

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1960

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 2nd February, 1960.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock 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*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. E. ST.A. HOLDER; Hon. D. D. GARNER (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. C. B. SEARIES; Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc.; and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

Prayers were read.

Mr. T. O. BRYAN entered the House and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting of the 26th January, 1960, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be now taken as read and confirmed. (*After a Pause.*) There being no objection, those Minutes are taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month ended 30th September, 1959.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise receipts for the eight months ended 30th November, 1959.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Customs Duties (Materials for Handbags etc.) Order, 1960.

The Customs Duties (Cane Rattan and Veneers) Order, 1960.

The Customs Tariff (Conditions for special Exemption from Duty) (Amendment) Regulations, 1960

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay Statement of Accounts of Dodds Plantation for the year ended 30th June, 1958.

PETITION

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a Petition from the members of the United Holy Church of America praying the House to pass a Bill giving them the right to the ownership of property in this island. The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

The Petition was taken as read.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is also a Petition standing in the name of the honourable junior member for Christ Church who, I believe, is not now in his place.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows :-

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 25) Order, 1959".

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 26) Order, 1959".

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 27) Order, 1959".

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 28) Order, 1959".

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Resolution to place the sum of \$5,616 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1959-60, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1959-60, No. 38 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICE

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill intituled an Act to incorporate the United Holy Church of America (Barbados District) be now read a first time.

Mr. SMITH: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

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

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill intituled an Act to incorporate the United Holy Church of America (Barbados District).

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: There are Questions standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy who, I observe, is not now in his place.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, at his request and with your permission, may I put the following Questions on the hon. member's behalf? The Questions are directed to the Hon. Minister of Education. They are as follows:-

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:

Will the Minister state whether it is Government's intention to establish a Schools Meals Service in Elementary Schools during the life of the present Assembly?

2. If the answer is "yes", will he undertake to appoint a Committee of experts to advise him on this project?
3. If the answer is "no", will he state whether he is at present satisfied with the present level of nutrition in the Elementary Schools.
12.25 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Hon. Premier:

1. Whether the Cabinet accepts the principle of appointing only legally trained persons on the Magisterial Bench of this Island?
2. If the reply is "Yes", does the Cabinet appreciate that the salaries currently offered to Magistrates are completely unattractive and inadequate?
3. Will the Cabinet take the necessary steps to pay salaries on a proper basis from the 1960-1961 financial year at the same time providing all necessary requisites, including free telephone at the homes of Magistrates?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill intituled an Act to incorporate the United Holy Church of America (Barbados District) be now read a first time.

Mr. SMITH: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to present a Petition from the Rector of Christ Church. The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the hon. member can do it that way. He has to obtain leave first and then he can proceed. He has to ask leave of the House to introduce it because he was late.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member said he was asking for leave.

Hon. M. E. COX: He went on to say the Petition is respectfully worded and asked that it be taken as read.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not what is before the House.

Hon. M. E. COX: I had to draw it to Your Honour's attention because it is not in keeping with the Rules.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would not consider that. The hon. member is asking leave to present the Petition of which he has given notice, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a Petition from the Reverend Gordon Vivian Hazelwood and also the Rector of the parish of Christ Church. The Petition is respectfully worded and I beg that it be taken as read.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a Bill to authorise the sale of glebe lands in the parish of Christ Church.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to present a Bill to authorise the sale of glebe lands in the parish of Christ Church and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to authorise the sale of glebe lands in the parish of Christ Church be now read a first time.

Mr. CORBIN: I beg to second that.

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

STATEMENT MADE BY THE HONOURABLE PREMIER ON THE EXPENSES OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICE COMMISSION

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I have a Statement to make re the expenses of the Local Government Service Commission. The Statement is as follows:-

"The members of the Local Government Service Commission have been appointed in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Service Commission Act, 1959. Section 6 of the Act provides for the remuneration and allowances payable to members of the Commission, and other expenses of the Commission, to be defrayed out of moneys provided by the Legislature.

2. Some of the funds voted in this year's Estimates under Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services, Item 67 - Advice on Local Government, will lapse because, as a result of the creation, on a permanent basis, of the posts in the Local Government Commissioner's office with effect from 1st October, 1959, the payment of salaries will be met from Personal Emoluments in the same way as all other established posts.

3. It is therefore proposed to use the lapsed funds to defray the expenses, remuneration and allowances of the Commission."

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I should like to make the following Statement:-

STATEMENT BY THE HONOURABLE MINISTER OF EDUCATION re PAYMENT OF EXAMINATION FEES FOR CANDIDATES OF GOVERNMENT MAINTAINED SCHOOLS

"At present in the yearly Estimates provision is made for the payment by Government of fees for the entry of pupils in Second Grade Schools to the examination of the Royal Society of Arts and the London Chamber of Commerce. No provision for payment of fees for similar entries by Government-Maintained Schools has ever been included, but as these schools now present candidates for these examinations it is desirable that the fees of these candidates also be paid by Government.

In view of the limitation imposed by the note in the current Estimates against Item 53 - Examinations in Head XX - Education, it is considered that the Legislature should be aware that it is proposed....."

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, I understand that under the Constitutional Provisions for this island no money should be expended - and it is actually found in the Letters Patent and the Royal Instructions - except by vote of the Legislature.

A habit has crept into the procedure of this Chamber in recent times, since the introduction of Ministerial Status, of Ministers making statements that they intend to take money and spend it in a manner other than that voted by the Legislature. I do not think, Sir, - and I would like you to check on this - that it is competent for the Minister of Education to come here and inform the House that we have voted for money to be spent in one particular direction or for a particular purpose, and that he intends by laying a Statement to appropriate it for other uses. That is the point of order on which I rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must tell the hon. member that much as I appreciate the principle behind his reason during his speech, I do not appreciate the interruption on that ground during a Statement.

Mr. BARROW: It is a very grave constitutional matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: However grave it is, I think it would have been much better if we knew the whole of the Statement and had not been interrupted during the Statement. 12.35 p.m.

The Minister has got to the stage where he intimated that he was going to make a Statement and I think the Hon. Minister should be allowed to proceed. The subject matter of the Statement is quite a different thing.

Mr. BARROW: I want to make this clear, Mr. Speaker. I think Your Honour has a Rule that no debate is allowed on a Statement. What I want to point out is this. If we sit down here and listen to the contents of a Statement, we cannot say anything on it and then tomorrow morning it would appear as if we agreed to the Statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: No debate can follow a Statement immediately, but it can subsequently. The reason for that is because there is nothing before the House when a Statement is laid. What the Statement contains is something in respect of which any hon. member afterwards can put a motion before the House. That is known, I take it, to every hon. member of this House.

Mr. BARROW: I just wanted to point out the peril which we are in now. I am not challenging Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I have told you, I do not welcome your rising on a point of order.

Mr. BARROW: I am only explaining why I rose on a point of order. Your Honour will appreciate that, once a Statement is made, as I have said, the next morning it would appear as if we agreed to the Statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not considering that at the moment. The Hon. Minister may proceed.

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: I will continue, Sir.

"In view of the limitation imposed by the note in the current Estimates against Item 53, Examinations, in Head XX: Education, it is considered that the Legislature should be aware that it is proposed to meet such expenditure from this item during the current financial year."

Mr. BARROW: Was that Statement presented to Your Honour before it was made here? If it were, I think Your Honour would have taken an entirely different view. I want you to enjoin all hon. members, particularly the Minister, that before they make Statements, even out of common courtesy at least they should submit them to you so that Your Honour can decide whether that Statement is in order or not. Your Honour has been placed in an invidious position where this Statement is concerned.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In connection with what is stated, I want to know whether the ruling Your Honour made with respect to Statements made by Ministers is one which means that a Minister can make any Statement he likes and we can discuss the matter only after the Statement is made by means of a motion. Now if there is anything on which we have voted already to be dealt with in a certain manner and the Minister makes a Statement which would mean the substitution of what we have already done for something else which he proposes in that Statement, it would mean that, with respect to all the items on which we have already decided to be dealt with in a certain way, the Minister only needs to get up and make a Statement just saying that he intends to deal with such and such an item in a way other than what the Legislature agreed to and it would be dealt with in his way. I do not think that is what is intended.

Mr. SPEAKER: I can only deal with matters of procedure.

Mr. WALCOTT: I appreciate that but I take it that Your Honour's ruling was made with respect to Statements which a Minister may make on any matter which does not conflict with anything which the House has already passed in so far as money Resolutions are concerned. I never understood that a Statement would apply to any item which was passed by the Legislature and for which they intended to act differently.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I must agree with the other two hon. members who spoke, and I too think that the correct form which should be adopted should be to bring a Resolution instead of a Statement. Let them come here with a Resolution to have any alterations in the notes with respect to an item of expenditure. If that is not done, then they would be coming here with Statements to do certain things in a different manner from what we had agreed to and that would be altering all that we have passed in the Estimates. The correct way to do it is by way of a Resolution and the Ministers should not be allowed to get it done through the back door.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sure, Mr. Speaker,....

Mr. SPEAKER: Before any other member speaks, let me read the Statement. (*Mr. Speaker read the Statement.*)

I do not regard this as a Statement at all. This is a Government proposal and I am going to rule that it should be withdrawn.

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I am not challenging your ruling, but I think it is incumbent on me to explain and further clarify the points which have been raised by hon. members of the Opposition.

In the first place, it is charged that I, as Minister of Education, and the maker of this Statement, have been guilty of discourtesy to you; but I would like to say that before I attempted to do anything in the matter, I told the Clerk of the House that I had a Statement to make and I asked his direction. I do not confess to be any adult so far as parliamentary procedure is concerned. If there is any appearance that it was my intention to be discourteous to you, I beg that you will accept my apology. On the other hand, I now ask leave to withdraw the Statement.

Hon. M. E. COX: If I am permitted at this stage, I would like to say a few words on this matter.

Mr. BARROW: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker; the Hon. Minister of Education has withdrawn the statement. The Hon. Leader of the House is entirely out of order now.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I would say is that I feel the Hon. Minister of Trade should not want to speak after the Hon. Minister in charge has withdrawn the Statement; but if he wants to do so, I cannot stop him.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand the hon. member who has just sat down.

Mr. SPEAKER: I feel you should not want to speak. As I have said, the Hon. Leader of the House should have never wanted to speak after the Minister in charge has asked leave to withdraw the Statement; but if the Hon. Leader of the House so desires, the House should listen to him.

Hon. M. E. COX: I accept your ruling.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

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

12.45 p.m.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1959-60 No. 36

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the first Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of \$25,160 under various Heads of the Schedule. As usual these Heads will be taken separately.

HEAD V - HARBOUR AND SHIPPING

Head V - Harbour and Shipping - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, under this Head in respect of the Item "Government Crane", the sum of \$220.00 is required for the purpose of protecting the area around the Government Crane on the Wharf. Recently it has been found that conditions around the crane are not in accordance with proper sanitation and it is proposed to enclose this area in order to protect it from encroachment by insanitary methods. I beg to move that Head V stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Note to this item states this:-

"For the purposes of protection as well as keeping the Government crane and immediate precincts in a clean and sanitary condition, it has been decided that an enclosure should be erected around it. The cost of this work is estimated to be \$220.00"

Mr. Chairman, it is true that in Barbados there has been the habit of making a row about things about which a row should not be made, and as to things about which they should make a row, such things are left undone. It is true that Barbados has an unhappy history, and an unhappy past, as far as sanitary conveniences and sanitary arrangements are concerned; it seems to be nobody's business that the public should have proper sanitary conveniences. This country has gone on for generations and people have been allowed to urinate on any part of the street like an animal. It seems to be quite permissible that a man can urinate along the street, and it may be that the Health Authorities do not pay due regard to people in this respect; it may be that things other than urination take place. Now you are protecting the crane; you are protecting the crane from urination, but you are not providing conveniences where the people can urinate. This is something which you should

examine. It is true that you are building a Deep Water Harbour, but it is a disgrace to find in Barbados what can be regarded as the old wharf toilet which was put there in days gone by as a relic, just as a Minister regards the slave huts as relics. That toilet looks into the sea, so that when the tourists ships come here, the first thing the tourists see is a toilet on that side of the wharf. If that toilet is not there now, the hurricane must have blown it down; but I know that there are over two thousand people who have to work on the waterfront, and I also know as a fact that there is no public convenience on the waterfront so as to accommodate these people.

Mr. Chairman, I am not one of those persons who feel that the warehouse owners should not provide their own toilets, but there are lots of people who are employed other than in these places. Wherever people congregate, as they do on the wharf, something should be done in order to provide these conveniences. I do not know when the authorities in Barbados will begin to get healthy in their outlook so that you can breathe and encourage healthy habits among the people. Protecting the Government crane is not going to solve the problem; it will only mean that the people will go elsewhere and urinate because you do not have any proper provision made for them on the wharf such as a lavatory which people can use. It is shameful to see that we are lacking in this country in the normal things which any civilised country begins to extend today. You cannot ask a man to walk from the wharf to the Fairchild Street Market or down to the Parochial Building to urinate; if you are asking that, you are asking for a loss of man hours. With the transient labour on the Waterfront, you could easily ask all the employers there to have the toilet facilities which would be required by any Health Authority to accommodate the number of people, because those who frequent these places come in bulk. When a ship is in port, you have more people on the waterfront than you would normally have at a warehouse; and there are those people who work in lighters. I do not believe that these lightermen are considered. These people do not have any proper facilities for urinating and therefore they urinate against the Government crane. I think that you should protect the public and not merely the crane from this type of indecency. Today we should take a forward step and be more healthy in our outlook than hitherto so that the people can become more decent with regard to their habits.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, if the last speaker had heard me first, he would not have used the phrase that he used; that is to say, that the Health Authorities were not mindful of the public conveniences - or words to that effect - for the people in and around the waterfront area. Speaking for myself, I have nearly twenty years of experience of local health authorities within the Municipality. I want to say, and I must agree with the hon. member, that it is a burning shame to think that the Government would have the temerity and the brass to come down here with this Resolution. The note to the Resolution states this:-

"For the purposes of protection as well as keeping the Government crane and immediate precincts in a clean and sanitary condition, it has been decided that an enclosure should be erected around it. The cost of this work is estimated to be \$220.00"

Am I to understand that the Government or the Minister of Health, although this matter rightly comes under the portfolio of the Minister of Works, is really more concerned with the protection of the crane than the provision of a more healthy standard of health conditions than they are providing today? I would like to say that recommendations have gone to this Government within the last five years and there have been set up Committees on which the Director of Medical Services has sat. Between the lower wharf, from Messrs. Wilkinson and Haynes to the Swing Bridge, no fewer than four sites were recommended and the Government were asked to provide funds from the Rural Amenities Fund and the Labour Welfare Fund for the erection of sanitary conveniences in this area. Let them

get up and deny this. Because of the smallness, the small-mindedness and the meanness, because they thought that somebody else would get the credit for these things, nothing has been done. Now today they will tell you that the credit may go to the Municipality and therefore the only interest they will have in this matter is to protect the crane from rusting. Today I look around and I see my one-time colleague in Local Government who had a lot to do with the matter at the time. I can name every site which was recommended for the erection of sanitary conveniences now.

12.55 p.m.

Government themselves owned part or portions of the land near Wilkinson and Haynes which we asked for. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, would you be surprised to know that this Government has not been courteous enough to reply? When we drew it to Dr. Byer's attention, a letter was sent to the Government and that was the end of that. We asked for four separate and distinct units because it was drawn to our attention day after day, Mr. Chairman, that people not only used the crane, but every gutter. As a matter of fact, as the last speaker said people working around this area could hardly be expected to leave the area and go in the direction where it had been convenient for the local authorities to put public conveniences such as Cumberland Street and other areas near around. It was impossible to acquire sites, but at the time we knew that Government owned the sites and we had in mind just small urinals and did not envisage general public conveniences.

It is not surprising to me today that they will ask for \$220 for the purpose of enclosing and protecting the crane because people urinate around the crane, but it does not seem to make any difference if all 2,000 men coming in from the boats stand next door to the Customs, with all their daughters and sisters looking downstairs, and give ease to nature by urinating in the street. What difference does it make so long as they protect the crane? What difference does it make so long as somebody asks to set up a Committee which would make it appear to the public that something was being done? Their attitude has been to turn a deaf ear to this matter. I challenge the Hon. Minister of Social Services to deny this statement. Dr. Byer, the Director of Medical Services, served on the Committee - and what is surprising to me is that the present Government is led by a doctor, and I take it that this would have come before him. He would have seen this and would have been able to go around in this country and see the conditions and smell the stench of the place over there. I suppose the hon. member would say he saw this for the first time when it went up, but if he has any doubt in his mind he could send for the files.

We will vote for this to protect the crane but we deprecate the idea of hon. members not seeing the wisdom in providing this necessary assistance. You will observe that in an area with 90,000 people, the Municipality, from the Rural Amenities Fund not one cent has been given to them although we have asked for it, purely because they have been unable and it is going to be a long time before they are able to control it. In other words, they are spiting the people because they refused to throw them into power in the Municipality; they refuse to give them one red cent from Rural Amenities Fund for providing any public conveniences of any sort not realising that when they refuse to do it in Bridgetown, then it is a blot and a stigma to tourists.

You should realise, Mr. Chairman, that it is your duty to represent the people in the parish of St. Michael, and you should realise it is incumbent on you as a back-bencher to impress upon the Government the necessity of getting something out of the Rural Amenities Fund. If you are going to wait until I am out, you have to write a letter to God Almighty asking him to destroy me. If you are going to suffer the people in the Municipality, waiting for me to come out, you should not do it because I will never come out. I will vote for this because I feel something should be done even though you have not replied to the letters we have written.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I have to reply to the hon. member in connection with these conveniences. I wonder if there is something wrong with the hon. member's memory. I was sent to the Ministry three years ago, and among other things I would say that within the first six months I got interested in this whole idea and took it up with the hon. member. The hon. member along with Dr. Byer served on the Committee, and I wonder if he would remember he sat in the Ministry with Dr. Byer.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I have not said that the hon. member did not set up a Committee; I said the Committee was working and have asked what has happened.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: The hon. member said exactly nothing. It is a question of why the Committee was set up and it was because of neglect in that particular area.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I object strongly to that. It is for the public to decide who is telling the truth, and I wonder whether they would believe the Minister of Social Services or myself, unless he is Ananias.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: The very reason why he wants to use the term "who would believe the Minister of Social Services" makes it clear that the hon. member is in doubt himself. However, Sir, the hon. member seems to forget the things that have gone before; he has grown rich and fat and forgotten his friends. I invited him to the Ministry for discussions and among others there was the Chief Sanitary Authority for the parish, Dr. Cochrane, a power on Public Health. Dr. Byer and the hon. senior member for the City are aware that under the Vestries Act it is for the Vestry to provide these conveniences, and, what is more, the member has a precedent for it. If he were in trouble with money in the Vestry, he knows only too well - and it has been done before - that he can come to the Government for a loan. I wonder if he would get up and say whether or not it is true and whether there is a precedent for it. I do not want to cause any further embarrassment in this matter.

There has been a delay going on for years with the hon. member in connection with a public convenience on the Wharf and over the Pier Head - a struggle for probably eight years - and his constant reply to people is that the Government should provide these things when the contrary obtains under the very Act. The Vestry is responsible; and what is more, in all this talk about the Local Government Act, it is clearly set out in that Act that public utilities are the business of the Council. Let him get up and deny this.

When this question arose I invited members to discuss it and I asked the Committee to go a little further because I was not happy that behind the huge sign which welcomes tourists at the Pier this slobby, miserable, contemptible thing should exist. I discussed it with the hon. member and he knows it is the responsibility of the Vestry - and now the Local Government - to provide these things. You cannot get out of it. Are you trying to place the doubt on the Government referring to the head of the Government as a doctor who knows what is happening along the Wharf? 1.05 p.m.

He knows only too well that it is his responsibility or the responsibility of his Council. I would like him to challenge me on this because I would enjoy replying to him. As I have said, he attended the Committee and we decided that we would go further than what was said to be done because we were not happy over the location. I asked my Director of Medical Services whether we could provide a spot anywhere along Cavan's Lane. Again, I repeat that it was the responsibility of the Local Government and the hon. member knows that the Central Government cannot take any action on this.

He says that we can use the Local Amenities Fund. Does he really mean that we can spend that Fund in the heart of the City? Mr. Speaker, I do not really want to

enter into a duel or a conflict with the hon. member on this matter. We are dealing with sanitary conveniences for the City of Bridgetown and, as I have said, we had a number of discussions on this matter. As a matter of fact, I discussed it in my Ministry with the hon. member. I suggested to him that if he were in trouble and he did not have the money, he need not go to the trouble of laying an estimate for it then, but that he could borrow the money from the Government to do it. What do you find happening today? He gets up and criticises the Central Government as though it was the Central Government's responsibility. I promise the hon. member that within the current year these sanitary conveniences will be created for the needs of the people in the City. But I would like to remind him further that it is the responsibility of the City Council. Read the Local Government Act on this.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, this attitude between these two hon. members is all very right as a pastime, but I am not interested in that. I raise a question of commonsense. Do not talk of the Act and what the Act says, and, as a matter of fact, I am no expert on the Act and what it says; but I challenge the Hon. Minister to say if there is anything in any Act of Barbados to prevent the Government from erecting a sanitary convenience anywhere it chooses. You got this monumental bit of ignorance from the brains of the former Premier some ten years ago when I was on the Executive Committee, of the Government refusing to put down sanitary conveniences on the basis that it was for the Vestries to do it. You get this ignorance that that is for the Vestries to do, and because of that you would not do something which you should do and thus you deprive people of this island of having the sanitary conveniences which they should have. As I have said, you get this state of affairs because you had a Premier who as Minister of Health said it was for the Vestry to do.

The Hon. Minister talked of your not using the Rural Amenities Fund for the purpose. Do you know that it could be spent on that long time ago? Therefore, do not worry to carry on the argument that it is under the Act for somebody else to do these things. Let me tell the Hon. Minister that the Local Government Act does not even give these wide and sweeping powers to the Local Government Councils to do these things. What I should say at this juncture in passing is that when we recall what has transpired in the last Session as regards the Local Government, no mention should be made of the Local Government. When it is considered what the people have been called upon to pay as a result of the ignorance of the Government in power because it is their legislation on this matter which has imposed these burdens on the people, members of the Government should not call the Local Government's name at all in this place.

The Hon. Minister knows very well that you have over 2,000 people on the Wharf and you have people using the sanitary convenience there who are not employed at the warehouses. It is common knowledge that some people go there and have to wait for hours before they can relieve themselves. The effect of what you are doing is that you are subscribing to this idea that a man can get off a motor lorry and go and urinate against the lorry wheel, which in effect means that you are subscribing to dirtiness. The Hon. Minister thinks dignity is how stiff you can keep your neck.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. When did I interrupt the hon. member?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. May I suggest to you to leave out these personal references. The Hon. Leader of the House has not spoken in this debate; he has had nothing to do with this Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: If Barbadians were more realistic, I believe it would be better for us. It is not unusual for the Minister to say that he has not spoken on such and such a matter but he sits in his seat and makes obvious

remarks and statements relative to the debate that is going on.

Hon. M. E. COX: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I have said nothing even to my immediate colleague. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is so sensitive.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I do not know if you have to say something to your immediate colleague to say something.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I again ask the hon. member to leave the personal aspect out of this debate.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Government is made up of persons. I am not afraid of the personal aspect because the day for you to rule by automaton has not yet arrived. When that day arrives, I would not have to deal with persons; I would have to deal with switches. Since the Government is made up of persons, I can make references to them. Let me remind you that the members of the Government say "we".

You have the position where lorries come into town and wait for hours before getting their stuff, and you get the position where men who are working on them have to get off and urinate against the wheel. That is why I said that dignity is not how stiff you can keep your neck, but it is how much commonsense you possess in your head.

The Hon. Minister of Social Services is saying that it is the duty of the hon. senior member for the City and members of the City Council to erect these sanitary conveniences, and not for us to erect them. That means that you have no responsibility in this island whatsoever and that you can pass on this responsibility to that body of people. You say that they must do it, but I must remind you again that there is no Act of this colony which says that the Government should not do it. All over the world the Local Government has got more authority than the City Council of Barbados possesses. All over the world Local Government runs and is responsible for light, laying the rates for certain things which so to speak are not the job of the Central Government. All over the world you get these things done by Local Government; but in Barbados you have small areas which the Governor-in-Executive Committee controls exclusively. All that I am asking you is: is it necessary to wait on Local Government to do something in the precincts of the Peirhead?

1.15 p.m.
Some Governments have erected things which Local Governments should have done and charged the running expenses to them. The hon. member should realise that markets are not run exclusively by the Central Government, but in Barbados we have decided that the Government should run markets. Why do you run the markets? Because you are satisfied that you can run markets, you run them. However, in New York, in London, in Bristol or in Birmingham, no markets are run by the Government; if that were so, then the Ministry in Britain would have quite a number of markets to run. You must have a common approach to all of these things. But members are going to tell us that this is something for the Vestry or the City Council to do and therefore the Government is not going to do it! The argument is that you are now requiring money for the purpose of protecting a crane on the wharf, and the protection is against the sort of thing which exists there. I say that there are not enough sanitary conveniences in this island for the accommodation of the population. In Bridgetown alone the population within a radius of four or five square miles is about 25,000 people; the density is not 1,300 to the square mile, it is about 5,000 to the square mile. When it comes to the question of where the people congregate in large numbers, there should not be any question of not providing the proper conveniences. We live in a tropical country and things can become offensive very quickly. You have people urinating publicly; that is something which you get in Barbados and which I defy you to see happening in any street in New York or in London, apart from a man who has become drunk. A man would stand up and urinate in the street

because you have a situation today where you do not have these conveniences. There was a problem alongside this Legislative building and you had to deal with it by putting a light there, because one of the dirtiest places you could find and one with awful odours was right here. You had to stop that state of affairs. This is the sort of thing which you should make people to understand, that you expect to have healthy habits from them and therefore you provide the necessary conveniences because you will chide them for not having these healthy habits.

I say that you should protect the crane from this state of affairs but I also want to see the people protected. If the City Council is not giving the protection which is required, it is not a question of any Act. I can quote instances in which the Government has spent money but the Local Government should have spent it; the Government did that because they regarded it as something which should be done. When it comes to the question of the Rural Amenities Fund, that Fund was not primarily meant to provide rural amenities for the Vestries, but it was the normal requirement that these Vestries should put down baths and urinals. Although they have done that in the past, nobody would get vexed with the Government and say that because the Vestry of St. Thomas or the Vestry of St. Joseph could not put down toilets for themselves out of the Rural Amenities Fund, the Government put them down and the Act provides that the Vestry should put them down. In that case there would be a question of postponing things for too long.

The Rural Amenities Fund is nothing which is in an Act; it is that there are certain funds which the Executive Committee will use for these amenities and they have changed that from time to time. In what context would you say that something is rural? In some of the Acts you do not call Speightstown a rural community, but there are things which you will do in Speightstown out of the Rural Amenities Fund. I want to say this, that as soon as you begin to play with words and not with ideas you will get this problem. Why are you playing with words now? If you find that the Rural Amenities Fund can be spent on something which has the same benefit to the community as one department has been giving in St. Joseph or in St. Andrew, if you can spend it in the City, of course you will do so. The Government has spent money and done something which is not in accordance with the idea of the originators as to how you should spend Labour Welfare money; you buy land in Ellerton as against buying it somewhere else where you have been asked to buy it; therefore, do not let us quibble about words. If it is proposed by some of us in this Chamber that something should be done and for some reason or other the members of the Government believe in this stupidity about somebody getting the credit for doing something, I want to say that you cannot prevent people from getting the credit for doing anything that is good. If an idea is a good one, it is a good one no matter from whom it comes. I often see members of the Government trying to bend over backwards in order to do something which they think would please their own Party members; but the time will come when the people will become fed up with him or with her, and out he or she will go. It is a question of what contribution a person will make to political life which will save him or her. I have been in this Chamber long enough and I have seen it demonstrated sufficiently to the members on the other side that if I were afraid of a seat, I would not be in here. The day when the people say that they no longer want me to represent them, that is what I am prepared to accept. Therefore it is not a question of using any underhand movements as a means of my getting back in here.

As to this matter which is before us now, I feel that it is a matter with which public health as a whole is bound up, and we could as well begin to teach and encourage the people to be clean and sanitary. If the members of the Government would take a hint from me, all of us should have a little bit of re-examination of some of the habits we see, and if we are representatives of the underprivileged people, let us not worry to encourage

the people in the habits which were allowed to grow with them as a matter of course, when people regarded these habits as something for them to do. These people are worthy of better habits and we should begin to get ready; and no Act is going to prevent us from having better habits.

1.25p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, much has been said on this Rural Amenities Fund, but that, as the other speaker has just said, can be applied equally in St. Michael as in Christ Church. As a matter of fact, the two facilities that were put down in Christ Church were done by the Government out of the Rural Amenities allocation, and I think the amount was \$500,000. The Vestry of Christ Church selected the areas, the facilities were built by the Central Government and then handed over.

The point that the Minister has missed is this: in the Report to him on the facilities needed in and around the Wharf the Report specifically stated that the four sites were owned by the Government. Now this is what we want to get out of you; are you prepared to make these sites available? If you have funds in the Rural Amenities Fund we will thank you for them, but we will raise the money to put them up; but we want the sites because Government owns the land around there. The four selected sites as Government-owned.

Now the exchange of land between the Central Government and the Local Government should be for the benefit of the people. When the Central Government wanted to put down the Library in Christ Church, it came and asked the Vestry whether it would give Government the land. We readily gave it and all Government had to pay for was the transfer. When Government wanted more land to put down the Hospital which they are putting down there now, again it was readily given. Surely the Government can realise the necessity of having conveniences around the Wharf. What is the difference between putting down rural amenities in Christ Church or in St. Joseph for the crop worker, and yet when he brings his sugar to the Wharf and want to use the facilities he cannot get them because he is a rural man and not a City man? He should therefore have the facilities provided by the taxpayers of the City.

