

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 7th July, 1959.

Pursuant to the adjournment the House of Assembly met at 12 noon 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*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); 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. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E., Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*); and Mr. J. W. CORBIN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meeting held on 30th June have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection, the Minutes were taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

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

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 17) Order, 1959.

The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1959.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, I am commanded to lay "The Customs Duties Order, 1959."

On my own behalf, I am commanded to lay "Reply to Question No. 16, /1959 asked by the hon. senior member for St. George regarding the irrigation of lands by fresh water wells."

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. 17) Order, 1959."

Resolution to amend the Schedule to Resolution No. 29/1959.

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1959."

Resolution to place the sum of \$158,993 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1959-60, Part II Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate No. 11 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$48,555 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1959-60, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate No. 10 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a "Bill to amend the Highways and Transport Act, 1945," and I should like to give notice of my intention to ask the House to deal with this Bill in all its stages at today's Meeting.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, I beg to give notice of a "Bill to amend the Factories Act, 1956."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next Meeting to deal with the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

QUESTIONS

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:-

Has the attention of the Ministry of Trade and Commerce been drawn to the ban by the Unit Government of Jamaica of further importations of goods from the Union of South Africa in protest at the latter's racial policy described as "Revolting to the conscience of all decent peoples throughout the world"?

2. In deference to public opinion in this territory, is it the intention of the Barbados Government without undue

delay to impose a similar ban in this island, against South African Products?

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:-

Is the Minister aware of the desires and needs of the residents of the Northern parishes of this island to have available to them the service of Natural Gas as a domestic fuel?

2. Is the Minister aware of the proximity of the Natural Gas pipe lines to the parishes of St. James and St. Peter?

3. Will the Minister take steps to have this fuel available to the residents of the six northern parishes?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Highways and Transport, Act, 1945, be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Factories Act, 1956, be now read a first time.

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

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

HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORT BILL

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to proceed with the Bill to amend the Highways and Transport Act, 1945 in all its stages.

This Bill has been circulated, and hon. members might ask why this unusual request; why not go through the regular procedure. I do not want to venture on a second reading speech, but I have spoken and explained to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that this will have some bearing on the Sandy Lane project. We, as Government, intend to co-operate to the fullest in this project. We view it with some importance. We want to encourage means of employment in this island.
12.25 p.m.

We are, therefore, asking the House to treat this Bill urgently. It would afford that project a means whereby it can get on the way as early as possible. I do not want to say anything more at this stage. When I introduce the Bill I will give a full explanation. I am asking leave that we go through with this measure today.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to take this Bill through all its stages today. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the Hon. Minister.

Mr. BRANCKER: I object.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is objection; therefore the measure cannot be proceeded with today.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I thought when there was an objection, the question would be put before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was under the old Rules; not under Standing Order, No. 16. Anyhow, I will look it up further.

(After a while)

I have the honour to inform the House that Standing Order No. 16 to which I made reference does not deal with the matter before us. I had in mind that that Standing Order dealt with this matter. Under the old Rules, if any-

one objected to a matter of this sort, the question could be put and according to how the question was resolved, leave was resolved. Standing Order No. 16 deals only with leave being granted with reference to a matter of adjournment of the House on a matter of public importance.

The Hon. Minister of Trade asked leave to proceed with this Bill through all of its stages today and the hon. junior member for St. Lucy stood in his place and objected to leave being granted. This is a matter on which "May's" itself does not issue any pronouncement; therefore, as a matter of fact, I think the House will have to proceed with it as under the old Rules. I will put the question now.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, may I draw Your Honour's attention to Standing Order No. 40.

Mr. SPEAKER: That Order states that no Bill shall be read a second time until it has been printed and circulated to hon. members. That has never been the practice with reference to Government Business; so usage obviates any difficulties here. Hon. members are well aware that usage holds as fast with the House as direct rules. Government measures are not as a rule printed first. It has never been the practice since this was a House of Assembly. That has only been the practice so far as Private Members' Business is concerned.
12.35 p.m.

The question is that leave be granted the Hon. Minister to proceed with this Bill throughout all its stages at this sitting today. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:-

AYES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE, Hon. F. E. MILLER, Mr. HOLDER, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. SEARLES, Mr. STRAUGHN, Mr. SMITH, Mr. COREIN, Mr. DOWDING and Mr. GODDARD - 13.

NOES: Mr. TALMA and Mr. BRANCKER - 2.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, thirteen hon. members voting "Aye" and two hon. members voting "No". I declare the "AYES" have it.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. I have been informed, only last night, that it is possible to obtain the Laws of Barbados in this island from the Public Library; I have been so informed by a young solicitor who has just done so. I have drawn this matter of members of the House being without Laws to the attention of Your Honour and the House on more than one occasion; and I feel that, if copies of the Laws of Barbados are available in this island, every effort should be made to provide each and every member of this House with a copy immediately. We are here, not as individuals, but to make laws and to preserve the rights of people. We cannot give one hundred per cent representation if we are not in receipt of the laws of the island.

I have letters constantly written to me on matters of representation, and I have not got the facilities at my disposal to give answers to those questions. This is a matter on which I feel very strongly. In my opinion, every member of this House should insist that the privileges which were granted to members of this House in the past are granted to the House today.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry that the hon. member has waxed so warm in his address to the Chair. I believe that every member of this House should have a copy of the Laws of Barbados as long as such copies are available. I busied myself very early indeed after the hon. member asked his question. I can assure the hon. member that I do not think there will be any further delay in hon. members being in possession of these copies. I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything more.

Mr. DOWDING: I thank Your Honour, but Your Honour must not think that, in my waxing warm, I was casting any aspersions on you. That is the way in which I express my feeling on any such matter.

NOTICE OF SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before you call the first Order of the Day, I would like to say this: I have spoken on the matter with some members of the House including members of the Opposition. It is well known that His Excellency the Governor is leaving the island at 1.30 p.m., today, and I think that those members who want to avail themselves of the opportunity of seeing him off should be given the opportunity to do so.

Most members have expressed their desire to see the Governor off. Whether this should be done by way of a motion, or if it is felt that the proceedings of this House should be suspended, I would make a motion that this sitting of the House be suspended from 1.15 o'clock p.m. until 2.30 o'clock p.m..

My reason for doing that is that I do not think we could get back here in time to do much work between 1.30 and 2 p.m.; and 2 o'clock p.m., is the time for the ordinary suspension of the sitting for lunch. Consequent upon what I have said, I think that we may very well suspend the sitting from 1.15 p.m., until 2.30 p.m., I beg to make that motion.

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

The question that this sitting be suspended from 1.15 p.m. of the clock until 2.30 p.m. of the clock, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill of which notice has just been given, be taken as the first Order of the Day.

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

The question that this Bill be taken as the first Order of the Day was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

AYES: Mr. BRYAN, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE, Hon. F. E. MILLER, Mr. HOLDER, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. SEARLES, Mr. STRAUGHN, Mr. SMITH, Mr. CORBIN, Mr. DOWDING and Mr. GODDARD - 14.

NOES: Mr. TALMA and Mr. BRANCKER - 2.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, fourteen hon. members voting "Aye" and two hon. members voting "No". I declare the "AYES" have it. 12.45 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, the Objects and Reasons of this Bill are short and to the point. As I have already told the House, because of its implication and because of the fact that it is related to the Sandy Lane project, it is bound to arouse more interest and more discussion than might seem foreshadowed by the brief Objects and Reasons of the Bill.

Now, Sir, the particular amendment which the Bill seeks to bring about is an amendment to Section 13 of the present Highways and Transport Act, 1945. Apparently, Sir, it is a very ambiguous Section; it is very difficult of interpretation. The Act itself is a rather cumbersome Act, old-fashioned, out of date and certainly in need of re-shaping, modifying and bringing up to date. Sub-section 2 of Section 13 is a very difficult Clause indeed.

Members will note that the Clause reads thus:

"Whenever it appears to the Governor-in-Executive Committee desirable for any purpose, and particularly for the giving of a road to church or market to any person who shall be without and shall require one, to alter the course of any highway to which this Act applies rather than to repair such highway, the Governor-in-Executive Committee is hereby empowered to lay out and allot such highway, etc."

Now, Sir, on the one hand you have this Clause reading that the Governor-in-Executive Committee can divert a road for any purpose if it appears desirable, but on the other hand, you have a limiting sentence "rather than to repair such highway". On the face of it, since these words must have some meaning, they seem to suggest that the power in this sub-section can only be exercised where the highway needs to be repaired.

I must tell the House that the Government diverted roads in the past and did not come here to amend the Act. For instance, you will remember the road near Top Rock; we diverted that highway and did not have to come to amend the Act. We also diverted another highway a little past Seawell going to St. Philip; and it was felt, Mr. Speaker, that in this particular case of the Sandy Lane project, the same thing could have been done although we were not diverting.

In view of the ambiguous reading of that Section, however, we felt that we should have this position clarified. To the Government this project is an important project; we have approved of it, and we intend to cooperate to the fullest in seeing that this project go through; we have now taken the step of asking the House to deal with it in all its stages today, although we only gave notice of it today.

I know, Sir, that this matter has given rise to some public discussion. We welcome such discussion because the highway in question is an important one. For years it has existed where it is, and has become part of the history of Barbados, part of the landscape of Barbados for as long as we can remember there was a Sandy Lane Road. From the aesthetic point of view, it is a pretty piece of road; and, obviously, Sir, the public had to be convinced that any inconvenience, however slight, that may be caused them, was obviated or rather was justified by the importance of the project to this island as a whole. That is what the Government is maintaining. It is because this project is..... (Pause) Mr. Speaker, I cannot hope to compete with the music from outside. 12.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, as acting Leader of the House, I wish to say that I hope Your Honour was notified that this interruption would have taken place, that this noise by the Police Band would have taken place. In fact, I hope that the Commissioner of Police did ask Your Honour's permission to allow this march to take place on this street at this time. It is not good enough for this House to be interrupted, unless with Your Honour's permission.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This parade is an occasion for His Excellency the Governor who has served in this country for many years. We must pay homage.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member must sit. That is not a point of order.

I wish to inform the House that I will pay very serious attention to what the Hon. Minister of Trade has said. I will inform the House that I had no intimation whatsoever of the Police Band passing above this House at this time today. I will assure the Hon. Minister that I will take the matter up with the Commissioner of Police and state my personal objection to the Police Band passing above this House during its sitting today.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no point of order at this stage. The Hon. Minister of Trade will proceed.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that we welcome public controversy and public discussion on this matter. We realise that, for any road of this sort, for any inconvenience however slight it may be, to be caused to the public, the public should be assured that there is every justification for allowing any inconvenience of this nature to take place.

We are quite aware of the objections and misgivings that may occur in the minds of the public due to the aesthetic setting of the road and the circumstances of the particular case, but we of the Government feel completely justified in co-operating with those who are initiating this project. It is because we feel that it is to the benefit of the people of this island that we should do so that we are bringing this Bill forward. We have agreed in principle to this road being diverted.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has started a discussion on this matter at length as a result of a Resolution which he tabled recently. I am not trying to draw any wind out of his sail, nor, Sir, am I trying to cut across the debate which he has initiated in any way; but by this means we will have a positive vote of this House as to whether the House is in favour of this project.

I may say that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition touched all around the subject but has not yet told us whether he is in favour or not of this project. I do know that his Party held a meeting-----

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister may not try to answer the Hon. Leader of the Opposition at this juncture.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I can see what Your Honour has in mind, and I will therefore steer off from the course I was taking. However, this thing is so bound up with that matter, it is a difficult thing not to touch on certain things which are occupying the minds of hon. members of this House. However, I will accede to Your Honour's request.

These objections, sentimental as they may be, but heavy as they are, are objections which we feel are quite outweighed by the benefits which this scheme will bring to this island. This Government is faced with very great difficulties when it comes to unemployment and growing unemployment, through the growing population of this island. Therefore, this island is looking to industrialise; but, obviously industrialisation is a slow process because of our economy.

Until we can get a Customs Union, we will only have minor industries; we will always be in competition with Jamaica and the other big islands of the West Indies. We have not found oil. Therefore, in order to provide employment for our growing population and in order to add to the national income, we have to attract other sources of capital from wherever they may come so as to generate some employment for these thousands of people who need it. We have, therefore, by sheer necessity, concluded and agreed in principle to support tourism.

We cannot afford to be lukewarm about a project like this. If we give the impression that we are putting a stumbling block and difficulties in the way of these people, then these people will take their capital elsewhere and carry out their project. Therefore we are going to co-operate to the utmost. That is why we of the Government are asking the House to agree to the passing of this measure today.

We are not unmindful of what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said. We will strive warily. We know that there are pitfalls, that in tourism there is the danger that you may go too far, that you are subjected to various ills. However, this is the first major project of its kind that has come up for a long time; and we feel justified in treating it with the importance which we think it deserves by co-operating to the fullest in pushing it.
1.05 p.m.

The area of this project is 380 acres. The number of workers formerly employed in agricultural cultivation is approximately 75 throughout the year. In the factory, 35. That is all.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret very much that the Hon. Minister is really replying to something which is not before us.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: With due respect to Your Honour, I am not replying to anything which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said. I know that we will be asked why we hurried with this Bill, and I am showing why the Bill is urgent. It is difficult to separate the two things.

Mr. SPEAKER I will point out to the hon. member, and if I may read them, the Objects and Reasons of the Bill state this:-

"This Bill seeks to clarify the provisions of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945 relating to the alteration of highways under the control of the Director of Highways and Transport and to ensure that the public is informed in cases where the construction of a new road results in an old road or any part thereof being abandoned.

The opportunity has also been taken to amend section two of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945 so as to correct two minor defects in that section."

