

X

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 22nd July, 1958.

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*); Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Mr. T. O. BRYAN, (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Mr. L. St. A. THORNE and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

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.

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following:

A Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921 which has been returned with amendments by the Hon. Legislative Council.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 10 Order, 1958.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 11 Order, 1958.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 12 Order, 1958.

Report on the Training Scheme for the financial year 1957-58.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement in connection with the Expenditure in expenditure of funds voted in the 1957-58 Estimates for the Mental Hospital under Head XXIII(3) - Item 51, Farm Extension.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 10 Order, 1958."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 11 Order, 1958."

Resolution to approve "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 12 Order, 1958."

Resolution to place the sum of \$2,397 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1958-59, No. 10 which forms the Schedule to this Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$95,721 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1958-59 Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1958-59, No. 11 which forms the Schedule to this Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$1,100 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1958-59, No. 12 which forms the Schedule to this Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$1,920 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of making loans to two delegates and two observers of the Barbados Elementary School Teachers' Association, to assist them to meet the expenses of attending the Conference of the Caribbean Union of Teachers.

Bill to amend the Governor's Act, 1890.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to amend the Governor's Act, 1890, was read a first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to point out that with reference to the two Resolutions for \$114,115 and \$4,425, the Addenda have been confused. The first Resolution which deals with the Tourist Board has the Addendum on the other Resolution for the Agricultural Society and vice versa. Hon. members will find in their places the correct Addendum for the appropriate Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the island.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that

Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

3.25 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1958-59 NO. 7

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$114,115 to make advancement to the Tourist Board which is to be set up in the very near future. During my absence, the House passed a Bill having for its object the establishment of a Tourist Development Board. Before that Bill was passed, the Government agreed to advance this Board the minimum sum of \$150,000 and a maximum of \$200,000, the remaining \$50,000 on a dollar for dollar basis. As you will see from the Addendum to the Resolution, the Board has already been advanced certain sums. As hon. members know, in the Estimates I think it is something like \$85,000 which has already been paid over to the Publicity Committee and that sum is deducted from the total amount of \$200,000. You will see that for the survey of the tourist industry, the Publicity Committee was advanced \$1,200, and \$84,685 was voted under Item 36 of Head XXVIII in the 1958-59 Estimates.

The sum which is now to be voted to bring that amount up to \$200,000 is \$114,115. I should like to add at this stage, although perhaps some hon. member may question it, that the Government has come down for \$114,115 which includes the \$50,000 which we say must be given on a dollar for dollar basis. Although this money would be voted today, that amount of \$50,000 will not be paid out immediately to the Board but as and when the Board contributes its \$50,000. As I have stated, this is on a dollar for dollar basis. If, for instance, the Board cannot contribute more than \$25,000 or \$30,000, then the Government will not advance more than \$25,000 or \$30,000; therefore, it is no harm in our deciding to vote today the additional sum of \$50,000 which brings our maximum to the \$200,000 as was already proposed to be given to the two Boards, namely, the Tourist Board and the Publicity Committee, as has been pointed out.

I think that explains the Resolution quite fully. I presume that when the Bill was before the House hon. members were given all the details and I do not propose at this stage to say anything more than to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I think the Government will be well advised, as oversights have occurred so frequently, to make it so plain to the Treasury that not one dollar more should be paid out of the Treasury in respect of the \$50,000 which the Government is providing on a dollar for dollar basis than what the Tourist Board is able to collect, because as you know, Sir, I have pointed out very often about the number of Resolutions which we have coming here to refund something. I hope that we will not hear of any mishaps, oversights or any lapses. I hope it will be seen that the Tourist Board would provide a dollar for every dollar which we give in respect of this further contribution.

As to the actual Addendum in respect of the Resolution which was before us and which we received over the weekend, Mr. Speaker, you have already made reference to it but I think from this side of the House that I should add my quota. It is not good enough for the standard of work being turned out at the Government Printery. I understand that the Government has all the equipment which it needs there; therefore I do not know if it is that the men whom they have there are not competent to do the work or if there is a saboteur; but it is not good enough for us to read in a Tourist Board Resolution something dealing with the extermination of rats as if tourists are to be treated

as such. There must be some sort of proof-readers at the Government Printery or at least there should be some. We are having these mistakes too often and too frequently. I do feel that there is some saboteur over there. You know, Sir, this work was done by a private contractor and I do believe that a lot of tears were shed when the private contractor realised that his time was up to give up the contract and the Government Printery was going to take over. As you know, Sir, I was a proponent for the Government Printery and that is why it hurts my heart to see the poor standard of work which is being turned out there. There seems to be some reason for it and I hope the Government will see to it that such instances do not recur. We know that there will be mistakes sometimes, but not such mistakes as we find the Government Printery up to now is continually making.

I have nothing to say so far as the Resolution is concerned because the principle has already been set out. All that I am hoping is for the best from the Tourist Board. I am looking forward that care is being taken that for every dollar received from the Government the Tourist Board will show their dollar put up and that there will be no oversight in respect of that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution in itself is a very laudable thing, but some important details have not been explained, at least at this sitting of the House. I do not know if this measure was explained when the Bill was before the House. When you read the Addendum of the Resolution, you see that the Government proposes to make a minimum contribution of \$150,000 per annum to the Tourist Board, which means that the Government can increase its minimum contribution by another \$150,000. In addition to that, the Addendum goes on to point out that there is a further amount to the maximum of \$50,000 which would be given to the Board on a dollar for dollar basis.

Now, if it is your intention to make a minimum grant of \$150,000 and you do so today, why do you have to come for the maximum today? If you do not intend to give any further sum until you are satisfied that they collect the corresponding amount, why come for this further amount today? You say how you are going to increase your minimum. You are giving a minimum amount of \$150,000 but as regards your maximum of \$200,000, you intend to give that on a basis of a dollar for a dollar which means that for now you are not committed to give that further sum of \$50,000 until they collect that amount. I therefore ask you, why do you have to come to the Legislature today to ask for the maximum when you do not know how much the Tourist Board is going to get in?

3.35 p.m.

If it is on a dollar for dollar basis, a dollar on each dollar they receive, what do you say they have received to make you give them \$50,000? We, in this Legislature, would like to have a progress report on the Tourist Board so as to know how it is working as a new entity. *A propos* to those remarks, let me say this: I did not know that I would have to deal with it today. You have sent out notices to people or to organisations asking them to nominate people to this Board and let me warn you that the Trade Union Movement is different from other organisations. If you want a nominee on a Board, you send to the organisation and ask them to nominate a person to be selected or approved by you; it is not for you to say that you are nominating a panel from a Body which is an accredited organisation, to know whom they have for you to play ball with the man. We know the interference which takes in Government circles with the Trade Union Movement at the present time; but let me say here and now, that I stand today as an accredited leader of the Trade Union Movement, not only in this Island, but in the West Indies. We denounce the idea that ~~there~~ we represent the workers and you need a nominee, you ask us to nominate a panel and therefore, the choice of selection belongs to a body in which we have no voice. When you ask for a panel of three persons and you need only one, the selection is yours and not the body which makes the nomination, because you will be selecting the person whom you will require. If, on the other hand, you ask a body to nominate a person, to be approved by you, out of three persons, it means that you will have to favour one of these

three and you will leave the other two to go cap in hand behind some Minister in order to see if the Minister would receive his approbation.

These things are all right in Germany or in Fascist Italy, but not in Barbados. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof, and a hint to the wise is sufficient. I hope that commonsense will prevail in the Minister's head to see that you should ask an organisation for the nominee you require. If the Secretary of State for the Colonies were to send and tell the Government of Barbados that he is going to have a Conference at San Francisco and ask the Government to select three Ministers from this Island when he wants only one, they would tell the Secretary of State for the Colonies to fly in hell, if I may use those words. Some of us are going there anyhow, and therefore, the words would be in order.

I do not want the Minister to go on with this idea of asking an accredited Board to go on with this sort of business which is objectionable. As far as what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said about the Resolution I will say more about it on the appropriate occasion. This is a classic example of work not being done at its proper source; otherwise, something like this could not reach hon. members and cause us to have this type of confusion which we now have in dealing with this matter.

With regard to the tourist business, this is a new venture and it is laudable in itself; but I do not subscribe willy-nilly to the idea that there is no sort of discrimination in Barbados in this matter. I live in Barbados and I know the segments and the sectors where this discrimination exists. All I say is that this Tourist Board must understand that its whole outlook should not be one of attracting white tourists to Barbados, but that there are tourists other than white who will come within the particular segment known as Latin-Americans. It is true that the situation in Venezuela has changed somewhat; otherwise, I would have a lot to say about Venezuela. I do not intend to sit as a member of this Legislature and let any funds be spent in any country where democracy has been suppressed. I do not intend to give my approval to any situation like this, because we can try and get some tourists from behind the Iron Curtain or Russia. I do not like any money to be spent on countries where the fundamental rights of its citizens are denied. There has been a little change in Venezuela, but it is still a country without an elected Government; and if there are Venezuelans who love freedom and who prefer to enjoy their vacation in a free country, then we should not do anything to prevent them from coming here. However, I do not subscribe to the idea that Barbados is free from the segment of discrimination.

I hope that if it is the intention of the Government to ask people to serve on the Board, there will be people serving on the Board who will bear these things in mind. This is a small community and it is a community in which we have a mixed population; one part of the population has the economic power and the other part has the man-power. I am not shunning these things, because I know that discrimination exists in employment in Barbados, and we have to try our best to weed it out. I do hope that with this Tourist Board, we will bring members of our own families in the United States here. The tourist traffic is something which we can have from January to December; what is wrong with Barbados that we cannot welcome tourists here? And any intensification of anything which can bring tourists here is something which anybody will appreciate. I want to ask this question; can the Minister say quite expertly why are they asking for \$50,000, which is the maximum you intend to give, when you have not yet given us any idea as to how much they have provided and your minimum of \$150,000 is an amount which you can increase? Why are you required now to give \$50,000 which is the maximum that you will give in any financial year from the 1st April, until the 31st March?

3.45 p.m.

Today is the 22nd July, so you can say that four months of the year have already passed and this is only going to work for eight months. We want to know why it is you are giving them the maximum and not giving us today any indication of how much money on the dollar for dollar

basis you are required to give. Moreover, if you are going to give them the minimum of \$150,000, are you going to give them a maximum of \$50,000 now or are you going to treat it on the basis of an annual budget? Although two-thirds of the year has gone, you are prepared to give them \$150,000; if you are prepared to give them that amount for eight months, why are you required to give them \$50,000 at this stage? What provisions have they given? Those are questions to which I would like an answer.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I would have thought that the apology made by His Honour the Speaker for the manner in which these two Addenda were written was sufficient satisfaction for members opposite. I think it is an accepted fact that the only person who does not make a mistake is the individual who does nothing. Anybody who does something must inevitably at some time or other make a mistake. I think that we have been too readily critical in the establishment of this Printery.

As I have said on this floor on more than one occasion, when a private concern was carrying on this work, it was never done to the satisfaction of this or any other House. As far as I know, debates were for the most part late and that private firm was never subjected to the criticism which this Government Printery has been getting, although this Printery has only been established a year ago. I still feel that members, realising that this is a new set-up and that the machinery and equipment used by this Printery is of a different type from that which is used in other Printeries, ought to give some sort of latitude to the Government Printery until it finds its feet.

Now, Sir, as regards the point made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter about the manner in which the Board is selected or the selection is made, I think that elsewhere the hon. member discussed this question, and, like then, I say now that he has not got a leg to stand on in his argument. Government sends to the Organisations and asks them to submit a panel. If, for instance, we need one individual, the Organisations send three of the best of comparable ability, qualifications and everything. They are the people making the selection although ultimately Government is responsible. What is wrong with Government taking "A" instead of "B"? They are the choice of the Organisation. How can it be construed that the Government then is the person who is making the selection when the organisation puts up three and says that either of them is as good as the other? If, on the other hand, Government had said that they did not agree with either of the names sent up, and went outside and selected an individual, it is then and only then that the hon. member's argument might have any sort of weight whatsoever; but it is not done that way at all. However the selection is made or whoever is selected from among the three, that is the selection of the organisation to whom this matter had been submitted and there is no argument that can be adduced to say that Government is doing something wrong.

If you take his arguments you would come to the conclusion that the Government is acting contrary to the will of the organisation. This is a policy that has been obtaining for some time, and there is absolutely nothing wrong with that principle. Whenever we have to consult, for instance, the Sugar Producers Association, the Chamber of Commerce or any recognised organisation in this island, Government sends to that organisation and asks it to nominate a panel or in some cases, asks for an individual. I can see absolutely nothing wrong with that.

Now the hon. member got a bit confused just now in mentioning that we have a minimum and the Government can, at the same time, increase the maximum. At one time he said that the minimum was \$150,000.....

Mr. WALCOTT: When the hon. member speaks about confusion, it is in his own mind. I can say precisely what I want to say. I said there was a minimum annual grant of \$150,000, and a maximum amount of \$50,000 on a dollar for dollar basis. From that stage he can go on to say what I said.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member went on to say

when he mentioned the \$150,000, that the Government can increase this by \$175,000. He does not remember what he said because he talks so fast. Now the Addendum sets out quite clearly the intention of the Government. Of course, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said he was not opposing anything, and hoped that the money would be well spent and that dollars will come in.

The position is that the Government is making a minimum grant to the Board of \$150,000 and that the maximum grant is \$200,000 and not as the hon. member said \$50,000. If the Tourist Board contributes a maximum amount of \$50,000, Government in addition to the \$150,000 will give another \$50,000; if they contribute \$10, Government will give \$10; if they contribute \$1, Government will give \$1. I thought that a child would understand that. 3.55 p.m.

Now, Sir, the hon. member would like to know whether any contribution had been made by the organisation, and of course he says that already three parts of the year has gone. I think I said in my opening remarks that as far as I know, no contribution was already made, but I told the House that despite the fact that no contribution was already made, the Government was prepared to withhold this amount of \$50,000 after being voted and dish it out on a dollar for dollar basis in accordance with what is put up by the organisation. The only reason for coming to the House of Assembly for the \$50,000 now is because we think it is a waste of time of the House and of the taxpayers to come here again to ask the House to vote this \$50,000 or, say, to come for a vote of \$5,000 now or \$10,000 later on, and if the Tourist Board puts up a dollar more, then come with a Resolution for a dollar.

We are asking that this money be voted now. Sometimes I am amazed at the remarks and the stupidity, the insinuations and innuendoes made by some hon. members. I think that hon. members ought to know that the Treasury controls this money and that you have to produce documents and vouchers to draw money from the Treasury when you want it. It is not because money is voted that it can be drawn the next day out of the Treasury. That is why you see that from time to time money lapses in the Treasury. If the money is not needed, it cannot be taken out of the Treasury. That is the safeguard which the taxpayers have for their money. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely a waste of time for a member to say that this money should not be voted because you do not want it until later on. The fact is that you will need it. If later on you need it, you take it out; if it is not needed, you cannot take it out. There is nothing wrong with that; there is nothing dishonest and I feel that when the Committee is voting for this Resolution as it is, it is doing so to avoid, as I have said, in the first place coming back to the House at a future date before the end of the financial year with another Resolution asking that this money be voted. We are asking for \$114,115 part of which this Government has decided to contribute to the Board. The Bill has already been passed and it is hoped in the near future to get this Board established. If it appears to hon. members that three quarters of the year is already gone, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has mentioned, we feel that the Board starting a bit late has to do a lot to catch up with the coming tourist season and we feel that probably all this money will be spent by the end of the financial year.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, it is true that I am not going to bandy words with the Hon. Minister on any elements of mathematics. I know the difference between three-quarters and one-third because it is something which you are taught in the third standard. If the hon. member is incapable of knowing the difference between one-third and three-quarters, that is a matter for him. I did not say anything about three-quarters of the year has gone already. If that is his mathematics, it is not mine. I did not say so. I would be stupid to say so.

The Hon. Minister goes on to say that it is wasting the taxpayers' money when you come in here.

Hon. M. E. COX: I did not say so.

Mr. WALCOTT: If you have to come back here with another Resolution, how are you wasting the taxpayers' money to come here? You are elected by the taxpayers to come here and, far from that, the work which we do here necessitates the emoluments which they give us that we should come here. The taxpayers have already agreed to pay us for the time we are elected here; therefore, do not let us use this red herring across the trail.

