
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1960

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 26th July, 1960

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); 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. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*); 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 the 19th July, 1960, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members and unless there be any objection, the Minutes will now be taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection, the Minutes of this meeting are taken as read and confirmed.

Hon. F. E. MILLER, Messrs. BRANCKER, TALMA and CORBIN entered the House and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

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

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 12) Order, 1960.

An account of the transaction in rum in the several districts of the island for the quarter ended 30th June, 1960.

Statement of sums of money paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police during the quarter ended 31st March, 1960.

Barbados Statistical Service - Selected Monthly Indicators - May, 1960.

Report on the Training Scheme Fund for the financial year 1959-60.

Messrs. BRYAN and WALCOTT entered the House and took their seats.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:-

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 12) Order, 1960."

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$2,400 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1960-61, Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1960-61, No. 11, 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 to deal with the Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

Sir, if I am in order at this stage, there is a Resolution which I would like to introduce but which is not quite ready and I would like to ask leave, when I get that Resolution, to introduce it today.

REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the report of the Select Committee which was appointed to consider and report on the Bill to incorporate the Trustees of the Congregation of the Presentation Brothers in Barbados.

That report, Mr. Speaker, has been duly circulated around this Table and I am at this stage giving notice and asking that it be proceeded with this afternoon.

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. 12.25 p.m.

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. R. G. MAPP: 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 1960-61 No. 9

A Resolution for \$13,769 was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to deal with this Resolution which stands in the name of the Hon. Premier.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, this is a supplementary Resolution under three Heads of the Estimates which will be dealt with separately.

HEAD XVI - PRISONS

Head XVI - Prisons - was called

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, under this Head there are two items - "New Equipment for kitchen" for which the sum of \$2,034 is required, and "Installation of natural gas for which the sum of \$2,734 is required. I think the explanatory note to each item sets out quite fully the reason for this supplementary provision. I will move the passing of this Head and if there are any questions asked, the Hon. Minister of Social Services, under whose portfolio this Head falls, will give the necessary answers. I beg to move that Head XVI stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD XXIII - MEDICAL (6) - HEALTH CENTRES

Head XXIII - Medical (6) - Health Centres - was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Head, there are four items requiring supplementary provision. They are "Unestablished staff," \$117; "Cost of Living Allowance," \$16.00; "Eradication of the Yellow Fever Mosquito," \$4,318; and "Station Wagon," \$3,375. Again, the notes set out quite fully the reasons for these supplementary amounts. I beg to move that Head XXIII stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, as to this Item 76 "Station Wagon" which is a new item, would the Hon. Minister tell us what has become of the unit which has been deemed to be unserviceable? Has it been sold by auction, given away, transferred or given to some other department? What is regarded as its valuation up to the present date?

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, will the Minister who is responsible for this Head also let us know what stage the campaign for the eradication of the yellow fever mosquito has reached? What areas are still visited and how soon they think they will be able to eradicate this mosquito? On the last occasion we heard that there were some pockets in Christ Church and in St. Michael, but I would like to know if they have been eliminated or reduced and what other parts of the island are now free from this mosquito. I would like to have some progress report. It is the *Aedes Egypti* mosquito of which I am speaking. The campaign has been going on for some three or four years; it was hoped to be finished in about two or three years and a report from the Minister would be welcomed.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I will begin by replying to the question asked by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in connection with the value of the unit which has been disposed of. I think the hon. member would ap-

preciate that the first thing we must ask for is a survey. That is done by a panel of surveyors and then we seek to replace the unit. This unit has been passed on to the Department of Highways and Transport. I have not been made aware of the value of this unit; that is not handed by the Ministry and therefore I cannot say for how much it was sold. The surveyors have condemned this unit and we are asking for this van to replace it. Thereafter I have no connection with this unit.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I can only thank the Hon. Minister for the lack of information, and await the arrival of the Minister who is in charge of Highways and Transport.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: It is not a question of a lack of information. You are selling Government's property and there is such an Officer as the Government Auctioneer. That is not the duty of the Minister.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for Christ Church asked about the pockets of the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquito. I wonder if the Minister is aware that Barbados has become the laughing-stock of the whole world as a result of the yellow fever campaign which is being waged. I would like the Minister to inform the House as to how many cases of yellow fever we have had in Barbados within the last fifty-three years; I would like him to tell us that. There is no point in talking about the wiping out pockets of resistance as if we are dealing with Public Enemy No. 1. I feel sure that if there were any such enemy, it would be the Minister himself. What about the cockroaches we have in Barbados and the rats at the Hospital? Are we going to fight invisible enemies? I would like the Minister to satisfy the taxpayers of this island that there is no waste of their money in fighting an enemy which does not exist. I repeat the question, Mr. Chairman, how many cases of yellow fever we have had in the last fifty three years.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I attempted to answer the question asked by the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the question asked by the hon. junior member for St. John is somewhat supplementary to that of the hon. junior member for Christ Church. The hon. junior member for St. John is evidently asking a question. Whether the records are available or not, that would entail some time. If the hon. member is serious about it, the most I can promise him is that we will get that information from the records for him, but, as I say, it will involve some time. It would be somewhat embarrassing to ask the Minister to tell you off-hand what is the number of cases of yellow fever we have had for the past fifty three years, as a result of the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquito.
12.35 p.m.

I do not think there is anyone alive who would expect that question to be answered. However, I will promise the hon. member to get the information for him.

In replying to the question asked by the hon. member for Christ Church, at the moment Government have cleared a number of areas of this mosquito, but now and again and every once in a while when we run into the rainy season, you will have flares-up here and there. This work is carried out by the Public Health Department, and it was discovered after investigations were made in St. Michael and Christ Church that there were a number of buildings with enclosed gutters under the roof where it was difficult to get at and fight this mosquito. The staff at the Health Centre reached the stage where it was impossible to carry out the work, and quite recently the City Council made arrangements where it supplemented the staff with Inspectors to carry on the fight against this mosquito in Christ Church and in St. Michael. That is the most I can say, and if you need more statistics, they are all available and I will get them for you; but to ask me from the floor of Parliament for such details is asking the impossible.

The figures will show that in St. Lucy it would be down to zero and negative for three or four months, and three months later there would be flares in other spots.

