to the Housing Board for houses and spots of land, you will see that there is a great need for expanding the scope of this work and that is why Government with its sense of responsibility is bringing down the new Housing Bill which I understand will widen the scope.

3.30 p.m.

As the Hon. Minister of Communications has said the Housing Board has only been asked to undertake the duties which they are performing now in so far as Aided Self Help Housing is concerned. But this new Bill will be very comprehensive in itself. This will be a separate organisation which will deal with housing throughout the length and breadth of Barbados, and that is what we need. It will be patent that more recognition will be given to people; and I quite agree with the honourable senior member for the City that more recognition should be given to those officers who are now performing such an arduous task, and they should not be called upon to vacate their jobs as a preference to some new-fangled idea. I am sorry that the hon. junior member for St. George has seen fit to level that kind of opposition and I take strong objection to his remarks about political vote catching. It surprises me how much the honourable member knows about it; I feel that members of the Selection Committee carry a great sense of responsibility when they sit in Committee allocating houses to people. We go into the merits and demerits as set out before us, and obviously after due consideration we decide which are the most deserving cases. Mr. Chairman, we are all looking forward to this new Bill which will take the place of this system under which we are now working and which will widen the scope of this Housing Board, because we are convinced that housing is one of the problems with which we are faced. The widening of the scope of housing by the Government is indeed a wise move.

Mr. ALLDER: I would like the Hon. Minister of Housing to give me some light on this matter. It is about a year ago since a body of officials including the Manager of the Labour Welfare Fund and the Manager of the Housing Board visited several areas in the parish of St. John; and several spots which were lying fallen then were selected for the purpose of a Housing Scheme or an Aided Self Help Housing Scheme. I was told that the Government had decided on a particular area and that negotiations were going on between the Executive Committee and the authorities of the particular plantation, but up to now nobody seems to know what is the result of those negotiations. Since then the respective plantation has put men to work in these areas and they have blasted stone and have since started to work up these areas which remained out of cultivation for many many years. They have never been worked until now; there were selected for the purpose of Housing Schemes. We all know that there is provision in our laws that if a property is needed for public purposes, you easily refer to the execution of those laws and everything is finished. The Attorney of that Plantation holds great influence in this small community, and it is being wondered why the Government has failed to take the necessary action in acquiring this land which is badly needed for a Housing Scheme.

It is definitely disheartening when one realises that when it comes to a question of purchasing 5 or 10 acres of land in an outlying district, to hear of the difficulty there seems to be in connection with the matter, but when land of the size of a plantation is set up for sale, you just hear overnight that the Government has bought it. It is very necessary for

the Government to pay greater attention to the outlying districts; as the honourable senior member for the City has said, the situation is very acute in the City because of the congestion which is in the country. I would like to know what progress has been made in this particular respect. As a matter of fact sometime last year a tenantry on which several families live were sold out; the remaining part of that tenantry was sold last month. Through the good graces of the honourable senior member for the City who was the seller of this tenantry, he caused an agreement to be reached between the former renters of the land and the new buyers to give them time within which they will reap their crops and also to give them alternative spots to which they could remove their house; but we all know of the difficulty existing in other parishes where people want to get land to buy, and the greatest disadvantages appear to be in St. John.

3.40 p.m.

Many of these people have been hoping as they were told, that the Government was in negotiation with the Attorney of Colleton Plantation, and that when the Agreement was concluded some of them would have been relieved. The crops are being reaped now and I believe that the time which these people were given is about to expire, and there is some confusion in the area. I would like to implore the Hon. Minister for Housing to do the best he can to see that Government expedites the transaction which I am told has been started nearly a year ago.

There is another point, and it is relative to the Pine Housing Scheme. The Scheme at the Bay Land is certainly an admirable one, and even parts of the Pine Housing Scheme are good, but I noticed that those blocks which were built to accommodate the flood victims are becoming very unsightly. They have been deteriorating for some time; and on some occasions I have tried to draw it to the attention of the housing authorities. The wash is coming off the buildings, and some of the residents seem to be very careless especially those who were carried there as the result of the flood. Some of them would not even come out and plant a rose tree in the front, or even a hole of cabbage; and they allow bits of paper and cloth and old tins to knock around and the place presents a very unsightly spectacle to one who passes through. You also see gangs of lawless youngsters gambling under the street light and in the centre of the road, and it seems that there is no authority responsible for the maintenance of order and proper discipline in that area.

I suggested sometime ago that just as the Strathelyde area was provided with a watchman or watchmen to see that order is maintained, certainly the same thing is needed in an area like the Pine to see that those people who feel that they can do as they like because it is a Government scheme, should not get on in an unsightly manner. It can be done very simply. The Manager of the Housing Scheme along with the members of the Board can make regulations to which each occupant would have to adhere. Although the question was raised in this Chamber on many occasions in the past, no attempt seems to have been made to remedy it. Even for the good name of the Administrator of the Housing Board they should see to it that when people pass through there they are not reminded of the areas from which the occupants were removed. It would be to their credit to spend some of their spare time in beautifying the area. If those buildings are permitted to deteriorate they will look worse than the wooding buildings which these people occupied in the areas which you call slums. The present deterioration which is going on reminds those who are acquainted with the facts that you are only removing the slums from

the front where strangers are liable to see them, and carrying them into the back where strangers would not go unless someone carries them there.

I hope that hon. members will not take seriously the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. George relative to non-payment of rents. He also said that because certain political patronage has been going on tenants have been allowed to owe more than they would have reasonably owed, if they had a landlord from private enterprise. While it is true that the Government is trying to relieve the masses of certain inconveniences, no patronage whatsoever political or otherwise, should cause the tenants to feel that they must live free at the expense of the other taxpayers. I do not exclude those tenants who might not own property but who still pay taxes. These people must be told that they have to pay their rents; because if the Board were to develop the courage or the unsympathetic attitude of asking them to leave, they would have to go to a private landlord and rent his house; and I am sure they would have to pay their rents better than they are paying now, according to the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of explanation Mr. Chairman. What I did say was that when I first started to attend the meetings of the Board it was discovered that the tenants were not paying their rents. But those things have been attended to and adjusted. The hon. member need have no fear that such conditions will obtain again.

Mr. ALLDER: I am suggesting that those people be taken advantage of as regards the collection of rents; I know that there are some who would be unable to keep their rent book clear. I am criticising bad practices both on the part of the Housing Authorities and the tenants themselves. I hope that in the near future one will see a campaign as regards the sanitation of certain parts of the Pine Housing Scheme, and also a campaign to improve the conduct of the youngsters whom one can see every evening gambling under the light in the area. I want to repeat that everytime the occasion arises, until something is done to improve the situation there.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I think it only right for me to say what I am going to say now as a result of what the hon. member has just said. The reason why youngsters play their games in the roads is because of the absence of communal recreation centres. In every area built up by the Government for the creation of the Housing Scheme, there should be a recreation centre for the benefits of the occupants of the area. Unless you do that the only places left for recreation would be the roads. A housing area must have a recreation centre.

You must get a recreation centre with any housing scheme; and that is a notable exception with our schemes. The ideal social scheme is to have in your housing area a recreational centre with everything on it, such as a pavilion and playing field where concerts can be held and cricket and football and other games can be played. Every housing area should be accompanied by its own recreational centre.

3.50 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, there are only one or two things to which I would like to reply as I have already replied to the points raised by honourable members. One is the question of the cost of the construction of those buildings. The honourable junior member for St. John said in the course of his remarks that the cost of construction of those houses which Government is building is rather high, and he quoted the cost of construction of houses in

Surinam. I think he is well aware of the fact that Surinam has a large amount of timber. He mentioned something in the vicinity of \$3,000 for the construction of one of those houses.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I rise on a point of correction. I did not say \$3,000; I said it was nearer to \$2,500 than \$3,000.

Hon. M. E. COX: As you will see Mr. Chairman, he is pretty vague on the point.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I rise on a point of correction.

This time Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister of Housing may find what I am talking about in the December issue of the Caribbean Commission Information Bulletin if one can be procured now.

Hon. M. E. COX: The honourable member does not tell us anything of the sizes of the rooms nor does he give us any guide as regards the labour costs. I do not want to press that point any further; but you will have to compare the sizes of the rooms and the cost of labour before you can come to that conclusion. I think I am correct in saying that in Barbados the cost of labour is higher than in any of those other places, because this Government believes in paying as high wages as possible to workers. I should like to tell him that a three-bedroom house of the Bay Estate Housing Scheme costs in the vicinity of \$2,900 and that is below \$3,000.

The hon. senior member for the City quoted me as saying that we would have to await the Town and Country Planning Bill. I said we had a Housing Bill before the House, and we could not expand throughout the island as we would like before that Housing Bill was passed. The same honourable member raised the point about slum clearance; that is included in the Bill. The honourable senior member for St. John mentioned something about the compulsory purchasing of some land at St. John for the purpose of resiting houses and to implement an Aided Self Help Housing Scheme. He went on to say that the Government was apparently afraid of some of the influential people in the community, and for that reason had not brought the Land Acquisition Act into operation. I would like to assure the honourable senior member for St. John that this Government still has the confidence of the electors and people of Barbados; and with that in view Government is not afraid of any big, little or a combination of a big and little person. If we are satisfied that it is right to do a thing we are going to do it irrespective of the circumstances. I have said already that the price asked for that land was exorbitant; and I say again, that negotiations are still going on in so far as purchasing this land is concerned. The honourable member should also know that negotiations like this take a long time before coming to a conclusion. It is not true to say that hundreds of acres of land were purchased in St. Michael. Apparently, his mathematics are different from ours. As a matter of fact, the highest acreage which Government has bought within recent days is something like 21 acres; I do not know if he calls that 2,200 acres.

I would like to say that members of this Government are interested in the well-being of Barbados and the people of Barbados, and not in any particular parish or individual. I want to re-assure this Committee that we are prepared to do whatsoever we feel is just and right for one and all. I should like to say at this stage, that a two-bedroom house at the Bay Estate Housing Scheme costs \$2,248 and a similar house at the Pine Estate Housing Scheme costs \$2,255.

A very unfortunate remark crept into the debate by the honourable junior member for St. James. During the course of his remarks he referred to a road which is being repaired and he brought in the name of Mr. Dan A. Springer, linking Mr. Springer and myself as friends, and insinuating that I repaired that road because he and I were friends. He said that this rumour did not originate from him but from the scurrilous fellows but it took the most scurrilous to put it in the record of this House. I would like to assure the honourable member that we selected our tenantry roads for repair between April and May; and as far as I gather, this land was bought during the latter part of last year. 4.00 p.m.

If he were to go further he would see that they are quite a number of people living in that area, and that is one of the roads which the petitioners begged and cried aloud for years to have repaired. Anybody who knows the condition of that road when the rain falls will know that a lot of mud is brought down to the main road. I want to appeal to the honourable member; I think he knows from his experience that rumours are very dangerous and they are accompanied by treachery and malice. I appeal to the honourable member as an educated man not to indulge in these cheap rumours, but rather discard them because they do this island no good whatsoever. There can do quite a lot of harm in the outside world and people will look upon us as the type of people who indulge in bad practices in this island.

Mr. ALLDER: I have been forced to the conclusion that the Hon. Minister of Communications finds it difficult to develop tact and decorum in public life. I asked him questions in the interest of the people of my constituency; I did not ask him who had confidence in whom; that is his personal business; but I did not expect the answer which he gave me relative to the acquisition of the land at Colleton. I am told that the owners or the Attorney of that Plantation is asking for £500 per acre for that land, and I have already intimated to the Government that it is a waste of time to expect to get that land cheaper than what its present owners are asking for it. The fact is that we do not have any law on the Statute Book to put a ceiling price on land. In St. John of all parish land is extremely difficult to acquire by the peasants and workers in the area, but it is not a sufficient excuse to say that the price of £500 per acre is preventing them from concluding the negotiations. The site which has been selected at Coach Hill is a very beautiful site from the point of view of it being an area which overlooks the sea coast and stretches as far as the St. Philip's Lighthouse. If the owners of that land wanted to sell it and they had put the price higher than £500 per acre, people would buy it overnight; but the only persons who could get part of that land for housing is the Government. The owners of this land are willing to accommodate the Government in this particular respect; not that they want the people to remove there, but they seem to realise the necessity for releasing some of this land for the accommodation of the public. I do not see if the Government has been so generous why it should be so unwilling to pay £500 per acre for land so as to accommodate those who are really in need of house spots. The Government members know themselves that owing to their agreements not very long ago, dealers were able to make in some cases nearly 50% profits; I do not

want to repeat the transactions and the prices paid by buyers. I am not going into that at the present moment at least; but I would like to let the Hon. Minister know now that he has to look for another argument against the purchase of this housing site. I do not agree with high prices being asked for land, but we want a regulation to prevent people — We want to relieve the suffering of people immediately and the only thing to do is to acquire this land immediately. If the whole plantation of 400 or 500 acres were put for sale it would be purchased immediately. Meanwhile the Government is waiting for some good feeling to develop in the minds of the Attorney of the plantation and the people are still there not knowing what their position will be. We want to see that the people are relieved.

The honourable member made a statement about Government being interested in the people and not in the people's representatives. Well, the honourable member will never grow up as long as he continues to make statements like that. If he made that statement to me Mr. Chairman, I would tell him that I certainly am not interested in whether the Government as a Government is interested in me. I am capable of protecting myself and to maintain an interest in myself. When one asks the Government to do something for a constituency, the Hon. Minister especially always takes it upon himself to use expressions which will cause one to feel that he thinks that when he does something, he is doing it for the representatives of the parish and not for the people who probably assisted in giving them power to run the Government. These cheap expressions do not even help the Party of the honourable member; and he cannot even see that he is only bringing a lot of unnecessary trouble in the Party of which he is a member. He is always making a lot of unnecessary statements that are full of bombast.

All that I am doing is asking the Government that in view of the fact that negotiations are going on between the Attorney of the plantation and the Government, they should expedite the matter and so relieve the difficulty which the people in the area are experiencing. Of course if it was something to accommodate someone more affluent than these tenants there would have been a fight on the part of the Government to get it through this Chamber. I would like to let the Hon. Minister know now that he can indulge in as many cheap jibes as he likes; they will only fall back on his head.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I will say a few words with reference to what the Minister referred to as regards a particular road being a tenantry road. He appeared to be questioning the remarks I was making. Now if you go up through Wavell Avenue and go around Clevedale Road, the tenantry road which apparently was to be repaired and was repaired would be of great value to all the persons concerned down there. That is not the point. The point is—and I really hope that the Leader of the House if he does not know the spot, will take a drive and see what I am talking about, and will look up the Minute Papers and see if what is happening now is correct. He will find that the road has been done up to the point where we reach the dairy and for about another 50 yards. Properly done; Road Board done. It has not been done where the poor unfortunates live higher up. Only a few stones have been left uncrushed and undone beyond this dairy which is there, so that that which is to be done has not been done completely, and what has been done was never intended to be done. Things have been said about this matter. Instead of stab-

bing in the back, what I am doing is giving the Minister a chance of explaining whether this has been done by his Department of Highways and Transport and with his knowledge and approval, and if so, why was it only done as far as this dairy and 50 yards up the road and not towards the end. This is a blind alley. It is nothing to do with the tenantry road. As a matter of fact after you pass the dairy you come to uncrushed rocks and then you come to nothing at all right up to the blind end. The Minister if he cannot remember off hand can look at his Minute Papers or ask his department if the blind alley was to be done. If it was to be done I will ask why; and why was a proper road made only as far as the dairy.

What is said is that because the owner of the dairy is a gentleman of some substance and is well favoured, the road was only done as far as the dairy and 50 yards beyond instead of being done right to the end. The explanation is probably there in the Minute Papers. If it is, let the Minister give us the explanation. It will clear the air and stop rumours. The only way to stop a rumour is to say clearly either that the road was not done, or that it was done for such and such a reason.

Hon. M. E. COX: I thank the honourable member for explaining what he means. I was under the impression that it was the tenantry road to which he was referring. The road to which he refers is not a tenantry road; (Wavell Avenue starting from Black Rock running pass the dairy) that road was there for a long time even before I was born. Recently we decided to recondition the road which has broken away at the edges. If the honourable member goes there he will see that from the beginning of Black Rock to a little distance beyond the dairy the Department has cemented the gutters and constructed a six inch concrete shoulder on either side of the road. It is not yet finished. We are prepared to carry that road to the extreme end. We are widening it as we go along.

4.20 p.m.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I did go to see it. I happen to know the district well. If I want to go to St. James it is easier for me to come through my residence, butt out on the Clevedale Road and go on the main road. It is a road that I occasionally use. What I am saying is that a most extraordinary thing is taking place at present. There are no rollers there, and no work is being done there. The road was finished, and it was completed as far as the dairy and just 50 yards further up.

A cul-de-sac is what I would nearly describe this area. The continuation of the Wavell Avenue was only done as far as one man's dairy, and in the other hundred yards of it a few loose stones were put on it and it looks as if the Road Board had completed this job although it only repaired as far as two-fifths of that cul-de-sac. If their intention was to go on with the repairs of that road up to the end, why then did they leave it in that condition? They were bound to make the people living in that district feel that they were only doing that part of the road which concerned the dairy. Not a single road roller, workman or anything was left down there after the road was repaired as far as the dairy. The Hon. Minister of Communications tells me that they are going to finish it; if that is so, he can go there and see whether there is a road roller or anything there.