The Hon. Minister does not seem to understand the Addendum which is supposed to be written by them. What does the Addendum say? Surely it does not say what he says. The Addendum says that the minimum grant to the Board is \$150,000 and the maximum further contribution by the Government is \$50,000 which would only be given on a dollar for dollar basis; therefore, this is no block grant of \$200,000 which you are giving to the Tourist Board. If that is not so, it is not here in the Addendum like that. According to the Addendum they cannot get one single penny of this \$50,000 until they collect a corresponding amount. If they say they are giving the Tourist Board a minimum grant of \$150,000 and, on the other hand, they say they are giving a maximum of \$200,000, what they mean by this is that the Government can at any time give the maximum. I wonder if the Hon. Minister thinks someone is so stupid as to think that they can increase it without the approval of the Legislature. The Hon. Minister said that \$150,000 is the minimum which they are giving the Tourist Board and if Government finds that they need more he will come back and give more, but so far as the \$50,000 which is to be given on a dollar for dollar basis, you are committed to give them up to that amount.

I asked him, what is the position today as some of the time has already passed. I do not want the vague generalisations of the Hon. Minister. He can only know if he has been up and had a word with the Almighty. He says that he knows what they will require. If he knows that they will require all this sum, what is the sense of saying he is giving them on a dollar for dollar basis. If you know that they will need more than the minimum, why not come with a Resolution for \$200,000? Your idea is that they themselves should seek funds and you are not giving them this \$50,000 until they get that amount.

The Hon. Minister seems to think that he knows something about selection. When he says that he has discussed it elsewhere, let me tell him that everybody who discussed it elsewhere disagreed with it. What the Hon. Minister does not know yet is that there is a difference between approving of the selection of some person named and your asking for names. Of course the Hon. Minister has the right to nominate the persons concerned to the Board; therefore you are choosing the personnel. The choice of selection is yours because you have the final word on the names sent to you but that does not mean that you have to select the persons. It means that you have submitted to you, the names for selection, which is a different thing altogether.

4.05 p.m.

For instance, the Press in Barbados would say that it has an Association or that it has no Association. If they have an Association which is representative of all Pressmen, you ask them to send one person to the United Kingdom, to Australia or to Sputnik; if you are satisfied that it is an accredited organisation, you can ask them to submit a nominee, because you only want one person; but if you are selecting somebody from the West Indies, you would ask them to submit a nominee from among a panel, because the selection is not coming from Barbados alone. The United Kingdom has asked the British Trade Union Council to submit names for the I.L.O.; they have one delegate, but eight advisers and they ask them to submit nine names for their approval, because in the net result the matter comes under the ambit of the United Kingdom Government. The Chamber of Commerce is not in the same position as the Trade Union. If there were more than one Trade Union, you would have to ask for a panel, but if you want only one person from an organisation, how can you say that you will make a choice from that organisation? A blind man on a trotting horse can see that. If I were in the

Island, they would have received a letter to the contrary; it is not a matter for me, because I would not be there. I only want to say that there is only one Trade Union in Barbados, and they have asked for the submission of a panel so that they can pick out people with whom to play ball in Barbados, and then the Minister says in his pontifical manner that 'the choice is yours', You choose a man from a panel, but we say that we should make the choice and you should approve of the person.

I will teach the hon. member something. Any time that you have to ask for a choice, and the nominee is unsuitable, you can ask for another nominee. If a man has a bad record as to representing Barbados on some Board, you can say: "Oh, no, I do not want him," and if you ask to submit a name, you are to select the one you want. The Trade Union does not go in for that sort of thing; the British Government did not send and ask for a panel of Mr. Mcleod who is a bigger Minister than anybody here; they said: "We will have one from Barbados and one from Malaya." It is not a question of a person giving an approbation to Mr. Mcleod. When I go to a Trade Union Conference, I do not go there to represent the British employers or the British Trade Unionists; I go to represent Trade Unionists from the West Indies. Many voluntary organisations exist in this Island, but they do not have the strength of a Trade Union and no one who is placed on a Board would accept this nonsense which you are doing. It is not like sending around to a lady's organisation and asking somebody to serve at a tea meeting; when you come to a responsible organisation, like a Trade Union, you cannot go on with this nonsense. You have this type of interference, because you are ready to go inside and pick out people, but you do not give the right to select the man you want. Imagine, my name being submitted to any Minister from among a panel! Who would suffer that indignity? But you have the right to approve of the selection made by the accredited body.

Mr. BRANCKER: The Hon. Minister in charge of this Resolution has said that at some time or other somebody may make a mistake; well, nobody will disagree with that. All I am saying, is that in the way in which the Government Printery is being done, too many people are too often making too many mistakes for one not to feel greatly concerned as to whether there may be at work a saboteur somewhere. We want this Government Printery to work. I do not know if, when the private contractor was doing this work, it took him more than a year to get the work going on fairly well. The mistakes are so serious in nature that it is hard to condone the Printery except there is something more than what meets the eye, except there is something which we cannot appreciate at the moment.

I am suggesting that the Hon. Minister should have a serious talk with the Chief Printer and ask him if he thinks that these mistakes and delays are due to a short staff, or an inadequate, inefficient staff or what. Or whether the Advocate Staff should not be transferred lock, stock and barrel to the Government Printery. There should not be more errors occurring than correct things; there should not be more incorrect things than those which are correct. That is all I am saying, Sir, and it is hard to disagree with that.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter has made a very useful point as regards the Tourist Industry and he has reminded this Chamber that we are not to cater only to white tourists; the word "tourist" does not connote all white folk, but it must include coloured folk as well. You, Mr. Chairman, will agree with me that we have coloured folk coming down here from the United States of America and very often Barbadians like yourself have contacts in the great Republic. If these people want to come to Barbados, they will know that if you cannot put them up, they will go to a very well respected guest house merely because the proprietor does not want to say "No". We have passed an Act in this respect, but at the time when that Act was passed, it was most difficult to get a conviction under it.

4.15 p.m.

What happens, as I understand it, at certain of the smaller

places is that even if they accept coloured persons, they are not made to feel as comfortable and are not looked after as well as white tourists. This does not apply to the Marine and the Crane, because whatever the feelings may be, the Goddards have never suffered from that and these places are still owned by them. This does not apply to the St. Lawrence or the Hastings, but to the smaller places in the island, where coloured people if accepted, are not made to feel at home, and are not treated as well as the white residents of such places which have never had a colour line in them.

It would be interesting to find out for the sake of the reputation of this island whether the alleged incident of which we have heard so much earlier this year is true, in which a coloured person made a booking at a small hotel and on arrival at the Airport when the proprietress went to meet that person and saw that she was coloured, got into her car quickly and left the lady there. The Tourist Board should be advised to have a serious word with the various people and let them understand that they must not only receive, but must welcome and do everything in order to encourage them to return to this island, and to advertise it to their friends. When they go to the Rhonda or the Bawden, they should be as well received as if they went to the Marine, the Crane or the Windsor. I trust, Sir, that that would be passed on to the Board and let them understand that it is from that assumption and basis that we are prepared to vote dollar for dollar.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is the result of a Bill very recently passed on which a great amount of debate took place from both sides of the table. I do not intend to go over that again today, but it is noticeable that the Hon. Minister who introduced it and the Hon. senior member for St. Peter were not here at the time. I heard the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Peter on the appointments or the nominees from the various Organisations to the Tourist Development Board. The Minister in reply to him probably did not quite realise that one of the reasons why this had been done was that the Chamber of Commerce, the Tourist Board and the Hotel Association were asked to put up a panel. If they had been asked purely for nominees, it might have been possible that these three Boards would have nominated one person from two of these Boards, and by putting up a panel of names, if the name appeared twice or three times, then the selection would be made preferably of that person to the Tourist Board, because these Boards are not going to get together and inquire who is being put up. They will put up the most fitting from their Organisation, and that is probably the reason why Government sent it out in that way. Of course, there may be a member of the Trade Union on the Chamber of Commerce, but the hon. senior member for St. Peter can argue that there is only one Trade Union in the island, and it is unlikely that the nominee from there would appear on the list of either of the other three Organisations.

Getting on to the Resolution as it is for \$200,000, I commend Government for coming down in that form. They have already handed to the Publicity Committee the sum of \$85,885; out of that \$1,200 was specifically earmarked for the bringing of a team of experts to Barbados to make a survey. Most of that money, I believe, must have been spent or committed; so the other \$114,115 will be dealt with by the Board when it is formed. It is not too much money to be spent because in the Tourist Industry you have to plan almost for 1960. The planning for 1959 should have been done already; so you will have to plan a matter of eighteen months ahead; it is done throughout the world like that. If we wish to get the summer trade next year, we have to be busy about it now, and not in December, because these Tourists Organisations in the big countries plan well in advance. They know what is happening throughout the world; this year there is the Brussels Fair, and it is presumed that that has filtered all the North Americans over to Europe. We have to try and see what is going to happen in the Caribbean and build around that to draw tourists into the Caribbean, and from the Caribbean to these small islands. For that reason the money we are voting now should be spent with a view to

1960 and not next year. You may be in time for the summer trade of next year, but certainly the winter trade has already gone. I commend Government for coming down in this form because you are giving the Board a minimum of \$150,000.

Now there is another \$50,000 in the Treasury which we have earmarked; all the Tourist Board has to do is to get around to their friends and get the equivalent of \$50,000 and then the \$50,000 in the Treasury would be given to them. If they get \$14,000, an equivalent amount would be given to them out of the \$50,000. Suppose they spent the \$150,000 and a scheme came up for which they wanted \$20,000, all they have to do is to make a special appeal, raise \$10,000 and get the other \$10,000 from the Treasury out of the money which is already earmarked.

I commend Government for the way they have done this because it shows that they intend to do business this time. I repeat that I am very pleased in the manner in which the Resolution is drafted in that the \$50,000 is there only to be got by the efforts of businessmen in Bridgetown putting up an equivalent amount.

Mr. WALCOTT: For the benefit of the hon. member, fiscal policy is not done in that way. It is not like a person catching a pan of water because he expects the water to be cut off. When Government says it is their policy to give dollar for dollar to the Board, it does not mean that they have to put money in the Treasury. I heard that argument being used as if at the beginning of the year you have to put a million dollars in the Treasury to run the island. If you put that money away, do you realise how much money you would be taking out of circulation which you would need during the year? People do not study fiscal policy and the financing of Government. You do not do things that way.

4.25 p.m.
(To the Hon. Minister of Trade) When you have manners, you will get co-operation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member address the Chair?

Mr. WALCOTT: If it is your desire to leave the Chair, say so. The Minister is impertinent.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. senior member for St. Peter referred to me as impertinent. The word "impertinent" is unparliamentary.

Mr. WALCOTT: Bad manners are also unparliamentary. A parliamentarian should have good manners. When they begin to have good manners, it will be better for them. Elementary decency is what is required of them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter took his seat.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I have been informed that you are not feeling well and I therefore propose that Your Honour do now report progress and ask leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to second that.

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

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

MR. THORNE APPOINTED CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. senior member for St. John be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees for the balance of the day.

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to second that.

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

RESUMPTION IN COMMITTEE

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. THORNE in the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Acting Chairman, I was drawing to the attention of the hon. junior member for Christ Church that your financial policy cannot be based on the flimsy policy which the Hon. Minister enunciated. It is a matter of principle. When you agree to make provision for a further \$50,000 to be given to the Board on a dollar for dollar basis, you do not have to put aside an amount of money in the Treasury because that amount can run into millions. It only means that you are committing yourself to give that amount. It means that the Treasury of the Government as a matter of principle will be providing that sum, but that does not mean that today you are required to vote that amount.

What is surprising is that hon. members will ask questions for information and then you get these vague generalisations by the Hon. Minister. All that I have asked is: what is required now? How much money have they collected? Cannot the Hon. Minister answer that simple question? In the Addendum to the Resolution it states that you are giving the minimum sum of \$150,000 whether the Tourist Board collects a cent or not. That is not based on how much money they collect; so there is no need for the Hon. Minister to say as to how the Board plans to pursue its policy, whether you are going to have a Fair, what are the Board's proposals or anything like that. That is no concern of ours.

In so far as that question which the Hon. Minister spoke about, he slipped up. Now, the hon. junior member for Christ Church is a very pleasant man. He has a very nice and pleasing personality which is suitable for leadership of the Conservative Party, but when you are dealing with questions put by the Opposition, it is not a matter of your having a nice and pleasing personality. You have people in the Chamber of Commerce, in the Tourist Board, in the Publicity Committee and in the Hotel Association. They have not been formed in an Employers Confederation, but the workers of this country have a firm organisation which represents them as workers. Therefore, the method you are going to use to nominate members of those various organisations to the Tourist Board would not be the method applicable to nominating the people from the Trade Union. What the hon. member is saying is that you have all these groups - the Chamber of Commerce, the Tourist Board, the Publicity Committee and the other groups. That is O.K. but have you a Confederation of all of them? That is to say, are they joined into an Employers Organisation which can speak for the employers? The Trade Union is in that position. We say if you want a workers' representative, there is one choice which we are going to make. That is why I say where you have this sort of hodge-podge arrangement where a member may be a member of the Chamber of Commerce or of the Hotel Association or of the Shipping and Trading Company or of the mercantile community, you will have to ask them to submit names; but if the Employers Confederation were in a similar position as the Workers' Union, you would not have to ask them to submit names. Where you have an accredited organisation, you do not have to ask that organisation to submit names. Why should we submit names? We submitted a person when we submitted people for the Caribbean Commission. We submitted a choice, not a number of names. We want a similar thing in the Trade Union Organisation. If you want us to have three seats, we will submit three names; but if you only want one person we are only going to submit the name of one person. Why should we submit three names to you? Is it for you to play ball? I can see the position of the hon. junior member for Christ Church. If you have all those bodies you must ask them to submit a panel of names. I hope the hon. member will see the fundamental difference between an organisation which is representative of its group and that of a parent organisation. The differentiation cannot take place in a single trade union.

4.35 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: There is a vast difference between

a Trade Union and an Employers' Federation. We have a Federation, but that is a Body for other things. Each of these organisations functions in a different way; the Hotel Association deals with the running of Hotels. The Tourist Board Organisation comprises merchants, and other individuals and the Tourist Industry as a whole including some hotel owners. When you come to the Chamber of Commerce, that is highly concerned with commerce in the city. All three of these organisations are separate and distinct; no one can speak for the other two. If you deal with the Employers' Federation, that would be a Body which will handle questions relating to that Body, but this is not a case like that at all. I hope that the hon. member sees the difference between his organisation and the three Bodies which have been asked to submit names. I should like to go a little further. The Government has not decided as to the proportion of seats which this organisation should have. The Hotel Owners' Association have said that they expect the Government to put up a large representation for the Hotel Owners, because they feel that they are primarily concerned with the Tourist Industry. What proportion of seats will be offered to the Chamber of Commerce, the Hotel Owners' Association and the Trade Union? I do not know if that matter has been decided. For those reasons, a panel had to be asked from these organisations. If the Trade Union decided that only one person would be asked, that is all right, but how do you know that no more than one would be asked? I should like to ask how much money has been subscribed so far. Nobody has answered that question. Money has been subscribed for the running of the Tourist Board which has been in inauguration for the last three years. There are well-wishers and businessmen who contribute to the running of that Board, but when this Tourist Board has been established, the affairs of the former Board will be wound up and all the funds which they have will be handed over to the Tourist Board which is now being set up. How much money that is, nobody knows. We are waiting for the establishment of this Board and then the funds will be collected by the new Board instead of the former Board. The hotels will be subscribing and no one can tell yet how much money has been so far subscribed or how much is likely to be subscribed. That is the answer.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1958-59, NO. 8

GRANT TO THE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The next Resolution, Mr. Acting Chairman, is a Resolution to place the sum of \$4,424 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1958-59, No. 8, which forms the Schedule to this Resolution.

