THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1955—56

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 27th March, 1956.

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

Present:

His Honour K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*), Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), His Honour A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Hon. M. E. COX (*Minister of Communications, Works and 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. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of the Opposition*), 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*), and Mrs. E. E. BOURNE.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that Minutes of the last meetings are not yet ready for confirmation.

DOCUMENTS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay Message No. 4/1956, from His Excellency the Governor to the House of Assembly regarding the prorogation of the Legislature. The Message reads thus:—

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable House of Assembly that he proposes to prorogue the Legislature on Tuesday, the 3rd of April, 1956, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Also Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for eleven months ended 29th February, 1956.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services, to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of this Island.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether you are ready to enlighten me on the point which I raised on the last occasion about the Resolution for $127,544.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order. I would like to say first of all that the point raised by the hon. member does not concern the motion but when the time comes the hon. member will get an explanation from the Minister in charge.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking for enlightenment on the question he raised about the Resolution for $127,544. He did give us notice of it a week ago. I will tell the hon. member that it is my opinion that since this Resolution is for the acquisition of buses, the only source from which money Resolutions can come is from the Governor-in-Executive Committee. It is the only source from which it can come to this Chamber and the only source upon which this Chamber can act upon Money Resolutions. The Government may at any time transfer the amount of money to the Government Transport Board to administer the money of the recently established Transport System. The Administration of the Government Transport system is a different matter altogether. As a matter of fact, no Resolution for the acquisition of buses can come from any other source. It can only come in the form of a Resolution from the Governor-in-Executive Committee, which is the only authority for us to proceed on a money Resolution; so I do not know that there is any irregular procedure in the Resolution being handled as it is being handled. I do not think there is any irregularity at all. It means this money may be handed over to the Board who will in turn assume all its responsibilities administratively and this Resolution can only come on the authorisation of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. That is my ruling.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am not against that, Sir, but the point I made was that it was not an Administrative Board but virtually a Corporation. That was my point, and with reference to the point of Order, if I needed to object to the

Resolution I would have taken objection when the House was sending it to the Committee of Supply.

3.25 p.m.

The question that His Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Re-organisation of Water Supplies

Hon. M. E. COX: This Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is for the sum of $1. The Addendum states:

> The rapid increase in the demand for water which has resulted from various factors, but mainly from the increase in population and the improved standard of living since the reorganisation of the water supply started in 1950, makes it necessary to augment the pumping facilities of the Waterworks Department, and the purpose of this Resolution is to seek token provision of $1 for two Harland Spindle pumps costing $30,000 each, which are capable of pumping 2,000,000 gallons per day each. The period of delivery of these pumps is 60 weeks following on order.

The Addendum also explains that it is the intention of the Government to apply to the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation for funds for this purpose. On the last occasion when I attempted to get this Resolution through the House, the reason was fairly obvious in that the longer we delayed in ordering these pumps, the greater is the risk that the inhabitants of this island might wake up on one morning to find that there is no water. We have already lost a week in respect of the delivery of these pumps, since this delivery requires 60 weeks.

Hon. members will remember that some time ago a debate took place in this House on this question of water supply, and I promised the House at that time that I would give an explanation as to the position of the water services, and more particularly, in respect of the pumps. There are four 115 h.p. pumps and two 96 h.p. pumps which have not been giving very good service. After various discussions, suggestions and proposals, it was decided to approach the makers with a view to having these pumps exchanged for smaller h.p. pumps. The reason for that decision was that the 35 h.p. and 45 h.p. pumps have given good satisfaction since 1935 when they were installed; but we have had trouble with the pumps which are over 50 h.p. It is true that with the exchange we would have had smaller h.p. pumps, yet it would be possible for us to be kept supplied with water in case anything took place.

The Report of the Chief Engineer in connection with these pumps is as follows:—

"At the present moment, the whole Island is served with water, but this is being effected only by emergency pumping due to the failure of the four 115 Horse Power Beresford Submersible Pumps at the Belle and two 96 Horse Power at Haymans. The other Beresford Pumps of similar Horse Power are giving excellent service."

That is the reason which prompted the Department in 1951 to order Beresford Pumps instead of any other Pumps, because we have had very good service from the Beresford Pumps which were in operation for some time.

The Report of the Chief Engineer goes on as follows:—

"In 1950, when the provision of the main Pumps at the Belle was discussed, it was decided to instal Beresford Submersibles. Up to that time all Beresfords had given good service on the Island, and there appeared to be little cause to doubt their efficiency in higher Horse Power". They were sponsored by the Crown Agents.

"Accordingly, in 1951, an order was placed for four 115 Horse Power Units for the Belle, and two 96 Horse Power Units for Haymans. These were received in 1952, in which year the Haymans' Units started working, while the four Belle Units functioned from 1953.

One of the Belle Pumps ran without trouble for 2½ years, one for 2 years, but the other two did not survive a year, and after major repairs necessitating despatch to the United Kingdom, only lasted another six months and three months respectively, and have been unreliable since.

Of the two Haymans' Units, one worked through from March, 1952, to December 1955 continuously and the other from March, 1952, to February, 1956 with a four months' break from January, 1953 to May, 1953.

Except for two of the Pumps at the Belle, the percentage of the time available for work in comparison with the period installed is, in all cases, over 90%, but when it is remembered that it should be 100%, it can be realised what anxiety is shouldered by those responsible for the supply of water.

Government have approached the makers with the suggestion of an exchange of these six highly-powered Pumps for a similar number of less Horse Power."

I may say at this stage, that it does not appear as if the makers are willing to make the exchanges. As a matter of fact, they represent that if they were to exchange these pumps or take them back, they could not dispose of them; but I should like to mention that the matter is still being discussed, and the developments and decision will be conveyed to the House in due course.

The Report goes on:—

"No reply has yet been received, but if they agree it would make all Submersible Units interchangeable, which is a great advantage. The design of the Unit appears to be deficient for Horse Power above 50 and the makers admit it required modification.

The local Agents, the Barbados Foundry Limited, have done all that was humanly possible to mitigate all trouble and difficulties, but with underground water resources, reliable pumping is essential.

It is therefore proposed to order two Harland Spindle Pumps capable of raising two million gallons per day each at the Belle. The period of supply is 60 weeks, but they are worth waiting for. The Crown Agents have been asked to obtain a quota for Units suitable for the conditions to be met.

Now, I would just like to say this, owing to the fact that on the last occasion some hon. members in reference to the pumping of water said that it was a very expensive job. One hon. member remarked that £1,000 was wasted every year, and all that sort of thing. Therefore I have tried to get these figures in order that the House should be aware of what has been spent on these pumps from time to time. The annual cost of repairs by the Barbados Foundry is $840. The annual cost to the Government when the pumps were returned to the makers for repairs averaged $2,558. As I have said, this figure does not represent the cost in every year. As I pointed out on the last occasion, in servicing these pumps they are removed, according to the maker's direction every one thousand hours and that costs $800 a year. I may say that that servicing is done by the Waterworks Department. The cost of transporting these pumps to and from the United Kingdom is $2,320.

That is the information which I have for the House so far as these pumps are concerned.

Now, we have been reliably informed that while these Harland pumps cost quite a considerable sum —and more than the Beresford pump— it is a fact that the Harland pumps are capable of giving about 20 years' service without having to interfere with them. As I have mentioned just now, you can get a Beresford pump in three or four months, whereas as regards the Harland pump it takes 60 weeks to get the order coming to you. As regards the Harland pumps, the motors are on the surface and can be easily repaired in the Island, so you can see that that in itself is an advantage; because as I have pointed out, the Beresford submersible pumps have to be sent out of the Island for repairs; nobody over here can interfere with them.

Sir, I am asking this Committee to agree to this token Resolution of $1 in order that you can proceed with the placing of an order for these pumps without delay. I now beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of $1 do now pass.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Minister before any debate take place can give this further information. Can he say what is the cost of a Beresford submersible pump, both the high and the low horsepower? Would he say that the $2,558 is the annual cost of the transporting and servicing of these pumps in England? I ask that question because the Hon. Minister gave two figures —$2,558 and $2,520. Would the Hon. Minister say whether these Harland spindle pumps are sponsored by the Crown Agents and if they are not sponsored by the Crown Agents, who are the agents for these pumps in Barbados?

Hon. M. E. COX: So far as I know, there are no agents for these pumps in Barbados. The cost of the four Beresford 115 horsepower pumps is $4,560 and the cost of the two 96 Beresford pumps is $6,682. You will appreciate that the larger Beresford pumps are older and were ordered long before the small ones. You will see that the two 96 horsepower pumps meet the increased cost including transportation.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, there are a few things which I would like to learn from the Hon. Minister about these pumps. With reference to the Beresford submersible pumps, I would like to know what caused the Government to change from the submersible pump to the spindle pump. When the four 115 horsepower pumps together with the two at Haymans were first bought, the Hon. Minister did say during the course of his remarks that the Government had made an approach to the manufacturers of these Beresford pumps with the hope that they would take any unsatisfactory machines back with a view to exchanging them for the better ones. There must be some reason operating in the minds of the Engineer and the Government that they have decided to change from submersible to spindle pumps, when modern trends for lifting large quantities of water is handled by the jet type equipment depending on the depths of water to be removed. As a matter of fact, the spindle type of pump is regarded as the old and reliable. I see the reason why the Government is making a strong approach to the manufacturers of these submersible pumps for a refund or replacement by more satisfactory equipment. If the submersible type of pump has failed just after two years of service, it is obvious that these pumps must have done a rather unsatisfactory job; and if the manufacturers from which they were ordered are reputable firms, I am very hesitant to believe that they will fail to replace these pumps. Surely, they will have a reputation which they will want to preserve. If you have this failing of our 115 horsepower pumps, surely there must be some justification for reclaim. I probably see that your engineers have been so disappointed in these submersible pumps that rather than continue to carry that type of pump, they have changed to the spindle type of pump; but obviously the change to the spindle type of pump is the result of disgust. It must have been maddening to the engineer who has the responsibility of getting water for the community to see these submersible pumps failing. Obviously, you can see the Engineer's nose on the grinding stone trying to satisfy the Government and to protect the Government's investment and at the same time trying to bring sufficient water to the people.

I do not know if the Hon. Minister is in a position to enlighten me, but I do hope he is. I must confess that I am just anxious to know what is the reason for changing from the submersible pumps to spindle pumps. Was it out of disgust owing to the way in which the particular submersible pumps were working or was it that the Engineer dreamt that he should change the type of lift? In short, was it that your decision to use the spindle type of pump was taken through the unsatisfactory working of the submersible type of pump? If "yes" is the answer, tell me why the Engineer did not think of using the jet type of pump.

3.45 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: If I remember correctly, the Engineer never mentioned anything about these pumps, but he pointed out not long ago where this Harland Spindle Pump was used since 1935 up to now. I do not remember that we have had any trouble from it. They feel it is the best type of pump for the job. I did not answer the point raised by the hon. junior member for the City. When I mentioned the figures the transportation costs as I pointed out was $2,320 but the cost of repairs which include parts is $2,558.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am making one comment at this stage, and I am sorry that the hon. junior member for St. George has gone. After all, the Resolution came into the House last Tuesday and one would not have imagined that the hon. member who had some knowledge about the Jet and Spindle pumps would have waited until after 3.30 p.m. to ask the question he has. He is a member of the Government party and with his knowledge of the pumps one would have expected that he would have taken some steps to get these things straight. That may have been the salvation of the whole thing. Other members have come in without any mechanical knowledge and one would not have expected the hon. member for St. George to wait until 3.30 to ask if they considered these things. Certainly, it would be showing a greater interest to people in politics and to his party if he had taken steps to get that advice because it might be the whole secret to the thing.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, it is rather unfortunate that my friend and colleague would elect to put it that way, as he would appreciate on the last occasion there was no opportunity during the debate for discussion. There was no means of doing so and it is the very reason for my asking the Minister today. They operate with certain experts in their departments and the question of pumping water being a technical one, I would have to wait, like my friend and colleague the hon. junior member for the City, for an opportunity in Parliament to ask the Minister the same questions. As my good friend, the hon. junior member for the City would

appreciate, when the pumps were ordered we had no opportunity to discuss it at all, but we voted the money for the development and expansion of the water service. I am only unhappy because for some reason the Minister in his explanation said, they have seen long service and the decision now to change to the Spindle type Pump shows there must have been some mistake when the other Pump was ordered. Again, this has always been the question hanging in the laps of the gods and the experts, and a normal member of Parliament would hardly understand and appreciate the decision of Government.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, it seems as if the pumps have been breaking down very suddenly from time to time and the fact that the majority of them broke down shows that we should be very careful how we order new pumps. I would like to know why we continue to hang on to the coat tail of the Crown Agents. I presume these pumps were used before in England and in other colonies. If we have agents to select these for us, Sir, I expect them to acquaint themselves with the most serviceable kind of equipment before they commit us to the purchase. It has always been argued that we should be in a position to make our purchases through local agencies who are more interested than the Crown Agents in selecting materials of the best kind; but I notice, Sir, in the face of that argument—and the Chamber of Commerce has also made comments upon that fact — what I do want to know is if the Minister has taken it seriously enough when he tells us that in the ordering of these not to expect delivery under 60 weeks.

I would like to know if that is the case. You say the pumps have been breaking down from time to time; they have had to be sent back to England to be repaired; and now you are telling us that even although we are passing this token vote which would mean expenditure of a greater sum, that you need not expect delivery under 60 weeks. Can the Hon. Minister say whether the Engineer has guaranteed him that the Department would try to keep these pumps which they now have going until the 60 weeks is up? Water being so important a factor in our everyday life, should the Minister and the Department not consider the possibilities of acquiring these pumps from other countries which might give quicker delivery than the Mother Country? I do not know which country, but Germany, I am told, is free to supply machinery even to England and America and elsewhere. You have Canada, America and places of that sort who are willing to expedite delivery; certainly, these avenues should be explored, because you cannot keep trade going to the Mother Country when a thing like water can be placed in jeopardy for 60 weeks before you can guarantee a continuous supply. I would like all these things to be gone into. It is not sufficient to come here and agree to the passing of a token vote and keep the population uncertain as regards a continuous supply of water. What would happen one of these mornings if we did not vote for the passing of these Resolutions? The population might wake up and find there is no water. Certainly, it would not be the fault of the hon. members who do not possess all the facts nor would it be the fault of the population; it would have to be the fault of the Minister and the Waterworks Department. Nobody else. I do not agree with having to wait 60 weeks for delivery unless you are sure no other place can supply these pumps in a shorter period than 60 weeks.

3.55 p.m.

I would like to hear the Hon. Minister say something about that, if he feels quite safe in having to wait for 60 weeks before these pumps can be delivered. I speak under correction, but I think the Hon. Minister has said that some of these pumps last for a few months and several times during that period, they have had to be sent back to England. If that is so, why can we not order these pumps from America or Canada if they are available in either of these places? There is nothing wrong if you were to select an engineer and send him overseas to see about getting the best pumps for us. We have spent a considerable sum on the re-organisation of the Waterworks already; it began about six or seven years ago, but it was expected to last for three years. I am not against extending the period if it is necessary to do so, but the question is that we should not step blindly into matters like these, because after spending a lot of money, you will find that the materials which are delivered cannot give the services which are required. The only alternative in this matter would be to seek other sources and see if we cannot get more immediate deliveries.

I have noticed that our tendency is to keep hanging on to the Crown Agents for our suplies; we have been forced to feel that we cannot buy our supplies unless they are bought from England. I have noticed that in Jamaica when the English coal was too expensive, Mr. Bustamante said that he could save between 25% and 40% on American coal, and he demanded the American dollars and he got them to run some concern in Jamaica. However, we have always been trying to say that we must buy this and that from England, although we know that articles are bought from Japan, Canada, Germany in England and then resold. Why can't we import articles from other places if we will get better service? I would like the Hon. Minister to make a settlement of that matter because I do not think we should sit back and wait for 60 weeks until these pumps are delivered. We do not know for how long the present pumps will last.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman I will now revert to making some comments on what I have heard, and the first one is that the Hon. Minister has said that he has lost a week because he could not get the Resolution last week. However, the Hon. Minister has lost years; we have not been re-organising this Department last week, because he has said that these pumps were giving trouble since 1952. Let the Hon. Minister give the date on which the first one gave trouble. He has not yet said that the firm had one of their own engineers looking after these pumps. [Hon. M. E. COX: The whole Island knows that.] He had a perfect right, not to come in here and read anything from a paper; that information should have been supplied to honourable members by the laying of a Statement. The Hon. Minister should not get any typewritten copy and read from it and you must understand what he reads; how do you know that he has read it correctly? It is a shameful thing that we do not get reports from the Engineer of this Department. Every now and then we have political reports saying that two thousand new services have been installed; there is this increase in the standard of living; there is this increase in water; but can't they see that they have been connecting services and not having any water in the pipes? These Harland Spindle pumps have been working since 1935; there was nothing wrong with them; but there is no reason to think that when you get one of these pumps in 1956, it will be of the same quality as those of 1935. The Hon. Minister is going in for speculation now; will he tell us whether the Barbados Foundry were the Agents for these pumps and that is why they were bought? Will he say if these pumps were recommended by the Engineer of the Waterworks Departmen? I have reason to believe that the Engineer did not want these pumps, although if it were left to him, he might have brought down worse pumps.

We have always been trying to tell them that in respect these things which are sponsored by the Crown Agents, people who have left us for commission up there, we must be very careful about them. Sir Alfred Savage has just gone up there; the people up there make handsome incomes, they have become millionaires out of selling. It is a question of business and whoever can pay out the most money will get their popular goods sold. The Hon. Minister has said that the Crown Agents have recommended these pumps; have the Crown Agents pumped water into their buildings with them. This is a shocking state of affairs; when you take the Housing programme, the bus programme and the Waterworks programme into consideration, I think the Hon. Minister of Communications should resign his office; he has made a hopeless mess in his Ministry. Everything is politics; and now you are spending $60,000 to get two pumps. Are you not ashamed that the pumps which you have ordered have turned out to be worthless? Are you not ashamed of such ignorance which has sprung from the arrangements that you cannot get these people to accept anything although they had their own engineer on the spot? Do you think that anybody in Broad Street could conduct affairs like that and remain at the Head of the business? Could you not get any satisfaction for this Government? What happened? Did the Barbados Foundry repair these pumps? Did they repair them because they are the Agents? The truth of this matter has not been told. What has happened? You have not answered the question as to whether you got a guarantee with these pumps. I repeat: it is a shocking state of affairs, and it is particularly on the water question that this Minister has been like that and remain at the head of the business? advertising himself. He has been chided in here to the effect that the only people who got an extension of the water system are the people who live in St. Michael.

I feel that the Hon. Minister should say: "I am very sorry for what has taken place." We have just got through the Estimates and have prepared to service these pumps without one single word from the Hon. Minister to the effect that this state of affairs existed in the Waterworks Department, and everybody must know that an Engineer has been out here! There is no Minister in the world who who would say that you must have a high sense of responsibility in your office, if you could do a thing like that; and if a member tells you that you had this trouble in the Department, you want to tell him that he must not say anything about this great Engineer, and before you can extend this contract he would have left. He is packing up and leaving you with these Harland Spindle pumps, one you can look at and repent, and the other one has to be dug up and you have to see how far you can go with it. If this gentleman had not renewed his contract and left here with this state of affairs, the first thing you would have heard is that dear old Mr. Garrod has gone, "Mr. Moses" has gone and there is no water to be obtained. (*Laughter*).

4.05 p.m.

They would have said that somebody interfered with the pumps after Mr. Garrod had left. That is what we would have been told. It is a good thing that this thing has been exposed at this particular time. With due deference to Mr. Garrod, he should pack up and go now before these pumps are ordered. If he knew of the Harland Spindle pump, with the great confidence that was put in him, he should have recommended those pumps. Has he got on record that those pumps were recommended by him and the Government did otherwise and gave the order to the Barbados Foundry for the Beresford pumps? We would like to know these facts. There are facts which are sheltering the Ministry and the Government from blame which should be attached to them.

As I have said on the last occasion, this is a very serious thing. I go as far as to say that this is a criminal act taking into account the importance of water to the community. That no report in its original form came from the Government about this state of affairs is something deplorable. The first time we knew anything about this matter was when a member of the Opposition got up in here and asked the Government if it were not true that their water pumps are 'tourist' pumps, going to up to England in the Summer and coming down in the Winter. The first thing you were told in answer to that was that you have no right to say anything about the Engineer and they ended up saying that everything you said was right. This is a Department which everybody felt was working in A-1 condition. How do you know whether there are other things which are not in just as bad a condition as this? Certainly this is one of the greatest instances of neglect of which I can imagine.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, to those people in Barbados who make the mistake of regarding the Government as a body of responsible men, the revelation of this state of affairs may come as a surprise, but to those who know what to expect from them it will come as no surprise. Now, we have water pumps in this Island which have given upwards of 40 years of service. I can take you now to the Central Foundry to see a steam engine there which has been in continuous use for over 60 years.

The Hon. Minister who introduced this Resolution claims that the average life without repairs of the new Harland spindle pumps will be around 20 years but the maximum life of the Beresford submersible pumps without repairs has been around three years—some less than three years.

Now where the serious irresponsibility and incompetence of the Government lie is that when at the end of two or three years these Beresford pumps failed to give efficient service, then was the time for the Government to demand from the manufacturers that they be replaced. But what has happened? We are told today that only now negotiations are going on with the manufacturers and the House will be informed in due course what are the results of these negotiations. By any stretch of the imagination, how can three years be regarded as satisfactory service for a water pump? How many of them have failed to give service? It is a fact that the Barbados Foundry cannot repair them and that they have to be sent to England for repairs. They go up and come back to give two weeks' service, then they go back again. That is a fact and now they are endeavouring to call upon the manufacturers either to replace these pumps or to give them some rebate because they were unsatisfactory. These negotiations should have been finalised as soon as the pumps broke down. There is no question about that.

4.15 p.m..

We should not now be making negotiations for a rebate to find out, after the Foundry and the manufacturers have repaired them, if they are going to give us a rebate on them. They would be utter fools to give a rebate on them now and I should not be at all surprised, Mr. Chairman, if you did not get a single cent rebate. Now, on the occasion of about two or three weeks when I drew the attention of the House to the state of affairs existing in the Waterworks Dept., the attitude displayed from the Government bench would have led any intelligent person to think everything I said was incorrect, but I am sure that from what has transpired since then and what has been said from Government bench today, there are only two deductions to be drawn: one is that the Government and the Minister at the time knew

absolutely nothing of what was taking place, or, if they did, they were trying to hide it from the public. As a matter of fact, the manner in which the Addendum to this Resolution reads forces one to the conclusion that even now the Government is being dishonest to the community and is not prepared to present the facts as they are. All this Addendum says, Mr. Chairman, is that there has been an extension in the supply of water in the island and an increase in the population and, therefore, we need new pumps to take care of bringing more water to the surface to supply the increased population and the increased number of water services. That is all it says. Not one single word is said in this document about the failure of the pumps that were in use and the necessity to replace them. In other words, Government has attempted to present the case to-day, not because of unsatisfactory pumps which they ordered years ago, but because of the extension of water service. That is rank dishonesty. Not one single word is mentioned about the pumps which were ordered to last 25 years and which have not lasted for one. They come here to fool the public that because the population has increased and new pipes laid down, they want new pumps. There is nothing here about the six new water pumps in use for less than five years and the unsatisfactory manner in which they operated; and the Government can sit down and be satisfied! What are they doing? They paid $6,000 each for these Beresford Submersible Pumps. They are now ordering pumps costing $30,000 each, more than four times the amount. Let us assume, Mr. Chairman, that the $6,000 pumps were no use. Do you mean you jump immediately from $6,000 to $30,000? Is money no object? The taxpayers put it there and the Government takes it and throws it way! There is no guarantee that the Harland Spindle Pumps will give any better service than the old Beresford Pumps, but you can spend $24,000 a pump more after the Beresfords have failed. What the hon. junior member for St. George has said would be accepted even by an infant because it is a most reasonable contribution to the debate. We have no right putting ourselves again in the hands of the Crown Agents for English Pumps to the tune of $30,000 each. Local Commercial houses are not doing that. The Cotton Factory wanted machinery and they got it from Germany. Nigeria and the Gold Coast had Ministers in Britain, and when they wanted machinery for textile and so on, the machinery came from the Continent because Britain could not supply it in the time they wanted it; and when they could, the price was not competitive and there was no guarantee that they would stand up; the Ministers said they were willing to do business in Great Britain, but in their opinion they had to consider the interest of Nigeria and the Gold Coast. This Government here thinks first about the interest of Great Britain. If they tell the Crown Office or the Crown Agents they are not buying Beresford Pumps or the Harland Spindle pumps somebody would not get a C.M.G. or C.B.E. It maters little or nothing whether or not we throw away $6,000 and another $30,000 three years after; it means nothing at all to them. You jump from $6,000 a pump to $30,000 a pump without the knowledge that one is better than the other. When I said, Mr. Chairman, that these pumps were going backward and forward across the sea at high costs every year, the Minister "pooh-poohed" the idea. As a matter of fact, I said the cost was high and he said it was around $150. Today we are told that the cost of transport is $2,320, and he has still taken to the non-sensical, stupid "pooh-poohing" of the idea that the cost of the transport was high. It is not high to him to pay $2,000 to transport a pump that cost $6,000 to England. It is so incredibly ignorant that you can hardly believe people occupying a position like that should not have their position rectified as soon as possible. You pay $6,000 for it and $2,000 to send it back to get it repaired. The same thing goes on for many occasions with the same pump. Now, the Hon. Minister said the annual cost of transportation is $2,320 and the annual cost of repairs by the Foundry is $800. The total cost is $5,678 a year. Now, here again, I do not profess to be able to travel on the same plane as he travels, but if I understand him at all he said it is the annual cost but it does not happen every year. So therefore, we do not know whether he knows what he means by "annual" or whether he knows if the figures are correct. You can't tell the amount you spend every year or the number of pumps it is spent on, because he himself does not know what he says. Let us assume for the sake of argument that $5,678 represent the annual cost. Now, he is afraid to tell the House how many times these pumps have been back to England. I told the House two weeks ago that the pumps have been back to England on more than one occasion and that some pumps have not worked for six weeks after they came back and had to be resent to England. In other words, what he should be telling us is not what is the annual cost and that it does not happen every year, but the total cost, Mr. Chairman, spent on local repairs to these pumps and the transportation to England and repairs in England in the last four years.

4.25 p.m.

I should not all be surprised if, when we get the total figure we have not nearly paid again for these Beresford submersible pumps. Let us have the total amount which has been spent on repairs and transport from the time that we have had these pumps. The six pumps would have cost us a little over $40,000, and in less than 5 years we are spending $5,000 a year in trying to get them to work.

The hon. member of St. John really made the mistake of expecting that the Government is capable of appreciating a serious situation. At the Waterworks Department today, at the major Pumping Stations, as I told the House earlier this month, we are bringing water to the surface with machinery which was dumped by Mr. Garrod himself. When we began to re-organise the Waterworks Department, Mr. Garrod himself said that the old steam engines should be scrapped. But now these same steam engines are pumping water at the Belle. They have a contraption working in St Peter comprised of a small unit which has been borrowed from the Agricultural Department, and some other more or less condemned machinery bringing water to the surface. At any time it can be expected that these contraptions may give out. These Beresford pumps are apparently spending their time as "tourist" pumps, to borrow the attractive phrase of the hon. junior member for the City; these pumps are spending more time on the water than they are spending in pumping water to the surface. The Beresford pumps will be joy-riding on the high seas, and they are now waiting for sixty weeks for the new Harlands.

It does appear to appear to the Government that we are running undue risk, or that we are facing the possibility of waking up one morning, and finding that we have not got any adequate pumping equipment to supply the Colony's needs. Therefore we can sit quite comfortably for over a year and wait until these Harland Spindle pumps get here. We are not under any such moral obligation to the British Government that in a matter of a vital necessity like water, we cannot buy a pump especially in the most reliable and considerably inexpensive market. We get less C.D.&W. grants than any

body else, and even now that we are entitled to financial assistance from Great Britain, we are told to go back and use our own piggy bank. The money which we should get to assist us in our national disaster, in the first instance, and money which we should get proportionately with other Colonies, we are not getting; and yet we are more concerned with importing machinery from the United Kingdom to give unsatisfactory service, than any other Colony in the Empire, merely because we have at the head of affairs, the people whom we have. That is all there is to it.

I repeat: if Mr. Garrod is responsible for this state of affairs in that he had brought to the Government's attention at the end of three years that the pumps were not giving proper satisfaction, we had no right to renew his contract; and if he brought it to their attention, and they sat down there so stupidly and regarded a water pump as a refrigerator engine or electric fan or something like that, which can go out of service every three years, well if you have them in their position still, you could better have five men from the Mental Hospital. You could not have people from the Mental Hospital doing worse than they are doing in their position. If they prove that Mr. Garrod drew to their attention that the pumps had broken down and were not giving any service, and they did not call upon the manufacturers to replace these pumps, or give a rebate on them, well, Mr. Chairman, the people made an error when they put those people at the head of affairs, and they are paying for that error.

If Mr. Garrod is right, then they are wrong; and if they are right, then he is wrong. However, the responsibility rests on their shoulders, but they did not have the decency to say that; they defend Mr. Garrod and accuse people of irresponsibility. The day on which I have to defend their attacks, I will commit suicide; I am accustomed to these attacks and they mean no more to me than water on a duck's back. The more they attack me, and the higher they climb, it is like a monkey climbing a tree; the more he climbs the more you see his tail. I tell them that the day they have to come to the House for money to improve the situation at the Waterworks, it will be discovered by the public who was right and who was wrong.

I am not so silly as to believe or to hope that anything which is said on this side of the table would influence the Government or prevent them from making colossal blunders with regard to the matter with which they find themselves responsible. But, Mr. Chairman, even the abstruse must understand that there are times when one has to take advice. I do not care how big or how great you are—I do not use these adjectives in reference to the Government Bench, of course, I am merely generalising—but I do not care how important a man is, there comes a time when even a little child can tell him something which he can follow with advantage.

4.35 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, they should further investigate the position with regard to the replacing of the Beresford pumps by the Harland pumps in this considerable increase in pumps. We have no guarantee at all that the new Harland pumps will stand up. It is a well known fact that in the post-war period British machinery of all sorts has not been what it was before the war. We do not know whose fault it was. There were expensive new cars coming here from Britain and in comparison with the continental cars they were like paper dolls. No British car coming into this Island can compare in quality, material and satisfactory service with the continental cars; and if private individuals in order to conserve their own economy have found it advisable to purchase outside of the United Kingdom market, Mr. Chairman, there is no reason why in this colony we who are paying our own way should not do likewise.

I was particularly glad to hear the suggestion of the possibility of procuring pumps other than those of British manufacture raised by a member other than myself because I personally regard that as the correct solution. The moment I noticed the increase of price—that is, you paid $6,000 for the Beresford pumps and the presupposed price of the Harland pumps is $30,000—I thought that the Government would be well advised to forget its habitual policy of ignoring advice because it comes from certain quarters. My reason for saying so is because the country pays when Government does that. I thought Government should be willing to adopt for the first time the attitude of listening to what is said by people in this Chamber who are elected on the same basis as themselves to represent the country, and therefore must have the interest of the country at heart to an equal extent as they themselves would have.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing has said that if one morning we wake up and find there is no water in the pipes that we can blame ourselves because we have already delayed this matter for one week.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I did not make such a statement.