Anyhow, the point we are making now is this, and I look forward to a reply because you said we will soon have it. The first thing you would have to do is to make the land selected available and we will operate them if you have funds to erect them and feel it is in the interest of the people to provide them; but if you do not put them up and give us the land, we will find the money. The point to get over is whether Government will make the sites available. If we get over that, it will not be long before we will have the facilities we are asking for today.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I must reply to hon. members. It is somewhat conflicting because, for instance, the hon. senior member for the City made it clear that it was somewhat doubtful as to whether this should be handled by the Vestry or the Central Government. The hon. junior member for Christ Church on the other hand

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of explanation, if the hon. member is trusting his memory, it is not so old. Please quote me correctly because you are replying to him and you must have commonsense to know that I will reply to the absolute balderdash. I have made notes and you should try and quote me correctly.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: The hon. member inferred that the Government were neglecting these things in the City but said he would vote for this \$220 because he was concerned about the preservation of the crane, but it was also the matter of neglect in the area. He also asked whether the Minister remembered having received a Report from the Committee on which the Director of Medical Services sat. I want to remind him that I asked the Committee to come to the office. The inference drawn on that side of the Table is

that it is the responsibility of the Government and we are expected to fix all of these amenities; and now that we are coming to spend this \$220 to put an enclosure around the Government crane, he would be willing to vote for this because it would preserve the crane.

Now my friend for Christ Church who is also on that Council had a slightly different point of view. As a matter of fact, he started off by saying that if the Government would give them the land, they would build the conveniences. Am I in trouble with my memory? Now the hon. junior member for Christ Church asks us to give them the land and they will build the conveniences, but that was not the point of view of the hon. senior member for the City. We are thinking of four units, but of the four units we are going to replace two of the old units, one on the Pier Head and one at the bottom of the wharf on Government land. I do not believe the hon. member would imagine that the Government would want to sell the bit of land on the Bridge to the Local Government Council for a public convenience. What would be the point except a nice little play of politics? There is no mistake about this, and my friend the hon. senior member for St. Peter repeated the point that because of the responsibility of Local Government in that matter it does not necessarily mean that Government cannot provide the conveniences but he failed to hear me on that occasion. It is specifically set out in the Act. Ask the hon. member for St. Peter what happened to the conveniences in the Orleans, and over the Bridge opposite the Plaza and Empire theatres. What happened in other areas like Carrington Village?

I would not want to accuse the Vestry of careless or reckless spending; I would hate to think so, but I did say that just as in other cases the Vestry would have been free to borrow money, it is your responsibility and you cannot shirk that, but on examination the hon. junior member for Christ Church is willing to honour it. He says if the Government gives them the land they will build these things, but has he any reason to believe that they would be denied the use of Government lands in that particular area? Are you asking us to believe that you are going to replace the existing units and they would have been built if the Government had given you the land? Surely, there is a question of money; it has been a long time—Christmas season, cricket and the incident in Trinidad—and everybody seems to be in trouble with his memory.

The hon. member says it is the responsibility of Government, and I am yet to understand for the life of right, honesty and anything we regard as decent, how the hon. member for the City can say that. It is for more than 2 1/2 years that I have been pressing for the appointment of a Committee, and I invited him to discuss this matter and he said he had no money at all. I asked him to examine the Act and I reminded him at my Ministry that there was only the question of applying to the Government for a loan and there was a good precedent for it. Again I point to the convenience opposite the Empire Theatre. Now we are told that we are responsible for it, but it is the Vestry's responsibility.

1.35 p.m.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter knows that.

I was not on the Executive Committee when the decision was taken to call it the Rural Amenities Fund, but there must have been some good reason for them to have stated "rural." There must have been some good reason and I accepted it as a very good reason. Why should he try to insinuate that because markets and such things are handled in other countries by Local Government and this Government runs markets, that we should also erect latrines in the City area? The hon. senior member for St. Peter told you the number of conveniences which are administered by the City Council and that number includes these two units.

Anyhow, Sir, we have had the assurance from the hon. junior member for Christ Church that if the land is made available to him he would build and finance these sanitary conveniences. How we like to hear that from him, in order that the public may get these conveniences. If

the hon. member would just tell me how long ago he came to that conclusion, I would be glad. It was never discussed and I can see that the idea was more or less hatched in the hon. member's brain today. I know that the hon. member is going to tell us that he did not know, or rather the City Council did not know, whether the Government was prepared to give them the land; but now that he knows, I hope he would make them available. I promise the hon. member that in this day of this year of grace, in this month of February and in this year of our Lord, 1960, he will have this land to build this convenience.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, we have been so much accustomed to so much four-flushing in this House.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I object to the remarks of the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: To what are you objecting? I said that we have been accustomed to so much four-flushing in this House, and I was going on to say that it is well that you have some Ministers whom we can get to do their jobs and their duty well without taking years to do so.

The hon. Minister ended by saying that in this year of our Lord, 1960, in this month of February, he is going to give us this land. Why has it taken two and a half years to answer the letter we wrote to the Ministry?

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of explanation. For the benefit of the Committee, I would like to know something about this letter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On what has the hon. member risen?

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I rise on a point of order. I want the hon. member to tell this Committee something about the letter which he has just mentioned. I take it that it is in connection with the site of the sanitary convenience for that area.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Again, I repeat that I was never moved by a four-flusher.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: As it seems to me, the hon. member is now taking out of his pocket the letter which he was to send to the Ministry two or three years ago.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, let me tell the Hon. Minister that I know my way about in this business. Let me begin this way. I see the Hon. Minister looking up the Act and I want to say at once that it is not in the Vestry Act at all. They have specifically said that it was the duty of the Commissioners of Health to provide ordinary sanitary conveniences.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not giving way to this ignorance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Any point of order must be heard.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: The hon. member made reference that he is not giving way to this ignorance.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Will you rule?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not know what he is about to say. Let me hear him first.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I rose on a point of order. I want to know something about this letter. Let the hon. member read paragraph one of this letter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is the Hon. Minister trying to be facetious? I said that it is nothing under the Vestry Act but it is specifically stated that the Commissioners of Health are charged with providing ordinary sanitary con-

conveniences for the general public. For generations, it was held that this did not include such sanitary conveniences as urinals, toilets and baths because such sanitary conveniences were not considered as an ordinary sanitary convenience; therefore when the Commissioners wanted to erect a public convenience, legislation had to be sought through this Chamber for money to be borrowed for the erection of such a convenience.

If I may tell this Committee now, there are some sixteen of these units in the City over which I have had something to do during the past twenty years. That is to say, they were there before the City Council came into being. The Commissioners of Health became somewhat apprehensive and worried about sanitary conveniences immediately within the City area and on the Wharf especially. They felt that these unsightly sanitary conveniences should go and should be removed. A Committee was therefore appointed to go into the matter and that Committee had absolutely nothing to do with the present Minister of Social Services. As a matter of fact at that time we did not know that he would become a Minister. I do not want to be personal but the Committee was appointed at my suggestion, and that Committee went around viewing sites and what-not, and finally submitted a Report. I have had the honour of having drafted and produced that Report which recommended sites for public conveniences. You have three types of public conveniences. You provide, in areas where the people have no pipes or shower baths, a shower bath and latrine. In other areas you provide only latrines, and in the City area you provide purely urinals and latrines. However, we realised, as time went on, with something like 2,000 people working on the Warf, that the then existing latrines were not properly sited. There was one at Cumberland Street, one out by the Railway, another one by the Theatre and one at Cavan's Lane. We realised that it was asking a man too much, if nature called him while he was on the Warf, to walk over to Cumberland Street or over by the Theatre. As I have said, the Hon. Minister knows nothing about this. That Committee worked on this matter for days and days going around and selecting sites; and in its selection of these sites, the Committee was fully mindful of the fact that it was our responsibility to erect these sanitary conveniences. When the Committee went up the Warf from Messrs. Wilkinson and Haynes right up to the Pierhead, it found that the Chamberlain Bridge was actually rotting out as a result of people urinating there and the Committee submitted a report to Government on the matter. We decided to put a urinal in Cavan's Lane because we found out that seamen and other people after coming off the ships were urinating just along there; so we decided to put a urinal there with the water running into the sea.

1.45 p.m.

Then we had one up by the Bridge, one by Lynch's and one by Messrs. Wilkinson & Haynes. We discovered that in connection with all four of these sites we had to go to the Government about them. I think the Hon. Minister should have all of these things in his file. We wrote the Government and asked them for these sites; we did not ask them to erect anything. I am fully conscious of my responsibility and I say that we have never got any reply from the Government. When the Hon. Minister took over as Minister of Social Services, I communicated with him in this matter. The Commissioners of Health never got any reply from the Government; I repeat that when the Minister of Social Services took over I discussed the matter with him. I am not one of those petti-foggers who think of jealousy; when I leave this world there is something better than what I am interested in here. I took up the matter with the Hon. Minister of Social Services and he said that he would call a meeting in connection with it; he called a meeting after we had sent in a Report. Let the Minister get up and say that that is not true. We discussed every possible thing. There was no Local Government system as there is today. We were conscious of the fact that we would have to borrow money in order to do these things.

The Minister in his usual dramatic way told us how unsightly these things were and he would do things. Mr. Chairman, there is no use in splitting hairs. As to the

Rural Amenities Fund, let the Minister stand up and tell this Committee out of what money he built the playing field in Indian Ground? What the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said is correct; the Hon. Minister called us in and discussed the matter and we went around. Has the Minister answered us about the Report or about the land? Since then we have written several times about this matter and all you would see advertised is that the Rural Amenities Fund will deal with this matter. But they want to belittle the City Council; the City Council was not in being at that time and it is not even a year old yet. At this time last year there was the weeping and gnashing of teeth and there were those who were seeing who could get me in a coffin and who could get me in a Sputnik. The Act is so confused with amendments that it makes the position difficult for the most ardent follower to understand; therefore I will leave the hon. member as far as that is concerned. I give the Minister credit where credit is due. When it was discovered that we could not get anything done we discussed the matter with him and he said: "We will get moving". What is he talking about this exchange? You had wide-awake people who were conscious of their responsibility, in that they had to do something and they never did anything like this; you repair parts of the roads which run through St. Michael and leave off the ones which run through the City and you think that you are spiting me. Like the other Ministers, you give instructions to repair certain parts of the roads in St. Michael but when it comes to the roads in the City you say: "Mottley is running the City". You do not repair any roads in the City and you think that you are spiting Mottley.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Are you the Minister? Sit down. The Minister should be in here. The Hon. Leader of the House cannot answer for every Minister because in that case he would have to answer for many sins of omission and sins of commission. Let the Hon. Minister show us a copy of the draft letter and show that the Government said: "We will give you a site at Cavan's Lane or by Wilkinson & Haynes or by the Customs". You cannot do that. You have had difficulties and you have not been able to reply to us. The Hon. Minister talks his nonsense about the changing of two areas. Years ago we wanted a piece of land by the Railway and I know that there were certain difficulties presented by certain officials relative to the selection of these sites, but I want to say that urinals could be erected in such a way that you could hardly realise that they are urinals. We know that there were certain difficulties in the way and that is why we kept quiet a bit.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that while they are protecting the crane they are still leaving undone things which should be done. Whether you have taxation or not, whether you have Local Government or not, if you are using your tourist industry as your secondary industry, are you going along with people urinating along the warf? Let us forget all of this pettifogging jealousy; let us come straight to the matter and let us have a grant from your Rural Amenities Fund. We of the City Council are willing to work in harmony with you in the interest of the people in the City. If the hon. member were to think of the City areas, of the people who use these amenities and those who come from the rural areas, from the statistics which we use we can prove what happens.

1.55 p.m.

I hope the hon. member will at least keep his promise by saying that he will send the letter telling us he has agreed to the recommendation and is willing to give us the sites to provide these things. As a matter of fact, if the hon. member feels that he is not prepared to give the Municipality money from the Rural Amenities Fund, we are prepared to cut and contrive and show we are able to borrow money over a number of years to do these things. It is not the first time that this Government has shown its malice, hatred and dislike for the people of the Municipality because they did not elect them to power.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I want the hon. member to get to grips with the question of this letter

instead of having all this talk about four-flushing, bamboozling and talk about the Rural Amenities Fund. I have sent for the files and I wonder if it is wise to hold up this Resolution any further for this information. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, you want to put the question at this stage.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, it has shocked my modesty to sit here today and hear so much concerning Head V. Sir, I think it should be \$5,000 in this Resolution instead of \$220, and instead of protecting the crane you should be building sanitary units for the same people who urinate around the crane. The Government should be responsible for sanitation throughout the island of Barbados. There is no man today who can oppose this Resolution; I do not see why he should, but when it comes to the crane, you do not only want to protect that because it is iron: you want to protect the inhabitants of Barbados throughout the eleven parishes. The Central Government should have absolute control in their hands over sanitation, because they are protecting the general health of the people in this country. If typhoid fever broke out in Belleplaine or St. Lucy which are the furthest parishes in the country, it would penetrate to St. Michael; so the Government should protect the whole island and not divide this power of sanitation into two or three hands.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 o'clock p.m., this Sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 o'clock. p.m.

On resumption,

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Question Time was called.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that we revert to Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh, no!

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I rather gather, from what the Hon. Leader of the House has intimated, that he would not object if leave was granted to proceeding during this portion of the day's meeting with Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member asked if he were in order to revert to Government Business.

Mr. BRANCKER: That is what he said. He wanted the assurance whether we would waive this period this afternoon; on behalf of my colleagues we have no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member would have to suspend the Rule to have that effected. The House is now governed by a Time Table which is part of the Standing Orders, and for any change in the order, the Rules would have to be suspended. If no member intends to proceed with Private Members' Business, the House normally reverts to Government Business. The Time Table cannot be changed unless the order is suspended.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, we are neither unwilling nor unprepared to proceed, but we are quite prepared to let the Government Business go on in this Session, if any of the matters in the Resolution which we started discussing are regarded as urgent in the public interest.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me inform the hon. member that if the House reverts to Government Business because hon. members are not prepared to do their Private Members' Business when the time expires, the Government is

then in its own right to continue and the House cannot revert to Private Members' Business. I just want you to be quite clear about that.

2.35 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think we quite understand that, but we are under the impression that the Hon. Leader of the House would like to request us to waive our time and that we are quite willing to do.

Mr. SPEAKER called the items under Private Members' Business and no action having been taken,

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is now normally reverted to.

MR. SEARLES APPOINTED TO ACT AS CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I have been made to understand that the Chairman of Committees is absent, at least for a short time, and I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. James be Chairman of Committees until the Chairman of Committees returns.

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

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

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. Andrew was speaking when the adjournment took place.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that this item needs any further discussion on it. We have spent plenty of time on it, and we have been into the details of it. All I think should be done now is that we put it to the vote.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question I want to make a few remarks on this question. I was not prepared to join in the debate even although the hon. senior member for St. Peter tried to draw me out. First of all, let me say that I am sorry that the hon. senior member for the City is not in his seat because if you remember in his closing remarks he said that it was through spite, hatred and dislike for the people of the City by the Government because they did not elect us, that this treatment was meted out to these people.

I am sure that if the hon. member would give a second thought to what he said he would find that there is absolutely nothing to bear out the statement which he made. Even before I was a member of this House, Mr. Chairman, I knew that there were certain functions, and certain duties under certain Acts that were specifically laid upon the shoulders of the Vestries. The Vestries were responsible for providing sanitary arrangements and services such as baths, toilets and things of that sort, not only for operating them. They were also responsible - and the Councils are now responsible in their place - for lighting the streets, for erecting platforms for standpipes, digging wells and things of that sort for the drainage from standpipes. The Government is responsible for laying out the sites of the pipes and the sanitary authorities are responsible for erecting the platforms, providing the drainage and thereafter for keeping those places sanitary. These things are laid down in so far as our Vestries or Local Councils are concerned. These things are now the responsibility of the Councils. They used to be the responsibility of the Vestries; therefore, it is not fair for any member to say, whether he is a member of the Opposition or otherwise, that this is the function of the Central Government, and further to say that because the Government Party was not elected in the majority in the City Council that the Government is using spite and malice. That is grossly unfair and unkind to us. Again, I say that the Act lays it down that they are

responsible. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, some time ago, so far as the administration of the City Council is concerned, when we had a big debate in here on the question of taxation, when we suggested that the City Council should have reduced their rates and if there was any deficiency then they should come to the Central Government for a subvention as is laid down under the Act, that the hon. junior member for Christ Church jumped to his feet and said: "We do not want you to help us or to give us any assistance. We do not want any assistance from you." That is why I say that I am sorry that those two hon. members are not now present. Of course, they like to hit and run.

You cannot on the one hand say "I put a bath at New Orleans, one by the Theatre, one in Cumberland Street, one in Cave Hill, but to put one on the Wharf by the Government's Crane or to put one by the Bridge - that is not my responsibility but that is the responsibility of the Central Government." That is not so. The Council is responsible for these things and I want to make it crystal clear that as far as this Government is concerned there is absolutely no truth in the statement which was made by the hon. member. That is completely out of the question.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to remark on this one thing more, and it is with respect to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I have never heard him so poor in my life speaking on anything. He was one of the architects of the Rural Amenities Fund. It was done when he was a member of the Government and he knows well enough that it could not by any means apply to baths or sanitary conveniences in the City of Bridgetown. How can the City of Bridgetown be rural? The very name that is given to the Fund would preclude and exempt the City from benefiting from it. I, frankly speaking, can very well see his reason for not supporting us and running to defend the City Council. I would not say what I would like to say now because the hon. member is absent. However, it is absolutely untrue to say that it is through any spite or anything like that that this Government did not give the City Council funds to erect sanitary conveniences. It is laid down in the Act that they are responsible for that and they never for one moment came to the Government and said: "We have not sufficient funds; help us with funds." They have never yet said anything of the sort.

2.45 p.m.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I think that for the sake of the record I should reveal the facts as regards what was said by the hon. senior member for the City as well as what was said by the hon. junior member for Christ Church. This file starts with a letter from the Civic Circle dated 20th March, 1947, signed by Miss Nell Manning, requesting that something should be done in the area - particularly the most used - of the Fountain Gardens. It was addressed to the Colonial Secretary, and it was despatched to the Vestry at that time reminding them of their responsibility for providing these facilities in the area. The Vestry replied, and the Government considered the question of whether the provision of these facilities was the responsibility of the Government rather than that of the Vestry. However, as time moved on, there was another letter from the Colonial Secretary in a second attempt to have these amenities arranged, and that was on the 26th July, 1951. Further on, there was a letter from Mr. Sharpe reminding the Government of its responsibility. There was another discussion about public latrines in Probyn Street and there was a battle of words and there was much verbosity. It is specifically set out in the Act that the provision of these amenities is the responsibility of the Vestry. There was another appeal made in a letter by Mr. Merritt and Mr. Kidney from the Commissioners of Health of the parish of St. Michael. This was another attempt to get the Vestry to undertake its responsibility.

There was a General Election in 1956 and the first thing which reached me in the Ministry about a month after I joined it was a letter from the Harbour Master, Commander Easey, who was unhappy about the matter. We are now discussing the possibility of encouraging the

Tourist Industry; we should have nothing like people deliberately urinating in the area and we decided that something should be done about the matter. I had a discussion about the matter and a meeting was arranged in 1957; there are notes of the meeting held on Monday 17th June, 1957. Present at the discussion were the present Premier, Dr. Byer, the Director of Medical Services, Mr. Merritt, the Chief Sanitary Inspector, St. Michael, Mr. Springer and myself. It was at this meeting that I gave instructions to the Committee asking them, with the assistance of Captain Tomlin, to make a careful study of the area and make the necessary recommendations. I have the recommendations for all the units. A copy was sent to the Vestry for further consideration and all we have had is talk and more talk, bamboozling and more talk. (Laughter.)

The hon. senior member for the City, in supporting the hon. junior member for Christ Church, said that they had despatched a letter to the Ministry asking the Government to give four bits of land for the erection of these conveniences and that they would be willing to supply these conveniences. I have this file from the Ministry and there is no such letter. I am wondering if sometime during the first half of today such a letter was despatched to the Ministry; however, there is no letter in this file asking the Government to consider the release of these bits of land so that the Vestry could carry out its programme. I hope you will agree with me, and I am sorry, Mr. Premier, that I have had to use all of this time which should have been used for something more valuable.

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of order. Does the Hon. Minister address the Premier when you are in the Chair, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I am addressing you, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member knows me only too well to know that I have an undying respect for the Chair. However, I am worried to this extent that I would be forced to use measures which ordinarily I would not use in order that these conveniences be provided by the proper authorities. I thank you, Sir.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question and for the purposes of the record, I should just like to read Section 71 of the Public Health Act, 1954, which had some amendments made to it from time to time. This is what that Section says:-

"A Council may, and shall where and as the Director may direct, provide public sanitary conveniences in proper and convenient situations.

Provided that they shall not without the consent of the Highway Authority, which may be given upon such terms as the Highway Authority think fit, provide such conveniences in or under any highway, or on or under any land forming the site of a proposed highway.

(2) A Council who provides any public sanitary conveniences may -

- (a) subject to the provisions of section one hundred and eighty seven of this Act make bye-laws as to the conduct of persons using or entering them;
- (b) let them for such term, at such rent, and subject to such conditions as they think fit;
- (c) charge such fees for the use of any such conveniences other than urinals, as they think fit.

Mr. Chairman, that is the most important part and we have to make our position crystal clear. Then this is what the Act says in Section 72 :-

"No person shall erect any public sanitary convenience in, or so as to be accessible from, any street without the consent of the Council, who may give their consent upon such terms as to the use of the convenience or its removal at any time, if required by them, as they think fit....."

It says that no person shall erect any public sanitary convenience in, or so as to be accessible from, any street without the consent of the Council. This particular Section prevents even a Government from erecting any such convenience because it says that no person shall erect any public sanitary convenience, in, or so as to be accessible from, any street without the consent of the Council who may give their consent upon such terms as to the use of the convenience or its removal at any time if required by them, as they think fit.

Mr. Chairman: The question is that the sum of \$200.00 be voted under Head V - Harbour and Shipping. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye" those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.
2.55 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, you put the question that the sum of \$200 do now pass; so it would not have to be revoted.

The question that Head V - Harbour and Shipping stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum and ask that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, did we vote without a quorum?

Hon. M. E. COX: Yes, and we will have to recommit the Head.

A quorum was obtained.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, would you mind putting the question again?

The question that Head V - Harbour and Shipping stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head X - Fire Brigade was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Under Item 19 - Stationery, I think it is very well known to this House and the general public that the Fire Brigade are very active inspecting different hydrants and Departments and making recommendations which very often call for up-to-date fire fighting apparatus, more hose, water buckets and that sort of thing, and consequently we can only make these reports after inspection. Consequently, the amount which was voted for travelling has been expended or is likely to be expended before the end of the financial year. After inspections, reports are sent out to the various people concerned and the amount voted for stationery is likely to be expended before the end of the financial year. We are therefore asking for \$50 in the case of stationery and \$600 for travelling.

I beg to move that Head X - Fire Brigade stand part.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head X stand part

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, my questions should not embarrass the Government; so you do not need to be quite so fast. Would the Hon. Premier be in a position to tell us when it is expected that this station in St. James will be operative? The phrase is "will shortly be completed", but you know that "shortly" can mean any length of time and can cover a multitude of delays and procrastinations. I wonder if he can give us an idea when that station will be operative. I have seen it going up for

a long time and I do not assume that people are being paid by the day, but by the task. We in that parish would like to be assured that that Fire Station will be opened as expeditiously as possible rather than "as shortly as possible". Could he help us with the approximate date of the completion?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I cannot mention any specific date, because men have to be recruited and equipment will have to be obtained. I think the equipment is on order and it is proposed to recruit men and train them at other stations first. I am sorry I cannot give the hon. member the information he is seeking.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, could the hon. member help us with the date on which it is expected the building will be completed? I should like to know that as distinct from the opening of it.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am sorry I did not hear that question.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I asked the hon. member if he could tell us when the building would be completed.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot tell him that either.

The question that Head X - Fire Brigade stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XIII - Legislature, was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This amount is for a Minister who did not draw his travelling allowance before the end of the last financial year and this is more or less a revote in order that this Minister may be able to get the travelling allowance.

I beg to move that Head XIII - Legislature, stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the Hon. Minister of Finance whether this Minister did travel at any time during that month of March, and if he did travel, whether he travelled within this island of Barbados or whether he was in that month outside of this island? Perhaps the Minister's conscience - I am entitled to assume that the Ministers have consciences - did not allow him to draw that money because he might not have been in the island and may have been in India or Ghana. We have the most travelled Ministers in any part of the British Commonwealth. With the exception of Mr. Harold MacMillan, there are no Ministers in the British Commonwealth who travel more than ours, and if we can ascertain whether the Minister in question was in the island and actually travelling by Motor transport in this month of March last year, we will consider on this side whether we will vote this money or register our protest even if we lose.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I can only answer the hon. member by saying that the Ministers to the best of my knowledge do not have to keep any record of their daily travelling to report to anybody. There is a flat travelling allowance and as far as I know it is presumed that they spend it.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, that is the point. There is a flat travelling allowance, but if the Minister is not in the island he cannot travel in the island; and this \$90 a month is meant for travelling in the island.

I am enquiring whether the Minister in question, before I press for his name and designation, was in the island of Barbados in the month of March, 1959. If he was not in the island in that month he would not be mor-

ally entitled to draw money for travelling which he did not do, because if he were out of the island he would be getting so much subsistence allowance and so many other allowances that this could not possibly affect him. Was the Minister within the island of Barbados during the whole or part of this month of March, 1959?

Hon. M. E. COX: Surely, Sir, the member will appreciate that if that holds good for a Minister out of the island, it certainly will hold good for somebody who is on leave as a member of the House.

Mr. TUDOR: We do not get travelling.
3.05 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would suggest that we leave that alone. When a Minister leaves this Island, he is on Government business; he is not his own at all. (Mr. WALCOTT: Not necessarily.) I agree with the hon. member because he and I were in Geneva on two occasions in 1957 and 1958, and we were not always, especially on nights, on Government business.

This is a fixed amount and I still repeat, even though it is quoted against me sometimes, that the allowances which Ministers get cannot keep on par with the purpose. But I hate to appear to be stirring up something which I feel should be left alone. It is not fair to attack a Minister and say that because he was out of the island he should not draw his travelling allowance when members can leave the Island not on Government business and yet can be paid their salaries.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I do not agree with either side in this debate and I have very good reasons for saying so. I believe the Hon. Leader of the Opposition well understands why I say so because this same matter of travelling allowance has caused a certain amount of things to be said and written. I am not going to say anything more about it because on the last occasion that the Hon. Minister of Trade and I spoke on this thing, we had a full explanation on the matter.

I would, however, say that I do not agree with the view expressed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that, if a Minister is out of the Island, he is morally out of place when he draws his travelling allowance for that period. I do not subscribe to that view because there is morally nothing wrong when that happens. Travelling allowance for a Minister is not computed on the basis that he is to be in the Island to draw it or that he has to travel to draw it. It was not given on any basis of how much he travels because there is no criterion to know how it amounts to \$90. It is an arbitrary figure which we have arrived at. We say that we are giving this \$90 a month to a Minister for travelling and, therefore, as long as a member is a Minister he is entitled to draw \$90 a month towards travelling.

I do not agree with the Hon. Minister of Trade either. This is different from giving a man travelling allowance just for the sake of travelling. As I have said, it was agreed to give a Minister \$90 a month for travelling when the ministerial system came into being - or whatever the amount was then. (A VOICE: It was \$60.) Where I do not agree with the Hon. Minister is in his referring to the salary which hon. members get. I am a member of this House. I do not think any member comes in here on the basis of drawing a salary, because, to be quite frank, a man today who wants to be a representative of the people and who is not capable in his own private capacity to demand more than \$220 a month is not worth much, because this \$220 a month is what you pay to a boy. A Senior Clerk gets more than \$220 a month. You can get a \$220 a month job anywhere about here. As a matter of fact, I do not know if the word "salary" is written down against what a member draws per month. I do not think it is written down that way. Anyhow, it cannot be regarded that members have to be in the Island for the month or that they must come to the meetings of the House to be entitled to get it, because a representative of the people

has other things to do than to be in here. For that reason I would not like that impression to go out to the public.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition did not say that the Ministers should not get their salaries. He said that they should not draw their allowance for travelling when they were out of the Island. He puts the allowance for travelling in a different category because you are entitled to your salary whether you are in the island or not. The opinion is that when a Minister is out of the island he is supposedly out on Government business. The Hon. Minister of Trade thought that I was facetious when I said in reply to that, not necessarily. I well remember that some time ago, some Ministers went out of the Island on Government business and alongside with that, they were invited to attend a meeting of the West Indian Federal Labour Party. There was another occasion when a Minister said that he was invited in his private capacity to attend celebrations in another country and not as a Minister or a member of the House. He used the words "in his personal capacity"; therefore, you cannot be out of the Island in your personal capacity and at the same time be a representative of the Government. That is why I told the Hon. Minister of Trade that each time a member is out of the island, it does not necessarily mean that he is out on Government business. If you are out on a conference which is going to last for three weeks, you cannot say that you are coming back to Barbados every night; and if you take the opportunity when you are out to stay over for two or three days to do something on your own, you cannot say that that is anything wrong. That is why I do not subscribe to the view that you have to be out all the time on Government business.

What I would say here now, and it is something which I am repeating from the time I came here, is that I cannot see why an ordinary member of the House is not entitled to travelling allowance. I am serious about this. He is entitled to travelling allowance as much as any Minister. Do not let us worry with even quoting members of the Local Government who get travelling allowance because Local Government is another name. A Local Government member gets travelling allowance and he should not have to travel as much as a member of the House of Assembly. I feel that the time has come when members of the House are entitled to travelling allowance.
3.15 p.m.

I go further, and I am not afraid of saying it, that hon. members of this House are entitled to what I regard as representation allowance, in so far as Income Tax is concerned. I am of the opinion that if you spend four cents per hundred persons, an amount should be put down which represents what can be regarded as a man's electioneering expenses. If you regard a man as paying income tax on emoluments which he receives from the House of Assembly, you should regard him also as incurring legitimate expenses by reason of being a member of the House; therefore there cannot be anything wrong in this world in saying that there are legitimate expenses which should be met. In so far as these allowances are concerned, I only rise to say that I do not want to be silent on the matter; I do not agree that because a Minister is out of the island there is anything immoral about his drawing travelling allowance because he did not travel. In the present situation, if a Minister is out of the island for five years, for every day of those five years he is entitled to travelling allowance. You will have to make a change so as to say that a Minister will only get travelling allowance as long as he is in the island; but if you treat it in this manner as a commuted allowance, you have to allow it to remain as such.

