

THE

# House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

*Tuesday, 28th 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*);  
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*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN.

*Prayers were read.*

### MINUTES

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

### PAPERS LAID

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

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 18) Order, 1959.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 19) Order, 1959.

Local Government (Compensation) Regulations, 1959.

Report on the Training Scheme Fund for the Financial Year 1958-59.

Barbados Statistical Service - Quarterly Digest of Statistics No. 10 - June, 1959.

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

Proposals for the establishment of District Hospitals Services in Barbados.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Customs Duties (No. 2) Order, 1959.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Town and Country Development Planning (General) Regulations, 1959.

### GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to place the sum of \$1,240 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1959-60, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1959-60, No. 15, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

In connection with that Resolution, I beg to give notice of my intention to ask leave to consider it in all its stages today.

Also, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$4,145 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1959-60, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1959-60, No. 16, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 18) Order, 1959."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 19) Order, 1959."

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$24,200 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1959-60, Part II, Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1959-60, No. 14, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I may add that it is my intention to ask leave to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meet-

ing to deal with the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with the Resolutions for \$1,240 and \$24,200 in all their stages today.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, has the Resolution for \$1,240 been circulated?

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been circulated, and the hon. member should have a copy.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Resolution for \$1,240, I have what appears to me to be a first page, because mine has the first paragraph of the Addendum beginning "The Barbados Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association ....", and the second paragraph "The Australian Branch", and at the bottom of the page "This" appears and I turn over and there is no continuation or second sheet. There is nothing on the back of the same sheet either; but I take it that although it would be nice to have it, I must draw it to Your Honour's attention; and I gather that whatever I have not got, and should have, will not make it particularly controversial. I am not objecting but I am just drawing it to Your Honour's attention.  
12.25 p.m.

So far as the other one is concerned, that seems to be complete; but another Resolution which was mentioned today was not circulated, and I understand that leave will be asked to proceed with it. We have not received that one at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member a copy of the Resolution?

Mr. BRANCKER: Yes, Sir, I have a copy of the Resolution for \$24,200. As I have mentioned earlier, I have got one for \$24,200 but I got the impression that the Hon. Minister was asking leave to deal with the third Resolution which has not been circulated.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to deal with two Money Resolutions which were given notice of today. Unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the House when in Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolutions for \$1,240 and \$24,200.

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

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

*Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BRYAN in the Chair.*

#### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1959-60 No. 15

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$1,240. As hon. members will see, it is the result of an invitation to the Barbados Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to send a delegate to attend a meeting of the Association in Australia. The Barbados Branch summoned a meeting recently which was duly attended, and it was decided that His Honour the Speaker should go to Australia as a delegate of the Barbados Branch. This sum of \$1,240 is to meet the expenses in connection with the trip.

As hon. members will see from the Addendum, the meeting will take place from the 24th September until

the 8th November; and our representative will also take part in the tours of Australia arranged by the Australian Branch of the Association. The Barbados Government is paying only the subsistence allowance but we have been warned - in fact, all the territories have been warned - that at present the climate over there is variable and at times it is fairly cold. As a result, there is need for warm clothing. As hon. members will see, we have provided for a warm clothing allowance of \$120 and the subsistence allowance for the 56 days amounts to \$1,120, making it a total of \$1,240.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, we are supporting this Resolution as we have supported the selection of a delegate to represent the Barbados Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, but I am availing myself of the opportunity to sound a note of warning that we on this side feel, since there is a Federal Parliament and that Federal Parliament is part of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, even though legally and constitutionally it is not entitled to represent us in the sense that we are entitled to our own representative as a territory, yet we feel that until the finances and economy of this island improve, as to the future we will be entirely satisfied with the fact and in the knowledge that the West Indies Federation of which we are part and of which we are a Unit territory will be represented by representatives of the Federal Parliament which is the Parliament of the whole West Indies. If our financial conditions improve, well then, each Unit territory can send its delegate.

So far as we are concerned - and I am speaking from our own standpoint - we cannot indulge in the luxury of paying the expenses of our own unit territory in this respect. So long as our finances remain in this precarious condition, if Barbados would have the moral satisfaction that Barbados was represented as a part of the Federation by the representatives of the Federal Parliament who would go on such occasions - and I think that two or three of them would go - we will be pleased.

As to this amount of \$1,240, it is not considerable but it is a question of the principle of the thing. My comment is in respect of any future invitation in which we would be asked to send delegates.

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

#### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1959-60 No. 14

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for \$24,200 in order to facilitate the work which is being done at the Cheapside Market. As hon. members know, the sum of \$72,000 was voted in the 1958-59 Estimates but of that amount only \$5,000 was spent, due to the fact that some of the merchants who had rum stored there were unable to find adequate accommodation elsewhere for storing their casks.

Now that we have started on this project, we want to do something more. I must pause to say that unfortunately for me when the plans were made out, I was out of the island; and some of the things which I am asking to be done now were not taken into account. Therefore, this is not a question that the money was wasted or was put to a different use; it is a question that we are asking for money to do more work.  
12.35 p.m.

The people who visited the site thought that they would only utilise a certain portion of the building, but I think that that makes for false economy; the pressing needs which we have before us, so far as hawkers and hucksters are concerned demand that we give them the utmost space in the market. The visitors to the site did not envisage utilising all the available space in the rum bond. We intend to make the entire building a market; not only

that, but adequate plans, according to what I would have liked to see around the market, were not arranged for toilet accommodation. We have, from experience gained at the Fairchild Street Market, discovered what is needed at the Cheapside Market; and, therefore, with that experience, we feel sure that we can come to a better decision as to what we are going to do at the new reconstructed market at Cheapside.

The Addendum to this Resolution is before hon. members and I must apologise to hon. members for the lateness of this Resolution, but due to the fact that we might go into recess after today's meeting, some of the workmen have been turned off until these funds are voted. It was therefore incumbent upon me to try and get this Resolution before the House today. If hon. members feel that they have been done a wrong, I apologise for the haste; it is not a matter of delay because in planning this new venture we must lay out what we want to do.

This market will serve a very good purpose in the life of our people. The population has become market conscious and I can say with some satisfaction that those of our greatest critics who criticised the markets are now giving us a lot of praise. It is our intention to extend these markets within the context of our ability to do so, and to see that the hawkers and hucksters who ply their wares for sale are given adequate facilities for so doing.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think I need say much more on this Resolution inasmuch as the Addendum to it is before hon. members. In paragraph 2 of that Addendum it says: The additional funds are required to meet the cost of alterations to the original plan". The original plan did not contemplate the entire utilisation of the building. We have to think not only of the staff down there but also of the customers. The people who go there from time to time must have proper lavatory accommodation. I was not satisfied, when I made an inspection of the premises along with the Superintendent of the Market and other interested parties, that the toilet accommodation is adequate. That is something which will call for additional money.

I think we have to set out here very distinctly, and hon. members will realise that the market is so placed that you cannot dig a well there. We have to build several septic tanks and that is an expensive job. We must have these things. Not only that, but it is a question of closing the tops of clothes' shops; it would be a very sad state of affairs to have the tops of these shops open. We will use B.R.C. wire so as to prevent pilferage.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be only too anxious to answer any points which may be raised in connection with this Resolution. This is an urgent matter; we have but a skeleton staff down there. We are hoping that this Market will come into operation at least by the middle of September, and these things are being asked for so that we will be able to get on with the job. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, it is very regrettable that the Hon. Minister was not present at the time when these estimates were made; and it is very regrettable that this amount of \$16,200 more is needed as far as the taxpayers are concerned. I rise to speak on this matter because I think it is necessary to throw out a word of caution.

We have had not the seven fat years, but the ten fat years. We are now in the second lean year and the first lean year which was due to the lack of rainfall is not comparable to the second lean year which is due to a bad price for sugar. In the Capital Estimates, in connection with the Cheapside Market, this is what is stated in the Note: "To complete the conversion of the Cheapside Rum Bond into a Market". That is the Note to Item 4 in the Estimates as to the Cheapside Market. The Note does not say "to complete part of the bond"; it does not

say that the amount of money which is needed is specifically for a part of the bond to be converted.

I think it is time that, in spite of the absence of the Minister, we must have continuity in this island; and the Minister's views, correct as I see them, must be clearly known to his subordinates. I stress that point, Mr. Chairman, There is the tendency today for subordinates not to be subordinate, but these subordinates should be in a position to carry out the every instruction of the Minister. I do not think that this Addendum or the Hon. Minister's rather quick précis of the situation is sufficient to allay the fears of many a taxpayer or those of many a member of this honourable House that the money which is being expended is expended with the attitude that there is plenty more where that money came from. That is why I am sounding this note of warning.

The Addendum merely says that additional funds are required to meet the cost of alterations to the original plan. I wonder which original plan they are talking about. If we go back to the history of the Rum Bond Market and whatever it is going to be next - I hope it will remain a market - with the amount of money to be voted and the amount of money collected there, it does seem to me to be a very big white elephant up to now. I think we have to consider these things in the light of the fact that it is time that these Heads of Departments and employees in Departments fully realise that every half-penny must be saved on these capital works. I am not yet fully clear as to the reason for this increase from \$75,000 to \$91,200. It is not \$24,000 but a matter of a difference of \$16,200. 12.45 p.m.

This is a lot of money, and this would seem to indicate that the larger part of the Scheme was not only contemplated but put into action in the first case and this is now some minor alteration which is costing a large amount of money. Exactly what is the \$16,200 to do?

I would like these Addenda to be a little more clearly worded to give us some idea of the actual work that is to be undertaken. It says "these alterations include the utilisation of the entire area occupied by the Rum Bond for the purpose of the Market." Now, Sir, how many persons in relation to the Fairchild Street Market is this Market going to accommodate? Unfortunately, I regret that we got this Resolution only yesterday afternoon, but the Minister should be able to tell us in comparison with the money expended on the Fairchild Street Market what is the position with the Cheapside Market. Is it going to house more persons? Is it going to contain more facilities apart from the sanitary arrangements which the Minister mentioned? On what exactly is this \$16,200 going to be spent?

I think this House is entitled in the first place to a better Addendum, and in the second place the Minister should give us a little more details particularly in these lean years. I do ask that we be given that in order that we may feel conscientiously that the money is being used properly. I repeat, Sir, that I see work being done in this island time and time again and thought is not being given to the amount of money which the taxpayers have to pay. There is a very prevalent thought that the Government will support the people, but let me remind them that it is the people that support the Government. I think we should take a little more care in these matters and go into a little more detail.

I do hope, Sir, that the Minister will give us a little more information than what he has given.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member reads the Addendum correctly, he will see that these are alterations, to the original plan. As I said before in dealing with this matter, I happened to be out of the island at the time - I think I was in India - when these plans and specifications were made, and therefore some of the things I as Minister would have wanted were not taken into consideration then. Now that the building has been reconstructed to a certain point I have visited the place and think it advisable to do all of the job at the same time.

In other words, there was a certain area which was left out and was not to be done, but with the pressure we have at the moment, hawkers on the street and hucksters doing business in the shade, as I said before, since we have the Fairchild Street Market, people are begging us to build more markets. There is a need for them in this island; this is not luxury money which is being taken from the poor people, but we are doing this to take them out of the sun and give them a place where they can do their business in comfort. So lean years or fat years, this Government is going to see to it so far as our financial ability will allow us that we take these people off the street and put them in a place where they can do business as human beings.

Apart from that, we owe it to the householders, housekeepers and housewives to prepare markets for them where they can go in comfort and buy goods rather than stop by sidewalks and alleys; it is a service we are rendering, so it is not that we are taking something away from the taxpayers. People are proud of what we are doing for them in this connection; so I do not think that there should be opposition for the sake of opposing and trying to pick holes in this when, in truth and in fact, the service which we are rendering to the people is being paid for by themselves. The money is not being wasted because they are getting a service for it.

The hon. member did ask for more information and I think I should tell him this: when I was out of the island it was originally intended to have 20 butcher stalls, 22 lock-up shops and 206 open stalls. All of that has been completely changed now and instead of 206 stalls, we are getting over 300 - I do not know for sure how many because the last figure has not come in; we will have, I think, something like 40 lock-up shops instead of 22, and there will also be more butcher stalls. You will see by that they had only envisaged the utilisation of a certain part of the building, but now we are going to utilise all of the space. (Mr. DOWDING: All right, sit down.) I see the hon. member is satisfied.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the hon. member for the speech he has made pointing out the work that is to be done.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest to the members who have spoken on this Resolution for the reconstruction of the Cheapside Market. I myself agree with this Resolution because in walking up and down Bridgetown I have seen many hucksters going to and fro even when the rain is falling, and having to shift from place to place as well as being removed by policemen; so if this Government has sought to provide a place for hucksters, butchers and other people where people can get their commodities and know where to go for them, then credit must be given to the Government. There need therefore be no criticism from anyone on this Resolution because we can see the purpose for the money.

All I am asking, Sir, is that when the Architect is drawing a plan he should sit down carefully first and realise what is needed and try to keep as near the margin as he can so that if the cost will be \$1,000 and he estimates for \$900, we will know that he is near the margin. 12.55 p.m.

I do not like to know when a plan is drafted, say for \$1,000, that the Government will be coming back the next few months and asking for \$5,000 or \$6,000 more to complete the project. It looks to me as if the architect does not know what he is doing. However, this plan is a good one; therefore, I wholeheartedly support this Resolution.

Mr. T. W. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to delay this Resolution but relative to this same Market, I wish to say that it was deemed a white elephant at one time and for years the St. Michael's Vestry was fighting the cause that the cooperage above it owned by Messrs Wilkinson & Haynes should be purchased by the Government. The reason was quite obvious. There is a long

wall there, and it is a common fact that the Market was very hot; and one of the reasons why the market was abandoned was principally due to the fact of that high wall which prevented air from coming to it.

Sir, I would have felt happier today if this Resolution included a sum to purchase the old cooperage in order that that wall could be pulled down so that the Market would get more air and the area would also provide space for parking. I would like to hear from the Hon. Minister if it is the intention of the Government to purchase that abandoned cooperage.

Furthermore, I hope that the Hon. Minister will see to it that none of those old butchers who now occupy stalls in the Market and who have been occupying them for the longest while, when the new market is completed, would be put out of a stall. I really would like that assurance. I would not like what has happened as regards the Fairchild Market happening to the Cheapside Market. I would not say that there is dissatisfaction, but quite a few of these butchers seem to be skeptical as to their future when this Market is completed.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I suppose the hon. member only wants what he has just said to be put on the record, but it is a fact that I have discussed this matter with him and told him that plans are afoot to acquire all that land around there. I may say that all that land is not open land; some of it has houses. We do not intend to buy the land on which the houses are built but Government has planned to purchase all the land that is possible in that area for the purpose of making it a parking plot. I think the hon. member need not have any fear about that at all.

On the other hand, so far as the butchers in the present Market are concerned, I want to be frank with the hon. member. These markets cost a lot of money to build and to reconstruct, and there are a lot of butchers in the Cheapside Market who owe us a lot of money. I have already given instructions to tell them that if they want a stall in the new market, they must straighten up and come right. On the first of every month, you must have your money to pay for the rent of your stall or otherwise you will be outside. Outside you will go. I am making a statement on the floor of the House. We are doing nothing to interfere with them now, but if they want to come in this new building, straighten up and come right.

I am not going to allow that sort of thing. Some people go away with the idea that so long as Government is running something it is free, gratis and for nothing. I will ease anybody who is in difficulty. If you are in difficulty, you will get aid but there are those who set out to withhold from the Government because they say that "whatsoever is Government's, we own."

In answer to the hon. member, we are making room for them but will the hon. member please tell them that we are going to bring trade to them by the very fact that you have so many stalls there. They will have bigger trade and if they are doing business - good business too - they will have to pay.

I want to assure hon. members that I have not done anything against them now, though some of them owe a considerable amount. I was asked to sue and dispossess some of them but I have done nothing up to now as regards that. But in the interest of the people whom the hon. junior member for the City cares about, will you please tell them that if they want to come in the new market, they must pay in advance their rent and they must pay it strictly at the beginning of every month.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say anything on this Resolution but hearing the Hon. Minister of Agriculture saying that the Government contemplates buying the whole site around the Cheapside Market to make more market and parking place for it, I got up to say that I consider it a very good idea. When I heard the hon. junior member for the City in his remarks, I said to myself that

it would be a wise thing to do because soon and very soon the City of Bridgetown would be more situated that way than it is here.

Now, Sir, hearing the Hon. Minister say that the butchers will have to straighten up and come right, I wish to say that it is not fair to allow the butchers in the market to owe that enormous amount of rent without taking legal steps to collect it when, in my constituency, there were poor boat owners who were deprived of their boats because they could not straighten up and come right. It is not fair. If one part has to straighten up and come right, the other should do likewise; and I do hope the hon. junior member for the City will take back the Minister's message to those people.

I am asking the Hon. Minister of Agriculture to put his foot on it and see to it that the funds are collected because we cannot do more good to the people if they are not prepared to help us to do the same good as we are doing to them to others. It is fair that they should be made to pay their arrears. The Hon. Minister is perfectly right not to allow them to come in the new market until they have come right.

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

#### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1959-60 No. 12 HEAD IX - MARKETS

*Head IX - Markets - was called.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, Item 31 under this Head is a new one for equipment.

According to the Note, a sum of \$3,681 was provided by Resolution No. 72/1958 to supplement the Estimates for 1958/59 for the purchase of furniture and equipment for markets at Fairchild Street, Six Cross Roads and Bay Street. A revote of \$1,647 of this amount is sought to meet the cost of certain of these items, (safes, stunners etc.) which were not received before the end of the financial year.  
1.05 p.m.

In addition to that, the sum of \$620.00 is required to provide a heavy duty platform scale and a counter scale for the proposed Bay Street Fish Market. A sum of \$580.00 is also required to purchase a heavy duty scale to replace that at the Bridgetown Fish Market which has been condemned by a Board of Survey as being unserviceable. That is the note in connection with this Item. I beg to move that Head IX stand part of the Schedule.

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

*The question that Head IX stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

#### HEAD XX - EDUCATION

*Head XX - Education - was called.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Head deals with Education. Item 40 is "Unestablished Staff", and the note states that it is considered desirable to have some form of supervision at night over the premises at the Technical Institute and the St. Leonard's Schools. There is a caretaker whose duties apply only during the day, and it is considered better for security purposes to have a watchman instead of a caretaker. The note goes on to state that supplementary provision of \$676.80 is required to meet the wages of this watchman.

The next item is Item 65 "Games". In this connection the note states that an amount of \$3,602 is necessary for the purchase of equipment for cricket, football and netball gear in those primary and Secondary Modern Schools which have playing space. Similar facilities will be extended to other schools when they secure the playing space needed. After all, Sir, there is the recognition of this need by the Education Department that we should extend facilities for games to the Primary and the Secondary Modern Schools

provided that they have sufficient space for these games. The position is the same in the Secondary Schools of the island except that in these schools a part of the fees provides for these games.