Mr. GODDARD: He did say that we have already delayed this matter one week unnecesarily. I personally would blame him and nobody else because I understand that three of those pumps today are in England undergoing repairs and we only knew of that today. Certainly, any one can make a mistake; and whoever made the mistake of ordering these particular pumps might have been generally unaware of the deficiency of these Beresford pumps when they get beyond a certain size. I say so, because I understand that the 96-horsepower pumps work well.

Now, Sir, what assurance has the Government got that these Harland pumps are the right type of pumps that we should now order? At last they are saying that they are about to discard the Beresford pumps costing around $6,000 each and are now going to invest in pumps which cost around $30,000 each I do not know how many of these Harland pumps will be required to replace those which are not giving proper satisfaction. It has been said that an attempt has been made to get the manufacturers of the Beresford pumps to take them back, but what attempt I do not know; because any reputable firm that wants to maintain its name on the overseas market would, I am sure, make some concession, if we could prove that the fault of the pumps is not at this end. The manufacturers should make some concession and, if necessary, take back those which are not giving proper service. Had representation been made at an early date and had not been delayed for four years, I presume we could have had a satisfactory settlement with the manufacturers.

We should have been given more information. The suddenness with which we have been given this Resolution to deal with tells the plight of our water facilities. We are now told that any morning we may be faced with a shortage if these Harland pumps are not ordered immediately. If we order them today, according to the note, it is going to take sixty weeks to get them. I do not know what the delay of one week would mean to that. I do know that when you order certain things nowaday and you are told that you will get them in six weeks, they generally take nine weeks to get them. Probably, now that

they have told you that it will take sixty weeks to get them, that might mean 90 weeks, because they have a way of telling you that owing to the shortage of material, the increase in wages and all that sort of thing although it was passed on to them, they could not get it before. It therefore might mean 90 weeks before we get these Harland pumps. What provision is Government making for the immediate remedy of this situation? If three of the Beresford pumps are at present undergoing repairs in England and this order of the Harland pumps is a 60-week order, is the Government satisfied that it can allow the remaining Beresford pumps which are not giving proper satisfaction and cannot be relied on to carry on without an attempt being made to get something more speedy?

4.45 p.m.

I am wondering whether he is satisfied, because I think after that alarming statement made today concerning our pumping facilities, that question should be answered in saying whether it has been debated, whether they have considered that or whether there is another type of pump that they have in mind that can be got more readily.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, at the last meeting when we were discussing the question of the water system, I was at pains to support the Government on the efficiency of the Engineer because I was satisfied and am still satisfied that he is the right man in the right place at the right time. I still feel that I am more satisfied now since I have investigated the matter further that the officer cannot be blamed in any respect of the matter, and I believe it is known in this country now. I am not here to curry favour with any officer; I am going to say exactly what I feel if they are wrong, because they are not responsible for putting me here and they cannot ask the Premier to put me out. I said last week I agreed with the Government upon certain matters, but I do not agree with the Minister on this. Rather than criticise, the Government should welcome the Opposition, and what are the facts plainly and simply? They are in Government; they are responsible for the extension of the water supply in this country. This is a British colony and it goes without saying that they must as far as possible order British goods. Now the British goods which they ordered proved to be no good. The Opposition on the floor of this House has been telling you so, but what are the facts? The Addendum which is in front of us is really not representing the true statement of affairs. I am bound to agree with the hon. senior member for St. Philip on that. I do not think the Government should at any time hide the situation from the Opposition or from the public. There is nothing to hide about this. Whatever members have talked here I knew was going on months ago, but I feel that that part of the machinery we are getting from England, which has not been bought in other parts of the world and brought to England and stamped as British and sent to the colonies, is of very poor manufacture. I do not think I need be ashamed of saying that, because it is a statement of fact. Therefore, if one who is interested says these things are going on, we will wait and see what Government will do. You have to supply water; you have to get the pumps; you get them from a British Manufacturer and so on and then they turn out to be no good. Is there any reason in this world for any Government even if the Government be five of the most loyal Englishmen in the world, to conceal facts from the people of this colony? None! It is not your fault: you tried to get pumps. If we were in Government we would certainly get English manufacture, but if they turned out to be no good we would tell the people and the House of Assembly. Why come with this mis-statement in this Addendum? I say it is absolutely dishonest. This is nothing but a mistake and the absence of the fact that the pumps are no good makes people become absolutely suspicious. I will mention to the hon. senior member for St. Philip that the Manager of the Waterworks drew it to the attention of the Government and there were negotiations between the Government and the manufacturers. [A VOICE: When?] Not now; some time ago. The Manager did draw it to the attention of the Government. Actually there are four pumps at the Belle, one 115 h.p. and two 96 h.p. at Haymans, six 45 h.p. at Bowmanston which are working well. Now the Minister can contradict this. There are at present two 115 h.p, pumps in England; these are the pumps not working well. The Minister should have told this House that sometime ago this was reported to Government and Government put it to the agents and the agents put it to the makers and the makers refused to consider the matter. Do not take what the Opposition says, but print it in your paper that the people in Barbados say to the Colonial Office that the dishonest people in England trying to bleed the people in the Colonies should go. If that is going to be the case let us buy from America. We are backing you. You ordered the pumps in the best faith. Nobody can say anybody knew whether they would be good or bad, but he can say these pumps were ordered and that besides the apparent corruption in high places, that the high places do not apply to Barbados. We had occasions when you had corruption in high places with top flight officials and engineers tainted with the corruption. I am in the position to say that when these pumps were ordered that they were ordered with the full knowledge, consent, approval, desire and recommendations of the Colonial Office. I do not know where the corruption was. Let us assume everybody felt the pumps worked. Refrigerators come from England or America; a lot come from England and they proved to be bad and the makers adopted a different attitude. Refrigerators come from America and from Canada; they proved bad, but you had a guarantee and they replaced them. They would not honour the guarantee in England. These pumps are guaranteed for six months, if of course they are working every day; if not, for a year; but everybody knows that is the normal guarantee. When therefore the pumps turned out to be bad, there was nothing wrong with the Government drawing it to the attention of the House of Assembly. We are not saying that the Government would have ordered pumps knowing them to be bad, but if they ordered pumps and they turned out to be bad, if it is the policy of Government not to be critical of a firm connected with the Colonial Office, it is our duty to be critical.

4.55 p.m.

These pumps have been bad for some time. What the hon. senior member for St. Philip has said is correct; the Government knows as much about these pumps as I know about aeroplanes. These pumps were recommended; I will say that they were not recommended by this present Engineer. If I were in the Government, I would ask that the best pumps be obtained. The Government have been informed about the condition of these pumps, and the makers have not done anything about it.

I would like to say that my opposition to this Resolution is different from that of other hon. members. You are getting some pumps and you get your recommendations either from the Crown Agents or other people. I hope that the members of the Goverment will listen to me; the 45 h.p. pumps have

proved to be good. Today, you have supplied us with an Addendum and you have withheld from this Chamber information which you should have not withheld. You state that these pumps have proved to be no good. An Engineer was brought out here from England to repair these pumps; he condemned them and in spite of that, these dishonest manufacturers have refused to bargain with you. They have not said: "Let us give you a rebate on these pumps." They have said "No" to that. This is where you must be truly West Indian; you must not be slave-minded. You bought these pumps from an English firm, and today you have withheld the real truth of the matter from this House. You come for a token vote of $1, and you are going to buy these Harland Spindle pumps. Who is to say that these pumps are good, and if they prove to be no good, that the manufacturers will not be the same dishonest, crafty, type of Englishmen who dealt with you in respect of the other pumps?

If those hon. members over there were on this side of the House, they would ask what guarantee have you got for these Harland Spindle pumps? I know that the Government has put up a proposition to the Agents about these pumps, and that an Englishman came down here and condemned these pumps; and why do you hide these things? What is the real reason for hiding these things? But you want to whitewash the faults of these people with whom you are trading! You should go back and say to them: "We are trading with an English firm recommended by the Crown Agents, or whoever they are, and although we acknowledge dishonesty in high places, we ask you for a replacement of these pumps; we ask you to repair them, because they are no good." But the manufacturers of these pumps say "No, we are not doing that." I think that every hon. member would like to have some sort of explanation, having acknowledged the fact that these pumps are no good. I know that the Engineer drew the matter to the Head of the Department, and the Agents brought an Englishman out here to see what could be done about it, and the Englishman said that these pumps were no good. It is roughly 3½ years ago that these pumps were put down; do not let us go back to find out who made the recommendation to the Government; now it has been proved that these pumps are no good, tell us before we vote anything today, who recommended these pumps, what guarantee you have and if these pumps are no good that they will be replaced. Do not tell us that you are dealing with English people, because they are as corrupt as those behind the Iron Curtain or Chicago. If you put down 18 pumps, and they prove to be bad, you are dealing with a Colonial Government, and if these manufacturers say "No," that is not right. Let the Hon. Minister tell us what guarantee he has for this $60,000 for these two pumps if they went bad?

It is true that you should be loyal, but you must be loyal to the people of Barbados first; secondly, to the people of the West Indies; and lastly to the people of England. That is how I look at it; it is a question of loyalty in the first place, to the people who have put you there, and if you are loyal to the people of Barbados, you will realise that if you cannot get a straightforward, honest deal with the people in England, and you cannot get a guarantee, it is your solemn duty to deal with other people who can give you this guarantee.

5.05 p,m.

I am going to put it straight so that any Minister can see my reasoning. If either Minister of the Government had been dealing for himself in a particular line of goods and he was offered British goods which were of no good, he would not buy them from Britain, he would buy them from America. That is your duty to the people of this colony in your capacity. If you went to buy a Refrigerator, a car or a suit and you found that the British goods were not in keeping with what you could get from outside and you had no guarantee for them, you would buy them from America. Let me say that America can produce goods as good as any nation in the world and better than many. I may say so for Germany also.

Without any further comment, I will summarise by saying that you should welcome our criticism. My criticism today is not on the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department. I challenge any member of the Government to say that he did not know that negotiations were going on between the Department and the manufacturers of the Beresford pumps and that the negotiations broke down owing to the manufacturers doing absolutely nothing about the matter. It is a fact that a gentleman came down from England to inspect the pumps and he condemned them. It is true to say that Government tried to get the best and did try to get the manufacturers to replace those pumps. In spite of all that, are you honest to come in here and deal with English firms? I would have told the Crown Agents "you have been so dishonest that you have made me to spend $6,000 with you in pumps and now you want me to spend $30,000 in the same thing when the others were not good." I would have told them "No can do." Unless you are prepared to come in here and bring your influence to bear on hon. members, we are not doing anything of the sort. Do not say that you cannot get these pumps from anywhere else. My contention is that having done all of that, it is not the Engineer's fault. He drew it to your attention all the time. My argument is that you should not come in here and ask us to vote for this Resolution. What guarantee have you got that these pumps which you are about to order are good? Who told you that this particular company is not going to fleece you? I would be dishonest to vote for this Resolution if you cannot give me a proper explanation as to whether these goods are guaranteed.

You might have to pay more money; I am not arguing on the question of the money you are paying for them. I am looking at the plain simple facts. What are the facts? The facts are: you ordered British goods: you were treated badly because they have not stood up. If you had ordered Japanese or American goods, the first thing they would have told you was that these goods came down here and in less than six months they have broken down. They would not have come back in here and said that despite all that they are asking for a further $30,000 to buy the same people's goods, despite that the people have no reputation. Of course, I do know that the Premier would say that it does not matter what we on this side may say. He would say "let them talk, when they finish, my sheep will follow blindly and vote for this." That is why I say it is the worse thing in the world that you pay members of this House of Assembly. If they felt they did not have $160 a month to lose, they would vote according to their conscience. Could this be said to be destructive criticism? If the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department had sat by and allowed these conditions to go on without drawing them to the attention of the Government, he would have been the person to blame. I do know that he drew the matter to the attention of the Government.

The Government has come back in here despite the fact that the Beresford pumps have proven to be of no good, despite the fact that the manufacturers would not give a rebate, and is saying "we are going back to mother and order some more of her pumps." That is not right. This is criticism which the Colonial

Office should read. [A VOICE: It is our duty to help the Mother Country.] I would say so too but we should help if they are honest. What the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing is saying suits 1812; not today. We have grown up.

Sir, before I vote one cent of this Resolution today, I feel that the Hon. Minister should be able to tell us what assurances he has of this new company and who has given him the guarantee. With whom has he discussed the matter? You know, Sir, that there is a rumour flying about that Mr. Roddam, the man who swindled the people in Antigua, is responsible for putting this on you. It is a fact that sometimes you get British officials in these parts drawing more commission than any Government can think of. Sir, before I vote for this Resolution, I want the Hon. Minister to say what guarantee has he of this company. That is what I would have sought out first if I were a member of the Government. Bear in mind that the goods from the former manufacturers proved to be a failure. You are absolutely wrong if you are hiding that from this House. It should have been set out here in the Addendum for the benefit of honourable members and the public. If there is no guarantee, there will be no vote from me for this Resolution.

5.15 p.m.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, after all the commonsense the hon. senior member for the City has displayed and also the direct evidence he has given, it is no use flogging a dead horse. It is absolutely sure and certain that these Beresford Pumps are bad. We have thrown that money away. What is worrying me is, are these Spindle pumps any better or have they been tried? We are only one of the thousands of Waterworks all over the world using electric pumps for pulling the water; therefore, it is incumbent on the Minister and his Department to examine this point clearly. Are the Harland Spindle Pumps used all over the world for this purpose, and if they are, are they successful? I have heard nothing about them. I am told that in the neighbouring colony of Jamaica for years they have been pumping water with electric pumps at a very cheap rate. I have not yet been able to get the name of the pump, but of course, that could be got; but I am told that these pumps work most economically; they pump water in the vicinity of 12c. a thousand gallons and God knows what we pay for water here. Is it not possible before for them to investigate this? I would like the Minister to answer this: I am not criticising him, I am helping. Is he certain that these Harland Spindle Pumps are of the type that will hold up to their job? Like the hon. junior member for the City, I am most despondent about English machinery today, from the very motor-car back up to wheels for cane engines. The old ones last and the new ones are breaking up. It is a serious situation. One factory put down gear the same year as I did; mine is an old one which is still working and the new one has been replaced. I am not against water; I have always been most active as regards water because it is essential; but before you progress you should see that your road is clear and that you are not going to retrogress I am not confident in that matter and I would like to hear something of these pumps. Are they used by other Waterworks units? I mean to say, we are only one of the places who have to pump water all over the world, and I would like to know if any Minister has asked about the Jamaica Waterworks who use electrical pumps very economically. We should hear this before the vote is taken because this is important. It is no use crying over spilt milk, because it has gone on the floor already. That is my argument and I am hoping that the Minister will give us that idea, or if he is not clear on it, postpone the matter and let us be sure of what we are doing. This is the only other way of tackling the situation. If a certain pump works in fifty countries, it will work in fifty-one. If it does not work in fifty, you cannot expect it to work in one. I will not delay the House any more.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the remarks made by the hon. senior member for the City, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, the hon. senior member for St. John and the hon. junior member for Christ Church; even though the hon. member for the City was very strong in his criticism and of course used terms which could be avoided, but it was clear that he wanted as far as possible to assist the Government as he said, unlike the hon. junior member for the City and the hon. senior member for St. Philip who no doubt seize every opportunity in throwing mud and slime upon people whenever the occasion arises. We always expect that from them. They cannot do anything more than that. He is a boss at it. He cannot help it and it keeps him right there where he is. Now, I regret that the senior member for the City was not in his seat. If he were, he would have heard me give all the information relative to the service given by those pumps from time to time. I want to assure him that no valuable information was withheld; it was not a question of not stating the facts. They were stated as clearly as could have been stated at the time with one exception which I thought was history to the House, because I thought everybody in Barbados knew that when the pump was first installed it did give some trouble and somebody came from England and I think it went back up; and if I remember correctly they reported that the pump suffered from fatigue when it made so many thousand revs and broke down under the circumstances. It was a question of the cooling system being faulty if I remember correctly. That was long ago—before the question of the Ministerial set-up—and I did not know that it was necessary to say it again at this stage; but I want to assure him that I told the House and the Committee when I was introducing the Resolution that the position was that the makers had refused to exchange those pumps, but I said the matter was still under consideration. We were still negotiating and the makers have said that they can supply a smaller type of pump which has given good satisfaction if we sent up the exact thing with all the specifications, and they would be willing to cope. I cannot at this stage say they are not prepared to make some sort of rebate or whatever the case may be or some adjustment, because the matter is still under consideration: but what I would like to emphasise is the fact that—and I think most members will agree with me—if to-day you had an Austin 10 and that Austin 10 gave good service, it is logical to feel and to conclude that an Austin 16 or 20 might give just as good service as the Ausin 10, and that is why when in 1950 the matter was discussed, the Beresford 35 h.p. and 45 h.p. gave such good service that it was agreed to purchase the Beresford Submersible 96 h.p. and 115 h.p. There are two 96 h.p. and one 115 h.p. pumps at the Belle and I might inform the House that only last wtek one was returned to the Island and was installed the same day. But what has happened? The persons pressing the question as to the satisfaction in the proposals to import the Harland Spindle, were the Chief Engineer in collaboration with his Assistant Engineeer Mr. Emtage, (who I understand is a first-class man), who recommended them. I want the honourable member for the City to listen to this: I understand that there is no agent in this island connected with this pump and it therefore takes a long time. It has to be made when you place the order. They are not like the Beresford people who have quite a lot on

hand; they have to make them and that is the position. I am assured by them that these pumps give first-class service wherever they are, and I mentioned when I was introducing the Resolution that it is on record that one of these Harland Spindles was installed since 1935 in one country, I do not remember which one now, and is still going strong without any trouble. The pump is down in a hole and the motor is on the surface where it is easy to get access to the motor and repairs can be effected in the island without having to send it out as in the case of the Beresford submersible.

5.25 p.m.

That information is from the technical expert, and, as the honourable senior member for the City has said, unlike other people who hope to be experts, what can you do? If you have been advised by an expert on a matter, what else can you do but follow the advice of the expert? If an expert advises you as to these Harland Spindle pumps, and a layman who knows nothing about the matter, says that you can get a better pump for one-half the cost, and then it goes bad on you, you would have turned down the advice of the man who has to see that the operation of these pumps is carried through. You have to abide by the advice of the technical expert.

There is one last point which I would like to make. The honourable senior member for St. Philip has said that the Chief Engineer has condemned the two steam pumps at the Belle; I want to say that there is absolutely no truth in that statement. When we had the Belle electrified, the Chief Engineer decided to allow these steam pumps to remain as standbys because everybody knows that the supply of electric current is doubtful. At least you do not know when it will be shut off, and you should always have a stand-by; therefore, these steam pumps at the Belle are used as stand-bys, ready to be started if the electric power fails. These pumps were never out of commission. Only last Tuesday morning, I was up there, and they were started and they pumped 21,000 gallons per hour. It is cheaper to lift the water by electricity than by oil or fuel, and that is why these pumps are allowed to remain as stand-bys; they were never condemned, as the honourable senior member for St. Philip has said.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I agree that the Hon. Minister should take the advice of the expert, but has the Government since found out from the Colonial Office or made investigations before we buy these pumps? I would take the advice of the Engineer, but we want to know something about these people who are supposed to have a reputation. I am not questioning the cost of these pumps, but we want the best. Since the Engineer told you what type of pumps you could get, have you been able to find out from the Colonial Office, the Crown Agents or anybody else if this is a reputable Firm? Are they just recommending these pumps and then going out of business? All of that I want to know. We are spending $60,000———

Hon. M. E. COX: We cannot get any guarantee until the Order is placed. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Oh, no.] All we can do at this stage is to make an enquiry.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am asking the hon. member to investigate whether this is a reputable Firm having parts and replacements and so on. Have you found that out from them? All Firms give a guarantee; you can guarantee anything, but it is a question with dealing with a reputable Firm.

Hon. M. E. COX: Before you can place an order, you must have the authority from the House to do so. After that, the order is placed with stipulations. But the hon. member should know that it has always been the Government's policy in consulting with the Crown Agents, to find out—[Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Is this a reputable Firm?] These people have a reputation because I have already said that the small h.p. engines gave excellent service. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Where?] In Barbados.

5.35 p.m.

It is the usual practice to work through Crown Agents and to get all the information of the reliability and otherwise of the firm and machinery before it is bought. That is the position with respect to this matter.

I should like to inform this House that one of these spindles has already been ordered for work on the Deep Water Harbour. The Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department is satisfied that these pumps will do all that is required. As a matter of fact, we lift three million gallons of water at the Belle Pumping Station with the boilers that are there, and he guarantees us that these spindle pumps will lift four million gallons per day.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member only knows of mud slinging and slimy remarks. He has taken note of that to-day merely because of the disgrace which has come upon the Ministry about housing. His past business and this dishonest dealing should make him so ashamed that he should resign his Ministry. [Hon. M. E. COX: That is nonsense; you should do that.] Sir, because one has the guts to tell him of his incompetence, he says it is nonsense. After this tomfoolery, listen to what he says: he said he told the Committee when he was introducing the matter to this House. That is not the time for this information to come before the House. Who told him anything of turning down the advice of the expert? Of course he has to take the advice of the experts. He does not have to be a man with all that honesty to tell you that something is wrong with the Waterworks Department. The Hon. Minister has come in here time and time again and has withheld the information. Do you want greater disservice and incompetence? This is not the ordinary type of incompetence this is criminal incompetence. All these years these Beresford pumps have been giving trouble. Can he escape from it? What is in the Addendum to the resolution is rank dishonesty. What is in this Resolution is something which could have been put in a Resolution coming before this Chamber in 1950. This is what is stated: "The rapid increase in the demand for water which resulted from various factors, but mainly from the increase in population and the improved standard of living since the reorganisation of the Water supply started in 1950, makes it necessary to augment the pumping facilities of the Waterworks Department. "They have not put in here anything of the increase and reorganisation we have already provided by way of the Beresford pumps. An honest statement would be that he is replacing the Beresford pumps with the two Harland spindle pumps which is the purpose of this Resolution. [A VOICE: He told you that.] Why not write it down in the Addendum? After we have already provided you with five or six Beresford pumps, you are putting this statement in the Addendum and you are saying that you want two Harland spindle pumps through that. Can anybody other than someone with a perverted mind claim that is an honest statement? That is rank dishonesty. There is not one word in the Addendum to say that the Beresford pumps have broken down. I am re-

liably informed that the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department has been making representation concerning this thing to the Government ever since, but the Hon. Minister of Works would not let the information come down in the monthly reports. He has been keeping the information back from the public. Certainly there is only one man to blame and that person is the Minister. That is the type of man who continues to hold the portfolio for this thing. He has not a sense of responsibility to know that he is letting down the Ministry. Of course he cannot be expected to have that. The next Resolution is going to show him up in another light. All he is doing is to waste the taxpayers' money because it is there for him to waste. He is absolutely incompetent There is not one word in this Addendum to guide the public that these pumps are not wanted for reorganisation but that they are wanted to replace pumps that are absolutely useless.

The hon. senior member for the City said just now there was a rumour going around about Mr. Roddam. I had the opportunity of going to two West Indian Islands and seeing the incompetence of that man. He has left a monument of his incompetence in the island of Dominica. He has been horse-strutting between Antigua and St. Kitts. [A VOICE: Horse-strutting? What is that?] Take the debates of this House and read them. The Hon. Minister has not said whether the Beresford pumps were ordered long before Mr. Garrod came out here. Mr. Roddam is a greater expert than Mr. Garrod. Mr. Roddam is not an Engineer to a little organisation like the Waterworks Department, he is Colonial Adviser to the Secretary of State for the Colonies and C.D. & W.; he must know more than Mr. Garrod. We warned you at that time that he was a man who was walking about the West Indies selling machinery. Look up the debates and you will see that for yourself. You cannot take advice of this sort from these experts. Fancy, the Hon. Minister got up and said that you must accept the advice of the expert. Is it not the advice of the expert that has got you the Beresford pumps? The very expert and greater experts told you to order the Beresford pumps; and with all that advice the Hon. Minister of Works comes back today and says that we must order the Harland pumps because the expert has told us to do so. Of course, you have to take advice from the experts. Has anybody told you whether this is a reputable firm before you place the order? You have not said so. Do you want any greater incompetence than that? This is a man whose head is devoid of any brain at all. Do you think anybody past the age of 21 years would have said that you must place your order with a firm for pumps before you can find out anything of the firm that is manufacturing the pumps?

5.45 p.m.

Hon. M. E COX: I have already told the Committee that we have a guarantee. The hon. senior member for the City asked if we have any guarantee before we ordered them and I got up and replied to that.

Mr. LEWIS: The hon. senior member for the City asked whether there was any guarantee from the manufacturers.

Hon. M. E. COX: He asked about the guarantee for the pumps—but the hon. junior member for the City just cannot help it.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for the City asked if he found out anything about the reputation of the firm. He himself asked the question because he could easily get an answer to it, but the hon. member has not done anything about it. It is incompetence again, incompetence bordering on gross ignorance to say you cannot find out anything about the people recommended to you. Are you going to wait until you get the vote to ask if they are a reputable firm?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I did not say that; I was referring to a guarantee because I said the same thing might happen to the spindle pump as to the Beresford pump and I was referring to the guarantee of the pump, because I told the Committee the Spindle Pump was already ordered for the Deep Water Harbour.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is in the unfortunate position that he has to ask himself the question that he can answer. He ended up by saying that. Do you think if he knew ever since a meeting started at 3.15 p.m., could he not have said it? What is he withholding that for? You are in the unfortunate position when the experts advise you about one pump and it let you down, you had to accept the experts' advice about another but you should go out of your way to get the information. Another thing is, are they going to give you satisfaction with the type of water you have here? Water is not the same everywhere. Find out if they have given satisfaction with a similar type of water all these years. There is no guarantee that they are going to give the same service with this water. Now that you have wasted money as far as pumps are concerned, you are now trying to make good your mistake. One would have expected that you would get all possible information about it, but you are as ignorant today about the thing as before you started, and you can never get away from the fact that you are the Minister in charge of the Waterworks and this state of affairs was not made public in this House by you.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I now beg to move that you report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mrs. BOURNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I was going to say . . .

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member making an amendment to the adjournment?

Mr. CRAWFORD: There is a motion before the House. I said, Sir, I intervened in the debate just now merely in reply to the hon. member for the City because he was accusing the Minister of simple ignorance; and with this matter, Mr. Chairman, I do not see why you should adjourn at this stage. Some of the remarks of the Minister should be answered.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what are you speaking?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am speaking on the motion for the adjournment. I am saying that at a point in the debate where the hon. member for the City was replying to the allegations to the Minister, the Leader of the House had no right protecting him by his motion.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Have I no right to make the motion I have made?

Mr. CRAWFORD: On what did he rise?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must take his seat.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I have every right to make the motion I have made.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I meant was at that particular stage in the debate when members were entitled to reply to the statements made by the Minister, it was discourteous and unfair to seek to curb the debate. You do not curb a debate at a point like that and I am saying, Sir, that while the hon. member for the City was making it as plain as possible. . . . .

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member is going to make a speech I cannot allow it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Well, I will vote against the motion. I told him why I was speaking against the

motion. I told him, Sir, that in my opinion the members who were specifically attacked by the Minister should have been given an opportunity to reply before the adjournment was called for, but it is far better, Mr. Chairman, to do it at this stage than to adjourn the House and then come back to it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I do not think so. You must have some kind of feeling for the Chair.

The question that Mr. Chairman do now report progress with leave to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative.

On re-assembling,

5.55 p.m.

Hon. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was in Committee of Supply.

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

Waterworks Debate—Cont.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the adjournment, the hon. senior member for St. Philip was speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not disposed to say much more, Mr. Chairman, because the hon. junior member for the City has already clarified the position of the Minister's remarks with regard to the guarantee. The hon. junior member for the City demonstrated quite clearly that the Hon. Minister is more or less a square peg in a round hole; and while the hon. junior member for the City was merely accusing him of simple idiocy in the matter, he got up and accused himself of compound idiocy. Be that as it may, I am not proposing to refer to that any more, but I do want to register the strongest possible objection to his characterisation of my remarks. Anything I have said here today or previously in connection with this matter, I have said it more or less as rendering a public service, and I am not going to sit here therefore, and have the Hon. Minister accuse me of making slimy representations, which is just what he has done.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that he is the very last member of this House who should have the temerity ever at any time to accuse any body of making slimy remarks. You have heard him in this House and outside of this House and you know that on a public platform the kind of remarks he always makes and he has always made. His idea of a political discussion is to dicuss somebody else's grandparents and other people's domestic affairs. People who hear him would believe that he has adopted the same position as the carrion crow, because, the filth in which he indulges both inside and outside of the House reminds me—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member can reply to the remarks, but he must not go outside of that. The Hon. Minister has made some remarks and you can reply to them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Knowing how strict your desire is to see hon. members preserve the propriety of debate, I am surprised that you should allow his remarks to go unchallanged. I say that hon. members who come in here at any time and make reference to a position similar to that which exists at the Waterworks Department, must do it with some sense of responsibility and must do it because they believe that is what they are here to do. We are not here to flatter the Hon. Minister or any Head of a Department, and if either of them is guilty of any dereliction of duty, it is our duty to refer to it publicly. It comes with bad grace to characterise any dereliction of duty on the part of a public Officer in the manner in which the Hon. Minister thought fit and proper to refer to the criticisms I made of the Waterworks Department. Everything he has said in defence of the position is a more forceful attack on the Government than anything that the Opposition has said, and it is expected of me to hope that he will realise that; but I am confident that the other members of this House and the public as well are capable of appreciating the true state of affairs.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, what is still worrying me is that the Hon. Minister, while he has attempted to answer some of the questions, he has failed to give a reply to the more pertinent ones. What is still worrying me is the length of time during which we have to wait before we can get the delivery of these pumps. I have asked him if he has explored all the possibilities of acquiring suitable pumps from elsewhere, so that these pumps would be delivered in a shorter time than 60 weeks. The Hon. Minister has not yet told us whether he has any guarantee that the existing pumps can last until the arrival of the new ones which he hopes to put on order; that is something which I would like to know. There is a great danger in having to wait for all this time for these pumps. We have already had some difficulties in ordering equipment for the same Waterworks Department; there were times when orders were put forward, the Engineer was brought down on contract, and months on top of months went by when deliveries were not made up to mark. What I wanted a guarantee on is whether we can safely await the execution of this order, knowing that the existing pumps will continue to give us the service which is required of them. That is what I want to know; at any time these pumps can break down.

There is another point, and it is this: does the hon. member have a sufficient guarantee as to the suitability of these new pumps which he proposes to order? We know that there are Ministers in other Colonies who undertake to go overseas themselves along with their advisers and see things on the spot before they commit their Ministeries and the Governments and the taxpayers to any expenditure. I would not be satisfied, having the experience with these five or seven pumps already, knowing that they have failed to last, and the uncertainty of the manufacturing firm to give us some concession as a result —I would be quite unwilling to commit the taxpayers of this Colony to any further expenditure unless we have those guarantees which are required under normal constructions. Mr. Chairman, what I would like to state is this; the new pumps have been ordered but the old ones which are now giving trouble had also been ordered. We are liable to have the same difficulty with the ones which are to come as we have now: let us place an order and be finished with it, but let us make sure that we are not throwing away money again. There is nothing wrong in the Department sending an efficient Engineer overseas to investigate how other Countries are pumping their water, what kind of machinery they are using and how long such machinery has been in service. You should contact the Trinidad or Jamaica Government or any of the other Governments in the various Colonies, and if that does not satisfy you, there is nothing wrong in going further afield to investigate the best type of pumps and equipment which we should have.

from them. The Safe in which the Currency is put was not bought through the Crown Agents we bought a Canadian Safe. I repeat. You are not compelled to buy through the Crown Agents; sometimes you may find out that you have made a mistake by not buying on your own.