We can justify this trouble and from a number of talks with the Director of Medical Services, they are now enjoying full cooperation from the City Council where they are sending teams of Sanitary Inspectors and Public Health Inspectors together to fight against the mosquito. I hope, Sir, that I have answered all the questions.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I realise that to ask the Minister of Social Services about something which is germane to the expenditure of this sum of money is what I can only describe as a hipshot campaign tilting at the windmills. I will ask him an easier question, and it is if there has been a single case - he says the incidence fluctuates in areas like St. Lucy during a period of three months - of yellow fever in Barbados for the five years immediately preceding the inception of this campaign. That should be an easy question for him to answer.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I have no difficulty in answering any question which the hon. member wants to ask. There is a slight twist in the statement. I was answering the question of the hon. member for Christ Church when I said that the incidence of the mosquito differs in Christ Church and St. Lucy. He is treating the incidence of the disease in the area of a single case, but we were discussing the flare-up here and there of the mosquito, and not the incidence of the disease. I hope again that I have answered his question which is by no means a simple one.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, if you will give me a chance, I understand that the flare up and the incidence related to the mosquito, and I would like to ask the Minister another simple question. Does he or either one of the District Councils carry out a mosquito count? I asked the Hon. Premier this some time ago. Does he carry out an actual count of the number of mosquitoes so that he can tell whether there is a flare-up? If there are no reports of yellow fever cases, how can the Minister say there is a flare-up? Do they have people going around counting the numbers of mosquitoes that inhabit a particular district or parish? I do not see anything difficult in his answering a simple question. You are asking the taxpayers to spend money on the Yellow Fever Campaign, but I know as a positive fact that even at a high level as the World Health Organisation this particular campaign is now regarded as a joke, to put it in plain language. I am not going to call any names, but I am stating that as a fact a leading West Indian Medical authority regards this as more than a joke, and I am merely asking the Minister to justify something that I asked him at the time when the campaign was started. As a matter of fact, I think it was the Hon. Premier who was then in charge of the portfolio, and the question was put to him of how many reports did they have of yellow fever cases for the five years immediately preceding the inception of this campaign and how many reports after. Is he in a position to say there was a single report?

Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the Minister means by flares-up of mosquitoes. Naturally in a rainy season we all know you get mosquitoes, but you do not get the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquitoes just because the rain is falling, because if the Minister had any sense he would realise that the term "*Aedes Egypti*" applies to the domestic kind which inhabit houses instead of ponds like the malaria kind. I am not a medical expert but I understand a little elementary Latin. It may sound frivolous, Mr. Chairman, for me to be asking questions as simple as that. The sum of money at the moment may not be great, but you are asking for money to spend in people driving around with butterfly nets and bags of powder all over the country at the taxpayers' expense. There are rats in the Hospital and cockroaches in every household in Barbados, and I have not heard the Minister of Social Services make any statement about approaching the World Health Organisation or any other Organisation to try to do something about cockroaches in Barbados that crawl over people's food and spread disease. We know about the epidemics which can occur and the different types of plagues, but what yellow fever is he talking about? Because yellow fever is in Timbuctu, does it mean that we must spend money in Barbados? I am not

saying that preventive measures are not better than curative measures. For instance there is a type of monkey in Trinidad which spreads some kind of disease. As a matter of fact, I think that they are associated in some way with yellow fever too. Because they are destroying the monkeys in Trinidad, does it mean that we must destroy all the monkeys at Turners Hall Wood when there is no report that there is any outbreak or reported case of yellow fever?

Mr. Chairman, the doctor does not appear to be in the House and perhaps he is still at sea; but, Mr. Chairman, does it mean that because somebody is carrying out a campaign, let us say, in British Guiana to eradicate the Malaria mosquito that we must spend money in Barbados to carry out a similar campaign when the circumstances that circumvent the inhabitants of British Guiana are not the same which beset the citizens of Bridgetown? We must be satisfied that the money which is being spent is not being frittered away to give jobs to a few people. You cannot talk of using preventive measures, because if the things do not exist or if the imaginary peril is non-existent, what is the point of having preventive measures and sprinkling a lot of D.D. T powder all over people's houses?
12.45 p.m.

The reason why I am asking these questions is because if the Minister knew his job, it will not be difficult for him to say that we started this campaign because such and such dangers existed and we want to get rid of the mosquito problem and we want to prevent further outbreaks. But what is he preventing now? Is it a non-existent plague? It is so difficult for him as a Minister to answer questions. He should have the file before him of the incidence of yellow fever in Barbados, the different areas which are particularly susceptible to the breeding of the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquito, and if those things are not available, he should get behind the Civil Servants who are supposed to instruct him in his job. He thinks that it is beyond his pale of duty to keep hon. members informed of the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquito which has shown its success by the decline in the number of reported deaths.

Let me give you an instance, Mr. Chairman. If you are carrying out a road safety campaign and the Commissioner of Police is asking for money for that campaign, the members of the general public would normally expect the Commissioner of Police to say that there were so many accidents in 1959 and as a result of the road safety campaign, there are only so many accidents this year.

The Hon. Minister cannot even tell us whether there is one single instance of this *Aedes Aegypti* mosquito.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I thought the Hon. Minister knew more of this campaign. We have been running this campaign for three years. We thought it would have been over in two years. We knew a year ago that there were pockets of the *Aedes Aegypti* in St. Michael and parts of Christ Church. We want to know if these pockets have been eliminated or reduced. When the Hon. Minister said that there is a flare up as a result of the recent rains, I do not think that is the reason because, as the last hon. member who has spoken said, this is a house mosquito and has nothing to do with rain. If you have had a flare up in St. Lucy when you thought that area was free, that shows that you did not discover it there. You will have to go after it.

This is a regional campaign. It was started from the U.S.A. and continued right down to South America. It was in British Guiana and they have been able to eliminate it and, Mr. Chairman, you know that that is a place where there are millions of mosquitoes of all species.

What I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, is if the Hon. Minister can say that in the foreseeable future it is expected - let us say within six months - that you will have complete control of the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquito in Barbados. If he has not got that information, surely he should be able to get it because the public is concerned about it. We do not want to go on from year to year with this yellow fever campaign especially now that we are building up a

tourist industry. It is not good to the tourist industry to have plastered in the newspapers that we are spending money to get rid of yellow fever because business from overseas would think we have yellow fever here. But, of course, one case coming in can be of potential danger. This is the type of disease which we wish to eradicate; therefore, if the Hon. Minister can give us further information on the campaign as it is today, I would be grateful.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to take part in the debate but I suppose it is expected that I should. Lest there be fear that I am disagreeing with the sentiments of the Government, I will say this. I do not think the Hon. Minister is *au fait* with the circumstances surrounding this campaign against this mosquito. I have said very often over on this side that hon. members on the other side must not underestimate the intelligence of members on this side on any particular matter because there is always some hon. member who can come up to standard on matters of this sort.

I think it was a mistake for the Hon. Minister of Social Services to say that the flare up again of the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquito had to do with rains. It has nothing to do with rains. Actually, the incidence of yellow fever is very low as far as Barbados is concerned for the last few years. I, myself, as Chairman of the Public Health Committee, and before that as Chairman of the Commissioners of Health, met doctors of the World Health Organisation at the first meeting held here and because they thought that they were the know-alls, they refused to listen to advice which was put to them and, Mr. Chairman, as you know, in my usual manner, if you try to be haughty, I will tell you where you get off whether you be a doctor or somebody else. However, Sir, as soon as I had a meeting with Dr. Byer on the matter, with his usual approach and way of reasoning, we were able to get our heads together on this matter. There is no question of the flaring up of this mosquito because of rain. The incidence may be nil so far as yellow fever is concerned but you may not be aware that many professional medical men have linked the incidence of yellow fever with Denby fever, because to them the two appear to be the same. Because of the report that Denby fever may be responsible, perhaps the Hon. Minister may not be able to give the actual figures.

However, Sir, in a matter of this sort, the Hon. Minister should be able to come in with some facts, at least for the last year or two, as to what you are doing about it. I say that it is peculiar to South American countries, and with our plane traffic between Venezuela - and here I am thinking of Venezuela now - we must be prepared to do every possible thing to protect this country and eradicate the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquito which is responsible so far as science has proved for the carrying of yellow fever and what many medical people here have diagnosed as Denby fever.