This sum of money, \$4,424, is for the purpose of helping to defray certain expenses which the Barbados Agricultural Society in conjunction with the Department of Medical Services will incur in undertaking to form what is commonly known as "Rat Week". It was only last year that "Rat Week" was inaugurated and from the Reports which we have had, it has been a great success. The destruction by rats in the storehouses, in our homes and in the cane fields is considerable, and this Government is assured that it should subscribe to the distribution of the bait. I think that it is all agreed that rats can be a menace not merely to food, but to health. I see from the faces of the Opposition that they are all smiling and that bespeaks that the Opposition is voting for this Resolution, perhaps, without comment. I know that there are times when we can see eye to eye with each other, and this happens to be one of those occasions. I do not think I need say very much on this Resolution. It has almost sold itself to the inhabitants of this Island. I am hoping that instead of having a campaign for just one week, we will have an intense campaign for a much longer time in order that the younger mice and rats will be got rid of very successfully. With those few remarks, Mr. Acting Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: I am supporting this Resolution. However, there are one or two things on which I would like to comment. Under the Item "Advertisement", we are asked to vote the sum of \$800. What I would recommend to the Hon. Minister to take care of, is that he should let it be widely known that there is a danger to health. People are very much concerned that when they buy this rat bait, instead of killing the rat, they may kill the cat, or both the rat and the cat. It would therefore be a good idea for the Hon. Minister to let it be understood how people should use this poison so that there will not be any danger to their pets.

Last year, I understand that people did not use this poison, because they were not assured that it would not befall their cat or dog or fowls in the yard; therefore, I am suggesting that the advertisement put out by the Minister be so worded as to encourage people that they need have no fear about any danger to anything other than rats from this Rat Eradication Campaign.
4.45 p.m.

Now, Sir, another point has occurred to me in connection with this Rat Week. It seems to me an obvious step in the right direction, but I cannot help feeling that the old Health Week should well be revived. I know that one Medical Officer in this island said in respect of Health Week, to encourage people to be careful of their health for one week out of fifty-two and for the other fifty-one weeks to pay no attention to it, it had better not go on. In respect of the proposed week, I wonder if the Minister has thought of including other things, and if he has, why they do not appear here too. There are things which are just as unpleasant, insanitary and obnoxious, such as flies and cockroaches. I am wondering whether we should not have, if necessary, a rat week, fly week and cockroach week; it would be as well to have a week dealing with the general extermination of household and storehouse pests, because I am sure that he will agree with me that nothing can be more injurious to health than flies. If the Minister used to visit hotels during Health Week, he would see the danger to one's food caused by the perching of flies on top of some morsel of food there for human consumption. At the present time, I think, throughout the length and breadth of this island, just as there is a plague of rats, there is a plague of cockroaches. If the Minister travels - and there is no reason why he should not travel; I travel a lot without \$90 a month and see and hear complaints of rats and cockroaches - he will know about these things. I think that attention should be paid to this just as attention is being paid to rats. Let the Government understand that the only pests today are not rats, but there are other pests, and I am dealing with four-legged pests which I am sure the Minister will appreciate. If the Minister does not think it workable to include a campaign, in the same week as the Rat Campaign, for flies and cockroaches, at least, let him bear it in mind and let us hear soon in this Chamber the benefits of his giving this matter equal attention.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am in support of this Resolution, but there are one or two suggestions which I should like to make to the Minister of Agriculture. I think, Sir, that he should know that Rediffusion has reached almost every part of the country, and I think that on the eve of the launching of this campaign, the Minister of Agriculture should broadcast to the people of this country the purpose of this campaign. If he finds it difficult to do that or is otherwise engaged, I would suggest that the Director of Medical Services should go on record in explaining to the people not only the importance of the campaign, but the diseases which rats are likely to spread if they are allowed to go unkilld, and if this campaign is not pursued vigorously. That would be a good idea because everybody listens to Rediffusion from St. Lucy to Bridgetown, and I think that would be one form of advertising which would not cost very much and which would be very effective if people are told the purpose of this campaign.

Now I represent, Mr. Chairman, a rural constituency, and it would be extremely difficult for persons to come to town just to purchase two pounds of rat poison from the Agricultural Department. The Minister does not seem to

be interested, or perhaps he thinks this Resolution is going to pass so easily that he need not take suggestions from anybody, but I am suggesting that he should allow the Agricultural Stations in the parishes where they exist to stock some of this poison. Take St. Andrew, for instance; if a person can go and get this subsidised rat poison at Haggatts in St. Andrew, it would save him coming to town to purchase this poison, and I think the response is likely to be greater to this appeal. Similarly, this can be done in St. Philip and St. George where you have Agricultural Stations connected to the Agricultural Department. I think that quantities of poison could be kept there for sale and the people notified of it. I know that the people in St. Andrew would prefer to go to the Agricultural Station in Belleplaine and collect the poison than to come to town just to purchase it from the Agricultural Department.

I remember on the last occasion that it was suggested in this House that the Minister should try and persuade the store-house keepers in Bridgetown to remove wherever possible, either when renovating or building, the wooden floors which they have and put in concrete. I do not know if that appeal did not catch on to the commercial community, because when it comes to spending money, except when it is also bringing in money, their views and ideas are somewhat limited and restricted. I am not suggesting that they should just tear up their floors willy-nilly, but when the opportunity comes for replacing the floor, I wish they would consider putting in concrete, because as you know, rats live beneath these wooden floors in the storehouses in Bridgetown.

The point raised by the Leader of the Opposition, re the effect that this poison has on animals, is also of importance because I know for a fact that people are very cautious in the purchasing of this poison because they fear that their animals or their pets may be destroyed. That can be explained to them in the Broadcast which I suggest either the Director of Medical Services or the Minister of Agriculture can make over the radio.

I think, Sir, that there is also another point which must be stressed to the householder in this community, and it is the fact that even if they set this poison and it causes them a temporary inconvenience by its smell, they should feel - especially the people in River Road, because they experience something worse than the smell of rats - prepared to put up with this temporary inconvenience which lasts, may be, for a day or two in the interest of the health of the entire community. As you will know, Sir, many people think that if the rat is killed in the attic or between the rafters and the roof, the smell will last for some days and so they are afraid to set the poison; they prefer to try a trap rather than try this effective poison which would have much better results. I know from personal experience that it prevented people from plunging into this campaign with the enthusiasm and fervour which we had all hoped, because they were all saying that the rats will die in the roof and will smell, and they did not want their houses smelling badly. You can see their point of view, but if it means destruction of rats in the interest of the entire community, this is a point which the Director of Medical Services, if he broadcasts on the launching of this campaign, can explain to the people and try and persuade them to give this campaign their wholehearted support.

I do not see anywhere in the Addendum that it has any effect on other than four-footed rats, because if it did, this Legislature would have to do something about it, as quite a number of the population would cease to exist. Therefore I shall support this Resolution because knowing that it is for the benefit of the health of the community, it deserves the support of this Chamber.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, unlike the hon. learned member for St. Andrew, I always forget that the Barbados Volunteer Force never faced the enemy.
4.55 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, some of us are Commissioners of Health of the various parishes and I take it that it is done

in St. Andrew as well as in St. Lucy and the other parishes and that the advertising - the word-of-mouth advertising - and the carrying around of some of the rat bait is done by the Sanitary Inspectors of the various parishes. I think that this bait is sent to the Commissioners of Health of these parishes, and, as a matter of fact, it is mentioned in the Addendum to the Resolution that this thing is done in co-operation with the Sanitary Commissioners of all the parishes. Sir, all I am saying is that when it comes to these rural parishes it is the poor Sanitary Inspectors who have to do the work. I am not saying that they should not do the work but they have to do it with the substantive duties of their office. It is the poor Sanitary Inspectors who are always the burden bearers and who have to go around the parish and do these things: but they are not thought of in respect of remuneration for the indefatigable and indispensable service which they from time to time render.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Government again for the last rat campaign that was carried out and I am speaking so far as it concerned the city of Bridgetown. The results in Bridgetown were very good. I do hope that this annual rat campaign week will catch on and grow as how the clean-up campaign has caught on. When we first started the clean-up campaign in Bridgetown, no one ever thought of bringing used tins out; but today you will notice that the people in the tenancies are collecting all used tins and bringing them to the front without there being a campaign on. They are doing their own clean up, and all that we have to do is to send the scavenging trucks around to collect these tins. I heartily agree with hon. members that this should be done throughout the island.

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution could have been brought down by one or two Ministers, either the Hon. Minister of Agriculture or the Hon. Minister of Health because of its two-fold effect. Not only is it for the purpose of reducing the rat population in the rural districts through their effect on the cultivation of cane, but also because of their effect on the health of the island. The people, as I have said, are bringing out their empty tins and bottles to the front road so that the scavenging trucks can take them away; but in the rural parishes, their finances are such that they cannot afford to have trucks and lorries to do the cleaning up. Therefore, I think it would have been a wonderful gesture, not today but two or three years ago, when we were putting all that money up for the Coronation festivities and planning what to do with it, if Government said that it was going to present each of the several rural parishes with a scavenging truck. That would have been an ideal gift. Let us call it a coronation gift. The parishes would be able to send around these trucks to clean up the rural districts. I do hope, if the Government does not get around to it before, that whenever it has another occasion of festivities and it wants to put off some bombs in the air, that it will forget that and make a gift to every parish of a first-class scavenging truck, presenting it to the Vestry of the said parish and saying to them: "This is our present to you; go ahead and clean up the parish and bear the required expense." I am sure that the people would appreciate that much more than seeing let off a few bombs in the air.

Mr. Chairman, I compliment the Government and I do hope that this Rat Extermination Week campaign will be an annual campaign. You will never ever get rid of the rats, but you can keep down the population of rats. You made a good beginning last year and this year I hope to see as good results.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not commending the Government; I take a different view. This is not a health campaign. The hon. junior member for Christ Church said that either of the two Ministers - the Hon. Minister of Agriculture or the Hon. Minister of Health - could have brought this but I do not take that view; this is an economic campaign. Read the Addendum to the Resolution and you will see that. (A VOICE: Health is economy.) Let us get it clear, Mr. Chairman. Those of us who come into this Chamber must show a sense of responsibility and commonsense

when we come to deal with something. According to the Addendum, the Barbados General Agricultural Society proposes to carry out a Rat Extermination Campaign during the week commencing 28th July, 1958. By that you can see that the Barbados Agricultural Society is the body which is initiating this scheme and the Government is subsidising that body in the carrying out of the scheme which is a laudable one; but the scheme stems from the Agricultural Society. If that body did not initiate this scheme, we will never see the light of this Resolution; therefore, you subsidise it.

I agree with the view expressed by the hon. junior member for Christ Church and hon. members. In addition, it also has a health aspect because the rats are not good things to have and we like to keep them out of our places. I do believe that the campaign is strongly supported by the Department of Medical Services; but do not let us get confused about the issue. The Director of Medical Services did not start it, but perhaps this idea was presented to him; and like everything else, the Department and more so the Head of that Department would feel that this is a campaign with which they should agree.

What I would like to say is this: let the Hon. Minister of Health initiate a campaign of a similar nature. It is true to say that in this island sugar plays such an important part that you can see it even predominating things of health matters. An hon. member spoke of the nuisance of flies. It is surprising to see that in Barbados the average man does not worry about a fly; as a matter of fact, he thinks of it as a friend. He says sometimes; "do not mind the foolish fly; eat the bread." A fly seems to him just a fly. Nobody worries about them. They fail to realise the destruction which a fly can do. Hon. members may take this as a joke, but if you make an analysis to see how many people are suffering from the types of diseases which spring from the exposure of food and not having proper running water, you will be surprised. You find some rum shops without running water, and you find the attendant whisking around a glass in something containing a little water and a little lime skin.

5.05 p.m.

As long as you put lime, you run her through; you rinse out the glass with half of the grog. You do not know how many of these people wend their way to the Hospital; as a result of a man buying a nip, the taxpayers may have to spend about \$1,000 to bring that man out of Hospital. An analysis as to the type of disease from which this population is suffering and how our health services should be determined, should be a study for the Medical people in preventive medicine rather than curative medicine. Those of us who have to worry about people's lives will realise that in the Agricultural Society alone inaugurating a campaign like this and not the Minister of Health, we will have to ask the Minister of Health what is his programme to go along with the Tourist Trade. You spend \$200,000 in connection with the Tourist Trade, but how many of our people are going along with tuberculosis? Is the incidence of tuberculosis not too high for a climate like ours? There can be no excuse in this twentieth century for saying that you cannot find dumping places for refuse. You have stuff dumped in the gullies and flies breed in them; that is something which is not good enough for an Island 21 x 14 miles and I would say that in the Borough of Manhattan the president, Julian Jack, has more control than there is in this community.

In some cases, there is no excuse for our health standards. There are too many things which create diseases in Barbados and what is somebody's business seems to be nobody's business. Where the interests of the sugar people are involved, they will not stop one inch in preserving it, and in this case they say that they will be exterminated if they do not want to exterminate the rats. I do not think that this will embarrass anybody; you have as good a Director of Medical Services as any Minister in any of the territories can have; I do not know how long they will be able to keep him, but as long as they have him, let them make use of his services. Where you have people dealing in preventive medicine, you should make use of them.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Acting Chairman, I think that there is a mistake in this Resolution with which we are now dealing. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: It has been corrected already). Very well.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Acting Chairman, I do not think that I have much more to say about this matter, but as to the fear which the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has expressed, I am afraid that he is not keeping *au fait* with what goes on in his parish. The Sanitary Commissioners are notified that this stuff is available, and the Sanitary Inspectors are asked to co-operate in the matter. I know that, in some parishes, they have paid a little remuneration to some of their Inspectors who help in this campaign. This is an island-wide campaign; it is not confined to the City. During the campaign it is made possible for all the parishes to get this bait from the Commissioners of Health and the Government subsidises it to the extent of 14 cents a pound. Ordinarily, it costs 16 cents a pound; anybody can go to Queen's Park and purchase this bait on any day of the week. I know that the plantations do not get this bait at the subsidised price which is strictly for the householders. The Sanitary Inspectors take this bait around, but the rich people can buy it; they can buy it at a penny a package. This bait is subsidised for a very good reason, and I will say that the Director of Medical Services has given us the best advice on it.

As regards the question of fly breeding, that does not come under my portfolio, but, as a Minister of the Government, I will say that when we talk about persistent diseases, is it not a fact that the Health Centres are doing good work in this Island? Is it not a fact that in the United States of America with all its wealth, there are still certain diseases which we have not got here? I am not going to say anything more on this matter, since hon. members have voiced their approval of it; but I just thought that there were a few points which I should clarify and make hon. members feel happy that everything is done not only in St. Michael - the hon. junior member for St. Andrew was not happy and I thought that I should satisfy the hon. member that his constituents can get their share of this bait.

I think that the approach given to this matter is a very practical one and it has received the acceptance of people. It is a good idea.

Mr. WALCOTT: I must apologise for speaking after the Hon. Minister, but there is a point which has slipped me and it is in connection with the question of Labour and Miscellaneous matters. I see from the Addendum to the Resolution that the amount under the Head "Advertisement" is \$800, and under the Head "Labour and Miscellaneous", the amount asked for is \$324. As a Trade Unionist, I should like to ask why is it that in a campaign of this nature labour finds itself at a low ebb even below "Advertisement"? If you are going to evaluate something like this, you are not paying out anything princely to people, but the \$800 for "Advertisement" does not seem to equate with the labour costs. I am always in favour of making people pay when they can pay; the difference between a penny and no cents at all, is very little. I want to warn the Hon. Minister that, psychologically, this is bad in some instances. You have to pay for something, and if you spend "X" thousand dollars on it, do not keep this Victorian idea that you must pay little for something in order to appreciate it. I subscribe to the view that you need not give every person everything for nothing; make some people pay for certain things.

5.15 p.m.

Now, with a man living in an 18' x 9' house, the house is no bigger than the rat itself; so you should not worry to think that this man's approach about killing rats is going to be the same as a man who lives in more commodious quarters. Let us begin to study the structure of the community we live in. A rat does not have much space to circulate in a 18' x 9' house, unless it circulates on one of the children. Are you going to send an inspector in my colleague's constituency behind Bawdens to tell a man returning from work with his cane-bill to pay a penny for rat bait? Do you realise that in some instances

he is more likely to feel that it would sooner poison the children than the rats, because there are so many children in the small house?