I am merely referring to the procedure because it is easy to satisfy hon. members that the recommendation has come from the Authorities in England, and it is almost invariably given by the Crown Agents. The contract which they make on behalf of the Government contains a guarantee and, of course, you have the necessary recommendation that you are dealing with a reputable firm, that that firm is not likely to let you down and it will be in a position to let you have spare parts.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to assure the hon. member who has just sat down, that the usual procedure is to purchase these items through the Crown Agents; that has been done. It is true that the majority of our materials are bought through the Crown Agents, because when we get breakages, we get back the equivalent for them. We are more sure about the Crown Agents as against local Agents; that is the usual procedure which we adopt all along.

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

Ayes: Messrs. E. D. MOTTLEY, CRAWFORD, ALLER, HAYNES, E. K. WALCOTT and GODDARD—6.

Noes: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs BOURNE, Messrs. HOLDER, BRYAN, MILLER, BRANCKER, and J. C. MOTTLEY.—10.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question has been decided in the negative, six hon. members voting "Aye," and ten hon. members voting "No." I delcare that the "Noes" have it. The question now is that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

Bus Transport Board

Payment For Buses

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to amend this Resolution.

Mr. E. D MOTTLEY: Which Resolution?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is asking which Resolution?

Hon. M. E. COX: The Resolution which is next on the Order Paper. This is a Resolution for the sum of $127,554, and I am asking leave to reduce it by the sum of $10,685.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I suggest to the hon. member that the correct method of doing that is to deal with it in this House first. We have done it in Committee by mistake; I am merely drawing the matter to your attention, Mr. Chairman, but it is a matter for you to decide. We had a Resolution which we amended in Committee, and there was a question raised; I did not say anything on that occasion, but I am saying something now. You cannot amend a Resolution in Committee.

6.20 p.m.

However, there are two ways of doing it. This House permits a certain resolution to be dealt with in Committee. That Resolution of course can be reduced in Committee because obviously that is a matter for the Committee. But this matter is not a question of a reduction in the manner of a reduction which I was talking about because you will not be able to deal with it later. This is a question of Government wishing to take out something out of this Resolution. The correct procedure to do it will be either to substitute another Resolution in place of this one or, to return to the House with it and get the permission of the House to allow you to reduce it and, if time will allow, then deal with it in Committee. This is only a Committee of the House. The House has sent down to the Committee of the House the consideration of a Resolution for a certain sum of money: therefore the Committee can in deciding on it reduce it, but they cannot add to it. It is true that we made a mistake the other day when in Committee of the House a Resolution was increased and I do know that there was much discussion on it. Really and truly the discussion on it was not acrimonious but purely on the question of procedure. I think that is the correct procedure which I am offering. This Committee wants the Government to bring down a different Resolution. There is no doubt that the House has got right before it sends down a Resolution to alter it to what it wants to be sent down.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have the greatest respect for the opinions of the hon. junior member for St. James who is an old member of this House but I would like to know whether there is a Rule for what he has said. It has been customary for us either to increase or reduce a Resolution in Committee. Surely, it has been done on several occasions. I would like to know if there is a rule of the House.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I am quite willing to help the Hon. Minister. We cannot increase it. As I have said it was done once when we wanted money for the London Delegation but we made a mistake then. Although the Government now by a prerogative right has been allowed to be run by five members of this House, whatever is done still has to be done according to the statutes of this Country. What I was talking about was incorporated in the Rule right at the end of the Executive Committee Act. That is as regards increasing; the lowering of it has never been done except when mistakes occur. The reason for increasing it is not only the Rule; it is stronger than the Rule. When we sit in Committee we are not the House. We are a Committee and though we might be a Committee of the whole House we can do nothing contrary to what the House ordered. You find all that in May's Parliamentary Practice (I think it is on page 711 of the 15th Edition.) It is so obvious that you need not look it up. As I have said, the Committee can reduce a Resolution but even then it has the right to send it back to the House for reduction.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will give way I will withdraw my request.

Now, Sir, this Resolution is for the sum of $127,554. Before I go further I want to make a special appeal to the Committee and for obvious reasons. This is a Resolution to pay certain sums of money to owners of buses whose buses were taken over some time in August last year by the Government. As the Addendum reads, the Government is advised that pending determination of the amounts to be paid in respect of the taking over of 116 buses and certain spare parts of eight companies, payment should be made of a sum to each company so as to reduce the amount of interest payable. As hon. members will remember, Government entered an agreement with these bus operators and decided (of course, this House by silent consent also agreed) to pay 5% on the amount which will be paid to the operators for their units. The payment of such amounts is being made without prejudice to any proceedings or to any sum awarded or obtained by the Companies in any proceedings.

It is also proposed to retain the services of a Queen's Counsel to appear on behalf of Government in

any proceedings which may arise. Counsel's fees are based on a payment of a retainer plus an amount for each day after the first day during the period of the actual proceedings, but as it is not known how long proceedings would take, it has been necessary to fix an arbitrary period.

It is also deemed advisable to have available the services of a person with expert knowledge of the valuation of motor vehicles and arrangements are proceeding with a view to securing the services of such a person from the United Kingdom. The cost of bringing such a person to Barbados has been estimated having regard to the air fares, fees and hotel expenses likely to be incurred; it is difficult to fix the amount of fees with any accuracy as it is not known how long this person would be required to be in the Island.

It is proposed to pay Messrs. Leon Alleyne and Denton Sayers the sum of $660 and $480 respectively for services rendered by them in connection with the taking over of the buses. The sum payable to Mr. Sayers represents an honorarium as he is employed in a Government Department, but worked for long periods out of normal office hours in carrying out the necessary work.

The amount stated in the Resolution is computed as follows—

(a) Payment, without prejudice pending determination of the amount to be paid in respect of 116 buses and the spare parts taken over by the Government	$117,619
(b) Counsel's fees	5,040 (an estimate)
(c) Expenses in connection with obtaining the services of a person from the United Kingdom with knowledge of the valuation of motor vehicles	3,755 (an estimate)
(d) Fees for Messrs. Sayers and Alleyne	1,140
	$127,554

6.30 p.m.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as we all know this matter is a very delicate one in that negotiations are going on at present between the Government and these concessionaires, and as you know, Sir, it was agreed that this matter should go before arbitration. In that case, Sir, we have to avoid as far as possible making comments which will prejudice the case one way or another: and for that reason as I said while I would hate to think or rather hate to make it appear as I would like to say here and now, that for the benefit of everybody concerned I will have to refrain from exposing it, as I know some members may want to know about the whole set up. I again promise hon. members that as soon as these proceedings are concluded that the House will have a comprehensive picture not only of the amount which is to be paid for these units but of the complete operation of the Transport Board from its inception. But hon. members will see the wisdom in Government making this payment because it is pointed out that this money carries an interest of 5% and one does not know when these proceedings will come to an end and for that reason the Government is prepared to make this payment. Now, in dealing with the second paragraph of the Addendum it has been represented to the Government that they should have someone with expert knowledge in valuation, and during the visit to the United Kingdom of the Hon. Premier and the Hon. Attorney General and Financial Secretary, they investigated the possibility of having a highly qualified individual come to Barbados if and when required to give of his expert knowledge. That individual, Sir, has been contacted and he has expressed his willingness to come to Barbados and so that explains the second paragraph to the Addendum.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation, it is not quite clear to me.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what are you speaking?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want some matter explained by the speaker, Mr. Chairman. He said in his last remarks that he was referring to the second paragraph of the Addendum.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am sorry; that should have been the third paragraph. The second paragraph refers to Counsel. We have also been advised that we should get some person to represent the Government's interest on this occasion and arrangements have also been made for that and as you see the fee set out here in the Resolution is $5,040. As I read out just now the estimated expenses for the visit of the United Kingdom expert is $3,755, and now with Mr. Sayers and Mr. Alleyne, that $1,140 represents as I mentioned just now an honorarium of $480 for Mr. Sayers and $660 for Mr. Alleyne. So far as Mr. Alleyne's fees are concerned, we have been informed that those are the fees or rather conform with the fees paid by private enterprise for this type of inspection work. Again, Sir, you will appreciate the position of the case, I know for example the hon. senior member for St. Phillip has asked quite a few questions about the operation of this Board. Of course he can appreciate the fact that it is a Corporation and not really directly controlled by any Minister.

However, I am prepared at a later stage to give the Committee all the necessary information; we have absolutely nothing to hide from hon. members, because this House is the boss, so to speak. At the appropriate time hon. members will be given all the information that is necessary. In any case, we would have to purchase these units; in any case we would have to have representation at arbitration or the Court whichever it might be, or both, and in any case, we will have to pay these two gentlemen who have inspected these buses. With those few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: With all due respect to what the Hon. Minister has said, it seems to me that there has not been at this stage, a reasonably free and frank discussion on this matter which should not be before the House at all. It is either that the public are now to be apprised of the financial details of the operation of the nationalised transport service, or that the matter should remain at the stage at which it was before, until such time as those facts can be given. What really intrigues me first and foremost, is to hear the Hon. Minister say that this nationalised transport service is run by a Corporation. That was my opinion too. Last year when we set up the Transport Board, it was my opinion that this Transport Authority would be responsible completely for the acquisition and operation of the bus service; therefore, I am at a loss to understand why this Resolution should have been presented to this House in this form. My impression was, that when you have nationalised a public utility, and you appoint an Authority with statutory powers, that Authority is responsible for all of the financial arrangements of the service itself. In other words, you give your Authority so much capital, and from the time it has been set up with statutory powers, all the transactions of the Authority are conducted in the name of and under the Authority itself. Perhaps the Hon. Minister will be able to tell the House

why is it that he says that the Minister is not responsible, that the service is being run by a Corporation.

Hon. M. E. COX: I said that it is not directly under the control of any Minister.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What he said was that the Corporation is not directly controlled by any Minister; but if he is the Minister of Transport, he formulates the policy of the Corporation; and therefore, in so far as we are concerned, all the responsibility is his. The Authority has to carry out what the Minister says. It appears to me that this statutorily-appointed Transport Board should be acquiring or paying for these buses, not the Government. Apparently, the Government is not in agreement with the estimated value of these units as assessed by the two people appointed for the purpose, these people being Mr. Alleyne and Mr. Sayers. Therefore, the only thing the Government could think of is to bring down an Englishman to see whether or not the valuation is right.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want the Committee to be under the impression that I am suffering from any anglophobia or anything like that, but I am mystified that in Barbados or in the West Indies for that matter, when there are so many competent engineering firms, we must yet send to the United Kingdom to bring out a valuer to assess the value of these buses. And not only that; it must be borne in mind that we took over these buses in August, now close on eight months. Is it possible to conceive that an Englishman coming here regardless of how expert he is, could in March, 1956, tell the value of buses which were acquired in August, 1955, buses which have been repaired, and on which appreciable sums of money have been spent by the Government during the period? It is, on the face of it, utterly absurd to expect somebody to come out here and tell you what the buses were worth when you acquired them in August last year. In other words, it is an absolute waste of money to bring this Englishman down here, and the Minister says that the Premier and the Financial Secretary had discussions with this gentleman and he has expressed his willingness to come down here. In other words, he is doing us a special favour in deciding to come down here.

7.20 p.m.

What else can you expect? If somebody is getting a free trip to the West Indies at this time of the year, good hotel accommodation, all expenses paid and good fees, do you expect him to express anything else but a willingness to come? It is a wonder that he has not landed already. Mr. Chairman, you would have no difficulty in getting one thousand people to come on a joy-ride like this. When he comes down here and he sees the buses on the streets, he will know no more of the condition they were in when they were taken over by the Government than the Prime Minister of England. All that he would be able to investigate would be the present value and especially as they have been repaired by the Government since, I would not be surprised if his estimate is higher than when the Government took them over in the bad state of repairs they were in.

Sir, they met that fellow when they were in England. He wants this trip to the West Indies and expressed his willingness to come; therefore, we are to pay for it. It is estimated that it will cost $3,755 but we do not know how long he may have to stay here. It is not known how long the Court proceedings will take and perhaps when it is finished it may cost $5,000.

Now in addition to that, the Government also proposed to obtain the services of a Queen's Counsel to appear on its behalf. The Queen's Counsel fees are based on a payment of a retainer plus an amount for each day after the first day during the period of the actual proceedings. There again it is not known how long the proceedings will take and if is estimated that the services of this Queen's Counsel will cost $5,040. It may cost us $10,000; therefore, by the time these proceedings have been further drawn out and fees paid to the Queen's Counsel, and the English arbitrator, we may have well spent more on the two of them what represents the difference of what the Government thinks of paying the bus owners and what the original valuators say we should pay for them. The amount at issue may in the final analysis be anything like $15,000. In any case when we get through, we can rest assured that the Queen's Counsel and English arbitrator will cause us to spend over $15,000.

Mr. Chairman, can you tell me that in a colony like this with Crown Law Officers, such as the Attorney General, his assistant, the Legal Draughtsman, the Crown Solicitors and what not, people who are legally responsible for advising the Government on these matters, that it is necessary to go outside and bring in foreign counsel in this matter? Apparently, the Government has no confidence in the valuators appointed locally nor any confidence in the legal staff attached to the Government. What is the Attorney General there for? What is the Crown Solicitors there for? What is the Solicitor General there for? What are the Crown Law Officers there for? [A VOICE: Drawing money] Are they only there to draw a salary and when any problem arises Government must obtain counsel from outside? They are either incapable or the Government is concerned with wanting to give a free ride to someone here. We have had many knotty problems arising here from time to time in important matters coming before Government. So far as I know, we have not yet resorted to bringing in counsel and so far as I know our Attorney Generals and our Crown Law officers of the past have not presented the implication of incompetence which this action would have implied. If I were the Attorney General of Barbados or the Solicitor General, I would not have this implication against my ability. The only deduction which the public can make from this action of the Government is that there is nobody in the Legal Department capable of representing the Government and defending its interest in this matter. Either that is slander against all the Crown Law Officers, or if it is not slander, they should be asked to resign and competent men should be put in their places. Can you imagine that in Trinidad or British Guiana when important matters arise, they go outside to get a Queen's Counsel to give them advice when they have legal advisers to the Government? This is no matter involving any special Crown, oil or mineral rights or some complicated knotty problem. This is a simple matter of equity. It is getting a valuation of the buses and paying the owners for them. That is all it is to this thing. The important thing is to get a proper estimate of the value of the buses. We are not settling any dispute as regards oil or mineral rights; this is not a dispute with the Gulf Oil Company as regards royalties and what not; this is just a matter with a few second-hand buses which the Government does not want to pay for and because of that it is bringing down an expert from England to do what should have been done eight months ago. The Government is also getting a Queen's Counsel outside of the island and paying him retainer fees plus other fees.

Mr. Chariman, it is an insult not only to the Crown Law Officers but to every member of the legal profession in Barbados. Do you mean to say that you cannot find in the whole gamut of legally trained men one solicitor or one lawyer capable of representing the Government in a small matter like this? The Government is being niggardly, apparently with

regard to the compensation for the buses, but they have money to squander in other directions. There are not two people when it comes to the question of valuation and ground of equitability like Mr. Leon Alleyne and Mr. Denton Sayers. The Government has used the services of these men on previous occasions and was perfectly satisfied with what they did. Mr. Sayers' services to the Government of Barbados have been honoured by the award of the M.B.E. a couple years ago. Mr. Leon Alleyne is the most competent mechanic in the island and I do not think anyone would question their probity or sense of honour, nor can they be probed by the bus owners to suggest that they will cause Government to pay more than what the units are worth.

I do not think anyone can question their sense of honour to suggest that they would recommend more than the units are worth. Sayers remains today in a responsible position in the Government Department and he is in addition, Sir, also occupied with the Technical Institute. Is there any justification for this kick in the pants by the Government to these two men?

Hon. M. E. COX : Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, is the hon. member saying the Government has kicked somebody in the pants? I am appealing to you, Sir, not to allow people to discuss this matter because it is *sub judice.*

Mr. CRAWFORD : If it is *sub judice* it had no right in here. The Government of this country, Sir, takes it upon itself to do anything nonsensical that comes to its head without thinking of the implications. The matter is not before the Court of Law; the matter is before arbitration. They themselves have repudiated all local counsel in the island; they have kicked them in the pants by going outside. They are dishonest. We have got competent mechanics in your service. Nobody in the country has ever pointed a finger of incompetence at Sayers. He has kept the Government's water boats in order and also the vehicles of Highways and Transport and during the war his service to the country was of such a high standard that he was recommended for the award of an M.B.E., and the Government is saying either he knows nothing or is dishonest; his word is not to be trusted. Now can anybody see that this is not a reasonable interpretation from what springs from the Government's action? I ask the Minister to put himself in the boots of either Mr. Sayers or Mr. Alleyne and ask him if either one of them can be approached by the Government again to render any service of this nature. Can you imagine Mr. Chairman, any time in the future you can call on either Mr. Sayers or Mr. Alleyne?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS : Mr. Chairman, I appeal to you. The hon. member is going too far. He has been appealed to already by the Hon. Minister, and I am asking you to rule. This matter is *sub judice.* I think it boils down to this: either you vote or you do not vote for it. You cannot discuss it.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I would like to suggest to the hon. member that like the Hon. Minister, I am in a difficult position because I represent some of these companies, but I am not going into that. I am dealing with the procedure of the matter. The Minister said the matter was *sub judice,* but that part of the Resolution which is *sub judice* should not be in the Resolution. That is all I was saying. It should not be brought in other wise you are placed in the position that this House and this Committee cannot be muzzled if you bring a matter up which is *sub judice* and the only part which should be removed in the Committee. Personally, I agree it is bound to be wrong and the Minister and myself both know. We would know better than the others that the matter is *sub judice* and that being so as you know, the rules of the debate says "matters which are pending judicial decision should not be brought before the House by a motion or otherwise. This rule does not apply to Bills." This is on page 280 and the next one is a rule from page 437 deals with the governing Speeches:

"Matters awaiting the adjudication of a court of law should not be brought forward in debate (except by means of a bill; see p. 380). This rule was observed by Sir Robert Peel and Lord John Russell, both by the wording of the speech from the Throne and by their procedure in the House, regarding Mr. O'Connell's case, and has been maintained by rulings from the Chair."

Otherwise, I submit, Sir, for your ruling that when it comes to procuring an expert for Government the Committee should debate that because in the preparation of their case where a certain person is necessary it is only commonsense. That does not quite need any rule which will prevent them from obtaining money. Similarly, if they wanted special fees for a special Queen's Counsel or if they wanted to pay men who have already performed their duties; but it would be impossible for the Minister himself or other members of this House to avoid interfering with the justice of the matter by any reference they make upon a matter which is *sub judice.* The part that must be interfered with is the matter for decision either by their arbitrator or alternatively by law, and these things are not allowed because of what I read, but I was merely trying to suggest that one matter of procedure was right.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that the honourable junior member for St. James has saved himself from making the same error which the honourable member on my right made. Even if you withdraw the part of the Resolution which was *sub judice* my remarks would still be in order. What I am discussing is the $10,000 to bring the experts. That is not *sub judice.* What is under arbitration is the amount to be for the buses. I am talking about that. What I am discussing is the $10,000 which would be voted to finance the bringing of the experts. I am opposed to that; so therefore, I am quite in order to make the remarks I am making. Even if the motion for putting $10,000 before the Committee had succeeded I would still have made the remarks I am making now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want to find out from the Hon. Minister if any part of this Resolution is *sub judice.*

Hon. M. E. COX: The whole Resolution, Mr. Chairman, as you will see is *sub judice.* One hinges on the other. We are bringing down an expert for $3,755 to advise you on spending $117,619, and then you have counsel also to advise you on the same thing. One hinges on the other and you cannot separate them.

While it may be true, as the hon. junior member for St. James has said, there may be some separation, yet at the same time it must be admitted that one is dependent on the other. It is a question of settling the matter which is before arbitration.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am trying to follow the position very clearly. I am wondering if it is not better for you, Mr. Chairman, to report progress and get His Honour the Speaker to give a ruling in this matter, because it will cause a lot of debate in here. I am yet to understand the Hon. Minister's explanation; it is either that we say nothing and let this Resolution be passed or we will have a lot of debate on it. If a part of this Resolution were to be withdrawn, that would leave us free to discuss the matter affecting Mr. Alleyne and Mr. Sayers and so on, but I will speak on the other part of the Resolution if it causes a bye-election.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On reading paragraph 2 of the Addendum to this Resolution, I see that this is what it states:—

"It is also proposed to retain the services of a Queen's Counsel to appear on behalf of Government in any proceedings which may arise."

That word "may" is worrying me. That is why I want to find out if a case has been set down for hearing and when the date will be; I want to find out if a case will be lodged, if arbitration has begun and things of that sort. I would like to find out all of those things.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Whether you accept my advice or not, it does not matter. The Hon. Minister has asked the Committee not to refer to something in this Resolution because it is **sub judice.** If the matter is **sub judice**, that is the basis on which we will deal with the Rule as to whether or not we should discuss in here something which the Hon. Minister has said is **sub judice.** If a thing is occupying the attention of some Judge, and if arbitration is to be done, that has to be made a Rule of Court. I have appeared for some of the Bus Companies concerned, and I know that the matter is **sub judice;** but my advice to the Chair is that the rest of the matter is not **sub judice.** The bringing down of experts, lawyers and so on is not the same thing as telling you that the payment of such amounts is being made without prejudice to any proceedings or to an sums awarded or obtained by the companies in any proceedings.

The Addendum says in paragraph 1 that the Government is advised that pending determination of the amounts to be paid in respect of the taking over of 116 buses and certain spare parts of eight companies, payment should be made of a sum to each company so as to reduce the amount of interest payable; to partake in a discussion as to whether or not this amount of money which is proposed to be paid should be a less amount or not is nothing to do with the other part of the matter, and you could not very well avoid bringing in some argument in connection with it. That appeared to be the first idea of the Minister when he wanted to take out the first amount *in toto.* What I have pointed out is that the usual procedure is to take out that amount by order of the House as distinct from an order of the Committee.

Hon. M. E. COX: I wonder if hon. members would agree at this stage to reduce the amount of the Resolution, since it appears that the hon. junior member for St. James would be willing for us to debate the other part of the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I 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 question was put and agreed to.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Communications who is dealing with this Resolution for the sum of $127,554, wishes to reduce this amount by $117,619. We are asking the leave of the House for the Committee to deal with this Resolution as amended..

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

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

8.00p.m.

On reassembling,

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

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

Transport—*Cont'd*

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the remarks which I have already made were applicable to this Resolution; therefore, I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of $9,935 do now pass.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman———

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman———

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Lucy will speak.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I was the last member who was speaking on this Resolution at the adjournment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You must remember that the Resolution was amended. It was changed in the House so I feel I am in order to allow the hon. senior member for St. Lucy to speak because he caught my eye first.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, this Addendum refers to the two matters with which we are now solely concerned in this Committee. I would just like to remind the Committee of this fact. We are considering the items of the Queen's Counsel fees and the expenses of an expert from the United Kingdom with a knowledge of the valuation of motor vehicles as well as the fees for Messrs. Sayers and Alleyne. There is not one of us who would not feel that the amount of $1,140 is not fully earned by those whom it is proposed to pay, that is, Mr. Sayers $480 and Mr. Alleyne $660. As to the expert from the United Kingdom, I am not quite clear what he is expected to do because of the fact, as an earlier speaker pointed out, that he would be coming here many months after the units have been taken over by the Government: and no matter how good an expert he may be, he would not be in a position to form a valuation of the omnibuses in respect of the date from when they were taken over, which is, after all, the material date. Although I am a layman in valuation, I am at a loss to understand how much help he can be when he comes, and particularly in view of the fact that we have already had the services and valuation of these two gentlemen.

9.00 p,m,

But I would warn the Government as to the 1,000 guineas for Queen's Solicitor and I notice it is singular and not plural. I happen to be in the legal world, and I heard the names of five Queen's Counsels mentioned and lest it be thought that I am calling any names before they are selected I have heard five names in alphabetical order, which are, Messrs. Archbald, Butt, O'Reilly, Wharton and Wooding, from whom I understand the choice of the Queen's Counsel will be made; and I will congratulate Government on being able to secure the services of anyone of these Queen's Counsels for the reasonable amount put down here. So far as Queen's Counsels' fees are concerned, there are two who are members of this Chamber but they live in a world of their own when it comes to charging fees. That is why members said you are rewarded by the fee which you can charge for the expenses of being called to the Inner Bar. But what I am reminding Government about is this:

whichever of these five mentioned Queen's Counsels is appointed, as soon as he accepts a brief from Government he will let them know this: you will provide me with one or two junior Counsels. What must happen is this: if he requires two juniors, you pay two-thirds for one junior and one-third for a junior junior; or if he requires one junior with whom to work, this two-thirds is fixed by the Convention of Barristers. Any Barrister taking less can be reported to the Bar Council. So we might as well face the fact that this $5,040 for Queen's Counsel is bound to necessitate a supplementary Resolution in order to pay for at least one junior, because he is not going into court at least without one junior to be associated with him. Now certain comments were made about Crown Law Officers and I must say this, Mr. Chairman, I am rather surprised that it has been found necessary to obtain a Queen's Counsel from outside, unless it is felt that the Crown Law Officers' Department today in Barbados is at such a low ebb that they do not feel themselves capable or they feel themselves capable, but they are not considered by other persons to be so in handling matters like this, because in this type of work there is always some abstruse point involved. It may well be that Government does not have the confidence the past Governments have had in their Crown Law Officers, or their Crown Law Officers do not have sufficient confidence in themselves to tackle a matter of this kind and that they have suggested a colony outside for a distinguished professional assistant.

Now, Sir, if it is suggested that the junior counsel will be provided from the Crown Law Officers' Department, then the two-thirds fee will not have to be looked for. This is how the matter appears to me. It would be *infra dig* for the Hon. Attorney General to appear as junior to any Queen's Counsel howevtr eminent, from overseas. As you know, automatically the Attorney General is leader of the Bar and the Leader of the Bar cannot be junior to anybody else. The second to the Leader of the Bar, the Deputy Leader, is the Solicitor General. He cannot appear in accordance with the best traditions of the profession as junior to this visiting Queen's Counsel, however eminent that Queen's Counsel might be — and it appears he will be one of the five from what one hears in legal circles in this island. That is the position with the two Crown Law Officers whom, I submit, cannot appear as juniors because of their position. If you are going to retain other Counsel, then you are left in the position of having to fall back on the very very juniors who are in the Crown Law Officers' Department. If the Queen's Counsel becomes indisposed during the negotiations, well then, automatically the other Counsel takes over and you will see what position we will be in when we have to fall back on very inexperienced juniors who are already in the Crown Law Officers' Department to conduct negotiations on behalf of the Government, which, it is felt, requires some of the most outstanding advocates in the area. So, Sir, I am saying that in supporting this Resolution I am anticipating that of a certainty another Resolution will have to come to us in connection with this fee, for with regard to the amount involved, Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt about it that to be able to assume that this fee includes a retainer and an amount for each day after the first day, a thousand guineas is certainly more than reasonable to be paid. Only last year Counsel from overseas was out here with five a thousand guinea retainer for a matter not involving so much, and fifteen guineas for every day (including Sundays of course) and his expenses paid. That amount did not involve the amount of money involved in this matter, but, Sir, I think that if this is an indication that either the senior Crown Law Officer lacks confidence in matters, or confidence is lacked in him, an intimation might be made to the Secretary of States that the filling of the Attorney General's post in Barbados is overdue, because it is so long ago that Mr. Wylie has been appointed to British Guiana that he was able to represent them in the Federation talks. It is high time we had the appointment filled so that we would not find it necessary to go outside in order that Government will be adequately represented by highly competent and efficient Counsel. To me the Addendum is worded to soften the feelings of the senior or acting senior Crown Law Officer by getting someone from outside. You speak of a Queen's Counsel, but you only put that in so that the acting Crown Law Officer here would not feel badly about it; but, Sir, there are some outstanding and experienced juniors in all parts of the Caribbean and the United Kingdom who are as good or better than certain members of the Inner Bar, namely, Queen's Counsel. The wording of the Addendum is to prevent the senior Crown Law Officer from feeling embarrassed or a bit put out that it has been found necessary to secure the services of a gentleman from outside.

5.10 p.m.

I know we may be told that only very recently in Trinidad in that most famous of criminal trials in the British Caribbean, the Attorney General did not appear in Court; however, in Trinidad it is recognised that the Attorney General is not expected to go into Court. We may be told that in the case of the *Queen vs Dr. Singh,* the services of Mr. Malcolm Butt were secured by the Crown, he conducted the case for the prosecution, and that has established the precedent to go outside the Crown Law Officer's Department to secure the services of Counsel. However the Clerk of that Department is a member of the Bar, there is the Attorney General, the Assistant to Attorney General, the Solicitor General and there is the Legal Draughtsman. Therefore, it could be hardly suggested that you are bringing somebody from outside because that Office is so inadequately staffed, that they are kept so busy that they cannot take time off to conduct these negotiations. Obviously, it is felt that they want somebody better than those who are in the Department; perhaps the Officers may have hinted that they had better secure the services of Mr. O'Reilly or Mr. Wooding or any of them. Whatever is the reason, there is an indication that there is an urgent need to have the Office of the Attorney General filled, without any further delay, by the type of Counsel which we expect of Island. Anybody who is the senior Crown Law Officer is expected to fill that office such as the late Sir Charles Pitcher Clarke and men of his calibre did.

We should support this Resolution because it is obvious that if we do not support it, the Government's legal representation is likely to fall below that of the representation of the other side, and therefore the Government will have suffered. Do not let us be penny wise and pound foolish; there are those around this Chamber who do not believe in paying lawyers adequate fees. I am on the outer fringe, but the fee proposed here is inadequate; the Queen's Solicitor would be very lucky to get anyone of these gentlemen whom I have mentioned, for the figure proposed in this Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not see any figure proposed in this Resolution. The Resolution claims that they cannot foretell how long the proceedings may take place and what not, and therefore the amount included here is merely an estimate. There is only one point which the last speaker has omitted

to mention; it is that this matter is so important, and it involves such highly technical legal knowledge, that the Government should make representations to Her Majesty's Government to ask that Government to send down to Barbados Sir Hartley Shawcross who represented Great Britain at the Nuremberg trials in order to get proper advice in this matter.

Unlike the last speaker, I feel that we should not vote one cent of this Resolution. The hon. Introducer said that in so far as fees payable to Messrs. Sayers and Alleyne are concerned, the fees represent more or less the type of fees paid for similar work in Barbados. That is not true; it is so patently untrue, that the other arbitrators who worked in conjunction with Messrs. Sayers and Alleyne representing the bus owners were paid much more than this amount.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. One of these gentlemen in question Mr. Alleyne, told the Government that the Insurance Company pays $10 per unit for inspection, and those were the fees which he was expecting the Government to pay.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Even if you only got to the second standard at school, you would know that if you are paying $10 per unit and there are 116 units the amount would be $1,160. This Resolution says that these Companies have spare parts so that the Government would not have paid anything for inspecting spare parts at all. The Insurance Companies pay $10 per man.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I think I have made myself crystal clear; the amount paid was $10 per unit. As many as 40 people can inspect a unit, that makes no difference.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is as as far as his knowledge goes. Other people who were employed by the Concessionaires were paid $9.60 per unit and $10 for the assessment of spare parts. Therefore the Companies paid $1,344 for the 116 buses and $69.60 making a total of over $1,400 for each assessor. Here we are paying $1,140 for two men and we are not dividing it equally.