Those are the Objects and Reasons of this Bill. They are very, very general and in my view, the intention is that they should apply to any road which is to be altered in this way in any part of the island and at any time subsequent from now. These Objects and Reasons are very, very general and they are absolutely nothing to do with any Sandy Lane project.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Thank you for your ruling. We will deal with the Bill. Now, Sir, the main section of the Bill is the one to which I called attention: the section where the ambiguity appears is in the use of words "rather than to repair such highway." We are deleting those words and substituting therefor the words "or any part thereof". The other amendments are consequential, minor amendments. This Bill simply clarifies the provisions of the Act and will allow the Government to go ahead and divert any highway without causing any undue worry. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, this Bill, - although it is in connection with a highways project and for the diversion of roads generally throughout the island - is so wrapped up with the Sandy Lane project that it would be difficult to do justice to it unless you give some latitude to hon. members to discuss that project. The background of that project will explain very fully indeed the reasons for bringing down this Bill; it will give us the opportunity of airing the matter very thoroughly in the interest of the public.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to stifle debate, but I think that with a motion before the House at the present time dealing with a Resolution standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, to have a debate now which will run counter to that motion and relate to it in some respect, is not justifiable. I never stifle debate. I always try to give hon. members latitude to express themselves as fully as possible; but I think it is very improper, with a Resolution before the House standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, to have hon. members discuss all the pros and cons about the Sandy Lane project. That is not desirable. I will not allow it.

Mr. GODDARD: That is a private motion. How do we know that it will be continued today and so present us the opportunity of expressing our views on this very subject?

As the Hon. Minister has said, road diversions have taken place in Barbados before; he has cited the one at

Seawell and the one at Harmony Hall, St. Lawrence; and there will be many more to come. As a matter of fact, the diversion at Seawell is only a partial one and not road straightening at all.

In Barbados, between now and another ten or fifteen years, we will have to give every facility so that those roads can be straightened and give due protection to those people's houses which may happen to be on roads which may be cut off. I refer to the one at Seawell most particularly; if a proper road diversion and straightening is done there it will mean a saving of the Crane area to Seawell of at least a mile; and, not only will it be a saving by road, but it will also be a saving in time in travelling sharp bends as they do exist in St. Philip. It will cut off another five minutes. This is very important a matter today when we have not got to catch buses but to catch planes which move to the minute.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly agree with this Bill for those reasons. The development in Barbados, whether members of the House like it or not, is going to take the pattern which is opening up to all of us.

Mr. SPEAKER: According to the motion which has been agreed to, it now being 1.15 p.m. of the clock, this sitting stands suspended until 2.30 p.m. of the clock. This sitting now stands suspended.
1.15 p.m.

On Resumption,

QUESTION TIME

Question Time was called.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. senior member for the City, I should like to ask three months' leave of absence as from today.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking three months' leave of absence as from today for the hon. senior member for the City, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

THE CARIBBEE HOTELS LIMITED (SEA DEFENCES) ACT, 1958

Mr. GODDARD: Mr Speaker, Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business is in my name. It is the second reading of a Bill to authorise the Caribbee Hotels Limited, now known as the Hastings Hotel, to construct groins with or without sea walls connecting with or attached thereto.

The purpose of this Bill, Sir, is to give the Caribbee Hotels Limited the right to construct a groin or groins with sea wall or sea walls opposite their premises now known as the Hastings Hotel extending to a length not greater than 200 feet out to sea. The reason for this, Sir, is to protect their beach - what there is of it - and even to encourage the widening of that beach. There are times when the beach may be 15 feet or 20 feet, and there are other times when the sea will erode what has been built up. It is right up to their boundary; and it means that their guests have difficulty in finding a suitable bathing site.

People who come to Barbados on vacation, Sir, come here to enjoy our sea-bathing. In the Hastings area we are fairly fortunate in having the Accra Beach known as the Blue Waters beach, but people like the Rockley Beach, because they like to swim as near to their hotels as possible. If you want an extended swim, you can get to these beaches; but people like to undress in their rooms and put on their bathing costumes, go to the sea and return to their rooms in their costumes. That is the advantage of having suitable bathings sites as near to these hotels as possible.

There is, however, protection in this Bill for Government. Before these people can start the erection of these groins or sea walls, they must provide the Governor-

in-Executive Committee with a plan; and, even after the erection of these groins, which is done with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, if there be any erosion on any other person's property and the Governor-in-Executive Committee feels that as the result of these groins erosions is being caused elsewhere, they can call on the proprietors of the Caribbee Hotel to remove the groins at their expense. It is purely a facility granted to the hotel to put up what they think will establish a beach at the back of their premises for the purpose of improving the bathing facilities. Groins are put up only after experts have been consulted. I understand that they have consulted or are consulting experts on this matter.

This is something that the House should readily permit. The tourist industry to us - we all admit - is a secondary industry, and a very fast-growing industry. This is but a small concession to the developers of this area who are now spending, at the present moment, hundreds of thousands of dollars in establishing a new hotel. They have bought the old hotel, pulled it down and have begun to put up a new hotel on that site. That is an area of not more than three-quarters of an acre, but, when it is completed, it will have something like 60 double rooms maybe accommodating 100 odd persons in that hotel; the sort of development we should welcome.

For that reason, I am moving that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion. In so doing, I should like to state that the establishment of groins is nothing new, though it may be new to this island. It is a policy which has been adopted not only by private enterprise but by governments in some places. When we consider that great erosion has taken place, and is actually taking place along that coast from Needhams Point to Oistin, and that that area is an area which is highly developed with hotels and guest-houses, it would be a good thing if Government were to consider the advisability of establishing groins along that coast.

I fear, Sir, that the establishment of this one groin may not be as effective as a series of groins along a particular coast. I fully realise the expenditure involved; but I think that, if tourism is to be undertaken on a big scale, the time will come when Government will see that, in order to boost the tourist trade and tourism generally, it may have to come to the assistance of private enterprise; or, if they do not come to the assistance of private enterprise, they will have to establish groins in certain parts on their own.

The principle of this Bill is one in the right direction. The establishment of beaches, through placing groins along the sea-coast, is one which has to be undertaken sooner or later. I feel that this particular hotel should be commended in that it is pointing the way along which future development of beaches should be continued.

I beg to second the motion for the second reading. I can see that it has no deleterious effect; it's merely a move for the establishment of beaches which were there formerly, and which have been washed away through currents, and are now being re-established.
2.40 p.m.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I am so glad that I have the privilege of speaking on this Bill.

We are not against any hotel being established in this island of Barbados for the help of the purposes of tourism, but we should have the understanding to know that we have to look out for somewhere to put the people. The Ministers of this country have the power to do whatsoever they will. There is no Act which can move them out of their places. They have the power because we have put them there as our overseers; and if they fail to do what is just, then we would have to take action.

Now, we have certain parts of Barbados which are planted in canes, provisions and other kinds of vegetables.

The Government, and those in charge of the Government, should be in a position to direct those who come in as to where they can put their hotels. We do not want them to take up the arable land which is for the growing of food to put a hotel. We have plenty of land around the sea coast for that purpose.

I have seen, and I have heard, that there are people who are coming in this island of Barbados, threatening this Government with a cheque book, and saying that what they want, they can have. My honourable friends, can we survive by a cheque book, or is it that we survive by food? It is food by which we can survive; and if we allow men from a foreign country to come here and take up our land to put down hotels, then they would be depriving our poor people of the facilities that are theirs.

God has given us a birthright, and that is this land of Barbados. We live by the land; we survive by the land. Do you think that cheque books or gold or silver or any kind of minerals are anything by which we survive? Do you realise that our population is increasing, that this is only an island 21x14? Where are you going to put the people? You give one man 380 acres of land to put down a hotel. Do you know the reason why he has taken all that? It is because he does not want to be surrounded by the poor inhabitants of this colony. Do the Ministers of the island of Barbados, whom the people have elected and put as watchmen for them, see the danger? Are they aware of the danger that is coming to the island?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have allowed the hon. member a little digression, and I think he has done very well.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, these references are to enlighten the understanding of men. What I wish to say is that, if the people of Barbados have put the Ministers in their places to be watchmen for them, can they not look out in the right direction and see what is taking place in this island? Men are coming here with cheque books and waving them to the Ministers. One man has come and has bought an estate of 380 acres of land for the purpose of erecting one hotel. What are our people going to do? How are we going to survive?

I am saying this from the feelings of my heart: I hope this man is not trying to buy the Ministers with his cheque book today so to put the poor Barbadians in the sea.

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

Mr. CORBIN: I will. Let us get back to the facts. I am sorry that I have gone off the course, but these references of mine had been necessary.

Mr. Speaker, you are a man who, I believe, have read your Bible; you know that when Egypt was in bondage all the people had to till their land because there was no food for the help of the population. All the money was spent. Must we allow people from outside to come here and purchase our good estates to put our people out of food? To whom must we go when that happens?

We are not against a man coming into the island and purchasing ten or twelve acres of land to establish a hotel, or any such place to help the situation here; but do you mean to say that you allow one man to purchase 380 acres of land? Is that right? We are selling our birthright. We have Ministers whom the poor people of Barbados have put there to see after their rights. What are we going to do now? When the next man who may come here says, "We want land in Broad Street; therefore, you would have to divert Broad Street," what would you do? You are men of business, and I think you are men who have understanding.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now going to some other thing.

Mr. CORBIN: I must bow in submission. Gentlemen, let us realise that people are coming into this island to take possession of it.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the hon. member is speaking on everything except what is before us.

Mr. SPEAKER: I know the hon. member is straying. He is a new member; and, because he does not know his way about, I am giving him a certain amount of latitude so that he will be able to make his point. I shall ask the hon. member to stick as closely as possible to the subject matter before us. I think the hon. member has indulged sufficiently in what he was trying to get across to hon. members, and I think you have been understood by hon. members. The hon. member should at least now proceed to deal with what is before us.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, we are not against the Caribbee Hotel. We know that that hotel will bring tourism here to give the people of Barbados some measure of relief; but can the people of Barbados live by tourism alone? Suppose tourism ceases to function here, would we live? A man comes here and buys 380 acres of land to put down one hotel to entertain tourists.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has repeated that so often, and so well, that I think we all have understood you. 2.50 p.m.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, what I want to bring to the attention of the Minister is that the man or the owner of the Sandy Lane project.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will not now begin to talk on the Sandy Lane project. I have cautioned hon. members that, while speaking on this matter they should not touch upon that other matter because it is still before the House. The concession of allowing the owners of Caribbee Hotels Limited to establish groins is now before us.

Mr. CORBIN: I thank Your Honour, and I will sit until further explanation is given.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill which is supported by the hon. members for Christ Church, finds complete favour with us. Long before the other side was convinced of the value of tourism, we supported these principles and ideas. Of course, as I always understood in respect of the Government, the then Leader was an uncompromising opponent to tourist development; he is now the present Prime Minister of the West Indies, and, of course, it was the shepherd who led the sheep.

We support this scheme and this hotel, and the idea of giving authority to the Caribbee Hotels Limited to construct a groin or groins. We appreciate that that will add to the amenities of the hotel and the attractions of this island to people from abroad; that is, the type of people whom we want to attract to Barbados. Too high a price, as I said last week, can be paid even for tourism. I will amplify that further when I am dealing with another matter which is on the Order Paper.

When it comes to this particular proposal which requires legislative sanction, we certainly give it our blessings. We realise that, with this Bill, the hotels will have an attraction; not only will this particular establishment be for individual attraction, but we are advertising Barbados' sea bathing. Every time we read that Barbados has swimming pools we are given the impression that Barbados sea-bathing is not all we make it to be, since we have to advertise swimming pools so as to make up for the deficiency of our sea-bathing. The people who advertise do not say that the places are some distance from the sea; they do not put that in the advertisement. They say that they have a wonderful swimming pool and they recommend it to the visitors.

The type of persons who have been patronising the Hastings Hotel is the type of tourist whom we want to continue to come to Barbados; that is, the non-segregationists. Another type of persons do not appreciate the existing hotels; they have not been there because they have heard

that there is not sufficient "Bermudisation" of these hotels. It is the type of persons who will go to the Marine the Windsor or the St. Lawrence, who will spend their money in this Island and who will do a good job to the economy of Barbados as a whole.

What we really need to get tourists in their hundreds and their thousands is accommodation, not the exclusive places which have swimming pools and which form a colony or an island in themselves. By swimming pools, we will only get a few millionaires attracted to this place, and we do not want them anyhow. Not only will they make a Bermuda or Bahamas of this island, but it will be the beginning of the end for a colony like this. When they started in one place they want to go to another; and you will find that there will be no room in Barbados for the people of Barbados, just as there is no room in Bermuda for the people who were born in that colony.

The Hastings Hotel, now the Caribbee, has a reputation for receiving persons, irrespective of colour, who have sought accommodation at that hotel; and I have no reason to doubt that that policy will remain unchanged. The fact that I see both hon. members for Christ Church, the capitalist and the socialist, supporting this proposal makes me feel that the policy of the old Hastings Hotel will be perpetuated in the Caribbee.

I think that the enterprise of Caribbee Hotels Limited is to be commended; they have shown sufficient vision that they appreciate what is needed at their particular hotels. In other words, they advertise our sea bathing for the enjoyment of sea bathing; and, in the preamble of this Bill, they speak of providing sea bathing facilities for the benefit of the guests residing at the said hotel.

We would like to hear from the hon. introducer - he is a big financier and he has the means, - that sooner or later he will be introducing legislation, if necessary, to provide for the establishment of some large and substantial hotels at moderate prices so as to accommodate those thousands of perpetual tourists who want to come to Barbados but for whom no accommodation is provided; we want to see that they can get places at three guineas a day. We want accommodation for the middleclass Englishman who, when he has saved the money to pay for his transport, can come to Barbados and be able to stay for a month's vacation or so in a place at \$20.00 a day or something below that, which is within his price range. 3.00 p.m.