I do deprecate your putting in the newspapers such a headline as "Barbados spending so much money for the eradication of yellow fever". As you know, Mr. Chairman, at one time we did have an outbreak of yellow fever here. If you go into St. Paul's Church Yard, the Cemetery or the back of the Drill Hall, you will see from tombstones that many soldiers fell victims of yellow fever around 1848. There is a building adjoining the General Hospital and some in the Upper Cheapside area where you will find people living who knew that persons had died out of those same very buildings of yellow fever. At one time even medical practitioners knew absolutely nothing of the cause of yellow fever. They did not know that the carrier of yellow fever was the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquito. They thought it was a wind-borne disease and because of that, you will find that there are a number of buildings in the Cheapside area and that one adjoining the General Hospital which were sold for next to nothing. Medical Science in its research has found that yellow fever is carried by this type of mosquito and with the traffic which we have today between Venezuela and Barbados, it is absolutely necessary that we do everything possible to eradicate as far as humanly possible this type of mosquito. You should take it in the same spirit as

when we had the malaria campaign here. Malaria was brought in from British Guiana and after you had an epidemic here you started a campaign and you eventually got rid of the disease.

12.55 p.m.

You brought in the mosquito from British Guiana by means of the schooners; you had an epidemic and you got rid of the mosquito by going into the swamps and eradicating it. However, this type of mosquito has absolutely nothing to do with the rainy weather; this is a house mosquito and we did have pockets here and there. I saw the reports of the inspectors who worked in conjunction with the youngsters appointed by the Government in the Public Health Department - those who go out spraying, and what not - and we have done everything to co-operate. The Minister should be able to come into this House and anticipate that a member of the Opposition would ask whether he could tell us if it is only in that part of Christ Church and St. Michael where you have the density of houses so great, that he is carrying on the campaign and whether he expects to get this work done within six months, or within a year or what. The Director of Medical Services should be able to give these facts and the Minister should be able to answer questions like that.

I was speaking with a medical man a short time ago and he assured me that as soon as they suspect typhoid fever they begin to use one of the anti-biotics. As soon as they suspect this disease, it is broken down and there is no question of reporting it. I repeat that we are pushing our tourist industry and when we have people coming in from Venezuela, there we have the trouble. I think that the money which we are spending is being well spent, but it is well that the Hon. Minister be able to answer questions which are asked. In my opinion, he should be able to say that we are getting on with the campaign and we want to eradicate this mosquito altogether. Whether you eradicate this mosquito this year or next year, when you have several people coming in here from Venezuela, it would pay, if you are interested in public health, to have this campaign carried on. As soon as you get through with the campaign, you carry on again in order to see that you eradicate these mosquitoes.

This Minister of Social Services has fallen into the bad habit of taking refuge - well, he has fallen into a bad habit, following one of the Ministers. It is the right of the Opposition to ask questions; it does not seem well to think that one is merely drawing a red herring across the trail when he asks questions.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this item "Eradication of yellow fever mosquito," I must say that I do not intend to oppose this vote. What I would like to see take place is a survey throughout the whole of Barbados; that is a necessary thing. We cannot wait until we see the evil and then try to get a solution so as to eradicate it. A survey is necessary before the evil appears and there are other evils which also need a survey to eradicate them. There are mosquitoes and there are also cockroaches which are an enemy to human beings and we should have a means of eradicating them. The money which is to be voted for the van is necessary because we must have a vehicle for the purpose of carrying around the people who are dealing with the campaign. However, at the end of the survey, the Minister of Social Services should have a record list so that when he comes here he would be able to give a clear record of what has taken place. Nobody could oppose this amount of money for this purpose because it is necessary. The health of the people comes first, and if we neglect health then we neglect our own lives. If a man waits until he gets sick to take a blood test, then he will be very far out to sea; he should have an examination beforehand. With those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this amount of money wholeheartedly.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, in spite of the criticism which has been made, I still think it my duty to reply to the questions asked about the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquito. Let us quickly examine the couple of questions which were asked. In the first place, I believe it would be correct to tell the Committee that if any one case of yellow fever were reported we would have to close the Port. That is not

a decision of the Government of Barbados; that is tied up with an international organisation, and the World Health Organisation. It reeks of folly to attempt to interfere with the campaign.

As far as question No. 2 is concerned, I was asked to give some idea of the figures in respect of the number of yellow fever cases over the past fifty years. What do you expect of the Government? You asked that the inspectors should inspect and round up the mosquitoes. We were told that the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquito is a house mosquito, nothing at all to do with the rainfall. The hon. senior member for the City has said that in order to hatch a mosquito from larva you must hatch him from water and this mosquito finds a natural habitat in the house. I am as interested in this matter as the Director of Medical Services and I am expected to move with him.

1.05 p.m.

We discussed all the Reports, and we are anxious for the Department. What should have been said in here from the other benches is how long ago the other Departments of Health have been supporting this campaign in fighting against the mosquito. What information am I expected to have on any file? Without any notice I am requested to give an indication of the incidence of the disease in the past fifty years.

Mr. Chairman, we have been fighting this mosquito because it is our responsibility and duty, but the argument here is that there is no question of the disease, hence let us abandon the campaign. I think I have answered all the questions, but if you need more information I will be more than happy to make it available. The hon. member for Christ Church wants to know in how many places they have flared up. We have been eradicating the mosquito in certain areas, but they flare up again and we must double our efforts and go back to these areas to fight them. I have been asked whether there was any flare-up in the St. James area and how long we have to continue this campaign. For me to tell members of Parliament how soon we will completely eradicate this mosquito is asking the very impossible. I do not believe that in medical science there is anyone alive who can tell you in a community like ours whether it will take two or three years. The most I can say in the interest of public health and medicine is that we must continue to fight this mosquito.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I will not let the Hon. Minister say something and let it go on record to the detriment of Barbados. Let him get up and say that what he has said is not true. He says that if there is one case in St. Michael we must close down the Port. If he does not say that is not true and allows the *Advocate* to publish it, it shows that the hon. member is an absolute idiot and does not know what he is talking about, and is misleading the House and the world. The hon. member knows that is not true, and he could have sat down without putting his foot into this.

I said that the hon. member who asked the question about the last fifty years did not expect the Minister to answer that. Who would expect Doctor Byer to answer that question about fifty years? You are spending funds and I can tell you now that as far as we are concerned, we have had to do certain things during certain periods, and periodical Reports state that we expect to go on for some time. I have said that because of the traffic between the mainland of South America and North America coming here, you cannot sit back and say you are finished. I have condemned the idea that you should continue to do this because you have to stop it some time and you can. We have got to carry on for a period, but to get up and say what you did is wrong and you should correct it. Both the *Advocate* and other papers carried some headlines recently which might be detrimental to the country; and to say that one case of yellow fever means that you will have to close down the Port is wrong. I challenge the hon. member to look at the Regulations which he ought to know something about. Did Trinidad close down their Port when it happened there? Do you know anything about quarantine regulations? Do not get up and mislead this House.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the flare-up of the hon. member is reducing this to what could be political strife.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is talking about political strife. Why doesn't he try to keep in a certain depth? I got up and dealt with you as a father should deal with a son when I realised you were wrong and ignorant. I was lenient with you, but you get up and put your foot into something you do not know about. I told the hon. member that he could not expect an answer to his question about fifty years, but now you get and talk about political strife. You can run the Government, Dick Brown can run the Government, but on public health nobody can be divided in running the country. What political strife are you talking about?