I am asking the Minister, therefore, if it is not too late as far as the money part is concerned, not to allow that to be a deterrent, because there are inspectors who can only take orders; and if you tell him to demand a penny from the people, he will bring back the bait and say that the people will not pay for it. There must be more liberalisation in your policy, and that is why I say you must stop this Victorian approach. It is propaganda you are dealing with, and your approach in a propaganda campaign must be different from a campaign which is purely economical and something in which it takes a long time to sell the idea. I apologise for speaking after the Minister, but this is something he should pay attention to if the campaign is to go off effectively.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I too must apologise for speaking after the hon. member. I usually give my support in all quarters to these Resolutions. I believe I can help the Hon. Minister by saying that as far as St. Michael is concerned - I do not know what the other parishes do - we are spending half of what Government is granting here, because we realise it is not a matter of my rat or your rat; it is a national rat. To be quite honest, this campaign is very important, and as far as the Commissioners of Health of St. Michael are concerned, the actual amount is about half the amount Government is spending here. The hon. member asked if we expected inspectors to do this free. This is one job I would insist that inspectors do free. We pay a staff to go around with the inspectors to put the poison under cellars and so on.

I whole-heartedly agree with the Resolution and commend it to all public spirited people. Last year it was a great success. I think hon. members will understand that contributions are made by the Agricultural Society, the Government and the Health Commissioners throughout the island, because it is part of their duty to help exterminate these pests; so no one is doing the Agricultural Society any favour. These pests become a danger to crops, and in Bridgetown and St. Michael they are very dangerous as far as health is concerned. I think I have mentioned here that you get these rats to such an extent that the question of black jaundice arises. When you get this amount of rats with nothing to eat, it is not uncommon to hear that rats go into the homes of agricultural labourers and nibble at the tops of their fingers and heels; that is an absolute fact. I am not familiar with the medical term, but the Commissioners of Health in St. Michael are very mindful of their duty and spend approximately half of what the Government is putting up, because in a population of 200,000 people of which 25,000 live in the parish of St. Michael, it is our duty to do it and we have much pleasure in doing it.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services, a Resolution to place the sum of \$41 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59, No. 9, which forms the Schedule to this Resolution.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1958-59 No. 9.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I have a rather simple Resolution on which I do not anticipate any debate. It is a simple supplementary vote for the sum of \$41. It is rather clear from the Addendum that due to an oversight the amount provided for a sewing machine for the Prison workshop is inadequate. You will remember that during a debate in the Estimates, the figure given was \$188 for the machine, but by the 1st April when the Institution got the machine it was discovered that the cost was up to \$228.88; hence the need for this Supplementary Resolution.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to this Resolution, but I again deplore that we so often have Resolutions coming before us and the Addenda speak of "due to an oversight," "due to an error" or "due to a miscalculation." It is not really good enough; it seems that the saying "too many cooks spoil the broth" is applicable to the people at the Ministerial Buildings in Bay Street. May I suggest that due to an oversight we have to vote \$41 today instead of \$40.88? I do not know who is responsible for these numerous, regular and consistent oversights, but it is not satisfactory that so much time should be taken up and so much printing done because of these continual and persistent oversights. Anyone can make a mistake, but even the Minister who is facing me has never in his private business made so many mistakes, oversights and lapses as we find recorded here week after week in the files of our House of Assembly papers.

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

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER. Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour and in doing so, I would like to inform hon. members that the Hon. Minister of Social Services is asking them during the interval to come and have a view of a model of the new Hospital which has been put on demonstration in the Lobby.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

5.30 p.m.

On resumption.

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE ON THE INFANTS BILL, 1958.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume Committee on the Bill to amend the law relating to the guardianship, custody and property of infants.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, you might remember last Tuesday the whole of this Bill was passed with the exception of Section 6 which was postponed for clarification of the last two lines. I was not in a position to explain it and, apparently, nobody else who was present, was in a position or willing to explain it and for that purpose the section was postponed.

I wish to say in explanation that in connection with that section it corresponds to -

(1) section 4 of the Guardianship of Infants Act, 1886, (Imperial); and

(2) section 6 of the Infants Ordinance of Trinidad.

The Act twelve Charles the second, Chapter 24 can now also be referred to as the Tenures Abolition Act, 1660.

The powers given by the Act to guardians are -

(a) Powers over the person -

Section 8 of Act:- "shall and may maintain an action of ravishment of and or trespass against any person or persons which shall wrongfully take away or detain such child or children for the recovery of such child or children and shall and may recover damages for the same in the said action for the use and benefit of such child or children."

(b) Powers over the estate -

Section 9 of Act:- "shall and may take into

his or their custody to the use of such child or children the profits of all land tenements and hereditaments of such child or children and also the custody tuition and management of the goods chattels and personal estate of such child or children till their respective age of twentyone years or any lesser time according to such disposition aforesaid, and may bring such action or actions in relation thereunto as by law a guardian in common socage might doe..."

These powers are explained at 17 Halsbury Laws of England 2nd Edition pp699-701.

The value of incorporating the Imperial provisions is to avail the Courts of the Island of any Imperial decisions which are relevant.

That is the instruction which I have received and I move that Section 6 of this Bill should stand part. If any hon. member of this Committee wants to see this copy of the instruction I will pass it on to them.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I really have not risen to contradict anything the Hon. Premier has read because, quite frankly, I did not hear any of it. It is surprising to me really that when Bills are postponed either in the House or in Committee and a week's grace is given for the elucidation and clearing up of some definite point, the Hon. Premier should think it only sufficient to come to the House or Committee the following week and read from a bit of paper and imagine that that is sufficient to clear the point up.

I take it that what he read to this Committee has been prepared for him in some legal department but what I want to find out from him is whether the words "Act twelve Charles the Second, chapter 24" is really what it should be. As I have said, I did not hear what he said. I had no chance to look at what was written on the paper which has just been passed around, much less to read it. My colleagues on my left who are lawyers are in some doubt as to the meaning of the wording of the Clause and now that they have before them the statement which has been read by the Hon. Premier, as far as I can see, they are no better off. 6.10 p.m.

The hon. junior member for St. John, my colleague, advises me that the Act itself has been wrongly cited, because if it were a Bill passed by the British Parliament in the first year of the reign of Charles the Second, then it should be quoted as "1 Charles 11". If the Lawyers are in difficulty over this matter, how much more so would a layman be? I wonder if the Premier would give us such further information as he has vouchsafed so far.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am afraid that I cannot give the hon. member any further explanation. I am not a lawyer; I have spoken with the Crown Law Officer and he gave me that explanation which I have read out.

The question that Clause 6 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

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 Bill was read a third time and passed.

ORDERS POSTPONED

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Orders Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 6.

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

CUSTOMS TARIFF (AMENDMENT) (No. 4) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members will see from the "Objects and Reasons", this Bill seeks to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, so as to bring it into line with the Conventions and Protocol which took place in New York in 1954, which Conventions and Protocol provide for the free entry of certain goods, vehicles and things of that sort belonging to tourists. It is felt that a Bill of this sort is necessary in order to carry out, or rather to regularise the position of tourists travelling from place to place and from time to time. Hon. members would have seen the definition which is given to "tourist". As hon. members will also see from the "Objects and Reasons", this Bill seeks to amend the Second Schedule of the Act in the following aspects and for the following reasons:-

"Paragraphs (i) and (ii) of Clause 2 grant certain customs duty exemptions in accordance with the requirements of the following Conventions and Protocol which were concluded on the 4th June, 1954, at New York between a number of countries including the United Kingdom.

- (i) Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring.
- (ii) Additional Protocol to the above Convention, relating to the Importation of Tourist Publicity Documents and Material.
- (iii) Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles."

The "Objects and Reasons" explain that "the object of the Conventions and Protocol is to relax customs formalities and to waive the imposition of certain customs duties in the interest of tourism generally. Those countries which have ratified the Conventions and Protocol are required, by the terms thereof, to permit, subject to safeguards, the duty-free importation of the personal effects of tourists, vehicles belonging to visitors and advertising material designed to encourage travel between and stimulate interest in the various countries. In view of the importance of tourism to this Island the Government considered it desirable that the Conventions and Protocol should be extended to Barbados."

As I was about to say just now, soon after these Conventions were agreed to, the Secretary of State for the Colonies apprised Barbados of the Conventions and the Agreement reached by the United Kingdom as signatory to the Conventions and asked whether this Government desired to become part of that Agreement or not. In the interest of the promotion of tourism and to facilitate tourists who come to this Island, the Government has agreed to be a Party to the Conventions and Protocol; hence this Bill is before us.

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

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

Mr. GODDARD: Any such Convention brings us into line with other countries which are making reciprocal agreements. We who are a very small territory, cannot afford to do other than what other countries are doing, that is, attempting to attract tourists to their shores. I am not fully aware of this Bill and the way it works in other countries, but from the mere fact that it has been worked out from a Protocol or some Convention in New York, it is quite evident that other territories in the Caribbean Area, if they have not done it already, will do it very shortly. We cannot afford not to be in line with other countries. If this Bill is another step to promote the Tourist Industry, and it evidently is, because one of the annoying features of any tourist - when I go abroad, I look upon myself as a tourist and I expect certain conditions attaching to the money I am spending when I am on the other side. I hate to think that I have to pay duty on anything which I

consider to be a personal facility and if I go to the United States of America, I expect to take out my bottle of rum free of duty. That is done for American residents. 6.20 p.m.

I remember once travelling from England via the United States to Barbados, and I had in my possession some records which I was bringing back to Barbados, and because I could not leave them in bond, I was called on in New York to pay a small sum. I felt hurt about that and I do feel that facilities should be put in the way of travelling visitors. I again congratulate the manner in which our Customs at the Airport treats such things. The law is very rigid; but where he can see that a man has come here for a few days and may be going on to St. Vincent or Trinidad and returning here, if the Law is satisfied that the goods which the visitor has are for his personal use and to be taken back out, he should not be called on to pay one penny of duty. If this Bill is to bring these things up to date, it has my blessing. I am sorry that I have not studied it more thoroughly, but from what I gather from the Minister, it seems to be in that direction.

Most visitors travel with cameras and films. If a visitor brings in a film he is not bringing it to sell to somebody else; he is bringing it to take pictures, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that one of the very best forms of advertising this island to overseas visitors is by letting the visitor come in with his camera and take back films of Barbados, especially if he takes them back in colour. As a matter of fact, I would go to the extent of saying that you should let all the duty come off films for that reason, because when he gets back to his country he is going to show his friends where he has been, and if he has ten good pictures - and we can offer good scenery in Barbados - that is advertisement which we cannot duplicate and which costs us nothing. Let him have free access to the beauty spots of Barbados and take all the pictures he wants; that is a form of advertising which we welcome. I am glad that we realise that we must not only make the visitor's stay happy, but when he first arrives in Barbados he should not be made to feel that he is being fleeced from the beginning. Let us give him value for the money he is spending here, and he will return and tell his friends that this is not only a place to visit but in which to stay.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, looking at this Bill, it has become a habit in Barbados not to be told anything.

This Section reads as follows:-

"Paragraphs (i) and (ii) of Clause 2 grant certain Customs Duty exemptions in accordance with the requirements of the following Conventions and Protocol which were concluded on the 4th June, 1954 at New York between a number of countries including the United Kingdom.

(i) Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring.

(ii) Additional Protocol to the above Convention, relating to the Importation of Tourist Publicity Documents and Material.

(iii) Customs Conventions on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles.

The object of the Convention and Protocol is to relax Customs formalities and to waive the imposition of certain customs duties in the interest of tourism generally."

What we have not heard is, if it is a reciprocal agreement, what are the countries in agreement with the United Kingdom, because the United Kingdom is acting on behalf of the territorial units. What we want to know is what is the relation and reciprocal agreement between the United Kingdom and its territories and the countries that form this agreement. Will the facilities offered to people coming to Barbados be similar to those offered to visitors to the United Kingdom? If we are not told that, then the question of reciprocity arises, and when you speak of protocol arrangements from this Bill, it is evident that this Bill would have to be constructed and based on the Objects and Reasons of the Conventions before us. If these conventions were before the framers of this Bill, the Minister should have

them; but there is a habit in Barbados that neither the public nor the Legislature should have any information. I think we are entitled to know what the Conventions and Protocol arrangements are, so that we would know what are the countries we are dealing with. If a Barbadian is leaving Barbados to go on a holiday, knowing that certain facilities exist in certain countries under these arrangements, he would seek to go to those countries and enjoy those facilities rather than go to other places where he cannot enjoy them, because some people go on holiday and take their motor cars and do not like them to be subjected to Customs duty. For that reason it becomes a very enjoyable holiday for them if they do not have to pay customs duty. It is our right, therefore, to know the number of countries including the United Kingdom that concluded this agreement in 1954, because neither the Bill nor the Objects and Reasons state them. We should like to know if the reciprocal arrangements for Barbados and the territories other than the United Kingdom would be treated in a similar way now that we are passing this Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I suppose that the hon. member knows that as far as the British Government is concerned, they are responsible for all her colonies. I have a list here which gives the names of them; they are for instance, Aden, British Guiana, British Honduras, Cyprus, Fiji, Gambia, Gibraltar, Jamaica, Kenya, The Leewards, The Windwards, Malta, Mauritius, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Seychelles, Tanganyika, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, St. Vincent and all the others. I am not sure as to the other Metropolitan Governments which agreed to the convention, but I can only tell him that in so far as these territories are concerned under the United Kingdom Metropolitan Government, it is hoped that these territories which I mentioned will agree to become party to the Convention, in which case any traveller through any of these islands will get the facilities which we are offering. The definition of a tourist is an individual who comes into an island and stays not less than twenty-four hours and not more than six months and after six months he can have his time extended to a year.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of explanation. The hon. member has not answered what I asked.

Hon. M. E. COX: On what is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. WALCOTT: When you go into the Chair, I will plead to you.

Hon. M. E. COX: He has not risen on a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is indifferent behaviour.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will address the Chair. 6.30 p.m.

MR. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. I posed certain questions to which I want a reply. I asked: what are the countries with which these reciprocal arrangements have been made and I asked that question in order that we may know the countries to which this thing may apply. I did not ask which were the colonial territories, because if this applies to Barbados then it must apply to the colonial territories of the United Kingdom. I asked what are those countries which have signed this agreement along with Great Britain and I further asked whether we in Barbados would be able to receive the same facilities from the territories concerned.

MR. CRAWFORD: This is not intended as a reply for the Minister; I merely want to warn against any general acceptance of conventions agreed to by the United Kingdom and other territories merely because the United Kingdom has accepted them. Implied in the remarks of the Hon. Minister was the theory that because the Imperial Government had ratified the Convention, we as a colonial territory should do the same thing too. Now Sir, by divine nature, the fundamental difference between Great Britain and Barbados is that one is a wealthy country while the other one is not; therefore, a conven-

tion which may be advantageous to Great Britain may be very disadvantageous to an under-developed territory like Barbados. Therefore, again, I merely want to warn against any general acceptance of conventions agreed to by the United Kingdom merely because the United Kingdom has accepted them. We must not accept the theory that because the United Kingdom agreed to them, we must follow likewise. For instance, we adopted all the G.A.T.T. recommendations merely because we were asked to do so by the Imperial Government and because the Government in power then felt that what was good for Great Britain was good enough for us; yet there were other Imperial countries which did not think so and did not agree to them. Of course, in this instance no harm can be done by our agreeing to the proposals; therefore the House can readily agree to them. But I do not want the Government to feel that any time they can come in here and ask us to ratify a convention merely because the Imperial Government ratified it. It may have been all right at a time when we were less alive to our own economic interest, but it is the responsibility of the Government most carefully to scrutinise these conventions agreed to by metropolitan powers before they bind colonial territories to their acceptance. We so often in the past cut our noses to spoil our faces and we have accepted conventions which in their actual operation were inimical to our best interest. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of the Opposition to sound a note of warning to the Government that merely because Great Britain had ratified a particular convention, it does not mean that the Opposition is going to sit back on its haunches and accept it, hook, line and sinker.