The next item is Item 66 "Cleaning". The note explains that formerly the gardening at the St. Leonard's Schools was done by the caretaker whose post has been abolished. It is therefore necessary to employ a gardener for these schools and the supplementary amount of \$535.68 is required to pay his wages to the end of the financial year.

The last item under this Head is Item 87 "Technical Institute". Hon. members will see from the note that it is proposed to have a time clock for the use of the night watchman of the Technical Institute and the St. Leonard's Schools. I have just made reference to this watchman. In short, we will have the system of the pegging of the clock at the regular intervals in order to make sure that this officer is on his job. I beg to move that Head XX stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I have been wondering about this caretaker whose post has been abolished and the individual who used to do the gardening at the St. Leonard's Schools. I am wondering if the gardener who is to be employed will be the same individual who used to do the gardening at the St. Leonard's Schools. I just want an assurance that this individual will not suffer as a result of the change. He may have reached the age of retirement in which event he will be looked after by means of a pension and I am wondering whether he will be re-employed in the new post without any break in the continuity of his service so that he will be entitled to the full pensionable emoluments for the use of his services which he has given to the Government.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, under this Head we are asked to expend money in the first case in respect of the St. Leonard's Schools and in the second case, at the Technical Institute. Where we had a caretaker, for some reasons which I have not been told, we are now going to have a watchman, a gardener and a time clock. This seems to me to be much more expensive than the old arrangements. I am wondering why it is necessary to change over from the old arrangements and what is exactly the scheme. I am wondering if the Hon. Minister does not agree that this change is more expensive than the old method. When he says "a watchman" I am wondering whether the Minister realises that that "a" must mean "two". I doubt very much that this Government would agree to have the services of one watchman when the Labour code calls for two watchmen. I rather think that it is on account of the equipment at the Technical Institute but I would like to know exactly the reason for this change; if it is to be a big administrative side of St. Leonard's Schools and the Technical Institute or if this is to be a policy carried out by the schools and what is the present situation really to be.

The amount of \$3,602 is necessary for the purchase of equipment for cricket, football and netball in these primary and Secondary Schools which have playing space. I think that that amount is extremely inadequate, and I think that it is very unfair to specify that this principle will be extended to schools when they offer the playing space which is needed. I want to throw out the suggestion, as has been done in other parts of the world, that it is quite possible for part of the fees which are now in existence to be used by the schools for this equipment.  
1.15 p.m.

I do not see why one school should be provided with cricket bats, footballs, etc., while other schools are not, when it would only be a matter of the school's Headmaster arranging for the grounds of another school or Social Welfare grounds or cricket club grounds for sports to be held on such and such an afternoon. I am positive, Sir, that a number of these schools which have not got playing

space are close to playing space which could be got by asking for it; and I am very anxious to hear the answer on this, because I do not feel that under any circumstances sports should be made for some and not others.

In my humble opinion, if it is to be extended, let us see a Resolution immediately for the extension of this to all schools; and let these schools take advantage of the playing fields near around them or, if necessary, supply transportation to take them as is done in other parts of the world, where schools are in busy centres and very often students have to be taken out of the bus area to fields quite a distance away.

When I was at school, I had to run two miles to get to the playing field and that was considered as exercise. I do not think that any of the girls and boys would be against a nice stroll to a playing field, and I am certain that arrangements can be made to accommodate all and sundry. Let us beware of any particular school being granted this favour. Let us ascertain that if there is a possibility in any of what I recommend - that the playing fields are available - that equipment is granted to all concerned.

I would therefore like to hear the reason for this extra expenditure at the Technical school and the St. Leonard's School; and I would also like to hear whether or not we cannot give facilities to all schools whether or not they have playing space.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, while we are speaking about schools, I notice here in the explanatory note that "an amount of \$3,602 is necessary for the purchase of equipment for cricket, football and netball in these Primary and Secondary Schools which have playing space. Similar facilities will be extended to other schools when they secure the playing space needed."

Now, Sir, games are essential, but I feel that books should take first place. Not so very long ago Blackmans School was in need of text-books, and I am asking the Hon. Minister to make the necessary enquiries.....

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order. I do not see anything about text-books in this Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on a Resolution for money to buy equipment and gear. I take it that the Hon. Minister is trying to pass this Resolution for the necessary things that have been drawn to his attention that are needed. I would like to mention something I know is needed because it is all education.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Not under this Resolution. This Resolution specifically sets out the items. I would suggest that if you want to include anything else, you know other methods of doing it, but I am afraid I cannot allow you to include textbooks under this Item.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, this is Education and we are dealing with Education under Head XX ....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with Head XX, Item 65 which is "Games". I am asking the hon. senior member for St. Joseph to stick to that point.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I was once a Chairman and I know what is what. I will not say anything more now.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I have been examining the items which the Resolution called for. "An amount of \$3,602 is necessary for the purchase of equipment for cricket, football and netball in those Primary and Secondary Modern Schools which have playing space. Similar facilities will be extended to other schools when they secure the playing space needed."

Sir, I am very glad that this Resolution came down because in the parish of St. Andrew there are certain schools where there are no playing grounds. Even when the children at St. Andrew gather to run their races, those that have playing grounds win the races, those who have no playing

grounds cannot win those races because there is no space for the children to exercise. The time has come when such space should be provided for those schools which do not have space at the present time so that the children may have and enjoy the same facilities as others. I have nothing against the Resolution but would like to see the facilities devoted to all those children who are at present at school.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, in attempting to answer the various questions which have been put by hon. members who have spoken on this matter, I want to begin by making some sort of explanation with respect to the state of affairs at the Technical Institute.

I wish to assure the hon. senior member for St. George that we are not indulging or even attempting to indulge in indiscriminate expenditure where this matter is concerned. I presume that he is well acquainted with the old proverb "A stitch in time saves nine".  
1.25 p.m.

I have discovered that there is the growing tendency on the part of people to encroach on the premises of the Richmond compound and to indulge in what I would call reckless acts. I know that I am responsible for this unfortunate matter of Education in this island, and I am not prepared to wait until the horse is out of the stable to tell you that the stable needs this or that to make it secure; so, as a result of what I have discovered, I was positively sure that the caretaker arrangement which in the past obtained could not provide the essential measure which was needed in that compound. Therefore, I have come to the House in this Resolution to have the necessary funds made available for us to appoint this watchman who would be there at night and throughout the night. To make sure that he is doing his duty, we are asking for this time clock. If we do not take this precaution, I am sure that something calamitous would take place there. I hope that explanation will satisfy hon. members.

In connection with this matter, I am very pleased that hon. members of this august Chamber are highly appreciative of the part which organised games play in the life of a pupil; but I was a bit surprised to discover that there are some hon. members who seemed to have got the erroneous idea that we are only prepared to cater to certain schools in this respect. I think it is true to say that the Addendum makes it unmistakably clear that we intend to provide all schools with the facilities for playing organised games; and I am sure that you will agree with me that it will not be the correct thing to do to wait until all schools get the necessary facilities then to initiate this. The old saying holds good here and that is, "while the grass is growing the horse is starving." Therefore, we feel that in the interest of the community we should start with those schools which can be started and after that we can strive to provide the others with the things which are needed before the equipment of games can be provided.

Sir, I am highly in favour of the effort which the hon. senior member for St. Joseph made when he brought the question up in respect of text books.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that I cannot allow the Hon. Minister to speak on that. I made a ruling against the bringing up of the question of text books in this discussion.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I bow to Your Honour's ruling. I do hope that I have succeeded in answering the questions, and I hope the hon. senior member for St. Joseph would see me privately over that matter.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get an indication from the Hon. Minister as regards his allowing those schools which have not got playing fields to use facilities of playing fields near to them until they get their own.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: In reply to the hon. member, I would like to say that that is being done.

*The question that Head XX stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

## HEAD XXV - PUBLIC WORKS

*Head XXV - Public Works - was called.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In connection with the first item under this Head - Item 23, Pumps - for which a vote of \$70 is required, in the current estimates a sum of \$700 has been provided under this item for the maintenance of pumps and windmills at various public institutions. The accepted tender, however, in response to public advertisement, was for the sum of \$770; therefore, that is \$70 more than what was passed in the Estimates. We are now asking for \$70 to supplement the vote.

The next Item - Item 35, Military Buildings, the sum of \$12,000 is asked to be voted. I will start out by saying that quite a few of the Garrison lettings are in a bad state of repair but the two more urgent are the two mentioned in the Addendum to the Resolution. Their condition is so bad that they are almost uninhabitable. It is proposed that immediate action should be taken to rehabilitate and extend them. No funds are available in the current Estimates; hence the need for this supplementary provision of \$12,000.

We come to Item 86, (New) Furnishing of Government Quarters. Now, Sir, provision is made for residences of certain officers of the Government to be supplied with certain basic furniture, but recently there has been a demand from quite a few of these officers who occupy these quarters for refrigerators. The total amount is \$18,000 but the Government intends to do it piecemeal. The Government intends that this amount of \$18,000 should extend over a period of three years or so because we consider that a refrigerator is a household necessity.

There are two which are more urgent. One is for the Maternity Hospital in the Matron's Quarters. As a matter of fact, there used to be one there sometime ago, but that belonged to the Matron. It has now become old and unserviceable and we intend to install a new one in the place of that.

The rent charge for furniture generally is 3% but, because the life of a refrigerator is shorter than other articles of furniture, it is proposed at this stage to charge 5% for the refrigerator, of course, pending the reviewing of the whole question of furniture so far as rent is concerned. This \$2,000 is asked for a start for furnishing refrigerators in certain of the residences occupied by the medical staff.

1.35 p.m.

I repeat that it is a total of \$18,000 asked for, and the whole question of the supply of refrigerators will be approached gradually. We have to satisfy the requirements over a period of three years. I beg to move that Head XXV stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, occasionally there comes before this House some Resolution which deserves nothing more than ridicule and contempt. For the last two years of the present Session of this Chamber, we have continually been warning the Government that they should have in these matters a more realistic approach. They have never taken any account of what we have said; and, now, here today, we have another of these silly and mistaken Resolutions. It is proposed to put refrigerators, as part of the furniture, into the houses of certain public servants for which they are to pay rent and this is what they tell us in the explanatory note:-

"In the past the quarters of these officers were not supplied with refrigerators as part of the basic furniture but it will now be agreed that a refrigerator is a household necessity."

Possibly that will be agreed by members on that side of the House and their advisers, but a refrigerator is not a household necessity; it may be a convenient luxury. If they agree that a refrigerator is a household necessity, why do they not put them in as many of the homes in their Housing

Schemes as possible? But they do not regard them as necessities for people who live in the Housing Schemes but only for Civil Servants for whom there should be certain necessary privileges; and the taxpayers' money will be used to purchase refrigerators which will have a short life and which will deteriorate and lose their value quickly, at what would be regarded as a nominal rent. How in the name of Heaven are you going to get back the money which you are expending on these things, and to what extent is the number of the Civil Servants or their houses in which you are going to install these things?

Anybody would agree that tables, chairs and perhaps a stove and cooking utensils are things which you would expect to find in a home. We have just modified the whole hire-purchase system giving a certain protection which is now better for people who want articles to purchase them under that system. In that case why should the Government undertake the responsibility for providing these refrigerators? What is the wisdom of that? Are these Civil Servants refusing to work for you unless they can have iced water from a refrigerator at all hours of the night?

There are thousands of households in which people are really too poor to buy refrigerators; and you are not suggesting that you will install refrigerators in these housing areas and charge a nominal rent for them. How comes it that you are making one set of facilities for one set of people and another type of facilities for another type of people? Do you want us to believe that a refrigerator is a necessity? I do not think that this expenditure is justified. This type of furniture will not last for more than a few years. One can scarcely give a guarantee for more than five years, and the Hon. Minister of Social Services will correct me if I am wrong; but do you expect to have payments for these refrigerators in five years when the officers may have other articles of furniture, probably amounting to thousands of dollars, in the homes?

A refrigerator, therefore, is one item which a householder may be relied upon to provide himself. We do not want to involve the taxpayers' money in that type of folly; and certainly the Government has come in a calm way by saying that a refrigerator is something which everybody should have in a household; but the Government knows that there are thousands of households in which there are no refrigerators and in which the inhabitants are alive and well, not thanks to the present Government of course.

They want to commit the taxpayers to this extravagance which is not at all necessary and hardly justified. This is not a question of a bed or a table or a chair in which a person could sit and eat; it is not a stove or anything like that; this is something without which you can live a comfortable life if you cannot afford to have it; and considering the nature of the article itself and the fact that it is of little durability as compared with other articles of furniture, does the Government feel itself justified in this kind of expenditure? Why do you pamper the Civil Servants at this extent? Having or not having a refrigerator in a Civil Servant's home cannot be a condition of service, so that the absence of a refrigerator cannot be a ground of complaint by a Civil Servant that the conditions under which he does his work are not comfortable because you do not stipulate that all must have refrigerators.

There are a lot of people in the Public Service who do all sorts of necessary work and they do it well, people whose services are almost indispensable to Government, but you do not hear any concern expressed about them; and they, if they could afford refrigerators in their homes, would like them. You cannot argue that you are putting a refrigerator there because a necessary condition of service is that the Civil Servant cannot do his work without it. What is the argument for this? The Premier has mentioned the name of the Hospital or of some hospital; if you want to continue this provision it would be far better to treat each case on its own merits and allow the Officers to borrow money to purchase whatever they want and lay down the terms on which the money is to be repaid; but the taxpayers would not be involved in the deterioration of the article.

If you want to lend a sum of \$600 or \$700 to an officer you would do so, and if you did not want to do that, you would not; but you cannot install refrigerators in Civil Servants' homes at the normal level at which people would not be able to put them in themselves, because they would have to pay much more than the rate proposed per month as an instalment on the hire-purchase system. Therefore, you are allowing a few people facilities at the expense of the taxpayers—which cannot be right. You do not consider yourself obligated to extend the policy of putting refrigerators at the Housing Schemes where people like us live. I remember some years ago when a promise was made to loan residents of the Clinketts Housing Scheme money for the purpose of buying furniture before an election took place; and, when the election was over, Sir Grantley Adams conveniently forgot the promise. These people did not ask for any refrigerators; they just wanted beds, tables and chairs. 1.45 p.m.

You have not found oil; all the equipment has gone back; but you can find money to lend a few people to buy refrigerators which are not necessary in the accepted sense of the term for their homes. There must be some way of stopping this madness. I counsel Government to think this matter over and not commit the taxpayers of this island to further extravagant expenditure of that sort.

I should be interested to hear what the Premier has to say; and, in the interest of people of this island, we should pursue the matter further.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Ever so often the hon. senior member for St. Lucy makes these verbal attacks. What is he arguing? He argues that you do not put refrigerators in the houses of the people in the housing schemes and therefore you should not give refrigerators to certain of your servants. Does Government rent these houses furnished? I am not aware that the Government rents the houses in the housing schemes furnished; but we are undertaking, in order to induce certain staff to come to Barbados, to provide furniture in houses for them. The hon. member is trying to give the impression that we are making fish of one and fowl of the other; that is absolutely not so. First of all, he referred to the housing scheme which Government rents to these people and said that we do not put refrigerators in them. We do not put any sort of furniture in them; they are rented unfurnished.

Secondly, he talked about other Civil Servants. The Government does not undertake to provide a furnished house for every Civil Servant. Certain Civil Servants, especially Medical Staff are given furnished houses. The hon. member knows very well the conditions that are existing at the Hospital when it comes to getting medical staff. *(Laughter)*. It is all right to laugh. The hon. member on my left said that if it was for the prison somebody would have said "yes"; but I am not concerned with the prison now; I am concerned with the Hospital. Everybody knows that we have only got three on the junior staff out of seven or eight; we cannot get the others.

A new Superintendent came here the other day and said that he was accustomed to having a refrigerator. We said we will give him a house fully furnished, and a refrigerator is considered a necessity. The economist will tell you that. *(A VOICE: Who?)* I understand the hon. member is an economist, and ought to know that it is economic to have a refrigerator.

The main consideration, Sir, is that this Government is doing all it can to secure medical staff to run the Hospital. We have had three Health Centres going for quite a few years and it is only recently that we could get a permanent officer; the rest are on contract, and if an item such as a refrigerator will help us obtain and retain staff, why should we not give it? When we have not got the staff hon. members come into the House and say all sorts of unnecessary things; that the Government is doing nothing to attract doctors to come to the place. *(A VOICE: Why not pay them?)* There are other things that people want beside payment. If the hon. member had read his note he would see that it said "mainly in the Medical Department" and that is where the trouble is.

All through the West Indies you find there is trouble in retaining doctors. I understand from reliable sources that the question of housing and certain other facilities in Trinidad is the basic quarrel. They are also having trouble in British Guiana, as I noticed a few weeks ago; so if we can, by adding a refrigerator in the house, help them to come to Barbados and remain here and make them comfortable, what is wrong with that?

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, as Minister of Social Services, this is my responsibility, but I must confess that I am really in trouble to unravel some of the folly and mutterings made. It is difficult to think that a man of his experience - I am thinking of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy - who has a responsibility to the community should make statements such as he made. Surely when you are in the Opposition you are free to oppose, but I am in trouble, Mr. Chairman, to understand. You must feel a responsibility to the community; that is the very reason that you are sent here by the vote.

For the hon. member to get up and make a speech like that, I am yet to understand what he expects from the community. He knows, all over the West Indies to some extent, and almost all over the world, the accommodation for a doctor. All the doctors attracted to the West Indies and to Barbados as well are brought here on a contract basis and a furnished house is regarded as part of the emoluments. That is what makes it so shocking.

The hon. member knows that you have a doctor on contract at a fixed salary and fees. Do you expect to bring a doctor here on a year's contract and expect him to buy a motor car and a refrigerator at \$500 or \$600 a month? Do you think there would be any reason why he would come to Barbados if in Trinidad and Jamaica he is offered furnished quarters with a refrigerator? 1.55 p.m.

We have been up against this; and it is for this reason, the problem of recruiting and of retaining our medical officers, that we are doing this.

The hon. senior member for St. Lucy talked about putting refrigerators in the Government Housing Schemes. He also made reference to the furniture at the Clinketts Housing Scheme. That argument by the hon. member is so mean and cheap.

Mr. TUDOR: Oh no, Mr. Chairman. I would listen to anything he says, but I do not intend to have him referring to me as being mean and cheap.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I have no desire of hurting the hon. member's feeling. I am concerned about the measure before Parliament. If it would make the hon. member happy, I will withdraw that statement.