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I would not interrupt the hon. member even on a point of order. I do not need any help as a father or any advice. It is up to anybody to follow or understand. Is the hon. member telling us that he has the last word on public health? I would like him to tell this Chamber how many appeals were made from the Public Health Department for his support in fighting against the mosquito, and how long has his Committee granted the assistance to continue the fight. Let him say how long ago and how many requests were made to assist the Board of Health in the struggle against this mosquito and how often he has denied that help.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I object to that. Not only is he a stranger to the truth, but he is absolutely lying. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: Order). Order or no order, I am not mincing any matters; he is lying.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: That is his atmosphere and I am not going to ask him to withdraw. All I am asking him is how many times and how many appeals were made to that particular member through his Council or Vestry before they decided and how long they have decided to join with the Board of Health in the struggle against the mosquito. What authority has he got on this mosquito? The hon. member is asking about emigration regulations. If in any area in this island this yellow fever is discovered, we can shut off that area and regard it as out of bounds without affecting the Port. Let him go and check that. Yet he is talking about ignorance and folly. He is utterly unaware of the situation, and because he thinks he can shout long and hard in here and is attached to public health, he rises on several occasions. Let him get up and tell us how many times he was approached for assistance and how recent he has been working with the Director of Medical Services in the struggle against the mosquito.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member talks about the tourist trade, but that is not important. Three years ago when we were fighting the mosquito, he did nothing about it, but now he is concerned about the tourist trade and what he can do. Let him tell this House how many times he has denied requests for the Sanitary Inspectors in the parish of St. Michael to assist in the struggle against the mosquito, and let him further tell us how recent has he been assisting the Director of Medical Services in fighting against the mosquito.

1.15 p.m.

The hon. member talks about my ignorance and having no knowledge of this and what has happened recently. Let him check and come back and see if he can be influenced. He talks of my lying but there is nothing else which he can do but to lie. Let him go and search and see if he can find anywhere it is not true that you can throw our Port out of bounds. We can close our Port if there is any indication of this fever moving into the island. Let him check further. It is all well and good to get up and say that it is lies because you know that next Tuesday you will not be present when we produce the Regulations. Let the hon. senior member for the City tell me how many times he has given us help from his Council. He has denied the Board of Health any help in its fight against this mosquito.

Let him tell me of my ignorance of this mosquito. I am not a medical man. I am the Minister for Health. Are you really asking me what results this disease will have on an individual and the complications of it? I am a layman. I must abide by the advice of my Director. Do you expect me to talk of Public Health and antibiotics to the hon. senior member for the City? Do you expect me to speak with any knowledge on that matter? Do you expect me to tell him in what year and what month we can eradicate this mosquito? Let him tell us instead of evading the facts how long since he has made it possible that members of his Department could assist the Board of Health in its campaign against this mosquito.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member seems to be very proud of being Minister of Health and not to know anything about disease. It is no wonder that he is so upset today. His colleagues have recognised that he is an absolute four-flusher in the Government. I am going to answer him in this way. I just want to make this clear and I want it recorded.

At a meeting of the Public Health Committee of St. Michael, Dr. Byer reported to us that the Inspectors whom the Government had appointed - the \$12 a week boys whom they had employed to do this job - were not meeting with success with the householders. I want to show you that the Hon. Minister is an artist at prevarication. At that meeting I said to Dr. Byer - and Dr. Byer did not agree then - that if you want to get success with the householders in St. Michael, you should attach one of your Inspectors to work alongside one of the Inspectors of the Municipality because the Inspectors of the Municipality were accustomed to going into the houses of the people and they knew how to approach the people. That is on record. If the Hon. Minister can prove to the contrary, I will give up my seat. Will the Hon. Minister give up his? As I have said, Dr. Byer did not agree with my suggestion and I told him that they were not going to meet with success in that campaign by sending young boys who knock at the doors of the people and say "Let me in. I have a right to come in." I stressed that if you attach one to every Inspector of the municipality, they would be allowed to go in and make their inspections.

Two weeks passed. It is on record and I am prepared to bring that record to the House. Dr. Byer discussed it with the members of the Board of Health and they came to the conclusion that I was right and my suggestion was the one way to meet with success.

As far as the Hon. Minister is concerned, at no time did any committee or commission of the municipality refuse to work with Dr. Byer or with anybody. As a matter of fact, when Dr. Cochrane was Medical Officer for Health here he brought in officers to discuss this matter and we told a man from Jamaica that the only way in which you could succeed with this campaign was to attach one of their Inspectors, that is to say, one of the boys whom they pay \$12 a week, with one of the Inspectors of our Department so that he will be able to go along with our Inspector to inspect houses. I suggested that because the people were accustomed to our Inspectors inspecting their houses. That Officer said then that that was not the way in which they were going to do it and we said to him: "Do it your way." At no time was the suggestion made or the Commissioners of Health were asked to allow their Inspectors to do it. The Hon. Minister is very ignorant of what he is talking about. These Inspectors whom the Board of Health employ to do this work are taught what the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquito looks like and then they go around with a ladle and spray-can and they spray the inside of people's premises. They were not allowed to go into the houses in some areas mainly because some of the youngsters were rude and not tactful enough, and when Dr. Byer reported that to us, we said that we would be willing to put at their disposal our twenty-two Inspectors of the districts into which this work is carried on. Dr. Byer would say if I am lying or if I am right. As I have said, two weeks after the suggestion was made to him, Dr. Byer sent back a letter to the members of the Committee saying that they had agreed with my suggestion and that it was the only means by which they could get success in the campaign.

At no time, I repeat, did the Committee refuse to help them. The Hon. Minister is absolutely ignorant of what he is doing and all that he is doing is trying to draw red herrings across the line of everything. He said that if one case of yellow fever is found, we would have to close down the Port: I said that he was misleading the House. I told him to get up and tell the House what is the truth. He said that if we found one case, we must close down the Port. Now, he comes back and says something different and accuses me of not knowing the regulations. The Hon. Minister does not take the time to prepare himself with his experts on matters of health. He now comes and asks us if he is expected to know. If you pay a man a salary such as the one that the Hon. Minister is getting, do you not expect him to know? You pay him to tell you and we expect him to tell us. We know that his brains are just like what he has outside, that is to say, it is plastered with lard oil just as how his hair is plastered outside. The Hon. Minister is saying "Do you expect me to come in here and tell you?" Of course, we expect you to come in here and tell us something. Under our Constitution, you are the Minister. You seem to be very proud that you are the Minister of Health, and not a doctor. By what stretch of the imagination do you feel that you can be a doctor? You are the Minister of Health, and you are the Minister of Health by accident. You know it better than anybody else. You are the Minister of Health by conniving - not by choice of your ability.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I do not think in this Committee that an hon. member can tell another hon. member that he is conniving.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is a good English word. It is not unparliamentary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clerk, May I have May's?

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member will have to be on his feet; if not I will continue. I am saying that if the Hon. Premier wants to take objection to that remark --

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am drawing it to the attention of the Chair, and it is up to the Chair to take action on it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Chair cannot prevent that. That is a perfectly good parliamentary term.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will check on it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Will you check on the buses too? 1.25 p.m.