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

HEAD XV - POLICE

Head XV - Police was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the first item under this Head is Item 32 "Clothing and Equip-

ment," and the amount required is \$3,420. Hon. members will remember that recently the number of Policemen has been increased and this amount of money is required for the purpose of providing uniform, etc., for these new men. The next Item is Item 38 "Burials". The amount voted in respect of this Item in this year's Estimates was \$100.00 and we are asking the Committee to supplement that amount by \$200.00. This amount is required because in the case of one Police Constable who died, his funeral expenses involved the whole vote. This Police Constable died in service and was buried in accordance with Section 97 of the Police Act 1908. This sum of \$200.00 is required to meet this liability and a similar sum is to be retained so as to meet similar cases during the year. Section 97 of the Police Act, 1908 states:-

"The funeral expenses of all members of the Police Force, except the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents, dying whilst in the Force shall be defrayed from the Public Treasury."

The funeral expenses of this constable were paid and a similar amount is due to the estate of another constable. That will require \$100.00 of the \$200.00 which is now being asked for and a similar sum will be retained for the purpose of meeting similar cases.

The next Item is Item 44 "New Instruments for Band". During the financial year the sum of \$800.00 was voted for the purchase of these new instruments; it is proposed to purchase a bassoon and information has been received that the landed cost will be \$1,050. Therefore the sum of \$250.00 will be required to meet these expenses.

As to the next Item, "Subsistence Allowance" for N.C.O's and men, the amount voted in the Estimates was \$5,633 and a further amount of \$1,800 is required.

Item 61 is "Newspapers". The subscription to the *Advocate* has been increased lately and this amount of \$30.00 is required to meet the increased cost of the subscriptions since the *Advocate* is sent to every Police Station.

The last Item is Item 69, "Removal of Dead Bodies". This work is done by contract. The sum of \$1,600.00 was voted in the Estimates; approximately \$1,430.00 has been spent up to the end of October last year and this amount of \$500.00 is required for the purpose of carrying on this work until the end of the current financial year. I beg to move that Head XV stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I am rather surprised firstly at the wording of this note. If you have read it with care, which I am sure you have, this sentence must have struck you. It says this:-

"This amount was paid to the estate of one constable who died in service during the year under Section 97 of the Police Act, 1908....." A little punctuation would have been very helpful in a case like this. Section 97 of the Police Act tells us that the funeral expenses of all members of the Police Force except the Commissioner, the Deputy Commissioner, Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents dying whilst in the force shall be defrayed from the Public Treasury. I am wondering what sort of funeral turn out - I think that is the correct expression - he would have had for \$100.00; I cannot imagine him having anything like a respectable or worthwhile - looking turnout, which would befit a member of the Police Force for \$100.00, particularly as the expenses are being defrayed by law out of the Public Treasury. I am wondering if the relatives of this constable subscribed something more so as to make up for the cost of a decent outfit. A funeral outfit in these days costing \$100.00 even with the best funeral outfitting establishments which are among the most economical, would not be good enough for a member of the Police Force especially, as I say, when the Public Treasury

is meeting the bill. I would like to find out from the Hon. Minister of Finance whether the Government, in this case, only contributed to the funeral expenses or if this \$100.00 represents the full Undertaker's bill. 3.25 p.m.

I cannot see anything worthy enough for that price today unless of course it is that this one undertaker gets all this business and he is working at this reasonable price hoping that as many policemen as possible will die as quickly as possible.

Now, Sir, in connection with this subsistence allowance, we are reminded that authority has been granted during this financial year for an increase in the establishment of the Police Force, and that recalls to mind, Mr. Chairman, the amendment which the Opposition made to the reply to the Speech in answer to the Governor's Address which we tabled in April of last year. You will remember, Sir, in that reply, our amendment in paragraph 7 in which we said that it is hoped that due consideration is being given to the number of men in the Force which is clearly inadequate, resulting today in police constables being required to do twelve consecutive hours of work as one duty period. If for the increase in personnel in the Force you need \$2,730 to equip a certain number of men at \$65 each, that would give us 42 men. I think you will do that quick calculation for me, Mr. Chairman. I doubt 42 men would be sufficient relief to be provided to ensure that policemen no longer have to do either a twelve hour duty period or even a period of nine hours or any period exceeding six hours at any one time.

I certainly know in the rural districts that they have to do very long duty periods. For the policemen on duty answering the telephone in rural stations or keeping the Diary, to my personal knowledge twelve hours is nothing unusual for him to be required to do, and I am wondering if the forty-two men proposed will be sufficient to relieve that grievance from which these men suffer. They really have no means of putting up a complaint. As you know, there is an organisation known as the Police Association, but it takes a very courageous policeman to put a point of view in that Association. It happened once in the case of a policeman who is now in the Trinidad Police Force and he was immediately transferred to some other duty which deprived him of a travelling allowance of \$40 a month by the then Commissioner. Since that happened to Mr. Campbell Springer, no other policeman has taken the risk of getting up at a Police Association meeting and putting a problem which was not fully acceptable to, or he was certain would meet the approval of, the Commissioner or Deputy Commissioner of Police. That Association is a farce; it is not representative of the points of view of the Force.

I am hoping that, when we pass this amount which we certainly have no objection to voting, it will afford sufficient relief whereby those policemen who now have to do twelve hours' continuous duty will be required as a result only to do the normal and reasonable period of duty. In connection with the increase in the Force which we will be sanctioning if this Resolution passes, we have to consider that a policeman is not required on being accepted for the Force to pass an examination as a chef. Some of these men suffer great hardship when they go into the Force and are put at a station far from their homes. That cannot be helped at times - obviously you cannot have enough St. James men to put in Hometown and only St. Michael men for the metropolitan parish and so on - but consideration has got to be given either to give them much more leave so that they can go home for one meal a day, or for those who can cook there should be some means whereby they may get a proper meal cooked. In St. Michael it is not so difficult because there are restaurants, cook-shops and various facilities, but in the rural districts they complain to me that they suffer this hardship. Sometimes they get a meal cooked, but it is said that God sends good food, but the devil provides the cook.

We are therefore supporting this Resolution, Mr. Chairman, and I trust we will have the assurance expressed

or implied by the Minister of Finance that this should go a long way to relieving these policemen, particularly in the rural areas of the long duty which they are of necessity required to perform. In other words, are 42 men adequate or not? Did the Commissioner ask for twice forty-two and the Cabinet reduced it or did the Financial Secretary, as he thinks his duty it is to do, persuade the Cabinet to reduce it? Is this the maximum number which the Police Board advised the Cabinet is all that is necessary to make the Force fully staffed with reasonable off-duty periods and periods of work which are not longer than our Trade Unionist specialist in this House would agree they should have to perform?

I think, Sir, that is the principal aspect of this vote on which I would like to comment, and I trust an assurance may be forthcoming from the Hon. Premier.

The question that Head XV - Police, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXXVIII - Old Age Pensions was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Now this amount, Sir, as set out in the Note, is to provide for a certain amount of Old Age Pensioners coming on the roll. The present number on the roll is 9,068 and it is expected that it is likely to increase to 9,100 by the end of the financial year, and this \$18,000 is requested to meet commitments to the end of the financial year.

If I am not mistaken, Sir, there is some question on the Order Paper standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, but I have not seen it.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation, I would like to inform the hon. member that there is under Private Members' Business a notice of a motion.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I was about to say that I shall not anticipate the hon. member by saying anything now which might be some reference to the Resolution which he now says stands on the Order Paper.
3.35 p.m.

Again, I say that this amount which is sought here is to provide for the payment of pension to about 100 people - I do not think it is 100 people - who were added to the roll and to provide payment for them until the end of this financial year.

I beg to move that Head XXXVIII stand part.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, like the Hon. Premier I, myself, have not been minded to anticipate anything which I have to say when I come to move the motion which stands under my name to an Order under Private Members' Business. Although they both deal with Old Age Pension, they deal with different aspects of it. This Resolution is for the purpose of making provision for those pensioners which are to be added to the roll between now and the end of the year; my Resolution is for an increase in the amount given to Old Age Pensioners.

However, there is one comment which I want to make and it is towards the administration of Old Age Pension. Quite a few people complain that they experience some difficulty at the places where they go to receive their pensions largely because, I think, not enough persons are there to attend them when they are there in full strength. Secondly, when it so happens that they cannot attend at those places for a week or so, the people whom they send have difficulty in getting themselves identified in order to get the pension for whom they were asking, and in some cases, for one reason or another, they have to go back two or three times before they can collect the pension for those poor old people.

As I have said, I think that is an administrative matter and Government can do something to make sure

that people, when they attend in person, can be attended to quickly, and when they cannot attend in person, that those who attend for them can be identified easily. The procedure of a person receiving money for pensioners should be explained to them so that there would be the least amount of delay.

Another thing is that some of the people who attend Old Age Pensioners complain sometimes of the short tempers, the general feeling and the lack of good behaviour occasionally among the old people, and the old people also complain of the short tempers of those who attend them and because this shortness in tempers and so forth, some unpleasantness is caused. I wonder if it could be pointed out to those people who have to deal with these Old Age Pensioners that, first of all, these old people are not always responsible for their shortness of temper because they have quite a lot to attend to. They are not so well placed at home; therefore, they cannot smile always. And if a little more cheerfulness could be extended to them, it may prevent them from being so quarrelsome.

Another thing which Government should do, just as they should do in respect of Post Offices, is to see to it that enough seating accommodation is provided so that these people would not have to stand for longer than was necessary when they go to receive their pensions. I, myself, believe that their shortness of temper and their inclination to be rude is due to the fact that they have to stand for a longer time than they ought to. If seating accommodation can be provided for them, that may help to smooth their feelings and cause them to behave in a quiet manner.

As I have said, these are matters which can be handled from the administrative level and if investigated and attended to, might do away with a lot of the unpleasantness which is caused when pensioners have to be paid. The other matters are matters of policy and can well wait a full discussion on the payment to Old Age Pensioners as such.

The question that Head XXXVIII 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 \$25,160 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1959-60, NO. 37

TENANTRY ROADS

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, hon. members will recall that in the Development Plan, we had a sum of money for tenantry roads, \$185,000 coming from local funds and \$400,000 from C.D. & W. Funds. Now, Sir, the funds that were obtainable from C.D. & W. came to an end this year.

These various amounts, as can be seen in the Addendum to the Resolution, have lapsed due to one reason or another, principally because the Department of Highways and Transport had been very busy on the re-instatement of roads that had been dug up by various public utilities. However, we want to complete the programme of constructing the 28 miles of road specified in the scheme before the end of the financial year; so we are asking the House to vote the additional sum set out in the Resolution.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, of course, we are all very glad to see that the Government is anxious to complete the 28 miles of tenantry roads that were set out to be done some years ago; but the reason given for the non-completion of this work, which is, that the Highways and Transport Department was particularly concerned or was busily engaged in doing other roads, cannot be altogether correct. That would apply to some parishes but there are many parishes where this work was undertaken until recently by the Road Commissioners; and had they been given the funds to carry on, I am sure that their work would have been completed.

What is worrying the people in Christ Church - and I do hope that the Minister will give us some idea of what is happening - is that the work on the roads in Christ Church ceased a week before Christmas. I am speaking of the work on the roads in the southern area of Christ Church, that is to say, Rendezvous and up. It is most unusual in Christ Church for that to happen because previously funds were always available to carry on the work on roads down to the end of March.

3.45 p.m.

These road workers and rock blasters find themselves out of work at a time when they can least afford to be unemployed. As you know, Sir, the drought has taken heavy toll in that area. The canes in Christ Church are at the lowest, so much so that one syrup factory in that area will not be grinding any canes this year. They will have to send their canes to a factory and that will provide less work because it is estimated that the crop will last for about five weeks only and it would not pay them to start. All of this has happened at a bad time. One reason given for it is that the allocation for Christ Church has been divided owing to the division under the Local Government System and the City area, and work in that part of Christ Church from Rendezvous down has been done by the Department of Highways and Transport, while the balance of the allocation is insufficient to carry on the work. I hope that the Hon. Minister will be able to throw some light on the matter. I have been asking the authorities about it; I know that the people are out of work at a time when they can least afford to be idle. After the parish roads have been done, the tenantry roads are taken over. As I say, I would be very much obliged if the Hon. Minister would help us in this matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to say that I am not happy about what the Hon. Minister has said. He said that the reason for this revote is that the money lapsed because they were too busy in dealing with the things which the Public Utilities had done. I have drawn to the Minister's attention in a debate in this House that there were men who were dismissed from the Department of Highways and Transport and the Minister's reply was that after a survey had been made it was proved that there were too many people employed in this particular Department of Transport. I feel that when you come to a revote in Barbados on the ground that you were too busy and you could not spend the money, that argument should be used in a place where there is full employment, not in a place where there is terrific unemployment and underemployment even among the people who are working for the Government. I am sure that all of these workers cannot get 52 weeks' work in a year. It is a very serious thing to hear that they were too busy and they could not do this work when lots of people are looking for work. It has been so all over the world, that whenever you are struck with a depression, you look to the Public Works Department to take up that depression because you provide work, and therefore you provide a service. You will make use of a road and you will always be in a position to do so. Far from there being not enough work on account of their being too busy with the other roads which the Public Utilities have dug up, I would like to hear from the Hon. Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to intensify the work on tenantry roads or on other roads in order to provide more employment, because there is going to be, as a result of the drought and

the short fall, a lowering of the price of sugar. We will lose about \$6 million to \$7 million in 1960; that is to say, less money will be distributed in 1960 than was distributed in 1959. You can see what is the difference between this year's crop and last year's crop; you can make a deduction and you will get the final answer. It does not need any Solomon to do that. Where your total national income is in the vicinity of \$70 million or \$80 million and you get a drop in income representing 10% of your total national income, it is a serious matter; and that in itself is going to be about 20% of the total income in the sugar industry. That is going to be reflected in the total amount which you estimate for the tourist industry. You have to be prepared to grapple with this situation and not have a period which will be too hard for you.

The programme in these tenancies should be intensified, but not on the basis of just building tenantry roads. I think that we should undertake some survey about the tenantry roads. There is the tendency that some people will go and put their houses in any cart track and call upon the Government to build a road in a cul-de-sac. You must be able to guide people aright and tell them not to put their houses in these places and then call for expenditure. I think the Government should come down with some sweeping changes; they should close up all the allies in Bridgetown which serve no purpose, and in other places the land on both sides should be given to the people and do not let us have the idea of maintaining an alley like Philadelphia Lane where only a push cart or hand cart passes through places like that. You should stop some of the maintenance on some of these roads and you should get down to dealing with roads which will serve the sort of traffic which we have now.

3.55 p.m.

While on Communications - and this is not a tenantry road - I will draw to the Minister's attention that I have driven over the new road, and although I am not an expert on this, I can tell when a road is bumpy from when it is smooth. At least you would expect in building a new road like that to feel the Hon. Minister is looking at you, Mr. Chairman; I wonder if he wants to hear that the Head is "Communications". - that you are driving over a road like the Churchill-Roosevelt Road. It is a narrow strip of road and I must say that I was shocked to think that I was driving over a road which opened last week.

Now if a Minister is not interested in the money he is spending and thinks that all that matters is to have his picture taken at the opening of the road, you will find that it is a waste of our money. You are Minister of Communications and Works and under this Head you are now asking for money to build roads and it is at this point that I am drawing the matter to your attention. Whether it is tenantry roads or public highways, you are the Minister in charge of Communications and I am drawing to your attention something that comes under your portfolio which should be looked into. There is this arrogant idea that you cannot draw anything to the Government's attention. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: What is that to do with this?) The hon. member asked what is that to do with him.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I must interrupt on a point of order. I never asked what it is to do with me; I asked what it is to do with this Head. If you want to have a full-dress debate on Sandy Lane in its appropriate place, I am quite willing; but for Heaven's sake we have to stick to the subject of the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: What Rule am I breaking? He is Minister of Communications and Works and is asking the House for approval in a vote for tenantry roads. He is also Minister for other road services, and I am taking this opportunity under this Head to say that one would have expected the road which has just been opened to be an excellent one. He asked what is that to do with him.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I again interrupt the hon. member. Is this road a tenantry road? If it is

not, then I submit it does not come under this Head. I am not afraid to face the hon. member with that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. Peter please stick to the Resolution which is before the House?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Head is not Tenantry Roads; the Head is "Communications."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is "Communications."

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, do not let us argue the elementary; the Head is not "Tenantry Roads"; the Item is "Tenantry Roads."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Well, deal with that. Roads come under Communications.

Mr. WALCOTT: Obviously that is the point I am making and because of the fact that roads come under "Communications", I am taking this opportunity of bringing this matter to his attention. That is what you do in Parliament under a money Resolution: so do not let us get to the elementary by trying to teach Ministers how you should debate questions on these matters. The Minister is asking this House for money to spend in his Ministry, and I am taking the opportunity to deal with something that comes within his Ministry - not Housing, but roads which come under the Head of "Communications" - to draw to his attention - without debating it - that the new road which has just been opened and over which I drove is a road which you would expect to be in a better condition as a new road than what it is, and we hope that such roads that we do, even tenantry roads, would be better. This is money you are spending, but he does not want to hear this; and if this arrogance continues, we will not get the proper services for our money because as a representative of the people I keep my eyes open whenever I pass anywhere, and if I see anything of public importance I make a mental note of it and when I come here and it is something that comes under any debate, I am going to raise it.

If other members have driven over that road and are satisfied, and if you who live in that area, Mr. Chairman, are satisfied that it is done to the best which you expect for a new road, I will say that I have driven over new roads inside and outside of Barbados which were in better condition than this. That road for some given reason has several bumps and I do not know if you expect that these bumps are going to settle themselves down, but we do not expect these bumps in a new road. If that is what hon. members are failing to say, and if that has nothing to do with the Minister, I do not know what would have anything to do with him under that Head if I raise that matter.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, it was indeed a strange remark to fall from the lips of the Minister of Communications that the Department was very busy on the reinstatement of roads and as a result this money was allowed to lapse. How, Sir, could the Department be so busy on the reinstatement of roads which were dug up by the various services - telephone, electric, gas or whatever it is - for you to be unable to proceed with the normal road programme, thereby not only keeping the roads of the island in order, but also in providing most essential employment for those people whose only livelihood is to work on the roads of this country? There must be something wrong with the running of that Department. It may be that the Head, who, I understand, is not exactly a Graduate Engineer, is unable to cope with more than one or two small jobs at one time, because certainly the labour was available. The road workers were ready to assume their normal employment if only they had been called out, but it would appear so ridiculous on the record that because the Department was very busy on reinstating roads which had been dug up by public utilities, as a result they could not keep pace. There were only twenty-eight miles of road which were specified in the road programme, and the result is that we are asked today to re-

vote the remainder of the lapsed balances amounting to \$17,594. Of course, Sir, we in the Opposition will support that.

Another point which arises is this: when this Resolution is passed, as of course it will be passed, there will be the taking on of labourers and I am working on one or two particular cases. There is considerable discrimination being exercised in the taking on of labourers to work on these roads. There are one or two overseers who seem to regard themselves as canvassers paid, not by members of the Government Party, but out of the funds in the Public Treasury to canvass for and sponsor the programme, and I have certain cases in mind of which more may be heard sooner rather than later in which overseers are taking on people after reference to a Political Party's book to discover whether or not these workers are members of a certain Political Party. If they belong to one Party, they are not taken on; but if they belong to another Party they are allowed to resume work, even although the people who have not been taken on in some instances have been people working for as long as twelve years with the Department of Highways and Transport, and they have been replaced through no fault of their own by people who have not worked so long with the Department, simply because political victimisation is at the moment rampant and is used in this Department to a greater extent than any other Department which I have in mind other than the Transport Board. But we will deal with that later on. It is so easy to get a job as a conductor or a driver if one carries a note. I have not heard, Mr. Chairman, of notes being carried in connection with these vacancies for labourers when new works are started.

4.05 p.m.

I do not think a note is carried, but sufficient information is told to enable one or two particular cases to come out as regards people who were usually employed or re-employed in this Department of Highways and Transport and Labour. Anyhow, that would be dealt with - not in this House - by means of an affidavit in the Law Courts.

I am saying that there is no reason why in this state of Denmark, because roads have been dug up by public utilities, this Department has to abandon or temporarily leave aside its programme of constructing the 28 miles of roads specified in its road programme.

Of course, the people are grateful for the work when it comes: but how much better would it be, particularly in the absence of a Christmas Bonus, for those people to be employed in the months of November and December so that they would be able to enjoy not the sort of Christmas Your Honour enjoys, but to enjoy a quiet Christmas of 1959! When people are waiting for work, and then instead of getting work, they are turned off, particularly those people who have been accustomed to regard themselves as regular casual employees of the Department, that really is not good enough. We have heard today of a Minister who did not draw his travelling allowance for one month, but that is one month only. When you have this class of people laid off for two or three months simply because a Head of a Department is concerned, not with maintaining his regular road programme but with doing other things, that really is not saying much for the Department or its Head, and I trust that we will never hear a similar statement made in this House. I trust I will not hear again that the regular programme as was specified was disrupted; that is to say, 28 miles of road specified in the programme was left uncompleted and because of that, this amount of \$17,594 has to be revoked simply because of the little extra duties; a few miles of roads had to be reinstated, because the gas works or some other public utility has had to get the road dug up for them to do their work.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that some hon. members of the Opposition are making great play of what I said about one of the reasons for the lapsing of this amount was that the Department of Highways and Transport was heavily engaged in the work of reinstatement of roads dug up by a public utility. Mr. Chair-

man, I do not see why hon. members should assume that because the Department was engaged in this work it led to unemployment on a big scale, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter seemed to believe. It is to the contrary. I will attempt to show the Committee that the opposite is the truth.

Now, Sir, to put it in a nutshell, it is impossible for this Department or for the Government and the Ministry to estimate at the beginning of the financial year to what extent the Department will be required to carry out work in reinstating roads dug up by public utilities. We do not know a year ahead what is the programme of the Barbados Light and Power Company or the Gas Works or even of the Waterworks or any other Department of Government. They are required to send in an outline of their programme six months ahead of the date that the programme is to be started, but very often due to the delay in obtaining material or due to one thing or the other, they cannot tell us exactly what the programme will be like. Sometimes it is heavier than what is anticipated, and so on.

What happens is this; due sometimes to the fact that expected materials suddenly arrive, these public utilities, in order to get ahead with their programme, suddenly notify the Department of Highways and Transport, and that means that the Department has to shift its equipment so to speak, such as road rollers, to the job of these utilities so that traffic will not be dislocated to any extent. Surely that does not necessarily mean that a large lot of people would be dislocated. Immediately this equipment is shifted, you get the work going on. What I mean to say is that generally when you shift the equipment you also shift the people along with it. We had a lot of work in Dayrells Road where the Gas Works was laying mains. Why hon. members try to make out that this has led to unemployment beats me. Lest some hon. member who is listening is unaware of the truth and feels that Government is not helping the unemployment programme, may I remind the Committee that we have employed a record number of people - over 6,000 - in the Department this financial year. Of those people, we have employed over 1,600 since the end of May. In what previous Government has that been done? This has nothing to do with those employed in the workshop. Far from there being less people employed this year, more people have been employed and re-employed than ever before.

There are one or two other points that have been raised. There were the usual statements about victimization and so on raised by the last hon. member who spoke. I wonder if he has heard that some of our own Party supporters have come to me bringing tales of victimization against them, cases of prejudice and so on against them by Heads of Departments.

4.15 p.m.

There will always be human complaints and human beliefs; but the hon. member is in the position of being shadow Premier; imagine him making an irresponsible statement like that, that the Department is victimising people! He is dwelling in the shadows and why does he not come out in the light? He says that Heads of Departments are victimising people because they belong to that Party.

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member saying that I am making an untrue statement? If he is saying that, then you must call upon him to withdraw it. I object to it.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Is the hon. member objecting to what I am saying or what I said as being untrue? The charge which you have made against this particular Department is untrue.

Mr. BRANCKER: Whom is the hon. member addressing? Is he addressing you, Mr. Chairman, me, or whom?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I will clear that up in a moment.

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of order. Irrespective of Party, Mr. Chairman, you must deal with members of your Party just as you deal with any other member of this House. I have got up on a point of order and the hon. member has remained standing; certain of his colleagues would not do that, of course. I am trying to protect the Chair, and I will say that the hon. member can only address you when he is standing.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I am not worrying to continue with that because I believe the hon. member himself feels that he is being light. The hon. member must surely realise that he is only catching at straws, or rather he is catching at less than straws; nevertheless, there are serious charges which have been made and they have been made in a place such as this House. I have heard an allegation made by people who should have employment and those who are even employed, and if I have proof that any victimisation is carried on by any officer or any person, that is something which I will deal with most strongly; but the mere fact that people cannot get work is not dictated by the fact that they belong to that Party and not to this Party. I have more complaints from people that Heads of Departments are victimising them because they belong to the Labour Party than otherwise. The hon. member knows that; therefore why should he say that Heads of Departments are victimising people because they belong to a particular Party?

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of explanation. I have never said that Heads of Departments are doing that.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I bear my responsibility and the Head of a Department must bear the responsibility for what goes on, and I hope that the hon. member bears the responsibility for what goes on in his Party. However, Mr. Chairman, I cannot allow these allegations to go unanswered. I will say no more on this occasion.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter has mentioned the Sandy Lane Road. It is only for the sake of the record that I will say this, but I am surprised that the hon. member was so taken up apparently in looking at my picture - I did not know it was so pretty - that he did not see what I said on the occasion of the opening of the road. The Company who has built the road is responsible for any defects in that road. If we find that these "bumps", as the hon. member has called them, do not disappear and iron out and that they have been caused by some defect in the road, then the Company has to put them straight. They are responsible for the road for a year; and if we find that after six months that the surface is not good enough, then we will call upon them to remedy the defect and supply a better surface.

When the road was to be opened originally, in fact, the Government had no opportunity of visiting that road until the temporary first opening. I said that the Government must look at the road before the trial opening. We went down and made an inspection of the road. We allowed one week as a trial and we insisted that there must be a period of one year during which this Company must take the responsibility for any defects in that road. Mr. Chairman, this Committee can rest assured that we are not allowing this Company to pull any wool across our eyes or anything of the sort. We are quite aware of our responsibility in this matter and we are quite prepared to carry it out.

As regards the question raised by the hon. junior member for Christ Church about the tenantry roads, I have had a delegation from the Highway Commissioners and other members up there. A part of the road in their areas has been left undone by the old Vestry. What has happened is that previously we never gave a grant to Christ Church; they always found the money to repair these roads because they are a rich part of the island. Now that Christ Church has been divided, it means that a lot of the tenantry roads which had been left undone and unrepaired under the old regime cannot be done under this regime. However, I

am going into the matter and I will promise the hon. member to let him know what the position is in a Statement because it is not correct to infer that it is all due to any inaction or neglect on the part of this Government that these roads are not being repaired. One of the members of the delegation said that they did more roads in Christ Church than in any other part of the island. The point is that the Vestry used to concentrate on the 'tourist' roads. That is the allegation; that is what was put to me. Now there is a new system and the grant is for the total number of roads throughout the year without regard to anyone. They have asked for this increase because now that that part of Christ Church has been cut off they will have no money to repair these roads without a grant.

4.25 p.m.

That is what has been put to me. I am going into the position and I am quite prepared to make a Statement for the benefit of the House and the hon. member in the near future.

Mr. GODDARD: I thank the Minister for throwing some light on it; but when he is meeting these delegations, he should certainly meet people who formed part of the old Vestry, because that is not altogether correct and I know that the delegation that would go to him would more or less say that.

There are several roads in the southern part of Christ Church that need to be widened, but there are still some in the Worthing View part of Christ Church that need similar treatment; one of them is the Morgan Road - the one from Rendezvous leading to Brittons Hill; so it is not altogether fair to say that all attention was paid to the Worthing View part of Christ Church.

I thank you very much for your explanation and I do hope that when you meet the delegation again you will have an opportunity of also meeting some of the people who were responsible in the old regime, and I am sure they will explain the whole thing to you. I have never been a member of the Road Authority, but I do know something of it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I must thank the hon. member too for the reply he gave about Sandy Lane, because as I said it was not intended to be a debate on Sandy Lane. If he had listened to me carefully, he would have heard that I said I was not an engineer or an expert, but it appeared to me that the road was bumpy and I still maintain that. If the Company is going to reinstate it, by all means it should be done; but I have driven on new roads before, and I will repeat that in my opinion this road is not to the standard of new roads which I have seen built before in Barbados. (Hon. M. E. COX: Your car may want changing.)

It has done 40,000 miles and is in first-class condition. Any man who owns a motor-car can pay a little more taxation, because when you spread the cost over the whole cost of a motor-car, it is infinitesimal to the service you get, tyres and upkeep, as compared with smaller items like a house.

The hon. member said they could not estimate - and I am sure he could not mean that - the amount of work they will have to do when you have public utilities interfering with roads. I am sure he could not mean "estimate" because the whole budget is based on an estimate. For the work that has been done over so many years you must have people who are capable of estimating how much you will do. You cannot work on the assumption that there is going to be any reinstatement of roads by public utilities; you must work on the assumption that if the reinstatement on roads for the last five years represent so much money, you cannot see yourself in this year with no money to be spent on reinstatement of roads; so the hon. member could not mean "estimate". You may say you do not know accurately how much money you would require, but nobody would know accurately how much money other than fixed salaries would be needed; so an estimate presupposes that you are going into these things on the basis of hypothesis without knowing how much

would be required, because an estimate is not supposed to be an accurate account. I only say that to correct the hon. member.