Hon. M. E. COX: I can assure the honourable member that I went there on Sunday and I have seen a road roller there. We were cementing the gutters of that road from one end to the other.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, since this matter has been brought to the attention of the Committee, I would like to say that this is not Wavell Avenue

or the cul-de-sac in it that the honourable junior member for St. James is talking about. I believe we are talking at cross purposes so far as that road is concerned. I have a strong belief that the honourable junior member for St. James does not mean Wavell Avenue.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Earlier in the debate it has been suggested that as regards the commiserate circumscribed Housing Board we should defer any remarks on housing until such time as the Housing Bill comes to this House. I really did not see any reason for this protracted debate really on this small item of this Head when we would have the time and opportunity of discussing the housing policy of the Government, when we are dealing with the new Housing Act to which reference has been made already. Nevertheless, there are two small things on which I want to say something. In the first case I want to settle the controversy between the Hon. Minister of Housing and the honourable junior member for St. John with regard to the cost of these three-bedroom houses in Surinam. The honourable junior member for St. John was right. The average cost of a two-bedroom house in Surinam is 2,500 guilders which I understand is about \$1,500 West Indian dollars. The average cost of a three-bedroom house is 3,000 guilders or approximately \$1,800 West Indian dollars which compares with the cost of a two-bedroom house at the Pine for \$2,200. It is therefore correct to say that the cost of housing in Surinam is much cheaper than what it is here; and there are fairly large houses too because the total area is around 511 square feet.

One further point is with regard to the land situation in St. John. I will have a lot to say when it comes to St. Philip and the general housing policy. Fortunately, the question of land for housing does not present any problem in St. Philip, since the Government owns a considerable acreage in that parish; in addition to the Admiralty, Government owns Dodds. You can therefore see that we have several hundreds of acres to play with when it comes to housing for that parish. However, land in St. John is an acute problem, and the aggravated position is due in a large part to the indifference of the present Government in refusing some years ago to acquire a Plantation called Rosegate when it was in the market, and when Government was urged to do so by the honourable senior member for St. John. That Plantation since then has been sold and the people who lived on it for 30 to 35 years were given notice to quit, and they have no where to go and these people have a very limited time to remove their houses from that area of land. I do not know if the Government knows that. However, there can be no excuse for the policy of the Government for the acquisition of land in any parish in order to house the people who are forced to move their houses from Rosegate. As a matter of fact, I am told that there was recently a death in the district not unconnected with the present position; and the Government certainly owes it to the people in St. John to improve the situation there at the earliest possible time. St. John is one of the most beautiful parishes to acquire land for any purpose, whether it be for housing or agricultural purposes. The owners of land in that parish regard their possessions as gold or diamond mines, and the normal prices asked for land in that parish are exorbitant and as a result are out of the reach of the average person to acquire. Since in the final analysis it is through Government that this impasse has arisen and these poor people have no where to carry their homes, obligation falls on the Government to do something about it.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Apparently, Mr. Chairman, I was not referring to the road to which a complaint was made by the people of the district, and I am sorry about it. I know the Wavell Avenue Road quite well because I pass over that road regularly. I understand that the road complained of is the road which was not built up. It is the one that is aback of certain property which has been bought by Mr. Dan Springer from Mr. Applewhite and that road is being repaired, and it leads to the road before you get to Wavell Avenue. It is true to say that the continuation of the Wavell Avenue is the road which is now under repair and which has got as far as Mr. Springer's place. The complaint has been made about the new road which I have just mentioned. Perhaps the honourable member can tell me whether there is anything in that. I have not seen that road, but it is quite easy for me to do so. Will the Hon. Minister say whether this is a new road or whether it is aback of a man's property or whether it comes under a Tenantry Road or not?

Mr. BARROW: Like the honourable senior member for St. Philip, I was a bit nonplussed to see that we were discussing roads under this Item.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member just sit for a minute? Let me say that I know nothing of this particular area, but hearing that a Housing Scheme was down there I was thinking that this particular road leads to the houses of that scheme. I have now heard from the honourable junior member for St. James that one Mr. Springer bought land from Mr. Applewhite and this road is something between it, and it has nothing to do with any Housing Scheme. I therefore, would be very glad if the Hon. Minister of Communications will enlighten me on this particular matter. I think we are going adrift.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member take his seat? I am appealing to the Hon. Minister of Communications to enlighten me on this particular road and if it has nothing to do with the Housing Scheme down there I will not allow any more debate on it.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, it has nothing to do with that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not allowing anything more to be said on it.
4.30 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: The Minister has now disclosed that it is nothing to do with public roads at all and that is very interesting. What I would like to find out is this: he would know that for the past three years, I have been asking whether the Government intends to appoint a Town Planning Authority and have the necessary legislation drafted. I understand from the Crown Law Officers that some legislation has been drafted (whether it has been completed or not we do not know) but I have also heard something intimately connected with the Housing Board which has me a bit worried. Apparently the Director of Public Works has been offered the appointment of Town Planner but for good reasons perhaps, because of the muddle which now exists, he may possibly decline the appointment. A very interesting situation arises; the Director of Public Works is a qualified architect and it takes some years to qualify as an architect. One probably never ceases to be a student of architecture but in order to get any kind of qualifications, it takes some years to qualify. If the Director of Public Works does not accept the appointment, the job is to be given to a—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is that anything to do with housing?

Mr. BARROW: If you look at Item 1, you will see that the salary of the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board is not fixed by law. What is proposed, (and the Hon. Minister professes ignorance of it) is that the Manager-Secretary should fill this post at a reduced salary. As a matter of fact, there is nothing under this Head which is fixed by law.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are referring to the Director of Public Works.

Mr. BARROW: I am showing you what is happening. If the qualified architect does not take this post, they will take the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board at a reduced salary. I am speaking on that Item provided that you do not put the motion. [Laughter]. There is precedent for it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am here to put the motion.

Mr. BARROW: The Hon. Minister of Communications does not say that that is not so. He says he knows nothing about it; he does not say that it is not so. It would seem to be another anomalous position that legislation could be drafted or plans discussed without the knowledge of the Minister of Communications. I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Communications who is doing his job; if he does not know what is going on in his Department, I wonder which of the five Ministers is actually performing the duties which the honourable senior member for St. Michael should be performing. I would like to warn the Hon. Minister of Communications that such a suggestion would not be acceptable to the members of this House; because if you are setting up an over-riding authority we must have a man with certain qualifications to do that particular job. When the Financial Secretary's Department was set up, the same thing happened; we brought over the Labour Commissioner to do the job of Financial Secretary. The Financial Secretary's powers like the powers of the Town and Country Planning Authority are of the nature of high technical efficiency. There are over-riding authorities in every Department which are similar in nature and operation. I also understand that the Hon. Minister of Communications will bring the Labour Department under his control.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is hearing and understanding things which are not in front of me.

Mr. BARROW: I understand that it will be done in the financial year. I believe that you will find some reference made to this amalgamation of the different Housing Authorities.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Who will be coming?

Mr. BARROW: There is reference to it right here in the Estimates and it is under Housing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point it out to me.

Mr. BARROW: The Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board is likely to lose his job and he is likely to be promoted to a higher job.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not know anything about anybody losing a job or getting promotion.

Mr. BARROW: I am entitled to speak on the question of any officer drawing his salary here for the year.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will speak on the Items which are here before me.

Mr. BARROW: I am speaking on officers whose salaries are not fixed by law, and who are likely to come under some alteration during the year. I am dealing first with Item 1. If you are changing the status of this Officer—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not see any change to this Item.

Mr. BARROW: If they are making a change, the House should be treated with a statement by

the Hon. Minister of Communications. He should make a statement in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not see what the honourable member is referring to under this Head.

Mr. BARROW: I am exhausting my patience with you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Whether you are losing your patience or not, as far as the Chair is concerned let us deal with the business in front of us.

Mr. BARROW: I am speaking on the status of officers of the Housing Authority whose salaries are not fixed by law. If you would suggest anything I should talk on, I would be glad; I would be glad if you would pass on a note, and as you Mr. Chairman are in the Chair I would raise it for you; but I will like to raise my own matters first. If the duties performed by any of these Officers are likely to undergo any change of multiplication during the ensuing year, I would like the Hon. Minister of Communications to make a disclosure now on that point; because it is very important that we should know what is going to be the fate of the Housing Board, if he is in a position to tell us that the Housing Board will probably be abolished in the very near future.

4 45 p.m.

I hope Mr. Chairman, when it comes to the imagination of the Housing Board with any new authority that is likely to be set up, and on which I have asked questions repeatedly in the past, that a nonskilled, non-technical officer will not be made head of the Planning Authority either at a reduced salary or at an increased salary. If you are filling the post of Financial Secretary let us get someone who knows about finance. If we have a Town and Country Planning Authority let us get a qualified engineer or architect. I suggest as regards the post and the salary of the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board, that that salary should not be drawn, and that post should not be held by a man whose only qualifications are those of a Wireless Operator. I do not see how anyone whose only title to fame in the architectural or building world is the ability to tap a morse key can be an authority when the Town and Country Planning Board is set up. The Minister said he knows nothing about it, so I can only come to the conclusion that he can say nothing in reply.

Another thing I want to know is when are we going to get some sort of Housing Scheme in the parish of St. George in contra-distinction to Housing Schemes in the parish of St. Michael. Some assurances were given some time ago that this was to be done, and up to now I am still to see one unit go up in St. George under the auspices of the Minister of Communications or some other Government agency.

Hon. M. E. COX: As regards the question of the Housing Scheme for St. George I would like to tell the honourable member that we are negotiating for the purchase of some land which is part of Carmichael Plantation and as soon as it is purchased we will start a scheme.

The question that the sum of \$38,637 be voted under Head XXXV was put and agreed to.

Head XXXVII—Peasants' Loan Bank

Head XXXVII—Peasants' Loan Bank was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$97,492 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I suggested at one time that an Appendix be added here. I hope that the honourable member will do something about it in the future. I am constantly saying that it is a wrong policy on the part of the Government to shift Items around in the way that they do. It seems to me that they allocate money for advertising and they come back for money for these expenses. We are giving the Bank a lump sum of money; or rather we are giving it to the Directors for conducting the affairs of the Bank; but it seems to me we are actually giving money for making loans.

The question that the sum of \$97,492 be voted under this Head was put and agreed to.

Head XXXVIII Old Age Pensions

Head XXXVIII — Old Age Pensions was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$508,027 be voted under this Head. In doing so, I would say that I know the members of the House and members of the public generally have been exercising their minds about Old Age Pensions in relation to the report of Professor Richardson. I will say right here that this report is still under consideration by the Government. As has been said on a former occasion, the Ministers do not have enough Permanent Secretaries and work is being held up on that account. That will be remedied by the appointment of another Permanent Secretary either to the Ministry of Communications and Works or to my Ministry.

We have not been able to get through this Report, but we hope in the not too distant future we will be able to come down with Government's policy on the report. Now, sir, I will weigh my words carefully. What I want to say is that in coming down with Government's policy on that report, the Government will consider the making of any increase in the Old Age Pensions retrospective as from the 1st April this year. When I say consider, I hope that it will be sympathetic consideration.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Social Services whether the reduction in the total amount for Old Age Pensions between last year and this year is due to a reduction in the number of pensioners availing themselves of the pension, or whether it is due to the rigours of the means test improvised by the Inspectors. Last year we voted \$514,328; but this year pensions pure and simple only amount to \$502,000 out of the total of \$514,328 resulting in a decrease of \$12,000 under last year.

I asked that Mr. Chairman, because the position would be rather anomalous if at this particular stage when we are considering a comprehensive social insurance scheme, and an increase is recommended by Professor Richardson and has been recommended by nearly every member of this House outside the Government's benches, that in this year of grace we should see a reduction in the total amount to be spent on the pensioners themselves.

I do not know if the Hon. Minister of Social Services is really aware that the amount this year is some \$12,000 less. Of course, it would be a very good sign if the decrease was due to the reduction of the number of pensioners or to the fact that people in old age are more prosperous than they were five years ago, and therefore would not qualify for this pension. It would be a very good social statistic if we can get that; and we would be very grate-

ful to hear the information from the Hon. Minister. 4.45 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister of Social Services has said that if there should be any increase in the Old Age Pension, it will be retroactive as from the first of April this year. Now, I am wondering why the Government has been forced to adopt that policy. The actual date of Professor Richardson's report was September last year which is over six months ago, and the actual recommendation with regard to Old Age Pension was as follows:—

"The present rates of old age pensions and public assistance grants to destitute persons are too low if related to the present cost of living and standards of wages. The rates of old age pensions should be increased immediately by 50 per cent, most of this increase being required to compensate for the rise in the cost of living since the present rate of pension was fixed in 1949."

Sir, I am not touching on the overall recommendations in the report on the need for a comprehensive social security system; all I am talking about is with regard to the increase in the old age pension itself. Professor Richardson pointed out that the prevailing rate of old age pension has been fixed since 1949. There has been a considerable increase in the Cost of Living since then, and in September of last year he recommended that the old age pension rate should be increased immediately by 50% so that from September or October last year if his recommendation was acted upon, the old age pensioner should have drawn \$1.80 instead of \$1.20. So seriously does Professor Richardson view the inadequacy of the pension, that in the same paragraph he says that at the beginning of 1958, if the economic and financial conditions remain favourable, the Government should raise the old age pension rates to double the present level. Since proper investigation of the situation, the existing wage is so low as to make it imperative to make a 50% increase immediately; that is, as from September last year and a double increase by 1958. That should mean that the decision of the Government, if it does agree to make it only effective as from the 1st April this year is not fair, and demonstrates the failure of the Government to appreciate the gravity of the recommendation by Professor Richardson.

I am sure Mr. Chairman, you can appreciate what pride old age pensioners would receive at the beginning of the next financial year, (that is from April the 1st next), a lump sum representing the back pay as from September last year. As a matter of fact, they should be getting this increase as from September 1954, and if they were getting it for those six months it would mean something like \$15 for each pensioner; and in my opinion it is not beyond the capacity of the Government to provide it. We do far worse with the money we have to spend than giving it to the deserving people like old age pensioners; therefore, I am completely hostile to the resolution of the Government to make this pension, (if it is increased retroactively) only as from the beginning of April this year. 5.05 p.m.

I have a faint recollection that the gentleman did the same job as he did here; he did the same thing in that he recommended increases in the Old Age Pension in British Guiana; and if my memory is not serving me tricks, the British Guiana Government accepted the recommendation in the spirit in which it was made and provided an increase as from

the date of the recommendation. As a result of that, I think that some Old Age Pensioners got as much as \$30 to \$40 back pay as from the time the recommendation was made and from the time the Government made it effective. I repeat, it would mean an average of \$15 to \$16 for each Old Age Pensioner and I cannot conceive of anybody in the community, big or small tax-payer grudgingly refusing to agree that this small windfall should accrue to our Old Age Pensioners. I therefore strongly suggest to the Hon. Minister of Social Services that the Government not only accept the recommendation, but make it effective as from the exact date of the recommendation.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: As I said in my opening remarks, the Government has not fully considered the report and the recommendations. It is quite likely that the Government will do what the honourable member has suggested, but at this stage the Government cannot bind itself as to any effective date.

Mr. HOLDER: I was very glad to hear the opening remarks of the Hon. Minister of Social Services under this Head. I was a bit surprised when I noticed the reduction; but with the opening remarks of the Hon. Minister of Social Services, my thoughts have been cleared a bit. I am not going into Professor Richardson's Report, but I would like to know something of those who are totally blind and destitute. Legislation relative to Old Age Pensions came before this House 17 years ago. The increase which has been made in the pension is alright, but the poor, blind and destitute are not taken on the Old Age Pension list until they have reached the age of 40. I raised that question in this House and it created great laughter from honourable members; but I hope that this matter will be given consideration. It is most appalling when you come to think of the blind that the blind is really taken care of by the Board of Guardians on the measly sum which was given in former years. It is so low that the blind has to live on charity and through the support of their family. Some of the Board of Guardians have given a little more than 3/- a week, but that is only a little help. In my question laid in this House I asked that the qualifying age should be reduced from 40 years to 21 years. I was dealing with this matter from the layman's point of view. When you come to 21 years, you are chargeable to the Crown; therefore, if you are totally blind, you should not wait until a man has got to 40 years of age to take him on. I am very glad to hear from the Hon. Minister of Social Services that they are considering Professor Richardson's Report. Professor Richardson has recommended that the totally blind and destitute be taken care of from the age of 20; he has gone even further down than I have gone. I am proud to know that the Hon. Minister of Social Services will take that matter into consideration; Professor Richardson has included the deaf and mute; I referred to permanent disability; they are some people who have strokes and who are laid aside for many years. I know of a case in my parish where a woman has been confined for 40 years and she cannot get any Old Age Pension. They are certain people who are bed-ridden and so on, but as I said the charity from the Board of Guardian is very low. I also hope that the Government will consider the question of assisting cases of permanent disability.