We stand to gain nothing by small hotels which will charge fantastic prices, and which will hurdle together, whether they admit it openly or otherwise, segregationists. The farther they remain from Barbados, the better for the self respect of Barbadians. Let them stay out. The few dozen of them would not count anyhow; they will just pay extravagant prices to the places where they are staying; and you can rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that the minimum amount of that money is going to circulate amongst the people as a whole; the maximum will remain among the people who are the proprietors of these hotels. This, Sir, is a first-class, middle-class project and, for that reason, it deserves the full support of this branch of the Legislature.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to this Bill. In fact it has absolutely no harm in it. The object is improved facilities along that stretch of beach, and, as the hon. Introducer said, they are only seeking the authority of the Legislature and the Government at this time to erect these groins. They have not yet submitted plans, but before they can start to erect they have to submit plans to the Government for approval, and we will make sure that these groins are so erected that the interest of the public and the island as a whole will be safeguarded. We think that they should be permeable. I think the hon. member did say that, if at any time erosion was threatened or there might be any obstruction, the Government could have them removed at the cost of the company.

There is nothing in this Bill, Sir, to cause alarm of any kind. I do not think I will say much more. I cannot

take the hon. junior member for St. Andrew very seriously; I understand that he nearly toppled into the sea earlier today, but he has gone completely over-board now, so I cannot say much in reply to him. The plans will come up later, but the groins should be on a low level so that no obstruction will be caused and we would not have to re-submit the plans to the company.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I gather that there will be no official opposition to this Bill. I think I may still say, however, that anything which gives the semblance that there may be monopolisation of any part of our foreshore certainly gives me personally a cause for some reservation.

I am sorry I did not hear the hon. Introducer of this Bill. I understand from all that has been said all around by the other members, that they would be considering the greatest public good in the erection of these groins; but I should like, for instance, to get some assurances from him as to certain possible interpretations that may be put to some of the sentences and Clauses in this Bill.

In Clause 3 on page 2 of the Bill, I notice that these groins will be set up for the purpose of protecting the existing beach forming part of the company's said property and with a view to extending such beach and providing sea-bathing facilities for the benefit of the guests residing at the said hotel. I wonder, Sir, what I can understand from that "for residents and guests of the hotel" Our beaches are becoming so restricted nowadays that I would not like to feel that only people actually residing at a hotel would have the privilege and opportunity of bathing at a particular beach.

Then there are the words: "and from time to time to repair or remove the same or any portion thereof respectively". I can see from what the Hon. Minister said that there would be a possibility, in case it is found that these groins are having any bad effect on the foreshore, that they could be ordered by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to be removed; but, certainly further down, it does give another cause for reservation when it says "for the sole use and benefit of the company its successors and assigns forever."

Even though I understand and agree that before any plans are put into action for the erection of these groins they must be submitted to the Governor-in-Executive Committee, I would like to say that this is a pretty binding Clause which is already written into the Bill. It is significant for us to take note of terms like these, Mr. Speaker.

The reason I am that concerned is because I am thinking of a Resolution which stands in the name of the hon. senior member for Christ Church, and even though that Resolution which he has on the Order Paper deals with the approaches to the beaches, I always have a very strong feeling that, unless we pay very careful attention here in Barbados, we will find that we will be developing a tourist industry for outsiders to be using our own beaches to the detriment of our own people.

It is essential for us to make sure that we get the best development of hotel sites and beaches for the benefit of tourists, but, at the same time, these beaches should be also protected for the use of our own people. I am particularly concerned about that and, even though there is no official opposition to this Bill, I think it is necessary to get some form of assurances because with the heavy population of this island, it means that unless we can assure people that they can have free access and use of the beaches of this island, they will soon find they have developed the beaches of the island for somebody from outside to use. It is commonsense that we must take adequate warning of actions like these. When we had the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference here I discussed a matter like that with one of the delegates from Australia, and, funnily enough, this delegate was staying at the Marine Hotel which is one of the concerns of the Introducer of this Bill. 3.10 p.m.

He said he was concerned over the fact that he found no way to get to the beach when he left the Marine Hotel; he could only reach there if he trespassed on somebody's property. In the course of my conversation with this officer, I learnt that there is a law in Australia which says that nobody owns any part of the beach up to 100 feet high water mark.

Sir, if we continue with a situation like this, without due safeguards, you will find that the beaches will all be owned by a few private individuals and there will not be free access to them for the majority of the people of this island.

We commend the Caribbee Hotel from a beach standpoint for doing what they are going to do. Somebody must take notice as to erosion and so on; and I think it was the hon. Seconder of this Bill who said that the Government must also take a look at this themselves. I think that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture did have some regard for that when he brought in his Beach Protection Act. But although that may be so, I say that somebody must be present to voice what I would consider justifiable reservations as to the indication that there is the possibility, or the semblance of a possibility, that there will be some restriction on our beaches if private enterprise are allowed to take up our beaches rather than their being for the general use of the whole public.

I certainly would like to get from the hon. Introducer of this Bill every assurance that this sort of thing, as I see in Clause 3 of this Bill, would not take place. As I can see from certain parts of this Clause, the general public would not be able to use this part of the beach. I do not want to say that the people should trespass on private property and do as they like but, with our limited space one must be sure that the beaches are kept for the interest of the general public.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the last hon. member who spoke with interest but, on reading Clause 3, it says that the purpose of putting up this groin or groins is for the purpose of protecting the existing beach forming part of the Company's said property, and with a view to extending such beach and providing sea bathing facilities for the benefit of the guests residing at the said hotel. I cannot read into that anything which precludes anybody from going to the beach.

This is a Private Member's Bill, and the funds by which this groin or groins would be put up are private funds; these people are putting it up purely for the guests of their hotel. I do not see how any hon. member can interpret from this section that it would be excluding any member of the public from having sea bathing facilities. It is so clear that I think it is overriding. I think the hon. member should be assured of that.

I do foresee that the attitude of this House is such that, in matters like this, unless there are real objections, we should commend them because there are other people who would like to be granted similar facilities but are afraid to come to the House to get authority for doing so for fear of being turned down. I would like hon. members to realise that industries like this need to be encouraged as much as the sugar industry has been encouraged in the past. Sir, however, I see the frame of mind of the entire House; and I now move, as has been already moved, that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: According to Standing Order No. 53, this Bill is automatically at this stage referred to a Select Committee.

On behalf of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, I have the honour to appoint to serve as a Select Committee of this House the hon. junior member for

Christ Church (Mr. Goddard), the hon. senior member for Christ Church, (Mr. Talma), the hon. junior member for St. Lucy (Mr. Brancker), the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing (Hon. R. G. Mapp), the hon. junior member for St. Michael (Mr. Bryan), the hon. junior member for St. Joseph (Mr. Straughn), and the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries (Hon. D. D. Garner).

RESOLUTION re STATEMENT OF HON. R. G. MAPP ON 21ST APRIL, 1959

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day under Private Members' Business, is to resume debate on the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution re Statement of Hon. R. G. Mapp on 21st April, 1959.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, I was beginning to conclude my remarks on this subject of Sandy Lane, but there is one more question which I would like to pose to the Hon. Minister if he decides to reply to any or all of the questionnaire. The question which I ask now is this: in respect of this scheme, I would like to know not only the number of rooms of this proposed hotel but the proposed scale of charges at this particular place which it is intended to erect. I would like to have it authoritatively, and for the purpose of the records and for Hansard, that this luxurious and super-de-luxe place is certainly not the type of place which we feel is in the best interest of the tourist movement and, in fact, of this island as a whole. It would be good if I get the assurance, as the Hon. Minister has been assured, that this place would be in the same price range and for the type of tourists whom we want to come here in large numbers. 3.20 p.m.

We want the type of people who are continuing to stay at the St. Lawrence, the Windsor, the Royal and the Marine and places of that sort. We do not want the Texas multi-millionaire type, those who come from the south of the Mason-Dixie line, who cannot come to Barbados unless they are assured that they are in their own preserves with their own road and sea and beach, their own everything; let us be without them; let Barbados maintain its essential Barbadian characteristics and not any imitation or replica of Nassau or Bermuda or any place of that sort.

There is no question about it that they want to come here for the benefit of themselves, for the benefit of the sponsors who are purely hard-hearted, ruthless capitalists who want to come out here to make money and who are not concerned with Barbados or the West Indies or the Empire because they change their nationality from U.S. to U.K. and backwards. They are concerned with spending their tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands or millions in order to make millions more; theirs is purely a hard-hearted and first-class money-making scheme; theirs is just a business enterprise, which seems to be the most likely investment for the million dollars or the billions which they happen to have at the moment resting in the Bank at a rate of interest which is not sufficiently attractive to them.

Tourism is a very problematical thing. You have some seasons which are successful; and then the tourists migrate to another part of the world, and you have your people who were formerly employed out of work. As I have already said, we can pay too high a price for tourism; that is my fear.

I happened to read only in last week's newspaper a remark made by Monsignor Justin Field, the Bishop of Grenada, on this subject of tourism. He is reported to have said that tourism is dangerous, although it is good; and he went on to point out that we might stoop and degrade ourselves by doing what we should not do, we might do what is contemptuous just in the interest of tourism and the American dollar.

I do not know where Your Honour attended Divine Service last Sunday night, but if it was in the parish Church of St. Peter, I gather you would have heard the

sermon from a leading Anglican Priest on this same subject of the use by people of their cheque books and their millions in order to buy anything and everything which they happened to want at any given moment. When we have support from the platform of the State Church fortifying the point of view expressed by a dignitary from another island in the Caribbean area, one can feel that it has come within the scope and notice of the religious leaders; that they have seen the harm which has been accruing, and is likely to accrue, to the residents of this island from a certain type, a certain restricted, exclusive type as they regard themselves, of tourists coming to these shores.

Mr. Speaker, when reference is made to the means whereby it is proposed to grant this diversion, the power of the Governor-in-Executive Committee under Section 13 subsection (2) of the Act of 1945, let it always be borne in mind that that section says this:-

"Whenever it appears to the Governor-in-Executive Committee desirable for any purpose," and it goes on and explains what really was in the mind of the drafters of this piece of legislation "and particularly for the giving of a road to Church or market to any person who shall be without and shall require one....." In other words, although this Section is wide enough to provide for a case of this kind, I am submitting that the very wording of the Section shows what the original drafters and legislators had in mind was to give the Governor-in-Executive Committee the power to give "a road to Church or market to any person who shall be without and shall require one, to alter the course of any highway to which this Act applies rather than to repair such highway," to empower "the Governor-in-Executive Committee to proceed to lay out and allot such highway."

It is important for us not to lose sight of that. That was the position in 1945 when this Act was passed. If we revert to another matter when Private Members' Business is finished, I shall deal with certain aspects of the Bill which will be before us. But I am saying that in 1945 the legislators who were responsible for putting this Act on the Statute Book never had in mind that the wide powers which this Act gives, would have provided for the occasion for which this Act is being used. No exception was taken to the St. Lawrence diversion.

3.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to add any more at this stage, but shall await with interest the answers of the Minister to my questionnaire. I hope he has noted today's questions as well, so that when my final reply comes, I will be able to deal with them. I must say that one rather gets the impression that Government is in a terrific hurry with this scheme, now that they see that public opinion is beginning to crystallise and harden against it; they give the impression that they want to get it through pell-mell, at all costs, and at the quickest possible time for fear that public opinion become so strong and so overwhelming against this particular tourist scheme that they would not dare dream of touching it any more.

Mr. Speaker, if I have not already moved the passing of this Resolution, I beg formally now to do so.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the passing of the Resolution.

I must say, Sir, that with respect to tourism in this island, the point on which we are now speaking, it is good in one sense and bad in another; and I will give you the bad points. Tourism is good when we make preparation, but what happens when tourists do not come? We, as Barbadians, have the power, and there is no man who can come in our home and take possession unless we give him possession. The Ministers who are in charge of the Government should have sense to know that when a man comes to Barbados he is looking for a good atmosphere; what about the people who live here? Don't they want a good atmosphere too?

When you allow people to come to this country and take up the greater part of it, what does the Minister expect of the inhabitants of Barbados? The inhabitants of Barbados need the same facilities or better facilities than anyone coming from any part of the world. You are the watchmen; the people have put you there to be watchmen, to prevent any evil from coming here. People are coming from outside where the atomic bomb is exploding; they are running from it; where are we going to run when you give them our land?

We must protect our island. We should not allow anybody to bias us out of our good attitude with a cheque book that is only paper which can be burnt up any time. Neither gold nor silver can cause me or anyone of us here to live; it is what the earth produces. And when we allow these tourists to come here and take possession, what are we going to do?

I was speaking just now and realised that I was out of order. I submitted to that, but now I am in order. I want the Ministers to acknowledge that you have

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

Mr. CORBIN: These are relevancies which I am bringing to enlighten the Minister's understanding.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will remember that he is not speaking to the Ministers, but to the Chair.

Mr. CORBIN: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. You are a man who reads your Bible and you will know what happened when Ahab wanted to take Naboth's vineyard and Naboth refused to give it; you will remember that Ahab got it by false accusation. When Ahab died, the dogs licked Naboth's and Ahab's blood and the dogs ate Jezebel's body because he defrauded Naboth out of the vineyard.

I hope the Reporters will take what I am saying and let the public see it. I am warning the Ministers not to let evil come on them. Do not let any man come from any part of the world to Barbados to bias you out of your gratitude. We are not against them coming, but do not let them take up the land from which we have to get our potatoes, yams, breadfruit, cabbage and coconuts.

Mr. Speaker, you know that every word I am speaking is true. I hope that the Ministers will let God guide them and enlighten them to see the danger that will come to Barbados.

3.40 p.m.

Are you going to allow people to come here and say, "put Broad Street on the wharf?" You all are the Ministers and we have given you the power to see after our rights. Why not see in the right direction? There is no estate in Barbados which should be sold to a foreigner unless you sign consenting to the sale. No human-being should be allowed to come in here to buy any land unless you, as Ministers, sanction it. As Hon. Ministers, you know that the poor people who are in your housing schemes are living only ten feet apart from one another.

Do you know why these people have come here and bought Sandy Lane? It is because they do not want people like us to be near them; they want to push us in the sea.