When the hon. member talks about what happened under other Governments, he should get this straight; when you use that phrase, you should leave it for when you are in Porey Spring talking to a group of workers and you are making a broad, general statement that today things are different from what they used to be; if things were not going to be different today, you would be the same age as you were 19 years ago. You have to appreciate certain things and arithmetic is one of those things. If you are spending \$21 million and receiving something like \$22 million, do you really seriously want to spend the same amount of money as somebody spent years ago when you budgeted for \$9 million? What would you do with the other \$12 million? Put it in your pocket? Would it be just to ask for taxation on this basis? People are not paying the same taxes that they used to pay years ago. Do not think the community is getting something it is not paying for, because every penny you are spending is money which you are getting out of the community by its work. When a carpenter or a mason today in a forty-two hour week gets more money, you take away more money in tax than before; so get that quite clear. Do not tell me that under other Governments they never had so many people.

The other mistake which the hon. member made was to suggest, as if he were talking to people in Porey Spring or Arch Hall, that I said the reason why you had unemployment is because you did something under Highways and Transport to create unemployment, and you produced figures to show that you had 1,600 people employed. Mr. Chairman, what I said was that if in twelve months' time you had so much money to spend on people and they are not people working for fixed salaries, and within this given period you did not spend it on them, Barbados is not a community that can afford it; and when he tells me about 1,600 people being employed, the hon. member seems to be going crazy. Does he know that if the United States of America had an unemployment figure like ours, they would think they are in for the biggest catastrophe? When they had a figure of 6% we had one of over 25%. That is the type of complacency that the Ministers want to lull the community into. It seems that the fact that you had 1,600 people employed last year means that none of us should open our mouths on this question when there are large numbers of people unemployed; but I say that any question about the lapse of money is a serious matter for us.

In a community like this, we do not want money to lapse, and I want to tell him what I have heard some people say. Some people believe that as long as you can balance your budget or if your fiscal policy shows that you can balance the budget, that is more important than the standard of living. With the type of economy we have, a balanced budget does not mean a balanced economy; so you can have a balanced fiscal policy but you can also have thousands of people going without the barest necessities of life, and it is not reflected in the economy you talk about. You cannot tell me you had 1,600 people employed. How many were unemployed?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: For the sake of the record, on Capital works that amount of people were employed in this Department alone, but there were over 6,000 employed on all Departments. That is a matter of fact and there is no complacency about it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, if 6,000 people are employed in a community where there are one hundred thousand people of employment age out of which 25% are unemployed, do you realise the seriousness of it?

4.35 p.m.

But there again there is this complacency which you have. You say that it is 6,000 people who were employed by you but look how many more are unemployed

and, as you have said, you did not use the money under the vote. In Barbados, we cannot be at such a stage, unless it is for technical reasons where you can say that you could not do the work. Surely, it cannot be from the point of view of labour. If there is anything in the world which we have, it is an ocean of labour; therefore, when the Hon. Minister raised that point, nobody on this side could agree with him. Do you know, Sir, that they create an unemployment figure. The unemployment figure being what it is in this island, you cannot now tell us that you cannot do the work when you had work to be done in that Department.

I want hon. members of the Government to understand quite clearly this. The Hon. Minister believes that a special favour is being done when you give people employment and the reason why he believes so is because there are some people in this island who are living much better off today than they ever expected to live and they feel that if there are other people who get some sort of thing to do for a living, that is some act of the Divine. I believe that it is part of our duty as legislators to comment on this critical situation which we have to face. The Hon. Minister says that his Department could not do the work and because of that the money under the vote had to lapse. I say, spend the money at all costs; do not waste it, but use the money which has been voted to the Department, utilising the maximum number of people whom you can employ, because in Barbados we cannot afford to have people unemployed when you have work to be done. Anyone who has his eyes wide open will realise that. The Hon. Minister says that 6,000 people were employed under the Highways and Transport Department but he also knows the method under which that Department employs people and he also knows the sort of employment which the people get for fifty-two weeks. Therefore, when you realise the problem which these people have to face, of these 6,000 people whom the Hon. Minister says have been employed by that Department, you can very well see that 50% of them can be regarded as people who are under-employed.

I hope that the Hon. Minister quite understands that it is not a question of your raising anything just for a debate. According to the Addendum to this Resolution money lapsed in 1958 and in 1959 towards the work of continuing this programme. Department Heads must be made to understand, when they are dealing with a labour force that they must try their utmost and organise their work so as to utilise the maximum number of people at all times. My last criticism is that this is not a problem. All it shows is that something is wrong with the method of preparing estimates in your Department. They cannot determine the estimates that can relate to the things of the Department in such matters as they were doing for the last twenty years.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Who said that we could not determine the estimates of the things we intended to do? I said that so far as estimates for work to be done for public utilities are concerned, the Department could only go by what has happened in the previous years. From what they tell us, we estimate that we will have to do so many miles of roads. But that is not what it turns out to be. As a matter of fact, we have exceeded the amount that they have told us. Already, I have come down with supplementary estimates to re-instate roads and very soon we may have to come back for more money for the same purpose. How can you estimate accurately in that way when you do not know from the people?

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister says how can you estimate in that way accurately. No estimate on that can be ever accurate. We did not say that you could do it accurately. You say: how can you estimate for this work when you do not know from the people; therefore, you mean to say that you cannot estimate for the re-instatement of roads until the Light and Power Company or whatever other public utility it may be sends in and tells you. Whom do you think you are talking to? You are talking to men who do not have to ask you any favours.

I say that that is nonsense. How are the people of Great Britain going to estimate for the roads they have to do? They have roads to do just as we have them. They have to make an estimate on the basis of whatever work public utilities are going to ask them to do. Let me ask the Hon. Minister this. Do you think any store in Broad Street knows how many shirts you are going to buy next year? How can you come down with an accurate estimate? You cannot come down with an accurate estimate, but you can come down, as you do, with some sort of estimate, and that is where the Government has always succeeded. They estimate for a deficit when we know that they are going to collect a surplus. When I made the statement in here sometime ago that they could afford to budget for a deficit, the Hon. Minister thought it was something criminal to say but it eventually turned out to be a surplus.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I would just reply to the Hon. Minister of Communications, only for the purpose of keeping the record straight, but not for any member to think that I have taken the Hon. Minister seriously. In common with other people of this country you know how seriously we regard that Minister. Certain Overseers who have made no secret of it have said because of the increase of available funds that they are consulting the constituency branches of the Barbados Labour Party, if they do not have the information themselves, in order to keep the promises made to the constituency members towards the question of finding employment in the Public Works for members of that particular Party. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that more will be heard of this in other places and in the very near future.

Of course, nobody will take the Hon. Minister seriously. I do not think that the hon. senior member for St. George could have bettered it when the Hon. Minister of Communications was asking us to believe that he was quite unaware of certain things in respect of that Department, when Overseers of that Department do not hide to tell a worker that he will be laid off and that he does not belong to 'our Party.' I know of cases in which this could not be more openly done, but my colleague and myself are dealing with these cases one by one.

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

4.45p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

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

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

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR ACCESS ROAD

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:— Resolution to approve the compulsory Acquisition of certain areas of land for the purpose of providing an access road to the Deep Water Harbour for the use of the public.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members will see from the Addendum to this Resolution, the reason for the Resolution is that we are providing an access road to the Deep Water Harbour for the accommodation and

use especially of the heavy sugar lorries which will be carrying sugar in bulk to these installations at the Harbour. As hon. members will doubtless have known, the road runs through Kensington Tenantry along Thomas Gap up to near Eagle Hall and this is one of the physical changes which will accompany the setting up and erection of this Harbour. The whole configuration of the hinterland will be changed and we hope that, by the construction of this road, traffic will be relieved along the main highway.

Now, Sir, the bringing forward of this Resolution does not mean that there are any difficulties as regards negotiations so far as the price of land is concerned; in fact, there are only three cases where the question of price is involved in this compulsory acquisition. In so far as the other cases are concerned, lots of them are matters of title, as hon. members can see from the Addendum to the Resolution, and in the case of others it is a matter of the vendors, having bought these lands which were previously laid out in tenantry, not being able to sell them by private treaty and they have to go back to the General Board of Health in order to get permission to divide and sell these lands. All of that takes time and in view of the fact that we want to get ahead with this matter as quickly as possible, we have decided to come down with this Resolution so as to expedite this work.

Mr. Speaker, if hon. members would like to have any other details I am quite willing to supply them. There were seventy-eight chattel houses involved in the area which were to be removed; twenty-three of them were re-sited in the same area and there were forty-nine of them, the owners of which had requested removal to housing areas. Those who requested removal to the housing areas have been granted the land by the Housing Authority and the houses have been provided with proper grounds and so on. The houses have been strengthened, all the negotiations have been quite harmonious and I do not think that in any case the people have felt that they were unreasonably treated by the Government. These people were paid the prices which the Board of Health laid down, and in cases where there were fruit trees and established plots which would mean financial loss to the owners, all of these things were taken into consideration. I want to assure the House that there has been no case of dissatisfaction in this whole transaction. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, at this stage I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock (noon).

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would really like to know why Order No. 3, which is the next Order of the Day, was not proceeded with. What I am very serious about is that if you are going to meet next Tuesday - well, I am making this as a broad statement now, that meeting from Tuesday to Tuesday with only two Orders on the Order Paper to be dealt with, seems to me to be a waste of precious time.
4.55 p.m.

Nobody is protesting going on with Order No. 3 which has been on the Order Paper from the beginning of this Session; but each time we came to it, the Order was not dealt with. Again today you do not deal with it and if it were dealt with, the Order Paper would be finished as far as Government Business is concerned. I do not know the measures which have been given notice of, but it seems to be nonsense to bring 24 people in here.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, if the hon. member would give way, I should like to inform the House

that the Government proposes to have a full statement on the financial position of the Transport Board before going on with this debate.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am very glad to hear that because I would not say what I was going to say on that as we have matters dealing with the Board, and although I am not protesting to the fact that you are adjourning until next Tuesday, I want to know if we are going on from Tuesday to Tuesday without having enough business to do in one day. We do not want to go back to the old days and meet from twelve noon until 4 p.m.; I believe it is better to adjourn for two weeks at least and let the Order Paper collect some business which you can do. Next week you may come back with non-controversial Bills to acquire bits of land or to give money back to people from income tax, and it looked to me to be an expensive way of dealing with these matters.

I do not know the Resolutions we have to deal with next Tuesday, but it seems to me that the Leader of the House should get together with the other members and evolve some new method in order that our time can be more expeditiously given to public service rather than meeting every Tuesday and doing two or three Bills.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I must say I agree with the hon. member who has just sat down. When earlier today the Leader of the House sought an understanding with the Leader of the Opposition and we agreed on our part to give up our Private Members' time, we did it merely because we glanced at the Order Paper and saw that Government Business consisted of three items, and we thought as their business was short they should be allowed to conclude it. Now we hear that they are not proceeding with one of their items, and we feel we have been led up the garden path because it was particularly on that ground that we permitted them or rather did not take any objection to their finishing Government Business. I would like to tell the Leader of the House that we would not like this to happen again because we really feel that something unfortunate was being played against us.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit I should just like to draw the attention of the Ministers to a matter which is of public importance on which perhaps in the near future they may care - the Premier at any rate - to lay a Statement.

For some weeks now and off in the Press West Indian attention has been drawn to the plight of a West Indian in a Middle-Eastern country who is supposed to be in trouble there charged with spying. So far no particular statement has been issued either by the Federal Government officially informing us, and it would be as well if they could pay some attention to it and find out what the facts of the matter are, because I am sure public opinion here as elsewhere would be glad to know what it is all about.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member had better treat this particularly and not just in a casual way on the motion for the adjournment. As a matter of fact, on the motion for adjournment, hon. members must stick to the adjournment. The House knows very well how to deal with matters of such importance. Questions may be asked or a Resolution may be passed, but on the motion for adjournment a Minister need not pay any attention whatsoever.

Mr. TUDOR: I understand that, Sir. I did not intend to debate it now, but I am asking the Ministers whether in the near future they could find out what it is all about and inform the House in consultation with the Federal Government.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the House combined his motion for adjournment with the setting of the Order Paper, an unusual procedure on his part because I think he normally sets the Order Paper first. I would like to carry on that combination just for this occasion to know if Order No. 6 under Private Members' Business could be made Order No. 1.

And, Mr. Speaker, speaking on the adjournment, I would crave the indulgence of the House just to clarify a statement which was made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, I think.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not allowed to bring up any new matter on the adjournment motion. That

used to be the custom, but the Rules of the House do not permit that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 9th February, 1960 at 12 noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

5.05 p.m.

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1960

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 9th February, 1960

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. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. T. O. BRYAN, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mrs. E. E. BOURNE; Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E.; Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc.; and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting held on 2nd February have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will now be taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection, these Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

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

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1960.

Barbados Statistical Service - Selected Monthly Indicators - November, 1959 and December, 1959.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Report and Audited Accounts of the Transport Board for the year ended the 30th September, 1959.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Twentieth Annual Report of the Peasants' Loan Bank for the period 1st June, 1956 to the 31st May, 1957.

Report of the Superintendent of Markets for the period 1st April, 1956 to the 31st December, 1957.
12.25 p.m.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$26,621 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1959-60, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1959-60, No. 39 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$93,588 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1959-60, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1959-60, No. 40 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1960."

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled "The Customs Tariff (Conditions for Special Exemption from Duty) (Amendment) Regulations, 1960."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Bill to amend the Barbados Turf Club (Imposition of Duty) Act, 1941.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Bill to amend the Highways Act, 1900.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In connection with this latter Bill, copies have been circulated with the approval of Your Honour and it is proposed to pass this Bill through all its stages today.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

BE IT RESOLVED that this House deprecates the renting by the Executive of the Railway Road at Bath in the parish of Saint John to private individuals and the consequential closing of the said road to vehicular traffic.

BE IT ALSO RESOLVED that action be taken to re-

open the said road and to acquire lands adjoining the sea for the use and benefit of the public.

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

QUESTIONS

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Hon. Minister of Health and Social Services:-

Will the Minister state whether he is aware that sedatives, not medically prescribed, have been administered to infants in the Children's Ward of the General Hospital?

2. Will he also state whether any deaths have resulted from such unauthorised treatments?

3. Will he institute immediately a thorough investigation into this matter and make a statement to this House on his findings?

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Hon. Premier:-

How many Policemen have resigned from the Force during each of the past five years?

2. What were the reasons given for resignation in each case?

3. How many hours per week duty is a Police Constable required to perform?

4. Is Government aware of existence of dissatisfaction amongst the rank and file of the Force at their emoluments and conditions of service?

5. Does the Constitution of the Police Association make no provision for selection by the men of representatives on the Council of this Association of persons who, unconnected with the Force, are free to express the points of view of the lowest ranks of the Force?

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Minister of Communications:

Whether his attention has been drawn to an advertisement in the Local Press of the Transport Board advising the issue of "a new type of weekly school children's ticket"?

2. Is the Minister aware of grave concern of parents and guardians in connection with this new type of ticket which permits of no rebate or reimbursement in cases where the child - through illness or other valid reason - does not travel on an omnibus during the currency of such ticket?

3. Will the Minister immediately make representations to the Transport Board along the lines suggested in above query?

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Minister of Social Services:-

Whether he is aware of the urgent necessity of installing electric fans in such of the free Wards of the General Hospital as are in need of adequate cooling, or otherwise lowering the temperature in such Wards?

Mr. STRAUGHN: To enquire of the Minister of Health and Social Services:-

Is the Minister aware of the existing anomaly in the present wages of the Chauffeur employed at the Speights-town Health Centre in the Parish of St. Peter?

2. Is the Minister aware that such employees prior to recruitment have been recommended by the examining officers of the Highways & Transport Department to be

put on the higher scale of wages for motor vehicle drivers in Government employment?

3. Is the Minister aware that this employee is the only such driver employed at a local Health Centre to receive wages on the lower scale for drivers of motor vehicles?

4. If the answers to Nos. 1, 2, & 3 are in the affirmative will the Minister seek to remedy this anomaly as soon as possible?
12.35 p.m.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Barbados Turf Club (Imposition of Duty) Act, 1941, be now read a first time.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Highways Act, 1900, be now read a first time.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1943, be now read a first time.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

LEAVE TO DEAL WITH HIGHWAYS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Premier indicated earlier that it was his intention to ask for leave to deal with a small Bill - a Bill to amend the Highways Act, 1900 - and I am now asking leave that this Bill be dealt with in all its stages today.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay a Statement which I promised the hon. junior member for Christ Church I would lay.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask leave to withdraw my motion until the Hon. Minister has made his Statement.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister to withdraw his motion.

STATEMENT re TENANTRY ROADS

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, last week the hon. junior member for Christ Church asked a question with regard to certain tenantry roads and I told him that I would make a Statement for the enlightenment of himself and of the House today. I would like to make that Statement now. It is as follows:-

With the introduction of Local Government, approximately ten miles of roads in the parish of Christ Church have

been incorporated in the City area and will now be repaired and maintained by the Department of Highways and Transport. The Highway revenue from this section of the parish therefore is now paid into the Treasury, and the parish is thus deprived of one of its richest sources of highway revenue.

The highway revenue now available for the upkeep and maintenance of the remaining 42 miles of roads in the parish is not adequate, and an approach has been made to Government for additional funds to complete the annual programme of repair and maintenance as the funds allocated for this purpose by the Southern Council have been exhausted.

It has been decided to make an additional grant of \$12,000 from the provision available under Head XXVIII, Subsidies and Grants, Item 34, District Councils.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1959-60 No. 38

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of \$5,616 under two Heads of the Estimates. It is for the purpose of supplementing various items under these two Heads and I propose to take these Heads separately.

HEAD IX - MARKETS

Head IX - Markets - was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: As I have said, this Resolution seeks to supplement certain Items under two Heads, the first of which is Head IX - Markets. It is set out very distinctly in the notes the purpose for which these amounts are required. In connection with Item 21, "Incidentals", an amount of \$220.00 is required for the purpose of providing signs, rope and tools for the Cheapside Market. In connection with Item 28 "Bins", the sum of \$144.00 is required for the provision of twelve waste bins also for the Cheapside Market. Everyone knows that this Market has just been overhauled and renovated and certain things are necessary. These things were not included in the original scheme but they are very necessary. This amount of money is needed in order to provide these bins for the cleanliness of the Market. The next Item is a new item - Item 32 - "Furniture" and the note states this:-

"No provision was included in the current year's Estimates for furniture for the Cheapside Market. It was expected that adequate arrangements could have been made without additional furniture, but the structure of the building is of such a nature that more supervision is required than was anticipated."

The requirements of furniture are set out as follows:- Two tables for Supervisors, \$60.00; Four chairs, \$50.00; Stand for Safe, \$24.00; and Bench for Cleaners, \$18.00, making a total of \$152.00.

I should like to explain that this building was not originally designed to be a market as such; and since the repairs have been made, we have found out that the building is really divided into two sections and it therefore calls for more supervision; therefore we have to get this amount of furniture in order to accommodate the additional staff which we now employ. These are very small items, Mr. Chairman, and I do not think that anybody would quibble over these small items of expenditure.

I beg to move that Head IX stand part of the Schedule. 12.45 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, this is a very small item for the Market which has just only been opened. I was rather surprised at the remark that it was never built as a market. This was originally a market; it was converted years ago from a market into a rum bond, and now it has been reconverted into a market. I would like to hear the Minister on this. There is a great absence of parking space for this market. Today there is no use building a market unless you have adequate parking space. People who shop today in a market for vegetables and miscellaneous food items travel there by car; all classes of the community today have cars and they travel to shop and no provision has been made for car parks for this market. It will be to the disadvantage of the stall-holders there if adequate provision is not made.

I am going to suggest that Government negotiate with residents on either side. There is Mr. Sampson's place below which is quite a large area. That could be and should be acquired as a car park. On the other side, there is that old cooperage and some houses in the front that need cleaning up. The access roads have to be widened at some time and all that should be taken into account in the near future. Let us have good markets where people can go and shop in comfort, and it will be to the advantage of the stall-holders of all sizes.

While I am on this subject, I should like to say that this week-end that market was overcrowded. Apparently the market seems too small already for the number of persons that have been taken off the road and sent there, so much so that it was overcrowded on Saturday morning. I understand that those hawkers who had to be put outside were even asked to pay four cents to stay there. They were not allowed on the street, were put outside the market as a resting place and yet were called on to pay. I do not think that is quite right. If it has not been drawn to the attention of the Minister, I am doing it now because I know he lives in St. Philip and may not come in on week-ends and may not know about it; but Saturday is a busy day and I do hope that he can assure me that he was there early and knew of it and I am not giving him news for the first time. I do not think that people who were taken off the street and put outside the market should have to pay; and if proper arrangements are not made, it is going to be to the detriment of those hawkers because if the market is overcrowded you cannot get to them and buy their wares. As a matter of fact, I understand that trade in the market was very slow indeed, maybe for that reason. I am not putting the blame anywhere other than that it is a new market and these things have to be attended to.

I think the mistake is that we should have adequate parking space for all markets. This has none whatever and cars are being parked down Cheapside going to the Fire Brigade alley. That road is already much too narrow and is being blocked; so I hope you will pay attention to adequate parking space, a great need for this market.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, all that the hon. member has said is true except for his lack of knowledge of whether I come to town on week-ends. I want to assure him that the Hon. Minister of Trade and myself were the first people to be there, and whatever he saw we have also seen. The only thing that he did not do that we did was to rectify some of the evils there.

I want to assure him that just where he saw those squatters at the front is going to be a parking space. It is not enough, but we have already started negotiations for the acquisition of Temple Yard. Due however to the difficulties which we have experienced in the past with the Queen's Solicitor, we were unable to get through with the job. Now that we have a permanent person doing that work, we hope to finalise those things very shortly.

I think I should say that the squatters who are there on Saturdays do not give a true picture of what the market

is likely to be. You get some people who plant their own vegetables and all that, and come to town on Saturdays to sell them themselves rather than sell to the middle man; they are the ones who were outside the market. You would not see them there on week days, and when vegetables are scarce you would not see them on Saturdays either; so we took them to the back which can accommodate them. The ones who sell a pint of peas and a couple of oranges created the bedlam, but the others who were looking forward to the market are aware of what it means to them and they are making use of it; so it is no criterion to say that so many people were squatting there. On the other hand I can assure you that negotiations have begun for the acquisition of Temple Yard and we hope to have matters finalised very shortly.

As regards the charge, I do not think the hon. member would believe that I would countenance anything like that. Of course that was an administrative detail, and I can assure him that it would not happen anymore. The Superintendent of the market knows that we subsidise markets very heavily, and if we spend \$120,000 on markets, we only receive about 50% or 51%, whereas in the other islands markets make money for Governments. But that is not the reason why we would charge people who are squatting outside. I say that in passing so that he would know that Government is subsidising the people who sell their wares there. I suppose the Superintendent, knowing that to be so, took the opportunity so long as they were within the market compound to take something from them, but speaking on a purely business strain now, the people who squatted to the front made better sales than the ones inside. I was there for a long time, maybe until 1 o'clock or 2 o'clock, and I saw that as the people came there they bought from those at the front. That is what happened; so we have all these things to adjust; and I want to assure not only the hon. member but the House and the community at large that we can only learn by trial and error. Things will become a little better, but you have to give us a little time to get things readjusted and put in their true perspective.

I am sure that everything the hon. member said was said in good faith because I was there. Everything will be remedied, and I know that if he has any property along there which he is willing to sell Government at a reasonable price, we are only too glad to take it over from him in a hurry.
12.55 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, we are now in the antiseptic age created by the present Government in which we are all relegated to the position of having to depend on the patronage of a particular Minister as to whether we can make a living or not. When one examines the current trend of spending the taxpayers' money on monuments such as Public Markets, and you go to so-called recognised advanced industrial countries, what do you find? Let us take the one to which members of the Government look with such adulation from time to time and pay frequent visits. I refer to the United Kingdom. You will find in the heart of the Empire, in the metropolis, street-side markets such as will be found in the well-known Petticoat Lane, and in areas of Paddington you have the Portobello market and the Caledonian market which were respected by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy in his culinary researches when he was in England. And then you go to Paris which perhaps can be considered in relation to Edinburgh as the most beautiful city, and find markets on the streets. If you go to the United States of America you will find on Third Avenue nothing but markets staffed by Puerto Ricans.

I really want to know what is wrong with Busby Alley being used as a way-side market. It is not a thoroughfare. When you scrutinize the motive behind the erection of these markets by the Government, all that you find is that it is an attempt to subjugate the independent people of this country, such as hawkers and people like that who do not work for Government, and put them in an embarrassing position to ask people who know something of Government or somebody in the Government to try and get a stall for them in the market.

What the hon. junior member for Christ Church has brought out here today in this debate is that the facilities which you have provided in the two large structures which have been erected during the last eighteen months in the City of Bridgetown for markets are hopelessly inadequate to accommodate the number of sellers who on market days have their wares to sell. As you know, Mr. Chairman, there are recognised markets days in every country of the world. Friday and Saturday happen to be the two market days in Bridgetown. If you go to the City of Ipswich or Norwich or York, you will find that those cities have certain market days; and more than that, you will find that the law protects the buyer on those particular market days. Therefore, I say that on Monday or Tuesday - let us say if we adjourn now - that you will not find anybody squatted down there will not prove a thing because there are days when you can close the whole market without affecting anybody.

What is happening in this country, as I have already drawn to your attention, Mr. Chairman, is that Government is putting up these monuments and trying to hurl every citizen of Barbados into the ghettos which they have created. They are saying that we must all go behind these barricades and it means that if you do not have a friend you cannot earn a living. That is the whole secret behind this whole thing.

Sir, I am now going to express my point of view. The market place in Busby Alley and James Street is near to the premises which I occupy and was a great nuisance to me; but I somewhat like the market there. As an occupier of premises in the near vicinity I rather much like the peace and harmony which prevails there since the hawkers have been removed; my clients can now come and see me without let and hindrance; but I still deplore the day when those hawkers have been moved from there. I have seen tourists sitting adjacent to the James Street Methodist Church all day long painting what, with the exception of the Careenage, is the most picturesque scene in Barbados and, that is, those hawkers sitting in Busby's Alley and along James Street selling their wares. Now, you want Bridgetown so antiseptic that you do not care how many people you put out of a living. You used to call the Cheapside Market Peck's Folly probably because it was near Lake's Folly. One of the other descriptions of it was 'a White Elephant' and that description was used in this Chamber. We have now converted it into a ghetto into which you say that every hawker must go, and that who cannot get in must stay out and starve. Other than that, a hawker must get permission to sell on the streets from Dr. Raeburn. There, again you are making the hawkers who are independent people to depend upon the good whims and fancies of the Veterinary Officer who is in charge of the Market. In order that you may get a stall you must see a Minister, and in order to get permission to go outside and sell you must see Dr. Raeburn.

I want to ask the Hon. Minister of Agriculture this question. Is it not true that every hawker must obtain a licence and is it not a fact that hundreds of these hawkers have been to him personally asking him to use his influence to get a stall at the Cheapside Market for them? I will also ask you, Mr. Chairman, whether people have been to you asking you to use your influence, if you have any, to get them a stall in the Market. I ask that question because that is a matter of public and general knowledge. I say, send the people back to Busby's Alley and I will put up with the noise. If anybody may happen to fall down on the pavement and may break a leg, I will be the person who will be responsible. I will put up with all that to see the people back there.

I will tell you, Sir, that Busby's Alley is being used now to park lorries belonging to the merchants of Bridgetown. Mr. Chairman, we can adjourn now and go down there to prove that. It is not a thoroughfare up to now. Why can we not have a Portobello Market in Barbados? What is wrong with the market on Third Avenue or with the Caledonian Market in those countries? We have got so civilised and so antiseptic that we do not want the dirty multitude; we want to get away from them and put them in ghettos and concentration camps.

Sir, I am not in support of a Resolution to provide bins and stuff cans for the Cheapside Market when I consider it unjustified expenditure on the part of the Public Treasury. The people are not satisfied and they are being deprived of a living and they now have to go out of their way to do so - not to talk of the dislocation that is caused. They are now being called upon to shift from one area to another. But, of course, the friends of the Government have property now in the district, although I am not really now concerned about that. The Party to which I belong does not carry on business there; and if we had to move from where we are down there, it would not affect our business as an organisation. Now, Sir, this dislocation does affect the convenience of the householders and the persons who were accustomed of going to a traditional market like that in Busby's Alley. 1.05 p.m.

I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture, while we are about this Resolution, exactly what system or formula was employed in the allocation of stalls in the market at Cheapside; and after I have sat down I do not want to get back up behind the Minister because I hope he will give me an adequate and satisfactory answer. There are people who have sold in the old Reef Market, if I may call it so, for 30 or 40 years and they have not got any stalls. On the other hand, there are those who have never been in business in their lives, far less having sold in the Market, and they have stalls down there. What is the qualification? What is the qualifying or academic or whatever kind of experience you may call it - what point system have you employed in the allocation of these stalls? You have a man who is the administrative Head of the set-up in the person of Dr. Raeburn; was the matter in his discretion absolutely or did the Minister interfere somewhere? If it was in his administration, then he must have had interference from above and therefore we would like to apportion the blame where it rightly belongs.