The hon. member thinks that I am a boy in the yard, but I know my way in here. The hon. member thinks he can get up and talk his dramatic nonsense. I disagreed with the hon. junior member for St. John who asked about the figures in respect of cases of yellow fever for the past fifty-three years. I castigated and showed him that he was ignorant in what he was talking. I backed the Government and I went further and asked if they did not believe it that Dr. Byer could tell them at some time: "We hope that at least within the next year or within the next six months we will be able to slow down with this campaign". The answer to that question is very simple; in Trinidad, St. Vincent and in such places the World Health Organisation started something and as soon as they eradicated this mosquito, they stopped. People asked and were told when to stop; are we going on all the time?

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister referred to the lack of co-operation of the Public Health Committee down here, I think he was absolutely wrong, because from the very inception we put our sanitary inspectors at the disposal of the Board of Health. It was done in Christ Church just as it was done here; it was only after a very long time that they refused to pay the inspectors and we thought that we would withdraw these inspectors. We continued to pay the inspectors for years and the Board did not want to give them the same conditions on which they employed their own people. When the

hon. member says that there was a lack of co-operation by the authorities down here, I repeat that that is absolutely incorrect; it was only after there was a dispute with the Board of Health that we withdrew the inspectors. At no time was there any lack of cooperation from the Vestry and then from the new set-up. The same thing happened in Christ Church. We gave the authorities the most senior people; it is not correct therefore to say that at any time we did not cooperate fully in the carrying out of this campaign. We supported it from its very inception.

Again, I would ask the Minister the question. If he had fifty persons employed at the beginning of the campaign and had less now, that would give us an idea as to how free parts of the island are from this mosquito. Are we having the same campaign throughout the island or is it confined only to St. Michael and Christ Church? That is all we want to know. Have you reduced the campaign? I am only asking for information and I think I am entitled to it. If the Minister has not got the information now, please get it for us. Are you having the same wide campaign throughout the island? After you have said that parts of this island are free for months are you continuing to spray these houses over and over again? The Minister should concentrate on these pockets where there is resistance. I should like to ask the Minister how many persons he has employed today as against the number with which he started.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I will reply to the hon. junior member for Christ Church. He is asking an entirely different question from the one which he asked at first. He wants some new information.

Mr. GODDARD: It is new information but it is not an irrelevant question. The question which I posed before was not answered and this other question is based on that. Therefore, I have put the question in greater detail; I have put it in a simpler form.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Anything which falls from the lips of the hon. member I can answer, and more often than not I anticipate his question before he opens his mouth. It does not bother anybody to anticipate the hon. member. There is no substitute for any ability when he talks loudly about making something more simple for the Minister. The hon. member wants to know whether we are continuing the island-wide campaign or not; the answer is "yes". As to the number of bodies we have been using in the campaign, we are using more than we have been using in the past campaign because more have been asked for by your establishment. The hon. member knows that what he says has absolutely no truth in it. I shall not call him a liar.

Mr. GODDARD: On a point of order. What I said I will repeat. I do not think that any person who has the facts could say that what I said is not true.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: The simple question of fact is that the campaign was started just as any other campaign with the sanitary inspectors in St. Michael, and it was not long before the fight with the *Aedes Aegypti* was regarded as the responsibility of the Government. The officers serving were paid by the Department of Government which waged this campaign against the mosquito, those officers serving as sanitary inspectors.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. That is not true.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Without exception I believe the officers should have qualified for the Department because they were first members of the Sanitary Department. The Government was expected to carry the whole load and pay all of the officers. I am thinking of those officers who served in St. Michael; However, if the hon. member wants to speak on a point of order, I will give way to him every time.

1.35 p.m.

I promise I will not interrupt him. The officers serving with the Board of Health are paid by Government. Originally this campaign was started by the Sanitary Department and the majority of the officers served with certain Medical

and Sanitary Departments. If the hon. member says that is not true, the men are alive and the Department is there. The community knows the discussions that take place in here and they know how to weigh and measure what appears to be the truth. I asked the hon. member on about four occasions whether he would tell me what year he had a meeting with the Director of Medical Services so that the public could have it, and also for the sake of the records there would be an idea as to the operation of the campaign, and how long and since when the Council has given any assistance to the campaign through the Director of Medical Services in the fight for public health. I will sit down if the hon. member will tell me in which year the Council decided to assist the Department by releasing some of its staff.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member said he would sit down if I give him some information. The Council has never released any of its staff. What is painful to me is that the Hon. Premier knows all about what I am saying and does not get up and deny what the Minister has said.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I simply asked the hon. member to refer to the meeting and tell me the year.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, we have never released any staff, but all along our staff carried out the campaign as Inspectors. This was done from the time Doctor Lampert came here, because there was serious objection by people to allowing Inspectors to spray things inside their houses; but a year or two ago when Dr. Byer said there were still pockets in St. Michael, some men were selected whom the Inspectors lectured to, and so you had a team of men, I think 48 who would help to do the spraying. When our opinion was sought at that meeting, I said that these people were finding some difficulty in the parish of St. Michael where that force was working because the householders were not cooperating, and I said that all we could do to help was to attach one man to an Inspector who had been visiting these houses for years. Dr. Byer did not agree but in two weeks' time he came back and said he agreed, and came down and lectured to the entire staff; one man that gets \$12 a week is attached to an Inspector of the Municipality. If that is what you want, that is a fact; but any member over there, unless he does not live home, knows that as soon as this campaign started householders took exception to Inspectors coming in and spraying inside their houses. I do not remember who gave the talk, but I think it was Dr. Byer or the now Premier who was Minister of Health. Now they come to St. Michael, that is what they are doing. If you want me to carry on, I can do so.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: The hon. member still did not give the year.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I said about two years ago when Dr. Byer came back and said he did not get the cooperation of householders when these boys were sent out.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Now that the hon. member has said two years ago, I think the House will have some idea as to how long we have been waiting to get assistance from the hon. member; but there have been all this bamboozling, fourflushing and twisting of the truth, and points of order. I have been discussing with the Director of Medical Services on several occasions whether to come to Parliament for legislation in this fight against people who resist the Inspectors. We have a couple of Inspectors as compared with the force of Inspectors in St. Michael in this struggle. The hon. member said there are about 48 men, but we never had that number and I do not think Parliament would permit that number. If the hon. member wants to get up on a point of order, I will sit down and will not interrupt him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not care whether or not you interrupt me. The Board of Health has eight or nine Inspectors, but you hired 48 men and lectured to them at Enmore and trained them for doing mosquito work. Your actual Public Health Centres never had such numbers, and they still carry out all the public health duties. The trouble is that you are not doing your work.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Now there is more fourflushing and bamboozling, and that is how Parliament goes. The position at the moment, Sir, is that we can only request people in the residences to permit inspectors to come in and spray the water. There are occasions when we ask the householder to lift the piano around and take pictures off the wall - they were not permitted to spray the wall - and very often mosquito larvae were discovered in the flower vase, and in a number of houses we have discovered all this owing to prejudice, fear, doubt and what not. You have a Sanitary Inspector covering the area and you expect him to cover every house maybe the same afternoon, and a member from the Board of Health is expected to go through the same house. You can come in here with all this bamboozling and talking, but we know and the community knows how to think. We have passed that stage and our community knows how to think, act and behave, and it has a way of answering these things in Parliament.