Another Item which I want to refer to is Item 6, "Travelling." I think that the amount given for the travelling done by Enquiry Officers is very meagre. The Note says that one officer is given \$20 a month and the others are given \$10 per month for

travelling. If an officer has to arrive at the "means test" of people, that entails a lot of travelling; I understand that these Officers are doing good work; they are going into the parishes and making investigation. I hope the Hon. Minister of Social Services will give my questions a good hearing especially as they have been backed up by Professor Richardson.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I think I should add my quota in this matter. I am hoping for the day when I will listen to the Government in their usual calm taking credit for the institution of Old Age Pensions. I am speaking on Item 7. Apparently someone must come from outside to tell this Government what these chaps in the Opposition have been telling them for a long time. [MEMBERS: Not chaps.] Well sir, it is really beneath our dignity to refer to them as chaps. If I were to start to refer to the various reports and the things which since 1946 when those of us outside the Government were suggesting what should be done, it would take you probably longer than a marathon sitting to do that. I know Mr. Chairman, that you will give me a little latitude. Like a voice crying in the wilderness you heard "You are giving people too much trouble if you encourage tourism." Everybody in Barbados was shouting for tourism and a gallant looking gentleman in passing talked about it at a luncheon, and now we hear that the Government is acting on it. Sir Myles Thomas said it and it was done. As far as the hotel industry is concerned—

5.15 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get back to Old Age Pensions.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am showing you how we have to get money for Old Age Pensions. Long before I came in here, it took somebody from Canada to make a suggestion — Even Sir Alfred Savage in a speech actually referred to some of the suggestions which the Opposition had made.

One of the last things that I recall, Sir, when we talked about industrialisation and things like that —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is going astray.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I know that better than you, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not going to allow it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am only saying that when people get old, even in an industrial community they make provision for them. Let us get back to what I would like to say. Now Sir, on this question of Old Age Pensions many people, even members of this House really seem to lose the courage of a conviction because of Professor Richardson. If you bring 40 professors and I am convinced about something I will not bow. Long ago, in the years 1946, 1948 and 1949 we have been talking about this thing. If anyone meant it as a vote catching stunt, I meant it from the depth of my heart. I cannot repeat often enough that but for the Grace of God I might have to be living on someone's Old Age Pension; I have not yet reached the stage of adopting an ungrateful attitude like the Ministers. We have been talking long ago about increasing these pensions, and we have always said that the qualifying age should be reduced. I am not prepared to give in on that, if you bring Professor Richardson or anyone else. I know more about Barbados than Professor Richardson does.

The Minister of Communications should be one to press for these things, because in the parish of St. Michael where you have two fifths of the population, you come into contact with these unfortunate cases

daily. In 1946 I had a personal experience, and I am having it again. The number of people in this country who would seek public assistance around the age of 65 is greater than the number who will seek it around the age of 68. Of course if you reduce the qualifying age it will cost the Government a tremendous sum.

There is one question I would put to this Government: if a Government of a different political complexion could institute taxation on themselves so as to grant Old Age Pension to give people at least a pittance, what should the present Government do? All the members of the present Government are from the same background, a labouring background; their grandmothers and our great grandmothers were all agricultural labourers. You may object to that but it is true. I know they would object to that especially if they have been to England once. That is all I have to say on that.

You could call on Colonel Duke to resign and get a pension at the age of 50; throughout the Civil Service people can resign at sixty-five. When some woman who started off to weed the field at the age of 12 years reaches 65 and there is no Social Security Scheme at all, do you not think she should get a pension? I do not pretend to be a Socialist, but if there are plantations where people work from 12 years old and you cannot tax those plantations to give those workers a pension at 65 years old, you do not want to tax them at all. The Government is granting Old Age Pension at the age of 68, and Holy Writ says that the human's span is only two years more; so it seems that you are hoping that each pensioner will die in two years.

I have seen day after day in Parochial Buildings of this parish cases of people aged 64 and 65 years, and the doctors tell them they have *Angina Pectoris*, High Blood Pressure and all the fancy names. What has happened to them is that they have to starve between 65 and 68 years of age because of a hardhearted Government.

One of the most humane men we have ever had in this country was the Revd. Francis Godson. I told him that the people of this colony would unfold their woes to people like myself quicker than they would unfold them to him. Despite Professor Richardson's figures with which I agree, I tell the Government today as I have been telling them all the time, to reduce the qualifying age. How is it that you cannot find money when you can find money for a lot of monstrosities? Another Professor or another expert will have to come to Barbados and recommend to the Government not to build Parliament buildings; if we say so the Government will not hear us. I say we should increase the Old Age Pension by 50%. The pension that the Government gives now is a little help; but how long, Oh Lord, how long will it be kept there? Let me ask every honourable member including yourself if they would not say to the Government that Old Age Pensions should be given at the age of 65 years, if the same people must work to pay others who work with their brains and go home at 60 and 65 years of age.

The Hon. Minister of Social Services is a doctor and he knows that after a person has put in 40 or 50 years of physical work, he should get a pension. I am saying all this because it is my duty to say it inasmuch as I having found myself in this elevated position. It is the greatest honour that anyone could achieve to be a member of this Chamber and make laws to govern your fellow men. I made a pledge to myself that if I ever got here I would make the plea that I am making today.

Even though Professor Richardson has not said that the qualifying age should be reduced to 65 years, the Government should use the Financial Secretary to get the figures and statistics to see what it would actually cost. Your Enquiry Officers should have the statistics; I hope they keep them. They should have the figures showing the number of people under 68 years who applied for the pension and had to be turned away. Those figures will show the Government that there is a desire and a great need for the increase and for a reduction in the qualifying age.

The honourable senior member for St. John brought an Address in this House asking the Government to reduce the age of the blind people who receive pension. This House passed it, but again it has taken Professor Richardson to come to Barbados and tell the Government that what the honourable senior member for St. John said was correct. As regards the help given to the blind, I want to know what happens to the child that is blind at the age of ten or twelve and whose grandmother is his only upkeep and the grandmother is sixty years old. Must he wait until he is 20 years?

5.25 p.m.

What will happen to the child who is blind from twelve years of age and whose mother is put away in the Mental Hospital? Must he wait until he becomes twenty-one? Why do you not be realistic? You are saying that he must wait until he becomes twenty years. Professor Richardson is an Englishman, and he has seen cases like that. As a matter of fact, there would be so few cases under twenty that there would be no cause for worry. I feel blindness is an affliction which if anyone had any control over it he would not bring it upon himself. That is one of those things that you really should assist from the cradle to the grave; you should not say as from twenty years no matter what are the circumstances.

We are not discussing Professor Richardson's report but in passing I would like to point out something to the Hon. Minister of Social Services, with the hope that he would do something about it: I would like to say that a most embarrassing situation arises when poor people go to the Enquiry Officer with regard to their getting an Old Age Pension; the great majority of them cannot read or write or who can read can barely sign their names, and 99.9% of them cannot fill out their applications forms. We are paying Enquiry Officers and it is a cruel thing for those officers to push one of those forms in the hands of an applicant for Old Age Pension and ask that person to fill it out and on top of that treat them badly. For what do you pay these Officers? Do you just pay them to sit and relax? It is their duty to fill those forms out for those old people; and I am asking the Hon. Minister of Social Services not to come back into this House and say that those Officers are not paid for doing that. The main thing which many of those Old Age pensioners can remember is that he or she was baptized at St. Augustine, Holy Trinity, the Cathedral or such a place. If you look at any of them and you come to the conclusion that that person is reaching the age of 70 years or something like that, I am sure anyone of the Clergy would co-operate. I am saying again that the least these Enquiry Officers can do is to find out from the particular church or chapel, when such an applicant was born and get the necessary information for those people. I know dozens of people in St. Michael whom the Old Age Pension Enquiry Officer had to go out of his way to make enquiries for them. We are paying them over \$100 a month and I suggest to the Hon. Minister of Social Services to communicate with the Chairman of each of these

old age pension bodies and instruct them that it is the part of the duties of the Pension Enquiry Officers to be considerate towards old people, and to bear in mind that the type of people to whom they are catering are of such ability that they should get the necessary information of those people to place before the Board. That is something which I think each of those officers should do. I do think the Hon. Minister of Social Services should give those instructions; because he is a practising physician in this colony and he knows what I have said is true. Do not deny those people pension as I have seen happened in St. Michael; because they cannot get the necessary information.

Finally, I say as the honourable member has said, the Government will do well if it considers increasing this pension as from the 1st April this year. I would only say to the Hon. Minister that the entire social structure wants revolutionising so to speak. It is your duty to reduce the qualifying ages and you did not need Professor Richardson to come here and tell you that you should reduce it to 55 years. I hope the Government will bear these remarks in mind and I hope that the Hon. Minister will do something to relieve the plight of the number of those persons who have reached 55 years of age and who on medical advice are unable to pursue their calling, say like agricultural labourers. As a matter of fact, the majority of those people are of the labouring class.

I know the Hon. Minister is going to say that Government is going to take care of public assistance, but the most pathetic thing about public assistance by way of a Poor Law Board (and you cannot take St. Michael as a guide because if that were so, there would be no need for the Maude Bill) is that there are many cases of clergymen applying for assistance for persons who have reached 60 years, but who are told that those persons do not qualify. Professor Richardson has strongly recommended that the Government should give grants-in-aid to the several parishes for this purpose. Nobody would be able to convince me that the labouring people of this colony who have got nothing can pass a means test. I feel that all of them should be entitled to an old age pension similarly as those who reach the age of 68 years.

5.35 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: The honourable member who has just sat down has been very strong as to Professor Richardson's Report, and he has said it took somebody from outside to tell us what to do. I want to say that Professor Richardson could not come here unless he had been invited to come here. I felt that there was something which we could do by way of an increase in the Old Age Pension, but not being an economist like the honourable senior member for the City—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I did not say that; I said I am not an economist. I know the people of Barbados better than Professor Richardson knows them. We knew that with the Cost of Living we could give more in the way of Old Age Pension.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I felt that way too.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Why didn't you do it then?

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I am not an economist.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: But you have your Financial Secretary.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I thought it best to get somebody who knows something about the matter to advise the Government as to what we can do and what we should do. I well remember that when Mr. Bethell was a member of this House he

had an Address passed in this House asking for an increase in the Old Age Pension. Whether the amount should be 10/- a week or not I do not know, but the Government invited Professor Richardson down here and I repeat he could not have come here unless he had been invited. There are one or two things which I want to mention.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think there are other honourable members who want to speak on this matter and perhaps the Hon. Minister could answer once for all.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Since I have started I will continue. The matter of travelling is being considered. When this Act comes into existence the whole question will be reviewed; the Enquiry Officers will have other duties to perform besides those of Enquiry Officers in connection with Old Age Pensions. I should like to point out to the honourable senior member for St. George that the amount of \$502,000 was the amount voted for the actual payment of Old Age Pension not \$514,000.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GODDARD: At this stage, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

The motion was put and agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker took the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

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

The motion was put and agreed to and Mr. Deputy Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.
5.45 p.m.

On Resumption

QUESTIONS

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to give notice of certain questions which, unfortunately as I could not be here at 12 today, I have not given notice of so far.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following questions:—

To enquire of the Hon. Premier:—

Whether Government will initiate, without unnecessary delay, legislation making provision for the establishment of the post of Standing Counsel for the Speaker of this Chamber?

To enquire of the Hon. Premier:—

Is it within the knowledge of Government that recently certain barber saloons in this colony have refused to attend gentlemen of colour?

2. If the answer to the above query is in the negative, will Government submit a questionnaire to every practising barber in this island enquiring into the policy of his business in regard to the racial and colour discrimination?

3. Will Government take steps, by legislation or otherwise, to ensure that no racial or colour discrimination is practised in the barber saloons of this colony?

ESTIMATES—Cont'd

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the House was in Committee of Supply on the Estimates.

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

Head XXXVIII—Old Age Pensions—Cont'd

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Social Services tried to disarm this Committee by saying at the beginning of the debate on Old Age Pensions that Government had under consideration the Report of Professor Richardson, and that they will come down during this Session to implement part or the whole Report. Mr. Chairman, this report is so full of things other than Old Age Pensions and it is so precise in its statements, that Government can do something now to increase Old Age Pensions by 50%. The Report says that it is within the financial ability of the present Government to do so. The Report makes that quite clear, as anyone who has read it once would agree. Government could do with this Report what they have done with other Reports. They came down here a couple of months ago and took out one part of the Report dealing with the Civil Servants and implemented that part of the Report.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want to draw to the attention of the honourable member that we are not discussing a Report.

Mr. GODDARD: I am speaking on the present Old Age Pensions and on what the Government should do today. In these very Estimates the Government came down for \$10,000 to subsidise B.W.I.A. without even asking us if we agreed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the honourable member not to stray.

Mr. GODDARD: We are dealing with Old Age Pension, but I must state that the present policy of the Government conflicts with what it should be.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Policy or Old Age Pension?

Mr. GODDARD: Their policy in these very Estimates. Government is saying that when they implement the Report they will give back pay. The pensioners do not want back pay; they want pay now. They are getting this small sum, and as Professor Richardson says it is a relief not only to the individual but to the people in their families who have to make up the difference. He makes it clear that this sum was given since 1949 and since that time the value of money has been reduced. It is known to all of us, because we have increased the salaries of Civil Servants and the pensioners of Government twice since then, and we have not given one penny of increase to Old Age Pensioners.

It is not beyond the ability of the Government to have come down in the Estimates with a 50% increase for these pensioners and allow them to draw their money next month. If they had come down with this increase in the present Estimates it would have given a truer reflection of the state of our finances. When they have to come for a supplementary vote it will make our present finances look better than they really are. In the same way that the Government could come with \$10,000 to subsidise B.W.I.A. they could have put \$250,000 in the Old Age Pensions Head. There are many of these pensioners who will pass on without that benefit. When they pass on there is no backpay for them. [VOICES. Hear! Hear!]

This Report has been in the hands of the Government since September; when they come to implement it, it will be next Estimates before these people get their money. It is a most comprehensive Report on the social structure of the island; some of the Report will be accepted, some modified and some rejected. Professor Richardson said that this should be done now, and he gives reasons why. The reason is that they are being underpaid as a result of the reduction in the value of money. We know the Estimates were coming down and we waited

since December hoping that this increase would be here. And the Government is telling us that when the Report is considered they will give these people back pay. We say give these people their money now.

I hope that the Government will realise the feeling of the House and will rush this Report, or take out the Old Age Pension part of it and implement it. We have already studied the Report; we do not need any longer time to study it.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it is sometimes easier to catch your ear if one has the strident tones of the honourable senior member for Bridgetown than to catch your eye. I have been waiting for sometime to intervene in this debate. It is an Item which many honourable members have referred to and I will refer to it in the light of Professor Richardson's recommendation. I will say that the Government is faced with the alternative of either reducing the qualifying age to 65 years or increasing the amount by 100%. I will submit that they should increase the amount by 50% and reduce the age to 65 years. The Professor has suggested that the pension rate be raised immediately by 50% to \$1.80, and that provided economic conditions in the island and the financial position of the Government remain favourable, the rate be raised at the beginning of 1958 to \$2.40; that is to double the present rate. When the honourable junior member for St. Thomas in the capacity of the Minister of Social Services is giving the matter sympathetic consideration as he has promised, I would direct his attention particularly to reducing the age in order to help a greater number.

As the last honourable member pointed out, when you wait until people are 68 years old they will have one foot in the grave. I know that sometimes we fall back on reports and urge that so and so did not recommend this and he recommended that. I am submitting that as far as we are concerned we realise the early age at which people who will benefit from this pension have to start and to toil in the fields of this country. It is essential that you reduce the age to 65 years. It has got to go lower; but I recommend that at this stage there be a reduction in the qualifying age of 65 years. I would ask the Government not to hold on to the sentence in Professor Richardson's report in which he says that no change is recommended in the age at which old age pension is paid.

6.25 p.m.

I certainly do not agree with the minimum increase of 50% and it is well that that point should be stressed. Reference was made to the fact that Mr. Bethell raised it, but he repeated what I said a year or two ago, and we can again quote Professor Richardson the adviser on industrial relations who is saying that it should be the minimum, and has also said that both the amount of the means test and the amount of the pension should be raised substantially even if it costs us more as individuals to put hands in our pockets to help those poor people. Why should we not budget for a few more shillings in taxation when we are spending many dollars of our own, in helping those people who come outside of the category of those who are in receipt of old age pensions.