No matter what the Minister says about the people outside making more money, the people are not satisfied; the price of vegetables is high enough for the housewives who go outside to make their purchases. There was some talk about erecting markets where they were needed; we have only one market at Eagle Hall and everybody knows that it is a tremendous failure; it is a flop. Those who sell there can hardly make a living. I would advise the Government to attend to first things first and let the interplay be the consumers' choice of the markets, to decide the location of markets or where markets should be erected. If we find that the consumers want a market in Busby's Alley, it is the duty of the Commissioner of Police to protect the people there and make sure that vehicular traffic does not interrupt them in the pursuit of their purchases and getting their commodities at a reasonable figure. You should not remove the people and put structures in the place from which you remove them. What kind of policy is that? For the ten years or so that I happened to be living in and out of London I have never known the Market called the Caledonian Market on Portobello Road to be closed in as a market. That happens in the heart of London; but in Barbados we have a market closed in. That is not my idea of socialism; if that is their idea of it, I would prefer being in the banana skins and refuse than in the antiseptic world which they are creating.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the hon. member who has just sat down wondering what is the system of obtaining these stalls; and if I may tread on his domain, he should well know that it is a question of the same terminology which I think he has used, the same *modus operandi* as the Housing Authority. I rise to support the hon. member's speech. As I have said before, this monument was built over there and there is a lot in what the hon. member has said. We are going to encourage tourists to our beautiful island of sunshine, and then wipe out the open spaces such as markets by placing roofs and stalls and wire around them, when we are telling the tourists of the beautiful open spaces and the sunshine etc.. That is still to my mind expending money for something which, as the hon. member has said, is not one of the first things. He is perfectly right. You can go to the Continent or England and to many parts of the world where they have not got these

365 days-a-year of sunshine and this beautiful weather we have in Barbados, and you will find the old Market Square, a site in respect of which, apart from artists who come to Barbados, artists in other parts of the world are fond of making their theme. It is an old custom to amalgamate into the idea of a market. I have spent quite a time of my life in the country of the United Kingdom, and apart from these open markets, I understand that some of the Ministers have made a trip down by the Windmill Theatre. If they would just go around the back, they will see a street which no one can pass, full of market goods. People from all over the place go to that street in order to buy their vegetables. The various persons who are marketing in that particular area take pride in keeping the area clean, something by which they can not only sell their goods but advertise such goods by the surroundings in which they operate. 1.15 p.m.

I think, Sir, that we would be well advised not to continue this policy in this island, with good weather conditions, of putting a roof, four walls and stalls with four sides for which it is necessary to have beliefs in the particular *modus operandi* that is being used by the Government at the present moment. It is not in the interest either of the taxpayers or the particular persons concerned that they have got to be controlled to a point where some must suffer. It may be commendable to have markets, but neither one of these is a market in my idea of the word; there are shops in one area with a roof over them, and we are going to find that the people for whom this was invented, so we are told, the ones selling the ordinary, everyday ware in this country are going to be the ones that find that they are selling imported goods in these very Government markets.

Now, Sir, that is not my idea of a market and I hope that the words of the hon. junior member for St. John will be taken to heart, and I hope that the additional support that I have given him will add weight. If those responsible look carefully at the debates, they will see that there is something to be considered both in what he has said and what I have tried to support him in. Honestly, Sir, it amazes me why we should try to do away with these things in this country when in other parts of the world they are notable. Tourists travel specifically to places like the Caledonian market and markets in Yarmouth and Norwich, - and on the Continent the same things occur; but I have not yet seen one of them in the United Kingdom that is based on anything like the American super-market. It is not really a market for local goods; it is really something which is getting on to the American super-market style but has not yet got there.

I do feel, Sir, that expenditure along these lines is a waste when we can ascertain that the streets and the areas concerned are kept in proper condition, and there is no need for any worry about any disease, because the people themselves take a pride in the area around them. One of our main problems is that there are a lot of us who have to take more interest and more pride in our surroundings; and if we could do that job by the various methods at our disposal, it would be unnecessary to expend large sums of money in building these markets, and I will be rash enough to prophesy that as many of this type as you build, you will still need more. I think the time has come, Sir, when those with this fad in their minds should say that they have got two good markets and will stop at that point, consider the expense and sit back and rest on their laurels, whichever way they might be acquired.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, I know very well that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture will not agree with everything that was said by the hon. junior member for St. John, but one remark made by him to which the Minister might pay high regard was when the member pointed out that we should build up our markets where people like to buy traditionally. I wonder how the hon. member would reconcile that with his reaction to the point raised by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture when the Minister used that same argument to justify the setting up of the fish market in Bay Street. I remember very well that the hon. junior member for St. John severely criticised the Minister for saying that he would use the site for a fish market in Bay Street

because that was where people were accustomed to buying their fish. The hon. junior member for St. John, having already blamed the Minister for using that same argument before, says now this is precisely what we should be doing when you want to build up the market trade; build it up where people like to buy.

I am quite certain it may be a little difficult for the hon. junior member for St. John to reconcile these two statements which were made just within a few months of each other. I am sure the Minister of Agriculture will be willing to give consideration to that part of his remarks. I do not think the Minister will agree that we should subscribe to all the ancient conditions pointed out by the hon. member and saying that we do not particularly need to be clean, and that we prefer the old way of doing things.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation, the hon. member really does not make any contribution that should be taken notice of; but since the hon. member chose to refer to me, I would just like to point out to him that when I spoke about the fish market in Bay Street, it was an issue of the Executive over-riding the opinion and decision of the Town Planning Officer. I would like to make that absolutely clear. But be that as it may, I am not reluctant to say that there are other considerations in connection with the market in Bay Street other than its being a traditional fish market, and that is the general inconvenience to the members of the public by the traffic blocks which would be created there. I was not saying that there should not be a market somewhere in the vicinity, but certainly not at that part of Bay Street at all. I suggested that if it was for the people in Jessamy Lane, we should carry it in Jessamy Lane to them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, this is a question on which I believe I can give some help. If, however, during what little I have to say I am somewhat critical, I am sure my friend, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, will appreciate that no one could help at this stage being critical in a matter of this sort.

I will begin first by saying that a little after I entered Local Government public life, I saw this as a burning question. If the Hon. Minister and his Government would look in the files, they would see that in order to be able to decide the area in which you want to accommodate people, one of the first things we did was to take a census of the people offering wares for sale at the various points on the various days, (a) on Mondays so many people, (b) on Tuesdays less, (c) on Wednesdays and Thursdays a little less, (d) and on Fridays and Saturdays there are more.

1.25 p.m.

That is what we did, Mr. Chairman, and we sent those statistics in. As time has gone on, that number has grown. Again, we had another census; and at the risk of the Minister going into the files and refusing to quote what is there, and taking advantage of saying that the number is not in his file, I will say that if those files are looked up you will find that the then Commissioners of Health sent to the then Government the number of hawkers that were to be found selling in the Eagle Hall area, the Golden Square, Busby's Alley, Chapman Lane and such streets. The number was different according to the various days that those people sold their wares. We then got statistics from the United States in order that we could find out how many square feet of space should be allotted to a person selling his wares and so on.

Sir, I say that this Government has made a rapid departure from what we intended the Market should be. The great majority of people who really make their living by offering their wares for sale on the streets are the people who are being denied the first choice of having a stall in the market. I am going to say something now which may offend some of my friends. I, myself, was shocked to find that Government has now decided on the erection of markets in order to subsidise people who were not normally selling in the alleys by allowing them to put

stores in the markets. That is something which we should not do. I do not know who is responsible or if these things are done in the Agricultural Department, but I say that it is a daring departure from what I consider to be the correct thing for markets. When we set about to build markets, we did so in order to relieve the congestion of hawkers which we had on the streets. I have gone through the two markets in the City and I find that this is not so. I can quite understand you having stalls in the markets, but you should have enough accommodation for all those who are accustomed to sell on the streets. There is no justification because somebody may be of the pigment of the hon. member who is beside me that he should be given a stall in the Market. I think that is wrong and I am saying so on the floor of this House.

On the other hand, dealing with the items under this Head "Markets"—Item 21, Incidentals, Item 28, Bins—no one should question things like that; they are necessary. However, the Hon. Minister should tell me what kind of bins he expects to get for \$12 each. The Hon. Minister ought to know that it is part of my duty, or the Department over which I have control, to look after the removal of the refuse which would be put in those bins; so I think that should be told to me. I do know that we cannot import any metal bin to suit this purpose for \$12. I also know that in our Department we have been making use of bins of metal which brought fats here and I am sure that that type of bin did not cost us \$12 a piece. I am sure the Hon. Minister can get that information from his Superintendent. I will not think of a concrete bin being used because I know that a concrete bin cannot be erected for \$12, because that amount is only two days' pay for the mason who would be erecting it.

However, Sir, we feel about matters, we must be conscious of responsibility. On Saturday last, I could have caused a tremendous stir if I were not conscious of my responsibility, and I think the Minister responsible for this portfolio is also conscious of his responsibility. I say so because whenever I call him on the phone and tell him that there is a row going on in the market, he immediately goes there and finds out what is going on. He realises that I represent the City, and because of that I have my ears closer to the ground than he. As I have said, I could have caused a tremendous stir in that Market on Saturday last and without anybody doing anything either. Members of the Government talk about a census; but if you ask them to tell you how many people they were providing for from Busby's Alley, James Street and the Ruins in the Cheapside Market, they could not tell you the number. Those are things which we detailed a Sanitary Inspector to do. On account of their not knowing, they were at a great disadvantage. I had a rude awakening when I was approached by a number of hawkers there last Saturday, and it was due to the fact, as they told me, that they were removed from the sun and weather in Busby's Alley, James Street and the Ruins. They had already acquired their licence and on going down to the Market they were put in the same sun and weather, and on top of that they had to pay for squatting there. I told them that it was not fair and I spoke to the Minister about it and he assured me that it would be remedied. At the same time, I was really tempted then to make something of it because Your Honour knows too well, if hon. members on that side get a chance, what they would do with me. I say that because, in my considered opinion, it was wrong. Somebody goes and takes out a licence as a hawker and is selling his wares in Busby's Alley. You remove him to the Cheapside Market, put him in the sun and tell him that he must pay for sitting there. Is that fair? I ask you this: are you going to make them pay for sitting there? How is it that in one breath you can say you are trying to capture the women's votes, and in another breath you are doing something to destroy them. Sir, I was told this morning by some hawkers who sell in the bus stand that they were told by somebody in authority that the only way they would be allowed to sell in the bus stand was if they paid \$1.00 a month for doing so. They came to me and told me that they had taken out a licence to sell as a hawker, but there was no room in the Fairchild market for them. I ask the Minister if that is right. That is the information I received not from any deputation

of hawkers, but from a crowd of women. How can you attempt to do a thing like this? A woman walks about with some nuts in a tray and you tell her that if she sells in the bus stand she must pay \$1.00 a month. You are sky-larking. You have provided markets. Your trouble is that you have provided markets with walls without considering what you were doing. In all countries you allow so many square feet for a person in a market. You have taken no census of the people who come in town with trays to sell their wares and that is your whole trouble. However, Sir, I am voting for this Resolution. As I have said, I could have caused a great stir last Saturday but I am conscious of my responsibility.

1.35 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I am as conscious of my responsibility as if I were running that Government. I would not do anything rash or irrational, but if this attitude is continued by the Government I will be forced to take steps and my threat is one to which you will have to listen.

In this Resolution there is no question of not supplying furniture or bins or incidentals because nobody would think of voting against these items; however, I would like to say this. I spoke to the Superintendent of the Scavenging Department and I would say that the provision of twelve bins is inadequate. On the other hand, I must say this: I have been in politics long enough to be able to say: "I told you so." When this market question was raised some years ago - I have been a man about town; I am the oldest real estate agent in this country and I know this. I brought forward a Resolution asking for the purchase of an area of land at a price of \$2.00 a foot in the Temple Yard and my colleague, the hon. junior member for the City who is not now in his place, had his tentacles in the Government and the Government members said that I was selling this land. Here was the place for a market; you had the trees and you had the place for a natural market there. The Local Government, which was the Vestry then, had no right to erect markets. Now I understand from the hon. junior member for Christ Church that the Hon. Minister has said that they are now carrying on negotiations for the acquisition of land at Temple Yard. I told you so; that is all I have to say and I make no apologies to anybody. If I have anything to sell to the Government, I will sell it to them. Do not make any mistakes about it; if you want to deal with me, you can see me at my office and I will deal with you. I am no member of the Government; unfortunately, I did not have this property to sell, but I suggested that Temple Yard, in juxtaposition as it was and situated as it was, was the ideal place to be bought at the time.

When I saw the entrance to the Market flooded out with all of those trays, you would have trays on top of trays inside the Alley; but for some reason or other people who used to keep shops, drug stores and everything else, were provided with places in the Market, whereas these other people have been left out. This country is a "go-to-market" country for now. I heard the moans and the cries of the people; I heard all of these women crying out: "We have been removed from Busby's Alley where the roofs of the buildings gave us some shade, but now we are left in the heat." Mr. Chairman, I will say this; I am very glad to hear that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture has shown enough interest in this matter that he has intimated to this House already that he is conscious of the overflow and the needs of these people, and that he is already in negotiation for the acquisition of the one proper site in the area which will give vent and ease to the people. There are the evergreen trees; but, of course, there are those who will measure other people by their own bushel, those who feel that I was saying what I said because I had something to sell. Of course, I had nothing to sell. I am assured from this side "You will never get that done because you recommended it"; however, I am glad that the Hon. Minister has intimated to the Committee that he has already taken steps to acquire this site which is the natural site for a market.

I would like to draw this matter to the attention of the Hon. Minister. One of the big problems which you have there is that of parking. As you know, after 8.30 o'clock

you cannot get any place to park in the stand. The time has come when the Highways Department, by some means or other, should straighten from the beginning of the entrance to St. Mary's Church, and have a wider entrance and so avoid a blockage there. I want to say that wherever you build markets or stores, parking facilities should be provided because this is the age of the motor car. You do not only provide facilities for people who walk to the market, but also for those who drive to the market. I told the Hon. Minister that at Temple Yard or the old cooperage there would hardly be enough space for housing the people who have come from the area from which they have been removed.

On this question of parking, you should consider once and for all that the area adjacent to the Market, where the people are now overflowing, should be acquired as a parking lot. I might even say this; for those who must walk to the Market and those who must drive to the Market there must be facilities. There is nothing wrong in calling upon me or anybody else to pay a dime or something like that for parking; you cannot get things done unless you pay for them. While I am voting for this Resolution I hope that the Hon. Minister will answer the question I have asked; I hope that this state of affairs will not go on next Saturday. Mr. Chairman, I am saying that I witnessed this thing with my own eyes. I parked my car and I heard the people complain that they had no shade and they had to pay. I thought twice; otherwise I would have gone through that Market and raised an insurrection because the people were ready for it; they thought that it was wrong that they had to go out in the streets without any protection at all.

1.45 p.m.

Now I hope the Minister will remedy that by next Saturday and I will not be given the opportunity of seeing this existing then. I do not know who decided that a poor woman who buys \$2 in nuts, a few pawpaws, two shillings in chilly plums, one shilling six pence in sugar cakes, \$1 in comfits, five cents in dounce and can walk around the bus stand should pay \$1.50 a month for selling there. I do not think that is right and neither one of those Ministers could say it is right. You should ask whoever did that to stop it. What are you asking them to pay for? I can see you asking them to pay for a badge for the right to sell, but do you mean to tell me that a woman who walks around calling "get your sugar cakes" should have to pay \$1.50 for that? You know what I am saying is true, Mr. Chairman, because you have had complaints about it, and I challenge you to say it is not true. I do not see how you can agree with it and hope to get support. I am not going to say anymore, but I do hope the Hon. Minister would be able to tell us that he knows nothing about it and that, in short, this situation will be remedied immediately.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I have sat and listened with plenty of interest to this debate. I have nothing against the Resolution because the items are necessary, but the facilities for the hawkers are rather grievous. When a hawker or anyone goes to the Minister or the appropriate authorities to make application for a stall, they should be made to understand what the stall is for. We should think of the poor women or men who go into the field and buy potatoes, yams, eddoes, corn, cabbage and tomatoes and bring them into the market. They should have the facilities and you should not allow the shopkeepers to move out half of their produce from the shops and take it into the market to sell and deprive these poor hawkers out of the facilities granted to them.

I have been to other countries and the last I have visited was St. Lucia, and I saw that the Government charges the people outside of the market. The reason for that is because there were vacancies in the market, and they charge in order to make them come into the market. No one who is given the privilege of entering the market should have to pay for squatting outside, and I will ask the Minister to look into that seriously. I know myself that advantage is being taken of these poor hawkers.

When rice, flour, beef and other commodities are imported from overseas, we have bond houses for them,

then they are distributed from the bond houses to the merchants and the merchants distribute them to the shopkeepers; so they are protected; but the hawkers and hucksters who go into the field to bring away vegetables and for whom you are making preparation to shift them from the weather by using drastic measures should have the facilities of the market, and the Minister and appropriate authorities in charge of the market should see that the hawkers occupy the spaces and those that bring in the imported goods should stay outside. If there are vacancies afterwards, then they can be accommodated, but the hawkers should be first.

The market, Sir, is like the Exhibition. When we have the Annual Exhibition we see some of everything which the land provides on show. The market is provided for that particular purpose, for meat, fish and the vegetables that grow in our island. Shopkeepers now have two shops, one at home and one in the market; that is a wrong idea. We should look after these poor people and see that they have the necessary facilities. What Government should do is to look into the residential areas, see where a market is needed and erect one there for that particular purpose and not erect them, say, in St. Philip or any other place. With regard to the market in St. Philip I understand that there is one butcher there and scarcely two bags of potatoes are sold there per week. What are we doing with that market there? That should be somewhere else. Anything the country produces comes to town from up there and that money is therefore wasted. I would never put a market in St. Philip when there are other residential areas that need one. We were put here to take care of people who cannot take care of themselves, and that is why we must look after these people and help them out of their difficulties. We cannot afford to have people in the market selling rice, flour, corned beef, butter, onions and other things while the poor people walk about the streets; and I will ask the appropriate Minister to look into that and rectify it as soon as possible, thereby giving the people the facilities that are due to them.

I believe, Sir, that the Minister is a man of ability and I do not see why he should allow such things to slip him. I hope from henceforth he will have the proper adjustments made and execute his duty as he should.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am not particularly enamoured about market debates, but I approach this matter purely from a commonsense point of view. I must say that I do not agree entirely with the hon. junior member for St. John when he regarded the people sitting in the alley ways as something which you can perpetuate only from a point of view of picturesqueness and availability as it is for artists, because sometimes the artists are a little bit neurotic, and what would appeal to an artist from an artist's point of view is not always the best thing for a community.
1.55 p.m.

Nor do I agree with the Hon. Minister when he uses what I regard as one of those worn-out phrases in respect of something costing something and that this is only part of the cost or 40% of the cost. Now, those worn-out figures should be torn up. Why should a Minister make a stupid statement like that in relation to your building a market in 1960? Does he believe that a market built in 1960 could ever compare with a market built in 1860? If in British Guiana they have built markets hundreds of years ago and, therefore, the capital cost is not the cost which they have to work their current expenses on, certainly a market in such a place is bound to show a savings or a surplus.

I agree with those hon. members who say that we need a market in Cheapside, but what hon. members saw there last Saturday was a positive disgrace. What I said last week, I am going to repeat now. The type of hawkers and hawkers whom we now have is a relic of the slave condition which we had. What we have is part of our plantation system. With the removal of slavery some of them found themselves being forced to find something to do to exist; therefore, they found themselves working as itiner-

ant traders. Nobody has stopped to arrest this movement from agricultural land. Again, there are some people who by their nature can not work agricultural land and some of them have become more sophisticated and, as a result of that, they come to town and squat in the alleys selling this and that, and so we have this population growth of hawkers.

As the hon. member has just said, nobody has any right putting a market in any area unless, by the density of the population, that area had shown that a market is growing up there. I say that because markets show the places where they are intended to be. There are certain areas today which have shown themselves as market areas which were not market areas when I was a boy. As a boy the then Golden Square was not a market square as it is now, and that is so because you did not have the number of buses to converge at such a point as you have today. The reason why the Milkmarket area has shown itself to be a market area is because of the fact that from the time you had any means of conveying transportation from the country areas, the Milkmarket area was one of the areas where all transportation converged.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 p.m. o'clock, the sitting of this House now stands suspended until 2.30 o'clock. 2.00 p.m.

On re-assembling

Mr. SPEAKER called Question Time and all the Orders Under Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: Having called all the Orders under Private Members' Business and there being no answer, the House now reverts to Government Business.

Mr. SEARLES APPOINTED TO ACT CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. James be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees in the absence of the Chairman of Committees.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the adjournment, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I was making the point that so far as markets and the erection of markets are concerned, I agree with the hon. junior member for St. Andrew in his view as regards putting a market in a rural area, because when you are putting markets in a rural area, that part has to be conditioned by the use which the people are making of that area.

What is striking about the situation as regards markets, and this is an undeniable fact, is that the Government would not have been called upon to build a market in Cheapside or Fairchild Street had it not been for the question of this congestion of hawkers on the streets. Markets were not built for the purpose of providing accommodation for people in stores; that was never the problem, and I do not think any person could have asked this Government, or any Government for that matter, to go and build a market because somebody wants to put a shop in a market.
2.35 p.m.

The market is the only natural accommodation there and the people create these things around the street. In some cases you allow the people to remain there if they do not make a public nuisance. I do not agree with the situation

in which you have this type of favouritism where you have a few people in Broad Street; that does not offer any problem for any special accommodation. The radius of the City is so small that there is no problem in getting from Fairchild Street to Cheapside. The idea that you are going to formulate something between these two points is only going to create a hardship. If anybody can stay in Milk Market or Busby's Alley, that is something like a tourist ship coming in and you give a certain area for certain occasions. In New York City people who sell handkerchiefs, and so on, are in areas where you can sell these things, just as how you had the people selling their fancy basket goods; it was nothing which would make the place untidy and so people could sell.....

At this stage, the CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES took the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: You build a market to suit the community and the things you get in the community. The Hon. Minister spoke about the money which is spent on markets.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. I spoke about the toll we collect from the Market.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am sorry that I did not make myself clear. It is a question of the amount of money which you get from the Markets and what it represents. The Minister says that it is a paying concern in other countries and we would be glad to have that. I do not know if it is with that in view that you have come with this idea of accommodating stores and shops at the expense of the people whom you take off the street, people for whom you cannot find any accommodation. I am going to be bold enough to say that because of the economy you have, you never had the accommodation for the type of goods which would make these people disappear. A woman will find that it is very expensive to come from the country with a certain amount of produce, to transport that produce and sell it on a proper basis. I do not subscribe to the view that any antediluvian system which does not make an economic future must be perpetuated because my grandfather carried it on. I am not a party to that sort of thing. The type of system which you have is not a revenue-bearing system and there is no point in imposing a tax on people who are selling sweets and nuts. That is a type of disguised unemployment which you have. These people are really unemployed and they are saying "Nuts! Call!" as a means of getting a few pennies, but that cannot support any woman. Invariably you will find as to every hawker or huckster who is selling nuts, that the Parochial Authorities or some other social institution have to carry these people because that is a sort of opening to the evils of life. It is one of the inroads of the population problem where people cannot support their children. I am going to be bold enough to say that the time it will take a policeman or a market constable to collect four cents from a woman, and the organisation which is there to collect that four cents - well, it will cost the Government more than four cents to collect that four cents. We have to get down to commonsense. I am sure that if an analysis were taken of the time factor involved, it takes some time to get an amount of money from a person. The Hon. Minister lives in St. Philip; for many of my years I have lived in the main area to Kensington Oval and on Saturdays where you have a big football match taking place there is a traffic jam. I saw some of these people in the street and I feel that taking these people out of Busby's Alley, out of Milkmarket and parading them in front of the Market square is not good enough. I do not know what the sanitary arrangements are, but I doubt very much that from the large numbers of people I saw there, you will get all of them wending their way up-stairs; and if you are not careful you will have another filthy area there, bearing in mind that we live in the tropics. To say the least of it, to put people by compulsion in the sun like that in a tropical country is nothing short of being criminal.

I think that the Government should make a thorough examination of this matter. I know a man who it is claimed was a butcher in the Market for a long period and this man was not given a stall at the beginning although he has been a butcher for close on fifty years. I understand that

it is felt that he should not be a butcher by now and that is why they did not allocate a stall to him. I understand that that situation has been rectified or is being rectified. 2.45 p.m.

Where I believe the Government has gone over the other side is that it is spending a lot of money in building stores for people. I want to be brutal about this. If there is one place that does not need anybody to build stores for them, it is Barbados. Far from that, there are too many, and if I were a dictator I would cut down on half of the rum shops, because they produce a lazy type of mentality. Where you have a community that is heavy-drinking, it is also a soft community. Drink affects the system and I do not support the idea of drinks from the point of view of taxing people. It is something you should outlaw if you could do it. (Hon. M. E. COX: They drink to forget the misery.) If you keep people in misery you have to dope them to make them forget. I am not for one moment facetious in my remarks. The heavy-drinking nations are the light-hearted nations in the world, and progressive nations are those nations which attempt to make people understand that they cannot make progress and drink rum at the same time. You should take an example from India; Nehru was not afraid to tell the Indians that rum drinking was not a part of the Indian philosophy, and if it were part of the philosophy of the Western world, they were not going to practice that.

Members of the Government may be thinking that these remarks are facetious, but I tell them that they should not take those remarks in a light-hearted way. I say that because the Government expenditure on the market was meant to provide facilities for people who were squatting alongside the streets; that was the main consideration. The main consideration was not to find a drugstore, first-aid or butcher stalls existing there. Government's main concern was to provide market accommodation so as to take people off the streets because it was an eye-sore, anyhow, in your City. I did not like to see what grew up in Probyn Street, and those who worked on the reconversion of this market should be complimented for making it what it is - considering the old structure - and making it more habitable as a market.

My feeling, however, is that you should not on the first day clutter it up with this number of people. I agree with the hon. senior member for the City that you should take a census and see whether all the people from all over the area can get into the market and consult the Police authorities and Sanitary authorities. You have built two markets and the Law says that everybody now has to go in the market; but do you realise that if the market can only hold 400 people and there are 4,000 people Government would put the 4,000 people in the market though it would cause a riot? Whilst on this, this indicates the feeling that it seems that Barbadians have the idea that although enough people cannot get into a bus or a car, as many as there are outside must get inside of this market, irrespective of the amount it can carry.

I feel sure that the Minister, on hearing the views expressed on the matter, should investigate it with a view to rationalising the situation, because everybody is agreed that there should be better market facilities both for the vendors and for the people who have to make their purchases. There is no question of disagreement on that; it is a matter of common sense; and if you have to build markets in future, it is purely a matter of structure. So long as you can build something strong enough, habitable and airy enough, that should be your main concern. We are not building palaces for markets, and I must say I like Barbadian standards. I do not think it is to our credit economically or financially to say that we are building markets better, in the context that the cost for building these markets is really fairly high, than anybody else, but the main thing is that you want a certain amount of decent accommodation for the people. I am sure that the Minister would agree that if you are building in St. Philip or in other parishes, you should look at the population of Barbados and see where to put them. I am satisfied in my mind that in a radius of 16 square miles in St. Michael where you have

a density of population of something like 100,000 people or over, and then the other 130,000 are scattered over the other parishes into the various districts, and this same large number of people will converge at some point in the City on shopping days, then there is not much sense in carrying market organisation out to these people when they are coming into the City. It is wiser to concentrate your market organisation within the area where the density of population is, and not regard this as something in which you have to satisfy the idiosyncracies of parishioners by making them believe that there is a market in their parish, when we know for a fact that when they talk about going to market, their market means Bridgetown. That is a thing we must realise and you must concentrate your money in the area for the purposes that the community is demanding by their own behaviour.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Peter who has just resumed his seat has anticipated so much of what I wanted to say that it is hardly necessary for me to make any contribution to the debate. The fact is that we have been spending money in extending facilities in order to remove the eye-sore of having hawkers scattered all over the place. Having done that, in typical fashion the Government is now permitting people who were never selling on the street, and who were never hawkers, to utilise this new space created in the markets.
2.55 p.m.

Our complaint when we wanted this money to spend on the Fairchild and the Cheapside Markets was that we wanted them built in order to remove all of the vendors from Probyn Street and Busby Alley with their make-shift shelters from wind and rain which was a scandal to the country and which certainly did not present a worthwhile spectacle for the inhabitants of this place or visitors coming in. Now, you find that in these new markets there are people with stalls who never before were hawking in Probyn Street, in Busby Alley or elsewhere. Therefore, Sir, there is only one thing to be done about that and that is to get them out of the market and thus find room for the *bona fide* hawkers.

One of the Market Officials has been telling people who want stalls that they must see the Minister; and along with that, they were making uncomplimentary remarks of the Ministers too. (A VOICE: Let us hear what they were saying.) You know what they are saying as well as I do. There can be no room for allocations either on the part of the public or on the part of the Market Officials for people who were not vendors or hawkers before. Certainly, there can be no room in these markets for those people at the expense of the *bona fide* hawkers and vendors. If there are such people in these markets, it means that they are privileged people and the question is, why should they get these privileges over and above those people who were hawking on the streets before.

Sir, all that we need in these new markets is not so much a question of stalls, but departments for given commodities - that is to say, a department for butchers, another for handicrafts, another for confectionery and other things like that. There are people in these markets who have stores and who are putting branch stores in these markets. None of us voted money in here for people to put a branch store in these markets. As a matter of fact, it is unfair competition because they are opening later and they are selling stuff in these markets at a time when under the Shop Closing Act, they should be closed. All that you are doing is to allow certain traders in the City to circumvent the law because they can sell until 8 o'clock in the night when their colleague who has a store in the City has to close at 4 o'clock.

What the Government must do at the very earliest date is to clear these markets of traders who, before we agreed to expend money on providing marketing facilities, were not in any way connected with street selling or hawking stuff. They should be given notice. You have more than sufficient vendors to fill your markets and they must be given space in the markets. It is a criminal thing

to have *bona fide* hawkers in the streets, gaps and lanes and the merchants in Bridgetown having stalls in the market. What is going to happen within the next few weeks is this. The people who are in the Cheapside Market area because they cannot get inside will soon start erecting all sorts of make-shift shelters. You will be seeing more crocus bag roofs - may be, here and there in Fontabelle - just now than you had in Busby Alley and Probyn Street before. In other words, you will have removed an eye-sore from those streets and put an eyesore in Fontabelle and Cheapside.

Now, the hon. senior member for the City who spoke with more authority on this matter and more practical knowledge than any member in this House today, stated that the preliminary requirement was a census of the accommodation we should have provided and then working outward from that basis. We should have dealt first and foremost with the people whom you are getting off the streets. It is not too late to do that. In any case, it seems that the problem now is greater than it was before. You ought to start first and foremost with the people whom you are getting off the streets, and then, anybody can come after. If you do that, you cannot find yourself with a greater problem than it was before.