MR. TUDOR: I think the most serious aspect of this matter is really that up to now the Hon. Minister has not told us the countries with which Great Britain concluded this agreement. It is possible that there are perhaps thirty or forty of them, and I take it that the majority of the countries concluding this agreement with Great Britain will be countries whose people do not come to the West Indies as tourists; that is to say, an agreement like this between Britain and France may mean quite a lot because quite a lot of people from England go to the south of France for their holidays, it may also mean quite a lot between Sweden and Norway and England because quite a lot of British people go to those countries for their summer holidays.

The countries to which we would want to have reciprocal agreements will be of course Canada, the U.S.A. and the Latin countries; therefore, it would be a good thing if the Hon. Minister were able to tell us the number of countries and their names which have subscribed to this Protocol because we in Barbados would know that of the large number - 40 or 50, whatever number they are - only half dozen or possibly eight or ten are countries with which we of the West Indies are concerned.

There is another aspect of the matter touched on by my colleague, which may well bear greater emphasis. It is true that these conventions were signed in 1954 and this Government is now bringing the ratification of them before the House; but since 1954 we have set up in the West Indies a Federal Government. Therefore, I wonder if it would not have been better for Barbados, Trinidad and the other Governments of this area to have asked the British Government whether the Federal Government should subscribe to the protocol on behalf of the whole area and allow the Federal Government to recommend the acceptance of it for all of us.

Sir, that would have this advantage. It would make every unit of the Federation immediately aware of what has been accepted and would throw the responsibility of seeing that the Agreement was signed not only by itself and by the individual units but by some of those other countries with whom the United Kingdom made the agreement; and secondly, it is no good a Minister telling us how many countries of the Commonwealth have had this matter recommended to them. We expect that, after all, if the United Kingdom has signed, obviously, she has signed

on behalf of the other colonies; so we expect that all such territories as Gibraltar, Mauritius and Cyprus - though in passing I do not know if tourism has much value in Cyprus now - are parties to it.
6.40 p.m.

We want to know whether we can go to South Africa at all and enjoy the same facilities, not only as tourists not only taking our films and cameras, but also our self-respect and dignity. Is South Africa one of the countries, is Yugoslavia or Soviet Russia a signatory? Let us know whom we may expect to visit and enjoy all the privileges, so that as and when they come we may accord the same privileges to them in return. That is a very important matter and one of the first duties of the Government is to publish a list of those countries with whom the United Kingdom has made this Agreement so that we, Barbadians, may know what nationals of what territories may come here and enjoy these privileges. If the Government does not publish such a list, the Customs Authorities here will be hard put to it and will have to judge which individual country comes under these merits. That is why I said that it would be better if the Federal Government had been requested by a certain party to enter the Agreement and then they would spread the information to each of the ten Governments, so that everybody would know, not only which Units of the Commonwealth had passed the legislation, but also with which countries the British Government and the Federal Government had got this reciprocal arrangement. Those are the two points which the Minister should bear in mind; otherwise, we are bound to have much trouble later on.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, if the House will permit me to say this, I did not know that the hon. member wanted the metropolitan Governments which had signed this Agreement; I thought that he was more interested in the Governments in the area. It applies to the United Kingdom, Ceylon, Australia, Belgium, Egypt, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Switzerland, Hawaii, the United States of America, the Virgin Islands, Canada and Tanganyika.

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. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, MR. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. THORNE in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called/ and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Acting Chairman, when I asked the question just now, the Hon. Minister said he did not know the countries which he had just named. I do not see any definition as to "tourists" and I am asking if what is in this section is the Agreement that would apply both ways. By that, I mean this: although a country makes an agreement, what I was asking is if this agreement is made on behalf of these territories which the Hon. Minister has named, and if they are applicable to these countries in the same manner in which they would be applicable to the United Kingdom. What I want to point out to the hon. member is this: sometimes you make a convention with a Metropolitan Government and it does not apply to the territories for which that Government is responsible. The United Kingdom has an agreement with the United States of America in so far as the emigration Laws are concerned, but the Emigration Laws relating to emigrants leaving the United Kingdom - because we hold British Passports in Barbados, we cannot easily enter any place. I ask that question so that we do not butt up on these snags. I ask if this is an arrangement which would not only apply to these territories, but if the same thing applies to the United States of America, Ceylon and other places as it applies to the United King-

~~dom.~~ Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I have referred to tourists and in so far as the interpretation is concerned I presume that the Regulations have already been laid in the House and in those Regulations the definition of "tourist" is as follows:-

"any person other than a person ordinarily resident in the Island who enters the Island for legitimate non-immigrant purposes and remains therein for any period not exceeding six months in the course of any period not exceeding twelve consecutive months; but does not include air-line personnel, ship personnel or students at any college or school within the Island."

The same agreement applies to us and to these territories.

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the ACTING CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ORDER POSTPONED

Hon. M. E. COX: I am asking leave to postpone Order No. 8, and to take Order No. 9 as the next Order of the Day.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE PENSIONS (PENSIONABLE OFFICES) (AMENDMENT) ORDER"

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1958."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this is the usual Civil Service Amendment Order which comes before this House. From time to time, changes have been taking place in the titles of officers, certain titles have been deleted for the substitution of others in some cases and there have been additions in other cases. There have been changes in the Departments of the Chief Secretary, Auditor General, Post Office, Fire Brigade, Judiciary, Department of Science and Agriculture, Public Library, the Medical Department, the Water Works Department, General Service, Accountant General and the Department of Civil Aviation.

6.50 p.m.

As I said, there have been changes from time to time and substitution of titles, in addition to new offices; so this Order seeks to regularise all these changes and to incorporate them in this Order. I have mentioned the different Heads under which these changes have taken place and the Resolution reads as follows:-

"Resolved that the Order entitled 'The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1958' made by the Governor on the seventh day of July, 1958, under the provisions of Section 2 (1) (a) of the Pensions Act, 1947, be approved."

There is nothing further that I can add, Sir, except to say that Resolutions of this nature have been passed by this House before.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, there is no general objection to this Order, but I think when you are dealing with the question of pensions, you should take the opportunity from time to time to see where a review is necessary.

Now you will see in this Schedule, Mr. Speaker, that you have people like Administrative Assistants, Secretary to the Cabinet and so on. The Secretary to the Cabinet is

a man who works for a salary more approximating to that of a Minister, but in this you also have people like washers and maids, and I believe the time has come when the Government should get down to the business of evaluating a Pension Scheme on a basis that could relate to the needs of workers in their various categories. A washer working on a casual basis for the emoluments which she gets is subject to the same regulations as someone who enters the Service as a career and is going to be promoted to something higher; it is in my opinion a better scheme to provide what can be regarded as a pensionable arrangement. You should have a Provident Fund or whatever you care to call it in which you can give an examination to the circumstances of a case which you cannot now do. For instance, a washer, maid or people in that lowly walk of life are subjected to certain social afflictions, but that is not so with Administrative Secretaries; and I feel the time has come when the same strictures that obtained ten years ago should not obtain now because the terms of service are different. People are subject to better living conditions and leave passages, and when you take everything together, you will find that you bring into this Order a conglomeration of people, and when you examine them, they differ widely but the same Pension Scheme applies to them. If you approach this in a most scientific manner, the ones employed as daily employees should be treated differently. If an attempt is made to do that, you can meet the needs of some of these people in a more practical manner, because you can very well see the evaluation of the amount of money which you have to give somebody as a pension. If a washer is getting a pittance and you begin to think of a pension, she has to apply to public assistance in order to live, but somebody in different circumstances can live without applying for public assistance.

These are not amendments which we should undertake in the House anyhow, but something to which the attention of the Government should be drawn. I will say again that the Report by Professor J. H. Richardson which was made here should again be the subject of study by the Government, because Professor Richardson gave a basis for looking at these things and making some assessment of them, and that is something which should not be ignored. If Government would pay some attention to that on a general basis, I think they can go a long way towards providing better benefits for these people. This country is not in a position to finance a Social Security Scheme such as the one in the United Kingdom, but it seems to me that if the evaluation of money which is given in public assistance were properly coordinated and directed, more relief could be given to people in these circumstances. It does not matter whether she is a washer at the Mental or General Hospital. My view is that she is as much entitled to receive what can be regarded as a decent emolument as a pension when she can no longer work as the Attorney General. That is a study that should commend itself to every citizen of this community, because there are those of us who would not be unwilling to see that these people get something more. Because of their educational limitations and the employment force in Barbados, they cannot rise above a certain level to provide for themselves in their short life time if they have to work for a small wage. Let us equate their pensions to something that would approximate to something which they can live on; I throw that out because it is a worthwhile undertaking for the relief of these people.

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

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 make provision for the change of name of the Town Hall. ((Town Hall (Change of Name) Act, 1958)).

TOWN HALL (CHANGE OF NAME) ACT, 1958.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is to change the name of the buildings now known as the Town Hall. I am not prepared to say just who occupied them in the earlier years, but these buildings are occupied exclusively by the Courts and it is considered that it would be more apt to call these buildings the Law Courts. Moreover, it seems an opportune moment for this change of name to be made, now that the reorganisation of the Courts is imminent.

As I said, we have always known them as the Town Hall, and I am not quite sure that that name applies properly to the buildings which house the Supreme Court and other Courts. In addition these buildings have been improved. The name Town Hall suggests a kind of Forum where people hold meetings, and it is no longer apt in a modern context to call them by that name.

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

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

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

7.00 p.m.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. THORNE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive were called separately and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business.

MR. MOTTLEY DISCUSSES PREMIER'S STATEMENT RE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to discuss the notice standing in my name: to move the adjournment of the House at its next meeting to discuss the Hon. Premier's Statement re the Natural Gas Corporation.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House for five minutes to discuss this matter, I should like to remind hon. members that two weeks ago as a result of a rumour which became rather rampant around the Island, I asked the Hon. Premier if it were true that the Natural Gas Corporation had given a contract to a Trinidad firm for the laying of gas pipes in Barbados for an amount in the vicinity of \$40,000 without advertising in Barbados or in Trinidad and without seeing whether any person or firm in Barbados was capable of doing the work.

The Hon. Premier was very prompt in his reply and the following week he made a statement to the House. I do not think I am bringing any secrets out because he showed me the letter which was written to him by the Director of the Natural Gas Corporation as a result of the question which I asked him. If hon. members can remember the reply, the Hon. Premier said, or rather read from the letter which was written to him by the Natural Gas Corporation as follows:-

"The new high-pressure pipelines being laid are of welded steel construction fully protected against corrosion, and are the first extensive pipelines of such construction to be laid in Barbados.

The question of local Contractors was considered, but the Corporation came to the conclusion that as there was no firm or individual in the Island who possessed the necessary experience for this specialised class of work, it would be wiser, in the interest of Government, to obtain the services of Contractors who are familiar with this Type of work.

The Corporation therefore obtained from Shell (Trinidad) Ltd., the names of several firms who had successfully carried out such specialised work in Trinidad where similar pipelines are extensively used. These firms were invited to tender, and the best offer was accepted."

Let me say before I begin how much I appreciate the Hon. Premier's action in the matter. He considers that

there is nothing to hide and when the Opposition asks a question, he promptly gets for us the information. In this case, he got it from this Corporation which, though not under any particular Minister, is a quasi-Government Department inasmuch as this Legislature gave this Department the right, backed by the Government of Barbados, therefore by the people of Barbados, to obtain a loan of a million dollars to run its business; therefore, in the final analysis, its business is our business. I hope that is clearly understood.

Now, Sir, any criticism which I make here would be made in good faith and I hope I would not see one hon. member having the brass or the courage to get up and defend this Corporation. I have never seen a more evasive reply during my term here than this reply to the questions I asked. That is the first thing which must be apparent to hon. members. My question was based on this: did you give out a contract for \$40,000? No mention was made of that at all and there was no answer as to whether it was \$40,000 or not. What they have said is this: the question of local Contractors was considered.

7.10 p.m.

That was rather evasive; how do they mean that the question of local contractors was considered? This is a public Board which is responsible for the spending of public money and this Board is giving out contracts. The Statement continues:-

"but the Corporation came to the conclusion that as there was no firm or individual in the Island who possessed the necessary experience for this specialised class of work, that it would be wiser, in the interest of Government, to obtain the services of Contractors who are familiar with this type of work."

I have been at pains to make enquiries from every Foundry in this country and from individuals who have experience in welding, and I have been told that this is the greatest lie which could have been told. On no occasion was any firm in Barbados asked or consulted; nothing in this Statement says that any firm was asked or consulted. What was said in the Statement is that the question of local Contractors was considered, but the Corporation came to the conclusion that there was no firm or individual in the Island who possessed the necessary experience and knowledge. They would have to get the necessary facts. There are a number of persons in this Island, no fewer than 50 qualified welders, who would be capable and competent to do this work. We all know that whether you have Federation or no Federation people who are engaged in this type of work cannot land in Trinidad and they cannot afford to go to Jamaica or anywhere else. There is a barrier in Trinidad - no landing, no working. It is a question of these peoples' rights with the Trade Union and those persons concerned.

They have said in this Statement that the question of local Contractors was considered and they came to the conclusion that there are no people qualified for doing this work. I had thought that they would have been able to say that they had sent out questionnaires enquiring whether people could do this work. You cannot just come to the conclusion that there is no firm or individual in this Island who could do this work. However, I shall refrain from calling any names.

In this Statement, the Premier further stated, "The Corporation, therefore obtained from Shell (Trinidad) Ltd., the names of several firms who had successfully carried out such specialised work in Trinidad, where similar pipelines are extensively used. These firms were invited to tender, and the best offer was accepted."

How are we supposed to deal with a \$1 million concern to whom the Legislature has given the right to borrow \$1 million to do work and when they have a contract for \$40,000 they have to ask people in Trinidad to tender? The last sentence of this Statement says this: "These firms were invited to tender and the best offer was accepted." We would like to know exactly what they mean

by that Statement, "the best offer was accepted". As far as I am concerned, no answer has been given to the question which I, as a member of this House, have asked for the enlightenment and for the information of the general public. I think that the Hon. Premier was treated with rather scant courtesy by the Board which seems to think that they can do as they like. Have you given out this contract without advertising in Barbados? Is it a contract for over \$40,000? The answer is either "yes" or "no". When we are finished this afternoon, I am wondering if the Government will be satisfied with the circumstances or whether they will consider that it is our right to know how this Board is spending this money when we have given them the right to borrow money.

I could not believe that this Statement by the Premier was correct and I, therefore, made diligent enquiries and I have been informed that there are 50 qualified welders in this Island. They will answer and say that they are not registered or licensed welders. There cannot be any case - there is no law which calls them licensed welders. During the War, under the Defence Regulations, people who were considered to be essential and who were welders, were told: "You are not allowed to go out of this Island; you cannot go to Aruba or anywhere else, because you are a welder and you cannot leave this Island; we want your services." But today, the same people are told that they are not qualified or good enough to do this work and therefore, somebody must come in from Trinidad and do it. We cannot allow a thing like this to happen here.

Since 1931, a certain Scotch Welder was brought out here and he started to train men in this country in welding. Such men are employed in doing work which is very important. In the Statement, in the first paragraph, this is what is stated:-

"The new high-pressure pipelines being laid are of welded steel construction, fully protected against corrosion, and are the first extensive pipelines of such construction to be laid in Barbados."

That is absolutely untrue. This matter calls for an Enquiry, because when they make a Statement here, when the Premier makes a Statement like this, the only thing to do is to have an Enquiry into the matter. As I was saying, a certain Scotch Welder came out here to train people in welding; therefore, you have men who are today members of the Barbados Workers' Union, men who were solidly behind the Government in power and men who are annoyed at this situation, because other people have been brought in to do this work. I want the Premier to say if they were those same men who were told that they cannot leave the Island, because they are needed here.

7.20 p.m.

I want to make this clear because any investigation into this will have to come out. There are welders with machinery in Barbados capable of welding pipelines to withstand a pressure of 560 lbs. per square inch and over, as instanced in the new Boiler at the Power Station and pipe casings at the Barbados Gulf Oil Company. This work at the Gulf Oil Company was done to carry 4,000 lbs. per square inch of pressure, and it was done by local people in Barbados with local machinery. That is chapter and verse. Local people did the Boiler at the Electric Company and the Gulf Oil Company pipelines. The Government must contradict the figures I am bringing, because this is not going to stop here.