9.20 p.m.

We are giving Mr. Alleyne $660 and Mr. Sayers $480. That is the way in which the Government proposes to distribute this money on an equitable basis but I can see no reason for it. If Mr. Sayers has less qualifications than Mr. Alleyne he should not occupy the position he does; but as he occupies the position he does, he should be paid on the same basis. This is taking advantage of a good man; however. I would be very surprised if either of them took that money anyhow.

Apart from the fees for these two valuators, as I have said earlier, I certainly will not stay here and stand for that nonsense of agreeing to pay $3,755 to bring an English Arbitrator. I do not see what he can do. If this matter goes to Court, can you imagine a Judge or a Jury accepting the assessment of a Valuator who would have valued these buses eight months after they were taken over?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am only warning the honourable member not to go too far over on the other side.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not quite understand what you mean, Mr. Chairman. This man is coming here to assess the value of these buses. His assessment may be used in the legal proceedings and I am submitting that it is a waste of time to bring him here because his assessment cannot stand in any legal proceedings against an assessment which was made at the time the Government took the buses. These buses are bound to appreciate in value [A VOICE: Shame, I object.] If the honourable member does not want to hear any discussion on this Resolution, let us give the Government complete autocratic power to do so as they like. [ANOTHER VOICE: Do not notice him] Of course, I will be just as stupid as he to notice him. I am saying that some of these buses have appreciated in value because the Government has had in many cases to put in new cylinder heads, new springs, etc., because they were of no use before they were taken over. Others have depreciated in value as compared with the time when they were taken over. Nobody in his right senses—outside of members on the Ministerial Bench—would imagine that a valuation made eight months after can be more representative of the true value than one taken just after the buses were taken over. This is a sheer waste of time and money. There can be no justification at all for this unless the Government proposes to bring out a man who is biassed to say what they want him to say, and anything so said would be taken cognisance of by the people concerned. I cannot conceive of a greater waste of money than what is proposed to do with this money. Similarly, Sir, it is a waste of time to have a properly staffed Crown Law Officers Department and in a simple matter like this to bring in counsel from outside to represent the Government.

I am saying, Sir, that in equal manner as the bringing out of the English Assessor is a kick in the pants to local assessors, so is the bringing in of Queen's Counsel a kick in the pants to the Crown Law Officers of this colony. If we have not got any legal counsel qualified enough to represent the country in a simple matter like this, which is merely a question of interpreting a contract in which the Government entered with the bus concessionaires, they are incompetent. God help them if they have to deal with matters which involve legal technicalities. I am therefore of the opinion that unless honourable members want to open themselves to the charge of assisting Government in squandering the public funds that they should not vote for this Resolution.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my quota to what the last honourable member has just said. I am going a little further than what he said. The Government wisely amended the Resolution to avoid what would be unpleasant to speak about at the moment, but I think they should have gone a little further. They should have further amended the Resolution after the Hon. Minister admitted that there is liable to be a Court proceeding arising out of this matter. The only sum of money which we should be asked to vote so as to avoid any discussion on this matter is that which concerned the fees for the two valuators, Mr. Alleyne and Mr. Sayers.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to move that the Resolution be further amended by deleting the sums of money proposed to bring down the gentleman from England and that to pay a Queen's Counsel. Let us take what is written in the Addendum to the Resolution. There is a paragraph which says: "It is also proposed to retain the services of Queen's Counsel to appear on behalf of Government in any proceedings which may arise". In other words, Government is actually anticipating that it is going to have legal proceedings. This thing may cut many ways. Recently, there was a case in Trinidad where the Crown Law Officers refused to bow to the wishes of the Government and give them wrong legal opinions or, in other words, you might say that the Crown Law Officers did not want to say what the Government wanted them to say and as a result the Government found itself in the position to get counsel from outside. I can see no reputable barrister giving any legal opinion which is not his opinion, just for the sake of giving any opinion to suit you. He is going to say that if you want to give an opinion contrary to his legal knowledge he cannot give you

the opinion. That may be the reason why this Government wants to bring in a Queen's Counsel from outside.

9.30 p.m.

Nothing here says they are bringing anybody from Trinidad or any place. They may be saying the Crown Law Officers are overworked and there is nobody to do the work, but why are you coming here for $5,040 for the simple reason, as the hon. senior member for St. Philip has said, that this is a contract? What has happened? There was a misunderstanding, a difference of opinion between the Government and concessionaires who were awarded certain rates. Government said "We are not raising bus fares; therefore, we are going to take them over." What I am worried about is why do we need legal advice. The bus concessionaires will say, "We want so much money," and the Government will say, "We are going to pay so much or let us go to Court." You are saying you have not got the lawyers here, you want somebody from outside. The argument is going to be that the officers are overworked. May be, they have not given us any good reason. Surely, the Attorney General has given Government the advice that they are legally wrong, and therefore, they want somebody to tell them they are legally right. Apparently, in the system of Ministerial Status in the West Indies the Crown Law Officers must tell them what they want to know. I am going to vote for this reason. You have withdrawn the sum of $117,000, the money which you propose to pay the companies, so what are you going to have counsel for? Now, therefore, I am saying that the same way we withdrew $117,000 we should withdraw the money to bring Counsel.

It is also proposed to retain the services of a Queen's Counsel to appear on behalf of Government in any proceedings which may arise. If you have a misunderstanding and they are not going to take the money you offer them, go to Court. There is the Attorney General and other Officers, and you have got to get Counsel so that you can come back and we will vote the money. This is wrong. You have taken the buses over. Now, I will go down to the other part, which is as follows:

"It is also deemed advisable to have available the services of a person with expert knowledge of the valuation of motor vehicles and arrangements are proceeding with a view to securing the services of such a person from the United Kingdom."

Now this is nothing short of an act of lunacy. You have been handling motor vehicles for sometime; you have a sound knowledge of motor vehicles. If you had for instance, seven or eight months ago, put a working vehicle in the hands of somebody with the agreement to buy it, provided you appoint arbitrators and they said what it was worth, and the person took it from you and worked it going and coming, the arbitrator was one person who would know everything about it; are you going to be satisfied to bring in somebody from outside who knows nothing about it? Suppose you were on a jury and that question came up, and Mr. Alleyne and Mr. Sayers said, "In August or September last year we valued them; we looked at them, and this was the condition." What would be the condition of the tyres of a bus doing, let us say 10, 20 or 150 miles a day working everyday for a period of 8 months? What are you bringing the man for?

It seems to me I am laying too much stress on this Counsel. There is a possibility of going into Court if after 8 months there is no reply to the gentlemen who valued them at one price, and intimated that the machinery was in good condition, re-bored, the cylinder heads are good, the chassis not sprained, and what not. Let us say the condition of these units is good, bad or indifferent. Now let us start to depreciate and take off $50,000. This is a wicked waste of money. If you come and argue your Crown Law Officers are over-worked or for many other reasons the Attorney General seems not to agree with Government, you will need Counsel some time or the other, so come here for the money and you will get it. In this matter you will need advice anyhow; as to how much you will need in a different matter. It is purely contract. The Concessionaires agree to sell and you agree to buy at a fixed price to be arrived at and that is the end of it. I am worried about the fees for the Queen's Counsel. It is rumoured that they do not agree with the advice given by the Crown Law Officers and we cannot help hearing. If they have to go in Court, come to the House and get money to pay Counsel; that is a matter for them. Now Sir, I take it that the Government must have agreed with Mr. Alleyne and Mr. Sayers as to the price. Let me ask this: the Minister of Communications in whose Portfolio this comes has more than cursory experience in dealing with vehicles. Mr. Alleyne has experience in dealing with the vehicles over 35 years in this country. It does not matter whether you handle motors in Barbados, England or Shanghai, you have been handling motors and it is a question of time. Sayers time is over 25 years.

In paragraph 3 it reads, "It is also deemed advisable to have available the services of a person with expert knowledge of the valuation of motor vehicles and arrangements are proceeding with a view to securing the services of such a person." Note the phrase "expert knowledge of the valuation of motor vehicles," not an expert on omnibuses and the transport services and so on. In other words, he is coming to do the same thing Mr. Sayers and Mr. Alleyne has done. If they came here and said this man has been in the Transport system in England and he knows about bus service and so on, my mouth would be closed. Why pay Mr. Alleyne and Mr Sayers if he is coming to do the same thing they have done eight months after? May be, you want to bring the man to show you how to run a more up-to-date service, but the Addendum says you are bringing a person here with expert knowledge of valuation and that the cost of bringing such a person to Barbados has been estimated having regard to the air fares, fees and hotel expenses, and it is not known how long he will be here.

9.40 p.m.

He will tell you about valuing a motor vehicle in Barbados; in fact, any English car is worth more in England as to age, than it is worth in Barbados. It is a question of purchase tax in England, but there is no such tax here. A 1953 Austin or Morris three years old for which you would pay $1,400 in Barbados, you would pay £500 for it in England; but you are bringing out a man from England with a knowledge of valuation after you have paid Mr. Sayers and Mr. Alleyne. Could I be honest to the people of Barbados to sit here and vote for that? You have appointed Mr. Sayers and Mr. Alleyne to value these units, and you are paying them $1,140; before you ask me to vote money for doing the same thing which these two gentlemen did, you must satisfy me that you are dissatisfied with their valuation. Have they not given you a fair valuation? In the absence of saying that you have not had a fair valuation, I am not voting for this Resolution.

You have appointed two reputable gentlemen, they have given you a valuation and you are bringing out another man from England to give you a valuation; it may be that this other man may not satisfy you, and you will have to start again. I

repeat, that you must satisfy us that these two gentlemen have not done a proper job, and that their valuation was tainted with prejudice in one way or other. In the absence of your saying that, would I be conscientious and honest to my constituents in voting for this Resolution?

I am moving that these two items "Counsel's fees" and the fees for bringing down this gentleman from England be deleted. I beg to move that the amount of this Resolution be further reduced by the sum of $8,795; I think that we should only vote the sum of $1,140 for these fees which the Government has agreed to pay to these two gentlemen. The Government seems not to be agreed on some legal point and they want legal opinion on this matter from outside; when the time comes, you will have to get somebody because he matter will be coming before the Court.

I am saying that there must have been some misunderstanding between the Government and the Concessionaires; the Government and the Concessionaires agreed that they will have somebody to value the buses and they would pay their valuers. You must satisfy me that there has been a deadlock, that the two men whom you appointed as assessors are dishonest and that their assessment was somewhat prejudiced; therefore you have to get rid of them and you have to appoint another valuer. We have not been told any such thing. It is as well that this amount of money has been withdrawn because there would have taken place a full-dress debate in here and a lot of things would have come out. I do not want to see any advantage taken of the Concessionaires or of the public; but I want to see everything done above-board.

I have said something here and I see the members of the Government look up in surprise. I am not objecting to their getting Counsel from outside; if they prove to us that the Government Officers cannot do the work, I quite agree that they should get somebody from outside. Having withdrawn this amount of $117,619 from the total of this Resolution, I do not think that there is anything more before us than to vote this money for the payment of these two gentlemen Messrs. Sayers and Alleyne. I beg to move that this Resolution be reduced by the sum of $8,795 leaving only this amount of $1,140 to be paid to these gentlemen.

9.50 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: This whole matter has been so clumsily handled from the inception, that we will be probably hearing a lot more of it before it is finished. I cannot see any solution of the matter in the near future because the parties interested seem to be so very far apart.

I am not a valuer but I do know that anyone whom you may bring from England, or anywhere else for that matter, can only value on the same basis as any one whom you have appointed before to do the job. When that expert comes from England, probably to his consternation he will find out that he has not seen before buses like what we have here because the buses which we have are made specially to suit local conditions. The chassis of some of them is made in England and he will have to go to one of the garages and see what they charge for one of those chassis here, not what a chassis like that would cost in England, because when that chassis comes here, freight charges and such things are taken into account. Then, he will have to go to the bus builders and take their valuation. He will then have to add those things together plus anything else and then make the necessary deductions for depreciation and so on.

What I cannot understand is why Government thinks that they can find someone who can do a better job of valuation at this late period (it being eight months after the buses were taken over) than that which was done by the two persons who were appointed at the time they were taken over.

This Resolution is broken down into three parts. The first part is for Counsel's fees. As the last hon. member who spoke has said, I do not think we have reached the stage when we need such counsel from abroad. We have not been told why we need one from abroad but I suppose that is one of the things upon which they do not wish to dilate. They might have been given some advice by the Crown Law Officers which does not tally with their wishes and for that reason they are doing without the Crown Law Officers.

The second thing is with respect to the expenses in connection with obtaining the services of a person from the United Kingdom with knowledge of the valuation of motor vehicles. That is something to which I cannot agree because I do not see the necessity for it. I do agree with the motion for the reduction of the sums of money that are needed for these two things and for that reason I am going to second the motion which was moved by the hon. senior member for the City. It would mean a further reduction of $8,595, so all that we would need to vote for now is the sum of $1,140 which is to pay the fees for Messrs. Sayers and Alleyne. Those are the two valuers that were appointed by the Government in the first instance. Somehow I am wondering how would they feel to know that they are going to draw a sum just over $1,000 and Government is going to spend $3,755 to bring out an expert to do the same thing which they have done. I do not know how they are classified. The amount for bringing out this expert is over three times what the Government is going to pay the two of them, but Government must have its own reason for bringing out this expert, and I have my reason for seconding the motion to reduce the Resolution by the amount which I have mentioned. My reason for doing so is because I do not think it is fair or necessary. It does appear as if the matter will have to be settled in Court and the value of the buses will have to be fought out there. The question is: would this new valuer influence anyone better than the valuers who were first appointed by the Government? I do not think so and for that reason I am seconding the motion for the further reduction of the Resolution by the sum of $8,795.

The question that the Resolution be reduced by $8,795 *was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:—*

Ayes: Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, and Mr. GODDARD—2.

Noes: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. Cox, Hon. C. E TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BRANCKER, and Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY—9.

The question that the Resolution for the sum of $9,935 *do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—*

Ayes: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. Cox, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY and Mr. BRANCKER—9

Noes: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD—3.

Supplementary Estimate, 1955—56, No. 78

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of $526 for incidentals of this House. The incidentals expenditure of the House has been so to speak in bad shape for the last three years; as a matter of fact, some debts have been incurred which cannot be paid out of the expenditure for the next financial year but that

was what was done in the past few years. You paid for debts out of the Current Expenditure and then left very little to pay for incidentals for the ensuing year. For instance, there has been an outstanding item Electricity, for which we owe $262.25. That has not been paid for since June, 1955. That is only one, but there are other outstanding items such as that. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

10.10 p.m.

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

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee.

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am asking leave to take Order No. 4, which stands in the name of the Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour. It is to do with amendments made by the Other Place of the Bill regulating Weights and Measures.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour, to move the consideration of the amendments of the Hon. Legislative Council to the Bill to consolidate the laws relating to weights and measures.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, the House will remember that we passed the Weights and Measures Bill and sent it to the Other Place; the Other Place has sent back these amendments. The first amendment is simple, substituting 1956 for 1955. The next is more important. I did not like this amendment at first, but if the House will follow it clearly, all that the Other Place has done is to substitute new units of capacity in the form of cubit inches, that is 274.420 cubit inches for the old figure. As members will know, at present we do not use the Imperial gallon in this island, we use the wine gallon. That is our measure of volume. The United Kingdom standard for the gallon as mentioned in the Bill is 274.240 cubit inches. In the United Kingdom Act the Imperial gallon is defined by reference to a standard which is expressed by cubit inches. Recently, it has been changed to 274.42/100, so that the Other Place by changing it to that figure have made it possible that if this Government or the Legislature should adopt in the future the Imperial gallon instead of the Wine gallon, we would have the figure and make the change all the more easily. By accepting this the House will not be agreeing with the substitution of the Imperial Gallon for the Wine gallon, but the House will observe it. The next amendment is the proviso, it reads,

"Provided that if the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall by order published in the Official Gazette direct that as from a date specified in the order the gallon as the unit or standard measure of capacity as well for liquids as dry goods shall be a unit or standard measure of the same capacity as the said imperial gallon, then as from the date specified in the order the gallon as the unit or standard measure of capacity as well for liquids as dry goods shall throughout the Island be of the same capacity as the said Imperial gallon."

So that by that proviso this would allow ample notice of this change to be given so that sellers can make suitable adjustments in the weights and measures. I may also mention that in view of Federation and the fact that this measurement obtains in other units of the Federation, I feel this change is a good one, and at any time that the Government feels it should be brought into operation, we can use it giving full and adequate notice to the people most concerned, that is sellers and so on.

The other amendment is Clause 16, after the word "regulations" insert "exempting in whole or part from the provisions of this Act any undertaking or class of undertaking specified in the said regulations and make regulations." That is, Sir, if it is found that in adopting the Imperial gallon as the measure it may be difficult to apply it to every undertaking at the same time, we might exempt that undertaking so as to give it a chance to change its measures and so on. The next Clause does not make any change of great importance. It makes it more precise instead of defining the places by deleting, "in any warehouse, store, shop, market or public place." In Clause 18, as members will know it read as follows:—

18. (1) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act it shall not be lawful for any person to sell or offer for sale—

(a) guinea or indian corn in the ear or stalk or peas, beans or other pulse in the husk otherwise than by weight at the rate of seventy-four pounds to the bushel: or

(b) white or building lime in any other measure than that of a bushel tub duly verified, stamped and certified in accordance with the provisions of section twelve of this Act.

(2) Any person who fails to comply with any of the provisions of this section, shall for every such offence be liable on conviction by a court of summary jurisdiction to a fine not exceeding fifty dollars.

These weights do not obtain to-day and further more under the Act what will happen is that the English weights and measures will obtain unless otherwise stated, so by deleting this we will fall in line with other weights and measures as far as the gallon and so on is concerned. The bushel is equal to eight imperial gallons, so it would be fair to the buyer to have it done by capacity rather than the old measurement by weight. Corn by husk may have more husk or lime, it is not fair to sell it that way, because in some cases the buyer may be seen to buy it by the bushel tub instead of by the gallon. Under the present Act by deleting this, lime can only be sold by capacity.

I beg to move that the amendments be now read a first time.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

On separate motions of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, in each case, the amendments were read a second time and agreed to.

RIFLE TEAM TO BISLEY

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I have just one more thing to mention, Sir. I want to take this opportunity to mention that in the Estimates just passed there was included $2,000 to send the Rifle Team to Bisley, but this $2,000 was granted on a dollar for dollar basis; they had to raise an amount up to $2,000 if they wanted that amount from Government, but since the Estimates have passed we have received a letter from the team asking us to remove the condition in as much as because of the hurricane and of other things people who gave before cannot help them now and it would be rather difficult for

them to raise the $2,000. As I said we have helped in this House before and this is to help along similar lines; only that because of the difficult conditions they cannot raise $2,000 and they are asking us to waive the conditions. If it is agreed to by the House, the Government will help.

10.30 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: I can quite understand the reason for this, but I only rose to say that I would not like it to be made a precedent. If you make a condition, then you should stick to it. I have no objection to removing the condition because of the circumstances which have arisen this year, but let it be undertood that this is being done because of the particular circumstances under which this Association cannot raise this money. I know that this is a case in which people have expended so much on their homes and assisted their relatives in the rehabilitation, that it is difficult to raise funds for charities in Barbados today. This is one appeal to the public which may have suffered as a result of hurricance.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: For the guidance of the Auditor General I am wondering whether it would be in order for the House to agree to a motion that this condition be removed so that, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has mentioned, it cannot be taken as a precedent. I will make a motion that the condition attached to this grant be removed for this year only. I beg to move that the condition attached to the Resolution for $2,000 relative to the sending of the Rifle Team to Bisley be removed

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

Mr. GODDARD: I do not know how we can deal with a matter which is not on the Order Paper. I am the only member of the Opposition present; I agree with this proposal, but, at this late hour, when everybody else has left, the House is apprised of this matter. I am sure that other hon. members would have agreed to this proposal, but it is a matter of precedent to make a motion in respect of something which is not on the Order Paper, or in respect of something which was not passed earlier in the day. I have no objection to this proposal.

Mr. SPEAKER: The only irregularity about the matter is that leave would have to be granted the Hon. Minister in order to proceed with this motion.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I did not think it would have been necessary for a motion to be made because this House attaches the conditions to all money votes. Nobody else can do that; we attach this condition and we remove it. We attached the condition that this grant should be given on a dollar basis, and the Barbados Rifle Association has made this representation to us.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the Hon. Minister has seen my point. This matter is not on the Order Paper, and I think that the Hon. Minister should ask for leave so as to proceed with his motion.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I ask leave to proceed with the motion which I have already indicated.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the condition attached to the Estimates relative to the grant to the Barbados Rifle Association be waived for this year.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today. Since we have been informed in a Message from His Excellency the Governor of the prorogation of this House at 4 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday next, I think that we should meet at the regular hour next Tuesday, so that any amendments from the Other Place might be dealt with. If that is the general agreement, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 3rd April, 1956, at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next 3rd April, 1956, at 3 o'clock p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

10.42 p.m.

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1955—56

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 3rd April, 1956

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

Present

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

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last Meeting are not yet ready for circulation.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor to lay Statement of Post Office Advances for the payment of Money Orders to 31st December, 1955.

REPLIES

Hon. M. E. COX: I also beg to lay the Reply to Question No. 70, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Philip, regarding the financial affairs of the Transport Board.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot do that at this stage. The Clerk has not finished calling for Notices and so on.

Notices and Petitions were called.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT TO DISCUSS ADDRESS Re LANDING RIGHTS AT SEAWELL

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am moving the adjournment of this House for five minutes in order to discuss a very important matter. I understand that in a few minutes from now, His Excellency the Governor will be proroguing the House, and it leaves us somewhat worried as to whether hon. members have forgotten, or rather the Administration have forgotten, the Address which was passed by this House relative to landing rights at Seawell Airport being granted to American Flag-bearing Airlines. We do not consider that this House should be prorogued with such a very important question left hanging in the air. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that quite recently this entire question of the Air Service was considered, and other West Indian Colonies seemed to have got quite a lot of benefit from it, and also got much of the old system reviewed. We, in this Colony, have not had any such consideration. We feel that this matter is of such importance that His Excellency the Governor could have, at least, given some reply to it. The Address was dated 29th November, 1955, and it reads as follows:—

His Excellency the Governor
To
The Honourable the House of Assembly

The House of Assembly desire to draw to Your Excellency's attention its dissatisfaction with the reluctance of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to grant landing rights at Seawell Airport to an American flag-bearing airline ready and willing to offer the island the benefit of scheduled services.

The House is of the opinion that these facilities should be granted without further delay and that similar rights should be extended to any other reputable national airlines willing to offer scheduled services.

The House respectfully request that a copy of this Address be transmitted by cable to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies with a request for prompt attention.

At least, the majority of hon. members who actually voted for this Address—there was no dissentient voice in this Chamber—feel today that this

very important matter should not be left to die a natural death or to be pigeon-holed, so to speak. We feel, that the democracy of which we have been hearing so much, is only a sham, if this state of affairs exists. If, in these days, we are told that we are given freedom and privileges, allowing us to run our own business, so to speak, we feel that some reply in connection with this matter should have been forthcoming. I do not want to accuse the Head of the Administration of being discourteous, but I want it to be borne in mind very strongly that we have passed this Address relative to the Airport which should be an open Airport; the Address says in paragraph 2 that the House is of the opinion that the facilities of landing rights should be extended to any other reputable national Airlines willing to offer scheduled services.

Here we have an Airport which is really a closed Airport. Today you must realise that if you had an American Airline with landing fees working out at $60, we would be getting something like $10,000 by way of revenue, and now we have to look for a lot of money to be spent on our Airport. It may be argued that we have been getting from the British taxpayers certain funds to assist us with our Airport, but a similar argument applies to other Colonies. Therefore, it cannot be said that we are being treated fairly.

3.25 p.m.

You know how the people in the other West Indian colonies look upon us and our Government, yet we are still told today in this Year of Grace that our airport is closed and, as far as the British Government is concerned, it is that Government which has the say as to who, and when and what should come to Barbados. I think that is scandalous. At four o'clock this afternoon this Legislature will be prorogued. The Address with respect to American flag-bearing Airlines landing in Barbados was passed on the 29th November last and up to now not one word has been said about it. It shows that we are nothing else but a bunch of figure heads and it is just so much "hooey" to say that we have any form of democracy. Up to now absolutely nothing has been done about the Address.

We are using the sweat of the people of this colony to subsidise an airline company. Anyone who had the pleasure of listening to the eminent Dr. Williams a few evenings ago would have heard his condemnation of the service which we are subsiding. He condemned the whole idea of it. Just fancy, Sir, that in these days you cannot have Barbados as an open airport so that you could get the benefit of landing fees from the lot of airline companies that would like to come here.

In a few minutes we shall wait upon the Head of the Administration to hear him with all the dignity and pomp at his command prorogue the Legislature and then within a few weeks he will come again to open it. We are told that this is a democratic country and that this is a country where everyone is given his rights and that no one has any stranglehold on you; yet we passed an Address in here asking that facilities should be given to an American Airliner to land here and it is now five months since we passed that Address and nothing has been heard about it. As a matter of fact, that was the third Address we passed on the said subject. Nothing has been done in the matter. Sometimes we wonder if our loyalty gets us anywhere; we wonder if it would not be better if we were to have a revolutionary spirit like British Guiana. Just fancy, Mr. Speaker, that Barbados boasts of all its loyalty and all its constitutional form of Government, yet with all of that, members of this House of Assembly without a dissentient voice agreed to the passing of an Address and the Head of the Administration has not the courtesy to reply to it. Surely Colonial Office should realise that it is four months since this loyal and ancient Assembly has passed that Address and something should be said about it before prorogation. It is scandalous; it is gross disrespect to this Chamber. As I understand it nothing more can be said about it after prorogation. I feel strongly about this matter. It is not affecting me personally or is it affecting any individual personally: but it is affecting the Island as a whole. The Address was passed in this ancient and loyal Chamber and we asked that it be transmitted to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, therefore common courtesy demands that we should be told something about it. A few minutes ago the Hon. Minister of Communications laid a Reply to a question asked by the hon. senior member for St. Philip. Why should not this House be given some reply to this Address before this Legislature is prorogued?

This is not a criticism against any member of the Government but it is noticeable that when the Address was passed not even one member of the Government walked out on the Address. Can you say this is democracy? This House sat, discussed and passed an Address on the 29th November, last year and asked the Head of the Administration to transmit it to the Secretary of State for the Colonies and up to now almost five months afterwards not one word has been said about it.

I believe hon. members of this Chamber will appreciate that the Address was not the wish of only a member of the Opposition but it was the wish of all sides of this House. It was Sir Alfred Savage, a former Governor of this colony, who in a speech said that the tourist industry was an industry which must be built up and if the tourist industry of this colony is something which must be built up, surely Seawell should be an open Airport. All members of this House realise that, and because they realise that, they decided that they should support the Address. I remember well that on the occasion of the passing of that Address my colleague rightly amended it to say that the facilities should be granted without further delay and that similar rights should be extended to any national reputable airline.

As I have said, not one word has been said about it. This House has been treated with grave discourtesy and the least that this House should do is to protest and in no uncertain terms. Are we nothing else but a bunch of figure heads? As I have said, one wonders if all this loyalty which we have gets us anywhere or if it is not that revolutionary spirit as that of British Guiana which gets us anywhere. As I have said, I feel very strongly upon this matter.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion for the adjournment I would like to say that on the last occasion when we passed this Address we hoped that we would have got an early reply; as a matter of fact, we on this side of the table expected a reply in a matter of weeks. This is about the fourth occasion on which an Address of that sort has been passed and nothing has been said to this Chamber about them. We have been treated in the same way on each occasion. As a matter of fact on one occasion the Address was left in a pigeon-hole of the Secretariat because when the hon. senior member for the City enquired about it, it was still there. They had forgotten to pass it on to the Secretary of State for the Colonies either wilfully or unintentionally.

3.35 p.m.

All of that was drawn to the attention of the Head of the Administration when this was taking place and he seemed so concerned about the whole

matter that we had hoped that within a couple of weeks we would have got a reply. This is now a matter of four months; the House is going to be prorogued within a couple of minutes and we are treated with the same discourtesy as on the other occasions. I wonder whether they feel so complacent about the whole matter that they can win over all the members of Government who seem to wink at the feeling of the House to the suggestion made to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies and to the Colonial Office on other occasions that they were willing to back the Colonial Office in its feelings. The Minister of Trade said when this was discussed on the last occasion that he was going to London in a couple of days and would take up the matter and let us know on his return what he could have got. He has not reported yet. I wonder if he will join in this debate today and tell us what was found out, because we will continue to press on this side of the Table for the opening of Seawell Airport to more than the existing airlines today. We are glad to extend the runway, we have been voting money to enlarge the terminal and we have hopes of expanding the economy through the Tourist Industry, but if we have to depend on this one airline it will be delayed beyond measure. This year, in the height of the tourist season, people are moving two weeks earlier than they would have done because there are not sufficient airlines to take them back to America, because if they remain here they will have to spend one month. All airlines going both ways are full. The Viscounts were promised a year ago; we got them this year. We are not treated as well as we expected. We have given them a monopoly and although they have improved the service they have not given the improved service we expected. They are now promising more Viscounts next year, but the tourist industry is being held back because it is not coming fast enough. I know we only have a few minutes and other members will want to express their opinion on this, but I again say it is discourteous that we should not have a reply to this our fourth Address to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Only a couple of weeks ago an international meeting of the Governments of the U.S.A. and Great Britain met over these areas and it was most pointing that Barbados was again left out. I saw the names of the Bahamas, Jamaica, Antigua, Trinidad and British Guiana mentioned. Barbados was again left out I hope every member who knows more will express the same feeling as we have today.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I take it that this mostly concerns today what the House might regard as discourtesy towards it by the Head of the Administration and has nothing to do with landing rights at Seawell. It is in that light that I will make comments. I think it is very discourteous; not only an Address was sent direct by cable to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, but it contained the phrase that we would like an urgent reply and it should be dealt without delay, and certainly, Sir, I think at least a reply should be sent to the House saying that you have received the Address and you have the assurance that it is being dealt with; but to come merely five months after and prorogue the House without intimation whatever that the matter is being dealt with is discourteous and it is discourtesy which has come from a quarter that should not be guilty of such discourtesy. The next Address I would bring in would be one to Her Majesty the Queen about what is happening. That is the sort of Address I would pass next time. Let us explore the possibility of doing that. We can send it by the Minister of Trade, Sir. He knows how to go up there and linger and do nothing and have tea on the verandahs and during that time he would be able to worm or trade his way in perhaps and see the Queen. I do not think this is the only Address upon which this House has been treated discourteously and others should be taken up, but I am rather surprised that this treatment should be meted out to this House which is very generous to the administration, and extremely generous to the particular Head of the Administration. Another thing I would do to impress our seriousness upon the Head of Administration would be to boycott his ceremony today or something of the kind, but some drastic step should be taken. It is unfortunate that prominent members of this Government should be guilty of conniving with the Head of the Administration to offer gratuitous insults to this House. They have been doing it for a long time and I think it is time they stop it because they should see the seriousness of it and call a halt. However, Sir I just rose to say I would not like any discussion as to whether Seawell Airport should be open or not; we know about that. My colleague said in discussing the matter that no reply has been sent.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for the City has done to the dignity of this Ancient House a great service by drawing to the attention of the public and other hon. members the manner in which the affairs of this country are being handled by those to whom the Crown and the people have placed confidence with a certain amount of respect. There are no fewer than 37 items of Private Members' Business quite apart from six Notices and numerous questions which from 1953 have been on the Order Paper of this Chamber and amongst these unanswered questions and notices which have not been given due consideration and Items of Private Members' Business is the Address to which the hon. member referred. In two and a half years this House has not found time to deal with a single Item of Private Members' Business, and I would like to lay the responsibility for that at the door of the Head of the Administration or indeed to attribute the fault to Your Honour as the person presiding over the affairs of this Chamber, but since we have Ministerial Status coinciding with this period of dereliction of Private Members' Business we must lay the responsibility for it at the door of the Ministers themselves. With the new conventions which must necessarily be observed at this stage of our history, it must appear to all but blind that the Head of the Administration cannot prorogue this Hon. Legislature unless he is advised to do so by the persons who are supposed to be entirely responsible for the running of the affairs of the country, and these persons are the Five Ministers.