Mr. VAUGHAN: There is a saying of people who approve of social services that other people expect you to give them meals and feed them with it too; but I do not want that to be said of what I am about to advise the Hon. Minister of Social Services right now. In this old age pension scheme

many of the old people who get pension have no person to go for their money on Saturday mornings; and this has been brought to my notice by residents of St. John who live by the Post Office which is at the end of that parish. You have to come from College Savannah and such districts down by the Post Office to draw your pension. I am throwing out the suggestion that you should have two paying offices for pensioners one by St. John's Church so as to prevent those people from College Savannah and thereabouts having to walk all the way to Four Cross Roads. It is a very great hardship to those people who have to walk such great distances to draw their pensions. It has been brought to my notice by the average resident of the Four Cross Road area that to see those old people hopping down for their pensions from such great distances, has struck them as cruelty. I am bringing this to the Hon. Minister of Social Services in the hope that he will do something for an easier distribution of this pension.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I am hoping that the Government will bring down the new schemes for Social Security as recommended by Professor Richardson, and that consideration will be given to those old age pension officers. I am of the feeling that if you improve your scheme without increasing the salaries of the old age pension officers, the scheme will not work as well as you want it. I noticed that some of those officers are getting as low as \$13 per week; and in my humble opinion that salary is insufficient for them. We have to bear in mind that old age pension officers have to go around the various districts to investigate cases which have been put up. I hope that the Hon. Minister of Social Services would pay some consideration to that.

I would also like to say that while I agree and appreciate the reduction in the age limit as applied to blind paupers, the age of twenty years does not exactly strike me as what this House wanted when an Address was initiated between 1948 and 1949. I initiated that Address and the then Acting Governor, Mr. Perowne, was very sympathetically disposed to the plight of those unfortunate blind paupers; and he did intimate to me then that he would do something as readily as possible to assist them. It is true to say that since then I have noticed that the grant to that institution has been increased. What I hope to see sir, is that instead of making a blind pauper wait until he reaches the age of 40 years before he qualifies for public assistance, it be given to him at the age of 14 years. The reason why I say that, is because there are cases where children become blind of tender age; and as you know a father is obligated by law to provide maintenance for his children until they reach the age of 14 years; after that age, he is not obligated any more and that is where I think Government should step in and give assistance. I want to make it very clear that I do not mean all who are blind; I only mean those who are considered paupers.

However, sir, I think it is not always the policy of Government to accept a scheme in its entirety, because it was recommended by some authority. Therefore, I am hoping that this part of the scheme in which Government proposes to reduce the age to 20 years be reduced further to 14 years as was first recommended by the Address which this House sent up to the then Head of the Administration. What I do like to stress as a rough estimate of blind paupers is about two or three hundred in the island, and if the population of this island is two hundred and twenty-five thousand people, then the two hundred and

twenty-three thousand who are not blind can very well make provision for the two hundred or so who cannot see and who cannot eke out an existence for themselves because of a handicap. I would prefer to see greater provision made for those who are so handicapped.

I agree that in accordance with Professor Richardson's Report that we have been depriving the old age pensioners of sums of money which they should have been getting long ago; but I can only hope at this stage that the Executive would consider those things to which Professor Richardson has drawn their attention. I am hoping that the scheme when it is brought down would be one which would be acceptable to all and sundry.

6.35 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: I too would like to add a word in favour of this increase. I really do not regard that Professor Richardson made any recommendation for an increase; it seems to me that he drew to your attention that if you agreed at one time to give the Old Age Pensioners 1/6 per week, you should bring the amount up to what it would represent now. Then you have to pay a little attention to the "Means Test" so as to put things right. A Government which can budget for a surplus of \$766,730 and end up with a surplus of \$2 million could put a 50% increase in these Estimates. You do not have to wait to consider Professor Richardson's Report, and I thank the Government for banding us this report before they did anything about it; but I believe that this is a report on which they want to get a report. I am thanking the Hon. Minister on this occasion for setting out the salaries which are fixed by law and everything else under this Head; it is in keeping with the recommendation I made to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture in so far as the Peasant's Loan Bank is concerned. When we come to the Head "Old Age Pensions," we see that there is an increase on the amount of \$514,000 and the vote for the Item Old Age Pensions is the same. Everyone of these Items is the same as last year and still you have to come down with the Old Age Pensions in another type with a figure of \$514,000; I do not think that any thing could be more idiotic than that. The Old Age Pension Committee had \$514,000 and they have not said so. I am against that type of thing because I have the feeling either that the Civil Servants are foolish or there is a conspiracy to put all kinds of nonsense before the legislature and ask them to accept it. They are either idiots or rascals, and I am not standing for either one.

In connection with some of the other Items in the Estimates, there is more feeling than last year. I am not one of those who believe that everybody will die before they reach the age of 65 or 68, because some of them will die before that; and some of the blind will die before they reach the qualifying age. I suppose that out of the same Professor Richardson's Report we will have a pension scheme. When the Civil Servants retire they become entitled to a pension and they call it an Old Age Pension but these people have contributed to the wealth of the colony out of which the Civil Servants get their salaries. It does not matter what the "Means Test" is for any Civil Servant; he draws his pension; and these people are entitled to the same treatment. I hope that some such scheme will come out of Professor Richardson's Report.

I would like to take up the Hon. Minister of Social Services on one point, that is, that he got Professor Richardson here. Experts after experts have

come to this colony but now have they come: after they have been in the area and after ten have come and nine of them were in the area before they came here. The Hon. Minister of Social Services or the Hon. Minister of Communications goes to England and he never arranges for anybody to come here; and the Hon. Minister of Social Services was one of the first members of this House to introduce Sir William Beveridge's plan; and all these Ministers are going up to England all the time and you cannot get any of them to bring out anybody. Professor Richardson had to go to British Guiana and after he was there, we could then show our foresight and get him here while he was in the area. But these Professors have to come out first and then you have to pay their passage back here. We have people who are members of the I.L.O., U.N.O. and other Organisation and you never hear about Government bringing anybody out here.

6 45 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I am very serious about that. Mr. Manley's party got victory at the Polls in Jamaica and the morning before he was installed as Chief Minister he went off to the U.N.O. and got some one, and since then our Premier has told us that he will get someone to make an economic survey. I am sure that that someone will come from Jamaica. We had an Income Tax Commissioner here; they did not have him medically examined before he came out.

It is nothing for us to be proud about. I remember hearing a gentleman say one time, "regardless of who leads, I follow". I do not know if he meant it the other way round, but that is what we are doing. We are supposed to lead the whole world in constitutional development and we do not know that an expert is in existence until he passes through Barbados. As a Barbadian I am not proud about that at all; I want us to be a little more original. For years and years we have been asking for an economic survey, a thing that would have been very useful to us.

Now, sir, I must say that as a gesture of goodwill towards that Report the Government could at least bring the Old Age Pension up to what the Government thinks it should be. When you increased it last time the cost of living and the devaluation of the pound had reduced the value of the pension; bring it back up. You cannot say that you have not got the money, when you have a surplus of three quarter million dollars and at one time it was two and three quarter million.

The old age pensioners use the money in trade. What I mean is that they want this money to keep body and soul together. They do that not only by going to church, but by taking a little physical sustenance. The business places therefore get this money back in trade and perhaps the Government gets back something out of it too. Although at one time we would have thought it crippling to spend a half million dollars on a scheme like this we have done it; and we have still collected more revenue. It has not been our experience that spending money in this way has done us any harm. It is a method of circulating money in the country. Even from that point of view I would spend some of the money that you divide in half every year and send out of the country. I sincerely hope that that will be done in future and that the Government will sympathetically consider all the other aspects of the question. Do not think that because you are giving a pittance these people will not die because they get it; it may be just sufficient to kill them.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, can the Hon. Minister give any explanation as to why they have not considered the Report yet? How many months do the Government need before they can consider a small document like this? There must be some reason. It is not that the money is not there, because they have budgetted for a half million dollars more than they want, and if their budgetting is as accurate as it usually is it will be 19 per cent. more than that.

They had the report in September. What on earth do they do that they could not come before the 15th of March and say that they will implement one part of the report or the other. Is the reason because of the inability to understand it or what? That does not refer to the Minister of Social Services. One would not accuse him of that; he is not one of the morons. Is it that we are doing freedom of movement so much that we cannot get freedom of pay? Or do they write so many editorials that they do not have time to do their work, even though no one reads them? There must be some excuse or reason. Giving back pay is a poor excuse for not doing your work.

If the excuse is that they had too much work they will of course tell us what that work was. Someone has said that they are keeping back this increase in the old age pension until election year. Is that next year or soon? [A MEMBER: This year]. I have heard a Minister say that he can swear for the people. It is written in the history of English parliamentary rule that on at least three occasions a Party with a big majority in the House went and faced an election and were turned out. [Hon. R. G. MAPP: This is not England.] Someone is muttering down in his boots!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the honourable junior member for St. James to stick to the point.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I will do that if you keep the honourable member quiet. I am sure that the Hon. Minister can give some reason why the Report has not been done. The Ministers of the Government are supposed to work on a full time basis; there must be some reason why they cannot do their work. It has been brought to their attention by the honourable junior member for Christ Church that when they got to Old Age Pensions in the Report they could have picked out that part and implemented it. They say that this matter will in due course receive active and sympathetic consideration "Active" means when they get down to it.

As the Minister of Social Services said some time ago, Mr. Bethell pressed for an increase and within a very short time some relief was given as an increase of pay. I am only asking the Minister if he can explain the reason for this delay. Did someone have to go somewhere or do they not allow the Minister freedom of movement in his decisions, so that he has to wait until the Premier tells him what to do, when the Minister knows that he enjoys a confidence of the House that is definitely unusual where the other Ministers are concerned?

I think that their election manifesto (I am definitely certain that ours did) advocated a decrease in the qualifying age for old age pension and an increase in the pension itself within the amount that we could afford to spend. I must admit that the terms of reference as set out were not really to do with old age pensions. But that does not excuse you for not taking steps to increase it if you are told so by the expert. When Professor Richardson read the terms of reference he must have thought that he was to undertake investigations with the object of assessing whether having regard to the

financial and economic situation of Barbados and obligations such as Ministerial Buildings—
6.55 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the honourable member to know that we are not discussing Professor Richardson's Report now.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I am defending the Ministers. They say they cannot implement certain things in the Report now, but in due course of time they will see what they can implement and they might come back later and ask us to give approval to them. I am only saying in defending him in answer to the honourable junior member for the City, that the Report by Professor Richardson is something which is to a large extent different from that of increasing old age pension; because they have asked Professor Richardson to do something different from that, and that is so whether or not they can have a social security system such as the Minister of Social Services for many years has been advocating and as tabled in an Address in this House or whether they can do it in a contributory or non-contributory way. The whole Report cannot be dealt with at this time; and whether you can afford a social security scheme as what prevails in bigger places is another thing.

What I am saying is that after he was told in September that you should forthwith increase your old age pensions by at least half and he looks at your budget and sees what you have, he should be in a position as regards the increase or lowering of the pensions to be able to tell you that they have not been able to reach that decision. He may not be able to tell you all the other points which have been put down in the Report. Would he be kind enough to tell us of the reasons for the delay? Would he be kind enough to tell us the reason why we have not been able to take this out as a, b, c, d, e, f, g? If he has not got these answers to hand he can tell us at the next meeting.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: The honourable member will understand that in a Report of this sort which involves additional expenditure and mathematical calculations as well as drafting of new legislation, you have to get advice on it and that will take some time. Another reason for the delay is that the Hon. Minister of Communications and myself have one Permanent Secretary; but that is going to be remedied in the very near future as it is intended to give each of us an independent Permanent Secretary. When that is done the work of these two Ministers will be speeded up.

Another thing which we thought would have happened by this time is that discussions on the Report by Professor Richardson would have been completed in this House. I think it is the honourable junior member for St. Peter who gave notice of discussing that Report. We do hope that it would only be a question of a few weeks when this thing would be implemented.

The question that the sum of \$508,027 be voted under Head XXXVIII — Old Age Pensions, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XL—Waterworks

Head XL — Waterworks — was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that the sum of \$672,707 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, there is the Item No. 35 under this Head which is for the delivery of water by lorries to augment the water supply in districts where supply is interrupted; and the

amount to be voted is \$1,350. I raised this matter sometime ago by way of a Question and I do not think the matter has received the attention which I think it merits. What I stress was: as soon as water is going to be cut off because of repairs to mains or to standpipes, at the same time let the water lorries leave the Waterworks and get to the spot ahead of men who are going to look after the repairs so that people would be able to fill their buckets. As you know, they do not give you warning that the water is going to be cut off nor do they tell the people in the district they will be out of water for an indefinite time. I suggest that a siren should go about the district and warn people that water is going to be cut off so that they will rush out and get their buckets filled before the pipes are dry. By that time the lorries would have left town with a supply of water, so that those who may not have been able to rush out in time would then be able to furnish themselves with this indispensable item. Let me say that it would not take a genius to arrange that. Sir, it is a matter of hours before they get those water lorries going. Sometimes these lorries are in the repair shops or they have no petrol in them; and all that time they are made ready the people are suffering for water, particularly those who live in districts which are far removed like St. Lucy. You can imagine the time it would take to get a water lorry started to go to the far north. I would not deny that the Chief Engineer of the Water Works Department is obviously a competent man, but when it comes to these petty administration details, like many highly technical experts, he is found wanting. That one is important aspect of the running of a department which needs proper attention.

When it comes to Item 15, Unestablished Staff, I would like to remark as I did yesterday with the Unestablished Staff of the Department of Highways & Transport that I trust the Government will make arrangements so that these people who are not paid a monthly wage will be allowed as much time as possible so that they may enjoy a little recreation at the Australian cricket tour which is just around the corner. There is no reason why they should not be allowed half-days in the same way as merchants in Bridgetown allow their employees such time without any reduction from their pay. It is a fact that when you allow them this recreation with pay, they give better service during the next week. If the Government treat their employees no worse than the merchants in Bridgetown treat theirs, then the Government would get much better service from these people of the Unestablished staff.

It is a matter for the Hon. Minister of Labour to decide on Government's policy with regard to giving people time off for International Cricket and races; however, the race meetings have been conveniently placed on three Saturdays so that the question does not arise now, but the question will arise during the cricket tournament in May and it is high time that the matter be considered. The members of the unestablished staff are waiting to hear a pronouncement in this matter.

7.05 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I think we will all admit that the entire question of the Water Services has been on the move within recent years and we quite appreciate that. We have a technical man and from the general point of view we see that things are moving and we have been getting greater co-operation generally from the staff; I quite agree with the last speaker when he said that. Dealing with Item 35 "Delivery of Water by Lorry", I want to draw something very forcibly to the Hon. Minister's atten-

tion now that this Water Service is on the move; I do not believe that the Government could overnight put water into the houses of every householder, but I believe that water could be carried within easier reach of the people who occupy houses. I have said this on several occasions and apparently the Government has not taken any steps to remedy it. My suggestion is that there should be an amendment made to the Water Works Act. As Chairman of the Commissioners of Health of St. Michael, recently my idea of that was strengthened when we received a letter from the Hon. Minister of Works on the question of the installation of water in an area, that area being a privately-owned tenantry. I have always asked that the Water Works Act be amended. Presently they cannot carry water into privately-owned tenancies, but I have been asking all along whether you should not amend the Act. Take this particular case into consideration: the actual mains are not there, and I can appreciate the sympathy of the Hon. Minister in his letter; it is a view which I have expressed on more than one occasion in this House. The nearest distance which you can carry water mains to tenancies would be more than half a mile. I am suggesting that you either make it compulsory for water mains to be carried to tenancies or amend the law; you should set out that wherever there is an established tenantry the Government can carry the water there. The Government has carried water to the Bay; the Government owns the Bay. I am not suggesting that you should lay mains on people's land so as to enhance its value; I am suggesting that you should amend the law either compelling the owner of the land to erect standpipes or allow the Government to install the standpipes. As a matter of fact, I have observed that the Board of Health has amended what it considered to be its unwritten law to say that where tenancies are being sold out, the nearest standpipes should be within 220 yards instead of 440 yards. I would ask the Hon. Minister of Works seriously: what is the good of saying that a standpost should be within 220 yards of a tenantry when the Act says that that cannot be done? If the Government feel that they should not put water in the tenancies then they should compel the owners of these tenancies to install water in the tenancies. Take a place like the Garden Land: that is private enterprise it is true, and you will have private enterprise; but it is not good enough that where these tenancies exist people have to walk half a mile or further for water.

In the particular case I have mentioned, the Commissioners asked that a standpipe be erected, but standpipes cannot be erected on private lands. The Hon. Minister would like standpipes to be erected in the Garden Land where the petitioners have asked that it be placed.

7.15 p.m.

I am drawing to the Minister's attention that this Act should be amended. Government cannot provide land for all the people who want to rent, and therefore even when the land is privately owned the Government should see to it that they provide the social amenities which will make the people comfortable. If the lands are there already there is nothing wrong with amending the Act so that you can install water; and if you are satisfied that it is beyond the financial ability of the tenant, the Government should pay it and let the amount be paid back by the private individual. If it costs say \$400 the Government should pay it and have first lien against the tenantry for the installing of water.

There is Bosvigo area. I am sure that the Hon. Minister of Communications knows that persons in this area in many instances have to go a half mile

for water. You should amend the Act. I am one who whole heartedly agrees with the Minister of Social Services that you cannot provide all the housing accommodation and all the land. I think that that Minister has seen the point of view; it concerns him because it comes under Public Health too.

Just to make an amendment saying that someone can sell a place as long as it is 220 yards away from a standpipe is not good enough; two hundred and twenty yards is a long distance to go for water. It is a suggestion which I put to the Minister of Communications.