However, Sir, I think you will appreciate, when you reflect on the speech which the hon. member made, with regard to comparing this matter with furniture in the Housing Schemes - and we have a number of Housing Schemes, too, some at the Garrison - I cannot see there is comparison at all. There are a number of people who occupy these houses but surely these houses are not furnished.

We are dealing with furnished quarters. The question is whether you want to regard, just as a stove is basic furniture a refrigerator as basic furniture. It is now the policy of the Government to regard a refrigerator as basic furniture. We have two refrigerators at Enmore and the vote for them passed through this House. As I have said before, this is regarded as part of the emoluments. In order to attract a doctor from overseas, you set out the salary at so much per month and you say so much for his furnished quarters. As I have said, it is now a question of whether you would say that you include as part of his emoluments in so far as furnished quarters are concerned the need for a refrigerator.

You bring a doctor here with his family. He has a duty to the hospital to perform. Let me say that some of

the doctors there now are working for eighty hours a week. You must make him comfortable. The hon. member asked where is the need for refrigerator.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, take a good look over the other side. Look at the Hon. Premier and the Hon. Minister who has just sat down and remember the exhibition with which we have been treated from those hon. members, and the extraordinary argument you have got from them: that all it takes to have the staff at the Hospital running well, all it takes to have all their worries erased, is a refrigerator.

Sir, if you had listened to their arguments you would have had to come to the conclusion that what stands between the people of Barbados and an efficiently run Hospital is the absence of refrigerators in the doctors' residences. That is the argument which we have been asked to examine now. Let us examine it.

Two years ago, - more than two, nearly three - that admittedly was the time, as you have just heard from the Hon. Premier, when the General Hospital was in such a mess - and he has conveniently forgotten to tell us who was the Minister of Health then, but we know that it was under his guidance and administration - they did not tell us then that it was refrigerator comforts which made doctors leave the Hospital. They did not tell us that it was the absence of articles of furniture in doctors' houses which made the doctors leave them; as a matter of fact, they could not give us any reason at all.

Between that time and now, there has been an adjustment of salaries, not to the satisfaction of every hon. member, but in consequence of that adjustment, conditions at the General Hospital among the medical staff have improved. What inference, if you want doctors to stay at that institution, you have to draw today when you have made their salaries as attractive as possible? The hon. Minister of Health argues that having their houses well furnished is part of their salaries. I do not believe it.

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2.00 o'clock, the sitting of this House now stands suspended until 2.30 o'clock. 2.00 p.m.

*On re-assembling.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, there being no quorum, I am asking that the Bell be rung.

*The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.*

*There was no question time.*

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER called Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business but the hon. member was not in his place.

#### HOUSE RESUMES DEBATE ON RESOLUTION re STATEMENT OF HON. R. G. MAPP

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order is to resume debate on the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution re Statement of the Honourable Minister of Communications, Works and Housing on 21st April, 1959.

On the last occasion, the hon. senior member for St. George was speaking at 4.30 p.m. when Government was resumed.

Mr. DOWDING: Sir, it is not my intention to continue this debate much longer. As I have said at the beginning this debate to me appears to be, if I may use the words of the former Premier of this House, without casting any reflection on him, a somewhat puerile attempt because the hon. and learned junior member for St. Lucy has

shaken a tree most forcibly and all he has done is to cause the roots to be strengthened. Rather than anything falling in his lap when he shook the Government's tree - and when I say that, I mean when he shook the Government for taking the correct road as far as my Party is concerned in support of this scheme - he strengthened the roots of the Government tree so far as the question of the Government passing the necessary legislation for the diversion of the highway along Sandy Lane is concerned. I cannot hear what the hon. junior member for St. George is saying.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: The hon. member said something about shaking a tree but it is not clear to me. I do not know if he is referring to a plum tree, a coconut or a Ronald Tree!

Mr. DOWDING: I was saying that it is a Government tree which was being shaken by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy; but, although he shook it, no fruit dropped into his lap but rather, the Government came down with legislation to strengthen the roots of their tree and that legislation was passed by this House. As a result of that I do not feel it is necessary for us to debate this matter at much length.  
2.35 p.m.

As to the points raised by the honourable and learned junior member for St. Lucy, I have already dealt with them except as far as the persons who are at present occupied in pulling down the factory are concerned. You can quite see that my reference to a dead cat is quite a reasonable one; and we should be very quick to be throwing a dead cat, which has something of a smell, out through the window of this House as quickly as possible. As far as the persons in the factory are concerned, the Union has that matter well under control, and so have the employers; and provision is made to ascertain whether these persons can only receive what is due to them according to the Union's Agreement and negotiations. As a matter of fact, the Manager of the factory has been retained by the particular company which has been formed, and he has also ascertained that as many persons formerly employed at the factory and the plantation will obtain work as can be employed.

I have to say that there is no argument in the hon. member's statement as to whether or not Mr. Ronald Tree is a multi-millionaire as against whether or not the Hon. Mr. C. W. W. Greenidge is a multi-millionaire or as against whether any members of the Caribbee Hotels Limited, of which the hon. member was so much in favour, are multi-millionaires or not. The hon. member has not brought us any evidence to prove that. Whether they are multi-millionaires or not - as a matter of fact, if we can get as many multi-millionaires into this island as possible, the better it will be for the persons concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak any further on this matter; I give the scheme my support. My Party supports the scheme wholeheartedly; and I hope that we will try and get ahead and throw this dead cat through the window as quickly as possible.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think that by now there must be quite general agreement on all sides of the House and among the different sections of the community that tourism and the tourist industry must be encouraged. That is a general agreement which we have been enjoying in and out of the House and which will be always existing. There was a time, for instance, when the members of the Government Party who are now probably amongst the foremost advocates of extending the tourist industry were rather lukewarm in their approach to it, and indeed they were rather reluctant to boost the tourist industry as such. The debates of past Sessions of this Chamber are replete with information which sets out quite clearly the fears and the doubts which the Government of Barbados entertained in recent years about tourism.

But while members on the Government side were fearful and doubtful as to the necessity for developing

and extending or even establishing a tourist industry on a proper footing, there were some members of the Opposition who, for just as long a period, were among its stoutest advocates and its foremost defenders. Therefore, to say that we, of the Opposition Party, are in some measure opposed to the development of the tourist industry in this island is to misstate the facts and give an entirely different impression or to give an impression which is entirely different from the facts that obtained.

If you look at the Manifesto of the three Political Parties which are represented in this House, you will see that so far as their published statements go, all of them are committed to the tourist industry and its expansion; they are all committed to doing whatever they can to make tourism an unqualified success as the second major industry in this island. I therefore resent any imputation which is cast upon my Party through either of the other two Parties which are represented in this Chamber, that the Democratic Labour Party is in some sense opposed to tourism, lukewarm as to its possibility or in some measure reluctant to give it unqualified support.

As I have already said, all three Parties meet on common ground there, although in each Party there is a difference of approach to the several aspects of the same problem. Therefore, there is nothing strange that the Chief Opposition Party should have to focus public attention to a scheme admittedly far-reaching which, if it is successful, will mean a lot to the economic development of this island, and which, if it falls short of success, will bring unqualified disaster in its train. It is the duty of an Opposition Party to scrutinise very carefully proposals which are brought before the Chamber by the Government of the day, to criticise them in public, if needs be, and to express the fears and apprehensions of the community at large.

I myself was made aware of the proposed Sandy Lane scheme in a very backhanded manner. I speak under correction at this point. I think I was the first member of my Party to have been told of the scheme, and it came about in this way. I happened to be in the precincts of this Chamber one morning in September last year when Mr. Ronald Tree, who, I understand, is the protagonist of this scheme, came up the main stairway and said that he had an appointment with Sir Grantley Adams. I showed him where he could sit until that gentleman arrived. I did that and when they had finished their conference and I was at the bottom of the stairs, Mr. Ronald Tree stopped me and said that there was a matter which he was just discussing with the Prime Minister of the West Indies, which he had proposed to discuss with the Ministers of the Government and which he intended to discuss with the Opposition Leaders and Parties, and he outlined to me in some detail the Sandy Lane scheme. To me it was just a scheme for tourist development, and I did not understand much of its implications; but what arrested my attention is that Mr. Tree said to me that he was assured that Sir Grantley Adams would move Heaven and Earth to assist the scheme. Immediately, I became rather interested in that scheme. 2.45 p.m.

My colleagues were consulted, as I was. We understood what it was, and as soon as we understood the import of the scheme, immediately we decided that we would reserve and suspend our final judgment on it until a Statement was issued in the House of Assembly - the proper place for a Statement to be issued.

In the scheme, as we understand it from the terms of the Minister's Statement, it is proposed that a sugar estate and factory now in the hands of private owners is to be sold over to a tourist development company for the purpose of putting up a hotel, a golf course, a housing development scheme of some sort, and amenities which one naturally associates with a plan of that sort. Further it was proposed to erect a hotel just where one of the main highways in this island is situated; and that if the hotel is erected just there, it would mean the diversion of the road to some point beyond the proposed golf course.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot expect an Opposition Party or indeed any political Party in any Legislature anywhere except, perhaps, in Russia, to read the details of a scheme like that which affects the economy of the island, the travelling public and the employment facilities of a large number of persons without questioning the scheme in some detail. To expect that the Democratic Labour Party would give its unqualified blessing to the scheme, even without voicing the criticisms which would naturally spring up, is to expect too much.

What is our attitude to it? Our attitude to it is a simple one. We feel that the Government and the promoters of this scheme in one sense have not made themselves sufficiently clear as to all the possibilities of it; and, in another sense, have made their intentions only too clear. Where they are not clear is just here; we feel that we should know in some greater detail the feasibility of destroying one industry or part of one industry in order to set up or accommodate another.

To take a sugar factory and a sugar estate out of cultivation in an island like Barbados is a very serious thing; it cannot be done lightly; and I for one do not believe the extravagant claims which are made on behalf of the new project; that all or nearly all of the persons who are likely to be employed because the production of sugar has ceased will, in some measure or to some large extent, be employed on the new project.

The tourist industry is a very highly specialised industry. People who work in it, whether they work as hotel owners, chambermaids, butlers, taxi-drivers or souvenir makers, are specialists in their own field; and you may hold, Mr. Speaker, some very reasonable ideas about the employability of labour, the ease with which one category of worker is transferred from one group of occupation to another; but I am yet to be convinced that there is comparable employability or ease with which you can transfer an agricultural labourer or factory worker. Is he the sort of person who can easily and readily be employed on a hotel project? Therefore the arguments that the rate of employment or employability will be the same or even greater with this new scheme, so far as these people are concerned, will have to be adduced more strongly and with a greater determination in order to convince people who are anxious about the future of these people.

There is another aspect, Mr. Speaker, of this matter which cannot be lightly put aside. As I said, the common ground which we all share in this House is that we all wish to promote the tourist industry to the limit of our ability. There is a very disquieting aspect of the matter. It is all right to say, Mr. Speaker, that you want to encourage the tourist industry; it is all very well to say that you want to give all the facilities whether by way of legislation or other encouragement so that this industry, when it is fully expanded, will take the place of sugar in an earning capacity or run a near second. That is all very well with these proposals; and any scheme which would bring that to reality would be easily accepted; but you have got to strike a balance somewhere.

What of the happiness of the people of this island? Once you admit that you can take away a sugar estate and factory here, there, or some other part of this island, because it happens to be conveniently situated on some point of our coastline, and hand it over to the tourist industry, the time will come when the majority of people of this island will be blotted off in the centre of the island and the coastline will be owned by foreigners; and much as we would like to see the expansion of the tourist industry, I think, Mr. Speaker, we should all want to pause before we allow ourselves to reach that stage.

The land of Barbados and its facilities are made for the people of this island. When you take it away, no matter what the argument of employability is, you are robbing them of real wealth. I do not mind, Mr. Speaker, how much the promoters of this scheme argue that no great harm will be done in this respect; I do not mind how careful

Government is and how jealous it is of the rights and privileges of the people of this island; there is bound at some time or other to be a feeling on the part of the promoters of these schemes that they are entitled to exclusive enjoyment. Even now with the establishment of this scheme, there are signs that we are in for a lot of trouble and unpleasantness in this island.

Only the other day while I was discussing in a large crowd this scheme, its merits and so on, somebody said that there are places now, strips of beach along the Leeward Coast of this island, where our own people are not allowed to enjoy their seabaths in comfort; and that this particular incident which aroused comment was that some people were having a bath some part along the beach around Carlton, or a little further down, and some gentleman, obviously a non-Barbadian, and of different skin complexion from the people who were bathing in the sea came out and said: "Well now, I hope you have enjoyed your bath; please make it snappy because I am going to let off my dogs on the beach"; and so said, so done. 2.55 p.m.

A decent interval was given for the people to come out of the sea and to get dressed and to move off; but, Mr. Speaker, if that sort of thing happens now, not that the Government condones it - obviously, no member of this House would condone that sort of attitude; but the fact that it can happen when you have not as yet established these exclusive, these large sea-side luxury resorts. You have got to be anxious as to what may happen when you have them.

Make no mistake about it; despite all the protestations about racial equality - that is all very nice to say - people will feel entitled to do what they like with their property and to hedge their property around with all sorts of restrictions. We live in a sort of society in which property rights are very jealously safeguarded; and, no matter what assurance you have beforehand, you will not be able even after long trouble and continuous litigation in Courts to correct any wrong which may be said to be done to any of our people when this scheme gets going. This is not an argument against the scheme but it is necessary that you proceed very cautiously in matters of this sort.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Sandy Lane scheme achieves only moderate success, let us say for argument's sake, it will be an encouragement for the scheme to be tried elsewhere. We would like to see an expansion in this sort of development; but certainly, it should be kept within due bounds. The diversion of the road there is a disquieting matter for several reasons. It suffices to mention two only. People have a prescriptive right to use the highway; and, if for nothing else, our highways in the British Commonwealth are known as the Queen's highways. From time immemorial the right of people to go to and fro over a definite path has been recognised and has been upheld. In all British countries there are severe penalties attached to attempts to bar rights of way or to prevent people from using roads that they want to use which they have been using for quite some time.

If you take the highways in this island, not from the point of view of a utility but of attractiveness, you will have to be a Philistine of the most debased order to destroy and divert the one highway in this island which, without a doubt, lends itself to some charm and natural beauty. In order to divert this highway and to put the scheme where the road now leads, you will have to commit wholesale massacre of some of the mahogany and other trees which have graced that part of the coastline for sometime now, and which, for sheer beauty, cannot be matched anywhere else in this island. If it is true as the poet says, that God made a tree, Mr. Ronald Tree will have a lot to answer for when he removes those trees to put his hotel there.

I make no apology for this particular argument, sentimental as it may seem; but, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot more to these matters than the income which this community may earn through a well developed tourist

scheme. Long after we are residing quietly in our forgotten graves - and I do hope that that will be a long time from now for you, Mr. Speaker, - there should be something in this island that succeeding generations can take solace in and will be able to enjoy. If the natural scenery is inhibited bit by bit, and if our beauty spots which, ironically enough, should be tourist attractions are going to be destroyed in all their natural splendour to make room for concrete and steel, small wonder it would be that a generation from now any Barbadian can come up with an appreciation of beauty.

Even with all the claims of the scheme, to be able to say that when you look behind the hotel you will see a wide open space where sugar was once cultivated, I do not think it would help to be able to say that. No objection whatsoever can possibly be made to the establishment of a hotel on a piece of land, and 50 or 60 acres of land can suffice for that. Architects, surveyors and the other experts would be the best persons to guide you on that matter. Let it be that amount of land and no more. You are taking all that amount of land, of which you have told us, out of agricultural cultivation just to set up an 18-hole golf course and that to me is the height of madness.

I know that we would all like to be millionaires. We have a tinge of being millionaires in us. Millionaires know that they can come and get their luxuries in the tropics, and when they come to these places, they can get value for their money in comforts and the things which they buy; but do you think it is fair to ask Barbadians to surrender so much for the sake of providing luxury for perhaps no more than 50 people? I think that is too much to ask of us. Therefore, our attitude towards this is a simple one. Of course, we would like to see the scheme put into effect. As a matter of fact, anything which can bring us in added income we welcome; but those who study the history of this colony know that similar extravagant claims were made on behalf of the sugar industry. I would be happy to know that we are able to develop tourism to the extent that it becomes the second, or even in time to come the first industry of Barbados; but the bitter lessons which should have to be learnt from the sugar industry should not be repeated. 3.05 p.m.

One of these lessons, Mr. Speaker, is that in the development of the sugar industry of this island over the last century, those responsible for it have ignored the general principle that people are more important than money. Because they have ignored that principle, the present generation of taxpayers have got to make good the deficiencies of the rulers of earlier times. The people who were responsible for the conduct of affairs said that agricultural land was too valuable and, whereas certain people lived in the front, they had to put the tenancies in the back, and the roads have been serving to help the plantations to get their produce out and take it to the factory. You installed the water services, not for the benefit of the people who live in the back of the cane fields; you did not think that those people deserved to have water in their homes, when you put water on the highways where the horses and the mules on their way to and from the factories would be watered and nourished, and the people in the back, in order to get water to drink or to wash, had to leave the tenancies a quarter mile or half mile away in order to get that water.

With the development of our water resources, we are redressing that deficiency; but if a little foresight had been used, and if the other people had allowed the agricultural labourers to live at the side of the road, they would have been living near the water and they would have been enjoying the facilities for which the taxpayers have to pay at such an enormous cost.

It is because of that neglect of the principle that people are more important than money that chances of the agricultural labourer have been killed and we are fighting for improvement today. The analogy comes to light with this consideration; it is not good throwing every consideration overboard, to bend over backwards, so as

to encourage the tourist industry. Let us encourage the tourist industry by all means; but let us have every reasonable and possible safeguard which ensures that the interest of the people of this island shall not be thrown overboard in the expansion of the tourist industry. Even if a particular scheme is profitable or if it gives employment to a larger number of people, these benefits can only be spread out among a section of the population.

Much as we admit, arithmetically speaking, that there has been an expansion of the tourist industry within the last four or five years, and much as we can prove that the hotel owners, taxi drivers and the souvenir manufacturers have done better than in former times, I would suggest that that prosperity has not percolated down to the broad masses of the community. It takes time for the advantages of the industry to mean something to the community generally; and if it takes time for these advantages to reach the community, then you have to make sure that, while these advantages are being sought, the community as a whole is not penalised.

I therefore reject entirely the accusation which has been made by inference by the hon. senior member for St. George; that our Party is in some way so irresponsible that we would rather not have this island develop its tourist industry. If the hon. member means that sincerely, and if that is his opinion of us, then I would tell him that it would be impossible for him to state the opposite to that without great approval.