2.45 p.m.

I think that the hon. junior member for the City has made an excellent suggestion, when he said that the next Address which we pass on the floor of this House should be presented to the Sovereign itself. I say that, because if the Constitution of this Country is going to be debauched in this wanton and reckless manner by people who profess to be the upholders of the Constitution, and if the Officer administering the Government of this Country is going to feel that Constitutional Convention binds him to the extent of conniving at the debauchery of the Constitution, then it is clear that the checks and balances which are not only expedient but necessary to control the actions of human beings who do not always act through the purest of motives—if these checks and balances are not observed and rigorously upheld by the Officer administering the Government, then there is no hope at all for the Parliamentary Democracy in this Chamber. Therefore the Sovereign who is the custodian of our Constitutional rights and privileges should be cognisant of the wanton way in which this

debauchery has taken place since the inception of Ministerial Government.

It is even rumoured that the purpose of the prorogation, and I have no evidence of it, it is merely suspicion—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is certainly straying from the motion which was the adjournment of the House in order to discuss the matter of a particular Address. The hon. member is now telling us about rumours in respect of the prorogation; I think he will have to say what he is saying in some other place and in some other manner.

Mr. BARROW: I understand that the hon. senior member for the City was objecting to the prorogation of the House before the House was treated to the courtesy of a Reply to a particular Address and to other Addresses which we passed to the Officer administering the Government of this Country. That is why I mentioned the question of the prorogation. In referring to the rumours, I do so merely because I do not want to make any aspersions at this stage without the legal evidence for supporting it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will keep to the question which is presently before the House.

Mr. BARROW: I was saying that there is a strong feeling on this side of the House by hon. members that the purpose of the prorogation—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not speaking on the motion which is before the House. We are not now concerned with rumours or about what hon. members feel about the prorogation; this is not the time for the hon. member to bring that in. I insist that the hon. member will now desist from making any such reference.

Mr. BARROW: With all due respect to Your Honour, I do not quite see how I could talk on this matter —

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now breaking the Rules of the House. If the hon. member thinks that he is going to get around me and hopes to deceive me when he wants to talk about the prorogation, he is only making himself appear to be not as sensible as I know he is. He will not deceive me, and I rule him out of Order.

Mr. BARROW: I should just like to say that I will restrain any further reference to the prorogation until the appropriate occasion; but I would like to say that I hope the purpose of this prorogation—

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member shows his obstinacy, I will name him. This motion deals with what the hon. senior member for the City regards as the way in which a particular Address was handled by the Head of the Administration. In case the hon. senior member for St. George was not present earlier, I will remind him of what the motion is. In fact I have done so already. The hon. member will now desist from making any reference to the prorogation; if he does so, he does it at his own risk.

Mr. BARROW: One of the unfortunate occupational hazards of being a representative of the people of this Country is to have to sit in this Chamber and listen to the fulminations of members of this Chamber from time to time and witness the debauchery of the Constitution. I will desist from making any reference to the prorogation, but I would like to serve notice on the Officer administering the Government of this Colony that he can only be respected in this Colony when he ceases to connive at efforts which can only be designed to stifle debate upon issues which are important to the people of this Colony. And having said so, I will desist. [*Cheers*].

Hon. M. E. COX: There is no doubt that this matter has been debated on many occasions. I think that as far back as 1953, when the first Address was passed in relation to this matter, a Reply was sent to this House as follows:—

His Excellency the Governor
To
The Honourable the House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to the Address of the Honourable House of Assembly dated the 16th of June, 1953, and to say that, with the introduction of the new service by the British Overseas Airways Corporation, a more direct connection link with New York has become available.

Before any consideration could be given to the operation into the Island of the foreign airlines mentioned in the Address, it would be necessary for those Companies to make the necessary applications.

That Message was communicated to the House on the 8th December, 1953, I think that from my knowledge, the situation up to now remains unchanged. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Shame!]

3.55 p.m.

I say that because the last paragraph says that the Company should make application and I am definitely sure that up to now no application has been made.

Now, Sir, I think I should reiterate that this Government is not prepared to be used either one way or the other. It is difficult to get to the root of this complaint. As I have said sometime ago, the manner in which it is done is rather strange because instead of the Company making representations direct to the British Government, it appears to me that the Company is asking a member of this House to put an Address or Resolution through the House to express the wishes of the House for such a Company to operate here, even if it may not be the wishes of the people to allow some foreign Airline to call to this Island with a view of taking a certain number of passengers. I am not prepared to say more than what I said on the last occasion.

PROROGATION OF THE ASSEMBLY

The Sergeant-at-Arms entered the Chamber and informed Mr. Speaker that His Excellency the Governor is in the Council Chamber and is ready to receive the House.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that His Excellency the Governor desired the House to attend him in the Council Chamber, and preceded by the Marshal bearing the Mace, Mr. Speaker followed by other honourable members proceeded to the Council Chamber where His Excellency delivered an Address and presented Mr. Speaker with a copy of it.

At the close of His Excellency's Address, Mr. Speaker and other hon. members preceded by the Marshal carrying the Mace cradle-wise returned to the Assembly Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: (*Sitting in the Clerk's Chair*) Gentlemen, — On the last occasion when it was His Excellency's pleasure to meet the members of this House in the Council Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to deliver the following Address on the Prorogation of the Legislature.

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly:

The Houses of the Legislature have been in session since 21st September, 1954. I thank you for the careful attention which you have given to the multifarious and important matters that have en-

gaged your attention during what has been an unavoidably long session. This appears to be a convenient time for a short recess.

It would be contrary to tradition for the Governor on this occasion to review the work of the session, and I only propose to mention briefly three historical events, of widely different natures, which have taken place during its course.

In February, 1955, during four unforgettable days, Her Royal Highness The Princess Margaret brought great joy and happiness to the people of this Island.

On the 22nd September, 1955, Barbados suffered its worst natural disaster of the present century when Hurricane Janet struck the Island, causing particularly widespread devastation in the southern parishes. The speed and energy with which the heavy task of rehabilitation was tackled has evoked widespread admiration, and I am thankful to be able to say only six months after the catastrophe that the Government's rehabilitation programme has been virtually completed.

The 23rd February will always be remembered in the British Caribbean Territories as the day in 1956 when their representatives reached final agreement that their countries should be bound together in Federation, and took the decisive step of requesting the Secretary of State for the Colonies to seek leave to introduce an Enabling Bill into Her Majesty's Parliament in the United Kingdom.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly:

I thank you for the supplies which you have voted from time to time to meet the needs of the public services.

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly:

By virtue and in exercise of the powers in me vested by the Letters Patent of His Majesty King George V, dated the 4th day of June, 1914, I now prorogue the Legislature and I order that it stand prorogued until the 24th day of April, 1956.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL.
Governor.

3rd April, 1956.

All the members of the Assembly left the Chamber shaking hands with the Speaker as they left.

The House then stood prorogued until 24th April, 1956.

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1956

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24th April, 1956.

Pursuant to prorogation, the 1956-57 Legislative Session was opened by His Excelleney the Governor, Brigadier Sir Robert Duncan Harris Arundell, K.C.M.G., O.B.E., in the Council Chamber, Public Buildings, at 11 o'clock a.m. today

The following members of the House were present in their Chamber:—

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (Senior Member for St. Peter, (*Speaker*); Hon. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., C.M.G., Q.C., senior member for St. Joseph, (*Premier*) Mr. J. E. T BRANCKER, senior member for St. Lucy, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., junior member for St. Thomas, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, junior member for the City; Hon. M. E. COX, senior member for St. Michael (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., junior member for St. Joseph; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E., junior member for St. Peter, Hon. R. G. MAPP, senior member for St. Thomas, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. T. G. BRYAN, junior member for St. Michael; Mr. F. C. GODDARD, junior member for Christ Church, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. F. E. MILLER, junior member for St. George; Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., junior member for St. Andrew, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, junior member for St. Philip; Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, senior member for St. James; Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN junior member for St. John, Hon. C. E. TALMA, senior member for Christ Church; (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, senior member for St. Andrew; and E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., senior member for St. George.

HOUSE SUMMONED TO OTHER PLACE

Honourable members being in their places, the Sergeant-at-Arms entered the Chamber and informed Mr. SPEAKER that His Excellency the Governor was in the Council and was ready to receive the House.

Mr. SPEAKER preceded by the Marshal carrying the Mace cradlewise and followed by other honourable members in pairs according to seniority, proceeded to the Council Chamber and waited on His Excellency the Governor.

His Excellency then addressed the two Houses of the Legislature as follows:—

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council:
Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly:

My purpose in addressing you today is to give you, along with a brief review of public affairs, an outline of my Government's proposals for the Session that is about to begin.

In December, 1955, the Honourable Sir John Chandler was succeeded as President of the Legislative Council by the Honourable Sir Archibald Cuke, C.B.E., whose services to Barbados and to the British Caribbean were recognised by a Knighthood in the Birthday Honours of 1955. Sir John Chandler's retirement from the Presidency ended a family tradition of service in the Legislature, which had continued unbroken for 85 years.

When Sir Archibald Cuke succeeded to the Presidency of the Legislative Council he was appointed by Her Majesty the Queen to be a member of the Executive Council. His place as the Legislative Council member of Executive Committee was taken by the Honourable Dr. A. S. Cato.

The Honourable Dr. H. G. Cummins, Minister of Social Services and Leader of the House of Assembly, was made a Commander of the Order of the British Empire in the New Year Honours of 1955.

There was one change in the Membership of the General Assembly during the last Session, in consequence of the departure from the Island of Mr. L. A. Williams. Mr. J. C. Tudor was elected in his place.

I record with regret the death in England of the Honourable Sir Dudley Leacock, who retired from the Presidency of the Legislative Council in 1950.

Thanks mainly to excellent sugar crops and to the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement, the revenue of the Island has risen steeply from $9½ million six years ago to over $17 million in the financial year which has just ended and has enabled the Government to carry out its fiscal policy. In the same period the expenditure on current account has risen from some $10 million to a little over $14 million. Thus, so far, current expenditure has been kept well below the level of revenue.

In the present financial year, however, there will be a considerable increase in current expenditure, including about $3 million for increases in old age pensions, about $180,000 for medical services and $145,000 for regional services. My Government is faced with the necessity of reviewing the emoluments of the Civil Service and Government employees, and this may result in the substantial increase in expenditure. Another factor which will narrow the margin between current revenue and expenditure in the present financial year is the reduced yield of sugar. The crop is not now expected to exceed 160,000 tons, as compared with 171,000 tons last year. The estimated surplus on current account in the Budget for 1956—57 is about $1/3 million.

Capital expenditure has risen over the past six years from under $1 million to $4 million, and this year's Estimates provide for capital expenditure totalling some $6¾ million. This expenditure, over and above the annual contribution of $¼ million from current revenue, will be met partly from the Island's allocation under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act, partly from local loan funds and partly from surplus balances.

It is important that we should make full use of the Colonial Development and Welfare Funds allocated to us and applications for substantial grants are being sent forward.

It is also important that before approaching the London Market for the external loan of $17¼ million, which will be needed later on to finance the Deep Water Harbour, we should raise as much money as possible locally. The list of applications for the new Government loan was accordingly opened yesterday. As and when market conditions appear favourable, further local loan operations will be carried out, including the loan of $1 million required to finance the developments contemplated by the Natural Gas Corporation. This loan will, of course, be fully guaranteed by the Government.

At the end of the last financial year the Island's accumulated surplus balance stood at about $4¼ million, $2¼ million less than a year ago. This reflects the heavy expenditure that had to be undertaken to repair the ravages of Hurricane Janet.

The Revenue Equalisation Fund, intended for use as a reserve in the event of a recession, now amounts to some $7 million or, say, 5 months' revenue. Consideration will be given to fixing a ceiling for this Fund and to drawing on it in order to provide temporary finance for the Deep Water Harbour project pending the raising of an external loan.

The necessity of making wider use of the Labour Welfare Fund in order to finance capital works, which will be of benefit to sugar workers, is another question that is under examination.

In order to promote thrift, Savings Bank facilities will be extended to all district Post Offices on the 1st May.

My Government's financial policy has been expounded during the recent Budget Session and their long term plans will be laid before you during the Session now beginning. I believe we can continue to have confidence in the Island's financial ability to carry through the heavy programme of capital works which is now under way.

In connection with the provision in the Estimates of $1,300,000 for the Deep Water Harbour, I should mention that Mr. D. C. Coode of Messrs. Coode & Partners, Consulting Engineers, is expected to arrive in June to complete the detailed plans and specifications for the harbour. He will be accompanied by a representative of Messrs. Tate & Lyle Technical Services Ltd., who are to advise on the bulk storage and handling of sugar. It is expected that work on the construction of the harbour will begin before the end of this year. Meanwhile, various preparatory and ancillary works will proceed.

Among the principal buildings completed during the last Session were the new Government buildings in Bay Street, the offices for the Public Works and Highways and Transport Departments on the Pine Estate, the Fire Station on Probyn Street, the Regional Police Training School at Seawell, the Enmore Health Centre, the Princess Margaret School, the Teaching Block of the Technical Institute and the Eagle Hall Infants' School. Major works now in progress include a new school on the Bay Estate, workshop at the Technical Institute, the new Christ Church Foundation School, mechanical workshops at the Pine, improvements and additions at the Law Courts and the new steam laundry at the General Hospital. The Capital Estimates also provide for the rebuilding of Combermere School, for a new Health Centre in St. Philip, for the enlargement of the Airport buildings, for a new Central Market and for other works which I need not list. It is a measure of the

extraordinary expansion of activities that has taken place that the expenditure by the Public Works Department rose from under $200,000 in 1952—53 to $1⅓ million 1955—56. This does not include nearly $½ million hurricane expenditure which was undertaken by the Department.

With regard to the provision made for the continuation of the programme of development at the General Hospital, plans will be laid before you for the construction of a new Hospital and for the reallocation and conversion of the existing buildings so as to provide adequate tuberculosis wards and staff quarters.

Consideration is being given to means of reducing the high cost of Government printing and a Resolution will shortly be submitted to the Legislature to provide funds for the purchase of printing machinery.

Rehabilitation since Hurricane Janet has included the repair of 15,000 chattel houses and the erection of over 600 new wooden houses. The first of six twenty-unit blocks of terraced houses has also been completed. Provision is made in the Budget for the rebuilding of two schools which were destroyed in the storm.

It is fitting that I should pay tribute to the wonderful generosity of kind friends of Barbados in many lands who have contributed towards hurricane relief. The Central Hurricane Relief Committee are doing everything possible to ensure that the funds at their disposal are wisely and fairly distributed among the sufferers.

The Housing Act of 1955, which provides for the co-ordination and expansion of the Government's housing programme under a public authority, was timely in relation to the hurricane. The Act was brought into full operation on the 1st of this month.

A Bill to facilitate certain loans under the Public Officers Housing Loans Act of 1952 will be submitted to the Legislature.

Draft Town and Country Planning legislation has been prepared and the advice of the Secretary of State's Advisory Panel is being sought on its provisions.

It is an indication of the progress made with the development of public water supplies that 7 million gallons a day, double the volume raised ten years ago, are now consumed. To meet the progressive increase in demand and to complete the reorganisation, additional expenditure is necessary; it is hoped that the greater part of this will be met from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds.

The extension and improvement of the runway, the additions to the terminal buildings and the reorganisation of the fire-fighting services at Seawell are in keeping with present day requirement at an important airport.

The reconstruction of highways and the building of tenantry roads are among other works items which I need not mention in detail.

The Public Utilities Act was proclaimed and the Public Utilities Board assumed duty on the 1st January, 1955.

Following a reorganisation, the new Barbados Light and Power Company Ltd., is undertaking a considerable expansion of services. This Company and the Telephone Company Ltd., are to be congratulated on the rapidity with which they repaired the heavy damage done to their lines and services by the hurricane. The statutory Natural Gas Corporation now has charge of all gas operations from well to consumer. Plans are being made to renew and expand the distribution system.

The four wells drilled so far by the Barbados Gulf Oil Company have failed to reveal commercial supplies of oil. A gas well was purchased by the Natural Gas Corporation.

The Barbados Development Act of 1955 recognised the vital importance of expanding the Island's production. The Board set up under the Act is urgently seeking key staff in order that it may soon be in a position to discharge its responsibilities.

Various concessions were made to private industry during the last Session. It had been hoped to lay before you more liberal Pioneer Industries legislation, but it was thought wise to await the results of the review of the subject that is being undertaken by the Regional Economic Committee. Proposals for the assistance of the hotel industry are being formulated.

A film designed to promote Barbados as a tourist resort was subsidised. A strip of land at Rockley was purchased in order to preserve the beach for bathers.

The efficient production of sugar remains of paramount importance and attention continues to be given to the development of irrigation, so as to reduce our utter dependence on rainfall, the improvement of soil fertility, the control of pests and the breeding of highly-yielding varieties of cane.

Dependence on sugar must not be allowed to blind us to the potential importance of the livestock industry and to the opportunities which exist of increasing our production of fruit, vegetables and other food crops, whether on a field or garden scale. Agriculture extension work, designed to build up confidence and co-operation between the Department and its stations on the one hand and the grower on the other, is beginning to show results. The subsidy scheme has

given considerable stimulus to pig breeding. The improvement of marketing arrangements that is contemplated ought to give an impetus to the local production of many things which we now import.

The mechanisation of the fishing fleet continues rapidly with the assistance of loans from the Government and the Budget makes tentative provision for the cold storage of fish. A token provision is made for a central milk depot. Work on the problems of the Scotland area awaits the appointment of a suitably qualified officer.

Emigration, mainly to the United Kingdom, is proving most valuable as an offset to the increase in population. The number of emigrants in 1955 is about equal to the annual increment in our adult labour supply. The recruitment of Barbadians on a considerable scale, e.g. by the London Transport Executive and British Transport Commission, depends on the finding of accommodation for the workers which is one of the principal tasks for the Island's Welfare and Liaison Service in the United Kingdom.

A survey of unemployment and related matters by Mr. George Cumper, Research Fellow of the Institute of Social and Economic Research, University College of the West Indies, has been completed. His Report, which has just been received will be communicated to the Legislature as soon as possible.

A successful start has been made by the Barbados Family Planning Association, and the Budget provides an increased grant towards their work.

Regulations under the Adoption Act of 1955 will shortly be laid in the Legislature.

Legislation has been enacted to implement Professor Richardson's recommendation in regard to non-contributory Old Age Pensions. His other recommendations are being examined.

The opening of Health Centres in Speightstown (1953) and at Enmore (1955) has focussed public attention on the importance of preventive medicine. This work will be extended into the southern and eastern parishes through the third Health Centre to be constructed in St. Philip. The Enmore Centre is also serving as headquarters for two public health projects—the eradication of the Aedes Aegypti mosquito and BCG vaccination. The Island is greatly indebted to the World Health Organisation for the skilled staff and funds that it is providing.

This is an appropriate place to refer to the tragic death of Dr. J. P O'Mahony, Director of Medical Services, on the 6th January this year. He was responsible for framing the schemes for the expansion of health services and the prevention of disease from which the people of the Island will live to derive much benefit.

Minor works intended to make country life more agreeable continue to be carried out, including branch libraries, community centres and playing fields, public baths and the like.

Action will be taken under the Education (Amendment) Act of 1956 to reconstitute the Board of Education with its constituent Committees. Legislation will be submitted to you to amend the Government Scholarships and Exhibitions Act of 1949 to ensure *inter alia*, that one award each year is reserved for a girl.

Emigration has accentuated the importance of technical education. It is hoped that the workshops at the Technical Institute will be completed and the teaching staff recruited in time for the September term. A start has already been made with theoretical instruction.

Erdiston College is now providing a two year training course for teachers from Barbados and seven other Islands in the Windwards and Leewards. Another regional institution, which will soon begin to serve Barbados and the Windward and Leeward Islands, is the Police Training School at Seawell.

The draft of a new Labour Code, prepared by Mr. C. O. J. Matthews of the International Labour Organisation, is expected shortly; pending its receipt the Bill to regulate and improve the conditions of work in Factories, which lapsed with the prorogation of the Legislature, will not be proceeded with. In the new code steps, will be taken to amend, *inter alia*, the Better Security and Workmen's Compensation Acts.

The Bill to remedy deficiencies in the law relating to the sale and supply of intoxicating liquor will be reintroduced.

Legislation will be laid before you to provide for the reorganisation of the Judiciary by abolishing the existing system of separate superior courts of record, and establishing a two level system consisting of Magistrates' Courts with increased jurisdiction and a Supreme Court. The Supreme Court will be vested with the Jurisdiction of all the existing Superior Courts and with an Appellate jurisdiction over the Magistrates' Courts.

Bills will also be laid before you to provide for the establishment of a Judicial and Legal Service Commission, to increase the remuneration of jurors and to repeal and replace the out of date Police Act of 1908. You will also be invited to give attention to a Resolution establishing staff for a Statistical Service.

In pursuance of the approval in principle which was given by the Legislature, negotiations for the establishment in Barbados of a United States Oceanographic Research Station have reached an advanced stage. Legislation will be submitted to you to provide for the compulsory acquisition of the site that has been selected.

Work is proceeding with the compilation of a common Register of Electors to be used both for Central and Local Government elections. Further amendments of the Local Government Act will be introduced in the near future.

A Sub-Committee of the Executive Committee has met a Committee appointed by the Lord Bishop to discuss the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Anglican Church. Discussions will proceed.

You will be invited to approve financial provision to meet our share of the cost of the Commission appointed to make recommendations regarding the location of the Federal Capital. I need hardly say that my Government will do everything it can to assist the work of the Standing Federation Committee.

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly.

No less than 235 Bills and 406 Resolutions were passed in the previous three Sessions of the present Central Assembly. I have said enough to show you that the coming Session is likely to be equally busy.

I now declare the Legislative Session open and I pray that the blessing of Almighty God will rest upon your counsels.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL.
Governor.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
BARBADOS.
24th April, 1956.

At the close of His Excellency's Address, His Excellency presented Mr. SPEAKER with a copy of it.

Mr. SPEAKER and the other hon. members, preceded by the Marshal bearing the Mace returned to the Assembly Chamber.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT and Mr. ALLDER entered the House and took their seats.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that on the last ocasion when the House attended His Excellency in the Council Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to deliver a speech a copy of which he presented to me.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that His Excellency's Speech be taken as read.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

DEPUTY SPEAKER APPOINTED

Hon. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for the City be appointed Deputy Speaker for the ensuing session.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the Rules of the House for the last Session be the Rules of the House for this Session.

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

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

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES APPOINTED

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the honourable junior member for St. Joseph be appointed Chairman of Committees for the Session.

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF STATUTORY COMMITTEES AND MEMBERS OF BOARDS

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as regards this item, I am suggesting to the House, in view of the fact that not only do we have Ministerial system, but that we are amending the centuries old procedure of appointing senior members of each parish, (it is obvious why that happened two hundred years ago, it is now out of date,) and until the rules which we are now considering in Select Committee have been passed by the House, all the members of the several Committees should be re-appointed. If the House agrees with that, I am going to move that all the members of the various Committees who were members last Session be re-appointed for this Session or until any new procedure makes it necessary to have to adopt a new method of selection.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph may not have been paying attention when Your Honour put to the House that the Rules of the last Session be the Rules for this Session. If the honourable member wanted to make a proposal, I submit that he should have moved an amendment to that motion; but the point I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention is that this motion is contrary to the procedure under the Rules.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Sir, if I may be permitted to speak I should have specifically said, obviously we will not appoint a Housing Board. I am afraid I did not hear what the hon. senior member for St. George said.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member said that inasmuch as the Rules of the last Session are to be the Rules for this Session, if the hon. member wanted to make a proposal, an amendment should be made to the motion.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: There is no rule governing this procedure; it is a custom. We have been accustomed to taking the hon. senior members of each parish and appointing them to the Committees. There is no rule and I am sorry to hear the hon. senior member say that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, the custom or the practice all along that the senior members of each Constituency be recommended for appointment to Committees is of very recent origin. I do not know if there is anything in the rules that preclude a sort of conglomerate appointment to the Committees. I would suggest, if there is no objection by the members on any Board or Committee, that perhaps it is quite all right to allow the motion to stand. The only thing that would be against it is that you should appoint each one separately so that you could cut out the Housing Board; but you could re-appoint the other Committees, and leave out the Housing Board.

Mr. Speaker, having ourselves passed the law to abolish the Board, I do not know if it is necessary to add that proviso; it automatically comes out because it does not exist. Unless any member objects

to the appointment of any particular Board, I see no reason why we could not save time and accept the motion.

The question that the appointment of these Committees and Members of Boards be the same as last Session was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay by His Excellency the Governor Message No. 6/1956.

His Excellency the Governor

To

The Honourable The House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to the Address dated 29th November, 1955, from the Honourable the House of Assembly in connection with the granting of landing rights at Seawell Airport to an American flag bearing airline, and to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that a copy of the Address was despatched by telegram to the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the 9th December, 1955.

A formal reply has recently been received from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the effect that Her Majesty's Government has carefully considered the Address of the Honourable the House of Assembly and has come to the conclusion that in view of the recent introduction of the British West Indian Airways Viscount Service, Trinidad—Barbados—New York, the present time is not opportune to introduce another operator between Barbados and New York. The Secretary of State also stated that the application recently made on behalf of Pan American Airways will be considered later in the light of the experience gained from the operation of the present service.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

I had intended, Mr. Speaker, and I apologise to Your Honour for not making it possible to see Your Honour before. I had intended to give notice of my intention to make a statement on this matter today, but in view of the fact that there is no Order Paper and any statement which I made would have to be personal, I did not want to give that impression. I am suggesting that a Select Committee be appointed later in the appropriate way to reply to this Message, and I am asking those members who may be appointed to report in time for next Tuesday. When that report is returned to this House next Tuesday, I propose asking the Leader to put high on the Order Paper the Reply to the Governor's Message; and I promise the House to give my version, the Government's version of the whole history of this matter. If I did not make myself clear, I wish to repeat that this Message is here and members will be informed unofficially of the attitude of the United Kingdom Government. I am therefore asking those members who may be appointed to reply to this Message to have their reply ready by next Tuesday when the matter will be debated.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay Statement of Post Office Advances for payment of Money Orders to 31st January, 1956.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $4,320 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956-57, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1956-57, No. 1, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $2,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956-57, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1956-57, No. 2 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials) Act, 1891.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend and consolidate the Acts of this Island relating to the jurisdiction of, and the practice and procedure before, magistrates' courts and appeals therefrom, and to matters connected therewith.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill for the constitution of a Supreme Court of Judicature and for other purposes relating to the better Administration of Justice in Barbados.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to make provision for a Commission to exercise certain functions in relation to judicial and legal appointments in the service of the Island.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Public Service Commission Act, 1951.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Bill to amend the Public Health Act, 1908.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Bill to amend the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare (Local Consumption) Act, 1952.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Bill to amend the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to consider the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

METHOD OF REPLY TO THE GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I must apologise to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in that I did not see him before hand in this particular matter, purely on account of pressure of business. In respect of this Speech from His Excellency the Governor, I am suggesting that we follow the up-to-date practice, and instead of appointing a Select Committee to draft a reply to the Speech, which might entail the submission of a Minority Report, we might follow the English practice of a member of the Government Party making a motion thanking the Governor for his Speech and leaving it to the Opposition to make all the amendments which they care to make, regretting the language of the Speech, deploring the fact that such and such a thing was promised and it has not been done, and so on. That will not debar any hon. member from making any comment which he likes to make on the wording of what should be the Speech from the Throne.

I am suggesting that inasmuch as we are having our Rules put in order to bring these matters up to date, we may as well be up to date from the earliest possible time. I suggest that no Select Committee be appointed to reply to the Governor's Speech, but that a motion be made by a member of the Govern-

ment thanking His Excellency for his Speech. The members of the Opposition can make all the amendments which they like to make. I suggest that a motion be made to that effect so that it can be put on the Order Paper, and hon. members can file their amendments with the Clerk. I am merely sounding out the House to see what will eventually come in due course. I am asking hon. members to agree to that suggestion because that procedure will be suggested in the Rules which will be brought before the House.

Mr. GODDARD: I quite realise that we are coming to what the Hon. Premier has suggested, but I think the most important thing is to have the appropriate Rule. If we are operating under the existing Rules, there is no provision for doing what the Hon. Premier has suggested. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: We can move for the suspension of that particular Rule.] We have heard the Speech from the Throne just a few minutes ago, and under the existing Rules of the House, the Mover and Seconder of the motion are always made members of the Select Committee to reply to that Speech. I think what the Hon. Premier has suggested is something desirable, and we are moving towards that position. If the Rules can be suspended to permit that being done, and we are allowed to do that next Tuesday, I think that hon. members should have an opportunity to carry out that suggestion. If the Government wishes to suspend the particular Rule, we, on this side of the House, would support it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If I may interrupt the hon. member. In the old days we had annual sessions of Parliament; every year there was a new House and Rule 26 refers to the opening of a new House, and the Rule affecting the opening of a new House does not really apply today. The first Rule says what should be done on the first day of the meeting of a new General Assembly which used to meet every year. That Rule affects a new General Assembly, and it really does not apply to us because we are in the fifth year of a new General Assembly.

If the House approves of the suggestion which I have made, then we will deal with the matter in that way. We have been acting as if each session were a new House, but that is not really so. I do not think hon. members should misunderstand me. The first Rule refers to the first day of the meeting of a new General Assembly; this is not a new General Assembly. I am therefore suggesting to hon. members that later in the day, some hon. member on this side of the House will make a motion to the effect that the House thanks His Excellency for the Speech which he was pleased to make, and this House will carry out the proposals enunciated in that Speech.