Sir, I do not want any member of the opposite side of the House to feel that the only public ventilation in a matter like this will take place now. I say that because the hon. senior member for the City has his occasions when he likes to present facts on the floor of the House and not under cover; but for reasons best known to himself he has failed to disclose in the frankest possible manner the situation which arose in Bridgetown last Saturday. Because he has failed to do it in this House today, it does not mean that he does not know what it was. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in the public interest it is the duty of the Government to endeavour to remove the grievances which have arisen here and there, and to endeavour to improve the situation along the basis suggested by members on both sides of the Table. We have just as much interest in the market and providing proper marketing facilities and in making Bridgetown present a pleasant and pleasing prospect as members of the Government have; and we certainly are not going to sit back idly or indifferently and allow the main purpose of this expenditure on the markets to be thwarted either by indifference or by selfishness or by thinking in terms of what is best for our friends and not what is best for the public. There can be no justification at all for people congregating and flowing over in Cheapside and Fontabelle, when inside the Cheapside Market there are people who have stores in Swan Street and elsewhere. That sort of thing is what has caused people to riot because when you start to interfere with a man's bread and butter you are telling him that he must die of starvation, and he begins to think in the way that if he must die of starvation, he can very well die by a bullet.
3.05 p.m.

And the thing is that when these situations are created, the people who cause them are the first people to tell you that they did not know what brought about these things. I want to say that enough has been said here today for any person who has any sense of public responsibility to take steps to meet the situation with the minimum of delay. I, for one, welcome with all my heart any justifiable proposal to provide marketing facilities in suitable areas. As a Barbadian, I feel ashamed of the conditions obtaining at Probyn Street and at Busby's Alley; but I am certainly not going to allow my sense of shame to prevent me from seeing what is going on and from appreciating the fact that certain people in authority feel that these new markets are created, not for the reason of removing these eyesores, but for providing special privileges for their friends.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I can well appreciate the remarks which have been made by certain hon. members, each on his own. Somebody has to say something about these matters, but I think that the best suggestions and criticisms have been made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I think that he is coming

around to his former position, I should say. (*Laughter*). Knowing the facts as he does and as they are, he has offered no destructive criticism; but I will take time out to reply to the first criticism and perhaps to the second one made by the hon. junior member for St. John. Who would have expected to have heard such things as he was saying here today? He would rather have our kith and kin bleaching out in the sun and getting wet in the rain and no attempt must be made to organise them and no sanitary arrangements must be made for them! He would have his artists looking through his window and taking pictures of my people bleaching in the sun and getting wet in the rain! That is his delight.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I never thought that I would have heard the hon. member definitely misquoting me. I never said anything about any friends of mine. What I said was that many an artist from abroad had come and used my gallery and painted the scene in Busby's Alley; but the people are bleaching in Cheapside now too.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Well, Mr. Chairman, it gave the hon. member a certain amount of satisfaction in seeing these things. Were the artists his enemies when they took pictures from his gallery of these people who were bleaching in the sun and getting wet in the rain? And the next thing you know is that they have the "flu"! We are now attempting to provide proper facilities for these hawkers and husksters to congregate in a place where they can get proper shelter and proper sanitary facilities. That means nothing to the hon. member so long as he can belittle the Government; the little beginning which we make does not delight him at all; his delight is in his artist friends taking pictures from his gallery.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I did not say anything about taking pictures; I said that artists have used my gallery to paint the scene in Busby's Alley. The Hon. Minister will not answer the questions I have asked; I am asking him to answer me as to whether one of the administrators in the Market has not told him that if the people want to have any place in the Market they must see the Minister of Agriculture.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member can give, then he must be able to take. I sat and listened to the hon. member when he was speaking and I did not interrupt him. I am coming to all of these things; I intend to defend every step. I am sold to this question, and I say from a humanitarian point of view that these people must be taken from the streets and placed somewhere where they can sell their wares. I am not surprised at some people because they will make proper arrangements for the place where their animals live and they do not care about the husksters in the street; but we on this side care for them. It is not our business to satisfy their whims and fancies; it is our business to see that these people are provided with proper facilities and sanitary arrangements. We are not making any apologies whatever for that. I have seen some people's horses well groomed, well housed and well taken care of; even their dogs are washed day and night.

As regards the formula for which the hon. junior member for St. John has asked, he would have noticed in the newspapers that an advertisement was there asking people to apply for the various stalls. When we advertised and offered 32 stalls we had 252 applications for them. (Mr. BARROW: And you still have some empty down there.) That is not true. Everybody was absolutely free, whether he was in the street, in the lane or wherever he was, to apply for a stall. Some eliminations were done. I went to a certain man in the street and I asked him if he would take one of these stalls; I told him that if he wanted one, he should apply for it. He said: "So long as I can get something for \$1.50 per month, I will take a stall." People are paying five or ten cents a day or \$1.50 per month; that is all they pay. That is the fee; we charge no more.
3.15 p.m.

When people know that they can get two stands for 20 cents a day, they are not going to take a closed shop when in

truth and in fact they do not need one for vegetables which need to be on the stands.

I have lived in America for a number of years and know about markets. I have lived in other countries and have seen that you can go to markets and the only thing you cannot buy there is a bride; but if you carry your fiancée in there, I am sure you can come out and go to the altar. So what is this talk about the various people in the markets? Are they not Barbadians? Do you think that only bare-footed people are hungry? We have people from all strata of society in Barbados. This is not sport; this is in the interest of the people of Barbados who have suffered for so long, and no provision had been made for them under any former Government to put them in a place where they could be respected as a business group. People have not been able to organise and get the respect of the community. They had to go from house to house calling "massa, massa" and "missus". We are not doing that any more; we have placed them in the market and if Mr. So and So wants anything let him go there and buy. If you want to buy groceries and food you should go to the market which Government has provided; you are not too big to go to the market.

What has happened since we opened the Fairchild Street market? All the people who are there are making better profits; that is a fact. Some of the people whom some of these yellow-crest journalists tried to excite against me, in the first instance when the market was opened up, have since come to me and said that they made a terrible mistake and that they could not be happier. Do you know why? Tom or Mary would sit at a corner and would have a few people who would patronise her or him, but now that we have made it abundantly clear that they cannot squat on the street and sell their wares, they go into the market and people who never knew anything about them before will go there and buy from them; so business has increased; although they did not know Mary before, they are now buying from her. Those are facts and if you do not care to believe them, you can go and ask the people.

With regard to the Cheapside Market, somebody talked about having a survey, but I want to tell him most assuredly that long before this market was even repaired, I invited the Commissioner of Police up to my office and he sent plain clothes men throughout the length and breadth of the prescribed area to get statistics and the facts. He and I on several occasions have driven around and seen the congestion on the streets and the traffic blocks that were so terrific. We did that mostly on Saturday mornings because of the traffic jams; so you can see that this was not any business that was not surveyed. We have the facts and we know how many were here, there and elsewhere. On the other hand, let me pose this question to you as reasonable businessmen and not because you are somebody different from the Barbados Labour Party; if we allow only a certain percentage of people from certain places to go to the market and they are called upon to pay five cents a day, do you think that anybody would remain in the market when they can squat on the street without having to pay five cents or ten cents? Would not some of the Opposition who is decrying the market say that we have built a white elephant? Could we allow half of them to go in and the other half to stay out? Those who go in and have to pay would walk out the next day because they would say they have to pay while others do not. I make this statement that so long as I am Minister, they have to move in the market, but I will also provide spaces for them, because Government is not going to build white elephants. When we build a market people must move in and stop selling on the streets.

Do you know what a delegation came to my office some time ago and told me as regards these markets? They accused our people of urinating on the cabbages because there were no sanitary conveniences nearby. I had to take it up with them and I was very strong in my protest, and I said that my people are not so mean. All these things were hurled at me; so do you think that in the light of all these things we can sit here and not organise these people into markets and get better service? It is unfair for the Oppo-

sition to berate the Government. We have done the best under the circumstances. We have not gone the whole hog, but we are making a try. Have any members of the Opposition passed along by Plantations Ltd. or certain other places on a Saturday morning and seen the bedlam there was? Traffic could not pass, and the same thing is true of Milk Market; and even if temporarily we have removed that, it is still inculcated in the minds of the people who have to buy that there is a market where they can go and buy what they want. We cannot allow the people to squat around the place where there are traffic hazards.

Getting back to the point with regard to Busby's Alley, apparently the Official Opposition did not get to work on this question because the Chairman has said one thing and one of the shadow Ministers has said another, quite apart from each other like the East and the West. One member says it hurts him to see the people in Busby's Alley and how disgraceful it is, and the other fellow said it is so beautiful and presents such a beautiful picture; so apparently they have not done anything on this score and are at daggers' end.

Now, Mr. Chairman, so far as parking space is concerned, originally we intended that where the people sat in front would be the car park, but what has happened is that the moment we made the people move in, we found how overcrowded it was. We have been conducting a series of meetings throughout the island and I have been very busy at night meeting groups and so on and begging them to plant more food, and the people are coming to the appeal. (A VOICE: Ask the planters to grow more.) I will. 3.25 p.m.

The people have responded to this thing and everywhere you will see people with a few beds around their house planted up. Naturally, when they plant something, they want something back and some of the people feel that it is worthwhile to come to town and squat somewhere and get something more for their goods than if they sold them to people in their district or to a hawker. That is the tremendous problem.

Hon. members have talked of the payment of four cents by these hawkers in order to squat there. I, myself, saw a few people - some from St. Philip - and they told me that they only come to town on Saturdays to sell. You do not get the overflowing in the markets as you get every Saturday. What the hon. member said in that respect is true; but hon. members must bear in mind that this is a new venture; it is something new and we tried months ago - not now - before the Market was reconstructed to get more space added to it. We made a certain move to get the Queen's Solicitor to see about land at Temple Yard but he is such a busy man that I do not think he has made the attempt to get it for us. Anyhow, I think it is now under actual consideration. We intend to do everything that is necessary to provide better marketing facilities.

I want to promise this Honourable House that we will not charge the people for squatting outside of the Cheapside Market although this Honourable House has passed laws which give the Superintendent of Markets the authority to collect tolls within the compound of the market. The laws provides for that; but if it is the feeling of the House, as some of my colleagues have been discussing it, we do not want to take anything from anybody unduly. We feel that, when you provide adequate facilities and accommodation, you ought to pay part of the fee for the service.

That brings me back to the point which was made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter when he said that I more or less took in the abstract the price at which Government is subsidising markets. I did nothing of the kind. I am not trying to get enough money from the people who use the markets in order to equate the cost of the services we are giving. What I said in passing was that I should like to know that we are not charging anybody exorbitantly. We realise we have to help these people and we are doing so. What I said was that we are only collecting 49% or 50% of the cost of the services which we are providing for the people. I said so merely for the purpose of giving hon. members some idea of the services which we are giving the people there.

I remember well when we sent two of our people out to find what other people were doing in respect of their markets, the report that they brought back was that those people were making money on the organisation of markets. I remember also when the report came back and I saw what we were charging in respect of what other people were for fish and so on, I was more than surprised. They were charging five cents and ten cents per hundred pounds for weighing fish and so on. We are charging something like a penny. Of course, we are not out to fleece people or to make it hard for them. Do you think a Government like this would make it hard for the people? Of course not. We know who put us here. But at the same time we still have to create discipline and organise the service there. No matter what you do, there are some people who will rebel so long as you remove them from A and put them in B or vice versa. We know that and that is where we feel the people want leadership; and so long as I am part of the Government I am going to provide the necessary leadership in my branch. I am going to tell the people the truth and I am not going to promise them what I know I cannot give them. When you tell the people the truth, although it may be unpalatable, later on they will find out that you were their friend. So long as I am here and I have to organise markets, every day that the markets are opened even although you will have to squat alongside, you must go there to sell your wares. What a sordid picture it would be if these people were allowed to remain on the streets! What members would say when they come in here? They would say: "Why, he built a market and the people would not go in there." But it is the other way now. We have made them go into the markets.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. What is this braggadoccio saying? Let me tell him that the Police Force had to drag the people down there. Do not give the impression that because you created a market there, the people went there willingly.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Now, Sir, as regards a survey being taken, I think I should answer that question. A survey was made and we had all the facts.

There is another point which I should answer before I sit down. Some hon. members talked about their being shops in the market. I want to tell them, "yes, that is so." Since we have allowed a certain amount of competition in the market, the prices of certain items have fallen. That is so because of competition in the market. I have had people who have come to me asking me to get certain people out of the market because they are underselling the other people. Let us have more of it. I received some information from one of the sellers, as I have said, that these people were underselling the others and I went over to the place where these two people were cutting down prices. I told them that I was just hearing a story about them. One of them who was a young girl said to me "Mr. Garner, I think the Barbados Labour Party would welcome people who would sell cheaper goods because the poor people will be able to get cheap goods." All that I could say was "all right" and I went along about my business.

Do not have any fear of what is selling in the markets. A market should be so diversified that you ought to be able to get everything you want there. Imagine that a man like the hon. junior member for St. John, when he drives there and if perchance he forgets that he has not bought a packet of razor blades in town or a tube of toothpaste, would be able to get them in there. Surely, you would be greatly pleased to know that he will not have to go back in Broad Street in order to get them; therefore, there is nothing wrong in such things being sold there.

As regards the question whether I had any hand in that, I stand here and put my hand up. I am guilty. (A VOICE: That is discrimination.) Sir, you must have discrimination when you have 250 people applying for thirty-two stalls. If you have five children and you have fifteen apples to share them, that is an easy thing to do; but if you have fifteen children and you only have five apples, that will pose a problem. We have been posed with the problem of having 252 applications for only thirty-two stalls. This is a serious

business; this is no sport. I do not think that the Opposition should feel strongly on this matter since the Government is trying its best. Perhaps, I must have put too much in it. But it is a matter of disciplining people and organising them.

3.35 p.m.

Do you know how many people in the country districts plant vegetables and even food crops and they have no outlet for the disposal of them? And while you have an overflow in one area there is a scarcity in Bridgetown. These markets have a purpose; let us organise the people. Agriculture is a serious proposition; we do not put politics into this matter. We are trying to organise the people so that when Mr. So and So has a surplus of beans in St. Philip he will be able to come to Bridgetown where there is an established market and find a purchaser for his beans. I have been a planter for all my life, and I know what it is when you have commodities to sell and you cannot sell them after you have put a lot of labour in them. There is a difference between the stalls and the stands. Those who wanted stands were given stands. You will always have people who have never been in a market before, trying to get there. Barbados will always be a land of sellers and speculators; we have to live by our wits and that sort of thing. I am sorry that the hon. senior member for the City is not here now, because as he was in the Vestry then, I told him that I intended to let some of the people squat along the streets. He said: "If you do that, I will crucify you". I said: "It is your opinion as against mine". Fortunately the members over there are not in power now and they can do what they like; but we have the power now and we will get this thing passed. What is wrong in allowing people to squat in Broad Street where, when people in the stores would like to buy an orange, they can send out and buy it? That is no traffic problem at all. What is wrong with that? I thought that I would have been called a dictator if I had removed the people from there. I have given these people a permit so that nobody can rush there.

I cannot call the hon. senior member for St. Philip my colleague as he once was, but he says that I am blowing a horn; well, it is better to do that than wait until you have told the people some sort of story on a dark night and try to sabotage them. I think I am second to the hon. senior member for St. George with my voice. (A MEMBER: Only second.) I may display my antics or whatever you call them, but that is my style and those who have no style begrudge those who have style. However, I will continue to work on this idea and set out to my brother farmers in Barbados that it is incumbent upon them to plant more food. I must say that I am disturbed at the price which we have to pay for vegetables because of inadequate marketing facilities. A woman may buy about 30 lbs of string beans in St. Philip today and then by Thursday, Friday or Saturday the price goes up. We do not want to import split peas from Holland or whole peas from Germany; we want our people to eat their locally-grown food. I have seen fields of eddoes wasting whereas people buy Irish potatoes at 15 or 16 cents per pound and you have people telling you to "pat them on the back." If we are trying to educate people into a better system of marketing, I say that it is for the good of Barbados and I appeal to hon. members to help us to put over this programme.

Mr. Chairman, I see that an hon. member is looking very dreary and forlorn. I do not know if he is a member of the Opposition, but I appeal to him in the interest of Barbadian farmers, and I take it that the members of the Opposition are well read. I say that one of them over there is equal to six of us over here; so I am appealing to their good conscience and good sense of fairplay to come to our rescue if they want to help Barbados. (Mr. BARROW: Come to your rescue?) Well, if one of them is equal to six of us, then we need rescuing. I say: let us be more serious. We know that the price of sugar has dropped and therefore we have to concentrate on planting more food; and in order to do that we must organise. I hope that what I have said today will help to push the Opposition in a place where they will realise that this is their Barbados, and that if there are people who grow these things and there is no adequate accommodation for them, you can rest assured that this Government will provide the necessary accommodation when we get funds at our disposal. (Cheers.)

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, it is of course not very easy to make an effort to reply to the remarks of the last speaker. So much of what he has said or was supposed to have said is in comic style that it is difficult to know what is to be taken seriously and what is to be taken as comedy. If we, on this side of the Table, were to pride ourselves on having some sort of style, rather than come here today, we would go to the Trade Winds or the American Club and perform these antics. The hon. member is priding himself about the style which he has and saying that we have no style. Well, Mr. Chairman, if style is an important consideration in this matter, then he should go to the Trade Winds at night and demonstrate that style. 3.45 p.m.

It is difficult to hear them talking about growing more local food and devoting more space to producing vegetables and what not when they are really only paying lip service to the question. They themselves own land and if you go to St. Philip you will find land lying fallow under the control of Government. At least they should set an example. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: Where is that?) At Six Roads you have grass on land.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the hon. member has not been in that constituency for a long time because we have cut pangola grass from there.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I saw it there myself last Monday on the way to Ruby, and I say there is land still lying idle and uncultivated; it has been lying idle from the time Government bought it. If they are really interested in increasing and expanding the production of vegetables in the island to supply the local and export market, why don't they implement the Roddam Report which has been telling them for four years to develop the sheet water areas in Christ Church, St. Philip, part of St. Lucy, St. James and St. Peter? They have an excellent Report from Mr. Saint and Mr. Roddam begging them to provide irrigation facilities and produce vegetables, but what he is doing is trying to mix up agricultural production with marketing facilities. He is trying to confuse the issue and is chasing the hawkers and vendors who sell all sorts of things off the streets.

This is the first time in my life that I have ever heard that you think of providing urban marketing facilities in terms of distributing agricultural foodstuffs. This island has always lacked proper distributing centres for agricultural products; but if the Government feels that it can remedy this defect by utilising the market space for this reason, Sir, they are really living in a fool's paradise. The two things are separate and distinct. Your grow-more-food campaign and marketing of agricultural products are entirely separate and distinct from the sort of thing we are discussing under this Resolution today. He began telling us on the one hand that people carry more vegetables to sell, and on the other hand he tells us that you can buy razor blades cheaper. I am amazed at somebody occupying his position being so easily floored by a single unsophisticated local girl who says to him she does not know she is doing wrong. He is so easily flattered and fooled that a little unsophisticated girl tells him.....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, that was when I happened to be in the Congress Party, not today. I want the hon. member to know that I am no longer a fool.

Mr. CRAWFORD: He demonstrated it here today. Some little girl in the market he asked whether she knows she is providing unfair competition; she tells him that the B. L. P. would be glad to think that she is selling foodstuff cheap and he walks off. If she is paying no rent and carrying no overhead or trade tax, she must be able to sell cheaper than somebody who is paying \$200 a month rent. If that is the case and you carry that argument to its logical conclusion, then remove the whole of Broad Street to the market, let the people pay no taxes and shut down the City. I have not heard so much nonsense in my life.

Naturally, Mr. Chairman, if you have no overhead or if it is reduced to a minimum, you should be able to sell

a little cheaper than the other man who is paying a big staff, high rates and all that kind of thing. In other words, what he is saying is this: you get a little hole-in-the-wall somewhere, pay no taxes and you can compete with the other fellows. There are small business people who have a little business somewhere trying to make a living, but they cannot compete with that kind of thing; they are not affecting big men like Da Costa's and Cave Shepherd. A man in his position should be able to see the question clearly and see all sides of it. He could not draw a salary as Minister from the little business places in the market. The Congress Party brought him in here; he could not get in here otherwise. It lifted him up, presented him to the St. Philip public as an unknown quantity, and asked the St. Philip public to put him in the House. After you get in here, Mr. Chairman, you get all sorts of inducements, blandishments and seductions to betray your proper loyalties. That happens all over the world. In every society and Party you get traitors at a price; they are not unknown.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, in all fairness to the Hon. Minister I think the Congress Party died and left him.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is a young member. He has just come in here and what he does not know is a surprise to everybody; but he does not have to display his ignorance on every occasion like that. We expect him to be ignorant on certain things, but he need not tell us that he is ignorant. What he has just said disclosed that he is even more ignorant than we thought. What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that with your knowledge of Parliamentary and Constitutional history, you should know that all over the world in all sorts of Parties you find people who are backbenchers in a given Session who respond to a little seduction to come over to the promised land because they can make him a Minister.

3.55 p.m.

That does not frighten us. But you also know that there is such a thing as a swing of the pendulum.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want to suggest to the hon. senior member for St. Philip that I have allowed you to reply to the remarks the Minister made; having replied, please get back to the Resolution. I think that is quite enough side-play. Please get back to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, hon. members have pointed out that in almost every city in the world you will find people still selling on the streets. If you go to Montreal or the United States of America, you will find people selling all over the place; but the tradition of people selling on the public streets in this island has reached the point where you have to put a full-stop to it, and we did so; but do not let us shelter behind that when we have people perpetuating gross evils in these new markets. If these new markets are to be places which should take the place of proper agricultural distribution centres and if they are to be places to provide for the many who sell on the streets - although instead of that, they are being used as places to provide unfair competition by a few friends of the Government - let us know that so that we will realise that you will never find enough space in them for the *bona fide* hawkers. If we go on doing that every time you provide more space there, you will get more merchants coming in and taking up more stalls which should be in a City store; and if you went on long enough, you will find all the business places which should be in the City in the Market. Apparently, that is what is envisaged by the Hon. Minister of the Government.

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

HEAD XXI - SCIENCE AND AGRICULTURE

Head XXI - Science and Agriculture - was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The first item under this Head is Seed Store, and according to the note the amount to be voted is to pay for supplies required to meet the demands for seed, insecticides, fungicides and spraying materials.

I do not think that needs any more comment. What I do want to say in respect of that is the fact that more people have become more conscious and hence are planting more food. In consequence of that, they are buying more seeds; hence we want this amount to supplement the original amount voted in the Estimates.

Item 61, deals with water, gas and electricity. According to the note, the sum of \$1,000 is needed to meet the cost of an increase in consumption of electricity as a result of the activities of the Scientific Officers and to meet the deficit caused by the payment of bills in respect of the last quarter of the previous financial year (1958/59) during the present financial year (1959/60).

Everybody knows that the price of electricity has gone up and on top of that, posts which were once vacant are now filled; therefore, we have more Scientific Officers now doing research.

Item 107 is Replacement of Booster Pump at Central Livestock Station and as is stated in the Note, the amount of \$656 required is a revote. The Note reads: "To revoke the amount of \$656 which was provided by Supplementary Estimates in 1958-59 but which was not included in the Current Year's Estimates due to an oversight."

Item 110 is for Extension of Poultry Production and according to the Note it is to meet the balance of the cost of a Secura Incubator which exceeded the amount of \$1,500 provided by \$84. As hon. members will see, we are asking for \$84 more because the cost of this incubator has gone up.

Item 113 is a new item and it is for Replacement of Exhaust Fan for Fume Cupboard. This is also a revote. According to the Note, provision of \$400 was made in the 1957-58 Estimates. This was revoked in 1958-59 in Supplementary Estimates. The excess of \$360 over the amount provided is due mainly to the additional cost of adapting the fan in the light of experience gained and of installing it.

Hon. members will notice from the figures given that the F. O. B. cost is \$498.42, Freight \$15.69 and the cost for installation and adaptation is \$245.92. In the light of experience gained, we intend to reconstruct this exhaust fan in a different manner. I do not think I need to explain this more fully.

I beg to move that Head XXI stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to refer to the Note to Item 107 and this is the first time for 1960 that I see again that we have to do something due to an oversight. I thought we would not have had any more recurrences of these amounts which we are asked to revoke due to an oversight. We have never in the past been accustomed to having to deal with so many amounts due to an oversight. I just do not understand what has happened. Of course, what happens is that A leaves a thing to be done to B who leaves it to C who passes it on to D and, in consequence, nobody does anything. Perhaps, because of that, so much of our parliamentary time is taken up on these matters. As early as this in 1960, we are asked to vote amounts which are due to an oversight. It is high time, as I have suggested last year when a similar matter was before this Chamber, that the Minister should call up his Secretary or whoever is attached to the Department and let him find out who is the Clerk, or the Under-Secretary, or what they care to call him, who was responsible for another act of carelessness and let them understand that they are not only letting down themselves and their Department but that they are also letting down the whole system.

4.05 p.m.

We have so many people to do the work which was done by so many fewer people, that there is no excuse for our being continually called upon to pass revotes which have been occasioned because of an oversight on the part of some person or persons in the Government Buildings.

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of \$5,616 do now pass.

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

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

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

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee was read a first and second time and agreed to.

HIGHWAYS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with the Highways (Amendment) Bill which was circulated to hon. members as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to move the second reading of the Bill which was circularised to hon. members - a Bill to amend the Highways Act, 1900.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is an amendment to Section 32 of the Highways Act, 1900. The object of the Bill is to make provision for and to exercise greater control of, certain bands etc., parading along the streets and processions generally, and especially so at Carnival time. Now, Sir, this festival of Carnival is something which is practically new to Barbados; I think it is about two years old. Last year it assumed greater proportions than the previous year, and it promises to be even bigger this time. My feeling is that Carnival has now come to Barbados; some of us like it and some of us do not like it, but the fact is that it is here and it is here to stay. The people have taken to it. Not far on my left I heard a voice, and we happen to know that it is the voice of a particular individual who delights in taking part in processions at Carnival time. As I was saying, Sir, since Carnival is here I think we should, at a very early stage, do some things and take some steps to control the processions; we should not wait until they assume the proportions which they have assumed in the neighbouring colonies where rowdiness, stick-fighting, bottle-throwing, knife-stabbing and things of that sort have taken place.

As I have said, the object of this Bill is to control these processions on the streets; the Police will prescribe certain routes along which these processions will proceed and they must be confined to the streets which have been provided for them by the Police. That is what we intend to do in order to make these processions orderly. There will be other things which will be taken into consideration at the same time, things such as the wearing of masks, the playing of bands and musical instruments, and at the same time the opportunity will be taken to control the playing of these juke boxes at night. We are having complaints from several districts about the late and loud playing of these juke boxes and things of that sort which disturb the night rest of people in the various neighbourhoods. These things should be controlled. These juke boxes will be able to play only until midnight and after that, the residents in the various neighbourhoods must be allowed to go to bed and rest and prepare for the next day's work.

In connection with this Bill there is paragraph 3 of the "Objects and Reasons" which reads as follows:-

"This Bill, therefore, seeks to amend the Highways Act to empower the Commissioner of Police to grant such permission and to make regulations, with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, for controlling marches and processions and for other matters connected therewith."

That paragraph has been wrongly worded; it should read that the power to make the regulations will be vested in the Governor-in-Executive Committee and not in the Commissioner of Police as is set out here.

Mr. Speaker, this is a short Bill and the Objects and Reasons, I believe, are very well accepted by this House. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, we are not opposing the passing of this Bill, but I notice that the Hon. Premier when introducing the Bill made reference to juke boxes. 4.15 p.m.

As a matter of fact, in view of a recent decision in the Magistrate's Court, I see the necessity for juke boxes to receive consideration under this Bill, because there is a case of conviction - and no appeal has been made in respect of the case of a juke box which was being played. Twenty-five people were dancing and singing to the music of it, and there was a conviction under Section 70, subsection (9) of the new Liquor Licence Act which we passed in 1957 for permitting on licenced premises this sort of conduct. That has been dealt with by this decision which I am not opposing, though I doubt whether it is a sound decision of Her Majesty's Court under a certain Section of the Liquor Licence Act.

I take it, Sir, that the principal purpose of this Bill and the reason for taking it up is the Carnival season which is approaching, and this is pre-Carnival legislation. There are one or two aspects of it to which I will refer when we go into Committee. As we know, the original Section of the Highways Act which this is seeking to amend was the Section under the caption "No playing on loud musical instruments". That Section 32 reads as follows:-

"If any person shall be found performing upon any instrument called the pump, or upon any loud musical instruments within twenty-five yards of any highway (except being within a dwelling house or enclosure), such person shall, for each such offence, forfeit and pay a sum not exceeding five shillings."

Of course that penalty is so inadequate that it is interesting to see that it is proposed under the new legislation for a penalty of a fine not exceeding two hundred and forty dollars or to imprisonment for any term not exceeding six months or to both such fine and imprisonment, as well as that a member of the Police Force in uniform may arrest without warrant any person who contravenes. I had thought that it would be a good opportunity in this amending section to provide more definitions than at the moment exist. I notice that "public place" is now defined and "procession" is also defined, but a very important phrase which received no definition even in this new Section is "loud musical instruments".

There are differences of opinion as to what that phrase really means, and it is a pity that it was not defined for the purpose of this new Section which is taking the place of the old Section 32. There are some who take the view, Mr. Speaker, that "loud musical instruments" may mean any musical instrument which is played loudly or the phrase applies to certain types of musical instruments which are regarded as loud instruments as opposed to other musical instruments or soft musical instruments; so I will say that in the absence of a definition in this new Section clarifying what is meant or intended to be meant by this phrase, you might have the points argued in courts of Law. At least in my profession there will be opportunity arising and having to go from Court to Court, Magistrate's Courts, Supreme Court, Federal Court and

Privy Council, perhaps, in order to get this point threshed out and settled, whereas it would be so simple if the draughtsman of this Bill had defined not only the two phrases which he has defined, but also what was intended by "loud musical instruments". I wonder if perhaps the hon. proposer of this motion, who would of course know what the Cabinet had in mind when they gave instructions for this Section to be drafted, knows what is meant by "loud musical instruments"; to which of the two categories to which I referred just now does this phrase belong? It may well be that our draughtsmen, now since that brilliant sequence of Lawyers left the Attorney General's Chambers - Mr. C. V. H. Archer, now Federal Judge, Mr. W. K. Fergusson and Mr. C. DeL. Inniss now Chief Justice of British Honduras - cannot find anything to copy from, either existing legislation or something from Trinidad or British Guiana. They just do not seem capable of thinking for themselves or drafting any Bill which will fill the gap, but for which there is not already some precedent. There must be something already in a book for them to copy, or else our legal draughtsmen of today seem to regard themselves as glorified copyists and not as lawyers at all.