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of personal explanation. I have not given that inference in any remarks I have made; I have not given the inference that that Party is against tourism.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the hon. member for that categorical assurance he has given; but in a House in which three Parties are represented, if two Parties take one attitude on the same matter and the third Party takes a different attitude, and if in the course of a speech made by the Leader of our Party, he is accused of drawing red herrings and throwing dead cats, and a Minister whose statements caused these deep congratulations to the hon. member on his statesmanlike approach to the matter, we of the Democratic Labour Party can certainly be forgiven for thinking that he is with the Conservatives and is against us.

I remember that a bitter exchange took place across the floor of this House, with the Hon. Minister of Agriculture bandying words with the particular member concerned, and they reached such a height and fury that I believe a protest was made against them. Well now, I find to my astonishment that in this Chamber both sides are in agreement; and both sides congratulate the other on their statesmanlike approach to the matter; and all my side is asking is that while it is all well, and while you are forming your Mutual Admiration Society, try and discover that all the possible interests which may affect the people of this island have been taken into account. We do not mind any laughter, but, after all, when we see who laughs, why should we mind?

We feel that we owe a duty to the people of this island to scrutinise every important scheme which comes before this House; to bring criticism to bear wherever criticism is due; and to assert that second thoughts should always be given to these schemes, the import of which hon. members may not always be aware. I know that it sounds good to boost the Sandy Lane scheme and be told that Mr. Ronald Tree will build a big hotel where we all will get work. If past experience is of any use in this island, who could believe that any scheme which has the blessing of this Government will necessarily increase the employability of the people at large or who do obtain work by this scheme? I stood in Sargeant's Village about the 22nd November, 1956, and I heard Sir Grantley Adams say that if not another cane blade sprung out of the earth it would not matter, because he has sixty million dollars to spend on development and every unemployed person will get work. I heard him say that, and of course by the time a subsequent meet-

ing was held in Nelson Street, he said that the amount was \$48 million. I remember remarking at our meeting that I have never known \$12 million to get lost between Sargeant's Village and Nelson Street within the course of two or three nights. He repeated that the development schemes were so great and vast that the money which the Government had to spend would find employment for every person. 3.15 p.m.

We have got the Deep Water Harbour now to which he made specific reference as a development scheme. The Harbour is now at its peak because, from what one gathers, it will be finished somewhere in the middle of 1961; and for all that was claimed for it along the lines of employability, the work it would give to these thousands of people, even now there is this ironical twist of the whole situation before it is completed and apprehensions and fears are being voiced as to the number of persons that will be out of work when the Harbour is completed.

When you hear a blessing given to a particular scheme on the ground that it will provide employment, Mr. Speaker, you have to examine the merits of the scheme. Of course, nobody can see into the future; nobody knows, strictly speaking, whether it will or not. All we have to guide us is past experience; and we have the experience of the Harbour and the development plan of the Hospital, and with this and others there will be work for everybody, and yet the opposite has been proved true.

To build a hotel, even a large one with a hundred rooms, is no great architectural feat; and the people who are promoting this scheme will have engineers and architects at their disposal to command who can put up a structure in the shortest possible time with all the mechanical means at their disposal employing the least amount of labour; so do not expect to see a lot of carpenters and masons employed on the actual construction of the hotel.

If this project is to be as vast as we have been made to understand it is, quite a lot of the material and fittings, furniture and what not will come in from outside; and therefore we do not know and cannot guarantee that our handicraft will get the benefit even of this scheme. All that is problematical and in the hands of the gods; so that is why, Mr. Speaker, I personally feel the diversion of the road is a bad and unnecessary thing because you are diverting the road to make room for a golf course. It is not that the hotel needs all that back space; it would not and could not.

If you want to take 300 acres or whatever it is out of agricultural production just to make somewhere for a lot of ulcerated old men to walk about, and feel that you should depress the income of this country from one industry on the problematical chance that you would increase it from the other, you have the Government of this island in your hands and you can do what you want; and if the people want it that way, they are entitled to it until they feel they have suffered enough. Although my Party will resign itself to the situation because it cannot do better, it does not entitle us to keep entirely silent on the project. We have to say what we feel about it, and certainly it does not mean that our criticisms must be taken to mean that if we were in power there would be no Sandy Lane scheme. Undoubtedly, there would be; but it would be different in its conception from the one that now obtains because we would certainly have more concern for the people of St. Peter, St. Lucy and St. James than this Government appears to have now. We would not just take away the use of a road in order that a golf course should accommodate a few people, because we do feel - and this where the cleavage of principle really comes between the Government Party, the Conservatives on the one hand and us on the other - that before you give your blessing to any scheme you have to consult the interests of the majority; and much as we would do anything to make 60 or 100 millionaires comfortable when they are down there, we feel it would be much more to our advantage and to the benefit of this island if 25,000 or 30,000 of our own people could be made comfortable as well. If a choice is forced upon us between the comfort of these people and the comfort of

our own people we know exactly where we would come down - on which side of the balance.

The dividing line between us, Mr. Speaker, is not that some are for Sandy Lane as such and others are against Sandy Lane as such; the dividing line is far different; the dividing line is that the Government of Barbados does not appear to have scrutinised the scheme as thoroughly as it should, and has given away unnecessary concessions, and will allow the rights of the residents of the parishes concerned to be unnecessarily restricted. That is the dividing line between us; and we do not feel, however prosperous that scheme may turn out to be in practice, that what is being done is entirely justifiable.

As a matter of fact, I have been told - I do not know how true it is - by somebody connected with the scheme that in the end the promoters of it may not require all the land. Well now, if that is true - I heard it as gossip - therefore some large part of it may be put back into agricultural production. I really hope that it is so; but why should it happen that the people of Barbados should have to await the generosity of outsiders when, in fact, it would have been better for the Government of Barbados to say: "We are not allowing you to have more than a certain amount because we want to retain this much in agricultural production." If it is 380 acres which is involved, and the people are now saying that 180 acres is sufficient for them and are prepared to hand back or devote the rest of it to agriculture, that would be a most welcome thing; it would mean a first consideration that quite a number of agricultural workers who would be otherwise unemployed will not necessarily be unemployed; or it may mean that the proposed golf course will not be as large as it was first intended to be, and consequently a little more land may be given over to housing. If that happens, it would be a good thing, because our object must be to safeguard the perennial interest of the people of this island while at the same time encouraging development.

Any policy on tourism, Mr. Speaker, should always aim at these two things; so the Democratic Labour Party has nothing at all to be ashamed about in our attitude. We are very grateful to the Leader of our Party in this Chamber for having raised the matter and having focused public attention. The ignorant abuse which may be hurled at us outside this Chamber by persons who are knee-deep from a financial point of view in the scheme we can well bear, but we feel that we have a public duty to perform; and that there was some dissatisfaction in several points in the Statement which the Minister made, because he did not make it clear whether and to what extent the interest of the people would be safeguarded.

On tourism generally, and on hotel development in particular our Party's record is clear and unequivocal. I am not disclosing our Party's secrets in saying what I am now going to say, but if you look at our manifesto for the 1956 general elections and the Section on tourism, you will see that it differs so far as principles go very little from the comparable section of the Government's Party's manifesto or from the appropriate section of the Conservative Party's manifesto.

3.25 p.m.

I say this for us, Mr. Speaker. When we were deciding what was our attitude on tourism, we did not just sit down and write out what we thought. We consulted members of our Party - those who were vitally interested in the tourist industry and for whom it is their life's work - along with a sub-committee consisting of a hotel owner, a taxi-owner and driver and a handicrafts souvenir worker. All three of them sat down and wrote out what our policy on tourism should be and it was accepted by the rest of us, because it was written and prepared by members of our Party who are vitally interested and concerned in tourism.

We do not find ourselves having to hedge on tourism; we are prepared to give the development of that particular industry our qualified support, but within those limits that any scheme which appears to our view to restrict the rights of the people of this island cannot be accepted by

us without scrutiny and criticism. If that is not a reasonable attitude for an Opposition Party or any Party to take, I should like to know what is.

Further to this matter, Mr. Speaker, you may find that it will not be necessary to divert the road along there. We just do not know. You have to take the opinion of the experts when they come along actually to survey the place. All that we know is that they have measured off a certain amount of land for the purpose of putting down a hotel with swimming pools and a golf course but the promoters have to leave the planning of it all to their experts. I feel the Government is foolish to commit itself wholesale to a scheme the details of which are not known to the promoters, and which scheme may have to be modified when the whole thing is gone into by the experts. I think it should be possible to save that road, to save the trees there and at the same time to give all the facilities to the establishment of a first-class hotel.

Sir, we have not heard any fully reasonable argument on this matter from the Hon. Minister or any member of the Government apart from what we have been given in the Statement. Of course, I speak under correction because I was not here last Tuesday, and did not hear what the Minister had to say on it. To say that you have given your blessing to a scheme when there are no outlined details of it, is to confess that there is something lacking in your outlook as a Government.

Sir, a debate of this nature should not necessarily be initiated by the Leader of the Opposition; it should be opened by one of the two sitting members of St. James within whose constituency this whole matter falls. It is not necessary for them to criticise the scheme if they are in favour of it, but they should open the debate on it at least to inform hon. members in this House what the scheme portends, even if it be only for their own constituents to know about it. I should be very astonished if I hear that the people of St. James have been vouchsafed any full explanation of what is involved for them as a result of this scheme. They are the first who are entitled to an explanation and to be kept fully aware of the facts about it.

Mr. Speaker, you will find as a consequence of this scheme that land values will go up in the surrounding area and along the coast. In order to prevent a haphazard development of the Leeward Coast, the very fact that you gave your blessing to this scheme should make you plan what you are going to do if requests are made for the sale or purchase of land along the St. James Coast for the same particular purpose. It may well be if the Sandy Lane Scheme proves to be successful, even in a moderate way, that in a few years from now hotel development may shift from the southern and south-eastern part of the island to the northern part; and because so much is involved, that is all the very reason why the interest of the people should be aroused on the matter.

If I may go back to the diversion of the road - and this has occurred to more than one person who has thought of it - another matter is the transport problem. They say that it will not cost us anything more. With the increase of bus fares and the comfort of passengers, can you imagine, all things being equal, anybody having to make a detour, any transport authority having to put on a bus running an extra quarter of a mile or even a hundred of yards extra doing so without calculating to the minutest degree the extra cost for transport that diversion would involve? The hon. junior member for St. James sucks his teeth at my saying that. I wish I were as happy as he over it. These are matters which have to be gone into. You do not dismiss them just like that or because you do not understand them. I know it is a fact that the things you do not grasp you dismiss.

All these things have to be taken into account such as the increasing cost of transportation, the wear and tear of every 200 yards on your tyres and on people's motor cars. Even the extra distance which people have to walk has to be taken into account. The consumption of petrol will show some appreciable rise; it would be

somewhat different to what it is now on account of the diversion. All of these things are matters which have to be gone into and you cannot infer that because a political Party is concerned with this matter, it is against the subject under discussion. That would be a very funny argument. Because Government has given its blessing to the scheme, it does not mean that the matter ends there.

You will find a hundred and one problems arising out of this one scheme, whether it is successful or not; and, as a matter of fact, the more the scheme looks like being a success, the more careful you will have to examine the problems which arise out of it. If it looks like something which would become of permanent value, because of that value, it would be an incentive to people to do the same thing. That would be a cause for your reshaping and revising your policy with respect to tourism.

You must also bear in mind that you are now dealing with a part of the island which has possibilities in this respect, and also a part of the island where other people earn their living by agriculture mainly. You have to keep a careful, close balance between the two industries. You cannot kill agriculture because you want to develop tourism. The anxieties expressed by the hon. senior member for St. George about the future of the sugar industry are anxieties which should be noted by every person.

3.35 p.m.

If his warning is true, then there is all the more reason why, if sugar has to go down, something else must be put in its place. By developing a second or third industry let us see that we do not destroy what prospects still exist in the main industry. There is an almost invaluable rule, the rule of utility of any problem and it is the overall benefits which it confers on human beings. We are not to be frightened merely with the claims of money or because something is profitable; that is not the only reason for encouraging it; that may be the main reason, but it should not be the only one.

We have no right, much as we want to see this island developed, to ignore the basic and important things of the community and set them aside as being of no significance on the ground that the economic advantages to be gained by a project far outweigh the disadvantages. I hold it as an article of my political faith that if the Sandy Lane scheme were to bring into the Treasury of Barbados as much as one million and a half dollars a year in revenue and if at the same time it made ten people in this island unhappy, people who were not unhappy before, that for me would be a condemnation of the scheme. I deem human beings to be more important than things.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Speaker, I would be failing in my duty as a representative of the parish of St. James if I did not have anything to say on this particular matter. I am old enough to be able to tell this honourable House that that entire coastline, running from the Lazaretto to Speightstown, has never been a sugar industry centre at all; it has always been more or less a fishing industry centre. Even if Sandy Lane goes out of operation as an agricultural centre this country will not be deprived of the amount of sugar which can be made in it.

The Government has had under observation, and given a very wide scope of development to the parish of St. Andrew; and when that parish is fully developed, some three hundred acres of land will be available for agricultural purposes. Even if Sandy Lane goes out of operation, this acreage of about two hundred and ninety or three hundred acres of land is particularly coast line and not an agricultural centre, and this country will stand to lose nothing agricultural.

With regard to the labour, I am in a position to say that Sandy Lane at no time has ever been dependent upon the agricultural worker; they always had to get their labour from inside. I remember some fifteen years ago as a member of the Vestry of St. James, I hinted at a meeting of the Vestry, that the day was not far distant when this country would depend wholly and solely on the

central parishes of this island for agricultural development. That is as true today as it was then. You cannot put back the hands of the clock; progress must be made, and we, in St. James, are fully cognisant of the fact that the development of the tourist industry along the coastline of St. James will definitely be an asset to this country.

A lot has been said by hon. members on the other side of the House, but they forget that even if the road is diverted it will not prevent the people from St. Lucy, St. Peter and other parts of St. James from passing into St. Michael. I cannot understand the argument of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy when he says that the diversion of the highway would cause inconvenience to the people of St. Peter and those of St. Lucy. The road does not go through St. Thomas and then go into St. Michael; it is only a diversion of a couple of feet, not miles; and when you reach to the top of the diversion and look out you will get a better view of the coast than at present exists.

I remember the time when people were afraid to go through the Sandy Lane woods on account of theft; it is only recently that the Vestry have installed lights there; and even now the lights are not sufficient to prevent people from being attacked and robbed. I speak with confidence and full of the responsibility which I owe to the people of St. James; they are in favour of the development of the road along the coast.

I want to say that if one wants to convince a multitude, he has not got to speak for ten or twelve hours; I say, without fear of contradiction, that a couple of minutes' talk will decide the issue. I am not going to speak for two or three hours, but I will say that we have nothing in this world to be ashamed of when that road is changed and people put down hotels. You take the diversion; you leave the Rectory and go behind Mr. Thorne's House and go back by the telephone exchange. What inconvenience is there to anybody coming from Speightstown to the City? None whatever. I am quite sure that the people of St. James will not be vexed with the attitude which I am adopting as to this particular measure.

A lot has been said about the millionaires and the multi-millionaires. I chance to know Mr. Ronald Tree; he is a man of money. I have found him to be a man worthy of being called a Barbadian and it is in order to call him a Barbadian. He has been very useful to us in this country and knowing him as I do, he will be an asset to this country even if he is a multi-millionaire. I want to say that every man who owns money is not necessarily an enemy of it.

With regard to the lights, I am sure that any hon. member of this House would agree that we should change those lights. (Laughter). If we are going to change the lights we will have to have something better than electric lights but we cannot get anything better than electric light at the present moment. I speak as a member of the Highways and Lighting Commissioners of the Northern area, and I say that it is our intention that every highway in this island will have electric current whereby people will be able to travel throughout the country without any fear or dread.

3.45 p.m.

I suppose if hon. members will take the trouble to go through Sandy Lane Woods now, even when the lights are on, they would have to carry a torch to be able to find their way. Is that saying that Sandy Lane Woods and that particular coastline has lost its charm and its beauty? It may have a natural space for seabathing, but nobody could tell me that Sandy Lane Woods even when lighted has all this charm and beauty. I am not going to say anything more; I think I have said enough to convince even the most sceptical that what this Government proposes to do is in the interest of this country and not in the interest of any particular Party.

Now racial discrimination. As an hon. member of this House, I have been sitting down here weekly listening to what you would call "junk" about racial discrim-

ination. What I would say we are suffering from in this community is class prejudice. Even a coloured man has a prejudice against his own colour so long as he gets give cents above his fellow-man, and that is the trouble today in the world. I do hope that any hon. member who gets up in this Honourable House to preach racial discrimination will get from me that venom which God has put in me.

Now the sugar industry of this country. As the hon. member has wisely put it, I am a member of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank and I chance to know the financial stability of the sugar industry of this country; and I am saying, without any reason to believe that I am not speaking the truth, that it is not in the best interest of this country that this debate should so go along as to cause the very industry to be subdued in certain ways. I will say what I mean.

This country has a negotiated price for up to 130,000 tons or 140,000 tons of sugar, and anything produced in this country beyond that amount is subject to a low price in the open market. If we in Barbados representing the people of this island do not realise that, if we do not get a profitable price for that surplus of sugar, we are bound to be affected. If anybody doubts that, he doubts anything that is right. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that it is the mainstay of this country, and it is our duty to see that that industry is maintained to such a high level that every man, woman and child who is eligible for work will find work in that industry; but the day the industry fails to give work to these people, Sir, then some other means must be made in order for them to get employment.

If these people come along and take a part of our barren coast, not agricultural, and develop it into a tourist industry where thousands of people can be employed, and help can be given to those people who cannot be taken into the sugar industry and cannot be employed by it on account of certain conditions existing today in the world, are we as a Government to sit low and idly by and let everything go to chaos and confusion? We cannot. We are bound to make avenues for all the people of this country; but I will say this to the labouring man today: there is a sense of irresponsibility existing in the labouring man today. I had only yesterday to deal with a case at the St. James Almshouse where one man was the father of twenty children; and therefore, you can see that if any cure is to be made along those lines, the agricultural man must take stock and reduce expenditure to a point whereby he would be able to make a living for himself and his children. I am only giving this out as a warning. I am not saying that every man is not in a position to have one million children, and, therefore, he should revert to family planning.

It is said that the sugar industry can do lots of things; I am not saying that it cannot do something, but it cannot do everything; and the stage is set - this is something I am prepared to give out irrespective of Party - for common agreement between the Sugar Producers' Association and the Labour Union to come to a common understanding as to what the position is. I was speaking to a man last night who owns a sugar estate, and he turned to me and said: "Searles, man, how am I to pay this production bonus? I have made \$2,000 on the working of my estate and to pay production bonus out of the \$2,000 I would have nothing for myself and the labourer would get more." I am in sympathy with every movement in this country to give the labouring man a living chance to buy the necessities of life which are essential for the upkeep of his family, and no Opposition in the world can tell me that you can make blood out of stone; but stone can retain water; mould cannot retain water; therefore the substance must be hemmed in that the man would be able to get his substance at all times.