Then, each hon. member of the Opposition who wants to (as a matter of fact, every single hon. member) can debate on the matter, to get as much out of today as we can.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, just to put myself in the right, I rise on a point of Order for the purpose of making a suggestion. With reference to the speech, I have already suggested that if the Hon. Premier give notice of his intention to deal with this at the next meeting of the House we can let that slide today. If necessary we can suspend the particular rule and deal with it as he said. I see nothing wrong in doing so. But if the motion is actually made today, it must be seconded and someone would have to move that it be postponed and that would mean that some hon. member might lose his right to speak.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move at the next meeting of the House the motion that the House tender thanks to His Excellency the Governor for the speech he delivered today and that the House promises to implement the suggestions contained therein.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1943.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Trade Union Act, 1939.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, the Bill to amend the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages, and Burials), Act, 1891, *was read a first time.*

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, the Bill to amend and consolidate the Acts of this Island relating to the jurisdiction of, and the practice and procedure before magistrates' courts and appeals therefrom, and to matters connected therewith, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, the Bill for the constitution of a Supreme Court of Judicature and for other purposes relating to the better Administration of Justice of Barbados, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, the Bill to make provision for a commission to exercise certain functions in relation to judicial and legal appointments in the service of the Island, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, the Bill to amend the Public Health Act, 1908, *was read a first time.*
first time.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to amend the Public Health Act, 1908, *was read a first time.*

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) (Local Consumption) Act, 1952, *was read a first time.*

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947, *was read a first time.*

On motion of Mr. BARROW, seconded by Mr. ALLDER, the Bill to amend Workmen's Compensation Act, 1943, *was read a first time.*

On motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, seconded by Mr. F. E. MILLER, the Bill to amend the Trade Union Act, 1939, *was read a first time.*

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, at this stage, I am moving that Your Honour appoint a Select Committee to reply to His Excellency the Governor's Message No. 6 /1956, regarding landing right at Seawell Airport. If I may, I would like to repeat what is suggested, that the Committee should try to have the reply ready by Tuesday next.

I beg to move that a Select Committee be appointed to reply to Message No. 6/1956 sent by His Excellency the Governor to this Chamber.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to appoint the following to serve on the Select Committee to draft a reply to His Excellency the Governor's Message No. 6/1956.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church, (Mr. GODDARD), the hon. senior member for the City (Mr. MOTTLEY), the hon. junior member for St. Michael (Mr. BRYAN) the hon. senior member for St. Andrew (Mrs. BOURNE), the hon. junior member for St. John. (Mr. VAUGHAN).

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that the hon. senior member for St. Philip be added.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the honourable junior member for the City, but I would like to decline.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In fixing the Order Paper, I want to make Order No. 1, the notice of the motion given by the honourable junior member for St. Michael.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I just rise to point out that it was a Private Member's Notice and perhaps it could be put above the Government Notices.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I now beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 1st May, 1956, at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

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

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1956

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24th April, 1956.

Pursuant to prorogation, the 1956-57 Legislative Session was opened by His Excellency the Governor, Brigadier Sir Robert Duncan Harris Arundell, K.C.M.G., O.B.E., in the Council Chamber, Public Buildings, at 11 o'clock a.m. today

The following members of the House were present in their Chamber:—

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (Senior Member for St. Peter, (*Speaker*); Hon. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., C.M.G., Q.C., senior member for St. Joseph, (*Premier*) Mr. J. E. T BRANCKER, senior member for St. Lucy, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., junior member for St. Thomas, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, junior member for the City; Hon. M. E. Cox, senior member for St. Michael (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., junior member for St. Joseph; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E., junior member for St. Peter, Hon. R. G. MAPP, senior member for St. Thomas, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. T. O. BRYAN, junior member for St. Michael; Mr. F. C. GODDARD, junior member for Christ Church, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. F. E. MILLER, junior member for St. George; Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., junior member for St. Andrew, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, junior member for St. Philip; Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, senior member for St. James; Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN junior member for St. John, Hon. C. E. TALMA, senior member for Christ Church; (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, senior member for St. Andrew; and E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., senior member for St. George.

HOUSE SUMMONED TO OTHER PLACE

Honourable members being in their places, the Sergeant-at-Arms entered the Chamber and informed Mr. SPEAKER that His Excellency the Governor was in the Council and was ready to receive the House.

Mr. SPEAKER preceded by the Marshal carrying the Mace cradlewise and followed by other honourable members in pairs according to seniority, proceeded to the Council Chamber and waited on His Excellency the Governor.

His Excellency then addressed the two Houses of the Legislature as follows:—

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council:
Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly:

My purpose in addressing you today is to give you, along with a brief review of public affairs, an outline of my Government's proposals for the Session that is about to begin.

In December, 1955, the Honourable Sir John Chandler was succeeded as President of the Legislative Council by the Honourable Sir Archibald Cuke, C.B.E., whose services to Barbados and to the British Caribbean were recognised by a Knighthood in the Birthday Honours of 1955. Sir John Chandler's retirement from the Presidency ended a family tradition of service in the Legislature, which had continued unbroken for 85 years.

When Sir Archibald Cuke succeeded to the Presidency of the Legislative Council he was appointed by Her Majesty the Queen to be a member of the Executive Council. His place as the Legislative Council member of Executive Committee was taken by the Honourable Dr. A. S. Cato.

The Honourable Dr. H. G. Cummins, Minister of Social Services and Leader of the House of Assembly, was made a Commander of the Order of the British Empire in the New Year Honours of 1955.

There was one change in the Membership of the General Assembly during the last Session, in consequence of the departure from the Island of Mr. L. A. Williams. Mr. J. C. Tudor was elected in his place.

I record with regret the death in England of the Honourable Sir Dudley Leacock, who retired from the Presidency of the Legislative Council in 1950.

Thanks mainly to excellent sugar crops and to the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement, the revenue of the Island has risen steeply from $9½ million six years ago to over $17 million in the financial year which has just ended and has enabled the Government to carry out its fiscal policy. In the same period the expenditure on current account has risen from some $10 million to a little over $14 million. Thus, so far, current expenditure has been kept well below the level of revenue.

In the present financial year, however, there will be a considerable increase in current expenditure, including about $3 million for increases in old age pensions, about $180,000 for medical services and $145,000 for regional services. My Government is faced with the necessity of reviewing the emoluments of the Civil Service and Government employees, and this may result in the substantial increase in expenditure. Another factor which will narrow the margin between current revenue and expenditure in the present financial year is the reduced yield of sugar. The crop is not now expected to exceed 160,000 tons, as compared with 171,000 tons last year. The estimated surplus on current account in the Budget for 1956—57 is about $1/3 million.

Capital expenditure has risen over the past six years from under $1 million to $4 million, and this year's Estimates provide for capital expenditure totalling some $6¾ million. This expenditure, over and above the annual contribution of $¼ million from current revenue, will be met partly from the Island's allocation under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act, partly from local loan funds and partly from surplus balances.

It is important that we should make full use of the Colonial Development and Welfare Funds allocated to us and applications for substantial grants are being sent forward.

It is also important that before approaching the London Market for the external loan of $17¼ million, which will be needed later on to finance the Deep Water Harbour, we should raise as much money as possible locally. The list of applications for the new Government loan was accordingly opened yesterday. As and when market conditions appear favourable, further local loan operations will be carried out, including the loan of $1 million required to finance the developments contemplated by the Natural Gas Corporation. This loan will, of course, be fully guaranteed by the Government.

At the end of the last financial year the Island's accumulated surplus balance stood at about $4¼ million, $2¼ million less than a year ago. This reflects the heavy expenditure that had to be undertaken to repair the ravages of Hurricane Janet.

The Revenue Equalisation Fund, intended for use as a reserve in the event of a recession, now amounts to some $7 million or, say, 5 months' revenue. Consideration will be given to fixing a ceiling for this Fund and to drawing on it in order to provide temporary finance for the Deep Water Harbour project pending the raising of an external loan.

The necessity of making wider use of the Labour Welfare Fund in order to finance capital works, which will be of benefit to sugar workers, is another question that is under examination.

In order to promote thrift, Savings Bank facilities will be extended to all district Post Offices on the 1st May.

My Government's financial policy has been expounded during the recent Budget Session and their long term plans will be laid before you during the Session now beginning. I believe we can continue to have confidence in the Island's financial ability to carry through the heavy programme of capital works which is now under way.

In connection with the provision in the Estimates of $1,300,000 for the Deep Water Harbour, I should mention that Mr. D. C. Coode of Messrs. Coode & Partners, Consulting Engineers, is expected to arrive in June to complete the detailed plans and specifications for the harbour. He will be accompanied by a representative of Messrs. Tate & Lyle Technical Services Ltd., who are to advise on the bulk storage and handling of sugar. It is expected that work on the construction of the harbour will begin before the end of this year. Meanwhile, various preparatory and ancillary works will proceed.

Among the principal buildings completed during the last Session were the new Government buildings in Bay Street, the offices for the Public Works and Highways and Transport Departments on the Pine Estate, the Fire Station on Probyn Street, the Regional Police Training School at Seawell, the Enmore Health Centre, the Princess Margaret School, the Teaching Block of the Technical Institute and the Eagle Hall Infants' School. Major works now in progress include a new school on the Bay Estate, workshop at the Technical Institute, the new Christ Church Foundation School, mechanical workshops at the Pine, improvements and additions at the Law Courts and the new steam laundry at the General Hospital. The Capital Estimates also provide for the rebuilding of Combermere School, for a new Health Centre in St. Philip, for the enlargement of the Airport buildings, for a new Central Market and for other works which I need not list. It is a measure of the

extraordinary expansion of activities that has taken place that the expenditure by the Public Works Department rose from under $200,000 in 1952—53 to $1⅓ million 1955—56. This does not include nearly $½ million hurricane expenditure which was undertaken by the Department.

With regard to the provision made for the continuation of the programme of development at the General Hospital, plans will be laid before you for the construction of a new Hospital and for the reallocation and conversion of the existing buildings so as to provide adequate tuberculosis wards and staff quarters.

Consideration is being given to means of reducing the high cost of Government printing and a Resolution will shortly be submitted to the Legislature to provide funds for the purchase of printing machinery.

Rehabilitation since Hurricane Janet has included the repair of 15,000 chattel houses and the erection of over 600 new wooden houses. The first of six twenty-unit blocks of terraced houses has also been completed. Provision is made in the Budget for the rebuilding of two schools which were destroyed in the storm.

It is fitting that I should pay tribute to the wonderful generosity of kind friends of Barbados in many lands who have contributed towards hurricane relief. The Central Hurricane Relief Committee are doing everything possible to ensure that the funds at their disposal are wisely and fairly distributed among the sufferers.

The Housing Act of 1955, which provides for the co-ordination and expansion of the Government's housing programme under a public authority, was timely in relation to the hurricane. The Act was brought into full operation on the 1st of this month.

A Bill to facilitate certain loans under the Public Officers Housing Loans Act of 1952 will be submitted to the Legislature.

Draft Town and Country Planning legislation has been prepared and the advice of the Secretary of State's Advisory Panel is being sought on its provisions.

It is an indication of the progress made with the development of public water supplies that 7 million gallons a day, double the volume raised ten years ago, are now consumed. To meet the progressive increase in demand and to complete the reorganisation, additional expenditure is necessary; it is hoped that the greater part of this will be met from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds.

The extension and improvement of the runway, the additions to the terminal buildings and the reorganisation of the fire-fighting services at Seawell are in keeping with present day requirement at an important airport.

The reconstruction of highways and the building of tenantry roads are among other works items which I need not mention in detail.

The Public Utilities Act was proclaimed and the Public Utilities Board assumed duty on the 1st January, 1955.

Following a reorganisation, the new Barbados Light and Power Company Ltd., is undertaking a considerable expansion of services. This Company and the Telephone Company Ltd., are to be congratulated on the rapidity with which they repaired the heavy damage done to their lines and services by the hurricane. The statutory Natural Gas Corporation now has charge of all gas operations from well to consumer. Plans are being made to renew and expand the distribution system.

The four wells drilled so far by the Barbados Gulf Oil Company have failed to reveal commercial supplies of oil. A gas well was purchased by the Natural Gas Corporation.

The Barbados Development Act of 1955 recognised the vital importance of expanding the Island's production. The Board set up under the Act is urgently seeking key staff in order that it may soon be in a position to discharge its responsibilities.

Various concessions were made to private industry during the last Session. It had been hoped to lay before you more liberal Pioneer Industries legislation, but it was thought wise to await the results of the review of the subject that is being undertaken by the Regional Economic Committee. Proposals for the assistance of the hotel industry are being formulated.

A film designed to promote Barbados as a tourist resort was subsidised. A strip of land at Rockley was purchased in order to preserve the beach for bathers.

The efficient production of sugar remains of paramount importance and attention continues to be given to the development of irrigation, so as to reduce our utter dependence on rainfall, the improvement of soil fertility, the control of pests and the breeding of highly-yielding varieties of cane.

Dependence on sugar must not be allowed to blind us to the potential importance of the livestock industry and to the opportunities which exist of increasing our production of fruit, vegetables and other food crops, whether on a field or garden scale. Agriculture extension work, designed to build up confidence and co-operation between the Department and its stations on the one hand and the grower on the other, is beginning to show results. The subsidy scheme has

given considerable stimulus to pig breeding. The improvement of marketing arrangements that is contemplated ought to give an impetus to the local production of many things which we now import.

The mechanisation of the fishing fleet continues rapidly with the assistance of loans from the Government and the Budget makes tentative provision for the cold storage of fish. A token provision is made for a central milk depot. Work on the problems of the Scotland area awaits the appointment of a suitably qualified officer.

Emigration, mainly to the United Kingdom, is proving most valuable as an offset to the increase in population. The number of emigrants in 1955 is about equal to the annual increment in our adult labour supply. The recruitment of Barbadians on a considerable scale, e.g. by the London Transport Executive and British Transport Commission, depends on the finding of accommodation for the workers which is one of the principal tasks for the Island's Welfare and Liaison Service in the United Kingdom.

A survey of unemployment and related matters by Mr. George Cumper, Research Fellow of the Institute of Social and Economic Research, University College of the West Indies, has been completed. His Report, which has just been received will be communicated to the Legislature as soon as possible.

A successful start has been made by the Barbados Family Planning Association, and the Budget provides an increased grant towards their work.

Regulations under the Adoption Act of 1955 will shortly be laid in the Legislature.

Legislation has been enacted to implement Professor Richardson's recommendation in regard to non-contributory Old Age Pensions. His other recommendations are being examined.

The opening of Health Centres in Speightstown (1953) and at Enmore (1955) has focussed public attention on the importance of preventive medicine. This work will be extended into the southern and eastern parishes through the third Health Centre to be constructed in St. Philip. The Enmore Centre is also serving as headquarters for two public health projects—the eradication of the Aedes Aegypti mosquito and BCG vaccination. The Island is greatly indebted to the World Health Organisation for the skilled staff and funds that it is providing.

This is an appropriate place to refer to the tragic death of Dr. J. P O'Mahony, Director of Medical Services, on the 6th January this year. He was responsible for framing the schemes for the expansion of health services and the prevention of disease from which the people of the Island will live to derive much benefit.

Minor works intended to make country life more agreeable continue to be carried out, including branch libraries, community centres and playing fields, public baths and the like.

Action will be taken under the Education (Amendment) Act of 1956 to reconstitute the Board of Education with its constituent Committees. Legislation will be submitted to you to amend the Government Scholarships and Exhibitions Act of 1949 to ensure *inter alia,* that one award each year is reserved for a girl.

Emigration has accentuated the importance of technical education. It is hoped that the workshops at the Technical Institute will be completed and the teaching staff recruited in time for the September term. A start has already been made with theoretical instruction.

Erdiston College is now providing a two year training course for teachers from Barbados and seven other Islands in the Windwards and Leewards. Another regional institution, which will soon begin to serve Barbados and the Windward and Leeward Islands, is the Police Training School at Seawell.

The draft of a new Labour Code, prepared by Mr. C. O. J. Matthews of the International Labour Organisation, is expected shortly; pending its receipt the Bill to regulate and improve the conditions of work in Factories, which lapsed with the prorogation of the Legislature, will not be proceeded with. In the new code steps, will be taken to amend, *inter alia,* the Better Security and Workmen's Compensation Acts.

The Bill to remedy deficiencies in the law relating to the sale and supply of intoxicating liquor will be reintroduced.

Legislation will be laid before you to provide for the reorganisation of the Judiciary by abolishing the existing system of separate superior courts of record, and establishing a two level system consisting of Magistrates' Courts with increased jurisdiction and a Supreme Court. The Supreme Court will be vested with the Jurisdiction of all the existing Superior Courts and with an Appellate jurisdiction over the Magistrates' Courts.

Bills will also be laid before you to provide for the establishment of a Judicial and Legal Service Commission, to increase the remuneration of jurors and to repeal and replace the out of date Police Act of 1908. You will also be invited to give attention to a Resolution establishing staff for a Statistical Service.

In pursuance of the approval in principle which was given by the Legislature, negotiations for the establishment in Barbados of a United States Oceanographic Research Station have reached an advanced stage. Legislation will be submitted to you to provide for the compulsory acquisition of the site that has been selected.

Work is proceeding with the compilation of a common Register of Electors to be used both for Central and Local Government elections. Further amendments of the Local Government Act will be introduced in the near future.

A Sub-Committee of the Executive Committee has met a Committee appointed by the Lord Bishop to discuss the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Anglican Church. Discussions will proceed.

You will be invited to approve financial provision to meet our share of the cost of the Commission appointed to make recommendations regarding the location of the Federal Capital. I need hardly say that my Government will do everything it can to assist the work of the Standing Federation Committee.

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly.

No less than 235 Bills and 406 Resolutions were passed in the previous three Sessions of the present Central Assembly. I have said enough to show you that the coming Session is likely to be equally busy.

I now declare the Legislative Session open and I pray that the blessing of Almighty God will rest upon your counsels.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL.
Governor.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
BARBADOS.
24th April, 1956.

At the close of His Excellency's Address, His Excellency presented Mr. SPEAKER with a copy of it.

Mr. SPEAKER and the other hon. members, preceded by the Marshal bearing the Mace returned to the Assembly Chamber.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT and Mr. ALLDER entered the House and took their seats.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that on the last ocasion when the House attended His Excellency in the Council Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to deliver a speech a copy of which he presented to me.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that His Excellency's Speech be taken as read.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

DEPUTY SPEAKER APPOINTED

Hon. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for the City be appointed Deputy Speaker for the ensuing session.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the Rules of the House for the last Session be the Rules of the House for this Session.

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

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

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES APPOINTED

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the honourable junior member for St. Joseph be appointed Chairman of Committees for the Session.

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF STATUTORY COMMITTEES AND MEMBERS OF BOARDS

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as regards this item, I am suggesting to the House, in view of the fact that not only do we have Ministerial system, but that we are amending the centuries old procedure of appointing senior members of each parish, (it is obvious why that happened two hundred years ago, it is now out of date,) and until the rules which we are now considering in Select Committee have been passed by the House, all the members of the several Committees should be re-appointed. If the House agrees with that, I am going to move that all the members of the various Committees who were members last Session be re-appointed for this Session or until any new procedure makes it necessary to have to adopt a new method of selection.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph may not have been paying attention when Your Honour put to the House that the Rules of the last Session be the Rules for this Session. If the honourable member wanted to make a proposal, I submit that he should have moved an amendment to that motion; but the point I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention is that this motion is contrary to the procedure under the Rules.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Sir, if I may be permitted to speak I should have specifically said, obviously we will not appoint a Housing Board. I am afraid I did not hear what the hon. senior member for St. George said.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member said that inasmuch as the Rules of the last Session are to be the Rules for this Session, if the hon. member wanted to make a proposal, an amendment should be made to the motion.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: There is no rule governing this procedure; it is a custom. We have been accustomed to taking the hon. senior members of each parish and appointing them to the Committees. There is no rule and I am sorry to hear the hon. senior member say that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, the custom or the practice all along that the senior members of each Constituency be recommended for appointment to Committees is of very recent origin. I do not know if there is anything in the rules that preclude a sort of conglomerate appointment to the Committees. I would suggest, if there is no objection by the members on any Board or Committee, that perhaps it is quite all right to allow the motion to stand. The only thing that would be against it is that you should appoint each one separately so that you could cut out the Housing Board; but you could re-appoint the other Committees, and leave out the Housing Board.

Mr. Speaker, having ourselves passed the law to abolish the Board, I do not know if it is necessary to add that proviso; it automatically comes out because it does not exist. Unless any member objects

to the appointment of any particular Board, I see no reason why we could not save time and accept the motion.

The question that the appointment of these Committees and Members of Boards be the same as last Session was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay by His Excellency the Governor Message No. 6/1956.

His Excellency the Governor

To

The Honourable The House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to the Address dated 29th November, 1955, from the Honourable the House of Assembly in connection with the granting of landing rights at Seawell Airport to an American flag bearing airline, and to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that a copy of the Address was despatched by telegram to the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the 9th December, 1955.

A formal reply has recently been received from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the effect that Her Majesty's Government has carefully considered the Address of the Honourable the House of Assembly and has come to the conclusion that in view of the recent introduction of the British West Indian Airways Viscount Service, Trinidad—Barbados—New York, the present time is not opportune to introduce another operator between Barbados and New York. The Secretary of State also stated that the application recently made on behalf of Pan American Airways will be considered later in the light of the experience gained from the operation of the present service.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

I had intended, Mr. Speaker, and I apologise to Your Honour for not making it possible to see Your Honour before. I had intended to give notice of my intention to make a statement on this matter today, but in view of the fact that there is no Order Paper and any statement which I made would have to be personal, I did not want to give that impression. I am suggesting that a Select Committee be appointed later in the appropriate way to reply to this Message, and I am asking those members who may be appointed to report in time for next Tuesday. When that report is returned to this House next Tuesday, I propose asking the Leader to put high on the Order Paper the Reply to the Governor's Message; and I promise the House to give my version, the Government's version of the whole history of this matter. If I did not make myself clear, I wish to repeat that this Message is here and members will be informed unofficially of the attitude of the United Kingdom Government. I am therefore asking those members who may be appointed to reply to this Message to have their reply ready by next Tuesday when the matter will be debated.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay Statement of Post Office Advances for payment of Money Orders to 31st January, 1956.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $4,320 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956-57, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1956-57, No. 1, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $2,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956-57, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1956-57, No. 2 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials) Act, 1891.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend and consolidate the Acts of this Island relating to the jurisdiction of, and the practice and procedure before, magistrates' courts and appeals therefrom, and to matters connected therewith.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill for the constitution of a Supreme Court of Judicature and for other purposes relating to the better Administration of Justice in Barbados.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to make provision for a Commission to exercise certain functions in relation to judicial and legal appointments in the service of the Island.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Public Service Commission Act, 1951.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Bill to amend the Public Health Act, 1908.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Bill to amend the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare (Local Consumption) Act, 1952.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Bill to amend the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to consider the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

METHOD OF REPLY TO THE GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I must apologise to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in that I did not see him before hand in this particular matter, purely on account of pressure of business. In respect of this Speech from His Excellency the Governor, I am suggesting that we follow the up-to-date practice, and instead of appointing a Select Committee to draft a reply to the Speech, which might entail the submission of a Minority Report, we might follow the English practice of a member of the Government Party making a motion thanking the Governor for his Speech and leaving it to the Opposition to make all the amendments which they care to make, regretting the language of the Speech, deploring the fact that such and such a thing was promised and it has not been done, and so on. That will not debar any hon. member from making any comment which he likes to make on the wording of what should be the Speech from the Throne.

I am suggesting that inasmuch as we are having our Rules put in order to bring these matters up to date, we may as well be up to date from the earliest possible time. I suggest that no Select Committee be appointed to reply to the Governor's Speech, but that a motion be made by a member of the Govern-

ment thanking His Excellency for his Speech. The members of the Opposition can make all the amendments which they like to make. I suggest that a motion be made to that effect so that it can be put on the Order Paper, and hon. members can file their amendments with the Clerk. I am merely sounding out the House to see what will eventually come in due course. I am asking hon. members to agree to that suggestion because that procedure will be suggested in the Rules which will be brought before the House.

Mr. GODDARD: I quite realise that we are coming to what the Hon. Premier has suggested, but I think the most important thing is to have the appropriate Rule. If we are operating under the existing Rules, there is no provision for doing what the Hon. Premier has suggested. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: We can move for the suspension of that particular Rule.] We have heard the Speech from the Throne just a few minutes ago, and under the existing Rules of the House, the Mover and Seconder of the motion are always made members of the Select Committee to reply to that Speech. I think what the Hon. Premier has suggested is something desirable, and we are moving towards that position. If the Rules can be suspended to permit that being done, and we are allowed to do that next Tuesday, I think that hon. members should have an opportunity to carry out that suggestion. If the Government wishes to suspend the particular Rule, we, on this side of the House, would support it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If I may interrupt the hon. member. In the old days we had annual sessions of Parliament; every year there was a new House and Rule 26 refers to the opening of a new House, and the Rule affecting the opening of a new House does not really apply today. The first Rule says what should be done on the first day of the meeting of a new General Assembly which used to meet every year. That Rule affects a new General Assembly, and it really does not apply to us because we are in the fifth year of a new General Assembly.

If the House approves of the suggestion which I have made, then we will deal with the matter in that way. We have been acting as if each session were a new House, but that is not really so. I do not think hon. members should misunderstand me. The first Rule refers to the first day of the meeting of a new General Assembly; this is not a new General Assembly. I am therefore suggesting to hon. members that later in the day, some hon. member on this side of the House will make a motion to the effect that the House thanks His Excellency for the Speech which he was pleased to make, and this House will carry out the proposals enunciated in that Speech.

Then, each hon. member of the Opposition who wants to (as a matter of fact, every single hon. member) can debate on the matter, to get as much out of today as we can.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, just to put myself in the right, I rise on a point of Order for the purpose of making a suggestion. With reference to the speech, I have already suggested that if the Hon. Premier give notice of his intention to deal with this at the next meeting of the House we can let that slide today. If necessary we can suspend the particular rule and deal with it as he said. I see nothing wrong in doing so. But if the motion is actually made today, it must be seconded and someone would have to move that it be postponed and that would mean that some hon. member might lose his right to speak.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move at the next meeting of the House the motion that the House tender thanks to His Excellency the Governor for the speech he delivered today and that the House promises to implement the suggestions contained therein.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1943.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Trade Union Act, 1939.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, the Bill to amend the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages, and Burials), Act, 1891, *was read a first time.*

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, the Bill to amend and consolidate the Acts of this Island relating to the jurisdiction of, and the practice and procedure before magistrates' courts and appeals therefrom, and to matters connected therewith, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, the Bill for the constitution of a Supreme Court of Judicature and for other purposes relating to the better Administration of Justice of Barbados, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, the Bill to make provision for a commission to exercise certain functions in relation to judicial and legal appointments in the service of the Island, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, the Bill to amend the Public Health Act, 1908, *was read a first time.*
first time.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to amend the **Public Health Act,** 1908, *was read a first time.*

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) (Local Consumption) Act, 1952, *was read a first time.*

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947, *was read a first time.*

On motion of Mr. BARROW, seconded by Mr. ALLDER, the Bill to amend Workmen's Compensation Act, 1943, *was read a first time.*

On motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, seconded by Mr. F. E. MILLER, the Bill to amend the Trade Union Act, 1939, *was read a first time.*

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, at this stage, I am moving that Your Honour appoint a Select Committee to reply to His Excellency the Governor's Message No. 6 /1956, regarding landing right at Seawell Airport. If I may, I would like to repeat what is suggested, that the Committee should try to have the reply ready by Tuesday next.

I beg to move that a Select Committee be appointed to reply to Message No. 6/1956 sent by His Excellency the Governor to this Chamber.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to appoint the following to serve on the Select Committee to draft a reply to His Excellency the Governor's Message No. 6/1956.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church, (Mr. GODDARD), the hon. senior member for the City (Mr. MOTTLEY), the hon. junior member for St. Michael (Mr. BRYAN) the hon. senior member for St. Andrew (Mrs. BOURNE), the hon. junior member for St. John. (Mr. VAUGHAN).

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that the hon. senior member for St. Philip be added.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the honourable junior member for the City, but I would like to decline.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In fixing the Order Paper, I want to make Order No. 1, the notice of the motion given by the honourable junior member for St. Michael.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I just rise to point out that it was a Private Member's Notice and perhaps it could be put above the Government Notices.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I now beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 1st May, 1956, at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Speaker adjourn*ed the House accordingly.*

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1956

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 1st May, 1956.

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

Present

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Hon. G. H. ADAMS C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., (*Premier*), Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Mr. L. E. SMITH J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*), Hon. R. G. MAPP (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*), Mr. F. C. GODDARD (*Leader of the Opposition*), Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES B.A., Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER, Mr. E. W. BARROW B.Sc.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

DOCUMENTS LAID

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Medical Certificate from Dr. A. L. Stuart recommending ten days sick leave for the Clerk.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Financial Report from the Accountant General for the month ended 29th February this year.

Also Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for half year ended 31st. March 1956 from the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of St. John.

Also,Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for half year to 31st March 1956 on Tenantry Roads from the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of St. John.

Also, Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for half year ended 31st March 1956 from the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of St. Philip.

Also, Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for half year ended 31st March 1956 on Tenantry Roads the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of St. Philip.

LEAVE GRANTED TO CLERK

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Clerk be granted ten days sick leave.

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

There being no objection leave was granted.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the Deputy Clerk be appointed to act as Clerk for the period of ten days.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Mr. D. A. Banfield be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for a period of ten days.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. senior member for Christ Church, the Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, I am commanded to lay the following:

Statement from the Barbados General Agricultural Society regarding the appropriation of the Legislative Grant for the year 1955.

NOTICES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

Resolution to place the sum of $10,250 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956-57, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1956-57, No. 3, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

3.25 p.m.

PRIVATE NOTICES

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

House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor

The House draws to the attention of His Excellency the Governor the necessity for the institution

of an annual Christmas bonus for all public employees whose pensionable emoluments do not exceed fifteen hundred dollars ($1,500) annually.

2, The House requests that Government take effective action whereby such will be paid from December this year.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if you will hear me, I would like to suggest to the hon. member that Addresses of this sort to the Governor are completely anachronistic. The Governor does not initiate any legislation, and I suggest therefore, that with a Ministerial system of Government, these Addresses should be put to the appropriate Minister. One can only address the Governor or the Queen on matters of State, but not on matters of policy. If the hon. member goes on with this form of directing Addresses to other than the appropriate Minister, it puts the Governor in an impossible position; he cannot take notice of things over the Heads of his Ministers. I hope that hon. members will move all Addresses which they feel like moving to the appropriate Ministers.

Mr. BRANCKER: I take it, Sir, that there cannot be any discussion on that matter at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, there is nothing before the House.

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

House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor

This House again draws to the attention of His Excellency the Governor the imperative and immediate necessity of implementing the Address unanimously passed by this Chamber urging the establishment of a Government printery in this Island.

2. This House urges Government to explore the possibilities of purchasing any Printery or Printeries in this Island capable of effectively doing all Government printing and binding with the assistance of trained available personnel presently unemployed, and others.

3. This House implores Government to readjust its list of top priorities and allocate Government printery to its first list.

Mr. BRANCKER: Also, of the following Address:—

House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

The House is of the opinion that it is essential to create the professional post of Standing Counsel to this Chamber.

2. The House requests that His Excellency cause the necessary steps to be initiated for the financing of such.

QUESTIONS

Mr. W. A. CRAWFORD: To enquire of the Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:—

Will the Minister cause to be published at the earliest date possible the figures showing the total amounts invested abroad as on 31st March, 1956, of funds accruing to:—

(1) The Price Stabilisation Reserve Fund.
(2) The Labour Welfare Fund.
(3) The Rehabilitation Reserve Fund.

2. Will the Minister cause to be placed on the Government Established Staff the herdsmen who have been employed at the Pine Agricultural Development Station almost from its inception?

If not, why not?