Mr. Chairman, I need not refer to the early statements which are in keeping with his manner of thinking, his general attitude, his general aptitude and his manner. That is private and personal and he can be as vulgar as he likes. There is all this talk about the Minister, but I would like to say for the first time for the sake of the records that the Premier asked me if I would serve in the Ministry, and I flatly said "no" to him because I was too tied up in my own business. (Laughter) I will come back to the question of the mosquito campaign, but I thought it necessary for me to make a statement. The Premier asked me to serve and I said "no" and gave my reason for it. The morning after, he telephoned me at my office and insisted that I should serve, so I thoroughly discussed it with my wife during that morning with the Premier still on the phone, and I told him to let me consider it during the day. When the term was expired I was in Jamaica and cabled my resignation to the Governor. When I returned to Barbados the Premier again asked me if I would take it; there was a lapse of almost five days' struggle to make up my mind before the Governor asked me to come and take the oath. The hon. member knows that I make more in my business than I do in the Ministry.

1.45 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know that.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: My business is the hard type of business. It is not the type in which you operate in an under-hand manner. It is above board. I served the Hon. Premier and he requested me to serve again. It is not a question of descending to the ugly terms used earlier here by the hon. member. It was asking too much of me and actually I had to give up a great deal of my business to serve. The Hon. Premier is in his seat. He can verify what I have said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I ask the Hon. Minister, having replied to that, to get back to the Resolution.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Sir, I do not think you will ever be able to accuse me of any indignity. But, Sir, I am dealing with mosquitoes and you must eliminate them.

The point which I want to make is that day after day we are pursuing this campaign. We must spray house after house. It is only recently that the Council has come to the assistance of the Board of Health. The hon. senior member for the City may get up on a point of order, but I will be here waiting to answer him. Two years ago, day after day, the Public Health Officers had been inspecting the houses alone in our struggle against the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquito and we have had a number of people who would not allow those inspectors to come into their houses. (A VOICE: That is not true.)

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I told the Hon. Minister just now that from the inception of this campaign not only the St. Michael's Vestry but the Vestry of Christ Church did put at the disposal of the Board of Health, inspectors whom they had selected to start the campaign. They never were withdrawn until about two years ago when they were withdrawn over some dispute and then they were reinstated.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: They became Officers of your Department without any contribution. Is that what you mean to say?

Mr. GODDARD: They have been paid by the Vestry ever since and they are still paid by the Council.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: We are dealing with the Inspectors of the Board of Health who are carrying out this campaign on the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquito. It is a Department of Government and the members of it are paid by Government. How long has the Council or the Municipality been paying even a part of the cost of the Board of Health? Is it the responsibility of the Council or the Board of Health?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am going to answer him. First of all, let me say that if I were the Hon. Premier, I would immediately after today look for a Minister of Health. I am dealing now with the Report of the Director of Medical Services and I think that this will clinch the argument once and for all as to the accusations that we did nothing at all.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Sir, I rise on a point of order. That is not true. I did not say that. I simply said that the staff was composed of the Board of Health. They were drawn from the Sanitary Inspectors. They are now operating under a Department of Government. What does the hon. senior member for the City mean when he says that they agreed to make available some members of his staff of the Board of Health?

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister should not twist what I have said. Is his mentality so warped that he has to do it? I hate to read this but I will have to do so. The Board of Health has a force of Inspectors. As a matter of fact, the Hon. Premier was a member of the Board of Health and he would correct me if I am wrong. The Board of Health supervises the entire island. When the Government wanted to carry out this campaign, they wanted to draw from us a number of Inspectors. Dr. Byer said - and this will clinch the argument once and for all - that it was not that the Inspectors whom they had appointed were not doing their work but it was that householders were not co-operating. They were not referring to the staff of Inspectors which we have. The householders told them not to come in their houses and some of them would shut their doors and tell them to come back tomorrow. When Dr. Byer told me about it, I said to him that the only way in which you could get this campaign carried out properly was to attach one of your Inspectors to one of our Inspectors. I said to him that we have divided the Municipality into twenty-two areas with an Inspector to each of those areas and he could attach one of his Inspectors to one of ours, so that at every house where our Inspector paid his visit, the Inspector of the Board of Health would accompany him, and by such means you could be sure of an inspection. Dr. Byer said at first that he did not see how that was going to work but I prevailed upon him and two weeks after I got a letter saying that the Board of Health would agree to my suggestion.

Now, Sir, this will stop the Hon. Minister's argument once and for all. Listen to what I am reading. It is from page 65 of the Annual Report of the Director of Medical Services for the year 1952-53.

Paragraph 10 deals with Mosquito Survey Work. This is what it says:-

"As in former years, this work was carried out at regular periods during each month. Included in this was also the inspection of water containers (tanks, cemented troughs and other receptacles) around plantation yards, whenever outdoor work was hampered to any extent by the inclemency of the weather.

Mosquitoes of the genus *Culex* were found breeding in general where the ponds and other collections were concerned, but occasionally *Aedes Aegypti* were encountered in collections in some of the receptacles around the various estate yards."

I will read another paragraph. It is as regards control measures. The hon. member has said that we did not co-operate. That is an absolute untruth. Dr. Byer will never tell you so. The Hon. Premier was in your position as Minister of Health and he would not say that we did not give them cooperation. He would say that they did not get the cooperation of the householders. The hon. member said that two Inspectors met at the same house. Of course, he has talked so much nonsense because he has also said that the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquito is a stagnant water mosquito. Will the Hon. Premier tell him that this campaign with the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquito has nothing to do with the yard Inspector? You must ask for cooperation because this particular mosquito breeds in houses, and in bottles in houses; and as it was not the habit of people admitting Inspectors in their houses you did not get the cooperation of the people. As you know, Sir, people leave the gates of their yards open so that the Inspectors would be able to go in; but the representations which were made were that the Inspectors of the Board of Health were not allowed to go into the houses of the people. He said that we did not co-operate. Listen to this.

"Control measures are still very limited and only in four (4) of the parishes of the Island (St Michael, St. James, St. Peter and Christ Church) has there been any semblance of regular systematic treatment of water courses and stagnant collections. In some of the other parishes, however, control work was also observed but this was generally spasmodic."

1.55 p.m.

People left their yards open for inspectors to come in. There has been in the reports that a number of houses were closed down and Dr. Byer asked to see about these houses. I have taken this stand about the removal of the pianos and the removal of receptacles, but reports came in that officers went into houses and sprayed people's pictures. People objected to that and we said that it was a matter of being polite and asking people to remove their pictures and let the officers spray the mosquitoes. I argued this with Dr. Lampert; the life of the mosquito is only for a certain time and if you say that two inspectors went to a house at the same time, what is wrong with that? If you had a sanitary inspector inspecting tanks on a particular day and a Board of Health Inspector inspecting the same area and the two inspectors happen to meet there, what is wrong with that? As a matter of fact, it was a good thing. We have had three inspectors meeting in a particular house on one day. If we have the Inspector of the Commissioners of Health and the Inspector of the Board of Health operating on the same day, that shows that you have to lay out the duties.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: All the letters from 1953 indicate that departments were neglected. I said that the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquito finds a natural habitat in the house; I am happy to see, however, that this co-operation which the hon. member is promising from the City has come about in two years.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have not said that. I cannot allow any warped mentality to twist anything I said in this House, whether it is 2 o'clock or 3 o'clock. I have not said anything about our promising this cooperation in two years.