Anyhow, Sir, if this Bill passes in its present position, we may well anticipate that long and learned legal arguments will have to take place in the event of any person being charged in connection with the definition of what is meant by a loud musical instrument. As you know, Sir, whereas under the present Section it says "if any person shall be found performing upon any instrument", this new Section is worded "it shall not be lawful for any person (a) to perform upon any loud musical instrument on or within twenty-five yards of any highway except within a dwelling house or enclosure; (b) to appear masked or otherwise disguised on any highway or in any public place; or (c) to take part in any march or procession in any highway or in any public place, except in accordance with the terms of a permit granted by the Commissioner of Police."

Those are just one or two comments which struck me as I looked at the Bill, but apart from that we have no objection to it passing into Law.

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, what I was referring to just now is what appears in this Clause 2, and I wonder if the hon. introducer of it would care to discuss with the legal draughtsman the desirability of including another definition in that part of subsection (f) (2) which is to be found in the middle of page 3 of the cyclostyled draft which we have in our hands. The hon. member will no doubt see the definition of "public place" and that of "procession", and the inclusion of a definition which I think will save a lot of unnecessary arguments and expensive procedure from court to court is the definition of "loud musical instruments". Hon members would recall the point I made about loud musical instruments in referring to a particular type of instrument. There are some instruments which can be regarded as loud instruments, and I am wondering whether by loud musical instruments the draughtsman intended to refer to any musical instrument if it was played loudly or with the maximum amount of sound coming from it.

4.25 p.m.
I am not suggesting that we delay it for this purpose but if the Hon. Minister discusses it with the Draughtsman, when it goes to another Chamber, they may include such a definition in that Chamber and send it back to us.

Then, Sir, under 32A (1), you have it that any person who desires a permit as aforesaid shall, at least three days before the day in respect of which such permit is desired, apply in writing to the Commissioner of Police for such permit.

I am wondering whether by that they mean three clear days; that is to say, if you want a permit for Saturday, and you apply the Tuesday before, will you have applied in time? When would be enough time before? Sometimes there are those who have permits to award who tend to discriminate. You might well have a Police Official allowing X, a friend of his, to come in on Wednesday and get a permit for Saturday, but somebody else who is not his friend or whom he does not like, if he comes on Wednesday he would say to him: "Oh no, you cannot get it now, you must come on a Tuesday. There must be three clear days before."

There is only one other comment which I have to make and it is that the Draughtsman unconsciously is quite humorous in respect of certain particulars which are required with this application. You are asked to give an estimate of the number of persons who are expected to take part in such a march or procession. Sir, you know that if you take part in a march yourself, you do not know how many people will follow you or join in your march, whether there will be 10, 100, or 1,000. It is absolutely beyond the capacity of anyone to give a reasonable estimation. Of course, the applicant may be expected to get out of it by saying: "I expect so many to take part." But one's expectation can amount to nothing in a case of that kind.

Sir, I want us to be careful in respect of these two points. You know, Sir, that the juke box is the only type of musical instrument which is available to people with small shops and business places by which they seek to keep their customers; and though the noise from a juke-box can be very trying, yet it must be borne in mind that the other clubs and business places which can afford bands, orchestras and so on and which have full amplifying equipment, can carry on, whereas the small shopkeepers with a juke box are in the unfortunate position where certain high officials in this island would take a delight to deal with them. I know of a case which has been made by a non-resident of the noise from a juke box which was loaned to a Barbadian and the Police Official went to the owner of the juke box asking him to call in the juke box from this person to whom it was rented. That is an indication of what might happen if there is an attempt to discriminate.

This is my point. All noises after certain hours when we should be resting or trying to sleep are irritating and disturbing particularly after one has done a day's work. Do not let us confine ourselves to the noise from a juke box. A juke box does not keep as much noise as you get in those places which have nine-piece orchestras where there is superb amplifying equipment, and which can extend to an area of about a quarter of a mile from where the performance is taking place.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT rose to speak.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: If the hon. member would give way, I would just like to reply to something which the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has just said. I spoke earlier and referred to Section 2 with regard to the Commissioner of Police granting these permits. I should have asked that that be amended.

Sir, if you will permit me, I am asking leave to withdraw the motion for the passing of Section 2.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Sir, on page 2, Section 32B (1), it reads that the Commissioner of Police may, with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, make regulations for all or any of the following purposes:-

I am asking to amend that to read: "The Governor-in-Executive Committee may make regulations for all of the following purposes - "

I beg to move that Clause 2 as amended stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, this is one of those enactments which one finds it difficult at times to have the right and precise bit of legislation to meet the need. Sometimes in legislation like this we get people discriminating just as what the hon. Leader of the Opposition said. But there is also the case where because a shopkeeper is poor and hard hit, he does not care whom he inconveniences and he would do it to his heart's content because he is making money; so it does not matter to him if he inconveniences anybody. I am not a party to that school of thought that because a man is poor, or because a shopkeeper is poor, he has the right to have all these conveniences for himself. As a matter of fact, I am one of those who are inflicted not by someone with a juke box but by those who do not have any regard for their neighbours. When it comes to any point, there must be a rational line taken. There is a vast distinction between a juke box playing all night and one playing just for a few hours and at a certain strength of tone. Of course, there are some people who when they go to punch a juke box feel that the louder they can get the juke box, the better it is or it seems to them that the more juice they get coming out of it.

I do not think people generally in any district will raise any objection to any of their neighbours keeping a dance, because that is not a frequent thing. Even in districts where there are dance halls, you do not get objection to the dance halls because sometimes those dance halls are situated in areas somewhat far from residents or if there are situated near to residents, the residents there do not seem to object to them.

4.35 p.m.

I would say that we know there is a general objection by people in the community and some attention should be paid to these things. I am not one of those people who believe that every time a working-class man or working class people begin to express themselves in the way which is not being expressed by other people, you must outlaw them. There are those who feel that as soon as some people express themselves either by juke boxes or steelbands, these things should be outlawed. I feel that any nuisance should be abated and any and every person in the community should be free from any nuisance whatsoever. I notice here in Section 2 of this Bill which amends Section 32 of the principal Act, that you will have to give three days' notice before the day in respect of which a permit is desired, and the Premier may be able to say something about this. One of the things in connection with which regulations are to be made is the control of the use of amplifying equipment on motor vehicles. I have heard people being offended by other people announcing the holding of a meeting and many people have to advertise a dance in the newspaper or over the radio which may be very costly - you may announce "Mr. John Harris, better known as 'Come-up-here'" - as a means of advertising a meeting. Some people take that as a nuisance and that is one of the things about which you have to give three days' notice.

I want to let people know that I am keeping a meeting tonight; I want to know if what you would regard as amplifying equipment is something which has a turntable on it; if you connect a microphone to it and let go a meeting, would somebody be prosecuted because you put gramophone records on it? I do not know if the lawyers would make a difference between what is called amplifying equipment and something which can make a loud noise. This sub-paragraph (e) of sub-clause 32B of Section 2 of this Bill says that regulations are to be made for controlling the use of public address equipment and of juke boxes. I believe that one of the things at which people take offence is the keeping of meetings. I do not know what is the limit, but some of us would be guilty of keeping a meeting after midnight. Some people who are not interested in politics tell you that if you are keeping a meeting you should confine it to midnight. That is all right for Queen's Park; but when you come to a place like St. Andrew, what is there to prevent people from keeping a

meeting after midnight? Nowadays when you should be having meetings to educate people they are considered as a nuisance, but at Election time you look forward to the fun at that time. How are you going to keep out one thing and get a little fun otherwise? I see that when you are going to have a meeting in the vicinity of a Church, you wait until the Church meeting is over.

Mr. Chairman, I am more perturbed about the traffic blocks which you have than other things. You have a donkey cart going through Broad Street at 10 miles an hour and a man sitting down on the cart as if it is nobody's business. Those are the things which would worry us more than other things. I agree that you must have a means of clamping down on nuisances when they become nuisances. I may be undemocratic enough to say that I would not permit the playing of juke boxes in a street. It is true that by and large people do not go in selected areas to do things, but when some people are out to do these things they are going to do them and it does not matter whom they offend or inconvenience. We cannot allow community life to be on a basis where it does not matter whatever harm is done to some people as long as other people's ends are served.

Mr. Chairman, I would like some more clarification of the public address system because it does not interfere with the public if you announce a meeting; it is not causing the Police any inconvenience. If you are having a procession you should allow the Police to know that you are going to have that procession. Speaking as a Trade Unionist, I feel that things do not take so long to develop; as a matter of fact, the space of 72 hours is a long time and a procession may be necessary within forty eight hours. I think that the time is alright in terms of Carnival, but in terms of any procession it may be necessary that the time factor should be really something about which you should have to give notice; you may have to demonstrate your approval or disapproval of something and that may require quick action being taken before something else takes place. A demonstration may be a demonstration of protest.

4.45 p.m.

The time factor seems to me to be a bit longish. I should like to get some information on this question of public address equipment because I do not see that announcing meetings on public address equipment as is done in Barbados can be regarded as a nuisance.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the points made by hon. members especially those by the Leader of the Opposition with regard to these three clear days, I will bring to the attention of the Crown Law Officer and have it clearly defined as well as the points with regard to loud musical instruments.

With regard to the juke boxes, of course the hon. senior member for St. Peter has really taken a balanced view of it, and as I have said earlier, complaints against the loud playing of juke boxes in the early hours of the morning have appeared in the daily newspaper especially, and complaints have been received by way of letters by people who claim that they are suffering from loss of sleep etc. because of the loud playing of these juke boxes. I myself can give an example of what happened, I think year before last or early last year, to a patient who lived not very far from a juke box, and the fact that the playing of this juke box on three or four nights in succession until the early hours of the morning had an effect on the particular patient. If they were played moderately, I do not think anybody would have any objection; but as I said, I promise to have a further discussion with the Crown Law Officer on the points raised by hon. members before proceeding with it any further and have the points clarified in the Other Place. I say the Other Place because I suppose hon. members will realise the urgency of this Bill. We are having Carnival a little later on this month, and we want to be in a position to make legislation in preparation for these processions and so on. If hon. members will pass the Bill, I promise to have further discussions and have these points cleared up by the Crown Law Officer before proceeding to the Other Place.

Mr. COREIN: Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that in certain areas there are many people who are suffering

from the full volume of these loud speakers. In my district I know that there is a young gentleman suffering from mental troubles, and even when he was recovering and would have been able to work for himself again he had a relapse. There are other women who have complained to me that they have to put pillows over their ears at night in order to have a rest because of these loud speakers.

I do not think, Sir, that this is a bad idea to have some control in certain areas over these juke boxes and loud speakers which disturb the people. We are not against them playing, but they must have them in areas where they would not disturb other people. If they would use their discretion, they can play at the doors of any other person, and that would be by lowering the volume. There are some people who put in ten cents and say they have paid their money and they are going to play as loudly as they like; they do not care whom they disturb and that is a bad idea. If this Government has control over such affairs, I think it would be good for the community because I know the danger it causes to certain people who are suffering from various complaints. I think this is one of the best things that can be done. If they do not control the volume, you should use some means of preventing them. I am in agreement with this Bill.

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill with amendments in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing: To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Transport Board Act, 1955.

TRANSPORT BOARD (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1960

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, some time ago I informed the House that I hoped soon to announce a comprehensive policy as regards the public transport in this island. I need hardly point out, Sir, to members that such a policy will necessarily involve not only the future of the Transport Board, but also several other considerations and ramifications and, I believe, the whole system of transport as it operates today.

Unfortunately, Sir, I have not found it possible so far to state to the House and to the public what the policy is, but in the very near future I expect to be in a position to do so.

4.55 p.m.

This also involves various alternatives to what we have today. It involves either a continuation of the present system or some retraction, and indeed, Sir, what some have in mind is something akin to what we had before.

I think I should inform the House that one of the matters which Mr. Cadbury is considering, against the economics of the Five-Year Plan, is this matter of transport. I may say that he has a long experience in other countries in this matter. At one time he served in a part of Canada which successfully ran public transport and he assisted the Government there; and we of this Government have sufficient faith in his knowledge and experience and his judgment to believe that he will also give us candid, impartial and good advice on the operations of the Transport Board. But this matter does give us very serious thought when we are faced with what may be a continuing subsidy in an island which depends on a one-crop economy. Therefore, we as a Government have to see to it that this subsidy is reduced to a very small proportion or eliminated altogether. As I have said earlier, we are giving it serious consideration for what it involves.

I would like to repeat what I have already said and it is that I regard public transport as an essential public

service. I regard it as a service to be looked at from the point of view of serving the people and not necessarily from the point of view of what it means to a few individuals. I have heard comparisons made between the Transport Board and some individual owners. I shall give you figures in a few minutes. As I have said, it is how you look at it. It is the premise from which you start. If you start from the premise that regardless of how the people are served or not served, you are going to chop up this island into little concessions, some lucrative, and some unremunerative, some having workers working long hours and, therefore, the owner making profits - if you start looking at public transport in that way, well then, of course, you will say quite easily and glibly: "Do away with the Transport Board and let A, B, C, and D and whoever may, operate it". If, on the other hand, you look at it as a public service, as a service to be operated for the benefit of the public and for the benefit of the people principally, well then, I say, Sir, that you are bound to see to it that it be so operated that it benefits them.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have not heard the Minister to say expressly that he is dealing with this next item on the Order Paper and I would like to say this, if I may. Only today, there was laid on the Table of this House a Statement of the Accounts of the Transport Board for the year ended 30th September, 1959, but we have not received any copies of that Statement; and Your Honour can well remember that that Statement of Accounts, not being ready last week, caused the Hon. Minister to say that he would not proceed with the matter until the Statement was laid. All that we know is that the Statement was laid but we have not seen copies of it and, so far as we are concerned, it would be impossible for us to debate this matter without having seen that Statement.

I do not know if the Hon. Minister proposes to do anything more than making his second reading speech and having it seconded and then postponing further discussion on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is speaking of Order No. 2. I take it that he is. If I may reply to his point of order, I would like to tell him that what the Hon. Leader of this House said on a former occasion relative to the laying of the Statement is just a moral obligation which I cannot enforce.

Mr. BRANCKER: I fully appreciate that, Your Honour. In such a case, the Hon. Minister may well have gone on with this measure on the last occasion. We are as ignorant now of it as we were last Tuesday in connection with the Statement and the figures, which are very important in considering a Bill of this kind.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure the Opposition that we on this side do not intend to do anything to hamper free, full discussion and I would quite agree to complete my speech and have further debate on this measure at another date. I would not say next week because there is to be a Council of Ministers which will be meeting next week in Trinidad. Therefore, I wonder if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would agree to having further discussion on this matter on another day this week.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like the Hon. Minister to state that he is moving the second reading of this Bill; otherwise, there is nothing before this House.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I am going to move the second reading of this Bill and after that enquire from hon. members whether they are willing to meet on Friday to debate it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

What I want to say is that I disassociate myself from the view expressed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition; what the Hon. Leader of the House said on the last occasion has absolutely nothing to do with my having to deal with this Bill before the House because this is a matter which deals with amending the Transport Act, 1955. Though it may be that the accounts dealing with the Transport Board

would mean something, this Bill is not contingent on the accounts of the Transport Board; therefore, I am not associating myself with that view and I am prepared to speak on this Bill after the Hon. Minister finishes his speech and the motion has been seconded.
5.05 p.m.

I myself hope to show that this Bill could be considered quite apart from the matter of accounts. I hope hon. members will follow me very closely in what I have to say later on. I am mindful

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the reason why we, on this side, would find it impossible to take part in this debate at this juncture without the accounts, is that the very Bill which the hon. member is introducing is a Bill to give permission to the Transport Board to borrow money, and we cannot give them authority on that basis without the accounts. Without the accounts we could not even take part in the debate.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I appreciate what the hon. member has said. I was saying that I am not unmindful of what the Hon. Leader of the House has said. I do not intend to forestall anything or to go ahead today without hon. members seeing a copy of the accounts; but what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said is quite factual and I hope that I will be able to show it. (Mr. CRAWFORD: It is not factual.) Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill I was developing the point that there seems to be a certain manner of thinking, and it is not confined to one section of the community. I cannot think that the Government could blithely go back on everything it has done and return to the chaotic system in so far as transport is concerned; I want to say that I am diametrically opposed to that. I do not want to develop that point too broadly today because later on, or in fact very soon from now, we are going to have an opportunity of dealing with this matter in all its stages and ramifications. I only want briefly to state the position which has led up to this Bill.

Soon after his arrival here, the Managing Director of the Transport Board drew to the attention of the Government certain defects in the operation of the Board, certain drawbacks which hampered the Board; and one of those drawbacks was the fact that they were operating some very old gasoline, over-aged units on which increasingly large sums of money were being spent by way of spares and so on, and which would require big sums being spent if these units were completely overhauled and rehabilitated. The Managing Director advanced certain other recommendations to the Government, which, if carried out, would have meant that it would be unwise and uneconomical to rehabilitate these units. It would be far better, in case that future policy was settled, to bring in or import new diesel units to take the place of the old gasoline units on which increasing sums were being spent for repairs. The Government went into the recommendations, they were considered by all sections of the Government; the financial implications were studied very closely and so on, and some time elapsed after the recommendations were forwarded to the Government. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, the position became worse and worse so far as the buses were concerned. Of these old gasoline units, nine are 1946 units, 17 are 1947, 3 are 1948, four 1949, two 1951 and four 1952. It is generally acknowledged that after eight years, without a complete rehabilitation of the unit, it becomes uneconomic to operate. That has been generally acknowledged by a Committee of Concessionaires which came before me and they said that between eight and nine years after units have been in operation you will have to rehabilitate them completely. We returned some of the buses to the owners and they spent considerable sums in rehabilitating those units. Let us not forget that those buses which belong to the Transport Board are not confined to two or three areas; they have to travel throughout the island. The accounts of the Transport Board revealed that there have been, from year to year, tremendous increased costs to keep these units in running order. During the last financial year the amount spent on repairs, replacements and mechanics' wages in respect of these units was \$183,300.82, as against \$157,348 in the preceding year. (ASIDES).

Mr. SPEAKER: I must inform hon. members that the asides are a bit too loud. I have some difficulty in hearing the hon. member who is addressing the House.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I was saying, Sir, that in the last financial year the amount spent in connection with repairs, replacements and mechanics' wages on these units was \$183,300.82 as against \$157,348.00 in the preceding year and as against \$136,000 in the year before that.
5.15 p.m.

In three years it cost over \$50,000 more to keep these old units going. We have been faced, Mr. Speaker, with increasing problems due, for instance, to increased school population—especially on the Leeward route—which has risen very much in the past year or so, and it has thrust considerable strain on the Board to keep the school service going and at the same time keep up these old units in a workshop which is deficient in many respects as well as supply the general public with proper transportation.

I may mention, Sir, that from the last financial year I do not think the public generally realises that this Board has subsidised the transporting of school children by as much as 40% amounting to \$30,000 last year. That is the subsidy which education enjoys

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but we are not quite clear at this stage on the point he is trying to make on this issue of the transporting of school children, and I would appreciate it very much if he clarifies it, because so far, up to now, the only impression I have is that the Transport Board is transporting school children at a reduced rate whereas the former concessionaires never did. There must be some other reason, and I should like him to make the position clear.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If the hon. member interrupts me before I can even get my thoughts going, how does he expect to be able to follow anything I say?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not interrupting for the sake of interruption. I presume he is talking and wants us to understand what he is saying. He said people do not realise that the Transport Board is undertaking the transport of school children at 40% and what not, but so far as we know the former concessionaires transported children at special fares.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member wants something clarified, and so he may ask the Minister to get things straight; but the hon. member need not go on to use any argument.

Mr. CRAWFORD: He just does not understand the question I posed.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I was developing a point and I prefaced it by saying that the public has not only increased, but the number of school children, and I pointed out what is a fact, that as against 20% up to 1958 we are actually subsidising school children's transportation by 40% of the regular fare, and it is costing us now \$30,000 a year. That is what it cost us in the last financial year as against half of that up to 1958; it has never been so high before, but that was only by the way.

I was saying, Sir, that it was pointed out to me that this Board was faced with a creeping paralysis due to these various factors I pointed out, and that unless something was done about it the position would become worse and worse. Now, Sir, whatever the future policy of the Government as will be announced pretty soon, the Government has it as a public duty to transport members of the public. We have got to keep the public moving; we have got to provide them with buses; and if we are faced with a breakdown, we have got to see to it that it is obviated by allowing the Board to have this blood transfusion, so to speak, and in this way finance the bringing of new units to take the place of those over-aged, inefficient units. (A VOICE: You have new ones coming.) That has nothing to do with policy as regards the future of the Board or even the financial dif-

ficulty of the Board. We are faced with a crisis; and if we do not do it, we will have to spend tremendous sums to rehabilitate the old units which have long passed the proper state they should be in and which have long become inefficient. That is a serious situation which any Government has to take a critical note of, and hence the reason for this Bill before the House.

Mr. Speaker, we are not through this asking to take money directly from the Public Treasury, but this is to inject some degree of financial confidence in the Board itself. They can go ahead and borrow money from the Banks if the Government guarantees, and bring new units in order to keep transport moving. Some members on the other side seem to think that this is a joke. (Mr. CRAWFORD: You are a joke, not this.)

There is, Mr. Speaker, in this island a body of opinion that seems to think you can regard transport in the same way as you regard the selling of fish or something of the kind. They do not view it in a comprehensive light; they point to one or two persons who may have small operations with their own family running the business or a few people in it, paying what wages they like, operating under any conditions, and they feel that is the system that should obtain. They ask if these people can make a profit, why can't the Transport Board do the same? We cannot carry on under those methods. On certain roads in this island the Transport Board makes a profit, especially on the short routes. It is on the long routes to St. Lucy and certain parts of the outer parishes that we lose a lot of money. To say that a small operator who may operate on a lucrative route makes money and point to that fact as against the Transport Board is foolish.

5.25 p.m.

You cannot look at public transport in that way.

Mr. SPEAKER: I just want to draw the attention of hon. members to paragraph 6 of Rule 29. It reads as follows:-

"While a Member is speaking, all other Members shall be silent or shall confer only in undertones, and shall not make unseemly interruptions."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Let us see what is the position of the Transport Board in relation to other people who are running transport. The Transport Board runs 70 buses. They employ 125 drivers and 153 conductors. There are eight private concessionaires operating 106 buses between them. That is 36 more than the Transport Board. They have between them 86 drivers compared with 125 drivers employed by the Transport Board and they have 115 conductors compared with 153 conductors employed by the Transport Board.

Of the eight concessionaires there are four employing drivers and conductors on a 48-hour week basis at varying rates. There is another with twelve drivers and twelve conductors who work for 60 hours a week. There is another with 23 drivers and 26 conductors; the drivers work for 52 hours a week while the conductors work 43 hours a week. Another has employed 12 conductors and 12 drivers who work for 60 hours a week. Another one has four drivers and four conductors and they work for 44 hours a week. Those are conditions that have obtained for sometime because it has been always difficult to unionise this type of worker; but for the first time, with the coming into operation of the Transport Board, it has been possible to get a unionised body of these workers under a responsible union which is facing up to its duties in a responsible manner. The Union has with considerable courage on more than one occasion told those workers that it is not going to tolerate any slackness. That has been reported by the Managing Director of the Transport Board and this is an opportunity of having a disciplined body of workers who will not be forced to accept any conditions through fear but who will be able to do their work without fear of being sent away or dismissed.

As regards the wages of these drivers and conductors, the Union is negotiating now with the Transport Board on

that matter. These are the present standards of wages: the Transport Board pays \$3.78 a day to the drivers of Diesel buses and \$3.06 per day to the drivers of the gasoline units. I may say that there is a theory that because of that differential, drivers are not careful with the small units and that they want to drive the big ones; but as happens throughout the world, not only in Barbados, you must have a code to which all employees of a Government concern will agree to and come under. Only the other day the London Transport Executive in negotiating with the Union agreed to pay their workers a bonus based on the number of passengers, the money brought in and all that sort of thing.

As regards the conductors of the Transport Board, those who work on the diesel buses get \$3.06 a day and those on the small buses get \$2.85 a day. They all work 48 hours a week. Those are the wages which operate today as regards the Transport Board, and the Trade Union is at present negotiating with the Board on this matter.

So far as private concessionaires are concerned, there are various wages which are paid out. As compared with the Transport Board which gives \$3.78 a day to the drivers of the diesel buses, one concessionaire with 13 buses pays \$3.50 per day to the drivers on the big buses and \$3.00 per day to the drivers on the small buses. That concessionaire also pays \$2.50 a day to the conductors on all the buses. Another concessionaire pays \$3.76 to the drivers and \$2.50 per day to the conductors. Another with 14 drivers pays \$3.60 and \$3.00 respectively and \$2.88 and \$2.50 respectively to conductors as compared with the Transport Board wages of \$3.06 and \$2.85 respectively. Another pays \$3.60 to the drivers and \$2.50 to the conductors. Another pays as low as \$2.40. Therefore, Sir, you will see that there is only one concessionaire who approaches near the wage standard set by the Transport Board. I say again that I hate to be comparing a small operator with 11, 12 or 13 units with the Transport Board which is a semi-Government concern, but it must be borne in mind that the Transport Board started under unfortunate conditions and circumstances and it will be always faced with conditions not at all conducive to the most efficient enterprise; therefore, it is impossible to compare the two.

While I do not want that aspect in this debate, I feel nevertheless that it would have arisen and I wanted to make my position clear. These are fallacies which I would have to talk on; they can hardly be avoided. The cost of operating those old units with which the Transport Board is burdened is 54 cents a mile as against the cost of 31 cents a mile for operating diesel buses.

5.35 p.m.

I have seen this report appearing in the newspaper about buses being shipped and that sort of thing. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth; no buses have been shipped because none has been ordered. I repeat that there is a representative of "Leylands" out here and any hon. member can ask him if that is true. (Mr. MOTTLEY: The report came from London.) The hon. member says that the report came from London, but newspapers work in a very mysterious way their wonders to perform. (Mr. MOTTLEY: *The Beacon*.) As far as I know, no buses have been ordered for Barbados and it is a mystery to me to know whence this report has come. No orders have been given by my Ministry and none has been given through the Managing Director of the Transport Board.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition tabled a question about children's fares. I do not want to go into that now because it is not bound up in this matter. However, we are working on a system whereby no hardship will accrue to the parents of these children. We do not want any hardship to accrue to the Board and we have to be very careful as to how we work this system. It is a system which was instituted so as to safeguard the monies coming to the Board, and in respect of any changes which we make, we will have to safeguard that position. Parents will have readily to abide by the rules which we want to lay down; otherwise the whole object of the new system will be defeated.

I am putting to the House that all this Bill does or seeks to do is to promote the financial assets of the Board

not however with the express purpose of anticipating any change in policy or anything of that kind. We have these over-aged units and the travelling public must be accommodated. Whatever happens in the future, that is the prime essential and new units must be ordered if that must be done. It is not true, I assure the House, that orders have been placed for these buses. I wanted to be able to come down and announce to the House and to the public the policy as regards the entire transport service and that is the reason why this matter has been kept back; we had decided on it some months ago. At some times deliveries take months and months to be effected and in order that we can relieve the situation, knowing that the Government has decided on this matter, the Board simply sent to Leylands making enquiries and hinting that they may want some units but no orders have been placed.

Mr. Speaker, what I have said is, in simple form, the reason why this Bill is here and I now formally beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to enquire if it is proposed to proceed any further with this Bill today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the Hon. Minister will give the House an assurance as to that.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Except that is any hon. member who wanted to speak on this Bill this afternoon, I think we should hear him; and if the Opposition wants the matter deferred after that, then we will defer it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear once and for all that I am an elected member of this Chamber, and I am not going to sit down here and allow any arrangements between the Government and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to preclude me from dealing with any matter which comes before the House. I do not speak either for the Government or for the Opposition, and no side is going to speak for me on any measure. If the Government introduce a Bill, they may say that they want to adjourn after that, but I do not like this short-circuiting. I will become very angry and I will become very intolerable to some people. If the members of the Opposition do not want to speak on this Bill, that is their business; I do not like this sort of subversive attitude and therefore I am going to speak. There seems to be the bad idea that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has the right to speak first in a debate.

Mr. TUDOR: He rose on a point of order which he is quite entitled to do.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this whole question of transport has been one question in this island for a long time. In some cases the Government messed it up and in other cases it was said that the Board messed it up; however, today the position is a factual one. This Bill seeks to give the Governor-in-Executive Committee the authority to amend the Act so as to deal with the accounts of the Transport Board. I believe that although the Hon. Minister did not say so precisely, this amendment must be done in a similar way to that in which the Housing Board is accounted for in that the Auditor General seems to have something to do with the Housing accounts but he has no authority to deal with the accounts of the Transport Board. Hon. Members would like to see the accounting of the Board; I am not against the members of the House knowing what are the accounts of this Board because it would be a good thing to know and to have the accounts before us in order that we may see what is taking place.
5.45 p.m.

I want to say quite clearly in here that I am going to stand and speak now for nearly 500 people together with the public which I represent by saying from the beginning that I am a believer in public ownership. I am a Socialist by political philosophy and the hon. senior member for the

City nor anybody else can bandy me about on that. I am not a Socialist that waits until the rain comes down.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I would like the hon. member to catch his breath. I know he is warming up, but I have never pretended. I am not a Socialist by conviction, or a pseudo-Socialist by persuasion, philosophy or anything, so what is the point of worrying with that? I have never fooled anybody with it. As a matter of fact, you can point your hand all round Barbados and say: there stands a man who is not a hypocrite."