There is another point: I have seen in the "Advocate" that the Minister of Communications had denied that this letter came from his office. I also saw in the "Beacon" a letter explaining the position of the Minister as regards water as a result of a discussion which took place at the Vestry of St. Michael. I think the letter appeared in the "Our Readers Say" column of the "Advocate" but really was not signed. It said "from the office of the Minister of Communications."

There seems to be some misunderstanding and I want to let the Minister know that that arose as a result of the old habit of the Waterworks Department acting on behalf of the Government, and drawing to the attention of the Commissioners of the various parishes when mains were extended in the various areas, and asking the Commissioners to make provision for the installation of standposts. Within the last year or so a letter came to the Commissioners of Health from the Government pointing out that that practice would cease. If the relations between these two public departments must continue to be cordial, it is necessary that the position be set right. In one breath the Government tells the public in the communication which appeared from the Minister's office that the onus rests with the Commissioners of Health to select spots for standposts, and in the same breath you say that it is the responsibility of the Ministry; you are at loggerheads.

It is the desire of the Commissioners, at least of the Commissioners of Health of St. Michael, to work in happy relationship with the Ministries more especially when it comes to social services. It is our duty to the general public; therefore I suggest to the Minister to try to put the matter right.

I hope that the Minister will see the wisdom in the suggestion I made not long ago about amending the Act. If that is done before the next Estimates are discussed he will see how much satisfaction it will give.

7.25 p.m.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, under this Head, Waterworks, I want to say that I highly appreciate the effort that is being made by this Government for the expansion of the water supply system in this island as a whole and in the parish of St. Philip in particular. But after listening to my honourable namesake, I must say that there are some points that he has brought out which merit consideration by the Government; especially with regard to the plantation owners who have tenants living far from the public road, some of whom have to go very far for water. You should either compel these plantation owners to install standposts in these areas, or the Government should install the standposts and call upon the owners of the land to defray the expense.

I think that if the plantation owners had to put in that water they would do it cheaper. I can tell you what it costs. This question of water is one of the greatest needs in this island and in spite of the efforts which this Government is making in that direction, I hope they will do more because there

are a lot of tenements which are very little different from a wilderness. If you go to Brereton's Village you will find that the standpipe is about a mile and a half from the tenantry. A few of those tenantry roads were repaired recently and I think that the Government should take the standpipes into one of those roads. I would suggest that you carry the pipe into the tenantry. I hope that the Government will act immediately upon some of the remarks made by the honourable senior member for the City. Government should make a survey of those tenancies which are separated from water supply, and get in touch with the owners of those estates so as to see if they cannot implement that that scheme which has been suggested to help those unfortunate people, some of whom live in gullies.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the Hon. Minister of Communications has any plans for the general extension of the domestic water supply service in this City and throughout the island, but I am sure that if the cost of installation were cheapened, the profit made by the Waterworks Department would be greatly increased by the time the next Annual Estimates come to this House for consideration.

As I have said previously, in the City of Port-of-Spain every householder has water, and I would like to say the same thing about the City of Bridgetown. This is one of the commercial undertakings which would repay Government considerably if it is embarked upon. There is nothing to lose about it whatsoever. The cheapening of installations will multiply many times the applications now made for domestic service and I hope Government would embark upon that policy before consideration of the next Estimates.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the Hon. Minister of Communications who is in charge of Waterworks that the question of placing of standpipes in the several parishes is not for the Commissioners of Health, but that is something in the province of the members of the House even despite Ministerial Status. I want to tell the Hon. Minister that it is grave discourtesy to members of this House for him to go driving through any parish between three and four o'clock and holding unofficial meetings with Commissioners of Health of the several parishes about the installation of standpipes, without consulting the elected representatives of the people; because the Act says that it is the members of the House who should see about that. The Hon. Minister knows that as well as I do because he tried to amend the Act so as to change that law; and I resent the Minister going into St. George and holding conferences with the Commissioners of Health when we have to ask questions on the floor of the House about the particular locations within our parishes for the siting of standpipes. I particularly have asked about Campion Village and other places, and I repeat I resent his going into St. George whizzing-whizzing with the Commissioners of Health. I do not want to hear that a new convention has sprung up over night or that the Hon. Minister of Communications can decide where these standpipes should go, because the Waterworks Act is still on the Statute Book of this island.

I will again ask the Hon. Minister of Communications when do they intend to put a standpipe at Campion Castle? He has not answered those questions although I have asked him two or three times already. We all know that in the old days that the position of the standpipes was decided by the last standpipe because standpipes were not put where people lived; standpipes were put at convenient distances along the public highway to water oxen. I

therefore find it difficult to understand why in 1955 after this new dispensation in which the Hon. Minister participates and which has a great deal of support, that he would countenance people in Campion Castle having still to walk over a mile and a half to get a bucket of water. Standpipes should not be put on highways far from any human habitation, in these days when we do not even have Model T Fords which would want water, far less oxen. Quite apart from Campion Castle there is also need for a standpipe at Ellerton, Jericho and Workmans.

I would remind the Hon. Minister that in 1953 he did not put in St. George any standpipes at all although the established custom is that you put two in each parish every year. From time immemorial that was so; and the Commissioners of Health used to recommend from a priority list. After I asked certain question as to why none were put in St. George or St. Philip over that some period, he then erected three in St. George one at Newbury and another at Greens, but he left out the one for Campion Castle. St. George was not the only parish to suffer, and yet four standpipes were installed in a particular district in a couple of months. On the 17th March, 1954, the Hon. Minister for Communications went to St. George and had a little meeting with the Commissioners of Health.

7.35 p.m.

He had no right doing that. I am saying that the law does not give the Commissioners of Health the authority to decide where standpipes should be erected. If he is relying on their advice, he cannot approbate them for certain purposes and reprobate when it suits him to do so; he cannot approve of their action when it is technically the functions of this Chamber and disapprove of their actions in another department. All I am telling him again is that the Waterworks Act has not been amended; Campion Castle is a top priority for the erection of standpipes in St. George and the standpipes will have to be installed.

In respect of Item 35, "Delivery of Water by Lorry", I am suggesting that if you cannot bring the water to the people in pipes then you should come to this House, and in any village where a standpipe is further than 300 yards from the nearest house, make it compulsory that water should be carried into that village. One waggon could go into the villages every morning; one waggon could serve three or four districts. They only use the water waggons in Boscebel and St. Michael, so that if there is a burst pipe in St. Michael when the water is only 50 yards away, you will see the waggon come up with the beating of the drums. But if the Hon. Minister is really interested in the welfare of the people throughout the island, he must see that these inhuman conditions under which the majority of the working-class people of this island have to live should no longer prevail. The Hon. Minister should know better than anybody else because he has lived in the country like myself and you, Mr. Chairman; and he knows what it is to see people walking a mile in order to get water every morning. These are not the days of the ox-cart; we are supposed to put the interest of the people before the interest of the ox-cart.

One of the objections to putting water in Campion Castle is that you cannot run pipes over private land; but I believe that the Hon. Minister has communicated that the Commissioners of Health of the several parishes can issue a new settlement of policy to the effect that he is prepared to run pipes over private land. The Hon. Minister has done that in Pile Bay where he brought the water through Fresh Water Club. The Hon. Minister knows about that because he went down there with a lot of ceremony

to see the water turned on; but he brought the pipe over private land and I seem to remember his making the statement that he is willing to bring pipes over private land. Ellerton, Jericho, Mayfield near Woodbourne are some of the priorities in my parish. If the Hon. Minister cannot bring the water to the people, then let the water waggon be sent into the villages.

Hon. M. E. COX: I should like to reply to the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Lucy first. I should like to inform the honourable member that I have given instructions in connection with the cutting off of water; and it is to be hoped that whenever the water is to be shut off these instructions will be carried out. In connection with the point relative to time off for cricket matches and races I think the honourable member made a similar point when we were discussing the Head with Public Works. I will assure him that I will take the matter up because I feel it is a reasonable request.

The honourable senior member for the City spoke in general terms on the question of erecting a standpost and he made mention of a Report which appeared in the *Advocate* newspaper sometime ago. The matter is somewhat confusing to me because I do not remember any letter being sent to the Commissioners of Health of St. Michael contrary to what the policy has been all the time. The policy has been that the various Commissioners of Health would inform the Waterworks Department as to the areas in which standposts should be erected for any given district. That policy as far as I can remember still exists today.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of Order, If the Minister is referring to me on this point, I cannot remember referring to him. I was pointing out that anything which has been badly done has not been done correctly; but I was pointing out that it is contrary to the law.

7.45 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: As I was saying, sir, the principle still holds good today. It was felt that the Commissioners of Health would be more *au fait* with conditions in the various parishes than the Waterworks Department, and therefore the recommendations were made by those authorities. The Waterworks Department, more especially since the establishment of Ministerial Status, is not bound to accept the recommendations made by the Commissioners of Health; but more often than not those recommendations are accepted. At the same time that does not prevent the Waterworks Department from extending even beyond the suggestions of the Commissioners.

However, sir, I want to come to the point which the honourable member made. I want to tell him that ever since we started to step up the programme of laying mains in various parishes of the island, I wrote to the Commissioners of Health for St. Michael and I also interviewed the Chief Sanitary Inspector Mr. Merritt, to try and keep pace with the Waterworks Department in so far as installing standposts was concerned. Unfortunately the Commissioners cannot and do not keep pace. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is not true.] Mains were laid for months in Bank Hall, Bush Hall and other areas, and no standposts have been erected. I appealed to Mr. Merritt on more than one occasion to put down standposts as fast as he could. I do not know if it is a question of finance which prevents him sinking the wells which are required before the department can put down the standposts.

As regards the point about the Waterworks Department not being able to put water in private

tenancies, I do not know much about the law, but I do not think that is correct. Section 25 of the Act reads as follows:

The Department shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, provide and keep in the pipes to be laid down by them, unless prevented by drought or other extraordinary cause or unavoidable accident, a supply of pure and wholesome water sufficient for the domestic use of the inhabitants of the Island, for cleansing sewers and drains, for watering streets, for supplying public standpipes, baths, or washhouses that may be established for the use of the inhabitants, and for any other such purposes as are required by this Act, and the Department shall cause pipes to be laid down and the water to be brought to every part of the Island within the limits described by the plan of the intended works approved by the Legislature.

A point was made by the honourable senior member for St. George not long ago—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If the honourable member would give way, I would say that I have not said that you cannot lay pipes. I was dealing with standposts. You can lay pipes anywhere. Look at Section 27.

Hon. M. E. COX: If the honourable member had waited I would have explained that. I was leading up to it. The Legislature gives authority to put down standposts. Standposts were erected in Drax Hall, a private tenantry in St. George and in many other cases that I can mention. It is not correct to say that the authority does not exist for laying down these standposts in private lands. As far as that question is concerned, I want to assure the honourable member that I am prepared to take up the matter and deal with it along with the Minister of Health because under the Health Act there is authority for dealing with the laying of water in various tenantry lands for development; and I am prepared to see not only half-inch mains run at any point to supply the residents with water, but also that three-inch mains should be laid in these tenancies.

For years tenantry owners have been getting around the Act in that they have not been seeing after installing water and providing other sanitary conveniences, and I am prepared to see to it that some improvement is made. I do not feel that the Government should put down standposts; I feel that mains should be put in these tenancies. You should not have hundreds of people depending on one standpost.

The honourable senior member for St. George made some point about my ignoring him. I would like to tell him that I am a Barbadian and I feel I can go anywhere as long as I have strength in my body. He said that I discussed with the Sanitary Authorities of St. George the question of installing standposts in that parish without referring to him. I was invited by the Sanitary Authorities to come up and discuss it with them. I went as a free citizen unfettered by any chains whatsoever. I feel that that is my privilege. There is no dictatorship in this island. It is my God-given right to go to any part of the island that I want to go. It seems that some members would like to deny me that right; but that is something I will fight for.

7.55 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: I said it was discourtesy on his part and a direct controvention of the principle laid down.

Hon. M. E. COX: Now, Sir, when it comes to the question of standpipes, he would have this House to believe that an injustice was done in St. George or that St. Michael was favoured at the ex-

pense of St. George where standpipes are concerned. I would like to give this House some figures over the last five years with respect to the erection of standpipes. These figures are as follows:—

	1950-51	51-52	52-53	53-54	54-55	Total
St. Michael	5	4	4	0	7	20
Christ Church	0	7	2	3	1	13
St. Philip	1	0	2	2	3	8
St. John	3	3	2	3	4	15
St. George	7	1	3	0	4	15
St. Joseph	4	3	1	0	2	10
St. Thomas	2	1	3	0	3	9
St. Andrew	0	3	3	3	2	11
St. Peter	1	5	1	0	4	11
St. Lucy	1	7	0	4	3	15
St. James	6	1	3	2	2	14
Grand Total						141

Sir, from those figures which I have quoted, honourable members will see that not only in St. George, but in St. Michael, St. Peter, St. Thomas and St. Joseph, not a single standpipe was erected that year. I know the reason why the honourable member asked that question. Let me again repeat that no standpost was installed in St. Michael that year.

On the question of the erection of a standpost at Campion Castle, I have recently seen the recommendation from the Commissioners of Health of that parish and they have as far as I remember seven standposts on the priority list; and I think the one for Campion Castle is the second or the third on that list, so that would be dealt with this year.

I will again say that you need not agree with all the proposals put up by the sanitary authorities of the several parishes; yet more often than not, we take the advice from the Commissioner of Health of the several parishes.

The honourable junior member for St. John asked about the policy of the extension of domestic services. I would like to tell him that our policy is to place water in every district for the convenience of the people. Honourable members will see that even recently we have reduced the deposit for the installation of domestic water service from 50% of the cost to 25%, in order that it may get closer to those persons who might not be able to pay as much as 50% in the first instance. This means that instead of paying for your installation in one year you have a period of two years to pay for it.

I may also mention that many people are glad for this reduction in the initial cost and are taking advantage of the offer. Let me say again that we are doing everything possible to encourage people to put water in their homes.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I would like to say that the statement which the Hon. Minister of Communications made was rather conflicting. Before I go further I would like to say I have nothing against the Hon. Minister in trying to do everything possible over the water question; that is his right and I would do it also; but he should not come in here and make statements which are not statements of fact. The Hon. Minister says that he cannot remember any such change in policy of Government going to the Commissioner of Health. That challenges the right of every member of this House. Let him tell me that if the original idea was not that as soon as Government carries its mains on certain routes, the Government would acquaint the Commissioners of Health of the various parishes and would say to them that the Government is pre-

pared in the coming financial year to erect so many standpipes in that parish, and ask the Commissioners to make recommendations. Bear in mind that is not the law.

Under section 27 of the Water Works Act the Government can come in here with a Plan and say "These are the pipes which we are putting up." When they wanted to amend the Act I voted with the Government. It was my experience that where you had a pipe creating a nuisance, you had to wait a month or so before you could get the permission of the Executive Committee to remove it.

8.05 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: When the hon. junior member for St. James was leader of the Government standposts were put down without any reference to the Legislature. [Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Never.]

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The hon. member has said that since Ministerial Status the position has been changed; the hon. member now says that it is the fault of the Commissioners of Health of St. Michael that they have not got pipes with the mains which the Government has put down. I tell the hon. member that that is not true; show me anything by which the Commissioners of Health can say: "I am putting a pipe here and one there". The Government has to call upon the Commissioners of Health and ask them to recommend the sites for the erection of standpipes. The hon. member also says that the Ministers are not bound to accept the recommendations of the authorities; he further said that he went to see Mr. Merritt and asked him to keep up-to-date. Imagine the Hon. Minister going to the Chief Sanitary Inspector of St. Michael instead of having his Department write the Commissioners of Health, and say that whatever has been done all the time, it is the policy of the Government to put down standpipes this year! The Hon. Minister knows that all the Commissioners of Health can do is to make recommendations for the sites for the erection of standpipes. I have nothing against the Hon. Minister for doing that, but the Commissioners of Health never knew for one day that a pipe had been installed at Pile Bay until the hon. member came in and said that a pipe had been installed and asked them to erect an enclosure.

Hon. M. E. COX: I did not go to Mr. Merritt on that account.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The hon. member must read his own newspaper. The matter appeared as if it were a letter, but it was as a result of Mr. Hewitt raising the question of putting water in Haggatt Hall; and the hon. member said that it was the duty of the Commissioners of Health to say where standpipes were to be erected. That is a statement of fact; I can tell the hon. member so. The Commissioners of Health have not got one foot of pipe. If there is a pipe to be installed, the Government has to install that pipe. All the Government has to do is to say: "We proposed to erect so many standpipes in the island; so many have been allocated to St. Michael and will you recommend where they should be erected?" The Government is always given the right to say how many standpipes they are erecting and ask the Commissioners of Health to recommend the sites. The Commissioners recommend the sites and you have to ask somebody to allow you to sink a well on their land.

8.15 p.m.