Mr. Speaker, provision has been made as far as I know for entry to the sea for every man who wants to go there along that coastline; and whether it is Tree, Dunlop or anybody else who wants to put that hotel industry on the coastline of St. James and he cannot yield to the satisfaction of this Party by giving an entrance to the sea, that

scheme cannot go through. I say now that there is another man who is interested in the development of his own land. 3.55 p.m.

I am now referring to my hon. friend, the junior member for St. Lucy. He wants that diversion through his land and not somewhere else, but that diversion would cause the people of St. Peter and St. Lucy great inconvenience.

Sir, the question of a diversion makes no difference in the world to a man whether he lives in Timbuctoo, St. Lucy, St. Thomas, St. Joseph or St. Andrew, so long as he can get an easy access to Bridgetown. Let hon. members put the thought out of their mind that the people of St. James, St. Peter and St. Lucy are dissatisfied about this diversion of the road. As a matter of fact, if this plan goes through, even those who are in opposition to the diversion of this road will realise that the diversion is in the interest of this country as a whole.

Let us assume for the sake of an argument that you have water mains and your overhead lights running through that road now. As soon as this plan goes through, the people who are sponsors of the scheme are bound, by the agreement, to put down a road on the other side; and, furthermore, as far as I know, they have agreed that sidewalks would be put down along that road. Now, tell me if that would not be a better highway? At present, you do not even have sidewalks to all the streets in Bridgetown.

Hon. members talked of the beautiful scenery through Sandy Lane. I know that you will have trees along the place where they propose to divert the road. If that is so, tell me how this diversion can affect the scenery. Surely, you cannot say that there is any lovely scenery through any dark woods as what you have there now. With regard to those trees, I am saying that Mr. Ronald Tree would be justified in taking out some of them in order to make the scenery more beautiful. If that scenery was to remain on the coastline when the hotel is put up, I do not know what would be the outcome with the number of racketeers who would be knocking around the country to see whom they can rob. I am sure Mr. Ronald Tree will be bound to take out some of those trees in order to see something.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I agree with the hon. senior member for St. George that the trees were being shaken by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy but no fruit has fallen into his lap. I take the opportunity to say I hope that I will remain a member of the Government's Party until it pleases Almighty God to take me away from this scene. I am a Socialist in a way, but I am not a Democratic Labour Party Socialist. I never will be because their idea of Socialism borders on Communism of which I am not a supporter. I say that because I cannot believe for one moment that, although you give a man the right to do as he pleases, yet on the other hand you say that if he does not as you want him to do, you will cut off his head. That is not Socialism; that is the ideology of a dictatorship.

I will turn now to the population of this country. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this country has a population close on 240,000 and we as a Party must preach the lesson of Planned Parenthood. If we cannot succeed along those lines, we cannot succeed at all. Over the 166 square miles of this island, you have a population of nearly 240,000 to feed, maintain and to give them the best that life has for them. Tell me if it is within reason to believe that this Government or any other Government can find ways and means whereby 240,000 people can be well established, well maintained and well employed with a one-crop economy? They cannot do it and no man in this world can tell me, whether he be of the Conservative Party, the Democratic Labour Party or of the Barbados Labour Party, that he can do it. They cannot solve that problem as easily as some people may think. The problem must be solved by the individual; that is to say, if a man works for \$10 or \$15 a week, he cannot expect to succeed in life if he

spends \$30 a week. When he does that he is only courting disaster.

I am saying to this Hon. House that we, as a Party, must go through the length and breadth of this Island of Barbados not only thinking in terms of party, but to do that which God demands us to do and to do the best that lies in our power for the human race. It is true that you cannot do these things without some financial assistance, but, if you go about it in the right way, the finance will come. If you go about it in the right spirit, you will get the people themselves doing things without thought of money and you will get some results out of it. If we move on, everyone in his own interest, you will only stop the wheels of progress; therefore, I am saying to every hon. member of this House and to every member of the public that if they come together as a whole and assist the Barbados Labour Party, in such a way opportunities will be provided for each and every one of us provided we go about it along certain lines. We cannot expect to take the bull by its tail and do not expect a goring. The goring will come that way but it will not come if you take the bull by its horns.

We have a duty to perform to our people. It is our bounden duty to teach them in the right way and not to teach them in terms of antagonism towards one another, but in terms of love towards one another. To love is of God. I say that until man becomes a living entity with the Christ and dwell in Him, there can be no hope for the human race.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to touch on one other subject and then conclude my speech. It is said that I am a silent member of this House. I claim that, although I am a silent member, I am not a dead member; and many a time one expresses himself better by saying nothing than in saying something which has absolutely no sense at all, no dignity, no point or else in it. I prefer to sit silently than do that but when it comes to the point where my constituency is at stake, I am not afraid to get on my two legs in this Hon. House and take up the cause of my people. In the taking up the cause of my people let me say that I am not taking up the cause of the people of St. James alone, but I am also taking up the cause of the people of the entire island; because, I realise that the constituents of St. James having returned me to this Hon. House, in doing so, they have returned me with the intention of representing the country as a whole.

With these few words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I commend this scheme which my Party is going to accept - although I believe it is already an established fact that they have already accepted it. I am sure that this Government will not permit anything to be done which will jeopardise the ways of the labouring man from making an honest living.  
4.05 p.m.

With those few remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I commend the Resolution, as proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, to the waste paper basket; it has absolutely nothing in it. The attitude adopted by the Government will prove to be a good one throughout the length and breadth of Barbados because it is something for the benefit of the country.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Minister who should properly reply to the Resolution which was moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is, unfortunately, not here. I am not in a very good position to reply to anything which has been said, because, truthfully, I did not listen very much to anything which has been said. There was nothing in it and naturally I did not pay much attention to it.

The most I did listen to is today when the hon. senior member for St. Lucy was speaking, and listening to him reminded me of a gentleman who was a member of the Legislature; I think that all of us who are now present knew him in his lifetime. Just about the eve of his days a social revolution had begun to take place in Barbados and he tried to be friendly with both sides of

the people. He was a coloured man and I am told that he used to say, when speaking with the white people about the coloured people "Man, do not mind them; all they have got is mouth". (Laughter). I was very much reminded about that when the hon. member was speaking and I almost said the same thing; "Don't mind them; all they have got is mouth."

The hon. member made a beautiful speech, with beautiful expression; etc., but what was there in anything he said of a practical value? There was the usual ranting and tearing and I think I used the expression earlier today, a diarrhoea of words and a constipation of thought; because anyone who is thinking of the future of this community would certainly not have made the speeches that they on the other side have made. After all, it boils down to this; that we are constantly reminded by them that we have a big population and they ask what about providing work and setting up industries? We are told that we are not doing anything to bring in industries or to provide work for people; we are told that day in and day out and when we try to do something we get this adverse criticism. If we were to listen to the remarks made by the members of the Opposition and follow them to their logical conclusion, we would sit down and do nothing as regards industries. It is all right to be a member of the Opposition; after all there must be some contrary opinion to that of the Government, but let us have intelligent and constructive opposition. We cannot always be right, and honesty and intelligence we will do well to consider.

As regards the question of development on the whole, we have been told, in fact we have been given an assurance as to the sort of development at Sandy Lane. Much has been said about destroying the trees so as to erect the hotel. I wonder why hon. members on the other side think that they are the only people in this House who can intelligently interpret the wishes of the people; or that they are the only people who have the interest of the people, especially the working class people, at heart. Do they not think that God has endowed us with the same amount of grey matter as that with which He has endowed them? In fact, I am doubtful about the matter of grey matter that we see displayed on the other side of the House, because getting up and talking and yapping, to use common parlance, really does not signify intelligence; very often it shows just the opposite - the lack of intelligence.

But let us get back to this scheme. I understand that in relation to the hotel proper, very few trees will be destroyed. As a matter of fact, that was the first point I made when the scheme was put up to me. I was assured by the promoter of the scheme when I visited the site and was shown the spot on which the hotel will be placed, that very few trees will be destroyed. As a matter of fact, there are probably quite a few shrubs which will be destroyed, but by and large there will be very few trees which will be destroyed as a result of the erection of this hotel.

As to the diversion of the road about which so much fuss was made, when that diversion takes place, perhaps the new road will be in the vicinity of two hundred feet longer than the present road. We are told that we must look out for an increase in bus fares, an increase in the use of gasoline and, Sir, we are told that all of that will come as a result of an increase of 200 feet of road.  
4.15 p.m.

We are assured that the building of the hotel, plus the building of other houses they propose to put up on the land, will occupy carpenters, masons, painters, labourers and people of that sort for about five years. We are also told that when the scheme is completed it will employ a minimum of 450 to 500 people; that is more than the Sandy Lane factory as it stands today in ordinary time and even in crop time employs now.

As far as access to the beach is concerned, from one end to the other, it is fenced by wire and this Government has demanded the right of access; and they have agreed to give a right of way to the sea for the use of the

people. That is something more than we have now. If you happen to go there now, and you can get to high-water without crossing their land, it is all right, but if you cross their land to get to high-water mark, you can be prosecuted. When this is done, there will be an access road leading to the sea. So, Sir, by and large the Government feels it is something in the interest of the people, something to provide employment as I said just now, for carpenters, masons, painters and labourers in the erection of these buildings for a few years, and when the scheme is completed it is estimated to employ 400 to 500 people.

What are we as a Government to do with the assurance given to us by the promoters of this scheme in the face of all we know as to the likelihood of finding alternative employment for people inside Barbados as well as outside? When all this representation has been made to us, I think we would all be considered lunatics if we told them "no, we do not want it". We said "yes"; we are convinced as I said that this scheme when it is fully developed will redound to the good of Barbados and we have given it our blessing and are satisfied that the outcome will be all that we hope and wish it to be.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it appears that all other members who proposed to contribute to this debate have done so. I shall exercise my right of final reply, but I would just like to be assured that I heard the Hon. Premier correctly when I understand him to say that he has been assured, or has been told, that the building of the hotel and the other houses will occupy carpenters, masons, painters and labourers for about five years. I wonder, Sir, if he does not rise on a point of explanation, if I may assume that I heard him correctly as to that.

Of course, Sir, he made the proviso that he was told; and therefore the hon. member 's only quoting someone who perhaps did not think it fit to attempt to particularise about that; Mr. Deputy Speaker, it would have to be a vast hotel and numerous houses of very considerable size, the erection of which would occupy about five years; and certainly not a fifty-room hotel which we have heard about, and the bungalows which we have been told about. One cannot envisage them taking anything like five years or even one year if a reasonable amount of labour is put on in the hurricane season for the completion of this job. After all, Sir, when private enterprise is doing a job, as you know, it does not waste time; and I cannot imagine any fifty-room building done by private enterprise in this island taking five years or even one year unless it runs short of funds during the time. Let me make this point plain.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not say the building of the hotel. I said the erection of the whole development.

Mr. BRANCKER: My point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was and still is whether the building of the hotel and other houses will occupy artisans and labourers for about five years. I was just about to remark, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the sponsor of the scheme is not doing it - as some of us either believe, or do not believe but would have others to believe - as an act for the benefit or the good of the working class people of Barbados, or for that matter, for the people of Barbados. He is doing it with the backing of a substantial financial interest with one and only one objective in mind; and that is to turn \$1 million into millions of dollars for the benefit of the promoters of this scheme. This is as hard-hearted and capitalistic an enterprise and undertaking as any that has ever been done in Wall Street or anywhere else; so let us not delude ourselves that this kind-hearted, nice old gentleman, despite the cheque book bulging out, has just come to this island to help the poor people of it.

I was told the other day that he presented to the Agricultural Department one or two Zebu bulls, and that he has come to this island to help the poor inhabitants thereof; he sees an opportunity of increasing his means, and he is prepared to the fullest extent

to profit by that enterprise which he has embarked upon with the blessing of the Government of this island.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it seems to me that the divergence in this House is this: on the one hand, unless I woefully misunderstand certain members of this Chamber, they are prepared to see tourism at any price. We of the Official Opposition say tourism, but there can be too high a price even to pay for tourism; and if the price is too high, if it is sacrificing all the amenities, privileges and the comforts of the vast numbers of the people who were in this island long before a particular "Tree" came to it, a particular species of tree, not mahogany, clammy-cherry or golden-apple, we are prepared, Mr. Deputy Speaker, irrespective of what these people with limitless means at their disposal are prepared to spend to let them understand this:

4.25 p.m.

We will encourage a hotel. If you want the money, that is perfectly in order; the Barbados Development Board will help with the money. It has helped with Eastry House, the St. Lawrence Hotel and all those deserving places; but it is significant that none of those places wanted to divert a highway or wanted the people to travel 200 feet from off the main road which they are accustomed to travel. Just because those doughty, prejudiced multi-millionaires are not disposed to cross the same street as the donkey carts, the people of St. Lucy and St. Peter and the working class folk from the Leeward, is the reason why you see the proponents of this scheme are not prepared to run the same sort of scheme for tourism that the other organisations have been prepared to run, and are running, so successfully for the benefit of tourism and without any detriment to the people of this island.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you can very well see that this roadway to the beach which Government tells us that they have insisted on will be little used. If members of the Government had listened last night to the talk over Redifusion, they would have seen reason why they should have insisted on a 64-foot roadway both ways - one to the north and one to the south.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you know how busy the people at the Hometown Police Station are going to be kept when coloured people and the working class people go on that beach in front of where this scheme would be operated so as to enjoy themselves. Those young boys and girls when they go there to enjoy themselves will be hindered by these doughty, prejudiced millionaires, those segregationists, because that is the type of person who is going to frequent this type of scheme.

#### REVERSION TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 p.m., this House reverts to Government Business.

#### HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When Government Business was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. BRYAN in the Chair

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the suspension, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy was addressing the Chair.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, it was refreshing some few minutes ago to hear the Hon. Premier say that he welcomes constructive criticism. Quite conveniently, he left it open as to what he calls constructive criticism or not. I have never known Government when you criticise any particular aspect of their policy to admit that your criticism was constructive. What they do is to follow up your ideas after and try to snatch the credit from the rightful owners. I notice that, recently, the Hon. Premier when replying to reasonable criticism from the Opposition, has taken the occasion to sneer at hon. members and to use remarks which are meant by him to be offensive. I think my bitterest opponents would admit that I use words correctly and I know

what I am saying and that what I say makes sense; of course, not necessarily to them.

Sir, I left off at the point at which I was dealing with the Government's argument with respect to the provision of refrigerators in houses of public officers though the Hon. Premier said that these were for the houses of doctors, and therefore, not necessarily other officers of the Government. I was saying that if you want to put a refrigerator in the houses of doctors, or indeed in the homes of public officers in order to secure their service, you will have to do much more than that because when the facilities of television becomes wide-spread, public officers coming from abroad who are accustomed to T.V. will claim that they are not comfortable in the house you provided for them without T.V.; and, therefore, it is a condition of service that you would have to provide T.V. sets for them. And if you apply that principle, you will find yourself providing every comfortable thing for them.

It is simply not the entire truth to say that the difficulty of staffing of the General Hospital is due to refrigerators for the doctors. Doctors, like any other public servants, look forward to adequate service as well as desirable conditions of work; but it would come close to pampering of public officers if you were to allow them to know that it was your policy to provide them with every comfortable article of furniture which they want.

I do not care how much argument is adduced by the hon. Premier, or the Hon. Minister of Health; nobody can convince me that because you say that you are offering furnished quarters to these people that it is taken to mean you are necessarily offering them refrigerators.

Mr. Chairman, I notice the hoots of laughter which the analogy I drew to the Housing scheme brought forth from hon. members on that side. That is nothing for me to be ashamed about. I have never said that you should put refrigerators in homes in the Housing scheme; but if you say that a refrigerator is a household necessity, well then, a refrigerator is a household necessity not only for rich people but for poor people as well.

I am saying that you should have your explanatory note to this item worded differently. You say in the note that it will now be agreed that a refrigerator is a household necessity. I am now at liberty to ask why did you not put them in other people's places or encourage other people to put them in. When we had trouble with the General Hospital two years ago, Government never said that it was the question of the furnishing of the doctors' houses which prevented the doctors from coming here. The Government never said, for instance, that because their houses were not furnished up-to-date, you found difficulty in getting a doctor to come to the Hospital. While it is true that the House at that time criticised very severely the Government, at no time did the House withhold anything which the Government said was necessary for maintaining the doctors there.

4.35 p.m.

If that is the reason and it has been carefully withheld for three or four years from the public, then we are entitled to ask if all that stands between this community and the Hospital is half a dozen refrigerators. Whom are you asking to believe that? If your salary scales and the actual monthly allowances are attractive, you will get the doctors you want; and if, as appears to be the case, you are encouraging doctors on the staff to go out for further studies which is a very good thing, you will realise that if they come back to you, you will have to pay them for the increase and extended qualifications which they have obtained. But the tail cannot wag the dog.

If the doctors or any of your Civil Servants are impertinent enough as to tell you that they cannot do their work or that they are giving up their work because they do not find refrigerators in the houses you give them, they are not serious. They have other grounds for not wanting to work for you. I admit that a furnished house is a condition of service and that, to a certain degree, it counts as an addi-

tion of salary; but what is the degree of furnishing? Where are you going to draw the line? If in a certain walk of life refrigerators are now a necessity and a new set of doctors say that they should have television, are you going to give them that too? Are you going to submit to this attempt at blackmail? You cannot convince the people of this island that without putting refrigerators in the doctors' homes you cannot get good doctors.

I suspect that the grievances of the doctors do not lie in that region at all. If the administration of the Hospital was such that the doctors could do their job properly and the actual hours of work were such that they could work to the best of their ability under conditions which were ideal and the money was adequate for the services which they are rendering, why would such officers quarrel about providing their own refrigerators? The very fact that an officer's work was enjoyable would make him want to spend his salary on his own comforts as far as possible. You cannot say that a refrigerator is basic furniture. If we could afford to have a refrigerator, we would like to have one at our home and it would be a convenience to us; if it goes bad we would be deprived of its use for some time. We did not always have refrigerators and we got on very well without them; a lot of us used to drink our water out of the monkey and the jug, but people find that refrigerators have been useful and that they should have them. However, nobody would insist that if you could only make good your undertaking to provide a refrigerator and unless you do that you would have all but a contented service. How can you argue that? If you could argue down the difficulties at the Hospital only to this point, if that were so, you would be entitled to congratulations. What is wrong with the Hospital is not so much that the doctors have not got refrigerators but inside the Institution itself things are not going well. If I accept the argument for one set of people, that you need all the comforts to make them work properly, then I would also extend that argument to another set of people who are working in the same Institution.