Mr. WALCOTT: If to be a Socialist you are a hypocrite, then I am a hypocrite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, from the introduction of a Bill dealing with this matter, I said I was in favour of public ownership, but I was not satisfied that the Government was clear in its mind when it took over; because although I am a Socialist and I believe in public ownership, before I took anything that I wanted to run as a public service, I would make my own survey, have a clear examination of what I am going to do and then when I had done it I would stand by it. Everybody in the House agreed at the time that the Government should take over the buses owing to the chaotic situation which the bus transport had reached.

There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that in taking over the bus service in a crisis, there was no alternative. What would happen if you did not take them over and did not agree to increase the fares? People would be like sheep without water, and even sheep without water will die. The situation was a very serious one in this respect. The Government made errors in appointing Boards and also in appointing personnel to Boards, and I can now speak because some have gone to the Great Beyond and some are not members of the Board; but the danger in a public organisation is not that in itself, and I repeated in this House that public ownership was not wrong, but the people who were running it did not know what they were doing; and you have given way to people like the hon. senior member for the City who said he is an avowed believer in private enterprise running buses, and you took them over at a stage where they were not much good with the axles dropping out and in a very bad state of disrepair.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must warn hon. members that the hon. member must be allowed to develop his theme uninterrupted.

Mr. WALCOTT: Private people ran the buses in a state of disrepair.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the owners are not here to defend themselves.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. If the hon. member does not agree with what the hon. member says, he has a chance to reply; but he should not, on any point of order, be saying the opposite to what the hon. member wants to say.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the hon. member not wittingly makes a statement which can easily be corrected, can it not be corrected at this stage?

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

Mr. WALCOTT: I repeat again, Sir, that these people ran the buses in a state of disrepair, and when it came to the question of taking them over, it meant complete rehabilitation in order to make these buses serviceable. (A VOICE: They could not get parts after the War.) Somebody says they could not get parts. These buses were here long after the War because the Transport Board was established in 1955 and the War ended in 1945. During the War people made money from running the buses, but I am satisfied that they invested the money in things other than buses which they were running as a business and therefore the buses were in a state of disrepair. There is nothing wrong in making money in one industry and

investing it in something else, but there is something wrong, when you come to rehabilitate that industry, to say you cannot do it because you have already invested the money somewhere else. If you put money in real estate in Bathsheba and other places and in other businesses and then come and say you cannot find the money to rehabilitate because you do not have it, that is wrong.

I am a believer in public ownership; otherwise I would give the Post Office to private people; but if Government by their attitude and diminution has allowed the hon. member to feel that they cannot run the buses and are going to allow them to go back into the hands of private enterprise, they are wrong. You took them over at a price and have given some back to private people on the roads that were making money because you had other means of making money. What right have Mr. Birch and Mr. Alleyne with buses? Theirs are the shortest routes in the whole place and you are running routes to compete with them. (A VOICE: Alleyne was not given back buses.)

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not be interrupted and I will not allow this debate to go on in this manner. Hon. members who have not yet spoken will have all the time at their disposal to address this Honourable House. If the Hon. member is addressing this House, he must be heard and heard distinctly and clearly. I cannot understand why the hon. member is being interrupted like this; he is not a Minister to be questioned anyhow. The hon. member must have an opportunity to be heard, and if hon. members on the other side of the House do not want to hear him, they must remember that I must hear. If there is one member of the Chamber who must hear, it is Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WALCOTT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I must also say to members that I am not a member of any political Party and nobody can discipline me. The only people who can discipline me are the electorate of the parish of St. Peter who sent me here, and members have to understand that when I express a view, I am expressing it from my own personal conviction, and it is nothing that is goaded on. I am not a believer in pussy-footing an issue such as this which has been going on for so long. The Government cannot make any excuse nor can the other members make an excuse.
5.55 p.m.

I am not making any excuses for any private ownership at all. As a matter of fact, I am opposed to the attitude of private ownership; therefore, I am not going to make any excuses for them. Those who defend them, let them make excuses for them. I am with them from day to day and I see too much.

The hon. member said that he did not give back those people the buses, but they gave Mr. Alleyne buses. I said at the time that I was not in agreement with that. You are looking at this matter from the petty idea of somebody running the buses. The hon. senior member for the City is sitting here and in a *sotto voce* remark he has said that the wages paid to some of these bus drivers are less than what he pays his scavengers. I do not want to be unkind in my remarks to some hon. members but there are too many members in this Chamber who are believers in exploitation—something which I do not believe in. As I have said, the hon. senior member for the City in a *sotto voce* remark said that what some bus drivers are being paid is less than what he pays to his scavengers. Sir, do you want me to sit here and underwrite wages even for a private concern or to agree to a situation in which they can make a profit by their paying low wages and then for someone to say, that is a matter for you? It is a matter for me because if you call a general strike in order to settle the wages of people in a certain category of employment, they get up and say, "What do you want to bring the country to? I am not underwriting the situation."

I am going to travel on the same line as the Hon. Minister of Communications in so far as the Bill relates to the workers. Without the drivers, conductors and such people you cannot have a transport system, and if you

want to have a transport system, you cannot leave it altogether to private enterprise. The Transport Board is not now a question of what you are going to do with public transport. I know that over the last six months the Union has been dealing with the Transport Board on the question of providing wages for the employees. The Government has already underwritten wages for people in the Government Service which were effective as from the 1st April, 1959. The employees of the Transport Board have been working all along without one penny more. If I ask those same workers to call a strike and bring to a halt the transport system, then you would realise what the situation would be. For the last seven months we have been negotiating with the Transport Board over the wages of the workers, but the Government was afraid and still is afraid of facing up to the issue that they have to increase the wages of these workers. Government took over these buses; they capitalised buses on a completely different basis from any sort of capitalisation which they had before. Why Government is afraid is because of what members of the Opposition would say. They would not be realistic. The real fact of the matter is that either you are going to subsidise the transport service or call upon the people to pay more bus fare. You had to buy new buses at something like \$25,000 each; you had to build a garage for them; therefore, how can you expect to run the service at the same price that it was run before? Only a crazy person would expect you to capitalise something at, may be, five times the amount it was and expect the same charges to remain. (A VOICE: You do not understand finance.) An hon. member says that I do not understand finance. What assets would a bus service have if you capitalise it at five times the amount and you allow the bus fares to remain the same as before? (A VOICE: But more people are being transported.) Who told you that more people are being transported than before? Are you going to bring people from Trinidad to transport them here? (A VOICE: You have more people to transport.) I am not talking what somebody told me; this is a matter of common-sense. The assets coming in from the running of transport, even although you have made a little increase, cannot make up for the type of capitalisation you have. Do you expect to pay employees more and expect the same running expenses to remain? Why, there it is that the city taxes have gone up and they have gone up on the same basis that they have more expense by paying out more - I do not know if they are giving more services - therefore, if their expenses have gone up, the taxes must go up. I hear a member saying that the valuation has gone up, but valuation of your house has nothing to do with it. The value of your house can go up to \$1 million but that has nothing to do with it; it is how much you want to collect from the people.

Sir, I just made that little diversion, but I was pointing out that this thing was based on its capitalisation, and it does not need Mr. Cadbury to tell you that this is a situation in which the operational structure would have to be overhauled. The very capitalisation of this thing would show you what it is. The capitalisation of the Transport Board is not like starting a company, with shareholders putting money into it. This is a Board which is composed of members of the community whom you select, and these Board members do not have to put one cent into the operational structure of the Transport Board service. It is being run by money out of the Public Treasury. Added to that, it is a brand new affair which you have started, and you have started off with none of the experience of the persons who were engaged in it before. You have started off with none of the workshops or anything of the kind to assist you; so you will see that you have operational expenses which your competitors do not have. I am only defending the Board on commonsense. The transport system run by the Transport Board is not like the transport system in New York. They do not have any competition in New York although more than one body runs it, because whenever they want an increase they go in a body and ask for more fares.
6.05 p.m.

The Government was wedded to the policy of not increasing bus fares; not even the hon. member's colleagues in his Party could take a venture like that, to capitalise the service to that extent and have a national basis at the same standard as it was before. My attitude towards that is that,

before you take over the buses, you should be satisfied that you can take over and do not give them back to the concessionaires. The concessionaires said that they could not undertake to buy new buses and operate them at the same rate, and the attitude of the Government was that they were not giving back any of these concessions; the Government would have to take them over. The concessionaires never said that they would run new buses at the old fares.

The reason why this bungling is taking place in the Government is that there may be members who feel the same way as members of the Opposition feel. A clear cut policy was not enunciated by the Board and they went on taking men who were failures; in some case they were dunderheads. It was a joke to take somebody and make him Chairman of something when you are going into millions of dollars; you are making fun with the people's money. You do not inspire any confidence in people in order to make them realise that you know what you are doing. The administrative knowledge which some people possess is just like when you put on a pair of short pants and disguise. That is what they know and you should not quarrel with a man for what he knows. When it comes to the economic part of the matter, I could not be a party to the Government's taking over something and then giving it back to private enterprise unless private enterprise was operating it better than how the Government was operating it. It may be that some hon. members may feel that a Trade Unionist should not press this matter in a debate but I am satisfied that this Chamber constituted as it is (ASIDES).....

Mr. SPEAKER: I should just like to say that there are times when the hon. member who is speaking is being diverted from his course; he cannot prevent himself from hearing the asides which are really too loud.

Mr. WALCOTT: Some hon. members have acquired the habit of speaking but not that of listening. Listening is an art. Getting back to what I was saying, Mr. Speaker, this particular question is not based on a man's economic knowledge; it is based on how a man can grasp a situation. Lord Citrine is the Chairman of the Government Electricity Board; he may not be possessed of an academic background, but that does not mean that he will never equip himself in after years, and he is comparable with those who had a formal economic background. On the question of the capitalisation of the buses, if a bus at one time cost \$8,000 or \$10,000, and you are going to have a bus which will cost you \$25,000 you could not run it at the old rate. The idea of the Government was that as they were buying this type of bus, the operational cost would be cheaper; on the basis of mile for mile, it would have been cheaper, but that does not say that if you have so much money invested - well, if you borrow a million dollars and you pay 7% on that, when you pay your interest charges you will find that you will be back up where you were.

If the hon. senior member for the City does not come face to face with this matter, his colleagues know about it. If he opened a grocery today and had to capitalise it, he could not go along the old basis because his capitalisation is a new one. If you were to ask him to buy some area of land in Broad Street and capitalise a new business on the old basis, he would say "No", he could not do that. The Government bought buses to run on fares and to operate on charges which did not exist before and look at what the situation is today! You take the employees at the Transport Board; the maximum which a driver gets is \$22.08 per 48 hour week. A man who is driving a gasoline bus gets \$20.16 per 48-hour week. The conductor of a diesel bus gets \$18.36 per week, and the conductor of a gasoline bus is getting less than what the hon. senior member for the City says that his scavengers get. On the floor of this House, what I would say is that you could afford to give a scavenger \$18.00 a week.

6. 15 p.m.

What I am going to say here is that if a scavenger is entitled to \$18 a week - and I agree with it; I do not feel that any man should be getting less than \$3 a day, because less than that cannot approximate to anything like a decent standard of living. I go further and say that when you can

recruit a scavenger at \$18 a week and you have a conductor, who is a man taking money and working in a different capacity, some is bound to stick to his hands. because he is part and parcel of a philosophy that has been practised by the Conservatives that you pay as low wages as you possibly can get labour for as it does not matter, and what comes by the way of subterfuge are the unfortunate circumstances of life. That type of philosophy has reduced the quality of people's outlook in this island - something I have to labour with - because you have produced a mentality in the minds of people that maximum productivity is not the thing they are aiming at; they aim to see what they can get on the cheapest basis. It has been preached on the basis of self-aggrandisement that you live in a capitalist society, and a capitalist society creates all these evils in which you can have some people on one plane and others on another plane, and so it seems to be an act of God.

How can you expect me to sit here and underwrite something like that? Any man who has passed the age of fifty and has not challenged the foundations of the society in which he was born will die in it, but we are fortunate that men like James Maynard Keynes were not like that; otherwise after the Second World War we would be back in 1939, and those people who believe that a capitalist society is sacrosanct would be slaves to the evils of a capitalist society. You live in it but you do not have to abide by it. (A VOICE: You will die in it.) Some of us are made up that way. I do not think that at this stage you can change me. So far as I am concerned you can find names but I am not going to sit here and underwrite a salary of \$17 a week.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for the City is a paternalist; he does not believe in Socialism, he believes more in providing paternity and letting you stay where you are. That is not my philosophy. I do not believe in giving you anything; I believe in your earning it on the basis of merit; so that is the difference between us. The hon. member would agree to the class of conductor who would allow money to stick to his hands, but I am willing to tell the conductor that if his approach is that of a perpetual thief, he would never improve the society, his mind would never improve; he would never rise above the level of a thief and would die without any enjoyment in life. I am not going to approach an employer on the basis that this man must be a perpetual thief, and underwrite \$17 as enough because he is going to steal \$10 when the week comes. That philosophy has so generated the minds of so many people that on one occasion a concessionaire said to somebody "You take the downs and give me the ups". That is the sort of philosophy that prevails in this island.

Mr. Speaker, I can go to a private employer and ask for more wages for people. We have got more from the Shell Oil Company; we signed the agreement for the first time for a salary of \$18.06 per week. Some people would suggest that we want to knock down the capitalists' equilibrium in this island; some gentlemen would like to see it promoted and the only way they can do it is by practising something which is inimical to this society. They would not like to see it broken; so Mr. So and So would take your boy with the paternalistic idea, teach him to drive his motor car, put a blue gown on him and turn him into a different species. It is that approach to life that is perpetuated in this sort of thing. They make profits at the expense of those defenseless people through their ignorance and inertia. But what can you do? You turn to the rocks and the mountains and get no refuge.

I would not come in here and say that because the Government made a mistake they should put the buses back into the hands of these rapacious people whose only idea in life is to make as much money as they can without any regard for the human element, and I say that without any question of apology. Now when you give Mrs. Rock or Mr. Birch these buses, they are going to the Banks and borrow money at 6% or 7%, and their concern is to get that money back to the Bank. Do you realise today that the interest on money borrowed from the Banks represents a substantial portion of the earnings of this community as compared with what is paid out in wages? Do you real-

ise that every time a company or an individual borrows money, the higher the rent on money goes, the more it impinges upon the standard of living of those people who work in the same industry? (A VOICE: Who raised the interest rate?) You know that the interest rate business is the duty of the outside world; so it is not a matter of who raised the interest rate. That is a statement to show, Mr. Speaker, that when you are borrowing money you have to take those things into account. The wage of a conductor is \$18.36; one Inspector gets \$20.16 per week and another Inspector gets \$19.20 per week. (A VOICE: Do you agree with those?) The hon. member is asking me if I agree; you must not ask me simple, childish questions. You cannot ask me if I agree with low wages, because you will have read my statements dealing with that; and the same people in this island tried to defend \$5 a week. I live in a society in which somebody has the audacity to defend \$5 a week. Can anybody in 1960 begin to justify \$5 a week in any industry? If we are going to have pioneer industries on the basis of paying \$5 a week, we do not want them. I pay my cook more than that and there is no industry in cooking food. When I eat good food she eats good food too; I cannot always eat good food because I do not have big money. You must appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the lighter side of things.

I am sure, Sir, that members of this Chamber will realise that I am not speaking as a Trade Unionist as such now - because this is a public matter - but I am only emphasising that part because I want to say that as a Trade Unionist I am not going to agree with any worker, whether in transport or otherwise, not getting down to the task of understanding that if he is working with an employer, his duty to the employer is to give him good, honest work. 6.25 p.m.

I am saying that here and now and I am not going to soft-soap any employee. The day you are not prepared to give your employer a full and proper day's work I am going to tell your employer to fire you. Sometimes, if the case warrants it, I will go and ask an employer to give a worker a break but, oh no, I will not say "Let the worker do as he likes." I am sure, if you ever talk of reverting to the old system of giving these buses back, that what you will be doing will not ease the situation. I am sure that it would bring a lot of chaos and it would be a very serious thing too.

Like some hon. members I would say this. I would like Government to give the assurance that they would agree favourably to an increase for the drivers and conductors of these buses. I do not know if hon. members are aware of it, but the Transport Board has offered the Union these suggestions that they would agree to an increase of 1 1/2 cents an hour; but the seriousness of it is that they say that owing to their deficit the Government is not prepared to give a subsidy to pay the wage which we have put up and what I as a representative of the Union have put to them. Speaking for the workers on behalf of the Union, I said that we would be prepared to take it from the time when the Government gave its employees an increase and that is from 1st April, 1959. The Transport Board asked that this agreement for increased wages should be effective as from August 1959 because that was the beginning of their financial year, but I pointed out strongly to them that we were dealing with them as from May. I pointed out that the workers had agreed to continue to work with the hope that when the agreement was concluded, it would be concluded on a friendly basis and we felt that it would not be the best thing to walk out. It is the easiest thing in which to have a dislocation. Sir, how can we underwrite a situation like that when such low wages are being paid out to these people? I ask: do you accept those as reasonable and fair wages for those people to get?

If hon. members are going to say that they do not agree that the Transport Board is run efficiently or that the right people are running the Board, I am quite willing to say that there have been instances where people have run the Transport Board badly. I, too, think that the Government should make a thorough investigation of the transport system in so far as the administrative aspects of it are concerned. I have seen some people over at the Transport Board at their work and I would say here with all

due respect to them that I think the Board needs a little bit of direction and straightening up. I have said it in private business, and I would state it publicly, that the hon. junior member for Christ Church is a senior partner in a firm composed mainly of one family and he has an elder brother who is one of the cleverest business men in this island, notwithstanding the keenness of the hon. member himself. I doubt anybody will tell you that if there were anything in the market to acquire, you could acquire it cheaper than he or if there were anything to sell, you could sell it cheaper than he. When you come to private business, you get that sort of positive direction by the management. But in Government Departments and in quasi-Government Departments, we are aware that a little bit of bureaucracy is necessary. You cannot run a Government institution like private business. If I may refer back to the hon. junior member for Christ Church, he is one of seven brothers running a business and they are unique. I have never seen a family stick together like that family. I am not a believer in family firms through my private work, because I believe it is easier to deal with shareholders in companies than in family firms because family firms have too much nepotism and favouritism; but I somewhat admire that firm.

The Hon. Minister has said that these are the wages that are now being paid by the Transport Board and other concessionaires are paying less. The Government cannot mind that Miss Weatherhead is paying less or even say: "Look! Miss Weatherhead is making a profit"; she has two or three sons and they can run behind their business for the whole day. Mr. Birch can go and take a last cousin and put him in the business. But you cannot run Government business that way. Mrs. Rock can run a bus business in which she can ask somebody to come home at night and fix the books for her; but you cannot run a Government business that way. You have to run a Government department or a quasi-Government department with all the bureaucracy which it takes. There must be nothing that is petty. We took over the buses with the understanding, as the former Premier said, that the bus fares will not be increased over his dead body. But the bus fares have been increased. So you can see that what he said was all moonshine. A politician may say certain things at certain times, but you have to be big enough if you made that statement at that time and you find that it is no longer tenable, you must be prepared to say now that "These are the facts; this is a reality now." Nobody in Barbados can expect with the type of bus service which you have today to have conductors and drivers wishing to work on the old gasoline buses. Have you seen how the men skip over the wheels from one part of the running board to another? Does it not appear as if they are doing some sort of trapeze work? And you have women working as conductors too. Do you think in England they would ever countenance a woman straddling over anything like that? The only thing a woman would straddle over would be a motor-cycle and a horse. 6.35 p.m.

In fairness to the public, if you have a public system of transport and you are running it, you have to be satisfied that it can be run by private people as efficiently as you are running it. You have to work out this question over a long period. The Government should have enough sense as to see that the proponents or protagonists of private enterprise go as far as they can until they want certain concessions and then they see what the Government is going to do. I am satisfied in my mind that we have reached the stage where you cannot run Barbados on private capital or government capital alone, and that there has to be a merger of both. Therefore, I say that my ideal situation would have to have a public corporation. This transport is being subsidised by the Government, but the private people do not get that concession. If you were to go to New York you will find that in that City they charge you fifteen cents and in Washington they charge you twenty cents; and in New York they want to make it twenty cents instead of fifteen. In Barbados you must acclimatise the people; you cannot expect to have a better bus service which is completely different from anything which you had in the past and say that this service can be provided for the same price as in the past. You cannot expect to get

a better quality article for the same price. That is the sort of idea which has been in evidence; you cannot expect to get a better service unless you are going to pay more for it.

A man who is driving a diesel bus is worth about \$25.00 a week, and you want to instil in a man a certain amount of care. When a man is working for a proper wage he has something to protect, but if it is going to be an infinitesimal wage then there is nothing to protect. As a means of helping you out of a serious situation, we are willing to compromise. If it is the Government's policy to give back the buses to the concessionaires - well, the Hon. Minister is not clear as to what the Government's policy is.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we have come to the end of examining all the aspects of public ownership. Let us not mind what is happening or what has happened in the United Kingdom. There is a Tory Government in the United Kingdom but there is no Tory Government in Barbados (Hon. D. D. GARNER: Local Government.) Your ineptitude has made them geniuses. If you go on making mistakes they will go on getting fatter. (*Laughter.*) I am quite serious about this matter; I do not think that any aside will detract me from the seriousness with which I have been approaching this matter. At any time when you have to revert to a situation which you were forced to take over, that is an admission that public ownership and public organisation by any Government is something unthinkable; but I could not be a party to that anyhow. I have nothing against the Electric Company or the Telephone Company, but these are services which you will have to examine in the light of circumstances and in the interest of the public. Nobody will say that these services should not be run by the public. The Trinidad Government has gone to the U.K. for a loan from the United Nations; the Government controls things, but you must have the right people there. When you have a semi commercial Board you should get some of the best people - and I mean by that not necessarily people who have voted for you or who voted against you; I mean somebody whom you happen to believe possesses the character and integrity to work on the Board in the public interest, because it is a public Board and they have the capacity to do things. I would advise the Government to look upon the matter in that light.

Mr. Speaker, I have made my position very clear. I will repeat that I am not a member of any political party in Barbados; no Party will take me because I have no desire to be associated with any political Party. I have made that point clear. I want to say that if I have come through up to here, then I will have to die here. I have no desire to serve the people in any other capacity. It gives me freedom in matters such as this to be in a position not to look on my left because I am speaking of what I am convinced to be right. I say that on the basis that a serious situation is likely to occur, if you feel that in this transport system there is any attempt to give back these buses - and from what I have been hearing today I am given the impression that there is a subtle attempt to revert to private enterprise with this transport system. I will say here and now that if we are going to do that then every member of the Government should tender his resignation to the Governor tomorrow.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate that at this stage, in view of what I said earlier in this debate, I move that the further consideration of this matter be postponed. I therefore beg to make that motion. 6.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member finished speaking?

Mr. BRANCKER: In view of the intimation received from the hon. senior member for the City, I suppose it would be much wiser for me to go on, or we can put it to the vote.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I listened for a long time to the hon. senior member for St. Peter.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member speaking on the motion for postponement?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir. That is why I am speaking because from what the hon. member said.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member get back to the business of the House?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak on the adjournment. I do not see how the Hon. Minister can expect us to go through with it tonight especially since we have not got the Report before us yet; but on the other hand, listening to what the hon. member had to say, I was at a loss to understand how he was led to make that speech, because making that speech as he did, one had forgotten that the Bill is to give the Transport Board power to borrow money.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member is speaking on the postponement, he should speak on that and not on the Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am just drawing to Your Honour's attention that it must have slipped Your Honour to let the hon. member speak at length on the entire ramifications and set-up of the Transport Board.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would just like to give the hon. member this information. If the hon. member speaks on the Bill and the motion for postponement is carried, the hon. member will not have the right to speak again.

Mr. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect to Your Honour,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: With the greatest respect to the Rules of this Chamber.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If I tell Your Honour that I am speaking on the postponement, who is to say that I am speaking on the Bill?

Mr. SPEAKER: The tone of the speech.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not agree with that; it is only if Your Honour rules. It is all right for hon. members to look at it in a facetious way, but if I stood up and said I was speaking on the postponement of the Bill - and it could not be anything but the postponement; otherwise I would be going *ultra vires* because Your Honour would not allow it - by what stretch of the imagination could there be any ruling that I spoke on the Bill when I could not do so unless you so allowed?

Mr. SPEAKER: The speech as it is contained, and nothing else. The hon. member may say he is not doing something when he is doing it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Just a minute, Mr. Speaker; for your guidance, Mr. Speaker, there is a motion....

Mr. SPEAKER: Not my guidance. I cannot be guided by a member's speech. I am only to be guided by the Rules of this House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am asking for your guidance. I am saying that there is a motion before the House which has been moved and seconded.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two motions.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There is also a motion by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition which has been seconded for postponement. On which motion am I entitled to speak?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may be speaking on either motion, but I can only judge by the tone of his speech. He should be speaking on the motion for the adjournment.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Therefore, if I speak on the substantive motion you will rule me out of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member speaks on the original motion, and he may be speaking on that and saying he is not, it is for me as Speaker to judge on that; so I am telling you that if I judge that the hon. member is not speaking on the postponement but speaking on the substantive motion, he will not again speak on the substantive Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I shall not attempt to challenge Your Honour's ruling at any stage. Hon. members should have the position clarified once and for all. I am getting this clarified because if a motion is before the House and there is another motion for postponement before the first motion is disposed of, can a member speak on the substantive motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, I would like to appeal to the hon. member. It is almost 7 o'clock now and we adjourn at that time; what we are hoping is that we agree to the motion made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and adjourn until Friday.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not agree with that; I am speaking.

Hon. M. E. COX: If we do not meet on Friday.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the hon. member would give way, surely I think it was raised in here before, and Your Honour pointed out that the accounts could not be ready by Friday.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not my business at all. As a matter of fact, if the hon. member is referring to the Report, I think the Hon. Minister is seeing that duplicates are made of that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: In time for us to study them?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have that hope.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I am glad Your Honour rules that it is right that if a motion is before the House and then there is an amendment for postponement, a member has the right to speak on the substantive motion although the motion for postponement is not disposed of. Therefore it is my right to speak on the motion before the House and disregard the motion for postponement.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member speaks on the substantive motion now, he would not be able to speak on it again.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Why, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: No hon. member is allowed to make two speeches on the same subject in the same debate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If I spoke on this until 7 o'clock, and the House adjourned and did not come back to Government business, am I entitled to come back again?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. Let me now say that in future when hon. members want to have any matters straightened out as to procedure, they would not be expecting me to give them replies from the Chair. No Speaker does that. Such replies are given in his Chamber.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do appreciate that; but what I am saying is that if a member is speaking on a particular subject before the House goes off for adjournment, as soon as the House re-assembles the Chair calls on him as the first member to speak, and any suggestion that I am not allowed to speak again would have to be challenged, because it is something that happens time and again with members of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: That point is obvious.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But if I sit down before Your Honour's intimation, it is obvious I would not be able to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member sits, he has made a speech.
6.55 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As a matter of fact, Your Honour intimated that if I spoke on the substantive motion I would not be allowed to speak; therefore, I will speak until seven o'clock. Of course, I have not yet started to speak on the substantive motion at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: But the hon. member has said that he is speaking on the substantive motion. Am I right?

Mr. MOTTLEY: When did I say so? I said I was speaking on the adjournment.

Mr. SPEAKER: And since then, the hon. member has said that he would be speaking on the substantive motion. What is the hon. member speaking on now?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am speaking on the adjournment. You distinctly said that if I said anything which in Your Honour's opinion would make you construe that I was speaking on the substantive motion, well then, according to the Rules, I could not speak after I have sat and I, therefore, said that I was speaking on the postponement as the Hon. Minister has intimated that he will be postponing further discussion. (A VOICE: Sit down.) I am on my feet. When you are between the devil and the deep blue sea, you have to know your way about. I am going to see to it that whatever is the ruling I would be able to speak again.

Speaking on the postponement, I wish to say that I agree with the question of postponing further debate on this Bill because we should have the Statement of Accounts in our hands by the next meeting so that we would be able to make a comparison. It is difficult for any of us to speak on the matter as contained in the substantive motion because we have not had the figures which would lead us to add anything constructive to the debate. That is why I say that I am surprised to see the hon. senior member for St. Peter being able to speak on the substantive motion.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7 o'clock, the sitting of this House now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. 7.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, there being no quorum, I am asking that the bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

THE TRANSPORT BOARD (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1960

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was discussing the Bill to amend the Transport Act.

Hon. M. E. COX: As far as I remember, Sir, there was a motion for postponement of this debate.

The question that further discussion on this Bill be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative on the declaration of the SPEAKER: "I think the Ayes have it".

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Friday, 12th February, 1960, at 12 o'clock (noon). I understand that members of the opposite side would like to know whether we intend to do this Bill alone when we meet again, but I would like to suggest that we come and do this Transport Bill and the other Civil Establishment Orders and then we can adjourn until week after next.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to know before we adjourn whether the Hon. Minister can give the assurance that the cyclostyled copies of the accounts of the Transport Board will be ready for us tomorrow.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I give the assurance that the cyclostyled copies will be ready.
7.50 p.m.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, speaking on a matter of privilege, I would like to point out that we have not yet settled our personnel for the Standing Committee on Privileges - a matter on which we had agreed in principle. I certainly feel that we should not have this matter unduly delayed. I am just drawing the matter to the attention of the Hon. Leader of the House who would be in a position to make some recommendations as to that. I do not want to feel that the matter is forgotten or delayed. I do hope that it will be possible, inasmuch as we are coming back here on Friday, for us to

be able to get some positive action taken on such an important matter. I do not like the delay in it and I do not think that you, Mr. Speaker, relish any delay at all in a matter such as this. If we have agreed in principle to have this Standing Committee on Privileges, I do believe that we should have some positive action taken on it. I do not know what is the actual cause of the delay, but I think we should have the matter dealt with.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, when we met on the last occasion it was agreed that the Committee should be comprised of seven members, two from each Party along with Your Honour, and one Independent, presumably the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I think that we all agreed to that and in view of the fact that the other Party is not present, I think we could agree to name the Committee of Privileges on Friday.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Friday next at 12 o'clock (Noon), was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

7.56 p.m.