At this stage, it being 2.00 p.m. of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

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

This sitting now stands suspended.

On reassembling

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to inform hon. members that they need not wait to hear the bell rung because electricians are working on this building and hon. members will not hear the bell. Therefore, after any break, hon. members may get back here as quickly as possible after the statutory time. It is now Question Time.

Question Time was called.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no Questions ready to be dealt with, the House will proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business.

Order No. 1 was called.

ORDER POSTPONED

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that Order No. 2 under Private Members' Business, which is also an Order standing in my name, and as far as I know is non-controversial, be proceeded with before the resumption of the first Order. There was a similar precedent created about two weeks ago in connection with the Bill dealing with the United Holy Church of America, which was successfully piloted through by the hon. junior member for St. Michael. That Bill was similarly placed on the Order Paper to that which is now before us - a Bill dealing with the composition of the Presentation Brothers.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to proceed with Order No. 2 standing in his name as the first Order of the day, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted the hon. member. (After a pause.) There being no objection, leave is granted.

PRESENTATION BROTHERS INCORPORATION BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the day under Private Members' Business therefore stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy: - To move the third reading of a Bill to incorporate the Trustees of the Congregation of the Presentation Brothers in the island of Barbados.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, in moving the third reading of this Bill which I now formally do, I will remind the Chamber - and in fact before I make the motion - that as Your Honour is aware, a Select Committee was appointed to consider and report on the Bill. The Report is to the effect that the Select Committee held two meetings and very carefully considered the various Clauses of the Bill. The Report has been presented and circulated to hon. members and I think it will be in order if I now beg formally to move the adoption of this Report.

There are one or two amendments made. For instance, in respect of Clause 2 line 4 it is proposed to delete the word "such" and the words "as aforesaid" and to insert the words, so as to remove any possible ambiguity, "of the Congregation of the Presentation Brothers in Barbados" in place of the words "as aforesaid".

2.35 p.m.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, in respect of Clause 2, it is proposed entirely to delete the last paragraph beginning from the words "Such Seal", the reason being, Mr. Speaker, that that sentence which appears on page 3 which was originally inserted by the firm of Solicitors who drafted the Bill was taken from a similar Bill in connection with the Presentation Brothers of Trinidad, and they were more or less copying from the Trinidad Ordinance. In Bills of a similar kind in this island, it is unusual to insert such a Clause, and the Committee decided to follow the local pattern of legislation as distinct from the Trinidad Ordinance, and we recommended the abolition of that sentence commencing with "Such Seal". This reads "Such Seal shall only be used in the presence of at least two of the Trustees and shall not be changed except by a resolution of the Trustees at a meeting held for that purpose." The Committee which as you know, Sir, is an all-Parties Committee, saw no need to include that and put that unnecessary and novel restriction so far as Barbados is concerned in this particular Bill, and that is why we proposed in our Report to delete the last paragraph in Clause 2.

Well then, Mr. Speaker, in respect of Clause 3 whether through a Clerical, a Solicitor's or what sort of error, the word "schedule" was referred to with a common "s" and the only amendment we proposed in respect of Clause 3 is that wherever the common "s" appears,

and it does so appear in lines 2, 3 and 4 of the same paragraph, a Capital "S" be substituted for a common "s".

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in Clause 6 we propose that there be inserted immediately after the words "borrow money and" in line 4 the words "to repay the same" and to delete the words "for the repayment of the same" which are in lines 4 and 5 of Clause 6 and insert the word "and" in place of that. Further, Mr. Speaker, to delete the word "or" at the end of line 7 of this said Clause and substitute the word "and" and to add at the end of Clause 6 the words "in exercise of their powers under this Act."

We feel that a necessary improvement has been effected in respect of this Bill and that the Committee's labours will not have been in vain. You know, Sir, that *a propos* of the inclusion of the words "to repay the same", the Committee of the House had in mind the incident of the neighbouring island of Trinidad in which a certain Board, I think the Trinidad Electricity Board, was discovered by that distinguished West Indian lawyer, Sir Courtenay Hannays, to have to borrow money, but there was no corresponding power to repay it, but out of an abundance of caution, *ex abundante cautela*, this Committee decided to insert these words after "borrow money and" so that it will now read "from time to time to borrow money and to repay the same".

It would be up to anybody who had money to lend, Mr. Speaker, to satisfy himself that the person who had power to borrow has power also to repay, but just to protect the unaware money-lender, if there is such a thing, we decided we would recommend the insertion of these words. As a result of careful deliberation and the unstinted help of the Clerk and Deputy Clerk on the two occasions we met, this Report is presented and I beg with this explanation, more than which I think is unnecessary, formally to move the adoption of the Report of this Select Committee.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION re LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, we now revert to what appears on the Order Paper as No 1. Mr. Speaker, for the past two Tuesdays I have been discussing this motion in connection with the Transport Board, and at the last meeting I was about to finalise my comments on public passenger transport particularly *a propos* to the Hon. Minister's Statement of Government policy on the future of the transport services of this island. I think that my comments on that particular aspect might well be finalised by saying that it is the view of the Official Opposition that nothing less than the appointment of a Commission headed by a Judicial Officer would serve to reassure the public minds in connection with the running of the Transport Board and, in fact, public passenger transport generally in this island. That is what we recommend and that is how I summarise the view of the Official Opposition in respect of the present transport economic chaos with which the Government transport services are now faced and have been since the inception of the Transport Board in this island. Such a Commission, Mr. Speaker, it is envisaged would have power to con-

sider the administration of the Board; firstly its constitution and whether the persons who constitute the Board are fit and competent in each and every instance to direct the transport services and to formulate policy.
2.45 p.m.

I said last Tuesday, Mr. Speaker, that there has been a great improvement recently in the personnel. When the Board was originally appointed, there were one or two persons who, one observed, were on that Board when one could not possibly, no matter how intensely one investigated their past, discover the reason or the justification, except for political reasons, for the appointment of such a Board of such individuals. There has been a marked improvement in the method of selection to the Directorate of that Board.

Mr. Speaker, we have always contended that this Board should be comprised of persons who are knowledgeable in transport matters irrespective of political affiliation, irrespective of colour or any other matter which was obviously irrelevant, but purely of people who knew something of the subject and whom the public have confidence in and full belief; people who possess the knowledge of the subject with which they were dealing, because, bear in mind, we are dealing with a matter which is costing the island millions of dollars. It is a matter which should not be entrusted to political stooges of any Party. This is a matter for which the best brains, the most intellectual minds of the island, should be harnessed not only for money to be spent to the best advantage, but - what is more important - so that the public acquire first-class passenger transport service.

So far as we are concerned, we are not for one moment suggesting that a service of this kind should be run with the view of making money. Public passenger transport service should never be regarded as a money making service. The whole idea of it is to enable people who do not have their own private vehicles to get to their work and their play at the most reasonable cost and with the punctuality which is so necessary, certainly so far as getting to work is concerned.