The other day I said on the floor of the House that with respect to the Hospital laundry a tin pot Caesar was making people uncomfortable. The Minister challenged me and said that I was inaccurate and that sort of thing. I did not say anything because I know what the consequences of my disclosure would have been; and within a few days from then the Leader of the Party referred to the same thing which I mentioned and which the Minister denied had taken place. If there are grievances which have nothing to do with salaries but grievances which are inherent in the place it is so much more easy to push up the scale of the nurses and the doctors. The whole Institution itself needs proper organisation and planning, and expert advice as well as common sense will do that for you; but do not mistake one thing for another and say that we have to attract these doctors to the Hospital and therefore we have to make the creature comforts as expensive and as numerous as possible.

I have no objection to doctors having refrigerators but I would have thought that just as you would lend a Civil Servant money to buy a car, you would lend him money to buy a refrigerator at the most reasonable terms he could pay. There is nothing wrong with that. As a matter of fact, there would be more justification for lending him money to buy a car because his duties may depend on his having a car; but you have not proved that the execution of the doctor's duties depend on his having a refrigerator at his home.

Do not let the public get the impression that all you are trying to do is to straighten out the difficulties at the Hospital by providing refrigerators. Doubtless the Ministers cannot mean that; they do not mean that and I am not drawing that inference for them. But it would sound like that if you say that it is an encouragement to get people to stay with you or to come. You have to clean up the Hospital itself if you want to attract doctors. Nobody can stop you from providing basic furniture. A man would expect a bed, a table, somewhere to sleep and something with which to cook his meals; that is regarded as a part of a man's salary. If you stretch that

argument to include the provision of a refrigerator without which a man can live with some degree of comfort, if you do that, you will find yourself committed to supplying that particular facility and you cannot do it. That is the reason why the line should be drawn somewhere. Another reason why I feel that these Officers should be helped to make their own arrangements about these matters is this.

4.45 p.m.

As everybody knows, we do not buy a refrigerator expecting to keep it until we die of old age. It is an expendable article; and everybody knows that after a few years of good service, if you are able to, you get rid of it before it gets so bad that you would spend more money on it than it is actually worth at the time. If that is true about this particular article of furniture, is Government really wise to commit itself in this way? It would be far better to work out an arrangement whereby the loss on the article is thrown on to the person who is using it. If you just put a refrigerator in an officer's home and charge him money, it is you and not he who will be bearing the cost of depreciation, because it is yours and he is using it and paying a rental for it. After he goes, say in four years' time, the incoming officer will quite properly and sensibly want a new one - why should he not get a new one? - and you are left with that on your hand. You would have then to sell it or pass it on to a public institution, but whichever it is, you yourself will be losing money on it.

In view of that, would it not be better - the same object would be served - to lend the doctors money to purchase refrigerators and they will then purchase what sort they want; some may not even want a refrigerator; they may prefer a deep freeze. They will pay you interest on the money you lend them with the proper guarantees and that would be that, and it would be for them to get rid of the article at the most advantageous price to them when they no longer want it, and the taxpayers' money will only be involved to the extent of a loan and its repayment. That is how I see it and all the more so when you say that it is principally the doctors who are involved. If this is to be done for half a dozen or so many as ten people, why go to the trouble of purchasing refrigerators yourself? Why not help the people to purchase them?

The argument, Mr. Chairman, therefore is not at all convincing, and Government doubtless has its own way in this matter, but I cannot see, apart from the small select crowd of doctors for whom this particular facility is provided, any joy and pleasure in giving this; and I want to emphasise, Mr. Chairman, that criticism on this does not at all imply that the Opposition or any member of it does not want to facilitate the employment of doctors at the Hospital on the best possible terms. It is only that the Government has not convinced us that the addition of this particular article of furniture in a house will make all the difference between content and discontent in a doctor. That is how I feel about it. Of course the Minister of Health pretended he could not understand my point of view clearly, yet he attempted to justify it a little more than the Premier did. The Premier was more concerned with answering or rather insulting me than with defending his own case.

What I wanted to find out, Mr. Chairman, is this: it is a serious thing for two Ministers of the Government to drop a hint that they are having trouble with the doctors in the Hospital. Perhaps out of the whole debate that is the most important thing that has emerged, the hint dropped by the Premier and backed to a certain extent inferentially by the Minister of Health that all is not well. If we are to take them at their word, should they not tell us in a frank and fair way what the trouble is instead of wanting us to believe that the trouble is so slight that only the provision of refrigerators in the terms set out here would be sufficient to heal the breach? Doctors are leaving, others are not staying the length of time, some are not coming back who have gone on leave, and others are asking for transfers. That is an old thing with the Barbados General Hospital, but we had hoped that in recent years it would have been a thing of the past. It certainly reached its worst under the Ministry of the now Premier when he was Minister of

Health; his successor has been making a valuable attempt to clean up the mess that he left with what success I do not know, but with very little success if the Premier is to be believed. So on the one hand we sometimes get the Minister of Health giving us reassuring words about the Hospital and now we have the Head of the Government who really does not have the portfolio but who is responsible for the whole Government telling us that matters can become serious if we do not satisfy these doctors. Which of the two are we to believe?

If it is true that there is dissatisfaction and that such has to be undertaken by Government to remove that dissatisfaction, what in addition to this are you prepared to do? I say quite frankly that if it were proved to me without any difficulty that all the trouble in the Hospital or most of it or the comfort of the patients was contingent upon doctors having refrigerators in their homes, I would be prepared to say give the doctors everything they want so that our people can be properly attended to in the hospital, but I do not believe that is the cause and if Government has committed itself to providing these articles of furniture, well perhaps it cannot get out of it now. I would like to see a revaluation of that policy and Government has got the remedy in its own hand. By its own admission, as you see here, principally the doctors are involved, and that means that a relatively small number of Civil Servants is to have this facility. Why could you not then have worked out a special scheme for them instead of permitting Government as a whole to the principle of providing refrigerators?

Do you know, Mr. Chairman, what the consequence of this could well be? Any public officer of a comparable status drawing a salary say equal to that paid to a medical officer of any grade at the Hospital and who at the same time is allowed to have furnished quarters could also ask for a refrigerator, because if the argument is that it is for a certain category to whom furnished quarters are part of their emoluments, any officer who finds himself in that salary scale and who in addition to the salary enjoys furnished quarters is entitled to ask for it too, and then where will you be?

4.55 pm.

You may ridicule the idea of people who live in the Housing schemes being supplied with refrigerators but you may find yourself landed with something more absurd than that of having to provide the same facility for every person of the same standard. I cannot draw a line at the doctors because there are other people who are just as important to you as doctors, such as the Director of Public Works or your Agricultural Specialists. Who is more important? Who is to gauge the importance of the work which your several highly placed and highly qualified officers do? It is true that the Government should draw a line somewhere and it is possible for the Government of Barbados to do two things; that is, on the one hand to satisfy the doctors, and at the same time not to leave the Government's door open to requests from others who are in comparable places as doctors for refrigerators as well. If you change that, you can manage all that you set out to do.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, under Item 6 of this Head, I would be glad to know how many pumps and windmills does this vote entail and if all the pumps and windmills will come under the services of this tenderer. In other words, are there any pumps and windmills which are kept in order by any Government Department or are there all to come under this contract?

As regards the next item, Military Buildings, the note says that following a visit of inspection of certain of the Garrison Lettings, it has been decided that immediate steps should be taken to rehabilitate and extend Lettings Nos. 10 and 52 at an estimated cost of \$12,000. Now, Sir, that is a big amount of money, and I would like to find out what is the income from those two Lettings and whether those Lettings are occupied by persons in the Government Service or otherwise.

Sir, I do feel that we are entitled to a little more information than what we get in these Addenda. The dignity of

this House should be upheld. These Addenda seem to be written in a manner which suggests that members of this House are incapable of sitting down and working out for themselves the pros and cons of the expenditure of the money of the taxpayers. If you can be given some indication with respect to the income of these two Lettings we would then be able to say, well, \$12,000 is a reasonable amount to be expended on these lettings. I feel that we are entitled to that information and I think we are constantly being slighted when it comes to these matters with so little information. I do know that it is difficult for the Ministers to have all these things at their fingertips but I think the notes in the Addendum can be more clearly set out so as to give more light to the facts and so that one can adduce from them whether the taxpayers' money is being fairly expended.

As regards Item 86, Furnishing of Government Buildings, I have, like the hon. member for St. Lucy, a few qualms on the statement made in this addendum. As far as I can find out from what is stated in the note, there are a few particular cases and you are naming those places for which it has been found expedient to place a refrigerator; but the Note goes on to state some very dangerous bits of what one would envisage to be a policy. It says that certain officers, mainly in the Medical Department, are supplied with quarters which are equipped with basic furniture. That means that there are other officers outside of the Medical Department who would be entitled to these refrigerators.

I do not feel that this House should commit itself to the whole of a Civil List which is a large book to be entitled to these refrigerators. I have not reckoned the number of names which are contained in that book. The fact that this note says "mainly in the Medical Department" means that there are other officers who are entitled not only those in the Medical Department. I would like to know who are the other officers in the other Departments who are going to receive this benefit. I would like to know that because I would like to know from here where do we go. One hundred refrigerators at a very conservative estimate would be in the vicinity of \$60,000 and that is a lot of money for the taxpayers to produce if it can be argued that this is a precedent which has been arrived at by the Government. I therefore think it is incumbent upon the Hon. Minister who is concerned to make a definite statement as to who are the officers who are entitled to this treatment due to some reason or the other and if he can state categorically that no one else would be offered these refrigerators unless a special case is made out. As I take it, those special cases will be discussed by this House on their own merits.

The note goes on to state categorically, that in the past the quarters of those officers were not supplied with refrigerators as part of the basic furniture but it will now be agreed that a refrigerator is a household necessity. Now, Sir, I take it that that is a statement of Government's policy. The Government is now saying that a refrigerator is a necessity in a household. Although the first paragraph says certain officers, mainly in the Medical Department, it does not say what other officers in other Departments are entitled. When a categorical statement like that is made, it is dangerous because it must give any person in the future on grounds legal and moral to argue that they are entitled to the same benefits because the Government now says that they consider a refrigerator as a household necessity and they will argue that on today's date at a meeting of the House of Assembly, the House of Assembly agreed that a refrigerator is a household necessity. I think that should be clarified by the Hon. Minister concerned. If he makes a definite statement, well then, we can say that in respect of the way the Addendum has been written, these were special cases and the records of this Hon. Place will show that these were special cases. However, the Addendum does not read as if these are special cases.

5.05 p.m.

I quite agree with the hon. senior member for St. Lucy that there is good reason for caution in this matter, particularly in the light of the wording of the Addendum to the Resolution. Now, Sir, the fact that the Medical Department is in a bit of a bad situation does not mean that that is the only Department for which this Government needs officers.

There would be other cases for which this Government may have to offer some better inducement; but I think that we are fooling ourselves if we think that the provisions of refrigerators is going to settle the problems of the staff at the Hospital, as the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has said. If that is so, there are people in this island who would be willing to offer as many refrigerators as you want staff now. I cannot see that the provision of refrigerators will solve the question of staff. What matters to anybody is the amount of money he receives, after his expenses and taxation etc., have been taken out, for his own use, for his own living and for that of his family - the take-home pay, the amount which goes into the pocket.

If we are fooling ourselves and the taxpayers that we are not increasing the payment of these officers, we are heading in the wrong direction. Let us face the facts and realise what is being paid in other parts of the world and let us come to the conclusion that it is necessary to create pioneer industries for the doctors of this island in order that they can operate; let us create that industry and have the hospital put in order. We want industries in this island and we have to create facilities for getting them to come to this island. Let us stop fooling around with refrigerators and allowances and that sort of thing and come down to the facts. You can give a man a refrigerator, a telephone and everything else and if he can get more money elsewhere he will not come here. If the situation is a bad situation let us formulate a policy which will give the doctors concerned the necessary money for the running of the medical services of this country. It is just as important as having industries in this island to have doctors being well paid for the benefit of this island. That is a criticism which I feel is constructive and I do hope that it will be taken in that light. The Hospital needs staff and no matter what you talk about refrigerators and you do not have the required type of staffing, the whole thing boils down to what a man puts in his pocket; and if ways and means are not found for putting more money into the doctor's pocket, we will not get staff at the Hospital unless we see after these matters.

Sir, there is something wrong with that Hospital (A MEMBER: This is our money.) That may be so but I want to say this. A few weeks ago an employee of mine got a bit of trash in one of his eyes and I sent him to the Hospital to get it removed and I was told that it could not be done that day. I sent him to Dr. St. John and he got it removed on that same day. I have the records, but I have not got them here. I gave my employees strict instructions that whatever takes place in that case should be recorded. Before these matters get worse, what are you going to do? Are you going to let these matters mount up and get worse? In my opinion, the Hospital will get worse according to how much staff you have during a particular period. During a particular regime, the staff at the Hospital was full, some of the staff left and things got worse. As far as I understand, the same thing is happening. We must do something to stop it and I do not think that what is proposed here is a means of stopping it.

I go further and say that at the rate of 5% of the cost of these refrigerators I cannot see what is envisaged. Is it envisaged that 5% rental would pay back the taxpayers for the purchase price of these refrigerators? According to my estimate, it will take approximately 20 years for repayment at that rate. I cannot see how this is going to be worked out; whether it is at the top, the middle or the bottom and it is Government's property it will be treated in the same manner as Government's property gets treated all over the world. If we agree to supply these refrigerators at the rate of 5% of the cost per annum, are we not going to run into trouble? How are we going to get this repayment at the end of five years? I put that time to the life of a refrigerator which is the Government's property; at the end of five years when something else goes into that house, the refrigerators will be in a condition where it will need a complete over-hauling. What is envisaged then? Are these refrigerators going to be taken over to the Public Works Department and sold or what? What is going to be done? What is going to happen about the service charges? Will they be borne by the 5% rental on the persons concerned or are they going to be a matter for the taxpayers? Some refrigerators will take a lot of service, certain models

will work perfectly well, but other models will need completely new motors, and in some cases the guarantee has expired or it has not expired, and you have to pay for a new motor. Some of these refrigerators run on a three-year guarantee and others on a five-year guarantee. I would like, in the light of the interest of the taxpayers, to find out the financial implications of this 5 per centum of the cost of these refrigerators. Are the service charges liable to the officers concerned, or are they liable to the taxpayers?

5.15 p.m.

With those comments, Sir, I would be glad to get some information. I repeat that in matters of this sort we are entitled particularly in these lean years to question every single half-penny that is being spent and how the money is to be returned; and I do hope that we will be given the necessary answers to the questions we have asked.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: At this stage, Sir, I certainly think that we are wasting important time in attempting to go all over this. The hon. senior member for St. George wants to know about the financial implications of the purchase of these refrigerators. Now as a businessman, he knows that all refrigerators are released on guarantee for a period of five years, and if anything goes wrong with the unit itself within the five years it is replaced by the manufacturers or agents. He knows that it is not true to say that you would have to put in a new motor, but it suits him on this occasion to say that.

As I said before, a refrigerator in a house is part of the emoluments, and there is no question of recovering the cost of the refrigerator on a one-year, twenty-year or 100 years on five percent basis. The condition of employment of medical staff is that you pay a salary of X dollars; let us say \$200 for a Specialist, and if he enjoys fees, he gets \$200 and fees, and the fees are arranged by a schedule through the Ministry. That is why I claim it would be regarded as part of the emoluments along with a furnished house.

If you take a doctor from the United Kingdom to serve in the Institution, he would probably start as a pre-registration officer or maybe as a Grade B officer with a salary range of \$250 to \$300 a month, and you could not expect that officer to rent a furnished house at \$150, if not \$180, per month. At one time, I believe, all the officers at the Hospital lived within that compound; but within the last five, ten or twelve years they occupied the four flats at the corner by Enmore. If you ask a doctor out on a two-year or three-year contract - we have had some for one year - can you reasonably expect him to buy a car and put furniture in a house? How farcical would that be! It is a term of employment and not whether or not the Government will recover the refrigerator at an interest rate of 10% or 15%.

The hon. member knows that in the past years we have had in the Estimates furniture and crockery for which we charge 3%. Do you hope to recover the crockery at 3% per annum? We will pay a salary and give a furnished house and there is no precedent in this.

The hon. member was in Parliament when we voted money to build the last few houses at Enmore, including furniture, crockery and a refrigerator; and no objection was taken then, but it suits him now to make this objection. It is not peculiar to Barbados alone. There is no question about it that we have had no grouse with regard to salaries at the Hospital - I am thinking of a Surgeon Specialist, the Anaesthetist Specialist, the Radiologist Specialist, the Physician Specialist and all the top-ranking officers; we have had no grouse with them at all, but it is the youngster at the bottom who, like every natural or normal human being, wants to move on in life. He starts on a monthly salary, moves on to a Grade A or Grade B, and if there is an opportunity for post graduate work at a teaching Hospital, he goes because he wants to come back and demand a salary including fees. That is what we are up against; not a question that doctors fail to stay at the Hospital on the grounds of salary. We have never had any dissatisfaction about salaries.

As a matter of fact, for the benefit of the hon. member at the moment the salaries paid to the medical officers are above the salaries paid at Hospitals in the United Kingdom. I have checked that one hundred times, and I have never had a complaint from the doctors at the Hospital since the last revision. The position at the moment is that we are operating with about seven doctors short, but do not let me tell you what is the position in Trinidad or in British Guiana as compared with Barbados. In Jamaica the University doctors can be absorbed in Jamaica at salaries above Barbados, but that applies to other officers of the Government. Take agriculture: are you asking us to pay the Director of Agriculture the same salary that is paid in Jamaica? I know that in your heart you have said "no". That applies to the Director of Medical Services, the Superintendent at the Hospital, the Physician Specialist as well as the Surgeon Specialist. There is a limit to how far we can go.

From the Registrar to the pre-Registration Officers the level of salaries is higher than salaries paid in the United Kingdom in the National Health Service. We are perfectly satisfied about this, but it is the general conditions in our Hospital which we have inherited; and when the hon. member for St. Lucy attempted to take a dive at the Hospital, I wonder if he searched his better thinking what his answer would be. We unfortunately inherited the awkward situation of a central Hospital with a population of 230,000 people.