As I have told you, in 1942, I was in St. Lucia putting up a steel building for the American Government, and the Germans had a submarine in these parts; therefore, they had cut off the communications to that island and there was no supplies coming to the Americans. The Government of St. Lucia saw the danger. They stopped the schools from opening; they sent every child with every schoolmaster to the field to plant food. Do not allow people to come here and buy our property and we all die.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must bear in mind that he is still addressing the Chair.

Mr. CORBIN: I must get back to my point. I am asking the Hon. Minister and all those in charge of the Government to open their eyes and try to resist against any evil that is coming into this country. Gentlemen, I hope that in the earliest future you will see the evil that is coming, and will resist it. God is in Heaven and he looks into the hearts of men. He sees the evil and the good and rewards man according to the doings of his heart. Therefore, if the people of Barbados have caused from the Hon. Premier down to me to be elected to this Chamber, never let a man come into the Island after today and buy land without your consent. There is no man who should be able to sell an estate in this island unless he gives Government notice of his intention to sell.

We are not against tourism coming here. Any man can put down a hotel but let him take six, seven or eight acres of land to put it on; do not let him take 380 acres of land. As I see it, you are not in favour of the people; you cannot be if you do that. Sir, as you know, Egypt was in bondage and when everything went down to the bottom the people said: "give us food and take our land." Would you like a tourist to come here with only a cheque book to offer you? Can a cheque book feed the people?

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

Mr. CORBIN: I am asking the Ministers to submit and to try and see the things which are right for the inhabitants of Barbados. If they do the things that are right, they will be elected again. However, I do not think they will be elected again because they are wrong. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I see this entire picture in a different light altogether. I see it today as I saw it twelve years ago when I first came into the House.

The Hon. Minister of Communications said a short time ago while dealing with the Bill to amend the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945, that this is the first opportunity which we have had of making a hotel development in Barbados; and it was for that reason that we should not turn our back on it. The only thing which I would add to that is that this is the first big hotel development since the Blue Waters Hotel Development Scheme some twelve years ago.

We have allowed that to go by and we have regretted it ever since; therefore, we cannot afford to do the same thing again. We have waited twelve years for the return of a project similar to the Blue Waters scheme; and we can only hope that this Sandy Lane scheme would be given a bigger send-off than the Blue Waters scheme. The Blue Waters Hotel project would have occupied 20 acres of land with a Golf course on the one side and some of the best sea-bathing beach on the other. It was only through a shortsighted policy on the part of the Government that that scheme fell through. Since then, several hon. members on both sides of the House have tried to convince Government that tourism is the essential secondary industry of the island; that it was our only hope of raising the standard of living of the people, other than by sugar.

We have toyed with the idea of industrialisation. We have, by legislation, given encouragement to light industries; but they have not come in great numbers. They have gone instead to Jamaica and to Trinidad. But the potential for tourism in Barbados is great and real; and by it we can fast outstrip any other West Indian island and in the Southern Caribbean. We are more advanced, and we have the potential for tourism. Why should we, on every occasion that something turns up that is tangible and good, turn our backs on it? I am not a party to that.

This question hangs on the issue of a road diversion to facilitate the development of Sandy Lane as a hotel area. It is said that 380 acres of land is too much for handing over for development of tourism. I do not agree

with that. When Mr. Issa was here earlier this year and spoke to us at the Marine Hotel, the question was put to him. He was asked whether road diversions were made in Jamaica to facilitate the erection of hotels there. 3.50 p.m.

His reply was that they had diverted at least three roads per year for this purpose. In Jamaica, they have been tourist conscious since 1945. I do not know for how many years they have been diverting roads, but you can see from that statement how many roads they have diverted from time to time to do the same thing which we want to do now at Sandy Lane.

He went further and he said this; that, in the diversion of roads, if the Government thinks that a development is worthwhile, they will do it at the expense of the Government, but not in every case. I have only stated that again in order to show you how the Jamaicans are thinking and how we are thinking; for fifteen years after them we are still hamstringing this tourist industry to which we all pay lip service.

I would publicly get up and say that this scheme will find employment for people; and our purpose is to find employment for people. Our programme also states that the tourist industry can employ many of the people who are now looking for work. You cannot say on the one hand that you want people employed and on the other hand, when we have something which we can say is a development, say that you cannot divert the road because we love this road and we are so attached to it.

I like the beauty of Sandy Lane as well as anyone else; it is one of the beauty spots of this island. I would like to drive through miles and miles of that road, and would say that it is not long enough. One of the beauty spots in this island was the Pine Road; it was indeed a pleasure to drive along that road and see the cabbage palms; but they have died as a result of disease and has anybody thought of planting them again? The thing to do is to plant this road again with trees; let us do that, but it will take time. We have to do more than that; we have to preserve some of our old windmills which are all going out or have gone out. We should rebuild some of them and have them working in the crop season even at the Government's expense. It is a national effort; we need a Committee to investigate and plan what is needed to make Barbados a happier place, not only for the visitor, but for people like us who are here year in and year out. Anybody should enjoy some of these amenities as well.

Let us get back to the tourist industry. This is something to which we must pay attention so as to strengthen the economy of this island. Let me quote some figures as to what the tourist industry can do. I am stating facts. The Marine Hotel has 120 rooms and, in the tourist season, it will have a maximum of 150 persons there. We will employ 150 persons in the peak of the season, one person per guest; that is what we do every year. I have been there and checked the books. Today we have seven people there, but we still have about forty employees.

I am blaming the Government in this matter because the Government has refused to furnish the Opposition with more facts. We should know what is taking place at Sandy Lane. I know nothing about it, other than seeing a plan which I asked the Minister to send across the table, and which I saw for the first time. I do not know how many bungalows are going up, how much space will be given for the Golf Course, and how much of the hundred acres will be occupied. If what I see on the plan is brought in and put into effect, thousands of workers will be employed there.

You have the Deep Water Harbour, and there are no more than six hundred persons needed there; but as regards this Sandy Lane project, over a period of time, thousands of dollars will be spent on the joiners, masons, carpenters and electricians who will have to be employed, from what I see that the hotel will call for.

Somebody says that it will be a fifty-room hotel, but

I would like to say that a fifty-room hotel would not justify the spending of so much money on that spot. If you spend a million dollars it will require another two million dollars for development.

I understand that they have plans for bungalows for some of these cottages like those at the Coral Reef; and there will be nicely laid out gardens, and so on. But the Minister should be able to answer all the criticisms and say: "This is what we can look forward to; these are the numbers of people who are likely to be employed in this project."

I will go so far as to say that this project will employ five times as many people as a minimum, or five times as many people as the sugar industry could have employed in the same area of land. If you have a hotel with 120 rooms and that can employ 150 people in the tourist season and a minimum of 40 in the off season, the sugar industry at Sandy Lane only employs 35 people in the factory or thereabouts and sixty on the plantation proper; 100 persons approximately. This project will employ people, and a minimum of \$3 million can be spent on no fewer than 300 persons and probably five hundred or more.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad of the opportunity to be able to express my views on tourism generally. It is not good enough to invite people here with capital to develop the industry which we all say is our only hope, and then say that, for reasons ulterior or otherwise; "We do not wish their money". We are not attracting capital in that way. 4.00 p.m.

I want members to realise that it is not any one man's money that is doing this job. The promoter may even have the least financial interest in a project, but it is his name that you may build around. He has to influence his friends, and the investors in New York and London; and if you condemn and criticise him you are shaking the very tree on which you wish to build. We have to look for a lot of capital. We have waited for local capital to come in, but you have seen that it is not forthcoming and we have to go outside. I give it my blessing. I see no competition in it; I see the economic development of this island.

I do hope that this will spearhead many more developments of a similar nature. If you have to come back to the House for any road diversion that is no less than this, I would willingly grant it. I am not going to give up all the beaches, nor am I going to say that we wish to preserve our beaches in a way that was never done in the past for certain types of people. The development here must be such that it will fit into the pattern which we have always known. We will live, swim and bathe on the beaches together. There will be no segregation for me. We have developed a pattern of hotels in Barbados without any such nuisance, and we will not do it today. I do not wish these private beaches that you hear about; but we wish to encourage and facilitate the investing public if they are coming here for tourist development. We cannot pay lip-service alone. We have waited twelve years for a return of a Blue Waters Scheme; do not let us turn our backs on it today. I give this my blessing and will vote for it.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, while agreeing generally with the fears and apprehension of my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, yet, Sir, I regard this Resolution as being somewhat dangerous. When I say dangerous, I mean that some of the principles involved in this Resolution may turn out to be somewhat serious or dangerous, if not properly explained and reported.

I will say, Sir, that it is a Resolution which has to be very carefully and tactfully handled, explained and reported lest an incalculable amount of harm is done to Barbados in so far as the tourist industry is concerned. Let it not be heard on platforms that the Democratic Labour Party is opposed to tourism. The Democratic Labour Party is not at all opposed to tourism through this Resolution. We are all in favour of tourism; have always been, and will

always be in favour. We are not trying to present any obstacles in the way in so far as foreign investors are concerned; and let it not be mis-understood that anything is being done by us to prevent foreign investors from investing heavily in Barbados in the tourist industry.

Anxious as we are to protect the rights and employment opportunities of the present employees at Sandy Lane Factory, as I presume the majority of members of this House would be, we feel that we want to have their case clearly protected, or, at least, to be given some sort of special consideration by the Government and by the new investors; these people will be thrown out of work, and we all fully remember the plight of the displaced coopers. We know that an Act was passed in 1953 concerning displaced coopers. I had to deal with that Act, and I had to administer it to some extent. I speak with a certain amount of bitter experience because I found myself very often almost left alone in the fight for these displaced coopers. I met with little assistance in putting up their case, in securing rights and benefits for them, and working out regulations whereby they would stand to benefit.

With your permission, Sir, the scheme which never developed was the question of land at Six Roads, St. Philip; a scheme which I worked out, and which was at the point of being implemented whereby displaced coopers over a certain age would have been given plots of land at Six Roads to develop kitchen gardens and vegetable gardens. I remember very well how I secured gratuities, grants and bonuses for them on two occasions on certain years, 1954, 1955 and 1956, especially at Christmas time and in the middle of August.

If no provision is made for these people who are being displaced now, and if the promises are observed in the breach, these people who are being displaced - I speak of the old agricultural and factory workers, more especially the older ones who have served for 20 or 30 years and who normally should in a few years be receiving some sort of pension or gratuity - would be thrown out of work and their families will be penniless, and, in time, homeless; they will probably drift to the Almshouses. Those are the people in whom I am really interested; not so much the younger ones. The younger ones could be swallowed up and taken in in the hotel and tourist industry, but the older ones who have served for 15, 20 or 30 years in some cases will be at a loss.

Has Government got a scheme for these displaced workers? Or are the factory or agricultural workers going to be treated like the displaced coopers? On the face of it, in 1953, the Government passed the Fancy Molasses Control and Export Act. When that Act was passed, the then Premier made all sorts of promises - you know the kind of promises he made; I do not think he spoke of "over his dead body" then - that these displaced coopers would be protected and given some gratuities, grants and bonuses, alternative employment, emigration and things of that sort. 4.10 p.m.

I did a lot of work in this matter, and I remember well that a lot of regulations were drawn up. What has happened recently? That Act was recently repealed; in other words, the displaced coopers would not get any more grants. They are a forgotten people. That is how these promises are kept. These are things which the people should know.

What really engages my mind is what would be the plight of these displaced workers. I feel that the Government should satisfy this Chamber that some plan or scheme has been worked out for these people; and I do hope that it is a better scheme than that for the displaced coopers. I do hope that it is a scheme whereby these displaced agricultural workers and displaced factory workers of forty years and upwards would be given some sort of assistance or alternative employment, a bonus, a gratuity or something of that kind. That is something which the Government should take up with the proposed investors, the syndicate, or whoever are the proponents of this

scheme. If I had been satisfied that that point had been gone into, I would have said nothing.

So far as the diversion of the road is concerned, I see little or nothing in it - unless the bus fare to that part is increased as a result. So far as a little more gasoline for the motorists is concerned, I do not see how that would really matter if the revenue of Barbados stands to benefit. In other words, in my view the revenue of the country would increase so substantially that it would compensate for what little extra gasoline would be utilised through the detour of the road. Therefore, on that point, I have very little to comment.

Sir, I hope that outside investors would realise that we, members of the Democratic Labour Party, and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in particular being a representative of the northern constituency, would naturally have to fight for the interest of the working-class people. For that reason his stand would have to be very firm in this matter, as it is his constituents who would be displaced. However, to suggest that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition or the Democratic Labour Party is diametrically opposed to tourism is something which is far from the truth; the Democratic Labour Party has always been in favour of tourism.

We feel that no obstacles, no manoeuvres or anything should be done whereby the confidence of foreign investors may be shaken. We feel that, provided some assurance is given to us at this stage by the syndicate, or has been given to the Government by the syndicate - in other words, provided we receive some assurance as to whether provision has been made to assist these displaced workers - then we will give the scheme our blessing.

The question of access to the beaches by the public is a matter which I have worked on for years. I am not saying that I am the only member who worked on it. At present I have a Resolution before this House to that effect. While I was a Minister I had to do some work in that respect and, as a result of that, we have got access to the sea at Rockeley Beach. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, you can well realise that I am as interested as any hon. member is in so far as access to the beaches is concerned. But I cannot see any grave danger in so far as the taking away of the right of the people to bathe at this particular point; at this particular point at Sandy Lane there is no existing access to the sea as far as I know, and I think I know the area very well; therefore, the public of Barbados would not miss it.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was at the point where I was saying that speaking from memory - and I have a fairly good working knowledge of the area although I do not represent any of those areas; yet I am a representative of the entire island - there is no public access through the Sandy Lane woods or in the immediate vicinity leading to the beach. As my colleague reminded me, from Paynes Bay right down to Hometown Police Station there is no access to the beach owned by Government. It is true that there are some other landowners who will allow some people to pass over their land and go to the beach. However, I think it would be possible for the Government to acquire some strip of land near by the Hometown Police Station, or in that vicinity or further up the road near to Sandy Lane, so as to provide an access to the beach in that area.