With regard to the flexibility of welded joints, the large delivery pipelines at the Molasses Terminals is a welded pipeline which has not only to withstand the internal pressure, but the buffeting of the waves; and from its inception there has been no trouble yet. In other words, the pipelines for molasses not only take a higher pressure inside, but they are pipelines to take a pressure higher than that which is necessary for gas pipelines, and all this has been done by local people; so you have the pipelines of the Gas Company, the Electric Company, the Gulf Oil Company and the Molasses Terminal done by your own people.

Without mentioning names, I have been told by English engineers here that you have welders to compare with any in any part of the world, though they may not have gone to a University or Technical Institute. The present job in hand is to carry a pressure of 25 lbs. per square inch, and I feel, Sir, that there are about fifty welders in this country who can do this work. Now it is not only a question posed for this Legislature or a question of welders, but it is a question of having local people. May I say here and now it is an established fact which Government should know that not only were the people brought from Trinidad, but they rented the material here to do the job? Any question raised by the Government will have to be brought by the Gas Company, because the equipment which the Gas Company is saying was not in the island, is owned by the present Gas Company which is owned by the Government, and the Trinidad firm has been allowed to come in and use it. Are we to say that if you have welders and equipment owned by yourself, you will allow other people to come in and use it and work for money when you have people here? In other words, it is not only a question of the men whom you have to do the work, but there is the question of equipment which is owned by the Barbados Natural Gas Company and which you have allowed the Trinidad firm to use.

I am confident that other members must take part in this debate; so I am going to be short and will wait to reply. The questions which I posed are as clear as a pikestaff. Is it true that the Government paid a Trinidad firm \$40,000 and over to do this job? One would have thought that the Premier would have been able to give us the answer; he was not evading the question because he gave us an answer which was taken from a letter written to him. Some people feel that as long as you are not a member of the Government, you are not entitled to ask questions, but I let those people know that I got elected here; they did not roll me in here, and as long as I am here, I am going to ask questions. It is my duty whether or not they write letters to see them. You would have thought that in asking them a question involving \$40,000, they would have been courteous enough to say it was not in the vicinity of \$40,000. In running a business like the Natural Gas Corporation or in Public Works where a small amount of money is involved, it does not matter if you do not call for tenders; if the Government was spending \$2,000 or \$3,000 nobody would ask any questions. If it is true - and they have not denied it or even had the courtesy to answer Government - that they gave out a contract in the vicinity of \$40,000, local people are apt to come in and say that if this is work to be done at the prevailing prices paid to our workmen, then there is going to be bacchanal somewhere.

You have at least fifty men and five or six firms that can do this job; so they must be in a position to say how much money they paid out. They must have a plan to run from Hastings to Top Rock and then across to Welches right up to the Old Train Line, and they must know the number of joints. Now I am in a position to tell you that the firm from Trinidad went to the Barbados Central Foundry to obtain a plant from them to do the work. I do not want to call names, but they have expressed surprise that you have men here so good and they were not asked to do this work.

This House of Assembly has given the Corporation the right to set up and carry on the industry, and you are backing them to the extent that they can borrow \$1 million which the people of this country must pay; therefore this Legislature is entitled to know something. They have come to the conclusion that there are no firms or individuals in Barbados; you have come to the conclusion that all the people in Barbados are idiots or fools, and that peculiarly enough is the attitude of a lot of people whom you put in certain positions in this country. How was the question of local contractors considered? Was it considered in your bedroom or talked over with a friend? Did you invite two or three firms to come in? Let us say that you have the material and equipment for doing this job; you have come to the conclusion that they do not possess it and it is ironical that the same firm came here and used the equipment in Barbados; and therefore you are dealing with the things of the people of this country. This House says that the Gas

Company can borrow up to \$1 million to develop, and if it goes down the drain, it goes down the drain. You have given out a contract for \$40,000 without advertising. I heard the ex-Premier criticise on that side of the Table the Trinidad Government for giving out a contract without advertising. Apart from asking the Shell Company, did they advertise in the Trinidad paper? They did not mention the figure because if they had, there are business firms and people in the Other Place who know about engineering. Are we to say that the drawing of water and the hewing of wood must be reserved for Barbadians?
7.30 p.m.

You know, Sir, they did not answer the question of whether it was to be done for \$40,000 or over, nor did they say how many miles of pipelines they are putting down or how many joints they are welding.

Since 1931 a Scotch Welder was brought out here and he taught people the art of welding and those people have taught other people. There is a tendency in this Government that if you have to criticise a corporation or anything like that, they think that you are criticising them. This thing is either right or wrong. In my considered opinion, this is wrong.

Before I sit down, I am saying finally that I shall await to see what attitude the Government will take on this matter. This corporation had it in writing and they refused to answer whether the sum for the contract is \$40,000. They say that no individual or firm in this country was capable of doing the work. They have heard now on the floor of the House that there are about 50 welders in this country, and I am speaking of A-Class workmen; I do not mean boys who are just learning the trade. You have heard from me tonight that I have got this information to bring to this House. Not only have the people here welded pipelines of a similar nature but the fact is that they have welded some of the pipelines laid here which have a greater pressure running through them than that of the gas lines being laid here now. You have also heard that welders over here have worked on the molasses terminal pipelines which not only have to withstand a pressure from within but a pressure of the waves from outside.

It is interesting for the people of Barbados to know why any person or persons on that Board did not consider giving the contract to some individual or firm in Barbados. Let me say here and now that the Government's representative on that Board is the Financial Secretary of this country. How any man in the position of Financial Secretary of Barbados sit down on that Board and say, "Let us give out \$40,000 on contract without advertising" when he is the Government's adviser, I do not know. Whatever damage has been done to workers here, let us look at it from a business point of view. When the public knows that the Financial Secretary is a member of the Natural Gas Corporation Board and this is the state of affairs, then I think it is time we call a halt. It is therefore necessary for us to get further information on this matter. Sir, things are either factual or not factual. These are facts; therefore I wait patiently for further information. I have brought back to this House the facts; and if justice is to be done, then the public should know the reason why it was that the contract was given to people out of the island and why it was given for \$40,000. May I ask, am I mistaken? Am I misleading the House? Make it out that I am misleading the House. All they have admitted is that they have come to the conclusion that they were the supermen who knew without asking one single firm or individual in this country that they had no one here competent to do the job. Even if they are supermen, then they are not supermen for me. I leave it now for the Hon. Minister to make a reply.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this statement is the subject of comment.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do you want to second the motion?

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes; I am seconding the motion.

As I was saying, this matter is a very important one in so far as our policy is concerned and I say that because when I read the statement and I heard the question which was posed by the hon. senior member for the City, one cannot see the relationship between the question and the reply. I may say here that it is a peculiar thing to find out from whom the Hon. senior member for the City gets his information. He always seems to get some information which is not vouchsafed to other people. This information is very important indeed. The question which the hon. senior member for the City posed was: "Is it true that the Natural Gas Corporation has given a contract to a Trinidad Firm for the laying of pipe lines here in the vicinity of \$40,000 without advertising in Barbados or in Trinidad?" The Hon. Premier's statement in reply is this: "The new high pressure pipe lines being laid are of welded steel construction, fully protected against corrosion and are the first extensive pipe lines of such construction to be laid in Barbados."

Mr. Speaker, you know there is a peculiar idea in Barbados that because something is going to be done for the first time there is nobody in Barbados who is able to do it. They do things in England and other countries for the first time and you hear nothing of this talk. They sent up Sputnik for the first time and they did not look for somebody from outside to go and send it up. This idea of getting somebody to do something for the first time is the same as if you have to make something to deal with something for the first time. The reason why you are using this idea of 'for the first time' is because you think there is no human being in Barbados who can put down a pipeline that is to be put down for the first time.

The Statement goes on to read as follows:-

"The question of local contractors was considered," I believe there are lawyers around this Table who are more competent to deal with this sentence than I. The Statement goes on to read as follows:- "but the corporation came to the conclusion that as there was no firm or individual in the island who possessed the necessary experience for this specialised class of work, that it would be wiser, in the interest of Government, to obtain the services of contractors who are familiar with this type of work."

I want to draw to the attention of the Hon. Premier and his Government that the employment situation among foundry workers in this country is so serious that during this year there were 58 workers at the Central Foundry Limited who were laid off for a period approximating 20 weeks. I will begin to elaborate to show you the seriousness of having artisans of this specialised class being unemployed. Let me say in the first instance that it takes a boy, to be a good foundry mechanic, longer to qualify than it takes any of those gentlemen who wear the long robe to become lawyers or barristers. It takes a foundry mechanic as long to qualify as some doctors take to qualify. The period of apprenticeship of a foundry mechanic is as long as the period of a doctor taking the first degree; so you can understand the sort of discipline and training which are required. I have spoken to the foundry directors on this matter.

I will go on to read the balance of the statement which is as follows:-

"The corporation therefore obtained from Shell (Trinidad) Ltd., the names of several firms who had successfully carried out such specialised work in Trinidad, where similar pipelines are extensively used. The firms were invited to tender and the best offer was accepted."

Even that is not a satisfactory state of affairs. This Corporation acted in a manner as if it were a private firm; it did not act as if it were a public Corporation. Its behaviour in approaching Shell (Trinidad) Ltd., asking for the names of individual firms who had successfully carried out such specialised work in Trinidad, is

behaviour in a manner as that which the hon. junior member for Christ Church would have acted in his capacity as Director of his firm. When you are a public Corporation, you cannot deal with a thing like this in a manner like that. You have to advertise publicly for tenders, and you must make your advertisements out in such a manner that other people can see them. You cannot go to a firm and ask if that firm can do this job. 7.40 p.m.

When you have done that, what have you done with public funds? You have acted with public funds in a manner in which you would have acted in your private capacity where you would not have to give any person any explanation for what you do. We cannot go along with this type of behaviour. The danger is that you have a Government backing up an indefensible position of a Corporation; you have the Government saying that the action of these people is such and such and there is nothing wrong with it. If there is nothing wrong with this action, well, nothing will be wrong with any Government Department. You give these people the right to operate a public Corporation, not a private Corporation, and their actions should be open to the public comment, just as in the case of any other individual, because they are spending public money, not of a private firm, but money out of the Public Treasury which the citizens of this country have put in there by their taxation. We cannot allow any Corporation to act in this high-handed manner; they are giving instructions in the same manner as that in which you are giving out a contract to a private party. You ask: "Do you know anybody who can do this job?" I say: "Yes, I know a man who can do it," and I ask you to send him down to me. Can you believe that in a country such as Barbados, we have unemployment, under employment and casual employment and the measure of permanent employment has been diminished in certain quarters? I have had discussions with the management of Foundries and I have told them that they should make application to the Government; they were asking for relief from customs duties. At the Barbados Foundry, they have made a roller for one of the sugar mills, which roller has stood up just as good as any of the rollers which are imported from the United Kingdom, and one of their requests was that they should be given relief from taxation, because if that same roller had been imported from the United Kingdom, it would have been imported duty free. However, the components which came in to make that roller in Barbados were subject to customs duty, and therefore, in the net result the costs of the roller would be dearer, because the components would be subject to customs duties.

Items which come in for the sugar factories are duty free. What you find is that the sugar factories prefer to import material direct from overseas, which means that our boys at the foundries are not getting the work. What can you do to get the employment force going? This Government cannot get Jamaica to depend on them, because in Jamaica, the cost of things is relatively higher than it is in Barbados, but the employment force is greater and you are creating an unemployment situation in your own country. Wherever I go, I enquire about the employment situation. As far as Switzerland is concerned, you cannot go there and get employment unless you can satisfy the authorities with certain things. We have to protect our people. From what the hon. senior member for the City has said today - do not let us go into details, because the details will reveal that if you say you cannot get anybody to do this job, you have to go overseas. It looks true, on the face of it, but we cannot carry it too far. Lots of people have done this before us; and if we cannot do a job which somebody did before, then we must have our people back to do the job. With the skill which we have at the foundries, the Government should tell the Labour Department and the Emigration Authorities that no Government contract is to be given to people who are bringing in outsiders to do the work unless a certificate can be given by the Labour Commissioner that such workmen are not available in Barbados. You cannot get a job in the United States of America, unless the Labour Department gives

a certificate. If a lady employs a maid and she wants to take that maid back to America, the United States Authorities will say: "No can do, there are many people whom you can get in the United States to do this job."

Apart from the recession which is taking place, and the recession cannot touch us in the same way that it would touch them - in the United States of America, you cannot get a certificate from a Labour Department of any of the 49 States to enter the United States to do a job. They would only allow a person to do that job if it could not be done by an American. Our farm labourers are in the United States of America, because the farmers over there had to apply to the United States Authorities for permission to get our labourers, because the American people do not like to do this farm work.

What do we find here? This Corporation is bringing in people to do a job, and we have people who can do this job! My Union had to make representation on behalf of these people, because they were paid 24 hours a week, and we were trying to get more than 24 hours a week payment for them, because we did not regard that 24 hours a week payment was enough for a man to carry home to his family. How can we allow the Natural Gas Corporation to send for people from Trinidad to do this work? Is that the way in which we are going to protect Barbadians against this type of thing? When are we going to do that? The Government says that they are building a Technical School and what is the earthly good of having that Technical School? What hope or encouragement is there for a young boy to go to the Technical School when this sort of policy is being created? What is the use of having this Technical School? 7.50 p.m.

If the Premier who has written this statement knew anything more about it other than what they have told him, this is something that should not rest with the Natural Gas Corporation. How have you determined that the people here could not do the job? What do you mean when you say there is no person with the necessary experience? Is it because you have never put down pipe lines like these before that you do not have the experience and you are therefore disqualified? That is a serious indictment. That is just like an indictment I heard where a person took sick, had never been to a doctor before and therefore could not get a doctor at night; therefore you must only take sick in the day. The idea that you have to do a job for the first time is just like saying that you cannot be Speaker unless you were Speaker before. If that is the case, we will have to stop basic training. If you bring something new to a man with training, he will not say that he cannot do it; technicians come across something for the first time and have to do it. We have welders and fitters here in the Foundries who have had experience for the last twenty or twenty-five years; so to suggest that they could not put down these pipe lines is a serious indictment coming from Barbados.

If you are talking about industrial developments, what is going to happen to the other firms when you say that Barbados does not have welders and cannot put down tanks in Barbados because you do not have the technicians? There is the situation in which workers go to the trade for five years. How do you think they are going to feel about this statement that Barbados has no capable welders to do this type of job and it proves not to be true? We are hoping that the Foundries will get a better means of finding employment.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, how some hon. members of the Government look at the unemployment situation in Barbados. Some of them feel that because Barbados has 166 square miles and has a redundant population, there is nothing they can do but fold their arms, build a few roads, do a few aspects of public works and allow the other things to take care of themselves. If you take a positive approach to these things, it will prevent you from sleeping. You have to bolster up every avenue of employment; for every cent we spend in encouraging employment, we should see that the maximum labour

force is used, because these are days in which technological changes come about so quickly, that the level of employment so far as numbers are concerned is being reduced in the various sectors of employment. With that before us, this statement is a very serious one because there is little justification in it. This is saying that there are no men in Barbados to do this type of welding on high pressure steel work. Even if the Shell Oil Company has a subsidiary in Barbados and if they have headquarters in Trinidad or London, we have to tell them that they cannot bring in certain people to do work here. They are told so in Havana and in the United States. In Havana, you cannot open an office. In France, you cannot open an ordinary office unless you employ so many French citizens. You cannot go to France tomorrow and open a business and bring in your family and friends, and that is because of the protection to the labour force in France. I hope that hon. members realise that President Eisenhower and Mr. Diefenbaker had serious chats because the Canadian Government was not allowing any strings to be put around its neck. You will realise too that there was a big row in the United States over trading with Communist China, because the subsidiaries said they could not trade with Communist China.