In Russia, the country which the hon. member wants to criticise at the moment, they operate with one doctor to 600 persons per population; in Barbados it is one doctor to 40,000, and our standards in Barbados are higher than in other territories. It is unfortunate that we have this pressure at the moment, and that is why this White Paper was released with regard to District Hospitals. It is an ungodly heritage which we were forced to accept, a centralised unit that has been developed over a period of sixty or eighty years with no attention whatever paid to rural areas, apart from a little group registered in one of the parishes, St. George or St. John where in a population of about 14,000 so few are regarded as paupers. You have to be labelled as a pauper before you can get free service.

We are attempting to answer this great need for medical service. I think the construction has started in Christ Church or probably will in a few weeks for the first District Hospital with a twenty-bed arrangement. I have had two meetings with the Northern Council where we are planning to offer this service, and it is a matter for the District Hospital at St. Peter. We have got the money. Are you asking us to break up everything even if we did not have the money? We have got something like 13,000 persons per month going through the Out-patients Department, and I know that we are taking a cruel and mean advantage of the doctors; but what can we do under the circumstances? It is only decent that they remain with us. One one occasion I have had to call one into the Ministry. On examining the case, there was a row between a man and the doctor, and when I checked, I found out that there were 450 patients that day and the man was at the lowest possible human ebb.

5.25 p.m.

How do you expect him to react? Look how much work is being done in the Out-Patients Department! If you take the parishes of St. George and St. John, you will see that, with all the money allotted to Poor Relief from the Vestry, one has to rub one's knee in mud and filth before one can be called a pauper. I say that it is all right to criticise and a very easy thing to do. The large number of 13,000 persons go to the Hospital every month for treatment. The hon. senior member for St. George is an employer and one of his workmen was injured. What does he do? Although as an employer he can collect insurance under the Workmen's Compensation Act, yet he decides to send that worker to see a doctor at the Hospital. How harder must it be if all the owners of the plantations were to take his viewpoint; that they are never to pay for these things but that they should just crash in on the Out-Patient Department of the Hospital where there are so many people coming for treatment that

there is no room for them even to stand. Surely if you could, you should relieve the strain on the Out-Patients' Department.

I say again that we are having no trouble as regards recruiting doctors when you think in terms of salary and conditions of employment, but the fact of the matter is that the doctors are not just there to be had. This is no criticism, but I have visited the Colonial Hospital in Trinidad and, looking at the floor of the main Ward, I was sure that it was not scrubbed for six or seven months. Do you know the reason why? The reason is that you have to put patients on the floor. I can tell you more. Sometimes, a patient has to remain in a ward for a whole week before seeing a doctor.

Sir, we are not concerned with the question of whether five per cent deduction would take as long as fifty years to pay for a refrigerator costing \$500. The condition of employment is to provide the officer with a furnished house. What have we been hearing all the afternoon? All that we have been hearing is the nonsensical argument of buying a refrigerator for a doctor. That is part of the conditions of employment; it is part of the salary. There is nothing that we can do about it.

Are hon. members aware that a doctor works 80 hours a week? You could not get a waterfront worker working all that time, but that is a fact when it comes to doctors at the Hospital. We have this heritage from a Conservative Government of one Hospital when, for a long time, there has been the cry of the people in the community for some health service in the country districts apart from the General Hospital; and now that we are getting to grips with our responsibility and thinking in terms of medical health and the extension of the service, you get all this argument and all this caustic criticism. When you criticise the General Hospital do you think that you hurt the Government? You make the doctors there feel that their terms of employment are being discussed. Some hon. members have an impression that they should criticise a doctor.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I am objecting to that statement. I have not criticised any doctor at all. That is an incorrect statement.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I am not saying that the hon. member criticised a doctor there but if he says that something has happened at the Hospital and we are moving in these refrigerators in the residences of doctors as a bit of paraphernalia or to add to the building. (A VOICE: The Premier said so; the hon. senior member for St. George did not say that.)

Hon. F. E. MILLER: The hon. senior member for St. Lucy said that you offer a house under the Housing Scheme to tenants and you do not put in refrigerators. You rent a tenant a house under the Housing Scheme. It has not been the decision of the Government to rent a house with furniture. As a matter of fact, many of the people who rent houses under the Housing Scheme cannot afford to pay rent for furniture. The hon. member is deliberately twisting the truth.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. First of all, I am asking the hon. member to withdraw the remarks with reference to me that I am twisting the truth. Secondly, I want to say that I never said that they should put refrigerators in homes in the Housing Scheme. I said that if they argue that a refrigerator is a household necessity, everybody would expect to find them all over the island even in the Housing Schemes.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: The hon. member said that if the Government's policy now is to put refrigerators in the homes of doctors at the Hospital, the Government should also put them in the homes of the people who now occupy houses in the Housing Scheme. The hon. member objects to my saying that he is twisting the truth. I was told if I say that you are twisting the truth that it means you are telling a lie; therefore, I withdraw that statement.

The hon. senior member for St. George got up and repeated the argument of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. All that I say is when you continue to criticise the General Hospital and day after day, Tuesday after Tuesday, you say that something is wrong at the General Hospital, all that you can do is to harm the working of the Institution. I would ask those hon. members to pay a visit there. Let them go there and ask the Superintendent to show them around. I know that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy would hesitate to go there because it would really call for a big heart after saying the many things he has said. This is the position in a nutshell. There is nothing wrong with the General Hospital more than undue pressure on the Casualty and on the Outdoor Patients Department. The call on the Out-Patient Department is 13,000 per month, not 13,000 per year. In order to attend to all, we had to shift the Physician Specialist and ask him to help in the Wards. I repeat, it is easy to criticise. Here it is, doctors are breaking their backs and hoping for a change. 5.35 p.m.

When we had the argument about two persons being in a bed, I said that if I had to put the sick on the floor I would do it. It is my business to rehabilitate the sick; I would put a man who is a breadwinner and who is sick on the floor, because he has to take care of his job. It would be satisfactory if we could reduce this number from 16,000 to 7,000. Day after day we have that criticism. The hon. member does not seem to understand that the five per cent charge is not an attempt to reclaim the money which is spent on the refrigerator, but it is a part of the man's emoluments since we have agreed to give the man a furnished house. A furnished house costs about \$150 a month and we have had to pay \$200 a month for an officer. If that officer was expected to pay for all his family what for a salary would he be receiving? Mr. Chairman, I apologise for wasting the time of the House and I hope that I have made my position clear.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I have sat and listened to this debate with much interest concerning this Note No. 8 in connection with the furnishing of Government Quarters. This is what the Note says:-

"Certain officers, mainly in the Medical Department, are supplied with quarters which are equipped with basic furniture. Rent is paid for the quarters and furniture."

I am an independent member of this House, I have listened to both sides of the House and I must say that a Medical Officer in this country or in any country is a very important man. We expect that the Medical Officers will do their duty to the highest degree and we should try to give these officers the best facilities which we can afford because we are looking forward to good results from them. I would say that the Addendum or the Note should have been worded a little better. I think the Minister means that certain Officers who are living in a Department or Institution should have these refrigerators, not any Officer. It is those Officers who are compelled to live in these Departments who should have these facilities. The Government has the power, where any one of these Officers needs this facility, to lend him money to purchase it, and that is outside the medical offices. I do not criticise any medical officer at all; I have been to the Hospital and I have seen the conditions of the patients and I know that it takes skilled practitioners to deal with these patients. I know that they are speeding up with their job to get the Institution to give the best satisfaction in the interest of the public.

What I really want to say is that in future, as we are about to build new hospitals, in view of that fact, we will be willing to supply all the necessary furniture which the Department will need. I quite agree that these Officers should have these things. We are not quarrelling over the salary; when a man falls down on the street we will know where to send him. If any of us is taken ill now the first place we will think of sending him is to the Hospital and I am therefore in wholehearted support of this Resolution.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I could not let this debate end without answering the Minister of Health. First of all,

he seems to have the idea that there is something so peculiar about the Hospital that it cannot be criticised. I do not think that any sensible person could share his view. In the second place, it is not true that from week to week or from day to day the Hospital is criticised in this House. I think that members of the Opposition work with restraint taking into account the knowledge which they have of the Hospital. I have taken up things at the Hospital with the Director of Medical Services and I have not mentioned them on the floor of this House because I had the assurance from the Director of Medical Services that the matters would be redressed. When we criticise the Hospital we do it on a matter of policy. I was the main speaker on this side of the House, and at no stage was any attack levelled against the doctors. The whole debate turned on the unsequential and unfortunate remarks which were let loose by the Premier whose portfolio is not Health and who answered my first part of the debate. The Premier said that they had to give these people refrigerators because it was an inducement for them to get doctors, and as soon as a responsible Minister says that, the Opposition must enquire as to what is wrong with the Hospital that only a refrigerator can cure.

The debate went on until the Minister of Health entered in it and he said that 13,000 people go into the Casualty and that if he had to permit people to lie on the floor he would do so because he wants to rehabilitate the sick. All of that is an attempt to justify things, but nobody says that he should not do what he can to encourage doctors.

I was appalled and astonished at the revelation which the Minister of Health made that the doctors at the Hospital were working for 80 hours a week. I do not care how many refrigerators or articles of furniture you provide basically people will be satisfied with salary. Yet our criticisms are not of the doctors although if we had to criticise them we would do it; but it is the state of affairs on their admission that you have to do what you are doing in order to induce doctors to come. I want to go further and say this:  
5.45 p.m.

There are things which the Minister can put right and should put right, but we are a little tired in this island now of hearing Government take the credit for everything that goes all well, and when something happens that goes wrong and they cannot put it right in a short time or the allotted time, they throw the blame on the Conservatives. Here we are told that if there are 14,000 people now going through the Casualty and doctors work 80 hours a week, it is something they have inherited; and they have been in power the better part of twelve years, and Adams himself was not tired of putting into the ears of the people of this country not to blame the Government but to blame them, and he was fond of calling the name of the now Premier.

How much further are you going to go? If you continue to hold the Government up to 1961 you will be saying that you inherited these conditions. You have got to put an end to that and the Minister should be more realistic than that. I do not mind what they say about me, it is what they do about the Hospital in the end; and stop this foolishness that you inherited this from the Conservatives. The time will come when the people will ask you what you have done with what you have inherited. You cannot go on ascribing everything to them. A few months ago the Minister made a categorical statement that there was no waiting list, then a week from that almost every member of this House by a report of a case in connection with the Hospital which appeared in the Press, had the idea that the Minister could not have been quite accurate when he made that pontifical statement about the waiting list.

You will find, Mr. Chairman, that politicians whether members of this House or outside and the public may grumble at conditions at the Hospital but are generously inclined towards the doctors, and the doctors would have to be manifestly bad for any adverse criticism to be made against them. I sometimes think that we are far too generous to them, but the idea that something said here is rebutted by the silly argument by the Premier is to say too

little of doctors. I imagine they have more commonsense than that. Why should they throw up their job to defend a silly statement made by a Minister in this House? He has left the impression with this House that a refrigerator in a house for a doctor is necessary as an inducement either to get him to come or to get him to stay. We feel that that was a superficial approach to the problem. The Minister of Health admittedly went further and gave in greater detail the situation of the Hospital. We have not criticised the doctors; we have merely said that if it is as bad as you say, something must be wrong and you should not be so pleasant about it.

One more point before I sit. Quite a lot has been made by the two Ministers of my reference to Housing Authorities and Housing Schemes and refrigerators in them. I do not have to apologise for what I have said. I drew attention to what was written in the explanatory note in which it was said that a refrigerator is now a household necessity. I therefore said that if Government thinks it to be a household necessity, why is it we do not see it in the Government Housing Schemes? I still know that nobody rents a house from Government on the understanding or the expectation that money would be loaned for furniture or they will have them furnished, so my argument is not that Government should as from tomorrow put refrigerators in the Housing Schemes because doctors are going to have them. My argument is that if you base your policy towards a doctor on the grounds that refrigerators are household necessities, I should expect to see more households than the doctors' households have them. That is all I mean and I said so, and if you had any interest at all in the people of this island and re-housing them properly, you would find it possible even as an experimental scheme to lend them money to buy furniture, but that would be outside of this debate.

If I am called upon to defend the point of view that people in the Housing schemes are lent money to have furniture, I can defend it and say I am in favour, but I was not arguing that particular point; I was arguing the point made by the Government that a refrigerator is a household necessity, and I said that if you think so much of it that it is a household necessity for a certain category of people, why should you not wish to see it in other households. I repudiate the inference made by the Minister that we are attacking the doctors. A more bitter and devastating attack on the conditions of the Hospital could not have been made than by the Minister himself. His disclosures if made by one of us would have been met by some colleague of his with a charge that we were irresponsible and annoying the doctors; but I am glad it has been made by him. We know how bad conditions are through the voice of the Minister of Health, and when we re-echo his words and use his disclosures as a basis for criticism, I hope that he and the Premier who understands so little about the Hospital will be well satisfied.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I have not got much more to say on this matter. To yield to the occasion is a mark of a wise man. The Minister said there was nothing wrong at all at the Hospital, but I will raise my case on the Minister's own speech. There is just one little matter of personal explanation, but before that I wonder if the Minister would be so kind - I know the *Advocate* would not publish it *verbatim* but it might be done through the Government Information Service - to publish his speech *verbatim* for the people of this island. I challenge him to do it.

Now, Sir, the point of explanation. I personally am not always present to run my business and have other people to assist me. On this occasion a particular employee who got a splinter in his eye was sent by one of my managers to the Hospital. As the hon. member said, he had a perfect right; but it is also thought that when it comes to the eye the Hospital is the best place to go by a lot of people in this island. On returning to my office and on the matter being reported to me, I immediately sent the man to Dr. St. John. That is the matter of personal explanation, but as I said, I yield to the occasion.

The question that Head XXV - Public Works, stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

## MISCELLANEOUS

*Head XXV - Miscellaneous Services, was called.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Item 9A is for a contribution which this Government is asked to make to certain institutions in the United Kingdom. As is set out here:-

(a) Colonial Liaison Section, Building Research Station, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research; (b) Colonial Liaison Section, Pest Infestation Laboratory, Department of Science and Industrial Research; (c) Appointment of Tropical Paint Research Fellow, Building Research Station, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, and Paint Research Station; (d) Appointment of Colonial Rodent Liaison Officer, Infestation Control Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food; (e) Preparation of Percipiting Sera at the Lister Institute of Preventive Medicine.

These are useful to the island and we get certain information when requested.  
5.55 p.m.

In previous years, as set out in the Note, these expenses were borne from C.D.&W. funds. Now the Secretary of State for the Colonies has requested the individual Governments to contribute 25% of the cost based on what the contribution is to the benefit of the particular Government and in proportion to 1956 national revenue, grant-aided territories being excluded.

I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, there can be no quarrel about this vote but this is a convenient occasion, perhaps, for the Government to review these matters. If in the past before Federation was established, the Government of Barbados and the Governments of the individual islands used to contribute towards the upkeep of these schemes and the Research Institutes in England, it is time now that these individual Governments cease doing so with the advent of the Federal Government.

I submit that, as we are now called upon to contribute \$600 as our part, these are matters which the Federal Government should take up because that Government is admirably suited to exert itself in these matters. It can act and speak for the whole territory. This matter comes under the Ministry of Labour and under the Ministry of Social Affairs. Part of their duties is the establishment and fostering of research schemes and the disseminating of information to the Unit territories.

I wonder whether the Hon. Premier would consider in the future taking up with the Federal Government this question of handing over these functions. There is no harm in doing so.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, although this is a small amount, the cost of such arrangement in previous years has been borne from C.D.&W. funds. We all know that it is expected that we will have to bear more and more weight in this line, so I would like to know exactly what are the benefits derived from these particular schemes and on which particular ones are we being rated. I ask that because the amount which we are asked to contribute is determined on the basis of the Government's benefit from the particular scheme in proportion to the 1956 national revenue. As soon as I hear you are talking of the national revenue and in proportion of it, I think we should know exactly what are the benefits we are getting from this service. While it is a small amount, it is a matter of knowing. Before we commit ourselves to a small amount which may entail a large amount as time goes on, we should know the benefits which we are getting from this service.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am not in a position to give you in detail what benefits you get from this expenditure, but I do know that we get information on certain mat-

ters in connection with each of these schemes which are set out here. If the hon. member insists on my getting the details, I will do so for him. I think the Hon. Minister of Agriculture remembers one or two of these schemes and can enlighten you on them.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Every year the hon. member will see in the Annual Estimates certain sums which are attached to this particular work. We contribute to these schemes in many ways and for many reasons. Everybody knows, I think, that you have a team of experts in England dealing with research in various matters and they in turn send out to the colonies certain literature. What is known to be good today might be outdated tomorrow. What might be of good today will not be needed tomorrow. Therefore, Sir, we subscribe to these periodicals and research bureaux. This is a small contribution for the knowledge which we get from these experts. It is a bagatelle in comparison with the service which we are getting. All of these things help to make agriculture what it is today. I must tell you that these experts are of good use to the Department of Agriculture because we get good literature from them and we are able to pass it on to the field staff. The people at the top get information also and when new information comes to hand, we subscribe to that information.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Hon. Premier would answer my question as to whether he thinks the Federal Government will do anything to help in this matter.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: From what I know of it, that has been discussed so I do not think the hon. member is on the wrong ground over it. We are of the same opinion.

*The question that Head XXIX stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

## HEAD XXX - INLAND REVENUE

*Head XXX - Inland Revenue - was called.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Under this Head the sum of \$450 is required for equipment and furniture. Due to an increase in the volume of work at the Inland Revenue Department, the services of an additional stenographer will be required. It is necessary that one typewriter, one typist desk and one typist chair be required.

I beg to move that Head XXX stand part.

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

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I just want to learn something on a small point. I do not think anyone of us would refuse granting this money to this Department for what is needed. As a matter of fact, personally, I feel more than that is needed.  
6.05 p.m.

This is one of the few Departments in this island that one can go into and see members of the staff applying themselves to their work rather than walking around the place. This Department is a credit to this island and I would like to mention that while we are here.

*The question that Head XXX stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

## HEAD XXXII - HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT

*Head XXXII was called.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The note to this item "Plants, Tools, Spares and Equipment" under this Head is as follows:-

"By the addition of a multi-purpose earthmoving machine to the mechanical equipment of the Department it will be possible to expedite progress as well as to effect savings on capital works. In view of the heavy programme now being undertaken by the Department, it has been decided that this machine should be purchased immediately, and this resolution seeks the provision of the necessary funds."