3. Is the Minister aware that the prices paid by sugar factories for canes supplied by small producers in respect of the current crop are considerably less than what the price of sugar would permit?

In view of the appreciably large number of of people and the appreciable sums involved will the Minister please state what steps it is proposed to take to ensure that the final prices paid bear an equitable relationship to the total value of sugar produced in the colony?

Mr. L. E. SMITH: To enquire of the Honourable Minister of Social Services:—

Whether it is true that Nurse Joyce Mason of the Barbados General Hospital was given notice to leave the Hospital?

If the answer to the above is yes, will Government state without delay the reason why?

Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Minister for Social Services:—

What steps, if any have been taken to implement the Recommendation contained in the 1952 Report of the Salaries' Commissioner, Sir Errol Dos Santos, to provide "for rations or allowances in lieu thereof", for (1) the orderlies at the General Hospital, (2) seamstresses and washers at the General Hospital?

Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Minister for Communications, Works and Housing:—

How many sealed tenders were "received at the Ministry of Communications, Works and Housing up to four o'clock p.m. on the 27th January, 1956, for the supply of Barbados Limestone, Cambridge Blue, Flintstone, Marl Filling and Earth Filling, to the Department of Highways and Transport for a period of twelve (12) months from 1st April, 1956" in respect of the Northern Division, Parishes of St. Lucy and St. Peter?

2. Is it a fact that Government advertised in respect of the above that it did not bind itself to accept the lowest or any tender?

3. Is it a fact that the tenderers included the contractor who had continuously executed this assignment for the Northern Division during the time of the Central Road Board, and up to last year was re-awarded the contract for twelve (12) months from 1st April, 1955?

4. Is it also a fact that throughout the many continuous years that the said contractor had been performing the said contract it was invariably executed efficiently and to the complete satisfaction of the authorities both of the Central Road Board and the Department of Highways and Transport?

5. If it is true that the abovementioned contractor was not re-awarded the contract on this occasion, will the Minister explain why?

Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Minister for Education at the next meeting of this House:—

In view of the Replies Nos. 58, 59 and 17 laid on 7.6.55 and 20.7.54 to Questions Nos. 58, 59 and 17 which were asked in this Chamber on 20.7.54 and 14.12.54 stating that Government still has under consideration proposals relating both to the provisions of a hot mid-day meal for children at Public Elementary Schools, and to the question of School Fees in Secondary Schools," has Government anything further to add to those Replies, particularly in relation to its decision as to priority of schemes of Government expenditure, ever bearing in mind (as stated in Reply laid 20.7.54 to Question No. 58)

that it is the declared policy of the Government to provide children at Public Secondary Schools with a hot mid-day meal free of all who are unable to pay for it?''

3.35 p.m.

ORDER PAPER

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, before the first Order of the Day is called, I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention that the Order Paper of the Day, as is placed before us, is not the Order Paper which was given notice of at last Tuesday's meeting of the House. At that meeting I gave notice of a Bill to amend the Trade Union Act, 1939, and it was read a first time. I do not see anything of it on this Order Paper. Why is it that this Order is not placed on today's Order Paper? [A MEMBER. It is under Private Members' Business] I did not see it.

I would also like to draw to your Honour's attention that none of the Orders on the Order Paper are placed before me, neither have I received any of them by Post; and I want to know how can I begin to discuss these matters if I have not received any of them. I have not seen even cyclostyled copies of these matters. I do not know if I am placed in a different position in respect to this matter as regards other hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not placed in a different position from other hon. members. Unfortunately, the Clerk of the House did not make an early preparation of the Order Paper and it is only today that the Officers of the House had to try their best to produce the Order Paper which is placed before hon. members. That is the difficulty under which the Staff has laboured.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, if I can now get any of the Orders to be discussed. I do not have any of them before me.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are some cyclostyled copies available. I do not know if there are copies of all the Items that appear on the Order Paper. I have already said that it is only this morning that some of these Orders were cyclostyled by officers of this House. It was unfortunate that the Clerk did not get the Order Paper ready before he left.

REPLY TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Order which stands under the name of the hon. junior member for St. Michael, and which is placed above Government Business, I am asking leave to postpone that. I understand from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that his colleague and himself are not in a position to proceed with that matter today.

The Order under the name of the hon. junior member for St. Michael is to move that this House thank His Excellency the Governor for his speech delivered at the opening of the Legislature and to promise to implement the proposals contained therein. As I have said, I am asking leave that this be postponed.

In connection with the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, you have already explained the position, and there is nothing further I can add. There are two money Resolutions as well as a few Bills which stand under Government business, the copies of which are cyclostyled, and I hope it is the wish of hon. members that we should deal with them today.

There being no objection to leave being granted to postpone the Order standing under the name of the hon. junior member for St. Michael, leave was granted the hon. member.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Government Business stands under the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grants of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Suppply.

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

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

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

ANGLICAN CHURCH

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the first Resolution is for the sum of $4,320 for the purpose set out in the Addendum printed on the cyclostyled copies of the Resolution which hon. members have before them. Under Section 15 of the Anglican Church Act, 1911, if a Rectory Vicarage or Curacy has been vacant for a period exceeding six months without being permanently filled, the salary lapses into the Treasury until a permanent appointment is made. As hon. members will remember, recently an Act was passed which said in future only temporary appointments will be made; the object being, not as some members of the Anglican Church think is the thin edge of the wedge of disestablishment and disendowment, but in order to help the Church to appoint parsons who otherwise may not be eligible for the permanent appointment. Consequently, in every case where a temporary appointment is made, the salary of the office will lapse after six months unless permanently filled; and will continue to lapse until a permanent appointment is made. Inasmuch as the money lapses, we have to come down with a Resolution for money to pay those persons who are now appointed temporarily.

Two temporary appointments have been made under the recent Act. Therefore, owing to their being no money to pay them, the amount of $4,320 under this Resolution is being asked to be voted to pay these persons who have been appointed. This is a simple matter. I beg to move that this sum of $4,320 be now voted and place at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956—57; Part 1.— Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1956—57, No. 1 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, it is not very long ago that a similar Resolution came before the House. I have been trying to get a copy of the amended Act, but I cannot find it among the records of this House. However, I thought, as the Resolution says, that no new permanent appointment would be made; that is how the Addendum itself reads. But I thought that the appointments that were to be made would be more or less permanent but not pensionable. That is what I thought we were passing. But, Sir, the next point is, if this thing is likely to happen not only with vicars but with rectors, why can't we have an amount of $10,000 or $20,000? We have money in the Estimates that will not be spent. This will only be spent where the appointments are made. And unless the

House is doing this in order to have an opportunity of reviewing each appointment, I do not see the sense of providing for this particular two, and then tomorrow if a rector dies and an appointment is made, the Government coming back with another Resolution. When another vicar leaves or dies, you will come back with yet another Resolution.

I thought the object of the amending Act was to get away from passing pension Bills and this type of Resolution. I thought the Government would have put a sum of money in the Estimates to cover contingencies. Let us put in $10,000 or $15,000 and save the House from continually having to do this. If I am not mistaken, we did this about two months ago.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, on several occasions we have argued against giving the Government a blank cheque. We have been forced to do so on a few occasions and we found that control of certain happenings was taken from us; and in those cases we only knew about the expenditure after it had been incurred. Therefore, I certainly must differ from the honourable junior member for the City in this respect. I prefer to handle a thousand Resolutions if they come individually, than to continue the practice of voting large sums of money only to be kept and used at will by the Executive without our having any say in respect of the matter.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member has picked the worst possible item to make that speech on. If you have that method of appointment, and if you are appointing a rector or a vicar in St. John, the honourable member himself does it. He is on the Appointments Board, so he would be coming in here and criticising a member of the House. The honourable member is seriously mistaken if he thinks I am one to give blank cheques. The law on the Statute Books says the Appointment Board shall consist of so and so. Members of the House have a say in the appointment on this occasion, but the honourable member wants to accuse me of giving the Government a blank cheque. I am sorry that his thinking is so confused at the outset of this session.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I think the honourable member is mistaken about these blank cheques. Not a single cent is ever paid to any human being in this world by the Auditor General unless an order says the Legislature has voted it for that purpose. If you have $10,000 voted, the Auditor General has to be satisfied that there is an Act which says the $10,000 can be paid out to A, B, C or D. So putting any sum of money in the Estimates or sending down a Resolution for a certain sum of money does not mean you can spend it as you like. It cannot be spent unless you can turn to some Act to see where it can be paid out.

Mr. ALLDER: I do not think so, Mr. Chairman. We all know that money is taken for conferences and so on. There was a time when this Government came for money when delegates were to be sent out, and we were forced to agree to the sum of money to be placed in the Estimates and at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee; and after we had done that, there were several occasions when we were not 100% in agreement with certain passages paid.

I was only trying to remind the honourable junior member for the City of our experiences in the past and to clear up the point which the honourable member made. While it is true that in respect of St. John I might be on the Committee which makes appointments, if it happens in the City I would not have that privilege, because the honourable member would be one of those members of the Committee making the selection for the City; therefore it is only here that I prefer to be able to say "yes" or "no" to any appointment I might have to decide upon.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member may rest assured that probably the only appointment would be the one in St. John. I thought he would have been good enough to get up and admit he was wrong. How can this compare with a conference? The Government can agree *ad lib* to anything sent to them. The Government can agree to the post of vicar in this island or create another rectorship in the Anglican Church, and I thought the honourable member would be decent enough to get up and say so. It is nonsense the honourable member is talking. He knows there are so many vicarages but you cannot go and create this and spend the money. To tell the truth, you mean for the sake of making a point, you make it irrelevantly. How can it compare with a conference? The Government says it is a thing they did not set out for; they put money in the Estimates for things that may arise. They cannot increase them, we have a law governing the appointment; and I say you would be coming here and criticising members of the House. The honourable member should admit if he lived in the City, that he would get the best representation possible in the House [A VOICE: From whom? You or Mottley!]

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and carried without division.

REFUND TO THE BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the next Resolution is for the sum of $2,000, refund of overpaid fees under Companies' Act, 1910. Honourable members will see as the Addendum points out that the Bank of Nova Scotia was granted a licence to carry on a business of banking in the island. The fees for Registration under the Companies' Act is computed at $2,239.20 which was paid by the Bank. There is however, a Companies' Act proviso that limits the amount of money payable on registration of a company to £50. That is how the old Act reads; but there was an oversight and the bank paid in the full sum as though that proviso was not in the Act. It has since been discovered, and it is therefore necessary for us to pay back the Bank of Nova Scotia the difference between $2,239.20 and $1,999.20.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

3.55 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that it does appear to me that the Legal Departments of Barbados are passing through very lean times from the point of view of the calibre of the personnel. It is, perhaps, euphemistic to call this matter an oversight; other people would regard it as sheer ignorance. If you have in the Companies Act a proviso limiting the amount of fees payable by a Company on registration to £50, is it not far more than an oversight to make a Company pay over $2,000; and now we have to come for a refund of the money? This may be a small thing, but these straws show the direction in which the wind is blowing.

If in small matters, the Legal Departments are incompetent to apprise the Government, or to pursue their lawful operations without making these errors, you can imagine what will transpire when we have

important things before the Government. That is why I have said that in the current bus issue, the Government has to go outside this Colony and bring in Counsel. It is to be hoped that the Judicial Commissioners appointed recently will go into the competence of people who are filling important offices in the Legal Departments ———

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If I may interrupt the hon. member, I should like to point out that this matter is nothing to do with the Attorney General's Department. It is regrettable that the mistake has been made, but it is quite possible for anybody to forget. The proviso comes in the Table of the Companies Act; and one can easily see that any Solicitor in the Island would have forgotten that. I repeat: this is nothing to do with the Attorney General's Department.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is quite in order to attempt to defend the Department involved, but certainly in the Registry we are supposed to have legally-qualified men; and if it is not one Legal Department, then it is another. My remarks about the competence of Legal Departments would therefore apply equally to the Registry; and they would apply to the Crown Law Officers' Department, if that were the Department involved.

Be that as it may, there is one other point which occurs to me, and it is this: normally speaking, there cannot be any obstruction placed in the way of any Foreign Company which wants to come to Barbados to do business. We already have two Canadian Banks and one English Bank operating here, and if another Bank wants to come here because the business appears to be sufficient to warrant its coming here, there should be no objection placed in the way of its coming here. However, I believe that we in the West Indies, should begin to realise that it is high time that a stop be put to this draining away of the wealth of the West Indies by Foreign Companies operating in this area.

This is the first time that I have seen this Resolution. The Government has a habit of taking important and unimportant matters and springing them on the House at a moment's notice. If I had seen this Resolution before, my remarks in connection with it would have been even stronger. There is no reason why the West Indies, which are on the verge of national independence, should continue to allow Canadian, American or any other foreign Banks to be established in the area, perform very little credit services in the area, and the profits they make are not ploughed back in the area, but are used to help other areas. Barclays Bank has now established a big Development Corporation and the funds are allegedly going to be used in the development of other under-developed territories; but I am yet to hear of any West Indian concern benefiting to any extent from the establishment of this Barclays Bank Development Corporation. I am yet to hear of any of these foreign Banks in the area extending proper credit facilities either to small-scale or large-scale investors who want to develop the country.

The inescapable conclusion is that the time has come for the West Indies to establish their own National Bank [*Cheers*]. The time has come for the West Indies to see that all the financial operations in the area are channelled in this area for the development of the area. In my opinion, the Government should have taken steps to prevent the Nova Scotia Bank from coming in the area. We have too many Banks in the area now; this Bank should have been told: "if you want to come here, you can come, but we are going to take the lead in the near future to establish a West Indian State Bank, and it may well be that shortly after your establishment, the business to be obtained will not be sufficient as to warrant that establishment." It is almost a betrayal of West Indian National interest to encourage either openly or otherwise, more foreign Banks being established in the area.

Even although they come here as registered, in my opinion, it is not too late for the Barbados Government, in common with other West Indian Governments, to make its position so secure in this matter that the Nova Scotia Bank or any other Bank with similar ideas, would be discouraged from establishing themselves in Barbados or in any other West Indian Island.

4.05 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, so far as the West Indian National Bank is concerned, while I think admirable sentiments were made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip on the matter, they are irrelevant on a Resolution of this nature. Sir, it would be a serious thing if you were to set out that certain companies cannot operate here.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. The hon. member seems to have misunderstood me. I hope he does not mean to say that I said that they should not operate here. I have no objection to any company coming here to operate. I said that we should discourage Bank Companies coming in, if we are clamouring to have our own West Indian National Bank.

Mr. LEWIS: Why should we discourage them? If the West Indies had their own National Bank and they were supporting it, then nobody would come in, because they would feel that they could do nothing in the area.

The next thing is this: Unless your Bank is going outside to do business, it will be of no use to the West Indies. You cannot have a Bank in a particular area and just leave it there, unless it is some little savings bank. If it is to serve the area, it must have correspondence or whatever other associations it has outside of the area in which it is operating.

I share the hope of the hon. senior member for St. Philip that the Barbados Government will join hands with the Jamaica Government in urging for a State Bank; especially for the purpose of issuing currency and matters of this sort.

I do not know if to put it down to incompetence in your having to bring down this Resolution for $2,000 when you need only $1,999.20. Perhaps this must have been a mistake made by the Company's Solicitors and the Registrar of this Island, because I cannot imagine that the Registrar knowing that we can collect only up to $240 for the registration of a company in Barbados still insisting on collecting fees up to $2,239.20. If these fees are payable on the paid-up or registered capital of the Company, perhaps, we might not be accustomed to dealing with such large companies. However, my point is this: since we are dealing with a specific item for a specific sum, we should refund the specific amount. Of course, it is only a matter of 80 cents difference, but the Resolution should come down for $1,999.20. It is just a small amount, but as far as I can remember of Resolutions for refunds coming before the House, the Resolutions were always brought down for the specific amount. This is a matter of your knowing how much was paid into the Treasury and how much you should refund; therefore, I am suggesting that you accept a motion that this amount be reduced by 80 cents. This is not a case where you are voting money for something which you do not know exactly how much may be spent out of it. You know exactly how much is the amount of this refund; you know

that the amount is $1,999.20. I am not saying that when you vote $2,000 you are going to pay out that amount, but I do not like the idea of our knowing exactly what the amount is and your bringing down a Resolution rounding off the amount. This is the first time that I have noticed in Resolutions for refunds that the amount was rounded off. As I have said, although I am sure you will retain the 80 cents, I do not like the idea of your bringing down a Resolution rounding off the amount.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the amount has been rounded off myself. Maybe it looks better. I really do not know what to say in reply to the argument by the hon. senior member for St. Philip. How can you reply? How can the Bank of Nova Scotia operating here possibly hurt the West Indies? Is the hon. member saying that a West Indian National Bank will provide all the money for the West Indies?

The hon. member every day gets up and say that we should have an international Bank. I am sure that because it has happened recently in Jamaica, he is going to attack this Government for not going to the United States to get a loan. I really do not know what to say on an argument of that sort. You have only to state it to see the absurdity of it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the hon. member does not know what to say, he should say nothing. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I should have]. It is sheer nonsense to mix up an international bank with a commercial bank. An international Bank is not a commercial bank. The International Bank is an agency of United Nations which is set up specifically for helping countries and for making loans to Governments who want to borrow money. What the hon. member has said is such a gross error that I want to know how could he be capable of it. Of course, only he could fail to realise that a foreign bank only comes here for the purpose of making money. It does not come here to operate because it likes him or us.

The Hon. Minister apparently is assuming that because the Bank of Nova Scotia is coming here to operate, that it is going to develop the country. If you want to start a business, in Barbados or Dominica or anywhere, unless you have proper security you cannot get one cent from a bank. Banks do not develop countries. If you have security, real estate collaterally, you can borrow money; or if somebody who has money and you want money from a bank and that person can endorse the note, you can get it. They charge a certain commission for the performance of the service which they render to Barbados. They are more or less commercial houses collecting bills and advancing credits on commission. I am yet to hear of a single commercial bank ploughing back to a country some of its profits to develop the country.

4.15 p.m.

To have the bank of Nova Scotia coming here does not mean one single thing to the expansion of the economy of Barbados. Only the honourable senior member for St. Joseph would think it does. All the international credit facilities we want, we have through the established banks; and the point made by the honourable junior member for the City is tenable in that a West Indian State Bank would have certain established connections abroad in the same sense more or less as Codrington College is entirely established with a University. While that is tenable, it is absolutely beside the point to fool the public that the introduction of another foreign operated bank in Barbados would mean anything at all to the colony of Barbados; it would mean something to Canada and to those countries in which this bank of Nova Scotia invests its surplus capital for development. We do not get any here. I doubt if any part of the West Indies gets any. They come here because some of the West Indian Islands are developing and there is good picking; therefore they will come in and do a little plundering while the going is good. That is all there is to it, and I repeat, Sir, that the sooner that sort of thing is done away with the better it is for the West Indies.

By all means they should have been encouraged. All the banking in the island is already properly handled in so far as it can be handled, and a link between Nova Scotia and Barbados in the form of a commercial bank will mean everything to Nova Scotia but not one single thing to Barbados.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I stand to correction, but until the honourable member had spoken I did not realise all that might have been said on this subject. I will promise him this in view of what he said; if the honourable member can do anything to borrow money without security, I will do my best to get him made Managing Director and Comprehensive Director of a bank for the Island of Barbados!

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member is regarding this matter as a matter for amusement.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: You said these banks did not lend any money without security.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member knows that what I said is this: the fact that you have Barclays Bank, the Royal Bank of Canada, the Canadian Bank of Commerce, does not mean they developed Barbados. They exist to advance money against proper security; but Mr. Chairman, a West Indian National Bank would have to go further than that. It would have to take risks.

We have in Barbados, in our small manner, a small bank for the development of Peasant Agriculture. We have what you would call a small bank for loans to fishermen. These banks take risks. When you lend a fisherman money to build a boat you have not got proper security; and the Peasants' Loan Bank will advance money to a peasant who rents land; you advance money against the crops. It is done elsewhere; it is done in Jamaica. And the idea is that the bank is concerned primarily with taking risks in developing the country which no outside bank will take, because it does not stand to benefit in the long run. A West Indian Bank will have to take risks because with the area's expansion, the business of the bank will also expand.

You cannot expect a foreign bank will have any interest at all in taking any risks in the area because they are not concerned. But the main point of my argument is not only the question of advancing money with or without security for development, the point is that banks render a service to the community for which they are paid; and there is no justifiable reason why we should allow these services to be rendered and paid for by foreign companies. That is all there is to it.

Ask the Hon. Premier to get the balance sheets of Barclays Bank, the Royal Bank of Canada and the Canadian Bank of Commerce and see what they make every year, see what they pay in income tax. Do you think they operate because we have good sea breeze and make good fishing? They operate because they make good money and the money should be made by a West Indian Bank and remain in the area. The money that Barclays Bank is using to develop all parts of the world should be kept in Barbados; the surplus profit made by its operation is spent all over the world and we contribute to it. St. Lucia, Jamaica and Dominica contribute to it.

Why ask the bank of Nova Scotia to come here? There must be money to be made in the West Indies in banking; and are we to understand from the Hon. Premier that there is some moral or legal objection to the West Indies themselves making in banking the money made in the West Indies, and that only foreign banks should make it? If we are to have that motto at the head of affairs it is no wonder we are drifting while other countries are marching forward.

Mr. LEWIS: The hon. senior member for St. Philip said that while the views I expressed were tenable, they would tend to fool the public—

Mr. CRAWFORD: I did not say so.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not know whether he had a full stop in his mind when he spoke about fooling the public on the issue. I merely pointed out that it would be very difficult for Barbados to legislate against companies coming to operate here. You cannot do it to any people coming from the Commonwealth; that is what I saw. If he feels assured that the Bank of Nova Scotia would come here for what it can get, if it does not get it directly it would get it indirectly. However, that could wait for another time. I am going to move that the amount be reduced by eighty cents so that the amount voted by Government will be the exact amount to be refunded.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I will accept that. While I am on my feet, I will say although it will provoke the hon. member to make another speech, that a bank is a company doing a particular form of business. Is he going to stop Fogarty and Sahely from doing business in Barbados?

4.25 p.m.

The honourable member apparently thinks that he is lecturing to second standard school children. If you accept that a Bank is only a Company doing business, at least Matouk and Sahely and other people are from other West Indian Islands; they come from the area and the profits they make in Barbados remain in the area. The Nova Scotia Bank is not from St. Kitts. How, on the eve of a Caribbean Federation, could you object to any West Indian firm or Company extending its operations to any other West Indian Island? But that is not the point at all. The extent of the business done by Sahely and Matouk or anybody else in this Island is regulated by a certain amount of competition; but in Barbados or the West Indies for that matter, where banking is concerned, the established Banks know full well that the only competition they can get is from some other Bank from a big metropolitan country.

Tomorrow morning Barbados cannot start its own Bank as easily as Sahely or Matouk can come in here. Banking is a special form of business. If Self-Help Enterprises Ltd. or anybody else were carrying on the same business as Sahely and they could cut prices, Sahely would lose money; but who is going to offer competition to the Bank of Nova Scotia or the Royal Bank of Canada or any similar Bank. To compare these things is to compare a public utility service with a rum shop; to make this comparison is like comparing water and telephone services with the sale of ginger beer and coconut bread in a back street somewhere. There is no comparison between these things at all; one is a highly-specialised service, and the other is a service in which anybody can enter without any special protection or knowledge or without any special guarantee or knowledge that you are going to make money.

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

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee of Supply were read a first and second time and agreed to.

REGISTRATION (BIRTHS, BAPTISMS, MARRIAGES AND BURIALS) (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials) Act, 1891.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I hope honourable members will not object to dealing with this Order although these Bills have only just been put into our hands. This is a Bill to amend the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials) Act. Some of us forget to register the birth of children which according to the Act should be done within a certain period, and sometimes the position becomes awkward because a child has not got either a Birth or a Baptismal Certificate. Of course, you can get around that position by getting an Affidavit from a Midwife or a Doctor to the effect that the child was born at a particular time; and that is accepted by the Registrar as the equivalent of a British Certificate.

Provision is made in the Act for persons to notify the Registrar and if they have failed to register the birth of a child, they pay a fine. This Bill is an Amendment which will make it easier to correct the omission. One of the things about this Amendment is that this legislation is similar to legislation existing in other Colonies and in the United Kingdom. At the same time, this Bill repeals Clause 9 of the Principal Act and makes it no longer necessary for the Registrar to sign copies of duplicates sent to him by religious bodies. Honourable members are aware that some religious bodies perform marriages, baptisms and so on.

I am suggesting that even although this is a non-controversial matter, the Acting Clerk should read out the Clauses of this Bill for the benefit of honourable members. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I would just like the Hon. Premier to pay attention to a little point which struck me on reading this Bill. I take it that this new Clause 9 starts off by saying that the birth of a child has not been registered at all, and how does the Registrar know for whom he should send? If a birth has not been registered at all, and the person has forgotten to register it, how can anybody know that that has happened and ask you to correct it: 4.35 p.m.

You do not ask for a birth certificate forty days or afterwards. It is when you get 20 and 30 years old and you want to go away that you ask for a birth certificate. I am wondering if something can be done. [A VOICE: It is after 40 days.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have the idea that when a matter like this came up before in this House so

that births could be registered at various points for the convenience of the people, I raised a point relative to the fact that when a birth certificate is given, it does not necessarily have the name of the child that is registered. To tell the truth, the exactness of the point, I cannot remember. This really, Sir, is registering the birth of a child rather than giving the name of the child; and I have heard of certain difficulties arising in view of the fact that you cannot go back and put a name on the birth certificate. There are occasions when a Birth Certificate would suffice for the purpose you want, if you got the name of the child on it. I remember mentioning that at the time because it was brought to my attention during the discussion on the Bill. I did not know that this Bill would have been dealt with today, otherwise I would have looked up that debate.

You have to get both a Birth and Baptism Certificate and there are certain difficulties and expense which people have to go through if the name of the child is not on the Birth Certificate. However, Sir, if I can find what is the real difficulty a little later, I can make it known when dealing with the Bill in Committee.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a most important amendment that we are dealing with today when so many persons are moving about. Having to get passports to get away, they have to get their Baptismal Certificate to verify certain facts. Then there is the fact that many parents are rather careless in the registration of the birth of their children. They put the matter off and then they find out it was an error of judgment.

I know the purpose of this Bill is not to make it easy so that there would be more forgetfulness, but I do hope that the easy method of registration now will bring home to parents the need for registration of births. and will not permit them to slip up and wait until the last day to register a birth because they have days of grace. I hope that they will realise that the child is injured as a result of their carelessness, and that they will do it at the very earliest date possible.

This method of regularising the registration of births in case it may have lapsed over 42 days is to be commended; but, as I have said, I do hope that this method does not make parents more lazy and cause them to put it off. Another point is that it may cause the Registrar an awful lot of work over his normal duties if he has to summon parents to register their children. As I have said, it is a small but important amendment. It is one of these things that are very necessary in these days when so many people are applying for passports because of the movement of persons.

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

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

Clause 1 *was called and passed.*

Clause 2 *was called.*

It reads as follows:—

2. Section 9 of the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages, and Burials) Act, 1891, is hereby repealed and in place thereof the following section shall have effect—

9. (1) Where a birth has, from the default of the parents or other persons required to give information concerning it, not been duly registered, the Registrar of the Island may, at any time after the end of forty-two days from such birth, by notice in writing, require any of the persons required by this Act to give information concerning such birth to attend personally at the Registration Office within such time as may be specified in such notice and to give information to the best of his knowledge and belief of the particulars required to be registered concerning such birth, and to sign the register; and it shall be the duty of such person, unless the birth is registered before the expiration of the time specified in such notice, to comply with the terms of the notice.

(2) Every person required to give information under the preceding subsection who wilfully refuses to answer any question put to him by the Registrar of the Island relating to the particulars concerning a birth, or fails to comply with any requisition made in pursuance of this section shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable on conviction by a court of summary jurisdiction to a fine not exceeding twenty-five dollars.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the original Act, as far as I remember, is to the effect that if you do not register within a certain number of days you can register within a certain further time on the payment of a fine. Then in 1949 we extended that time and said:

"Notwithstanding anything contained in the principal Act, the Registrar of the Island may at any time after the expiration of twelve months from the date of birth of any child, at the instance of any person present at the birth of such child, or any person interested on behalf of such child, who makes statutory declaration, to the best of his knowledge and belief, of the particulars required to be known touching the birth of such child, register the birth of such child according to particulars of such declaration."

There is also a proviso to the effect that the Registrar of the Island shall not effect any registration in pursuance of this sub-section unless the person applying to register the birth shall (a) have obtained the consent of the Governor-in-Executive Committee (b) have paid into the Public Treasury for the public use of this Island a fee of two pounds.

It is obvious that a civilised country must ensure that people are registered, apart, from the question of knowing what you have for "cannon fodder" as some people term it. Therefore, it is essential that there should be some sort of penalty in order that people might register births. It has grown up, sometimes deliberately on religious grounds, that people object to registering births.

The point made by the honourable junior member for the City is a good point. However, if the honourable member reads the amendment carefully he will see that after the expiration of 40 days where a birth has from the default of the parents or other persons required to give information concerning it, not been duly registered, the Registrar of the Island may, at any time afterwards by notice in writing require any of the persons required by this Act to give information concerning such birth to attend personally at the Registration Office within such time as may be specified in such notice and to give information to the best of his knowledge and belief, and to sign the register. If you get your doctor or midwife to swear that this child was born on a particular day, it makes it easier. It happens sometimes that you have to get such people to swear in order to prove a will. It happens now and then that people like these have to come before the Courts and make a declaration that to the best of their knowledge and belief John Jones is the child of Mary Jones.

This is an attempt to make it easy for people who for various reasons have not complied with the law. The declaration is in order to prove the date of the birth. That is more relevant than the exist-

ence of the birth because the person whom you are seeking to find out is obviously standing before you 4.45 p.m.

I think it would be a good thing for all Newspapers to give unlimited publicity to this matter so that persons may know they may go any time without danger of being fined and get a record made of the birth of children whose births may not have been recorded in the past. Much good could be done if columns dealing with House of Assembly debates of this sort could be publicised so that people of these parts would know what the law is.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I take it that this one sheet is the entire Act. Is Section 9 which is being taken out the one that allows a person to pay a fee? I am wondering if Section 9 is the one where you pay a fee.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: When I was looking at it I thought the same thing as the honourable member; and I think it is possible that everything is not here. I am going to ask leave to postpone further consideration. In the Objects and Reasons this Section is repealed and may be there is a page that should be attached to this.

Mr. LEWIS: This section repeals it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Section 9 merely provides for the Registrar to send district registrars copies of the duplicate registers of births; so by repealing the whole section and re-enacting this, it has nothing to do with the original Section 9.

Mr. LEWIS: Then, Mr. Chairman, is the 1949 amendment repealed too? That is what I would like to know. Mr. Chairman, what I want to get clear is that in 1949 you said notwithstanding anything contained in the principal Act. In 1949, as I heard him say, you could go and pay a fee and register the date. What I mean now is, does it still stand? Would it read now "notwithstanding this you can pay a fine"?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not know if I were drafting this if I would draft it this way. Section 9 says the Registrar must send copies to district Registrars; Section 10 speaks about forty-two days. What the draftsman of the amendment has therefore done is to repeal Section 9, and instead of that he has put in its place "after forty-two days" which would logically come after Section 10. Section 10 says up to forty-two days; this says even after forty-two days have passed you can still go and register, so scientifically it should come after Section 10 and not take the place of Section 9.