We have no grouse with the Sandy Lane scheme. We feel that it is a good thing; that it is a means of increasing the revenue of the island substantially, and, in such a way whereby some of our bad houses can be repaired, whereby we can have very many more housing schemes and more facilities which the people of Barbados have been longing and looking for over many years.

Sir, I want to make my position perfectly clear. I regard this Resolution as a dangerous one; and one which

should be carefully and skilfully handled. If any hon. member just jumps up and blurts out something, he may be doing something which may do Barbados incalculable harm. Responsible members of this Chamber who wish Barbados well ought to weigh their points carefully and consider what they are going to say very carefully.
4.20 p.m.

I am asking the Reporters to try and report what has been actually said, and not to concoct their stories because they will give a wrong impression and make hon. members appear to be stupid; the Reporters have a way of making people who speak in this House appear as ignoramuses.

I am asking hon. members to weigh carefully the terms of this Resolution; it is a Resolution which has been moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition so as to protect the rights, the jobs, the living conditions and the opportunities given to his constituents in the Northern area; and he is perfectly justified in doing that since they have returned him to this Chamber over the last 21 or 22 years. The hon. member would be lacking in his service to these people if he did otherwise. I think that no misrepresentation should be given to this Resolution at any stage or juncture.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, naturally in an agricultural community like Barbados, any proposal to utilise as many as over 400 acres of land on a tourist project is bound to excite considerable public attention and interest. Mr. Deputy Speaker, for me, the answer to the question as to whether or not this proposal should be supported, hinges mainly on two factors. In the first instance, what does this new proposal mean to the economy of this country? And, secondly, how does it affect the general welfare and living conditions of the people of this island? If these two points can be satisfactorily resolved, well then, I feel that we are on good ground to support the main principle of the proposal. If there is no satisfactory answer to those points, then, of course, the position is entirely different.

The hon. and learned Leader of the Opposition has concerned himself, during most of his contribution to this debate, with answering the question of the effect which the implementation of this proposal is likely to have on the living conditions of the people of this island. He has been concerned with pointing out the possibility of our establishing on the St. James coast a healthy paradise for the millionaires who may have highly undesirable racial views; who may import into this country certain undesirable features of racism; who may attempt, after they have been allowed to come in here, to introduce policies and practices against which we are prone to protest from the implication in South Africa and the Southern States of America. It is therefore first and foremost the duty of members of this House to concern themselves and ensure that there is not the slightest possibility whatsoever of the Sandy Lane project being used as a spearhead for ultra-segregationist practices, or for any further attempt to divide the people of this country in terms of race.

The Government has it in its power to ensure that nothing of this sort takes place. We, on this side of the Table, you can rest assured, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will concern ourselves in this matter to see to it that if this project does become a reality, the ordinary democratic rights and privileges of the people of this country will be respected; that no persons will be allowed to come to the country to infringe upon these rights.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to carry this argument a little further before actually going to the main principle of the proposals, I will say that even although we may be able to make out a case eventually for satisfying the people of this country that this project will redound to the economic benefit of this island, yet still, as I said before, all aspects of the matter and all features of the proposal demand the most careful scrutiny and examination. Speaking for myself, I do not believe that we should permit a diversion of the highway. I think it is wrong in principle to divert a public highway at the request of any group or individual....

At this stage, it now being 4.30 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. DEPUTY Speaker: It is now 4.30 p.m. of the clock and the House will revert to the consideration of Government Business.

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT
(AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the last occasion of Government Business, the hon. junior member for Christ Church was speaking on the second reading of a Bill to amend the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I was speaking on this Bill before the suspension of the sitting, I was trying to introduce into the debate, what I have had the opportunity of saying under Private Members' Business. What I would re-state is this: these amendments are necessary, not only for the highway diversion so that the Sandy Lane project can go on, but that in the near future the Government will wish to straighten many of the dangerous bends which now exist. The only thing of which I am thinking now is that it will be necessary to protect those householders who may have to be sited on disused roads which we may have to maintain as secondary roads; but I am in complete agreement with the amendments for the reasons I have given.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as you will have gathered from the attitude of the hon. senior member for Christ Church and my own attitude today when the first reading of this Bill was moved by the Hon. Minister, we are not in favour of this Bill. Particularly, we are not in favour of it at this time when there is obviously a move to try and rush through this diversion scheme before we have had the opportunity in this Chamber of threshing out the matter of the Sandy Lane diversion.
4.35 p.m.

Now, Sir, I will deal with a few remarks made by the hon. Introducer. He spoke about the importance of the project to the island as a whole; he spoke of the inconvenience however slight to people as a result of it

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is true that I did start to say something along those lines, but Mr. Speaker ruled that that had nothing to do with this Bill; that that matter was already being discussed under Private Members' Business. Mr. Speaker would allow no discussion on it, and I therefore ceased my remarks.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the hon. member indirectly denying or giving the impression that he did not say in his opening remarks "the importance of the project to the island as a whole"? He used those words. I took them down, and I trust the Official Reporter will not allow them to be deleted. He spoke of the "inconvenience however slight"; he spoke of "sentimental objections"; and he remarked that the Government was faced with great difficulty due to unemployment and, "by sheer necessity, we have agreed in principle to support tourism and we are going to co-operate to the utmost with the sponsor of the scheme."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to deal specifically with the Bill in which we are now asked to consider some amendments. In Section 2, Sir, there is nothing very much to quarrel with; that only refers to the definition. The important Sections we propose to amend in the 1945 Act are Section 13 and Section 16. Sub-Section 2 of Section 13 is the one which says:

"Whenever it appears to the Governor-in-Executive Committee for any purpose, and particularly for the giving of a road to church or market to any person who shall be without and shall require one, to alter the course of any highway" and it is proposed to delete the words "rather than to repair such highway" and to substitute the words "or any part thereof".

What should be borne in mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that when this Act was passed in 1945, what the Legis-

lature of that day had in mind was to give the Government power to alter the course of a highway particularly for the purpose of providing a road to church or market. They never had in mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, giving the Governor-in-Executive Committee wide power to please any millionaire, to please any segregationist, to satisfy any person with more money and tricks than brains.

Then you have the other Section 16 which is proposed to be amended. This is the Section which says:

"If it shall happen that in the laying out of a new road any old road be abandoned, it shall be lawful for the owner of the land through which the said old road may pass to resume the possession of the same on payment into the Public Treasury of such sum as the jury assessing the value of the new road shall consider to be the value of the land of such old road."

It is proposed to amend that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, so that it will read:

"If it shall happen that in the laying out of a new road any old road or any part thereof be abandoned, it shall be lawful for the owner of the land through which the said old road or said part thereof may pass to take the exclusive possession of the same at any time after the Governor-in-Executive Committee having caused to be published in the *Official Gazette* and a newspaper of this Island a notice declaring the said old road or said part thereof to have been abandoned shall have given him permission so to do; and in granting such permission, the Governor-in-Executive Committee may if he shall think fit require such owner to pay into the Public Treasury such sum to be determined in default of agreement by arbitration as shall be considered to be the value of the land of such old road or part thereof".

In other words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is clearly *a propos* to a scheme which is very much before the public eye at the moment; and this if it passes, will result in a notice in the *Official Gazette* and a notice in a newspaper of this island declaring the said old road, whether it is Sandy Lane Road or whatever road it is, to be abandoned, and the Governor-in-Executive Committee may require the owner to pay into the Public Treasury such sum as the Governor-in-Executive Committee determines.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as to the sum of money, the sponsor of this scheme seems to have friends in high places in this island. Let me tell them that, so far as the land in that part of the island is concerned, no one offers land there for sale at a price less than \$5 per square foot. In Derricks and Paynes Bay the minimum is \$2 per square foot; and the higher up you go the greater the price and certainly not less than \$5 per square foot.

If this amendment passes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Governor-in-Executive Committee may, if he shall think fit, require such owner to pay a sum of money into the Public Treasury. It is not the duty of the Government, in the interest of the Public Treasury and the taxpayers of this island, to allow this absolutely superlative concession with this particular scheme, whereby those who love segregation will have their absolutely golden opportunity to practise it in this little colony of their own, this little island within the island of Barbados.
4.45 p.m.

If these people are going to be allowed to have this road for themselves and no person can use it but themselves, let them be required to pay into the Public Treasury a substantial sum for it; let them pay a sum which they the sponsors of the particular scheme would require to be paid to them if they were selling it. Let them pay what they would make others pay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as has been indicated by the hon. senior member for Christ Church earlier this morning, we are not supporting this Bill. The Objects and Reasons state that this Bill seeks to clarify the provisions of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945, relat-

ing to the alteration of highways under the control of the Director of Highways and Transport, and to ensure that the public is informed in cases where the construction of a new road results in an old road or any part thereof being abandoned. The opportunity has also been taken to amend section two of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945 so as to correct two minor defects in that section.

I have no objection to the minor amendments to section two; but, obviously, that is not the reason for this amending Bill before us today. The reason clearly is because they wanted to interfere with Section 13 in order to allow something to take place, something that is presently uppermost in the public view. It is to provide the opportunity of putting a small publication in the *Official Gazette*, which nobody reads, and a newspaper of the Island; and I would not be surprised if the sponsor of this scheme would advertise in the newspaper which would be dear to his heart, a paper which is read by fewer people yet. I would not be surprised if this advertisement appears in the *Official Gazette* and the *Beacon* newspaper that this old road has been abandoned and a new road substituted.

I do not know if any figure has been considered in respect of the abandoned roadway. I do not know whether you would pay the same price as is paid for land immediately adjacent; but, certainly, as I have said, there is no justification for attempting to rush through this Bill today. We received our papers on Saturday, and we had our Order Paper fixed with other matters, seven of which we felt would reasonably be dealt with in the course of today's meeting. Why it has been felt that this matter should receive priority today and be rushed through all its stages? Just, obviously, to satisfy a particular individual or a small group of individuals? That passes all understanding.

I have no sympathy with it. I see no reason why it should receive my support. As I have said, there is nothing wrong with the definitive section - section two - but that is not the reason why this Bill has been rushed through today.

I think this is the appropriate stage, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for me to move that further consideration of this Bill be now postponed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second the motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We on this side of the House do regard it, to say the least, highly improper that there should appear to be this unholy haste on the part of the Government. Does the Government want to make the proponents of the particular scheme feel that the very laws will readily be altered merely to fit in with the implementation of this scheme? For our part, we view very seriously the attempt to abandon the old road and to substitute another road which has given rise to this amendment to the Highways and Transport Act.

Under general circumstances, there might be wholesale support on this side of the Table for the amendments to this Bill; but, in the special circumstances which have given rise to them, we feel justified in viewing the matter with a certain amount of misapprehension.

The diversion of a highway should be approached by any Government with the utmost concern. In the particular instance under reference, or to which I have said earlier has given rise to this amendment, the Government should not view lightly the proposal to deny the public the use, perhaps, of what is the most beautiful piece of highway in the island merely at the request of private individuals even under the guise of promoting the national economy.

The Objects and Reasons of the Bill emphasised that it seeks to clarify certain provisions under the old Act and to ensure that the public is informed in cases where the construction of a new road results in an old road or any part thereof being abandoned. In other words, this is to compel the Government legally, according to the significant part of the Objects and Reasons, to notify the public when the old Sandy Lane Road has been abandoned and the new road comes into use.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this power in the hands of the Government, naturally, would have received our support. None of us would be so silly as not to want to make it public property when a road is no longer in public use. Notification of its disuse is normal courtesy; but since, as I have said, this Bill is so inseparably associated with a particular proposal, naturally we have to hesitate in giving sanction to this proposal. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if there were no proposal to abandon the old part of that road at Sandy Lane and substitute another, there would be no reason for this Bill coming here.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: For the benefit of the hon. member, this particular Bill is not seeking to abandon an old part of Sandy Lane Road and to substitute another.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I did not say so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You mentioned Sandy Lane Road.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I said was this: We venture to suggest that if there was not before the country a scheme to abandon the old Sandy Lane Road and to substitute another, this Bill might not have been before the House today. I am of the opinion that this suggestion is well founded. I say that, normally, for our part, to abandon an old road, it is the natural obligation of the Government by the medium of public expression, to inform the public of its intention so to do.
4.55 p.m.

Any proposal to abandon an old road should spring from an attempt to facilitate the travelling public; or, if it became dangerous to use that part of the old road which it is proposed to abandon or have an alternative means of transport provided, then it should be more readily accessible or more convenient to the travelling public. On the other hand, if the proposal to abandon an old road or any part of it, springs from an attempt to deprive the public of well established rights to highways or parts of highways which it is essentially desirable to retain for public use, and to which the access of the public should not be denied, then any such proposal is to be strongly contested.

Let us assume, merely for the sake of an illustration, that this proposal springs from the desire for a part of the Sandy Lane road; we maintain that any such proposal would not be justified. There is no danger to the public involved in the utilisation of the existing Sandy Lane road; its continual utilisation is not fraught with any danger whatsoever. On the contrary, it is highly desirable that the use of this road should be retained.

In some parts of the world, more especially in the Iberian Peninsula of Spain and Portugal, people are not allowed to build on the sea side of the road at all; all the construction which has been done has been done on the opposite side of the sea in order to retain the beauty of the sea-scape, and also to satisfy the aesthetic desire of the travelling public. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have been told by one of my colleagues that at Copa Cabana all the hotels are on the land side.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I should like to inform the hon. member that we are dealing with an amendment to the Department of Highways and Transport Act, not with hotels. The hon. member is dealing with hotels and beaches which are not included in this Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not doing anything of the kind. I am mentioning a hypothetical case. I am suggesting that, at any time that the Government wants to abandon an old road and substitute another for it, the public should be informed.