This amount of money is required to assist in the moving of earth and, according to the Department, it will make for greater progress and it will also effect a saving on capital works. I beg to move that Head XXXII stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that this is a Department about which I am not very happy. We are asked to provide this multi-purpose earth-moving machine for this Department and I would like to ask this: is there such a large amount of earth moving to be done under the present plan? What is this heavy programme which is now being undertaken? The only thing I can envisage in thinking over this matter is that this machine might be necessary in a programme like the East Coast Road. If that is the purpose for which it is wanted, I can quite see the possibility of effecting a saving on capital works; but I would like a little more information as to what exactly this multi-purpose earth-moving machine is. Is it the wheeled tractor type of machine and would it be capable of working on the East Coast Road Project or only on small projects where the foundation is good? As I have said, I am not too happy about this Department. I am not saying anything about anybody else but I would like to get some information as to what this heavy programme now to be undertaken is, particularly if it is anything to do with the East Coast Road. If that is not so, what are the schemes?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, this machine is a traxcavator, it is an all-purpose machine. I cannot say that it will be used on the East Coast Road because no policy has been assigned to that as yet; but we have a large amount of heavy work to do and this particular machine can do a lot of work and thereby save a lot of money on capital works. It can be used when we come to the approaches to the Deep Water Harbour and many other jobs. Pretty soon we will have to do some work at the Airport and instead of wasting money and getting something smaller, we are asking hon. members to vote this money in order to get this machine.

The hon. member will know the difference between hand labour and ploughing; when a man is forking a straight bank and when you are using a plough in the earth, they are two different jobs. When you use this machine you are saving human beings some strain on their nerves. The Director has asked for this machine because he has said that the acquisition of it would be a good boon to the Department by reducing labour costs and it would be a fair charge on the items mentioned because it will be used on the works to be executed in the future. The new Five Year Plan is being dealt with now and some of it will call for heavy work and it may be that the East Coast Road may be included. I do not say that the East Coast Road will be included and therefore do not let anybody say that I have said so. I say that it may possibly be included. If this machine is bought now it will be put to a useful purpose.

Mr. DOWDING: A traxcavator is a light machine and I am observing that they are using this light machine for a heavy programme.

*The question that Head XXXII stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

#### HEAD XXXIII - CIVIL AVIATION

*Head XXXIII - Civil Aviation was called.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Head Civil Aviation, the Note to the Item "Equipment" is as follows:-

"The quantity of freight handled at Seawell Airport has increased from 498,000 lbs in 1956, to 1,350,000 lbs. in 1958, and there is now an urgent need for mechanical assistance to expedite its easy handling. It has been decided therefore to purchase a mechanical fork lift for this purpose at an estimated cost of \$1,500.

By Supplementary Estimate 1958-59 No. 32, a sum of \$2,250 was provided to meet the cost of an I.B.M. Clock

System, a Control Tower Desk and a typewriter. These funds lapsed at the 31st March, 1959, as the items were not received, and a re-vote of the amount is now necessary."

I beg to move that Head XXXIII stand part of the Schedule.

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

*The question that Head XXXIII stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

#### HEAD XXXVII - PEASANTS' LOAN BANK

*Head XXXVII - Peasant's Loan Bank was called.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In connection with this Head, it will be seen that the Peasants' Loan Bank (Amendment) Act provides for an addition in the staff of the Bank as follows:- One Accountant, One Secretary and One Long Grade Clerk. It is estimated that an additional provision of \$5,379 will be required to meet the salaries of the additional staff to the end of the financial year, and also to meet the cost of additional furniture and other incidental expenditure. Owing to the inability of the present staff to cope with the increasing volume of business, certain work has fallen into arrears and it is proposed to employ a temporary clerk for a period of about four months to assist in bringing this work up to date. Supplementary provision of \$320,00 is required for this purpose.

6.15 p.m.

In addition to that, Sir, it has been decided to pay the staff of the Bank this cost of living allowance on the same basis as that provided for the Government servants and the provision of \$1,447 is required to meet this increased cost of living.

I beg to move that Head XXXVII - Peasants Loan Bank stand part.

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

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I would like to be informed of what is the position with the accounts of this Bank, what are the last audited returns and what is the standard of repayment.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Will the hon. member repeat those questions?

Mr. DOWDING: Perhaps I have handed over now to the hon. junior member for St. James. I see that he is now drowning the Clock with his talk.

I should like to know what is the position with the audited returns of the Bank, what are the last audited returns and the date of them, and what is the standard of repayment. Are the loans being paid back well? Is it 10% outstanding every year or 50%? I would be happy if the Minister assured me that the standard of repayment is good.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I am glad to hear the hon. member come to the point and ask direct questions which I propose to answer off-hand.

Now, Sir, as to the audited returns, they are about six months behind hand due to the fact that there is a shortage of staff there. The work of that Bank has increased so rapidly over the past two or three years that it is necessary to give them more staff. I have had the good fortune to go there and see how these loans are processed, and I came to the conclusion that they should have more staff.

We have certain difficulties because of the extended franchise. By that I mean that we now cater to people who have no security at all. We loan money to tenants without any security whatsoever, and they are the people who have given us the most trouble. Pretty soon from now you will have a new Bill but that will take some time, so we have to bring in amendments before the new Bill is ready in order to make our money secure; because, I repeat, wher-

ever you try to help some people there are always those who think that what they get belong to them personally and would not repay it. The Bank would not be able to go far or serve a useful purpose if these people are allowed to get away with it, though there are honest people who get this service through the Bank.

The standard of repayment is very high. There are some people who from time to time get into difficulty and we have to give them an extension of the time, but then all the payments are not annual repayments, some are over seven years in the matter of buying cattle and mules. When it comes to yearly repayments you get some people who for some reason or other get scotched and ask for time and latitude which we give, but where we are having the fundamental trouble is with the tenant who owns no land and is only a renter, but gets a loan as a person who has a freehold. We have no means of collecting and therefore in a short while an amendment will be brought before you in order to get things up-to-date.

On the whole my opinion is that it is doing a good service and people are not abusing it, but the reason for these new members to the staff which you are asked to sanction is because the work has increased and they can no longer carry on the work and do the clerical work while still taking care of the books. We have to have an Accountant, Secretary to the Manager and a Long Grade Clerk. I have seen the processing and other things there and more staff is asked for, but we cannot afford anymore at this time, and I think if they are given this it would make a very good impression and would help to relieve the service these people get there.

As regards the \$320 for this backlog of work, this person will be able to clean up and bring all that up-to-date. I do not know if that satisfies the hon. member, but that is the position as it is.

*The question that Head VII - Peasant's Loan Bank stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$68,964 do now pass.

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

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

#### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1959-60 No. 13

*Head VII - Agriculture was called.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this is Capital Expenditure. Under Item 7, Soil Conservation, the Scotland District Soil Conservation Board has been appointed and it is now proposed to speed up the rate of operations in the Scotland District in an effort to meet the many requests received from land owners for reclamation measures to be carried out on their land.

In order to enable this to be done, it is proposed to place orders immediately for an additional D9 tractor which it is hoped will be available for use by the end of the rainy season. As the sum of \$150,000 provided in the Estimates is intended to cover only the cost of normal operations of the scheme, it is necessary to provide an additional sum of \$110,000 to meet the cost of the D9 tractor.

In other words, Sir, in order to speed up the work in the Scotland District of the Soil Conservation Board, they are asking for another D9 tractor; and the sum of \$150,000 was provided in the Estimates to cover only the cost of normal operations, and \$10,000 is needed to purchase this additional bit of machinery.

I beg to move that Head VII - Agriculture, stand part.

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

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, the note says that it is proposed to place orders immediately. Before I go any

further, would I be correct if I said that the order has been placed and that the tractor is in the Island?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Yes, Sir, that is true.

Mr. DOWDING: Well, Sir, I do not think we need say much more about that. This is a democratic country and here we are being told today that it is proposed to place orders immediately and the Minister has told us that the order has been placed and that the tractor is in the island.

Now, Sir, I take it that there will come a time of urgency when certain things will have to be attended to, but I honestly cannot see how it would be possible that this House could not have been treated with the courtesy of what is in front of us now. Surely, Sir, this Addendum should have been changed to read "orders had been placed and the tractor has arrived" and not "it is proposed to place orders immediately."

6.25 p.m.

I think these are serious things. I do not intend to belabour it.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I do not want to stop the hon. member from having his say on the matter, but if he will give way and allow me to explain I will be glad to do so.

What has happened, Mr. Chairman, was that we had a meeting with the Soil Conservation Officer whose term of office will not be very much longer with us and who is a very wonderful man. Everybody in that district wants some work done now. We have one D-9 down there and that is a heavy duty tractor. Sometimes it breaks down and when it breaks down heavy work ceases; therefore, it was thought wise to get a second D-9 tractor instead of having one only. Permission was sought to send through an order so that in six months time when this Resolution would have passed this House the D-9 would have been here.

Now, what has happened is just a coincidence. When the Director of Agriculture got the go-ahead signal to make out the order it was a coincidence that a ship there was being loaded with trucks and such things to come here from the same company, and in the same week that the order was placed the order was put on the ship; hence it came down the week after the order was placed. As I have said, we thought it would have taken three or four months before the order came down. This thing has not transpired so long ago. I remember well that somebody rang the office and said that the D-9 is here, and I said at the time that the Resolution for it has not even come down to the House yet.

This is another thing which hon. members must bear in mind. Every ship does not take that sort of freight; only certain ships bring that freight. I think hon. members are aware that that particular ship had to go all the way down Six Men's to unload that machine; therefore, I am asking hon. members to see that, while it might seem an infringement on their democratic rights, yet, Sir, it was a God-send to get it down to us at that time.

I do not want the hon. member to look at it from a narrow point of view. As a matter of fact, it was nothing of the kind. It just happened, when the go-ahead order was given to the Director of Agriculture, and the Director sent up to the Company to alert them about the matter at the same time a ship was coming down here with that sort of freight and the D-9 was put on board the same time; before the ink was dried the thing was in Barbados. We are very thankful that it has come because those farmers in that part of the island who are getting their land reclaimed can put it into cultivation.

As I have said, the Soil Conservation Officer will not be here very much longer. He is going, I am sorry about it because I am satisfied along with other people that he is doing a good job of work. He is changing the face of that part of the island. I want to assure this House that nothing clandestine was done; it only happened to be a

coincidence that as soon as the order was sent up in the hope of having this Resolution passed by the time that this D-9 was sent down, instead of that a ship was coming down here with that sort of freight and this D-9 tractor was put on board the same ship and sent immediately. That is the explanation. And that is the Gospel truth.

Mr. DOWDING: Sir, I am grateful for the Hon. Minister's frank explanation, but I cannot agree that the taxpayers of this island should be committed to an expenditure without the sanction of this Hon. House. I admit every word that he has said about the luck of having a ship coming down at the time and that this D-9 was put on it which was a first-class idea, and that there is nothing at all wrong with getting it; but I do feel that this Hon. House is entitled to dealing with the matter first.

I see no reason why, if this matter was brought before the House, despite the number of weeks that lapsed this House could not have given the opportunity of discussing this matter to commit the taxpayers to this expenditure before the order was sent. I hope I would be corrected if I am wrong, but I take it that as soon as the order is placed that the taxpayers are committed to the expenditure. I take it that if the D-9 had arrived in the island and it was not paid for, the Government could be sued for it. I do know that there are people who say that the Government cannot be sued before Court. Anyhow, I do not think that is the spirit of democracy.

Now, Sir, as regards the construction of the new building at Seawell Airport -----

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: We have not yet come to that item.

Mr. DOWDING: I am sorry.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, as concerning the Hon. Minister's explanation, we have understood that from reasonable feelings the order was placed before this Resolution came before the House. He has given us a clear explanation and the reasons why the Resolution was not brought before the House before. We all realise that the getting of this second tractor would be of great help in my parish especially because we have to do some very heavy ploughing and the small machine cannot do it at the present stage, therefore, when that second D-9 came here, it arrived in an acceptable time.

I am thankful to the Minister when he threw out the first suggestion that they were able to catch that ship and that this machine has arrived in the present time of need. However, I will ask him in future not to take such steps again. Let him bring a Resolution here for the taxpayer's money before he places the order and he would not have any kind of criticism in this respect. While we agree that the urgent need for the machine is the reason why he acted in that respect, we say that he should not do so again. There is no harm in this Resolution; it can be passed at any time.

Mrs. BOURNE: Mr. Chairman, there are just a few remarks which I want to say on this particular matter. I think that I should begin by complimenting the Government Soil Conservation Officer, Mr. Collett, on the good work that he has done in the Scotland area. It is regrettable that he is leaving us at this time; but I do hope that his successor would be equally as good as he because I can assure this House that Mr. Collett is doing a fine job in that area.

There are just one or two things which I would like to express with respect to this matter.  
6.35 p.m.

The Soil Conservation Board has been formed and now that this work is going on in the Sedgepond area, it involves quite a few peasants in the Bawden area who are a bit worried because of some misapprehension. I know that the Hon. Minister visited the area a few weeks ago and I also invited him to come along with the representatives

to see these people and allay their feelings as regards certain things which they have been hearing. I hope that the Board will make recommendations and suggestions to the Minister who will take them back to the Cabinet. There are peasants who have recently owned land in the area and some of them have said that they have borrowed money from their Solicitors and have agreed to pay it back as soon as they reap their crop. As far as I know, no provision has been made for compensation to these peasants.

I feel that some consideration should be given to them. The Minister has told me privately that the Board is going into this matter, but I do not know if they are taking into consideration the money which the peasants had from their private solicitors to purchase this land. The peasants are wondering if the Government will come to their assistance by way of loans or by some other method of repaying this money which they have borrowed. It is true that much of this soil will come back into cultivation, but it will take some time before it can produce as formerly. If the Board fails to make recommendations then there should be some arrangements so as to assist these people who are losing crops and fruit trees. These people should be assisted in repaying the loan which they have borrowed and perhaps some of them, who are tenants in an area like the Greenland area, have had money from the Peasants' Loan Bank. The land in that area will be pushed and there is no feeling as to who should bear the burden.

If this soil comes back into operation, the peasants will not have the benefit but the owners such as the Musson group. The tenants have come to me and said that they have been given notice not to cultivate the land any longer. I have also been discussing the matter with the Attorney of these places and he feels that the owners should not pay but the tenants should bear the burden. I do not believe that the tenants should bear the burden because they have borrowed money from the Peasants' Loan Bank to manure the land and they are wondering if they will be compensated by the Government. I still feel that I should express my view on the floor of this House although I have spoken with the Minister, because if I do not mention the matter here my constituents will feel that they are not being represented. However, the Minister has assured me that the Board is going into the matter and I hope that when the time comes, these peasants will be rewarded if not by the owners of the land, the Government will see to it that such peasants are compensated in some way or other.

Mr. CORBIN: With regard to the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, I acknowledge that I have the same responsibility towards my constituents. The people who have rented land from the estates along Bawden and Greenland have their plots already planted and it would be very hard on them that they should lose their interest. I think that before that job is begun, a Board should be set up and we should be able to go into the matter and make conciliation for these people who will be the sufferers. We think of those who have purchased land in the same area; they will not be able to pay their interest or receive any benefits at all because when that machinery sends down the plough and brings up the soil in the Boscobelle and Nicholas areas, it will take some time before the soil can be used. I think that these poor people should be considered and be recompensed for their present crop and for the time during which that land will be dealt with. These people have to meet their solicitors or the Peasants' Loan Bank with a certain instalment and therefore it will hamper my constituents if a Board is not set up to consider the question of compensation before they start operations in that area. I would be very glad if the Hon. Minister would interest himself along with the hon. senior member for St. Andrew in choosing a particular day when they can come to visit these areas so that we will be able to reason with them and that the people will be recompensed.

*The question that Head VII - Agriculture - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Start* HEAD VIII - COMMUNICATIONS

*Head VIII - Communications - was called.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In connection with this Head, as hon. members will see from the Note, with the construction of the new terminal building at Seawell Airport, it has become necessary to provide new road entrances and car-parking areas as well as proper drainage in connection therewith. That is estimated to cost \$72,000 and as no provision for this expenditure was included in the Current Capital Estimates, supplementary provision is now required. This amount of \$72,000 is being sought to be provided as a supplementary vote.

In connection with the construction of the new terminal building at Seawell Airport and the extension of the parking apron, it has become necessary to re-organise completely the lighting facilities at the Airport as the low tension distribution is affected. This work involves the lighting of the new car parking areas, the removal of all the overhead lines and poles, the laying of underground cables, the installation of a larger transformer so as to cope with the increased load and flood-lighting of the extension to the parking apron. The estimated cost of this work is \$5,525. I beg to move that Head VIII stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, again I would like to know something more about this matter. The Note says this: "With the construction of the new terminal building at Seawell Airport, it has become necessary to provide new road entrances and car park areas as well as proper drainage in connection therewith....." I would like to know if these entrances and areas have been provided and whence the money has come if they have been provided. Before I go any further, Mr. Chairman, could I be informed of that?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I think I have said and the Note says that this work was not provided for in the Current Capital Estimates; hence we have to come here for this money as a supplementary vote.

Mr. DOWDING: In other words, has the work been done?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: No, the work has not yet been done.  
6.45 p.m.

Mr. DOWDING: Now Mr. Chairman, I understand that this work has not been done. I also understand that a large amount of the Highways and Transport money has been expended in this particular car park and entrance from what I believe to be reliable authorities. The note says "to provide new road entrances and car parking areas". Car parking areas have been provided and new road entrances have been provided, and I would like to be definitely clear that none of this money has been expended out of any other particular vote.

There is no doubt, Sir, that you need these car parks and new entrances; my information from what I see is that car parks and new entrances are there - I am not talking about parking areas for the planes, - and this \$72,000 as I understand it is for new road entrances and car parking areas. Perhaps I am wrong and there is going

to be another entrance provided at some other point. I again repeat that I would like to find out at some juncture whether money is not being expended which had been allocated to any particular vote.

*The question that Head VIII - Communications, stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$187,525 do now pass.

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

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

*On the motion of Hon. D. D. GARNER, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of four Resolutions in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On the separate motions of Hon. D. D. GARNER seconded in each case by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, in connection with Order No. 3, an amendment to the Income Tax Act, I did hope that we would have been able to do that today. It is imperative that this Bill be dealt with this week because the House hopes to take a long recess this week until some time in month after next. I have spoken to members on the opposite side; the hon. senior member for St. George is not ready to go on with it today, and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is absent, but said that if the others agreed he would do it, but he, too, would prefer another day to consider it. So, Sir, in consultation with those two sides of the Opposition, we have agreed to come back on Thursday and do this Bill, so that on that day we can do Orders Nos. 2 and 3. I do not know if 3 o'clock on Thursday would suit members on the opposite side. If so, Sir, I will move that this House .....

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give way, would the meeting be to deal with these two particular items and nothing else.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was just about to ask that. Would it be a special meeting to deal with these two items?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: It is a general meeting.

Mr. SPEAKER: Why 3 o'clock in the afternoon if it is a general meeting? If it is a special meeting, late in the afternoon might do.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: If hon. members feel that way we will make it 12 o'clock on Thursday.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday 30th July, at 12 noon.

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

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

6.55 p.m.