It is very rarely that you buy the land. In most cases the Commissioners pay a shilling a year for the spot. I was at pains to point out that the now Minister's letter was received before the hon. member became a Minister. It was when he was

in charge of the Waterworks Department before Ministerial Status came into operation. Since the system came into operation we received a letter from the Waterworks Department telling us that. Since then all the Commissioners knew, was that sites were selected by the Waterworks Department. Let the hon. member say that that is not true.

Do something to carry water in every corner; but do not get up and try to make out that the Commissioners are not keeping pace. As a matter of fact we could not have attempted to put a standpipe at Pile Bay; you would actually have to run a line for the main. But it is right to carry it there. Do not try to make out that the Commissioners are in default. You would be surprised to see where I would carry water. I object strongly to the Minister saying that water would have gone all through Bank Hall and Bush Hall and the reason why it has not is because the Commissioners are not keeping pace. It is an untrue statement; it is either a calculated attempt to mislead people or the Minister does not know the true position.

Whatever the Minister says happened in the time of the hon. junior member for St. James I do not know. When the Hon. Minister brought in the first plan under the amending Act he did not even know there was to be a plan. The hon. junior member for St. James said: "Maybe the plan is in your pocket" and the Minister started to feel in his pocket for it and the Marshal went and brought the plan.

Section 27 says: "The Department shall maintain, provide, and fix proper standpipes upon their main and other pipes at such places as the Legislature may determine, from which the inhabitants may take water for domestic purposes, for their domestic stock, and for stock or for use in vehicle, propelled by mechanical power, if they require it when on a bona fide journey between the hours of 5 o'clock in the morning and 10 o'clock at night.

When that section was raised I actually voted against the decision at the time because it had been my experience lying ill in hospital, that right under my bedroom window was a standpipe where people carried on as early as 3 o'clock in the morning. I said that when you wanted to remove a standpipe you should give power to the department and the Government to remove it without having to come to the House. The Legislature said no.

The Hon. Minister says that the Government will write the various Commissioners, but they are not bound to take the Commissioners' advice. The Government is supposed to act within the law, or it should. It is clear. In your Estimates at the beginning of the financial year you know how much money you are allocating for standposts. I contend that the Commissioners should have a list. You have 90,000 odd people in St. Michael.

It is the Minister's responsibility to work out with the Head of the Waterworks Department that he proposes to lay, say, 150 pipes this year. You need not do it, but in accordance with custom you write the Commissioners of the various parishes telling them their allocations. They are after all still responsible for the health of the island. You write and tell them what you propose to do and ask for their recommendations. Do not say that the Commissioners are not putting down standposts; it is not true. It is dishonest to say that the Commissioners are responsible. Let the Minister look it up and he will see that I am correct. The Commissioners work under the Act. The hon. senior member for St. George is correct. It is the Minister's responsibility to say how many standposts must be put down. The Commissioners will

make recommendations as regards the sites which you are not bound to accept. Because someone or some organisation may attempt to take the credit for something.—[Hon. M. E. COX: Mislead the public]. Mislead what public?

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

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

The question was put and agreed to and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
8.30 p.m.

On resumption.

Mr. TUDOR: Before I proceed with my Resolution, Mr. Speaker, the honourable senior member for St. Philip has asked me with your permission, to ask leave to undertake the moving of a Resolution of which he gave notice with respect to appreciation of the work of the Hon. Albert Gomes at the G.A.A.T. Conference.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking for leave to take charge of a Resolution by the honourable senior member for St. Philip in connection with the appreciation of the work of the Hon. Albert Gomes of Trinidad. If there is no objection —

Hon. M. E. COX: I would appeal to the honourable member to move the passing of his Resolution and leave the Resolution of the honourable senior member for St. Philip.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I object to leave being granted.

Mr. SPEAKER: Objection having been raised, the question must be put instantly. The question is that leave be granted to the honourable member. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye" and —

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not want this matter to be controversial.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member withdrawing his leave?

Mr. TUDOR: Yes Sir, I willingly do so.

CONGRATULATIONS TO HON. T. A. MARRYSHOW, C.B.E., M.L.C.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the following resolution:—

*The House of Assembly of Barbados
To*

The Hon. T. A. MARRYSHOW, C.B.E. M.L.C.

Resolved that this House offers to the Hon. T. A. Marryshow, C.B.E., M.L.C., of Grenada, its warmest congratulations on his thirty years continuous membership of the Grenada Legislative Council, and on his great contribution to the cause of West Indian Nationhood during that time.

Mr. Speaker, there is the saying that it is a wise child who knows his own father, but it is still a wiser nation that knows its own founder so to speak. There is something about the Hon. T. A. Marryshow which means much to this island and to the history of the Caribbean. The fact that the people of Grenada has

seen fit over thirty unbroken years to award him with their confidence which he still holds up to this present day, is an indication not only of his integrity as a legislator but also of the influence which he has been able to wield on the affairs not only of his island home but on the Caribbean as a whole. The ups and downs of his politics do not concern us; but it is on record throughout the Caribbean that his name stands as few others do as the founder of the idea of federation of the British West Indies. Over a number of years, in season and out of season, he has preached to us the concepts of unity and nationhood; and I am sure that all honourable members of this House would wish to congratulate him on having spent thirty years continuously in the Legislature of the island of Grenada and for the contribution which he has made to West Indian affairs during that time.

There has been conference after conference dealing with all aspects of West Indian problems; and in all that he has attended, he has brought to bear his wisdom and we are all the richer for the contribution which has sprung from his wise and venerable head.

It is our hope that he may be spared on the West Indian scene for many more years. Now that we are on the eve of Federation it is not too much to hope that when the federal structure is established, a place will be found for him to adorn so that he can assist with his maturity and distinction the continued growth of our nation. In the years to come we hope that many may say of him as Alfred Duff Cooper has said:

"Fear not kind friend if Spring be past

And evening shadows fall,

These years shall be, although the last

The loveliest of all." [Cheers.]

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion of my colleague. In so doing I would say there is no one to whom the title "The Grand Old Man of Federation" could more appropriately be applied than Mr. T. A. Marryshow.

All West Indian legislators must welcome a Resolution such as this as we recall how in his latter days, he has been having more strenuous fights to maintain his seat in St. George constituency than he did in his prime; but with his maturity and experience he has been able to hold his own and we are all happy that so long as he is in the flesh and is willing to remain in the political arena that the tall, picturesque figure of perhaps the most eloquent orator on the West Indian scene, the Gladstone of the British Caribbean, will remain as eloquent and will continue to display his omnipresence and the ubiquity which Mr. Marryshow displays whenever any important event takes place in these parts. As a matter of fact, I think he was present in three or four places this year to meet Her Royal Highness, the Princess Margaret; so it can be said that despite his years, they fit very lightly on him.

This stalwart in the cause of federation has lived to see it reach a stage when it is next door to him and actually within reach. I feel it is most fitting that he should see it reach such a stage.

Sir, I congratulate my colleague for moving this Resolution and I am happy that the oldest Legislature of the British Caribbean has thought fit to pay tribute to this most distinguished Statesman. There is no question about it, Mr. Marryshow is a West Indian in the widest sense of the term. We do like to think that of him. It may truly be said that while men may come and men may go, the honourable T. Albert Marryshow remains forever on the political scene of the British Caribbean. He is, I

hope, a picture as permanent as any human being is permanent. I am very proud to be in the position of seconding and supporting a Resolution of this kind. [Cheers.]

9.25 p.m.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I shall be as brief as possible, but it would be strange if I did not add my quota to the tribute paid to the Honourable T. A. Marryshow. I have lived in Grenada for two years and as a result, I came to know him politically as well as personally. I always heard the name of Mr. Marryshow mentioned from the time I was a little child. Since I went to Grenada I found out that he it was who challenged the concept of colonialism when it was moral impertinence to do so.

He it was who began the now accepted practice that West Indians should be elevated to official posts of importance. In 1944 when I was there the two now famous West Indian leaders in the persons of the Hon. Premier of Barbados and the Hon. Albert Gomes, journeyed to Grenada to save what they thought was the risk of Marryshow's seat, but it was quite unnecessary. The people of Grenada know that in Marryshow they had an everlasting talent and there was never any threat to his seat. Even the new and ultra-modern challenger in the person of Mr. Gaity has failed to shake the political confidence of the Grenadians in the Hon. "T. Albert" as he is popularly known in St. Georges. He lives in the hearts of Grenadians of all classes, and I do not think there could be a greater tribute paid to him than to say that he lives in the hearts of Grenadians of all classes. I share in the tribute paid to him on his thirty years being resident in the Legislature of Grenada.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: From this side of the table I rise to pay tribute to Mr. Marryshow. I remember in the pre-war years that Marryshow of Grenada, Cipriani of Trinidad and O'Neale of Barbados were the three West Indians who lighted the torch of democracy as far as these islands are concerned. During those early years, Mr. Marryshow was the first to speak about Federation and I am sure that he must be a very happy man tonight when he realises that his child is being born. Not only in the field of politics was Marryshow a prominent man, but as a Journalist I used to read his newspaper the "West Indian." He was also an outstanding personality as a Journalist. He has always fought the fight of advancement of West Indians and we are all happy in joining the honourable junior member for St. Lucy in paying tribute to this honourable gentleman.

Mr. GODDARD: Although I do not think it could be claimed for Mr. Marryshow that he originated the idea of Federation, he was certainly the champion of Federation. For one to be in any Legislature for thirty years is a very great achievement indeed. In the years during which he has passed we have seen many changes; Mr. Marryshow is not only a Grenadian, but he has a very strong West Indian bias. I know of no occasion that any colony in the Caribbean has made any form of progress which Mr. Marryshow has not followed closely. I remember that on the first of February last year, when we went in for Ministerial Status a cable of congratulation was received from Mr. Marryshow. He followed politics in this island as he followed politics at home. I am sure that in any advancement with Grenada has made, he is always at the fore-front giving it his blessing. I heartily associate myself with the Resolution which has been moved by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy sending good wishes to Mr. Marryshow.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I, too want to associate myself with the remarks of honourable members in offering a word of congratulation to such an illustrious figure as the Hon. T. A. Marryshow; and in doing so I would say I feel we fall short in expressing our appreciation of the Hon. T. A. Marryshow for what he has rendered and the effort he has utilised in pointing to our vista the possibilities of West Indian Federation. [VOICES: Hear, hear!] I feel that this honourable Chamber could do no less than offer a word of congratulation, to such a West Indian as the Hon. T. A. Marryshow.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the question, I have the honour to acquiesce in the sentiments expressed in congratulation to the Hon. T. A. Marryshow.

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

Mr. TUDOR: I ask Your Honour to arrange for a despatch of this Resolution to the honourable gentleman.

Mr. SPEAKER: I acquiesce in that.

ESTIMATES RESUMED

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Estimates, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Head XL—Water Works

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When we were last in Committee on the Estimates, Head XL — Waterworks was being considered.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister in charge of the Waterworks to have said that when I was Leader of the House, standposts used to be erected without this House knowing about it? Because, if he said so, that is utterly incorrect. Someone drew to the Hon. Minister's attention during the debate the fact that when he was in charge of matters relating to the Department before Ministerial Status, he attempted to pass a Resolution as to the placing of a standpost somewhere and I called upon him to produce the Book of Reference. He looked around for it, he looked into his pocket, and I then reminded him that he had to find a big map which we kept at the Waterworks Department; and any standpost which had to be erected had to be marked on the map and brought in here as a Book of Reference, and the matter had to be passed by Resolution of this House. The procedure was two-fold; in some cases the Commissioners of Health of the various parishes would forward to the Secretariat an application and a request for a standpost to be erected on some spot which they regarded as suitable, and that was in due course considered by the Governor-in-Executive Committee and if approved, it was sent down to this House in accordance with the Act which was passed by the House. But the practice almost invariably was to get the Commissioners of Health of the various parishes themselves of their own initiative to consult with the representatives of the House for the purpose of securing an easy passage when the decision could be taken under ballot. In those days there was no Party Government, and if the members of the Executive Committee were to have attempted to pass any Resolution with regard to the placing of standpipes which did not meet with the approval of the representatives of the

parish, it would have met with a reception in the House which would be the equivalent of failing to secure the passing of the Resolution. You could not rely on members of the House passing the Resolution.

9 35 p.m.

The alternative and second method which was used, was that in certain cases the Waterworks themselves would approach the Commissioners of Health of the parish concerned and suggest to them, or the Governor-in-Executive Committee would write and ask them whether or not they desired that standpipes should be placed in the parish, and if so where. Within the means of the Commissioners they would provide for the placing of the standpipes after consultation with the Head of the Waterworks Department.

You will see in the Statutes of the Island, in the Waterworks Loan Act, 1935—10, that the preamble says, "Whereas it is expedient to raise a loan of one hundred and fifty-two thousand pounds sterling for the purpose specified in the Schedule to this Act etc." In the Schedule to that Act you will see that provisions were made for the purchase of lands, and that in the items of the Schedule numbered from 10 to 19 provision was made for additional standpipes. In the Items numbered from 20 to 24 provision was made for additional fire hydrants followed by provision for extending mains and laying water supplies to elementary schools, and further extensions of mains and the erection of standpipes in the items numbered 90 to 164.

All the items and places and the expenses likely to be incurred were actually set out in the Schedule to the Act, and in that case there would be no necessity to rely on the Waterworks Act. The point I am making is that on no occasion and in no way has a standpipe ever been erected from Government funds without the necessary consent of the Legislature; which consent, to my knowledge has never been withheld because the procedure was that the same persons interested would be able to oppose such a passing, whereas in these days of course you are bound to obey the sections of the Act; but it is simplified to the extent that under the party system you can rely on your Government for the necessary passing in the House.

That is the position as I remember it; it has never been otherwise; and if the honourable member in charge has ever been told otherwise, the law cannot be broken. I merely got up to say how it had been done and how it has got to be done. The figures which he supplies us may be helpful to certain honourable members; but in truth and in fact I do not think they are so material as they would be, if he would tell us how many standposts there are in the respective parishes and how many we have added to them. If he had started in his own parishes of St. Michael it may well be that he has supplied that parish sufficiently in the past (not he, the Government) and they were within the requisite distance of not less than 300 to 440 yards from where persons were living. But when you come to where villages have sprung up in the present days, land has been sold out or cut up into lots under the consent of the Public Health Act it is necessary to put in a proper water supply; and it has meant that the Government has had to come afterwards and supply these places with water for the convenience and comfort of the persons living there. If you prepare your statistics and circulate them as in England, you will find that St. Michael has always, by reason of its high percentage of population com-

pared with the rest of the island, and by reason of the fact that it is a place in which you get the most houses, tenancies etc., it has been in the past properly supplied with water although it might have been necessary in the latter years and in these present years to put in just as much or more for the outside districts.

As you know, the most misleading thing in the world is a percentage; because a percentage can never work out right. If you are going to say that because you have two-fifths of the island, say 40% of the island congregated in one district, therefore at this late hour of the day in 1955, or for the last five years you have only put 20 standpipes compared with 14 in St. James, nothing could be more misleading; because it may happen that your hydrants, standpipes, and houses supplied with water and the conveniences and things of that nature are so well dealt with and provided for in the parish of St. Michael, that you have probably most of the districts and hundreds of places probably running into thousands, concentrated in the district which is the town district.

9.45 p.m.

The percentage would be entirely wrong by saying that you have added twenty, because in truth and in fact you should not make any comparison with the out districts. I merely mention that because while statistics are of value, when you take them over the last five years they might be very misleading. In addition to that, we have a new setup in your housing scheme such as you have at Deacons Road or the Pine Housing Estate, and you will probably find that you have omitted to mention those standpipes which you have probably erected for the convenience of the residents in those new tenancies with which Government is concerned, and therefore, again your percentage would not represent a true position because you may have removed from one district to another a standpipe, or you may find that you require less in a district owing to the people putting in their own water service or the residents there having been removed to another spot where there is water service.

The other point raised by the honourable senior member for the City was whether or not you could put a standpipe wheresoever you like. That is not so. As he explained, it is usually the case either for the Government to send and get the Commissioners of Health of the particular parish to arrange with the owners of the land on which they desire to place a standpipe when they are not using part of the public highway to pay rent for it, and in some cases they have even purchased the spot of land on which they want to put the standpipe.

I have looked up an old debate, not because it may be necessary to the passing of these Estimates, but because I understand that it has been said that in my time when I was representing the Government in here and representing St. James, in those cases where the people wanted to put in standpipes they sent in their application to the Legislature. That is not true. As a matter of fact, it is the opposite; and I am sure that even before I was a member of the Government and of the Executive Committee, it was actually the practice of the Waterworks in those days to consult with members of the House before they attempted to put in standpipes. My recollection of the whole matter in the past when I was on the Executive Committee, was that there was co-operation between the Commissioners of Health of the respective parishes and the Engineer and Manager of the Waterworks Department. I am certain that in the parish which I have the honour

to represent, there was also consultation with the Commissioners of Health.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Chairman, perhaps this debate is somewhat enlightening as to the various duties of the Commissioners of Health. I would like to say that I will never subscribe to the view that any Government should send to the Commissioners of Health requesting them to select any area in which mains should be laid or standpipes should be erected. I am rather inclined to the view that the elected representatives of the people should know their constituencies and the needs of the electors better than any Commissioner of Health, therefore, we the representatives should have the say as to where mains should be laid and standposts erected.