What I am saying is that if this Bill springs from the proposal to abandon part of the Sandy Lane road then it is not justified. On all sides it has been admitted that that road is one of the most beautiful of the roads of this island, at least the area through which it passes is beautiful; and,

for Your Honour's information, I am saying that in some parts of the world people are not allowed to build on the seaside at all.

The hon. Introducer of this Bill has given no reason to explain the immediate urgency of the Bill, or why it has become so important to amend this Act; we have not been given any reasonable explanation; therefore we are led to surmise that the immediate reason for this Bill is to deal with the Sandy Lane proposal.

I welcome these hotels in any part of the island, St. James, St. Peter, St. Lucy on any coast at all; but I do not see why the public utilisation of the island should be so completely changed merely to satisfy the people who want to underwrite hotels. We owe the people of this island a right far and above that of satisfying the investors, or of permitting private conversion. There are seven hotels on the land side at Hastings ----

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is dealing with hotels which are not included in this Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have given my reason for so doing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member will have to confine himself to this Bill; he will have his opportunity to deal with the Sandy Lane Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am dealing with this Bill; that is what I am doing. I was saying that in abandoning an old road, more especially denying the public the use of an old road - I say that this is a hypothetical case - which has been in use for centuries should be a matter undertaken by the Government very carefully.

What I want to inform the Government of is this: the Government can support tourism and provide all the facilities for expanding tourism, as we do, without being fooled into the belief that, in order to promote tourism, you must allow people or encourage people to build on the sea side. That is not entirely necessary.
5.00 p.m.

I am sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you, as well as those of us on this side of the House, are most definitely concerned with preserving all the rights, all the privileges and what we can for the people of this island. In so doing it is our right to preserve the democratic tradition, and the political rights, and to promote their general welfare. Perhaps, the hon. member on my right, the hon. junior member for St. John, could speak with more authority on this than I can. He should be able to tell the House that, in almost all parts of the world, prohibition of public use of highways is undertaken only after the most serious consideration.

Certainly not in my time and certainly not in your time has there been any attempt to deny the usage of any highway or part of a highway merely at the request of private individuals. Why the unholy haste for this Bill? Why is it so important today the 7th July? We got this Bill by special delivery; it was not given notice of last week. What special circumstances have arisen to make of such importance and such immediate urgency the giving of legal power to clarify certain provisions of the old Highway Act and to make it necessary to publish the fact that part of the road has been abandoned? Is the country at War? Are we being invaded or something? Would any part of the Highways programme suffer if this Bill is not pushed through today?

There is nothing at all in the road programme before the country which makes these amendments important today; and, since it cannot be denied that they are associated with hotel proposals, the least that the Government should do in common decency is to await the putting of this Bill before the Legislature for its sanction until such time as the issues involved in the hotel proposals have been finally threshed out.

All the embodiment of wisdom and public interest are not vested on that side of the Chamber. We have, I

should say, more at heart the interest of the people of this island than they have. We have something to contribute to these hotel proposals, and our points of view should be heard. There should be more general clarification of the public mind on the matter; and since this Bill on the face of it is completely innocuous - it involves no far-reaching principle and its passing under normal circumstances can by no means be regarded as any matter of priority for the Government - there can be no reasons whatever, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in not agreeing to its postponement for further consideration.

I am quite prepared, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to accord the power vested in the Government in the Bill under normal circumstances; but, at this stage, it is giving the Government power to proceed along lines which have not received the complete sanction of the complete public as yet; it is giving the Government power to proceed in a direction in which, in our opinion, all the necessary safeguards have not been established; and more than that, Sir, it is making the sponsors of certain schemes believe that the entire machinery of Government is at their disposal for anything they want done; that the Government can be relied upon to ride rough-shod over the feelings of the public and the Opposition in this matter, because their opinion is like the laws of the Medes and Persians which cannot be changed.

All the wisdom and all the knowledge which should be utilised in going about these schemes are not vested in them. I am prepared, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to support the motion for further postponement.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was quite surprised when this Bill was specially circulated and we were informed by a memorandum, dated 3rd July, that the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing intended to ask leave to deal with this Bill in all its stages at the next meeting of the House on Tuesday, 7th July, 1959.

Now, Sir, the hon. member who has just sat down has raised some very interesting points, interesting not only from the point of view of the academic content of what he has said, but interesting from the point of view of what are the public and general rights of the inhabitants of this island. The hon. member queried whether some invasion had taken place, what new emergency had arisen which would cause us to leave all the other matters of more pressing importance such as old age pensions, economic development and planning, finding work for the 26,000 unemployed people in this island, to introduce a Bill of this kind on this occasion precipitously and at such short notice.
5.05 p.m.

But there is an invasion, Mr. Deputy Speaker; it is an invasion of the public and general rights of the citizens of Barbados both by outsiders and fifth columnists within the gate. That is how I see it.

I do not agree that there is any necessity for this Bill. Even if this was a Bill of some importance, the provisions for amendments to the Highways and Transport Act of 1945 are not adequate to deal with the emergency which appears to now confront the members of the Government Party. It is not my business, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to point out the defects of the drafting of this Bill; but, in referring to such defects, I will only be serving notice on the general public whose rights may be invaded as to what residual rights do remain with them.

The first thing is this. The Objects and Reasons to the Bill say that this Bill seeks to clarify the provisions of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945, relating to the alteration of highways under control of the Director of Highways and Transport and to ensure that the public is informed in case where the construction of a new road results in an old road or any part thereof being abandoned.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want particularly to draw your attention to the words "being abandoned."

The Objects and Reasons go on to say that the oppor-

tunity has also been taken to amend section two of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945, so as to correct two minor defects in that section.

Now, the first fallacy which I want to draw to your attention is that there are no defects in the Act of 1945 at all, because the Act of 1945 has no hypocritical powers. Actually, what I want to say is that we had at that time a former legal adviser to the Dominions Office, who was an eminent legal authority and luminary in the United Kingdom as the Officer administering the colony of this Island. I refer to Sir Grattan Bushe. We also had, at that time, as Attorney General of this Island, a person who had been relentless in his pursuit of accuracy in drafting; and anyone who is acquainted with the legislation of this Island, contrasting the Act of 1945 relating to Highways and Transport with the original Highways Act of 1900, would realise that there is nothing inaccurate or defective in that of the 1945 Act at all. I say that, not because I am defending anyone, but because there is a certain amount of hypocrisy in the Objects and Reasons of this Bill, whoever is responsible for the hypocrisy.

So eager was the Government to ingratiate itself with some private person or group of persons, they did not had the time to look up the Laws of Barbados and find out the legislation which dealt with how the roads had to be maintained. To suggest that there is a defect would also be implying that the legislation which we have had for the last 59 years was defective; of course, it all depends on what you mean by defective—because, a man who does not want to see a certain thing, may have a defective vision towards that thing. Certain people may find legislation defective or repugnant because that legislation, in some way or the other, limits their medium; or it may be because that legislation is hostile to their peculiar financial interest. Therefore, if the Government means defective in that particular sense, I would accept that these Acts are defective.

We have been operating under the provisions of these two Acts - the Highways Act of 1900 and the Highways and Transport Act of 1945 - and I say this without fear of contradiction; there has never been in this Island of Barbados, in the Privy Council, in the West Indian Court of Appeal or the Federal Court of Appeal, any single case in the last 59 years in which a defect of the particular class which they now consider to be defective has ever been raised as an issue. I can only speak, of course, within the limits of my own experience; but from the point of view of research, I have been unable to find a single person who is conscious of such defects having been raised as a substantial issue in any Court of Law.

Wherein is this legislation defective? I will try to point out what they treat as defective. The first thing which they have dealt with is the Interpretation Clause, which is Section 2 of the Act of 1945. In the Interpretation Clause they have deleted from the definition of the expression "Director" appearing therein the words "appointed under the provisions of this Act." The expression "Director" means the Director of Highways and Transport. Is that worthwhile coming into the House of Assembly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to waste the time of the House and to use up paper? I understand that the Government Printery is hard-pressed at the moment. Is that something which should necessitate a special circular being sent to members of the House, something necessary for leave to be granted to deal with throughout all its stages today? We have Resolutions on the Order Paper dealing with the Civil Establishment for a considerable time to be considered. The only reason why this Act is offensive is because we have clarifications in the Civil Establishment Act.

The next definition they are taking out is in the last definition of the expression "highways to which this Act applies". They are asking to delete after the word "to" in line three thereof all the words to the end of the definition and to substitute the following words "take control of and to construct, reconstruct, repair and maintain in repair." That expression now means "all highways which by Section 4 of this Act, the Director is authorised and

required to take control of and to construct, reconstruct, repair and maintain in repair." Whereas before, by the 1945 Act, the Director was empowered mainly to maintain and repair roads, they are now saying that the Director has power to take control of and to construct, reconstruct, repair and maintain in repair.
5.15 p.m.

Let us see quite externally what are the specifications in the Schedule to the Act which sets out all the highways which were given on a plan which accompanied the Report of Mr. Ragnor in 1935 setting out all the highways of Barbados. This is nothing to do with the neglected roads, because all the highways are set out in this Act.

It appears to me that, if a private person wanted to use the Government's equipment to reconstruct a portion of a highway under the Act, he could not get the authority to do so. Is the reason and purpose of the amendment which the Minister is now seeking to introduce, to make it possible for the taxpayers' implements and equipment and time to be devoted to the construction of private works? I would like to get that clear, because that is how it appears to me. They are now inserting the words "take control of and to construct, reconstruct, repair and maintain in repair." These words have been inserted in the definition of Section 2 of this Bill. As the 1945 Act reads now in Part I, the last paragraph on page 65 of the Laws of Barbados, if you look at it, you will find this: "the expression 'highways to which this Act applies' means all highways which, by section four of this Act, the Director is authorised and required to and maintain in repair." Now that I have repeated it a little more slowly it will be properly digested. You will see that the definition of "highways" does not include any road which the Director may build for the first time. All the highways are set out in that Plan of Mr. Ragnor and delineated since 1935.

There is another snag which I want to draw to Your Honour's attention. The amendments in Section 3 and the amendments in Section 4 of this Bill, particularly in Section 3, are merely consequential because they have only inserted in Section 3 these words: "or any part thereof". All of this relates to a particular situation that the Government is now dealing with at the instigation probably of private lobbyists; it does not relate to the roads in St. Andrew or in St. Joseph or anywhere else where there may be a sudden landslide which would create an emergency in the transport system. This Section 13 Subsection (2) of the Act which is now being amended by Section 3 of this Bill before it was amended read as follows:-

"Whenever it appears to the Governor-in-Executive Committee" - I believe that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has already referred to this Section - "desirable for any purpose, and particularly for the giving of a road to church or market to any person who shall be without and shall require one, to alter the course of any highway to which this Act applies rather than to repair such highway....."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are unfortunate enough to represent a parish which has suffered more by the neglect of the Highway Authorities than any other parish of this island with the exception, perhaps, of St. Andrew. I believe in that particular region of the island there is the Turner's Hall district which has been crying out for repairs, and which has been closed to the public for a very long period of time. I remember that on several occasions you introduced question after question about Joes River road going towards the Cambridge and Cattlewash District, and it has only been done within the past 18 months or two years; but for a long period of years inhabitants of that district were disconnected by the sliding of roads as a result of heavy rainfall and matters of that kind. Under the existing Highways and Transport Act, and it was a very good provision, the engineers could go and visit the location, such as the one about which you have talked so frequently on the floor of this House, and decide that the road was badly sited, and you would always continue to have washing away of plantations and washing away of bridges if the road remained as it was. They would have no authority to

divert the road at all. This is a matter of a public and general right which affects every inhabitant of this island. The authority was given by Section 13 subsection (2) of the Act in these specific words: "Whenever it appears to the Governor-in-Executive desirable for any purpose..."

They did not have to build luxury hotels and gambling casinos, but it was the simple purpose affecting the day to day existence of the humble citizen and particularly for giving a road to church or market to any person who shall be without one and who shall require one. Whenever it appears to the Governor-in-Executive Committee desirable to alter the course of any highway to which this Act applies rather than to repair such highway, in every such case the Governor-in-Executive Committee is authorised to proceed to lay out and allot such highway.

5.25 p.m.

Now, Sir, the very fact that the Legislature in its wisdom gave the Governor-in-Executive Committee that power, that power could only be exercised in accordance with the provisions of the Act; and it means, by implication, that neither the Governor-in-Executive Committee, the Director of the Department of Highways and Transport nor the Commissioners of Highways of the other parishes of this island by common Law would have had power to make any such diversion of a highway or road in this island unless under the specific sanction of the provisions of the two Acts, the Highways Act and the Highways and Transport Act, 1945. That is abundantly clear; and it also means that when the Governor-in-Executive Committee had to exercise its mind as to the diversion of such a road, the only consideration would be such as you would find existing in your particular constituency or in the parish of St. Andrew, that it would be more profitable or more feasible to divert a road rather than to repair the existing road.

In other words, Sir, it is clear to me that under the existing Law in Barbados the Governor-in-Executive Committee believe that self-government means licence to kill people and do what they like, to starve them and all that kind of thing. It does not mean that, because you have a Constitution and Laws, you must not have the Rules by which society is supposed to be regulated; otherwise, it would be tantamount to a special anarchy in this island home of ours. Bear in mind that the British Cabinet is still circumscribed by those principles which we call the rule of Law. You cannot today impeach a Minister of the Crown for any Act which he does under the guise of public authority; yet his decision or actions may remain unenforceable by declaration of the Court of Chancery in England; and the position is exactly the same in Barbados, except that we can go one step higher, to the Privy Council if necessary, when there is an invasion of the public rights.

The Act, as it at present stands before it is butchered, reads "to alter the course of any highway to which this Act applies rather than to repair such highway" which is a restriction on the members of the Executive Committee to interfere with the existing road; and, instead of the words "rather than to repair such highway", they are now substituting the words "or any part thereof", so that the whole sentence would read "whenever it appears to the Governor-in-Executive Committee desirable for any purpose and particularly for the giving of a road to church or market to any person who shall be without and shall require one, to alter the course of any highway to which this Act applies or any part thereof....."