I am not accusing any member of dishonesty, but there are certain aspects of American life which are going to be applicable to these small communities. Members will have read the case of Sherman Adams and Bernard Goldfine; Sherman Adams was supposed to be behind the President in everything; so he cannot do without him now. We do not know what takes place in other places, and the sooner we get down to this type of investigation, the better. If we get down to this type of investigation, somebody will commit suicide. That is the type of investigation we want in Barbados; but everything is couched up under the Law and you cannot ask private or confidential questions because people will commit murder. You do not know about these things until you see people getting rich overnight, and if you carry out an investigation into certain people's incomes you will want to know how it is their salary is only \$X and they have so much savings in the Bank; you will want to know, too, how it is they never pay Income Tax and they have so much real estate; you would want to know, too, how they have no salary and they had a bank account for all these years. These are the things that make you get suspicious. Those of us who have to labour hard for our money and cannot escape the Income Tax Commissioner feel very diffident when we go to the Treasury and have to pull out our money. The taxpayers have no objection in seeing money well spent, because well spent taxes means a more prosperous community. We have a situation in which Foundry employees are out of work after the crop and I will say here that men without hope are men that are lost. You have men training for five years, and when they reach maturity in life, say around forty or forty-five years, they can only work for twenty weeks in a year; what are you asking boys to go to the trade for if you cannot provide that type of employment for the future?

Only this morning, one of these people came to me on this same question and informed me that employees at the Central Foundry have been working for nineteen weeks at half-pay. When we see the squirm on some people's faces, who have not got to worry about money, while those who live close to them have to worry about it, it becomes a different story.

8.00 p.m.

It is true that we live in different times from those which existed in 1789 when the people of France had to rise up, but these are the sort of beginnings of discontent that make people become very angry. One of them is when you see in a community people in positions that can be regarded as well off making no serious attempt to pay attention to some of those fundamental questions which will bring relief to people. This question is treated now as if it affects some thing dealt with by the Atomic Energy Commission. This is thought of as one of the super secrets. They regard certain things in Barbados as mysteries. When you talk of gas or oil, they are regarded

as something for some mystery man to deal with. They feel that a member of the Legislature cannot talk of the putting down of gas pipes.

The Statement reads:- "The Corporation therefore obtained from Shell (Trinidad) Limited the names of several firms who had successfully carried out such specialised work in Trinidad." That is to say the Natural Gas Corporation wrote Shell (Trinidad) Ltd., asking that company to tell them of names of firms or people who could do this job, and Shell Limited sent the Natural Gas Corporation the names of people who could tender for the job. Just fancy that the public funds of this colony are being treated in this way! This corporation decided that nobody in Barbados could do the job; therefore, they did not give anybody in Barbados the opportunity of applying. This is like telling a man: "we know you are going to fail the examination; therefore, do not sit." They do that instead of allowing him to sit the examination. I say if you know he is going to fail, let him sit and fail. Accidents will occur sometimes. Allow the people to apply.

The statement also reads:- "The question of local contractors was considered." You do not know if these people were asked whether they could do this job. There is nothing in the statement saying that they were asked. You only say that the question of local contractors was considered; that is to say, we sit down together and we consider, should we give it to Central Foundry or the Barbados Foundry? And after consideration we say: "Do not let us give it to any of them because they cannot do it." There is nothing to say that any of them was asked. Even when it comes to the smaller people in the business, there is a big idea in Barbados that right away you regard such people as knowing nothing of the job. If someone were to ask you: "do you think, Mr. Speaker, that the Reporter knows anything about how water is softened to put in beverages?" you are apt to say: "no, he does not know anything about that." That is typical Bajan emphasis. You come to that conclusion because you know that he never worked in a beverage place in his life; therefore, he cannot know anything about it. Similarly, they have come to the conclusion that the Barbadian engineers could not do this job, and so they sent down to Shell (Trinidad) Limited and asked them to submit names of several firms who had worked in this capacity to write them.

Mr. Speaker, I have had a lot of dealings with Shell Oil Company. I may say that this company has one of the best liaison officers for industrial relations in the person of Mr. Jack Lee. I would like to see him down in the West Indies but that does not mean to say that that is sufficient that you should ask that company for names. The Shell people are very excellent people to deal with and some of the best labour conditions which we have in Barbados are being conducted by the Shell people. However, when it comes to this method of dealing with a public contract, I do not see why it should be worked in that way.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, I was a member of the Executive Committee. I am going to say this although they are always ready to lock me up. As a member of the Executive Committee, it was the policy of the Executive Committee at that time, if you had to sell an old boiler, to advertise it because objection was taken to selling and buying property of your own. Now I see the Natural Gas Corporation which cannot be bigger than the Executive Committee carrying out a policy which is contrary to the Government in power. Sir, you cannot have a policy in which you do something, and a subsidiary of yours does something which is directly opposite. Why should the policy of the Barbados Natural Gas Corporation cut across the policy which the Government is carrying out? Surely, no subsidiary can be bigger than the original body. What is the Natural Gas Corporation? Is not the Natural Gas Corporation a public Corporation operating with Barbados money buying out pipelines from the old Gas Company? The thing makes you laugh when you think of it. From what you see in this statement you would be led to believe that the Natural Gas Corporation is running with its own

money. Our money bought this thing. What is the Natural Gas Corporation? It must be Sputnik.

The most serious thing that is worrying me, and I suppose is worrying most of us who feel like me, is that with your present unemployment in Barbados it is unthinkable for anyone to bring somebody from outside into Barbados unless every avenue has been examined and you know beyond a shadow of doubt that nobody here can do the work.

Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the adjournment of the House for five minutes to deal with this matter and it needs more than this. This matter really needs an independent investigation other than the Natural Gas Corporation to determine if it is a fact that there was no Barbadian or nobody in Barbados who was capable of performing the task which the Natural Gas Corporation has to carry out. If it can be proved that nobody in Barbados could do the job, then the Barbados Government would have to give serious attention to finding out ways and means of training Barbadians in the higher skills, either in England or some country like that. I do not know that in England they would take into their factories boys from Barbados. I do know that the General Electric Company is taking boys from the Commonwealth countries and training them in all sorts of skills. A former Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Chandis is now Chairman of that company. In the United States of America, which is a foreign power, there are arrangements for you to send persons there for technological training and I do know that that country is quite willing to open its doors through the Foreign Aid Programme. They have done it for the people in the Middle East and in the Lebanon and they will do it for Barbados. I am sure that I would be voicing the sentiments of every Barbadian who loves his country that a situation like this in which a contract is given away to an outside country especially when it is in a line of employment which is diminishing would meet with the wholehearted sympathy of the people of this country.

8.10 p.m.

I do hope that the Statement has been examined by the Hon. Premier, that there is no doubt about it that there is nobody in Barbados who is capable of doing this work. There is a temptation among Ministers who seem to think that when it comes to technical questions, they do not need any questioning, but they lose their powers when they begin to think so. When a man raises a technical question which does not fit in with your point of view, it should be examined by some one else, in order that you should be in keeping with the policy which you want to pursue. The average Barbadian does not believe that there are no welders in Barbados, who are capable of doing this kind of welding job. I am not an expert on welding, but with the jobs which are done in Barbados, I say that people are capable of doing the kind of job which is required to be done.

In a small community like this, you have a state of affairs where somebody asks you something on one occasion and you are nothing more to do with him; you will spite the whole community in trying to get at somebody. Some people will say that they had a row with the Central Foundry or with somebody else and on that account they are nothing to do with them. However, when you come to hold public funds, you have to bear in mind that the money is not coming out of your pocket, but out of the public purse, and I do feel that an investigation should be made into this state of affairs.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should attempt, after hearing the remarks of hon. members, to put the Government's point of view. I think it was the then hon. junior member for St. Peter who brought forward the Bill to establish the Barbados Natural Gas Corporation; I think it was in 1950. In that Bill no provision whatever was made for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to usurp any authority whatsoever over the Board unlike recent Bills, like the Housing Bill and the Bill to establish the Transport Board and the Bill to establish the Tourist Board, where it is specifically provided in certain sections of these Bills, that the Governor-in-Executive Committee should give general instructions. Perhaps, I should read

the particular Section which applies to the Transport Board. I am developing this line of argument, because throughout the speeches made, especially in the speech made by the hon. member who has just sat down, while on the one hand, he did not appear to be attacking the Government, yet on the other hand, the remarks which he made generally, when he spoke about the Government not being serious about the employment situation, how many people are out of work and so on - as a matter of fact, the whole debate is definitely an attack on the Government of this Island, and it is therefore necessary to speak on that point. Section 10 (1) of the Transport Board Act, 1955 says this:-

"The Governor-in-Executive Committee may, after consultation with the Board, give to the Board directions of a general character as to the exercise and performance by the Board of their functions in relation to matters which appear to him to affect the public interest, and the Board shall give effect to any such directions."

That Section gives the Governor-in-Executive Committee general powers, so to speak, over the Board, but in this particular Act of 1950 which establishes the Natural Gas Corporation no such power is given to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. Throughout the Act, except on the question of the provisions of funds - the agreement as to how much the Corporation can spend - the reference is not to the Governor-in-Executive Committee, but to the Governor. I want to make it crystal clear that, the Board being a law unto itself and operating in its own right, such questions as have been raised by the two hon. members would not have been referred to the Government, and what was done was done without the knowledge of the Government (Mr. MOTTLEY: Make that clear for us.) I can go so far as to say that the Board did not refer this matter to the Ministry, neither was the Government apprised of the Board's intention to bring in people from outside to do this work. The Board acted within its own right; therefore, when it appears that the blame is thrown on the Government and more especially on the Ministry of which I am in charge, I want to deny emphatically any knowledge of the Board bringing in people from Trinidad or from anywhere else to do this job. The matter was not referred to me and we know absolutely nothing about it; it is for the first time tonight that I have heard that people were brought in from outside to work on these gas lines.

Having said that, I will say that I know as a fact that when it was considered that this gas work should be reorganised and new pipes should be laid down, Mr. Garrett made it known to the Government that this was a highly-specialised type of work and if we wanted to reduce the loss of gas to minimum, we would have to get some highly-qualified person to do this job. It was recommended that this pipe should be of a certain type and it should be welded. That happened either in 1954 or 1955. That is the position and I can say with authority, unlike the mouthing of people who merely keep a lot of noise about unemployment and would make it appear that their hearts yearn and their bellies burn for those who are not employed, that there is not a single Government in the area which has done as much to relieve unemployment as this Government has done.

8.20 p.m.

I regret that I have to touch on things in general because the emphasis was on unemployment. The hon. member who has just sat down said he did not know how some hon. members of Government looked upon unemployment and went on to say that you must tell the Shell people not to bring anybody here to work and that the Labour Commissioner should have power to keep out anybody.

Now, Sir, that may sound very good in theory; but in practice, it will militate against the interest of workers in Barbados. We have an unemployment situation in which we have got to look for outside avenues in which to place people from time to time, and if we are prepared to lay down dogmatically that no person should come in through Shell or anybody else to do any kind of work in Barbados,

it means that the people from the other end can lay down stronger terms that Barbadians cannot come into their territories.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. Did I say that? What I said was that this is a job which could be done in my opinion by people in Barbados and that though Shell may be a good Company you should not permit them to bring in somebody to do work that could be done by people here. Though Shell operates as a Subsidiary, it should not be allowed to bring people to do a job in Barbados that could be done by Barbadians. That is what I said.

Hon. M. E. COX: I know for a fact, Mr. Speaker, that people from this country have gone to Trinidad to do big jobs for Shell. I repeat that from time to time we export people to various places to work; they go to Curacao and Aruba, among other places. If we are so silly as to lay it down as the Law of the Medes and Persians that nobody should be brought in by Shell or anybody else, that is going to react against us and our people, and the people who keep noise are going to suffer.

As you know, Sir, we have two Five Year Development plans, and I am sure that those persons who have been following these plans would see the large expenditure on the various items, Capital Works and so on which this Government has undertaken in order to provide employment for people in this island. This has been going on for some time. I think we are at present employing not less than between 2,500 and 3,000 on Capital Works. This Government, Sir, as you know, has since 1955 been embarking upon a scheme of lending people money to go to England

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, really and truly

Hon. M. E. COX: The unemployment situation was so played up by both members.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not true. The hon. member said I played up the unemployment situation. I want the hon. member to answer me on the question of the contract for \$40,000 and something within the industry of welding. I never played up the unemployment situation or anything of the sort. I want the hon. member to deal with the question of the contract.

Mr. SPEAKER: I just want to tell the hon. member that I hear very easily and he does not have to shout.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I apologise to Your Honour. The hon. member said that both members over here played up the unemployment situation.

Hon. M. E. COX: That does not change me because I know what I am saying is correct. The unemployment situation was played up more so, it is true, by the hon. senior member for St. Peter.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am not going.....

Hon. M. E. COX: I am going to reply if it takes me till morning. .

Mr. WALCOTT: We are as fresh as you are. When the hon. member said that I played up unemployment, what I did say was unemployment within the industry in which welders were employed. If he thinks that is playing it up, that is what I said.

Hon. M. E. COX: I was merely attempting to point out that Government has explored every avenue and has done everything possible to relieve the unemployment situation in Barbados, and it is not true for a member to insinuate as was done by the hon. senior member for St. Peter that the Government was not cognisant of the unemployment situation in Barbados. Members will say that they are not accusing you of anything, but when they get on political platforms they "raise Cain" and accuse Government of

doing this and that. Both of them did nothing but make political speeches to the Gallery and made them believe that.....

Mr. SPEAKER: No reference was made to the Gallery.

Hon. M. E. COX: \$40,000 could have been spent in this island to help the unemployment situation, but the Government has agreed to allow these people to come in from outside.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The hon. member is not so shamelessly getting up and saying that in moving the adjournment of the House to discuss this matter, I said that the Government.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not use the word "shamelessly"; it is bound to offend.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member has the temerity to get up and say I accused the Government. As a matter of fact, I was at pains to say that this was a matter in which Government should call an investigation. As a matter of fact, I was very mild. My criticism is that this Board appears to have more power than the Government.

Hon. M. E. COX: I apologise to the hon. member, as long as it is made clear that it is not Government's fault and that it was done outside of Government. The hon. member having said so, I know at a future date if he says anything different, the record will be there and he will not be able to contradict it.

Now, Sir, I was just referring to the Act which was passed in 1950 and as I said, the Natural Gas Act and the provisions which are found in other Acts which gave the Governor-in-Executive Committee the power to issue instructions and general directions to the Board was in the original Bill which this House passed and which the Other Place took out.

8.30 p.m.

What I should like to promise this House - and it can only be a promise because I must confess that while I agree with the Act as it stands, we have absolutely no authority over the Board. If the Board agrees to absorb people from outside, we have no authority under this Act to prevent them. If you read this Act, and this is one which the hon. senior member for St. Peter brought in here, and if he cares to read it again, he will see that under the present Act, the Government has no power where this Board is concerned, nor does it have any power to direct this Board, but I will promise hon. members to bring in an amendment. As a matter of fact, an amendment to the Natural Gas Corporation Act is before the House and while it is true that the particular section dealing with the Board is not before the House, I am prepared to take the Bill back to the Cabinet and see that an amendment to that Section is inserted. We have changed the word from "Governor" to "Governor-in-Executive Committee" which as you know means the Minister in charge.

Well, Sir, I must say that none of us on a matter of principle would agree to the company going outside and bringing in workmen to do jobs which you will find local people here capable of doing; but when the hon. member makes it appear as if the Government has something to do with it, that is the bad part of the matter. What I do object to is the many misleading statements which would make people believe that we are up against their interests, when in truth, we cannot be acting more in their interests than what we are doing. I say again before I sit down and so as to bring to the notice of the House and to all those listeners -

Mr. SPEAKER: Whom do you mean by listeners?

Hon. M. E. COX: I mean to the public - that it is the fault of this Government that this thing has occurred. This is the first time that I happen to hear that people were brought in and that a contract was awarded to somebody from outside to carry out certain works to pipeline.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Would you agree to their paying \$40,000 for the contract?

Hon. M. E. COX: I cannot tell hon. members whether or not I agree. I will say this. It is all well and good for one to say that we have a firm in Roebuck Street, a firm over the Bridge, a firm in Belleplaine or another in St. Lucy, capable of doing this job. I do not know of that. What I do say is that if there are people in this Island who are capable of doing the job satisfactorily, then I say that the job should be done by the people of this Island.

(A VOICE: That is all that we are saying too.)