Sir, I have interviewed the honourable senior member for the City in his capacity as a Commissioner of Health for St. Michael in connection with the erection of standpipes in the area embracing Barracks Road, Queen Victoria Road, King Edward Road, etc., and I would like to tell him that I have gone even one step further than that and have interviewed the Chief Sanitary Inspector. What I would like to know and the people in the area also is what has occasioned the delay in the erection of these standpipes. I have taken the trouble to go into the area and obtain the permission of two residents who expressed their willingness to allow the Commissioners of Health or the Government to erect the standposts on their lands, and I really thought that the matter would have been very easy after that permission had been obtained; but I find that up to now the people in that area are still travelling the same long distance to obtain water.

Perhaps this debate may serve a useful purpose. I sincerely hope it would have the effect of stepping up the erection of the standpipes in those areas so as to alleviate the sufferings of the people in those districts where they have to travel a distance to obtain water.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I have a small contribution to make to this debate and it is by way of asking a question. With respect to Item 35, Delivery of Water by lorry, I am wondering if the Hon. Minister can tell me why is it changed from non-recurrent expenditure to recurrent expenditure? Why are we going to say that this will be a permanent method of obtaining water? When you place it under recurrent expenditure, you give it a sort of permanency which I do not like. If we are going to remedy the distances which people have to walk for water, let us go about it as quickly as we can; do not let us be optimistic as to regard this method of supplying water by motor lorry as a normal way for those people to get water.

I would like to enlarge on what my colleague had to say on the opening of new tenancies, or what is more correct the developing of new areas. Quite recently, the Board of Health has altered its opinion, an opinion that it always regretfully held, that standpipes should be at least 220 yards away from any spot that is to be sold out as a house spot. Well, who can disagree with that opinion, except we agree that the distance should be less. But, Sir, as I have argued at the time, what is the use of saying that, when you are not going to allow the developer of the area to put in a standpipe or standpipes as the case may be. Quite recently, we have heard the Government overruling the Waterworks Department or the Hon. Minister in charge, in the opinion given that this land can be developed and the person given the option to erect standposts thereon. They say that you cannot erect standposts thereon because there are no houses on that land. Yet they are saying that they will not let you put a house there unless a house

spot is within 220 yards of a standpipe. Let us face facts. The distance of 440 yards which was originally set out in the Act is very inconvenient for people to travel to get a bucket of water. You will find that the people of to-day are moving from one district into another because of the water supply; and it is the duty of the Government to furnish them with water so that even if the developer of land is compelled to see that the farthest spot he is selling out is less than 440 yards away from a standpipe, when the area becomes a densely populated area, the Government should step in and put in water in that district.

9.55 p.m.

It is of no use telling me that somebody is putting in the standpost and collecting a higher price for the land. The Government has its assessors to assess the value of the land, and all that can be done before the work starts. If you do not want these developers to put in the standpipes, if they want to sell bare land and make money out of it, they will put in the standpost in the same manner as they supply private roads. Quite recently the Government has said one thing in respect of some plan passed by the Board of Health; that is, that no houses are there and therefore they will not put in these standposts which have been recommended by the Commissions of Health for the particular parish; but how can you sell out the land if the standpost is there? The Board of Health will not approve of the Plan unless there is the guarantee that water is there. We are making it very difficult for anybody but a rich person to come in and sell land; the more difficulties you put in the way the more money the people will have to pay for the land. I say: allow the developers to get within 400 yards of the standpipe and sell out their land. I feel that in addition to everything else, if the Board of Health authorities say that in order for this land to be habitable these amenities should be supplied, it is of no use saying that you are not allowing them to put in water. We hope we will soon hear that the Government will facilitate the putting in of these standposts in places which are about to be developed by the developer himself.

There is another point: I would like the Hon. Minister to tell me if the Government has got any good results from the appointment of the debt collector at the Water Works Department. I see that the Commission which is put down for him is \$400 this year. I remember the controversy raised in here over this matter. I would like to get some report to the effect that these arrears have been collected and that they are not being accumulated.

Hon. M. E. COX: In reply to the hon. junior member for the City as to the question of removing this Item from recurrent expenditure to non-recurrent expenditure, it has been our experience that you will have a burst pipe at any time and it is necessary to carry the water by lorry to the place affected. It is a certainty that you will have to carry water to areas in which there are burst pipes there it is necessary to keep the Item on the recurrent list. As to the question of installing standpipes on private people's land, I can see that the hon. member is trying to get around the law as it stands today. The hon. member is a member of the General Board of Health and I am sure he knows that the Act does not say that you have to install standpipes. Section 52 (1) of the Public Health Act says this:

"There shall not be any division and letting
"in lots or any division and sale in lots of any land
"until there shall have been deposited with the

"Board by the owner or possessor of the land a
"plan in duplicate prepared by a sworn surveyor,
"drawn to scale not smaller than forty feet to one
"inch in respect of any lot or division which shall
"comprise five acres or over of land, and showing
"the situation, quantity and boundaries of the land,
"and the number of size of the lots into which the
"land is proposed to be divided, the position and
"width of the roads or streets and of the gutters
"or trenches for taking off water to be made or constructed over and through the land, and the levels
"for surface drainage, together with a statement
"describing the proposed provision for the supply
"of water for the consumption and use for domestic
"purposes of the persons who may become dwellers
"on the land, and the proposed provision for necessary sanitary arrangements; and such owner or
"possessor of the land shall also set forth such
"further particulars, either on the plan or in the
"statement aforesaid, as the Board may from time
"to time prescribed by regulations. Provided that
"there provision for the supply of water for the
"purposes aforesaid is made by piping for a supply
"from the Water Works Department a statement
"and plan descriptive of the proposed provision
"shall be submitted to the Water Works Department and approved by the same."

This does not refer to any standpost. The law lays it down that you must provide a sufficient supply of water for the people who are prepared to dwell on that land.

Now sir, the particular case to which he is referring is one I made mention of a few nights ago in Queen's Park. I am still convinced that I was acting in the best interest of the community when I made it clear that that was a move which was being made to get around the Act. The hon. junior member for St. Andrew has a plantation to sell out called Baxters—

10.05 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not think the hon. member is going right.

Hon. M. E. COX: Another member referred to it. However, sir, I know the particular case. What happened? An individual wants to develop his land, but instead of doing as other people do, people like Yearwood in the Pine and other people, instead of going to the Waterworks Department and getting permission to lay down four-inch or five-inch mains so as to provide an adequate supply of water for the people who will inhabit these areas, (the individual being a member of the Sanitary Commissioners) he submits something to the Waterworks Department asking them—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member still referring to that?

Mr. M. E. COX: I do not know how else I can explain my position. The hon. junior member for the City is a member of the Board of Health. I appeal to Your Honour to give me an opportunity of explaining the position. He went and appealed to the Board in the first place and the Board recommended that a standpost be pushed in a cart path.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member does not know what he is saying at all. He has made a charge and he is willing to say anything to prove it.

Hon. M. E. COX: I object to those remarks. The hon. member is trying to make people think that I am saying something which is untrue. I am saying what is the gospel truth. The sanitary authorities to whom I am referring—

Mr. LEWIS: His own Waterworks Department told the Board of Health that water would

be available to those people. The Waterworks acted in the same way as they have acted in every other instance.

Hon. M. E. COX: The individual concerned goes into this cart path and a very unusual thing happens. I want to reply to the hon. senior member for the City. It is the duty of the Sanitary Commissioners to provide a platform for standposts, also a proper drainage or well for taking off the waste water. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Show me the authority.]

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: The reason is, that the sanitary authority of the parish would be responsible for the cleaning of the gutters. The Government puts up standposts in particular areas and the Legislature agrees to them being put in these areas; but if the Commissioners do not provide for the taking off of the water they will say that the Commissioners are breeding mosquitoes.

Hon. M. E. COX: Let me thank the last honourable member for his information; but I want to assure him that that is stale news. I know all about that report. What I am saying is that a very unusual thing happened. It is the duty of the Commissioners to erect the platforms; that has been customary and it is still customary.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It is customary but it is not their duty.

Hon. M. E. COX: On what point is the honourable member getting up?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Since he has been in office they have changed that system.

Hon. M. E. COX: The Waterworks have never erected one platform.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: They have erected pipes—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member keep quiet?

Hon. M. E. COX: Everyone knows that the Waterworks Department puts down the pipes. Everyone knows, or should know, that is has been and still is the practice of the Sanitary Commissioners to build platforms and also to provide drainage for the waste water. All I am trying to say is that in the case to which I am referring, the Sanitary authorities of that particular area did not erect any platform or take part in any provision for the drainage of water; this was done by the owner himself who was selling out this land.

That is very unusual and extraordinary behaviour; I will not put it any stronger. I was asked to look at the site and I said I could not justify the Waterworks spending any money to put a standpost in that particular area. If I had allowed that to be done, I am sure that the honourable senior member for the City would have been the first to come here and start a vote of censure. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I agree with you on that.]

You just could not justify it. The gentleman as I said, erected the platform and made all the arrangements out of his own pocket; and after that he called on the Waterworks Department to run a half-inch pipe for some hundred feet in some blind alley where no one lives.

I will go further and say that I knew before that another part of that land was to be sold out. No standpipe was there for years, and the same sanitary authorities before Ministerial Government started decided to get the Waterworks Department to put a pipe there, and soon afterwards the land was sold. That is contrary to the Act as it stands. The Act says, that before you can sell such lands you must

make provision for a proper supply of water on the site.

10.15 p.m.

We have been faced in recent years with the ugly spectacle of having people every now and then coming to us and telling us that they bought this or that land and no provision was made for water; and as a result, the Government has had to foot the bill. We cannot get water in those places fast enough, and the people who sell out those areas of land sell them out at exorbitant prices and then leave the dead on the poor taxpayer who never drew any benefit from the sale of the land or otherwise, to pay for installing standposts in these areas. That is the position as it stands to-day. A case escaped notice sometime ago where a pipe was put on a site where nobody was living around at the time, but soon afterwards the area was developed and a number of poor people carried their houses there to find that there was no water in the area. That sort of thing is not going to continue where my Ministry is concerned; at least, not as long as I have a say in how things should be run.

Sir, the honourable junior member for St. James said that whenever a pipe was to be installed, the Health authorities of the particular area always came to members of the House to get their agreement. He did not actually say whether the House passed it; I did not get that out of him; so I take it to mean that they always agreed with them.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: It appears to me as if his hearing is very bad or he went out of the Committee, or he was not listening. You cannot pass it unless you come in here and show the plan. The Hon. Minister will remember how I pulled his leg because he did not bring in the big map when he was dealing with a Resolution to give approval to the extension of the water service on the last occasion. When I made reference to the map, he pushed his hands in his pocket to see if he could find it and there were roars of laughter. You cannot pass it unless you come in here and show the plan. I talked about the co-operation which used to be invited in the method of securing the passage of the Resolution. At that time, party government was not in existence, and if you came in asking for the approval to two standposts being erected in a particular place and the two members of the House of the particular parish did not agree with your plan, you could never get the other members of the House to agree with it.

Hon. M. E. COX: What the honourable member said about map in my pocket is not so. He is a bit humorous! [A VOICE: It did happen in here.] Sir, I was in this House since December 1944 and I am yet to see the time when the honourable junior member for St. James who used to conduct the business of the Government come to this House to get the approval of the House to the extension of the Waterworks service to say, Josey Hill, Coach Hill or any other place, and passed a Book of Reference. I am satisfied from my time in this House that it was only on the removal of standpipes beyond a certain distance that permission would be sought from this House. Section 27 of the Waterworks Act says:—

“The Department shall maintain, provide, and fix proper standpipes upon their main and other pipes at such places as the Legislature may determine, from which the inhabitants may take water for domestic purposes, for their domestic stock, and for stock or for use in vehicles propelled by mechanical power, if they require it when on a *bona fide* journey, between the hours of 5 o'clock in the morning and 10 o'clock at night.

A VOICE: That is amended.

Hon. M. E. COX: The honourable member cannot interrupt with those wrong statements. No amendment was made to this particular section. The question of water has been my portfolio since 1948. That section of the Act gives the right to the Waterworks Department to remove any standpipe within the limit of twenty yards but not beyond that distance without reference to the Legislature.

Sir, I contend that except in cases of new developments on Government estates, or the removal of standpipes to a greater length than twenty yards, no plan has ever come before this House. We have brought from time to time plans for the removal of standpipes to a greater length than is laid down in the law. We have also brought before this House plans for the development of new areas such as the Bay Estate and the Pine, but not even when private individuals make applications for names on new developments have I ever seen a plan brought in here. I pay great attention to the work of this House and to the Rules of this House. As I have said, I have never seen plans brought here to put a standpipe, say, at Westbury Road or any place like that. Let us check on the old Debates to see whether that used to happen. The practice has always been for the Sanitary Commissioners of the various parishes to submit to the Waterworks Department lists for the installation of standpipes in the various areas and upon those submissions the Waterworks Department would act. To say that there is no co-operation and harmony existing today is misleading. It remains the same as it was previously. Sir, in the parish of St. Lucy the Waterworks Department laid mains for water and many months afterwards the platforms were not erected. The delay was so lengthy that some of the residents came to me about it and I had to point out that the Waterworks Department had already done its part when it laid down the mains, and it was left to the sanitary authorities of the parish to erect the platforms and allow for drainage either by pushing the water down into the gully or in a well. As a matter of fact, we did circularise all the sanitary authorities asking them to speed up the tempo of the erection of platforms in order that I do not attach any blame to the sanitary authorities.

I want to touch now on a matter raised by the honourable member for the City concerning something which was in the newspaper.

10.25 p.m.

Sometime in January it was reported in the newspaper that there was no water either in Robert's Tenantry or in Fairfield; I know that water had already been installed in those areas. I went along and saw for myself; it was rather strange when I read that report, and I therefore went again to satisfy myself that there was water in the area.

Since 1953 water was installed in the areas mentioned. It matters nothing to me if somebody wants to get in the Vestry; I would like to see the truth explained on all occasions; but it is regrettable that some people will take it upon themselves to mislead the public at times. It is definitely misleading for the Press to be told by the Vestry as late as January 1955 that no water was in these areas in 1954, and it was through the instigation and persistence of Mr. Hewitt that water was put in that area.

In so far as the question asked by the honourable junior member for the City in connection with the appointment of the Debt Collector at the Department, I must apologise to him because I have not got that information. However, I will get the information and pass it on to him as soon as possible.

The honourable junior member for St. James asked how many standpipes are installed throughout the island in the various villages. I do not know whether he was here sometime in December when the question arose during the consideration of the Resolution to approve a Book of Reference on the Clinketts' Housing Scheme in St. Lucy, and I gave the figures. To those figures recent installations must be added. There are in existence 826 standpipes in the island; Christ Church, 86; St. Philip, 60; St. George, 65; St. Joseph, 62; St. John, 53; St. Andrew, 58; St. Peter, 58; St. Lucy, 61; St. Thomas, 55; St. James 58; and St. Michael the Metropolitan area 211. [Laughter].

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I asked how many services were attached in the different parishes.

Hon. M. E. COX: Due to the financial position of many people there must be many more services in St. Michael and in Christ Church than they would be in the other parishes, because the other parishes comprise mainly of agricultural workers who would not be in a position to install these services. However, I will get the information and pass it on to the honourable member as soon as possible.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member knows as well as I do that there could be no question of people assisting others in selling out land. In so far as the Board of Health is concerned we refuse to let people sell out their land if the water is not within a certain area. There are times when you can only put down the pipe since there is no water. At one time the Government said that there were air pockets in the mains; if you object to putting down the pipe whether or not houses are there, and you go on with that, how can you get any development at all?

As far as water is concerned the Board of Health said that some houses could not be built on spots unless there was a supply of water of their own. Water must be provided in the house by the person selling out the land. I do not think the honourable member is right there at all; I think he must have misunderstood the whole situation.

10.35 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: There is one thing which I want to tell the honourable member. The honourable senior member for the City has disposed of a piece of land in the City, and the Waterworks Department granted him permission to supply water to the people in the same area.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The honourable member wants to impress people that he is the only honest and truthful man in the island. When I see anyone who pretends to be so honest, I keep my hands on anything I have in my pocket. He still has that old feeling that he had when he first came into the House of Assembly. He has risen to a position of responsibility and has not dropped that petty feeling yet. He should sit and talk with the Premier or with the Minister of Agriculture who for years have been following the development of land as a vocation. The Hon. Minister has read the Public Health Act and he misunderstands the whole thing.

When the Board of Health came into being in 1928, the law said they should make regulations; they have not made one yet. No one has attempted to carry them before the High Courts to make regulations. Here you have a standing rule which says if you are going to develop land the furthest point from any Government standpost must not be 440 yards. The Minister has accused my colleague of trying to help big business develop land. If the Hon. Minister thinks that the harder you make regulations the better it is his business—I am trying to point

something out to him and this Government for the benefit of the people.