The whole always includes the part; and no draughtsman who was not being dishonest, or had a dishonest prompting or direction, would need to put anything like that in an Act; because, if you have power to do the whole, you have power to do the part of it. It does not mean, if you found that a road going down Melvin's Hill had slipped away 100 yards and somebody's cowpen was on your land as has frequently happened in your constituency, or if you woke up and found your breadfruit tree on the next door neighbour's land or on Mount Wilton's Plantation - that has happened - that the Director, in order to repair that portion of the road on to which your land may have

slipped, has got to go from Bridgetown from Nelson's Monument to Cattlewash and divert the whole road; because, the power to divert the whole of it would give him the power to divert part; so why does the draughtsman have to put in "or any part thereof"? What they are doing is emasculating Section 13 of the Act to suit the purpose of some private individual.

I cannot help making that statement; if they can tell me what great matter of public interest and moment has now arisen that, apart from some private lobbying, causes them to do that kind of thing, I would remain silent for the rest of this debate. What great catastrophe has overtaken the inhabitants of the parish of St. Andrew and the parish of St. Joseph? I do not know. I have not heard that the road at Turners Hall is going to be repaired; I have not heard that the East Coast Road project is going to be started upon; nobody in this island has heard the slightest rumour that these things which ought to be done are about to be done.

Now, Sir, I will go on. Section 4 says that they are amending Section 16 of the principal Act by inserting immediately after the word "road" where it appears for the second time in line 2 "or any part thereof", and then by deleting therefrom all the words appearing after the word "road" in line 3 to the end of the Section and substituting therefor the following words:

"Or said part thereof may pass to take the exclusive possession of the same at any time after the Governor-in-Executive having caused to be published in the *Official Gazette* and a newspaper of this Island a notice declaring the said old road or said part thereof to have been abandoned shall have given him permission so to do; and in granting such permission, the Governor-in-Executive Committee may, if he shall think fit require such owner to pay into the Public Treasury such sum to be determined in default of agreement by arbitration as shall be considered to be the value of the land of such old road or part thereof."

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Section 16 of the original Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945 is a very short Section. All it says is "if it shall happen that in the laying out of a new road any old road be abandoned" and at this point they are inserting the words "or any part thereof" - meaning Sandy Lane, I understand the Minister said - "it shall be lawful for the owner of the land through which the said old road may pass to resume the possession of the same on payment into the Public Treasury of such sum as the Jury assessing the value of the new road shall consider to be the value of the land of such old road."

Would you believe it, Sir, that they have inserted the words that when a new road is laid out and any old road or part thereof be abandoned "it shall be lawful for the owner of the land through which the said old road or said part thereof may pass to take the exclusive possession of the same at any time after the Governor-in-Executive Committee having caused to be published in the *Official Gazette* and a newspaper of this island a notice declaring the said old road or said part thereof to have been abandoned"? It does not now depend on the same conditions which existed in Section 16; it depends now merely on the Governor-in-Executive Committee publishing in the *Official Gazette* that the old road has been abandoned.

5.35 p.m.

It goes on to say that the owner of the land, through which the said old road may pass, can take exclusive possession of the same at any time after the Governor-in-Executive Committee having caused to be published in the *Official Gazette* and a newspaper of this island a notice declaring the said old road or part thereof to have been abandoned shall have given him permission to do so; and in granting such permission, the Governor-in-Executive Committee may, if he shall think fit, require such owner to pay into the Public Treasury such sum to be determined in default of agreement by arbitration as shall be considered to be the value of the land of such old road or part thereof.

Under the old Act, the person taking over this old abandoned road, as they called it, had an obligation. That per-

"Whenever it appears to the Governor-in-Executive Committee desirable for any purpose, and particularly for the giving of a road to church or market" does not mean giving a road to a church or market, but particularly for the giving of a road to church or market. The hon. member says that "purpose" cannot apply to hotels, but could only apply to a simple thing as a church or market. Could anybody read that into this Clause when you have the words "for any purpose"? 6.05 p.m.

Mr. TALMA: If the Hon. Minister would consult his legal advisers, they would interpret to him that these words are used in that way; that is, the term *Eiusdem Generis* applies. They do not carry you any further. They mean what is of the same class.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: We have more legal experts now! The hon. member said "if I consult my legal advisers". All of this which I have given is legal advice.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker,...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr. TALMA: I rise on a point of order. I am trying to explain that what he is saying is just the reverse of the truth. He does not know what is the meaning of *Eiusdem Generis*.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am grateful to the hon. member but I am quoting legal advice. All that they say is that the particular clause is ambiguous. They say that the words "the Director is authorised and required to and maintain in repair" create a defect. It is in order to correct that seeming ambiguity that we come in here with this amendment.

It is amazing, sometimes, to have the arguments which we hear coming from the other side. Take the speech of the last hon. member who spoke. Legal Draughtsmen say that it could be for any purpose whatsoever, whether it is for a hotel, a church, or a market, or whether it comes to an old road or anything at all. Hon. members of the Opposition are now saying that the Legal Draughtsmen do not know anything, and that their own interpretation is correct. We are sticking to the opinion our legal advisers gave, and that is what this Bill attempts to do.

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

AYES: Messrs. CORBIN, TALMA, BARROW, CRAWFORD and BRANCKER - 5

NOES: Mr. BRYAN, Hon'bles Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, D. D. GARNER, R. G. MAPP, L. St.A. THORNE, F. E. MILLER, Messrs. SEARLES, HOLDER, STRAUGHN and Mrs. BOURNE - 10

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

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—

2. Section two of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945, hereinafter referred to as the principal Act, is hereby amended as follows:—

- (a) by deleting from the definition of the expression "Director" appearing therein the words "appointed under the provisions of this Act"; and
- (b) by deleting from the definition of the expression "highways to which this Act applies" appearing

therein all the words appearing after the word "to" in line three thereof to the end of the definition and by substituting therefor the following words.....

"take control of and to construct, reconstruct, repair and maintain in repair."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether, now that the power of the Director is extended to the control of and to construct, reconstruct, repair and maintain in repair, it is really necessary to do so. During the course of the second reading, I made certain observations and the Hon. Minister seemed to want to stir up some kind of feud between his legal advisers and myself. They are no threat to me; therefore, you will see that he is wasting his time.

We on this side of the Table looked at it in this way. It is for the Government to tell the Legal Draughtsmen what they want and, therefore, it must be taken that the Legal Draughtsmen have done what the Government desires to have done in this case. It is the Legal Draughtsmen who put into legal language what the policy of the Government is. The Ministers have a habit which has been implied by the Hon. Minister of Communications himself, whenever there is a misunderstanding, of coming in here and throwing the fault on their legal advisers which I say cannot be constitutionally correct. The legal advisers are not the policy making arms of the Government; the Cabinet is that.

If the Minister assures me that this thing is what he wants, then I say that you better get rid of some of these legal advisers because they are frustrating the wishes of the Cabinet. I doubt very much whether we want to extend this power to the Director of Highways and Transport as to the taking of control and to construct, reconstruct, repair and maintain in repair all the highways in this island.

I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention that highways are still specified in the first schedule of the Act of 1945. You will find that on page 87 of the 1945 Laws of Barbados. Any consequential amendment arising out of this amendment to this Clause has been made to accommodate the reconstruction or construction of new highways. 6.15 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I would agree with the hon. member if it were that this change cuts across any policy which we are seeking to bring about, or any policy which we had in mind. The particular Section of the Principal Act says: "The expression 'highways to which this Act applies' means all highways which, by Section 4 of this Act, the Director is authorised and required to and maintain in repair." The change which I have brought in today is to repeal Section 4. The present definition does not do that; the present definition refers to Section 4 and it states: "take control of and to construct, reconstruct, repair and maintain in repair."

If hon. members will refer to Section 4 they will see what the Director has to do. He has to take control of and to construct, reconstruct, repair and maintain in repair highways, portions of highways and roads. We have gone further and referred to the very words in Section 4.

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

Clauses 3 and 4 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

POST OFFICE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume debate on the second reading of a Bill to amend the Post Office Act, 1911. On the last occasion when this Bill was under consideration, the hon. senior member for Christ Church was speaking.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion when this Bill was engaging the attention of this Chamber, I expressed my general agreement with the principle of the Bill, but I attempted to bring to the attention of the House certain dangers which may be involved in the case of errors or mistakes which might be made in the transmission of these messages by the Post Office Clerk to the Officer of Cable and Wireless Limited.

It is proposed that officers of the several Post Offices will receive messages and will telephone the contents of these messages to be telegraphed by Cable and Wireless at St Lawrence. The operator there will telephone back to the officer at the Post Office the number of words and the charge, so as to enable the officer to collect a fee from the sender of the message and keep a proper record of the transactions. That is the general principle.

While I am in agreement with that general principle, I was on the point, on the last occasion, of explaining to the appropriate Minister the danger which might arise owing to a misunderstanding by telephone, or it may be some mistake or misrepresentation which might be made. It is very dangerous to take messages by telephone. I was quoting a simple instance of some important message which may be transmitted by some businessman in Bridgetown whereby he might be involving in sale one half of the sugar crop. Having got word as to the sale of sugar, at the appropriate time a message might be rushed through, and it might be misunderstood by the Post Office Clerk; or it may be a simple order mentioning three thousand bags of rice when it may be only a question of one thousand bags. The hon. member will realise that mistakes over the telephone are quite possible and highly probable to be made.

I was enquiring from the Minister who would be liable in the case of any misunderstanding which may take place, whether it is by way of negligence or otherwise. Would it be the Government's Post Office Clerk or the Clerk of Cable and Wireless? There is no provision to deal with that particular aspect of the matter.

It is true that attention has been paid by the Penalty Clause in Clause 5 of the Bill whereby penalties for disclosing the contents of, or delaying the forwarding of messages to be sent by telegram are set out. In the latter part of Clause 5, 43 A in the last few lines of the Clause it says this: "If any such officer detains or delays or procures or suffers to be detained or delayed, without reasonable excuse, the forwarding of such message to Cable and Wireless (West Indies) Limited he shall be guilty of an offence and liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding \$100.00 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two months or to both such fine and imprisonment."

That is in the case of an officer disclosing the contents of the cable or delaying it.
6.25 p.m.

The point which I have been attempting to bring to the attention of this House has not been covered. I am hoping that the Minister will look into this matter and see what the Crown Law Officers will advise him on this point. As the Bill stands at present, in the case of any misrepresentation or misunderstanding arising between the Post Office Clerk and the Wireless Clerk as to the precise terms of the message, there is no knowing who will be ultimately responsible; and it may be a good thing, Sir, if an additional Clause were here inserted.

I know the Minister will not want to do it now, or will not want to postpone the Bill, but an amendment should be brought down whereby these messages should actually be sent on in writing so as to provide some sort of protection for the Government and for the Post Office Clerk in particular.

This will entail, as we see, an increase in the staff of the Post Offices or at least in the General Post Office. To expect a junior in the Service to take important telegraphic messages and telegrams for transmission, and to expose himself to this liability, would be asking too much. I am hoping that the Post Office authorities will see to it that a Senior Clerk in the Government Service or someone who is receiving adequate remuneration will be called on to perform these duties.

The Bill generally, Sir, is a means of facilitating the public; but I see great danger involved, and I see great risks and great pitfalls for the employees of the Post Office in particular.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is desirous of replying if no other hon. member wished to join this debate.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I think hon. members of the Opposition are worried as to one or two points of administration, so to speak.

As regards the last point raised by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, I have enquired into that and, apparently, Sir, no responsibility for loss or any other mishaps to which he drew attention would fall on either the Government or Cable and Wireless Limited itself.

I am told that all Cable Exchange Offices throughout the world operate under the International Communications Convention; and, apparently, it is an accepted convention by all these Exchange Offices that that is one condition of the convention, and these conditions are printed at the back of each telegram form.

It is just like insurance policies where you sign the policy and you see a lot of fine print which you do not understand; and, if something happens, you discover that there is something there which slipped you and it necessitates legal people to tell you that the Company is not responsible after you have signed. As a matter of fact, a cable from the Premier of Barbados to the Premier of Trinidad went astray; but it may be more serious than that. Nevertheless when the Premier signed that cable, he signed his name whether or not he knew it to conditions which read as follows:-

"Neither the Company nor any Telegraph Company, or Government Telegraph Administration, by whom this telegram is or would in the ordinary course of the telegraphic service be forwarded, nor any of their respective officers or servants shall be liable to make compensation for any loss, injury or damage arising or resulting from non-transmission or non-delivery of the telegram, or delay or error or omission in the transmission or delivery thereof, through whatever cause such non-transmission, non-delivery, delay, error, or omission shall have occurred even though occasioned by the neglect or default of such Company or Administration or any officer or servant in their employ.

The above mentioned conditions also apply to telegrams tendered to or delivered by the Company by telephone, over a private line, or by any other means whatsoever."

All that is printed on the back of the Cable and Wireless form. Then you have in fine print "I request that the above telegram may be forwarded subject to the conditions printed on back of this form by which I agree to be bound."

The hon. senior member for St. Philip talked about a recent case. I do not think that he should take that seriously. (Mr. CRAWFORD: What about the St. Lucia Government case?) I do not know anything about that.

Now, Sir, I think the hon. senior member for St. Philip raised the point about having to telephone from the Post Office to the Cable and Wireless Office, and the operator telephoning back the rates and charges. I have raised that question. That has been a condition called for by the Cable and Wireless people out of an abundance of caution, for the simple reason that you have to be very careful. Their explanation is that they take weeks and weeks to train a person expertly. They must know certain codes by which to transmit the cable; there are three different sets of cables and charges. All these things will have to be taken into consideration, so it is a matter of check and re-check.
6.35 p.m.