Hon. M. E. COX: I must emphasise again that we have no power at present over the Board. The Board can employ whomsoever it likes to carry out any sort of work, and so on; therefore, anything which has been done has been done without the consultation of the Government and without the knowledge of the Minister in charge of the portfolio. Sir, I will not attempt to refer to the Statement made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter when he referred to Mr. Goldfine.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I first of all want to congratulate the hon. senior member for the City for having a printed answer to a question which he asked on the same date. If the hon. member will examine the circumstances of the present debate, on the 1st July, 1958, the hon. senior member for the City intimated to the Hon. Premier that he was going to discuss a contract given out by the Natural Gas Corporation to a firm in a neighbouring colony to the exclusion of a Barbados firm. I think he was more concerned with a particular firm getting the contract than the workmen employed. The hon. member actually gave notice of this question on the 1st July but the typewritten form came out on the 8th July and marvellous to declare, the hon. member was circulated with the reply on the same date made by the Hon. Premier himself and printed with more alacrity than the debates of this House and the Order Papers with which we have to deal from week to week. I remember that when I table a question, the question is put on the Clerk's Table; and I have known that I have had to wait fifteen months for the answer to a question. Here we get the hon. senior member for the City getting the answer to a question actually before the question was raised.

Well, Sir, a person with a suspicious mind like myself, if I may use a term which is in common with the usage of parliamentarians, must say I begin to smell a rat. I can only come to the conclusion that this whole debate was a dog dancing between the Ministerial Benches and the Conservative Opposition. When the hon. senior member for St. Michael got up before any hon. member over here could even make an expression of opinion on the replies which were laid on the 8th July by the Hon. Premier himself, he talked almost exclusively of the Natural Gas Act of 1950 and the fact that there is an amendment to it before the House and that the Government has no control over the Natural Gas Corporation; therefore I put two and two together and I got the number four, six or eight - you can choose a number, hon. members can choose another - but the first conclusion anyone would come to as a result of this debate up to the present is that no one is less embarrassed by the question than the Government of Barbados. As a matter of fact, I may even go further and say that I, so to speak, think that the Government would give the hon. senior member for the City every possible facility in raising a question of this nature; and by facility I mean print the answer on the same day when the question was put; I am not saying that it is true but these are the deductions which one can make.

8.40 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order Mr. Speaker, this question was posed a week ahead and the Premier gave the answer in the following week. You will remember that.

Mr. BARROW: Even that, for the Government Printing

Office, is a record. I defy any hon. member to say that he has had any of his questions answered in a week. My recollection is that the hon. senior member for the City gave notice of the questions at one day's sitting of the House, but the printed form did not come - - -

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I never gave notice of any question. I posed the question during the debate and, as a result of the question which I posed during the debate, the Hon. Premier read out that statement. That is how it came into print. I know how to get answers out of the Government better than any other member. (Laughter)

Mr. BARROW: I said everything which the hon. member had to say except that on the Order Paper under the Head "Notices", we find this: "Mr. Mottley: To move the adjournment of the House at its next meeting to discuss the Hon. Premier's Statement re The Natural Gas Corporation."

The Statement was laid on the 8th July, and I have said that the hon. member mentioned the matter on the 1st July. He did not even put it in the form of a question, so that the hon. member would have known exactly what the debate was all about. Within a week, this Statement could have been prepared and printed. I therefore say that the Government is less embarrassed by the debate than the members of the public would like to think. If I have a suspicious mind, I cannot help, but on numerous occasions, I have risen to my feet - I will give you an instance.

In 1955, when the Transport Board was being incorporated by Statute, in common with other hon. members who are jealous of civil rights and principles and matters of that kind, we pointed out that the Natural Gas Corporation Act was a model Act. The hon. senior member for St. Michael has disclosed the fact that the Government has not got any say in the matter; well, I will read out the Sections in which the Government has a lot of say in it. It was during the debate on the Transport Board Bill that I made reference to the Act of 1950. In Section 6 of the Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950, the members of the Corporation are appointed by the Government, but that was before the introduction of Ministerial Status, and the Officer administering the Government of this colony told me to my face that whenever the word "Governor" is read in any Statute, he is following the Convention of consulting his Ministers on all points. Therefore, whenever "Governor" is read, we must read "Governor-in-Executive Committee" or the Appropriate Minister. Section 6 (1) of the Act says this:

"The Corporation shall consist of a Chairman and not more than four members all of whom shall be appointed by the Governor."

Sub-section 2 says this: "Every member of the Corporation shall hold and vacate his office in accordance with the terms of his appointment, and shall, on ceasing to be a member, be eligible for re-appointment."

Not only that, but there is the Proviso which says this: "Provided that any member may at any time by notice in writing to the Governor resign his office."

Section 7 (1) says this: "The Governor may at any time remove from office all or so many of the members of the Corporation as he may consider necessary in the interest of the effective and economical performance of the functions of the Corporation."

The powers are there, but they want further powers. There is no doubt that if a Minister recommended to the Government that these persons should go on the Board, they will go on it. The members of the Board are as follows:- Mr. N. S. Atwell, Colonel J. Connell, O.B.E., E.D., The Financial Secretary, Messrs. Julian Garrett and H. A. C. Thomas. The Hon. senior member for St. Michael wants to tell me that he did not know one single thing about this matter and here is the guardian of the taxpayers' money, the Financial Secretary, and that gentleman did not know anything about it. Every one of these members of this

Corporation is appointed by the Governor, and these members can be removed from office by the Officer responsible to the Cabinet on the recommendation of the Minister. The whole situation is this: when the hon. member says that the Government did not know anything about it, that cannot be true. If it is true, then the Financial Secretary is not doing his job, because he has been put there to safeguard the interests of the Public Treasury, and he has recourse to the Ministers at any time of the day or night - at least those Ministers who can be found. (Laughter), and he has access to them at all times. They can call upon the Manager or the Chairman of the Natural Gas Corporation.

I will endorse what the Hon. Minister has said on the score that according to the wording of the Act, this is a Statutory Corporation and their decision can be embodied *ex post facto*, they do not have to consult with the Executive Committee before they appoint certain people; but there are other Statutory Corporations in this Island who are not functioning in that way at all. There is the Transport Board; there is a popular superstition that you cannot get a job either as a Driver or Conductor at the Transport Board unless you have a recommendation from the Minister. They cannot do that with the Natural Gas Corporation; therefore, they create a public furore about the activities of the Natural Gas Corporation and if there is one thing that the Barbadian suffers from, it is disunity. If you want to unite Barbadians, you have to look for what another West Indian politician has described as a "scrape goat". (Laughter) The best "scrape goat" you can find in Barbados is a foreigner with a foreign firm. If you want to unite Barbadians, you tell them that a foreigner is getting some benefits which a Barbadian should have.

I have listened carefully to the hon. senior member for St. Michael and he has made remarks to the effect that he hopes that the hon. member, when another debate comes up, is not going to say something else. I know the debate which will come up, because it is a debate on a Measure which will change the set-up of the Natural Gas Corporation which has been functioning more efficiently than either the Transport Board or the Housing Authority. 8.50 p.m.

Now the whole thing is not that the Natural Gas Corporation is not providing employment for people outside, but that when they do make decisions about employment or the award of contracts they are not toeing the Ministerial line. That is what I suspect; I do not have any information on it. I also suspect that the hon. member before October is going to introduce a Bill in this House asking to amend the Natural Gas Corporation Act as a result either of an enquiry or the questions raised by the hon. senior member for the City, and nobody could be in disagreement except myself and other members of my Party who would have taken part in this debate, because we immediately see this xenophobia influencing our debates and we fly up and say it is wrong and that there should be employment for Barbadians. I want to get the premises absolutely clear, and I will go on to discuss the merits of the strictures which the hon. member has made against the decision of the Natural Gas Corporation as it is presently constituted. This is what I would suggest to the hon. senior member for St. Michael; if he disagrees with the action of the Natural Gas Corporation as a body, he should change the personnel on the Board. That is very simple. We are not criticising the hon. member by saying that he deliberately influenced the Board to go outside of Barbados to introduce a foreign firm of contractors. When the hon. senior member for the City said that he was not concerned with employment, I am concerned with employment, but I am horrified to hear - I do not want to misquote the hon. member - that he was not attacking this purely from the employment point of view; but the hon. senior member for St. Peter made it clear that there is the fundamental question of unemployment and the relief of unemployment in this colony involved. In other words, they are looking through opposite ends of the periscope, as is only right.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter is a representative of the workers, and he has to see the workers' point of view like myself, because they put him there. The hon. senior member for the City on the other hand is concerned

because there are firms in Barbados whose profits are depleted.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I object to that. The hon. member knows that is not true. He is saying that I was not interested in unemployment, but I said in reply to the hon. member that I did not only raise the question of unemployment. I raised the point of morality in giving out a contract without advertising at all. As a matter of fact, you are bound to be interested in the question of unemployment as soon as there is the question of employment out of Barbados. I am entitled to say how I feel about it, but the hon. member is claiming that I am interested in firms because their revenue is depleted. You cannot have firms unless you have employees.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can reserve his comments for his reply.

Mr. BARROW: I was saying that it is their point of view that they deplore the action taken by the Natural Gas Corporation, and I repeat that the hon. member for the City must be primarily concerned with the loss of work to a firm, and secondly, I am not saying that he is oblivious or unconcerned, but as a Trade Union Representative, this is of Trade Union interest first and a Conservative must think of the firms who have lost profit, and you can trace this and come down to the Government who has lost Income Tax.

I am not denying the hon. senior member for the City the right to say that he is also concerned about the working class and the people who are looking for jobs in Barbados, but his emphasis must necessarily be on the loss of work to firms; so you now have a symphony of forces. You have employers and employees joining and clamouring against what is patently an error of judgment or a deliberate act against the best wishes of the people of Barbados as a whole, and the Government in a situation like this must necessarily be in a very happy position, because I only want to warn hon. members that the Government probably, as far as I can see, welcomes nothing better than this debate because it is a useful whipping post against the Natural Gas Corporation. I will make certain predictions and if they do not come true, I am a false prophet: the first is that this Bill which I now hold in my hand, and which has not had a second reading, will be amended or withdrawn - it is the Natural Gas Corporation Amendment Act, 1958. I anticipate that this Bill will be withdrawn and I can read the Preamble now. "As a result of the rising outcry, it is clear that the composition of the Natural Gas Corporation and the Statutory powers are outmoded and not consistent with present day Ministerial Practice" and they will go on in language much more happily couched than what I am employing now and emasculate the Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950 so that it conforms with the Transport Board Act, 1955.

On the merits of the strictures raised by the hon. member, in 1954 Turners Hall Nos. 19 and 20 were purchased from the British Union Oil Company. Three or four years later, the Gulf Oil No. 1 was added to the resources of the Natural Gas Corporation. I want to make it absolutely clear that the Barbados Gas Company had nothing to do with the Natural Gas Corporation and in fact, the Natural Gas Corporation had all the powers necessary to carry out the undertaking of gas distribution for domestic and industrial purposes throughout the island long before they bought over the decrepit machinery, equipment and building which were formerly the property of the Barbados Gas Company. As far as I remember, sometime late in 1954, the Barbados Gas Company and the Barbados Natural Gas Corporation were until that time two separate entities altogether, one a public organisation, a model of its kind, functioning efficiently until Government spent \$1 million taking over the concern which was not only moribund but dead, and merely waiting for *rigor mortis* to set in, and Government always has this propensity to nationalise or take over organisations and firms which are no longer profitable to private entrepreneurs. Before Government took over the Barbados Gas Company which was owned by foreign capitalists, the Natural Gas Corporation had no trouble at all. They had two very good wells at their disposal, Turners Hall Nos. 19 and 20. 9.00 p.m.

I mentioned these two wells for this reason. There is a pipeline which runs from Turner Hall right down to Welches Terrace. That pipeline was laid down by the B.U.O.C. and taken over by the Natural Gas Corporation along with the compensation for the two wells. They were also compensated for the old pipelines. There is a three-inch pipeline which is the main pipeline that brings the gas from its source all the way to Bridgetown exposed to the elements. It passes through about five or six parishes and up to now it has not been giving you the facilities of natural gas. Now they want to replace some of this moth-eaten rusted out pipeline which they bought from the Barbados Gas Company from its source all the way up to Top Rock in order to service people in the higher income brackets to the dereliction of the other people who live at the well head. The people who live at Turner Hall cannot get natural gas as a fuel although it is so near to them.

This is what I would like to know, Mr. Speaker. The losses incurred by the Natural Gas Corporation up to the year 1954 were of the order of 27%. The minute that the Government for some peculiar reason took over the Barbados Gas Company for the Barbados Natural Gas Corporation, the losses rose to something like 54%, and now it is something within the region of 58%. It is a fact that somewhere down Black Rock the gas runs through a hole in the ground. That is what they say.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is grossly misleading.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I know that because I have read it myself. The Hon. Minister says that it is grossly misleading. I have the Annual Reports of that Corporation. If it is grossly misleading, then you should really get rid of the Board and the Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, listen to this. The Hon. Minister says I was misleading. I was underestimating. This is what the Report says:—"The taking over of the faulty Distribution System of the former Barbados Gas Company has naturally had the effect of causing a heavy increase in the Corporation's over all "Unaccounted for"; the figure for the fiscal year being 58.4% as compared with 27.6% for the previous year."

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want him to read the last report. Let him read the report of 1957.

Mr. BARROW: I would like to ask the hon. member what report it is that I am reading. This is the Sixth Annual Report and Statement of Accounts for the period from 1st April, 1956 to 31st March, 1957. There is no report from 1st April, 1957 to 31st March, 1958 which has been laid on the Table of the House or circulated to hon. members. As a matter of fact, that Report could not be ready yet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I go any further, I would like the Hon. Minister to withdraw the words that I was grossly misleading. Why is he flying up in the air? He thought that I was talking in the air. "Unaccounted for Gas" is an expression used to denote the difference between the quantity of gas produced and the quantity sold or otherwise utilised. I am saying that the taking over of the Barbados Gas Company which was a moribund company has caused the Natural Gas Corporation to have the figure for the "Unaccounted for gas" more than doubled; in other words, the Natural Gas Corporation was functioning fairly efficiently without the pipeline which comes from Turner Hall to the City of Bridgetown.

Now, the hon. senior member for St. Michael may want to tell me that this is not in the Addendum to the Resolution that they were asking for one million eight hundred and seventy dollars and needed as much as \$1,200,000, though they themselves did not say in the Addendum what we knew already; that is, of the 27 miles of pipeline which were taken over from the Barbados Gas Company, 25 1/4 miles were absolutely rotten and of no good; it was merely a hole in the ground. Ask the Hon. Minister if that is untrue! That is why I say we should have an investigation.

The hon. member made two major points. The first major point which he made was that he was some kind of enemy to the hon. senior member for St. Peter who was a member of the Cabinet at that time. They always had collective responsibility. I have sat in this House and heard the hon. senior member for St. Michael introduce matters which were within the portfolio of the hon. senior member for St. Peter and vice versa. They sat together and criticised members of the Opposition with equal stringency and virility when the occasion arose.

Now, Sir, I want to say this. Since the introduction of Ministerial status, the Government has power to sack the whole Natural Gas Corporation if something comes to light which is unsavoury and which is contrary to the Government's policy. Not only that, they have a watchdog on the Board in the form of the Financial Secretary of Barbados, the Hon. E. S. Burrowes. They had him there actually from the time of the inception of the Corporation and there is no man who has more intimate knowledge of the Natural Gas Corporation than the Financial Secretary. I have said that the Government can dismiss the whole Board at will and they have the Financial Secretary as a member of that Board. Well, the hon. senior member for St. Michael told this House that they did not even know so and so happened; they were not consulted. If they were not consulted, why was it in 1954 according to his own disclosure when the Chairman of the Board informed him that these pipelines were coming down that he never told us anything about it?

Mr. Speaker, before I make the motion for the suspension of this sitting, I am going to say that the hon. member knew as far back as 1954 that these pipes were needed and he never said one word to hon. members. It is also remarkable that that being so, he should now say that they did not have any consultation or anything else with the Chairman or the members of the Board on this matter.

At this stage, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

The question that this sitting be now suspended for three-quarters of an hour, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
9.15 p.m.

On re-assembling

NO QUORUM - ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: On the resumption after the suspension of the sitting of the House, there being less than nine hon. members present, I declare this House adjourned until this day week at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

This House now stands adjourned.