The Act was amended in 1945, and it called upon the owners of all tenancies. Take Rosegate in St. John: that tenancy has existed for 30 or 40 years. If you want to develop land you make applications to the Board of Health and they say "yes" as long as the furthest spot from the Government standpost is 440 yards. I am asking the Government to make it harder for the land lords and easier for the tenants. Instead of saying to a man who owns a tenancy valued at £30,000 that the furthest spot from the Government standpost should be 440 yards, I am saying that you should call on him to install water within the tenancy at his own expense. I am not asking the Government to spend any money to help anyone develop his land. Is that helping big business? It is hard to get some thing in some people's heads.

On the other hand under the 1928 Act, which the honourable member has been reading, (let him ask the Minister of Agriculture) it is for the Waterworks Department to say where water in the area is available. The honourable member referred to Blue Waters and those places. When you are developing an area like that you are not making application to develop an area where someone will have to go a quarter mile for water, therefore, you tell the Board of Health in such cases that the houses will have a supply of water from the Government mains, and you are told that there must be a four-inch main. When you are developing such areas as Blue Waters, Highgates and Pine Hill, you are not developing a place like Ellerton in St. George where there are peasants.

What, I repeat, is wrong with telling a man who has a tenancy to put in water at his own expense? He cannot do it now. Ask the Minister of Agriculture who has been following the development of land for years.

10.45 p.m.

Now in the case which the honourable member referred to-day, I would be the first to say 'No' if any person who wanted to develop land would want to go to the Waterworks Department and ask them to put a standpipe in the area; and that is why I agree one hundred percent with what the honourable member said. However I would say that there are areas where the standpipes are 440 yards away and it would be better if you carry water nearer to the people. The question of having a pipe not more than 220 yards away is a better proposition than 440 yards which was laid down in the Act. If you take Carringtons Village and Welches, (those are old developed areas) Carringtons Village having more than 1,600 houses, you therefore put a plan to the Commissioners of Health of St. Michael saying that you want to develop that area. As a result, you lay down a four-inch main because it is your hope that every householder will install his own domestic service. However, you cannot compel anybody to install water; therefore, it is your duty to install standpipes at reasonable distances.

Let me say that this House makes the laws but the Chief Justice is there to say how they can be put into force; no Minister can say that. Now, suppose we start to sell out Carringtons Village, you can go down the street and get water or any householder there can ask you to install water on his premises. Again, suppose Bosvigo is to be set up for sale; all the owners would have to do is to submit their application to the Board of Health with a plan showing that there is a standpipe at Eagle Hall corner, and the Board has no alternative but to

approve of the application. But what I want to say is that you should go further than what you are at present doing. Go to the same Bosvigo again. Can anybody living there put in their own domestic service? No. You should be able, at the owners of that land expense, to lay a main through that tenancy so that the people there could install their own domestic service. Certainly it would prevent them from having to travel 440 yards to the public standpipe; that is what I have been asking for all the time. I agree with the Hon. Premier when he says that no person should be allowed to sell out his property in lots when he wants Government eventually to put in a standpipe at the expense of Government. Surely if you do it for one, you would have to do it for all.

An accusation has been made against the General Board of Health. Whatever went wrong, went wrong with the Commissioners of Health of the particular parish. Let me say that all that the Board of Health is interested in is the Plan put in by the surveyor. The Board then asks the Waterworks Department whether it can supply water in that area and if the Waterworks Department agrees, the Board approves of the matter and its work is finished. Suppose for instance you make application for a place in St. Andrew; it is within your knowledge that the Government's water main is running along the road. All you have to see is that the water supply is here and it is from Government's mains and that will be the end of the matter; but I am saying that you can do better for the people. Another instance is this: I have 60 acres of land running along the public road; it is not in the Pine Hill or the Navy Gardens but the farthest spot of land is not more than 440 yards from the standpipe. The Board of Health has no alternative but to approve of it because the standpipe is less than 440 yards from the farthest spot of land. The people who buy that land still have to travel 440 yards before they get to a standpipe while you should make the person who is making application to develop the land to erect at his own expense a standpipe. Again I would say that it is the duty of the Government to see that the people get better sanitary and social conditions than they got years ago. All I am saying is that you should amend the Waterworks Act so as to give permission to persons to put in their own standpipes. I go as far as to say that it should be given to those applicants who are not even selling out their land because applications that come before the Board of Health are also for land to be rented out in lots, and the same conditions apply.

Mr. Chairman, most of this development takes place in the country and this development not merely applies to persons who want to sell out land only, it also applies to those persons who are renting out house spots. As it stands now the owner of any plantation in St. Joseph can take any back area of his land if he is so willing, and put a Plan before the Board of Health and so long as he can show that a standpipe is not more than 220 yards from the farthest spot he wants to sell, the Board of Health will approve of it. The same conditions apply if he is going to rent out the land. What I am saying is that if a man wants to do that he should at his own expense put in a standpipe. That would be infinitely better.

10.55 p.m.

I can remember selling out Farmers at one time and I pointed out that even if you have a Town and Country Planning Bill, you have got to bear in mind that you are going to zone your areas.

There are certain areas with houses of a certain value and the like. Are you still going to bring in regulations applying American laws? There is no statute in the island which states that you must sell land for agricultural purposes; such land must still apply the same rigid test. You are selling some land on the main road; a peasant is buying a piece of that land and he is going to improve his condition; are you saying that the same conditions which apply to Blue Waters must apply there? I have spoken with the Director of Medical Services and he says that you must take the economic condition of the people into consideration. I suggest that if you are selling out land tomorrow with the amended regulations, you have to go within 220 yards of water, while I think that for the purpose of developing the land as long as water is there, as long as you can get a supply of water, you can go in and buy.

I heard the honourable member making certain suggestions as to the development of land. What is wrong in an individual acting on his own and calling on the Government to do certain things? I suggest that the Act should be amended giving certain rights to the individual. You cannot say that the land should be developed with a better water supply and in the same breath say that you cannot put water because the land has already been developed. I counsel the honourable member to amend the Act and he would be doing a service to the community.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will consider that point.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is a matter for him and for the Board of Health; but as far as I am concerned, I am satisfied that the Government would make something out of it for the benefit of the community. I do not think it should be said if you allow that to happen Mr. "X" will make too much money.

Mr. BARROW: I would like to point out to the Hon. Minister of Communications that there is no authority under the Act for standposts to be erected either by the Commissioners of Health, or by anybody else. Since the honourable member has become a Minister he uses language which is in contra-distinction to the English word which is used in the Act itself. The Act refers to "Standpipes" not "Standposts". The Act says this: "The Department shall maintain, provide and fix proper standpipes upon their main and other pipes at such places as the Legislature may determine..." The honourable member is talking about one thing and I am talking about another; apparently he has some Act which gives him authority to consult the Commissioners of Health and take their advice. I said up to last year that he is wrong; he has no right going into any parish and deciding where to put standposts, especially when he does it without bringing in the Book of Reference and letting us know what is going on.

11.05 p.m.

Now, I would like to say that I agree entirely with the honourable junior member for St. James, (and it is not everything that I agree with him on) when he pointed out that you can make statistics prove anything. The Minister of Communications gave the game away when he said that people in agricultural areas do not normally have the domestic water service. That is the very reason why you should have more standpipes in the rural areas than in St. Michael, because in St. Michael nearly every other house has the water service while in the rural areas of places like St. George and your parish, the water is far away; and whether you want to put it in your house or not there is not the remotest chance

of getting water in your village unless it is done through the department at the instigation of the Minister and with the approval of the House.

For all the time that I have been in this Chamber, I only remember during the last four years that the Minister brought in a book of reference on one occasion in this House. Apparently, before that he was not aware of what a book of reference looked like. If you look at Section 12, you will see that a book of reference and plan must be put in, because it says in that section that "it shall not be lawful for the Department to proceed in the extension or establishment of any waterworks hereby authorised unless they shall, previous to the commencement thereof, lay before the Legislature for approval a plan showing the limits of the parts of the proposed waterworks, prepared on a scale of not less than three inches to the mile, and a plan and sections showing all works for obtaining and storing the water, in detail, with a book of reference thereto for the better understanding of the same; and the said plan when approved of shall be deposited in the Colonial Secretary's Office, of this Island etc."

Now, what I want to say is, that there would have been no necessity for my asking any questions as to the number of standpipes in St. Michael, St. George, or any other parish, if in matters of courtesy aside, he had followed the law and brought in a book of reference showing what extensions he was going to undertake. When he said that from 1934 he does not remember the now honourable junior member for St. James bringing in any book of reference, he must remember that in 1935, £150,000 was voted for Waterworks extension, and all the plans were made in 1935 for the next ensuing seven or eight years; and every single standpipe to be extended or erected was put on the Statute Book of Barbados and can be seen now in the Schedule of the Waterworks Loan Act, 1939.

They went further; you will see the exact distances involved in the erection or removal of the standpipe set out in the Act. All that having been done, there will be no necessity to bring in a book of reference at all. If the Hon. Minister is relying on that as a precedent for not doing those things which he should do, I would like to remind him again that until such day as he succeeds in catching the House offguard and changing the Waterworks Act, I want to know what standpipes are to be erected and I want to see the plan.

He cannot go to the Commissioners in the Vestry Room and decide where he will put standpipes in the parish I represent. When he says he can do what he likes, he is accustomed to doing what he likes, but does not always do it legally. If he wants to commit murder with the taxpayers' money in that way he must take the consequences of his act. I must say that he does not seem to realise that what he is doing is wrong.

I would like to comment on one other matter under this Head although it is time that the House be adjourned. Sometime ago, the Minister for Communications came with a Resolution to pay a debt collector to collect water rates which had accumulated over a long period of years. You will remember sir, that the Minister of Communications made a statement in the House to the effect that there were a lot of bad debts in the books of the Department and they wanted \$200 to pay a debt collector to collect these debts. The members of the House did not like the idea of debt collectors being appointed to Government departments, because there will soon be an established figure of £2,000 a year to pay a collector of the Waterworks Department

and other departments; and you will find all the stooges in these positions.

The very idea of having a debt collector in a Government department is obnoxious; but the Minister said that there were long outstanding arrears, although he could not tell us what was the particular amount due and owing. We said to write it off and that the Government were lucky that there was only a small amount outstanding. I said that the Government would find it very difficult to find any debt collector in Bridgetown who would collect debts at less than 20% commission, and therefore, the amount must be in the region of \$1,000 and \$1,100. The Minister eventually sent someone for the figures and the amount turned out to be \$1,200.

Several members pointed out that these arrears had been long outstanding and that the majority of people were either dead, or did not intend to pay or were out of the island; (I think that was the language of the Minister) and some had removed to other districts. We pointed out that if the people were dead you could not collect the money. If they were out of the island they were out of the Court's jurisdiction. If they were in other districts you would have to spend a lot of money to find them. We said to forget the whole thing. Those were long outstanding arrears. We never had a debt collector before.

What I want to know now is if the Minister is saying that since we have started to pay a debt collector, we will get an average of \$2,000 a year uncollected by the Waterworks Department when in all the years only \$1,000 was outstanding.

It does not make sense because the debt collector will charge 20%. I am still opposed to the idea of the debt collector on another ground. You have to take a clerk from the department to prove before the Petty Debt Judge that the person owes the debt; the debt collector cannot prove that. You are still sending your Civil Servants to the Courts and you are still giving your Writ Servers a lot of trouble. I can say that Mr. Crane from the Income Tax Department and Mr. Pilgrim from the Parochial Treasurer's Office of St. Michael go in the Petty Debt Courts for 15 minutes on mornings that they have cases to attend to, and they clear off all their arrears and get judgment against their defaulters in that time. Now, in all those years previous, you only had \$1,100 arrears; in this year of grace you expect that it will be some \$2,400. It seems to me that you are trying to set up some new department in the Government; and I am insinuating that the next thing you are going to hear is that on the permanent staff of the Barbados Government is a Debt Collector. That is the only conclusion I can come to when I see this.

11.15 p.m.

Mr E. K. WALCOTT: Sir, the Hon Minister of Communications in referring to the question of bringing in the plan of reference said he was going to look it up. I did a little looking up myself and I got the Librarian to take down a few volumes of the debates and go through them for me. I have some here but I am not going to read from all. On the 28th June, 1938, when Mr. F. W. HOLDER, B.A., was acting Attorney General, he dealt with an extension of Waterworks in St. Michael and in so doing he asked leave of the House to proceed with Order No. 40 standing in his name: to move the passing of a Resolution for approval of Book of Reference and Plan of the proposed extension of Waterworks in the parish of St. Michael. There was objection but he was allowed to do it the House dividing 10—3.

In moving the passing of the Resolution Mr. Holder said:

"Mr. Speaker,—This Resolution seeks to obtain the approval of the House in respect of the Book

of Reference and Plan of the proposed extension of the Waterworks in the parish of St. Michael. It comes before this House for approval in accordance with sections 20 to 25 of the Waterworks Act 1895. The proposal is to erect a standpipe in connection with the existing pipes of the Department in Beekles Road, St. Michael. The proposed site of the standpipe will be seen on the general plan of the Waterworks by the letter K surrounded by a red circle. The cost of erecting the proposed standpipe will be borne by the applicants, namely, the owners of the Bay Estate. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass."

It was seconded by Mr. Elder and then passed.

We all hear that they cannot do it so but that is not so. The Waterworks was taken over from a private company and if you go through the old Act you will see that it was run by a Board of Management. The Waterworks was vested in them and they had the authority through that Act to lay pipes for which you paid. In this case in the Bay Estate a pipe was put on to the existing pipes of the department in Beekles Road, St. Michael. The owner of the Bay Estate asked for the erection and promised to pay the cost of erection and also for the water which came out of that standpipe. You will have to pay for it anyhow, therefore you bring it here because water comes out of it. Nowadays we are paying for it out of the taxes collected from the people.

I will refer to something which is not on the same subject. On the 23rd November, 1938 with the extension of the water supply in St. Lucy, on being called upon by Mr. Speaker, the honourable senior member for St. Lucy who was then a member of the House put the following questions standing in his name:—

"1. Whether the Government appreciates the necessity of extending water mains and erecting additional standpipes in certain districts of St. Lucy, i.e.—

- (a) Checker Hall
- (b) Roaches, near Animal Flower Cave, and
- (c) Round Rock Road, Chance Hall?

2. When was the attention of the Public Works Department first drawn to the fact that additional facilities for water were requisite in the above districts, and upon how many occasions thereafter?

3. If it is a fact that a considerable time ago the main pipes have been extended in the Checker Hall District, what is the reason for delay in erecting an additional standpipe there?

4. Whether the Governor-in-Executive will brook no further delay on the part of the Public Works Department relative to the erection of standpipes in all areas in St. Lucy and elsewhere, where ever same may be necessary in this colony?"

The answers to those questions were given by me. I replied as follows:—

1. The extensions referred to are included in the Schedule of Improvements to the scheme of water distribution which will in due course be submitted to the House.

2. In December, 1936, the Governor circulated the Vestries of all the parishes asking to be informed whether any further extensions were considered necessary for the improvement of the water supply of the island.

On the 26th of January, 1937, a reply was received from St. Lucy's Vestry that the following three extensions were necessary:—

- (1) Extensions of the main at Checker Hall Village to the end of the highway.
- (2) Extension of the main at Wakenham to Jordan's Village.
- (3) Extensions of the main at Union to the Cave.

On the 24th April, 1937, a further request was made for an extension down Chance Hall Hill to Round-Rock Road.

On the 31st August 1938 a further request was made for an extension to the Northern section of Checker Hall district.

3. A length of main as authorised by the House of Assembly under the Improvement of water supply scheme was laid to supply a standpipe, but the Sanitary Commissioners did not approve the position of the standpipe. The site they required necessitated the laying of an additional length of 345 yards of main. This extension has been included in the Further Improvement of Water Supply Scheme.

4. There has been no delay on the part of the Public Works Department in the erection of Standpipes throughout the island under the Waterwork's Extension Scheme. The Department is awaiting the provision of funds for the further improvement under the Waterworks Improvement Scheme which will be submitted to the House.

Now Sir, the honourable senior member for St. George pointed out to me sometime earlier this evening where there is a section of the Public Health Act which actually required the Sanitary Commissioners for the respective parishes to build the necessary facilities for carrying off water, drainage and so on, but as you will see from these questions and answers not merely was it a case of standpipes but also of the mains. I have understood from information which I asked that the map was only brought in once and that was on the occasion when I asked about the book of reference. It was not brought in since but that is what is supposed to be done. You will see in addition to that, that on no occasion in these days was this House otherwise treated with

the courtesy which it was required to be treated, because by the provision of the law it would have to be done.

11.25 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Before you put the question, I would like to say that people are selling land at exorbitant rates because of the Government's appraisers who are sent in to value this land.

If that matter can be attended to, it might do some good.

The question that the sum of \$673,707 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XLI—Social Welfare

Head XLI—Social Welfare—was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the sum of \$10,306 be voted under this Head.

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

The question that the sum of \$10,306 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I would have liked to finish all these Heads but honourable members would like to go home. I therefore beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

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

The motion was put and agreed to.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that this House do now adjourn until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The motion was put and agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

11.35 p.m.