Mr. LEWIS: Just to put it right, Sir, I am going to make a motion that further consideration of this Bill be postponed and let somebody second it and put it right.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I agree with the honourable member. Logically it should come after Section 10. I confess I did not read it before it came here. It is better to amend Section 10 and tack this on to it.

The question that the Bill be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that your honour do now report progress:

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

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 half an hour.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am wonder if the Government has anything they have in mind to do. If they have one thing in mind to do, I would ask them to withdraw the motion and get through with it. We know printing is difficult and what not, but no matter how much debate we have on it, let us have the debate and finish with it.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am asking leave to withdraw the motion.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

SUGAR INDUSTRY BILL

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Item 4. as the next Order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour; the second reading of a Bill to amend the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Local Consumption) Act 1952.

4.55 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Since 1952, sums accruing from levies raised on sugar for local consumption have been applied to subsidising crystal sugar. For the past three years the price of this sugar has been held at 7½ cents per pound. It is proposed to continue the system of subsidising this sugar from these funds to hold it at the same price.

As I have said, the total amount of sugar sold locally is 10,000 tons, and it is expected that the levies to be raised on this sugar will amount to about $140,000. There is a balance from last year of $27,699.60 and that makes the total amount $167,700 for subsidisation. In order to keep the price of this sugar at 7½ cents per lb. that amount of money will subsidise 33,126 bags which is the equivalent of 3,312 tons. I am perfectly aware that every year we are faced with the same problem when it comes to this sugar. It is something like a perpetual problem so long as we keep this system of distribution for longer than eight or nine months, or three-quarters of the year.

Quite naturally, what happens is that although the subsidisation of this sugar is principally intended to benefit the consumers, because of the fact that this sugar is not rationed—it is very expensive to set up a system for the rationing of this sugar—much of it gets into the hands of bakers, mauby sellers and other people, and it is therefore very difficult, as I have already said, to control the distribution of this sugar and see that it is channelled into the sources and mouths of the people whom it is intended to benefit.

I have this year cut down on the profits of the wholesalers in order to spread this sugar a little further, and I may say that the profits compare very favourably with profits elsewhere although they have been cut down. We are trying out a system of rationing; last year we tried out a system of part-rationing so to speak; we tried to make this sugar last throughout the year. As honourable members know, this system will fall through because there is not a sufficient amount available for the subsidisation of this sugar. We cannot allow the cost of living to go up; we must try to keep down the cost of living. We feel that it is better to avoid a greater evil and stick to a lesser evil of continuing a short supply of this sugar and keeping it at the same price, rather than allow the price of the sugar to go up and have a month's supply more at the present rate of distribution and consumption. That is our policy, and I do see the snags in it; but, faced as we are with a rising cost of living, we have decided to keep this sugar as it was last year.

In the previous year, we had marginal differences which have not occurred again this year, and therefore the amount of money available for subsidisation is less than it was last year. We provide for a greater number of bags of sugar to last for a whole

year, but it is not possible to raise any other amounts this year as we have done in the past. Last year, we took the surplus balances in the hands of the Controller of Supplies and used them to assist in this matter, but it is not possible for us to do that again this year. We can therefore only subsidise this sugar by the method proposed. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. GODDARD: This Bill has become an annual one, and this year the Hon. Minister is holding the price at 7½c. per lb., and giving us an inadequate of sugar for the supply of the entire twelve months. I should like to say that if the same subsidy had been used to subsidise a greater quantity of sugar and fix the price at 8c. per lb., just a half cent more, the same result would have been achieved. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: How could we do that?] We would be paying half cent more, but instead of buying sugar for eight months at 7½c. per lb., people would be buying it at 8c. per lb. for the whole year.

To continue the argument of the Hon. Minister in favour of the price of 7½c. per lb., he could subsidise a smaller quantity even heavier at 6c. per lb., and let it run for four or five months. He would have expended the same subsidy, but the sugar would have gone into fewer channels. It is just a question of the method. I feel that it is better, if an item is to be subsidised, if you have so much money to expend, you should give us a year's supply. Instead of this sugar being 7½c. per lb., it might be 8c. per lb. There is another reason why people are clamouring for this sugar at 7½c. per lb.; it is because it is out of all relation to the other two grades of sugar which are not subsidised. Whereas if this sugar were held at 8c. per lb., there would have been a greater demand for the sugar at 10c. and 11c. per lb. That would have at least given the consumers the opportunity of buying sugar at 8c. per lb., for twelve months of the year. When it comes to the question of this sugar being used to a great extent by the mauby sellers, bakeries and other people, I should like to say that with this sugar, it either reflects in his profits or in the increase size of a loaf of bread.

5.05 p.m.

It is the same thing with the mauby seller. If this is going to be used in the mauby, the seller makes either another six cents per day or it is passed on and probably another half gill of mauby fills the glass.

There is one thing of which I am glad. I am glad that this Bill has come down a little earlier this year than is accustomed in previous years. Last year, this Bill was brought down in June and the sugar disappeared off the counters before Christmas. It has come down this year on the 1st May, and if it is passed through the Other Place as speedily as it is passed through the House, then this sugar will go on the market early this month; and I am sure there will be no 7½ cents per pound sugar after November this year.

As I have said, you are subsidising the item wrongly. I say, let the full subsidy be paid but in a different way, and I am assured it will achieve better results. You will still be expending and subsidising something for local consumers. You should not discriminate. You should not say it should not be used at the Marine Hotel but it should be used in St. Joseph. [A VOICE: Who said so?] This is for local consumption and you must not do that. As I have said, I would approach this matter in a different manner. I hope that the Hon. Minister of Trade is listening to what I say and next year he will come back with my proposals. [A VOICE: Who told you that he is coming back next year?] However, Sir, I hope this type of sugar will soon be put on the market; but I am warning you that the sooner it comes on the market, the quicker it will disappear.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable junior member for Christ Church, as well as the Hon. Minister, has put up a proposition on something on which he does not know what he is talking about. The whole purpose of this Bill is to amend the Act so as to continue its operation indefinitely. If you read the "Objects and Reasons," you will see that you are not making this Act any longer than an annual Act, but that it will be *ad infinitum* a law of Barbados.

I want to say that the scientific approach to this matter is not that the sugar sold locally should be at 7½ cents per pound, because we are not wedded to the idea that the consumers should not pay a greater price than 7½ cents per pound for any commodity. I am saying that it is fantastic to suggest that you are ceiling the price of sugar at 7½ cents per pound without relation to the other economic factors. Let me say that the price of sugar is wedded to the price of sugar which is exported. It is because of the subsidy which you get from those three funds that you are subsidising this type of sugar, therefore it cannot be excluded from any section of the community. This type of sugar should be reserved for the whole community. The next thing is that under this context which you are subsidising this sugar it means nothing, because you are only subsidising something for a certain part of the year. Another thing is this: no one can guarantee that this grade of sugar which is to be sold at 7½ cents per pound is not mixed with the other grades which are sold at 10 and 11 cents per pound. There is no inspectorate to check on it.

With regard to the question of rationing this grade of sugar, it is ludicrous to talk of it when you have more sugar than you can use. As a matter of fact, you do not need a ration system when you have more sugar in supply than the population can consume. Would you have expected after these years of seeing the evils of subsidising this grade of sugar that Government could not make better use of the subsidy?

The Sugar Producers' Association, the employers and the Trade Union have agreed that the time has come when you should have a Provident Fund for the people who toil in the sugar industry. I make bold to say that if you go throughout the length and breadth of this community and take a census, you will find that the greater number of people will agree with your taking this $140,000 with which you are subsidising this grade of sugar and using it as a Provident Fund to benefit the people who work in the industry, and so as to prevent cane cutters and such people from wending their way into the eleven Almshouses of this Island or depending on the 5/- per week Old Age Pension. Why are you using $140,000 to subsidise an item like sugar when there are other commodities which you are not subsidising that the whole community uses? Are you going to subsidise milk which is produced in this colony? I know that you are subsidising rice. To put in a Bill that you are going to subsidise sugar at 7½ cents per pound is tantamount to your saying the price which should be paid for it is uneconomic for the Barbadian to pay. Do you know how much sugar is consumed in the Island? Do you know how much money a man spends on

sugar? As far as I know, the average is 79 pounds of sugar per annum per man.

5.15 p.m.

The annual consumption for any man in the West Indies is an average of 79 lbs. of sugar. That comes from the International World Sugar Council; 79 lbs. being used in warm climates and 99 lbs. in colder countries. This means you are going to subsidise sugar of which he uses 79 lbs which is less than two lbs. a week; therefore, in his budget you are subsidising an item that does not really come up to a shilling in the whole financial structure. You go to the expense of taking $140,000 to utilise in something that is less than a shilling a week in the budget and leave out other items of which you are using a larger proportion.

The proportion you pay in rent is higher than the sugar which you are subsidising to the tune of $140,000; therefore, you leave the section of workers for whom you are subsidising without any security whatever. It is the same worker engaged in producing this sugar that is forced to go to the almshouses. He does not get from the industry at which he works one single penny as security. Moreover, the price of sugar should not go above 7½ cents but he also had to buy a dearer kind. Then again, there is no inspectorate system to control the dilution of this sugar when it goes to the shops. There is no means of controlling it and therefore what you would regard as putting something by, some would get it at 7½ cents for a certain time.

I would ask the Minister this: what has happened to the idea of providing a Providence Fund for these people. I would suggest that you should garner all your funds at a stage like this in order to provide a Providence Fund for workers in the Sugar Industry. I think the Government should realise they have to face the issues. They will find the quantity you are subisdising would be infinitesimal when you come to look at it from a budget point of view; but if you tell a man it rises from 7½ cents to 11 cents per lb., and you give him that and take it $140,000 to subsidise, let us do something about it.

When you realise the average man's or the community's consumption cannot exceed 79 lbs. per annum, he will realise what you are subsidising. You are giving a man a subsidy on an item of which he is spending less than one shilling a week, so my suggestion is that you should look upon giving some aspect of social security in the Sugar Industry which is vital in order that when the people grow old you can give them sick benefit; that is something lacking in the community. When a man can go to doctor to get medical attention he is therefore a better worker than when he cannot go; and when he grows too sick he cannot go any longer.

You can subsidise a section of sugar but the $140,000 could be used to put in a fund to do something of a positive and constructive measure to increase the economic structure by giving workers better social security. When you make him a bet ter worker he becomes of more economic value to the community as a whole. This is a palliative for the person who is not thinking of these economic values. Does it mean much to a man's budget that is so heavily weighted; it is not like flour and rice, things without carbohydrates. If you cannot subsidise all the sugar for a man for a portion of the year, what are you doing for the people generally? But when you examine the amount of money you are spending or the sections you are taking from the Sugar Industry for this purpose, it could be used for the people in the Sugar Industry. The purpose of the Price Stabilisation Fund is to assist people in the Sugar Industry. It is now being used for other things; but at this stage the aspect of social security should be meted out to the workers and they would not be worried about the funds which are going to help a section which represent a portion of workers in this country.

Mr. SMITH: I do not think I should allow a debate of this sort to pass without saying something. I feel that I would be wasting time to throw out my suggestion, but I will do so. Now, Sir, the honourable junior member for St. Peter said that this money should go in a fund. I am saying that this money could be used otherwise which would help the people we want to help. There are other commodities that should be subsidised, that the mauby seller or the baker would be able to make use of and the people you want to help.

Now, Sir, when you subsidise part of this sugar the quality is such a nice quality, (it is near the 11 cent quality) that the Hon. Minister will be surprised to know that at this time when the sugar is scarce, when it has all gone there are some business people who still have some sugar to blend with the expensive one and sell for the higher price. So long as you cannot subsidise it in such a way that every person would be able to buy it whenever they can get it throughout the year, you are doing nothing.

Now, there are some people who get a very small amount of this sugar because it goes quickly. There are some shopkeepers who cannot get it at all; and there are others who have it throughout the year and some part of the year, and the people you want to help still have to buy the expensive kind because they cannot get the sugar to buy at 7½ cents. I am sure the people would be more pleased to buy it at 8 cents per pound and get it throughout the year than to keep it at 7½ cents and get it for only part of the year.

Now, I can see that the Government wants to help these people by way of subsidisation; but they are not helping at all, they are making it harder for them. There are some people who cannot use sugar at all, but there are other commodities they have to use twice a day. They would like to buy these other commodities but because of the expensive rate of the subsidy, the Government cannot import them If the Hon. Minister wanted information he had me at his disposal and I would have told him what to do. This $140,000 could be used to subsidise these commodities and take the subsidy off sugar entirely and let it go wild.

There are certain salt meats which people have to use daily and sometimes twice a day; they cannot get it because it is not being subsidised, and it is being rationed because the Government cannot import this meat that would help the people. Take the $140,000 and use it with the other commodities that the people have to use daily, then the bakers would get a chance to benefit from it, the blenders of this sugar would not be able to blend it, and people would use the expensive sugar only when the other one has gone. I am saying you should take the subsidy off altogether and put it on other commodities that will help the people of this country.

5.25 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like the honourable junior member for St. Joseph to know that there are some people who cannot eat salt. This is a Bill in which, from the time that the idea started, the intention was to keep this idea. The Government has got into trouble by perpetuating this Bill, and in my opinion, this Bill should be an annual one. This is something which needs to be reviewed in the

light of your experience, and it does not seem as if the Government is capable of reviewing it in that light.

If you institute a system of rationing, the only result would be that you would know how much was mixed; you know that you can subsidise 3,312 tons of sugar, you would issue ration cards for that amount, and you would know if any body is hoarding that sugar. That is all that can happen. However, there are great difficulties in carrying out this scheme, and you cannot prevent people from buying this sugar when it is available. As the honourable junior member for Christ Church has said, if you are making this difference in the sugar, you cannot expect people to buy sugar at a greater price when they can get another grade at a lesser price.

I would really like to see the Government institute the scheme which has been suggested to them every year; that is, that this sugar be sold at 8c. per lb. and let the people get it for a longer period. The Government have been accused at one time of bringing in this Bill too late so that it will last with in the financial year. If you bring in this provision early, the sugar will go quickly.

Now, there are times when the people cannot get this sugar; This sugar should be subsidised and distributed, but we are taking sugar and subsidising sugar. We are saying that the wages of the people and the profits allowed are putting up the price of the sugar and we have to subsidise it. There is no reason in the world why sugar produced in Barbados should approximate the price at which you can sell it abroad. That is a ridiculous idea; when somebody says that it was always so that is nonsense. I suggest that you should regulate the price of sugar, make it a reasonable price and cut it adrift from what you would get for the sugar abroad.

We have made a mistake in contributing to the cess funds from locally-consumed sugar; that is ridiculous. I say that the Government should have cut adrift from that idea ever since. If you want to subsidise this sugar, then use the Price Stabilisation Fund for that purpose; that is what you should do. I would like to know for what purpose is the Price Stabilisation Fund used? I can never get that clear. If you want to give the people cheap sugar, then you should subsidise it from this Fund, or manufacture more of this sugar so that you can get it for the people throughout the year.

I have heard somebody saying something about sugar at 10½c. per lb., but when the sugar at 7½c. per lb. has all gone, it is 11c. per lb. which people have to pay for sugar. I am wondering if the Government would re-draft this Bill and make it an annual one. This is a Bill which would have been revised already, rather than come here with it every year and admit your difficulties, and when there is a remedy for those difficulties, you cannot use it. This is a Bill which has been placed on the Statue Book for all time; are you going to perpetuate these Funds?

I think it is time that we be told that some proper assessment is going to be made of the condition of the sugar factories in this Island and whether we can stop the Rehabilitation Fund or allocate more or less to it. During the War you did not do much to your sugar factories, and you were given this advantage by the British Government. I say it is time that we have some survey of these sugar factories and see what the position is; it is time to have this survey, I repeat, and let us see the extent to which this particular Fund is necessary.

5.35 p.m.

So far as this Provident Fund is concerned, I do not know that it will be a worthy object to contribute this fund to; but let us get away from the idea that we should get a Provident Fund for a particular set of people. We want a type of welfare Fund for the entire community of this Island. You have a Welfare Fund for sugar workers already. It is time to think of the welfare of everybody in this Island. In the absence of a general scheme let us have this.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what would be the effect, but I am going to make the suggestion that this Bill be made an annual Bill.

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

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

Clause 1 *was called and passed.*

Clause 2 *was called it reads as follows*:—

2. Section two of the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) (Local Consumption) Act, 1952, is hereby amended —

(a) by substituting the word "year" for the word "years" appearing in the tenth line thereof; and

(b) by substituting the words "and thereafter" for the words "to one thousand nine hundred and fifty exclusive."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, do you see that the Government does not have the courtesy to reply to the speeches made? That is as much as to say, let us do without the Opposition. We are fast evolving into a dictatorship system. [LOUD ASIDE: You are talking blasted nonsense!] Who said that I am talking blasted nonsense!] Mr. Chairman, you should not allow those words to be used in this Chamber. There was no reply made by the Government to the speeches made although very good reasons and certain facts were put forward for objection to this Bill.

The honourable junior member for the City has rightly brought to the notice of this Chamber that if at this stage you are not so clear in your mind as to what you should do, (and the Minister of Trade spoke of all the evils to this matter and said that this was the lesser evil) why should you put this Bill on the Statute Book for all time if it contains all those evils? This is a Bill which you want to put on the Statute Book for all time; you do not want to deal with it from year to year as it was done up to now.

I think this is the sort of legislation which you should not want to put on the Statute Book for all time. Which Minister can tell you, unless he went up and had a talk with the prophets, he knows that this is the sort of legislation which needs no more review by nim; therefore, there is no need to deal with it annually. Does he know what will be the economic situation of the island next year? Is he saying that it will be the same as it is now, therefore, you will need to subsidise sugar to keep it at the same price?

Then on top of that, you have this vulgar phrase that you are talking a type of nonsense. Some members think that they can subject other members by the most vile and vulgar language. They think we have reached the stage where we are children. I am too old to be a child, therefore, the day any member refers to me with a vulgar phrase I will reply. We come here to debate a matter. Why should we not debate the matter on its merits? Did any one say that the Hon. Minister of Trade was talking nonsense? You hear from the Government

Bench every now and then somebody saying that the debates of this House have lowered; and it is from those very seats that use of these vulgar phrases are made to honourable members.

I feel, Sir, that this Bill should not be put on the Statute Book for all times. If we vote for this to-day, we are saying that you should subsidise sugar at 7½ cents per pound for all times. Why should we vote for it for all times without there being any question of raising the price? The Hon. Minister of Trade has not told us that the reason why they are putting it on the Statute Book for all times is because they know that it represents such a substantial portion of a man's budget that he cannot afford to pay more for it. He says that the bakers and mauby sellers use it but he does not say how much of it is used by them. Mr. Chairman, as you have said, certain people in the country districts never get the 7½ cents per pound sugar at all from January to December because of the number of shops at which this grade sugar is distributed, some do not get it at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking you to keep to the Section.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: You made a first-class point on this matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you keep to the Section?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not believe you had the opportunity of reading this Bill carefully enough. If you read Section 2 you will see that it says that Section 2 of the Act is hereby amended by substituting the word "year" for the word "years" appearing in the tenth line thereof; and that means that you are subsidising this sugar not for a year as it was before but for years to come. I am saying that when you state that, it will mean that the same shops which you said could not get this grade sugar as a result of which some people could not get it, will be condemned to this system for all the years to follow. I again say that this is the type of Bill which you will not need to put on the Statute Book for ever. It is the sort of Bill which should be reviewed annually.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The honourable member is labouring under the impression that the amendments to this Act mean that this will be scheduled perpetually. It does not mean that. From 1952 we have been carrying on this system.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I said that this Bill seeks to amend the Act so as to continue in operation the Act indefinitely thereby obviating the necessity for amending the Act each year.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, all I am saying is that although we have brought in this Bill so that the Act will not be an annual Act, that does not mean that we will not review the matter from time to time. All it means is that if next year we decide to continue this levy so as to subsidise sugar locally consumed we will not come down with this Bill but if we do away with this system we will come down with a Bill to that effect. We may do what the honourable junior member for Christ Church suggested, (I did not say we will) in which case we will continue with the system and apply the money in another way. I do not think it makes sense to come down with a Bill every year to do the same thing.

5.45 p.m.

I cannot predict what will happen next year. An honourable member of the Opposition has predicted what will happen to me! No one knows what will happen in a matter of this kind. We will do away with the system altogether but I wanted to correct the honourable member on this point.

Mr. LEWIS: I am wondering whether the Hon. Minister will explain whether this is going to be an annual Bill so that we would be in a position of being able to review it. It is not a waste of debate if you have discussion on a matter. If the Government say they are not going to consider it, I feel it is far more difficult to get down to an amendment or whether or not they are repealing the Act, because before you consider it you have to find out all the experiences you have had and say I will do it this way. I am not saying the method of subsidising cannot be altered, because it has nothing to do with the actual method of subsidising; I am only saying that this money will be used for this purpose and the Governor-in-Executive Committee are the people to say how it is going to be used, whether it is to subsidise so much sugar, so many tons, and spread it over a year or for a particular type of sugar, and that is what they have to decide; but I do like the idea of reviewing the situation ever year and coming to the Legislature for that purpose.

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to report the passing of the Bill.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill be read a third time.

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

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that the Bill do now pass.

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

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

SUGAR INDUSTRY BILL

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to take Order No. 5 as the next Order of the day.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. R. G. Mapp, Second reading of a Bill to amend the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization) Act 1947.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: As the Addendum reads:

Under section 3 (3) of the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947, all levies raised under the Act are required to be paid by the 31st of July of the year to which they relate; whereas it is not always possible to determine the rate of levy and make the necessary Order by that date. This Bill seeks therefore to amend the section so as to require levies to be paid by such date as may be specified in the Order, or if no date is specified then by the 31st July. What happens now, Sir, is where we do not know the rate of levy, we will have to come back down with another Bill after the 31st July. This Bill seeks to make it possible not to do that, but just to amend the section so that the levies may be paid by such date as specified in the Order. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

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

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I cannot help rising to congratulate the Government on bringing this Bill today. Last year owing to the Agreement with the sugar producers the prices had never been fixed; but apparently now from this, we will be able

to settle the prices of sugar and pay for canes at a proper time, as we used to pay for them from September to October. Last year we never were able to pay until it was close to the end of November; not only the preference money but the balance due in back payments. I am only hoping that this amendment will ease this situation and that the appropriate Minister will be able to deal with the regulations at a proper time each year. I very much welcome it, Sir.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether the honourable member will accept some sort of amendment and at least let us have a maximum time. The other thing I would suggest is in the form of a question. If you are waiting until the 31st July in the hope that we will make an Order and they make it on the 1st day of August, we will be in difficulty just the same, and I think you should make an Order that would extend it longer than the 31st July. You will have to make the Order before the 31st July. I am wondering how this amendment is really going to help.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. At present, Mr. Chairman, the Order made for the 31st July is valid, but it is not enforcible; so that all this is saying is that you have a date—31st July—on which to pay the levies, and another date so that if you do not know by the 31st July what levy will be raised, you would not have to come back with another Order under this amended Act.

5.55 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member will appreciate my difficulty, since his explanation is not in the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill. What I am saying is this: If you have to do something by the 31st July, and you are admitting now that it is difficult for you to do it by that date, the very Order you are making must be made after the 31st July. I do not see that this amendment is really helping the position, because as the honourable member says, you are prolonging a penalty. You must allow a person to make an Order which will include what you must do and when you should do it. Can you make an Order with the information that it is difficult to get something done before the 31st July? I have not studied this question fully; it does seem to me that you have to make this Order, and put in it this information that you cannot do this thing because of that difficulty.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: What happens is that sometimes you have to come down with this matter after the 31st July, and you cannot do it under the present legislation. The note by the Legal Draughtsman says that all levies will be made by Order under the 1947 Act, and the practise of raising extraordinary levies adopted in earlier years will cease. It may be necessary to pass more than one Order in any year. I think that that explanation will meet the honourable member's point.

Mr. BARROW: I really do not understand how the Government could arrive at the amendment which appears in this Bill. As the honourable junior member for the City has pointed out, the 1947 Act refers to payments being made to the Sugar Production and Export Control Board, under Section 3 (2) of the Act, which has not been repealed. When you are making amendments, you have to make sure that they make sense in relation to the Act which you are amending. If you are altering the provisions of the Act in any one particular section, you should be consistent with the general tenor of the Act.

In the 1947 Act, Section 3 (3) states: "Every producer of produce shall pay any levy imposed on such produce by or under this Act not later than the thirty-first day of July in the year in which such produce was manufactured."

If we are going to say that every producer of produce shall pay any levy imposed on such produce by or under this Act by such date as may be specified in the Order so if no such date has been specified, then not later the 31st day of July in the year in which such produce was manufactured, if that is going to be the future practice, then it would appear to me to be much more reasonable to leave the date at the 31st of July, unless this date was extended. The Order should be made and published not in the way advertisements in the daily Press not later than the month of August in the particular year in which the sugar is manufactured.

I think that an amendment of this kind has far-reaching repercussions and it is a matter which would probably be better dealt with by reference to a Select Committee. I am not making any definite proposals in that regard, but Your Honour will appreciate that when the Government is introducing legislation like this on the very day on which the legislation is being considered, hon. members are put in a very peculiar position *vis-a-vis* in the interest of the constituents and the particular legislation being dealt with. We know that it is the practice of the Government to do things in a hurry, in an unorthodox and, in many cases, a hasty manner; but I do not think that things should be done in such a manner. I am asking the Hon. Minister to scrutinise the relevant legislation with a great deal more care than is evident from the introductory speeches which are made from that side of the House.

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

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

6.05 p.m.

Clause 1 *was called and passed.*

Clause 2 *was called it reads as follows*:—

Subsection (3) of section three of the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947, is hereby amended by inserting after the words "this Act" the words "by such date as may be specified in the Order or if no such date has been specified then."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. LEWIS: I am just letting the honourable member in charge of this Bill know that it is not quite clear to me where it is difficult to decide on the the allocation of money and therefore it is difficult to know what levy should be raised before the 31st July what sort of order in that respect to make. Will you make an Order to extend the time? I may tell the Honourable Minister that my difficulty is that you have said that by the 31st July it is sometimes very difficult to determine the rate of levy. You do not have all the relevant facts by that time. I take it that you are not extending the time because at any time you can make an order to extend that. If you are saying that it is difficult to know before the 31st July what Order to make I am saying that the 31st July will pass and then you will bring in an Order to say that you hav eextended it. [A VOICE: As soon as you see that you cannot do it by that time you will bring in the order]. If in the Order you are to say that the amount of 12/- is to be paid in and the relevant facts are not before you by the 31st July, how can you say that? If the Order is to say how much should be the levy and you are saying that you may

not know before the 31st July, how can you make an order until after the 31st July? That is my difficulty.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I have just one particular point to put before the Hon. Minister in charge of this Section which we are discussing—Section 2 — which amends sub-section 3 of Section 3 of the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947. I want to get that straight so that the Minister of Trade will be able to follow me. I will try to use words of monosyllables for his benefit. Section 2 states that that Section of the Act is hereby amended by inserting after the words "this Act" the words "by such date as may be specified in the order or if no such date has been specified then."

If you look at the Principal Act in the interpretation Clause there is no reference of the word "Order" at all. Now, the first reference of the word "Order" is found in Section 4, Sub-section 3 of the Principal Act and it reads as follows:—

"All moneys received by the Sugar Production and Export Control Board under the provisions of this Act by way of levy on produce during any year subsequent to the year one thousand nine hundred and forty seven shall be paid by the said Board to the Sugar Industry Capital Rehabilitation Reserve Board, the Sugar Industry Price Stabilization Reserve Board and the Governor-in-Executive Committee in such proportions as shall be fixed in respect of that year by order of the Governor-in-Executive Committee with the approval of the two Houses of the Legislature".

You will see that there is no question of dates under that sub-section or the Executive Committee being given any power to make the order as to the dates on which they are to be paid. The order that the Executive Committee makes is in relation to the proportions which will be allocated to the three different funds. I want to make this point clear: there is no mention of what an order is in the Interpretation Clause which is Clause 2 of the Act. We come in this Year of Grace —nine years later—and refer to the word "Order". Which "Order" are we referring to? You cannot amend an Act and say "in the order" unless it is in the Interpretation Clause. If you look through the Act you will see that the order is only made in relation to proportions. The Executive Committee has no power to make any orders as to date. It can be done but it will have to be done in a different way. You will have to state in Clause 3 that the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall have power to make an Order as to date and you will have to specify how that order is to be promulgated.

I said before, when this Bill was being considered at a different stage that the method of publication for the kind of information should be entirely different from merely laying it on the Table of both Houses of the Legislature. That is not a satisfactory way of publishing the date. It should be done by advertisement in the Press. The confusion arises because people go in for legislation in an **ad hoc** or piecemeal manner without any continuity of system or ideas.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I think the last hon. member said we should do something we are doing. I do not know if he is mixing up the Bill with the Order. He said that having raised a levy or made an Order by 31st July you cannot make an Order today and we would have to put in the existing Bill a proviso to give the Government the power to do so. If you do not know by the 31st July what the levy would be, we have the power in the existing Act to come back at a further date to make an Order which is enforcible with the power of penal provision. If we did not bring in this Bill we could make an Order for the 31st July, the the penal provision would not apply. We cannot penalise a manufacturer. I have already had legal opinion but the hon. member may have a legal opinion of his own, but I am guided by the legal opinion of the Government.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I attempted just now to use words of one syllable for the benefit of the Hon. Minister. I was trying to assist him, but there is a certain level of condescension below which I refuse to fall. I do not want to be condescending to the Minister but I would like to explain like the alphabet. The 1947-13 Act, says, there would be a levy: Section 3 says, when the levy is to be paid; Section 4 says that after the levy is paid in that the Governor-in-Executive Committee makes an Order with the approval of the two Houses of the Legislature which is a cumbersome bit of machinery. Anyhow the money is paid in to the Governor-in-Executive Committee who make an order specifying the different amounts or proportions in which this fund should be allocated to the three funds. Now, Sir, I wonder if the Minister has followed me so far.

Now, you have a levy then you pay money to the Sugar Production Board and then after the money is paid in the Governor-in-Executive Committee has the power to make an Order. Now, in this Bill which he brings today, he says that the Governor-in-Executive Committee in making an Order shall specify the day when the money is to be paid in. If I could go to the extravagances of the senior member for St. Joseph I would say a boy in fourth standard, (but I would say a boy in second standard) would understand you cannot make an Order before the money is paid in. You cannot make an Order until the money is paid in, as otherwise, as the saying is, somebody would not get any. In other words they will find themselves in a serious position because the money has not been paid in. Therefore, that is my suggestion to the Minister; because after all, I am a Barbadian and I do not want to see my constituents suffer by a Clause in this Act. The Order is to fix the proportion or to fix the date or both, and in section 3, the Governor-in-Executive Committee is hereby authorised to make an Order not later than the 31st July each year specifying the date on which such levy should be in the fund.

I will repeat for the benefit of the Minister, the Act repeals the Order on the levy, Section 3 says when the money is to be paid to the Sugar Production Board and Section 4, after the money is paid in the Governor-in-Executive Committee makes an Order. It is clear to all except the blind when the money is to be paid in; but perhaps, Sir, you might be kind enough to get one side after the House has been adjourned and try to simplify things a little for him.

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

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

On separate motions of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

The Order Paper having been fixed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 8th May, 1956 at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

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

6.20 p.m.