As a matter of fact, when the message is put through to the Cable and Wireless, there is another Clerk along with the Clerk who receives the message to check with him. They do not rely on the whims and fancies of one officer. They have to be very careful. As the hon. member has said, there seems to be that there is this double process. However, those are the explanations to the points raised by hon. members on the other side.

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

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—

2. The Post Office Act, 1911, hereinafter referred to as the principal Act, is hereby amended by inserting immediately after section eight thereof the following new section to be numbered "8 A" --

8 A. At the General Post Office and such branch post offices and receiving houses as the Postmaster General may from time to time by notice published in the Official Gazette appoint, messages may, subject to the provisions of regulations made under this Act, be received from any person within the Island for transmission by telegram by Cable and Wireless (West Indies) Limited to persons outside of the Island."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, what does the Minister think of the staff at the Post Offices? Is it proposed to employ special Clerks at the Post Office to handle these telegrams, or is it expected that the Clerks there would be able to handle this work in conjunction with their present duties? It seems to me that there may be considerable volume of this business and special telegraph clerks may have to be attached to the Post Office. I cannot see the ordinary staff would be sufficient to cope with these additional duties.

Then there is the question of compensation by the Cable and Wireless Company for the services rendered. Perhaps the Hon. Minister would be in a position to tell us what part of the fees collected by the Government would accrue to the Government, or whether the service is free to the Company or what is the general financial position? If it is a question of additional staff being necessary, then the question of additional compensation arises on the part of the company to the Government.

We could not be expected to employ additional staff at the Post Office to handle this work and to pay them sal-

ary, pension rights and what not without compensation. Has the Cable and Wireless Company Limited taken the view that the telegrams would have to come to them anyhow, therefore, they are not going to give the Government any compensation for the service? Or, has the Government taken the view that they are rendering the public a service and they are prepared to pay for the additional charges out of the general revenue? Or, is the Government accepting the view that, although they want to render the public a service, they still want to be paid by the company for rendering this service?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, it is an undisputed fact that the greatest number of calls would be in the districts of Hastings and Worthing and Bridgetown, that is, at the Central Post Office. So far as the other District Post Offices are concerned, there would be but a few calls. I cannot tell the hon. member definitely that we would have to increase the staff at these post offices. We will have to watch it.

I am sorry that I did not say this in my introductory speech. We have agreed to a fixed fee of twelve cents per message. It is not a free public service, so to speak.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Is this fee going to be paid by the sender of the message?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: It is going to be paid by Cable and Wireless Limited. I do not think that they have the authority to pass it on to the sender. As hon. members know, they operate on fixed rates. That is the fee which we are charging them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I rather feel that the fee should be fixed on a sliding scale. A message may cost \$5.00 or \$10 but the Government is going to get the same fixed rate for a \$1.00 message as they get for a \$10 message. There is no reason why we should accept a twelve cents fee for a \$10 - cable and the same twelve cents fee for a 4/- or 5/- cable which, perhaps, may be going to one of the neighbouring islands. However you look at it, Sir, we are saving them some extra work and we should be properly compensated for it.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, both parties have agreed in the light of experience to a fixed rate of twelve cents per message. However, I will keep the hon. member's suggestion in mind. In fact, that suggestion did occur to us too.

However, it is not facilitating only the accommodation of Cable and Wireless Limited; it is facilitating the public and preventing members of the public from travelling, say, from St. Lucy to St. Lawrence Cable Office. It may be some person who lives in St. Lucy who wants you to send a Cable to England with respect to some person's death.

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

6.45 p.m.

Clauses 3 to 5 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CUSTOMS (FEES FOR OVERTIME) REGULATIONS

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 Customs (Fees for Overtime) Regulations, 1959.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is a Resolution seeking the approval of the House to Regulations entitled "The Customs (Fees for Overtime) Regulations, 1959. I think it was in 1956 or 1957 when this question of overtime fees for Government Departments came before the Government and a Select Committee was appointed to investigate the question and report to the Government.

That Committee seems to have had quite a few meetings, because, as I said, this question was extended to every Department of Government where overtime fees were paid. The Committee reported and the Report was considered by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The Resolution which is now before this House is part of their recommendations. I say that this Resolution is a part of the recommendations inasmuch as the Report involves certain other Departments.

It is set out here what are the present rates of overtime and also what the proposed rates are. As regards the Customs' Officers; the amounts recoverable from private individuals or firms are also mentioned. If the officers are retained from the close of official hours, the present rates are 96 cents an hour and the proposed rates are \$1.20 an hour. If they are not retained from the close of official hours the present rates are \$1.92 an hour and the proposed rates at \$2.40 an hour.

With regard to Sundays and Bank Holidays, the present rates are \$4.80 for any period between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. plus 96 cents an hour for work before 8 a.m. and before 4 p.m. and the proposed rates are \$4.80 for a period of four hours or less, thereafter \$1.20 an hour.

When these Officers are paid by the Government, on working days outside official hours and on Sundays and Public Holidays, the present rates are 96 cents an hour and the proposed rates are \$1.20 an hour. As to the Female Searcher, when paid by the Government on working days outside official hours and on Sundays and public holidays, the present rates are 48 cents an hour and the proposed rates are 72 cents an hour.

When you come to Customs Guards and Porters and the fees of overtime are recoverable from private individuals or firms, on working days outside official hours, the present rates are 24 cents an hour and the proposed rates are 48 cents an hour. On Sundays and public holidays, the present rates are 24 cents an hour and the proposed rates are \$1.92 for any period of four hours or less, thereafter 48 cents an hour. Where the fees are paid by Government, on working days outside official hours and on Sundays and public holidays, the present rates are 24 cents an hour and the proposed rates are 48 cents an hour.

The rates which I have mentioned are the new rates which are proposed by this Committee which was set up by the Government to investigate these rates paid to Customs Officers, the Female Searcher, Customs Guards and Porters. The Committee was also set up to investigate this Department as well as other Departments, and these rates were accepted by the Government. The Committee which was set up was comprised of Government Officials such as the Financial Secretary and the Chief Secretary, and the Minister of Labour was included. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not opposing the Resolution. I just want to draw to the Government's attention that, between 1954 and 1956, I pointed out the fact that the Customs Clerks were underpaid as compared with what the merchants' Clerks got. As the Hon. Premier has said, a Committee was set up to go into the matter and these are the recommendations of the Committee.

These old fees were fixed about fifty years ago; they must have been arranged on the basis of salaries as obtained in that day. Since then, the Barbados Workers'

Union obtained an increase for its members from 96 cents an hour, which was the standing rate, to \$1.20 per hour plus a ten per cent increase which brought the rate up to \$1.32 an hour.
6.55 p.m.

I feel that, in the light of present day conditions, the Government could at least bring the Customs Clerks' fees up to the level of those received by the Warehouse Clerks. The Warehouse Clerks have by now outstripped some of these Customs Clerks when it comes to salary. If you just look at the present day fees you will see that, where a Warehouse Clerk receives \$1.32 an hour for overtime, the Committee has now recommended five shillings for overtime to Customs Clerks. For Sundays and Bank Holidays a Warehouse Clerk gets \$10.56 plus \$1.58 for overtime per hour, that is he gets \$10.56 for working from 7 o'clock to 4 o'clock and then \$1.58 for every hour after 4 o'clock. The Committee has recommended for the Customs Clerk \$9.60, that is, \$1.20 for the first four hours and for the next four hours \$1.20, and after 4 o'clock he is to receive the same \$1.20, and Sundays and Bank Holidays are as normal days.

A greater disparity yet, is Christmas and Good Fridays. A Warehouse Clerk receives \$20 odd a day and \$3.95 per hour overtime, but if you look at the Government scales you will see that the fees for a Customs Clerk are \$1.20 for Sundays and Bank Holidays and for Christmas and Good Fridays. I feel, Sir, that the Customs Clerks deserve better treatment. The recommendation of the Committee is very welcome, but I still feel that this is in need of another revision to bring it to the level of what Warehouse Clerks are getting. You must bear in mind that the Customs Clerks are in charge of the Bonds.

I would therefore welcome a little more.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being after 7 p.m. o'clock, this Sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. o'clock.

On Resumption,

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of a Resolution to sanction the Customs (Petroleum Products Bulk Storage) (Amendment) Regulations, 1959.

THE CUSTOMS (PETROLEUM PRODUCTS BULK STORAGE) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 1959

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, these are Regulations in connection with the Petroleum Products Bulk Storage Regulations, 1959.

The Regulations provide for the payment of overtime fees in accordance with the fees paid to Customs Officers who supervise the landing of Petroleum Products at Bulk Storage Installations.

This is another of those things recommended by the Committee set up to go into this question of overtime paid to Government employees.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

The question 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 passing of a Resolution to approve the Warehousing of Rum in Bond (Amendment) Regulations, 1959.

THE WAREHOUSING OF RUM IN BOND (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1959

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, in this case this Resolution deals with the warehousing of rum in

bond. Again, Sir, it is a question of overtime fees which are again recommended by the Committee on the same principle as that of the Customs Officers. The present pay is 96 cents an hour or part of an hour provided that, if the services of an officer have not been retained from the close of official hours, the Officer is then paid \$1.92 an hour or part of an hour. The proposed rate is \$1.20 an hour or part of an hour and, in the second instance, the Officer should be paid \$2.40 an hour or part thereof.

In the case of a Customs Guard and Porter, the present rate is 24 cents an hour. The proposed rate is 48 cents an hour.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I see that there is also an explanation on the reverse side of the Resolution. I wonder whether the Hon. Premier has read both sides.

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

7.55 p.m.

State. have
RESOLUTION TO APPROVE HARBOUR AND SHIPPING MASTER'S DEPARTMENT (FEES) REGULATIONS

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 Harbour and Shipping Master's Department (Fees) Regulations, 1959.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution also deals with the question of overtime fees. They are on the same principle as that of the others which have been passed. Ninety-six cents an hour is the present rates which is paid to Harbour and Shipping Master's Clerks for working outside the official hours on working days, and the proposed new rate is \$1.20 per hour or part of an hour provided that, if the services of the Officer have not been retained from the close of official hours, he shall be paid \$2.40 an hour or part of an hour. On Sundays and public holidays, the present rate is 96 cents an hour but the proposed rate is \$4.80 for a period of four hours or less and thereafter \$1.20 an hour or part of an hour.

The present rate for a Mate working outside official hours on working days is 84 cents an hour; the proposed rate is \$1.00 an hour or part of an hour provided that if the services of the officer have not been retained from the close of official hours he shall be paid \$2.00 an hour or part of an hour. On Sundays and public holidays, the present rate is 84 cents an hour but the proposed rate is \$4.00 for a period of four hours or less and thereafter \$1.00 an hour or part of an hour.

The Regulations also fix the rates of overtime for seamen and labourers as has been shown. There has been no increase in these rates.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 16) ORDER, 1959

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 Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 16) Order, 1959."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 16) Order, 1959. In this case, before the establishment of the Ministerial set up, there was a Confidential Clerk, or what amounts to a Confidential Clerk, that is to say, there was an Officer who took charge of all confidential reports, cables, confidential files, etc.

Those files were dispersed among the several Ministers and, quite recently, because of security reasons especially, it was found necessary to have these files under one authority as before. You can very well understand that, with the dispersal of these files amongst the seven Ministers - and several persons being responsible for them - there cannot be that security as there was before Ministerial set up came into being. Since the coming into being of the Federal Government, that has also contributed to the increase in the number of documents of this nature.

This Order is to make provision for the creation of a post of Confidential Records Officer for the Secretariat; to be responsible for all secret files, secret cables, the decoding of secret cables, and things of that nature. This Officer will be put on a salary scale of \$2,640 x 120 - 3,360; 3,528 x 144 - 3,816.

At the present, the confidential and secret duties are performed by a senior Clerk; but it is considered that the duties and responsibilities of this post are far greater than those of a senior Clerk, thus we require an officer of higher status.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, that closes Government Business.

RESOLUTION re COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE FOR EMPLOYEES OF HOUSE

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the House, and as Government Business has been concluded and there is no other business which I am aware is to be tackled tonight, I have a Resolution of which I gave notice in connection with the cost of living allowance for the employees of this House. If the House is willing that the matter be proceeded with now, I shall be happy to know of its indulgence to proceed with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to proceed with a Resolution of which he gave notice earlier in connection with the cost of living allowance for employees of this House. Unless there is any objection, leave will be granted the hon. member.

(A pause) There being no objection, leave was granted. ▼

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution, to which I trust that copies are in the hands of hon. members, reads as follows:

"BE IT RESOLVED that the Clerk, Deputy Clerk, Chaplain, Marshal, Librarian and Secretary, Deputy Marshal Messenger and Library Attendant of the House of Assembly be paid a cost of living allowance at the rate of \$108 per annum each.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Government take immediate steps to give effect to this Resolution."

Mr. Speaker, I take it that it is not necessary for me to speak at any great length on this Resolution. It is just

in keeping with the usual tradition that, if Government employees are in receipt of increased emoluments by way of cost of living allowance or otherwise, the employees of this Chamber should be similarly treated.

I will not repeat the comments which I made in connection with the cost of living allowance when it was before the Honourable House of Assembly, because I could only be commending to this House that the employees who fall in the lower brackets should be given greater consideration. But because a tradition dies hard, it would be unprecedented for us in this Chamber to offer our employees more than people in similar categories of the Government Service who have been in receipt of this cost of living. If this Resolution meets with the approval of this House, from the Clerk down to the Messenger will be drawing a cost of living of \$108 per annum.

I formally beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in seconding this Resolution, and I am glad to notice that it is not necessary at this time to have a dividing line one way or the other on it. I was a little worried about the omission of the other members of the Clerical Staff - the Typists and the Reporters - but I was assured that these have been taken care of. I, therefore, take this pleasure in seconding the Resolution.

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

8.05 p.m.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper under Government Business having been fixed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any change in the Order Paper proposed under the Head Private Members' Business?

Mr. BRANCKER: No change is proposed, Sir.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 14th July, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next 14th July, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.