I may say this is not only from my personal observation but from the testimony of numerous persons who have to travel by buses of the Transport Board that that punctuality has never been the concern of that Board. If it has been, it is purely academic but never practicable. These are the bugbears of the service. The drivers and the conductors are prepared to move out the buses on time. And I may say here now that they are the most deserving and meritorious servants of this Board. When money disappears, the public is allowed to believe that it is the Conductors. If it is, it is to an infinitesimal extent. Where it goes is to one of the numerous persons in the offices. After all, that is not surprising, because the people whose offices are run without such a multiplicity of Clerks, are the private concessionaires who are still being held high above water. Of course, they do not employ so many Clerks and none of them are in politics. They are only concerned in getting their work done with only as many people as are necessary to do the work, and not one more person; therefore, the money to Mr. Alleyne, Mr. Birch, Mr. Trotman and Mr. Coward does not have to pass through fifty hands before the last bit of it reaches the person to whose hand it should go. But with the Transport Board, when the conductor carries in the money to the office, that is where the juggling of the funds starts. The conductor hands in the money in no less a way than he would hand it in if he were driving the bus of a Private Concessionaire, but when he hands it in to the office of the Transport Board, it goes through one hand, through a clutching hand and finally, so little of it reaches the safe or the till of the Transport Board that it bears small resemblance to that which was conducted by and handed in by the conductor at the end of his day's work.

So Sir, the Commission I have mentioned is one to which a judicial official must be appointed, and without

which there is no hope of getting a properly run Transport Board in this island. But it must not be a white-washing Commission; it must not be a Commission in which white lime is the principle substance employed. It must be a Commission headed by a competent, fearless, may I contend, a highly placed and highly respected judicial official of the community who would take evidence in the searching intensive manner to which he would be accustomed in the Courts of Law and he must be assisted by an Accountant - I would say by a Chartered Accountant - in his deliberations and the third person should be one who has a first-class, intimate knowledge of transport matters. That is the sort of Commission which we see is absolutely necessary in the present state of our transport problems.

We have talked about overloading buses, but you have not given the real reason for the unpunctuality of the buses. As I was saying, the drivers and conductors are there on time to move out the buses; but as soon as a bus is due to leave with the driver and the conductor in their places, along comes an Inspector and says to them: "No, you are not taking this bus out now; this bus must go back into the yard." The people who are in it are either driven into the yard with the bus or they might have to get out and wait until the Inspector chooses another bus for them. Something may be wrong with that bus which is to come or perhaps another Inspector may see fit to countermand that order and he may say that that bus is not going to the Alexandra School - let us say that that is the place where it is to go - and then another bus must go out to take the place of that bus. So, Sir, you can very well see that if they are not driven in the yard, you have to wait until another bus appears on the scene. Too many cooks spoil the broth and too many Inspectors, too many Clerks, too many bosses and one or two highly salaried officers sitting right in the background like Field Marshals are responsible for the complete chaos which is up to today to be observed in connection with the management of public transport in this island. This unpunctuality is due to the fact that there are so many people directing and misdirecting the drivers and conductors. When buses are to leave where they are to go on their destination, these people other than the driver and the conductor are making them turn back and are calling them back and things of that kind; therefore, there can be no schedule. There is no clear directive as to who is to go where and when and with what. There are too many straw bosses, and the worst bosses in the world are straw bosses and that Transport Board is full of them.

Of course, the former General Manager was the typical type of official one would expect to come out to Barbados for a job such as this. He was a man who was obviously well informed of the healthy, good climate of Barbados and of what a wonderful little island it was, how recuperative was the climate of Barbados and he would have been told that he as General Manager with the superb salary which that particular layman was in receipt of in this island, would be able to spend his time here in the best way possible and no doubt he and his family may have been benefited from their contact with Barbados and their state of health must have been improved.

2.55 p.m.

There is no question about it that the Transport Board does nothing except with the knowledge, concurrence, approval and sanction beforehand of the Minister of Transport. It would be interesting if he were to attempt to deny that. I congratulate that Minister on the fact that in his absence on many occasions from this Chamber particularly during this debate, he has had the good fortune to have that most careful of all Ministers, with the possible exception of the Leader of the House - I always render to Caesar the things which are Caesar's - to make a careful note of what I am saying. I am speaking of the actual Ministers, not those who are calling for a reshuffle; so that when the Minister of Communications returns, if he returns, if only to hand in his resignation, he would be properly informed even before Hansard appears, by his colleague, the respected Minister of Education, of what has taken place.

Mr. Speaker, when this Commission is appointed as we recommend, they will not only consider the question of the composition of the Transport Board, but also that of the inside staff, the clerical staff of the Board, the actual functioning of the inspectors and the question as to who has the power to override the instruction of somebody else perhaps as to the running of a bus, the carrying back in the yard of a unit and things of that kind. Then they should also have power to recommend, in respect of certain routes which are not covered, that a service should be supplied to such routes. Then there are those who come to my knowledge - the transport workers, conductors and drivers being summarily laid off and during the period for which they are laid off they are not being paid for those days. That is a matter in connection with which such a Commission could make a recommendation that no man should be laid off except the Union, assuming that he is a Union man, is called into the matter and the Union Official should consult with the appropriate official of the Department as to whether this laying off is proper or not. It is not good enough for a worker to be laid off and he does not know when he will receive a pay cheque again.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will find me in agreement with him but I do not think it is very pertinent to the motion.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, one is always gratified and assisted on the occasions when Your Honour interposes; but I only had in mind the statement as to the Government's policy on the future of the Transport Service of the island and particularly when it refers in paragraph 2 to good management/employee relationships and the co-operation of the workers and the public. It is only for that reason that I referred to that matter knowing that you, with your vigilant eye, would see that I did not overstep the mark. Before I diverted to the matter of the Workers' Union I had made the point that in order to ensure that as to what the Hon. Minister states he has in mind as to the continuation of the present transport service or its expansion into an integrated all-island service depending in large part on the following:-(a) adequate management, (b) possibility of raising finance (c) good management/employee relationships and (d) the cooperation of the workers and the public, there should be no rough-and-ready policy in dealing with employees if you are looking forward to good management/employee relationships. With good management there should be no willy-nilly laying off of people when some officer gets in a fit of temper and says: "You can go until I send for you." During that time, what about the dependants of a worker when he has no weekly pay packet? However, it is not necessary for me to proceed in any greater detail along these lines. I am only explaining that we advocate not merely the appointment of a Commission with limited powers, but a Commission with comprehensive powers to go into the present public passenger transport service with reference to the running of the Transport Board, headed by a competent judge or ex-judge, a Commission with almost unlimited terms of reference in so far as matters of transport are concerned.

3.05 p.m.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, there is one aspect upon which I have not yet touched of the Minister's Statement with which I do not propose to deal in any great detail, but that is paragraph 4 of that belated document, the document which as I reminded this Chamber before was laid in this House on the 16th of last month after this Resolution of No Confidence had been given notice of on the 24th of the month before that. If this motion has achieved nothing better than a drawing out of the Minister into making a Statement, it has achieved something which is worthwhile. By that I mean the fact of making the statement, not the statement itself, because one would read and re-read this page of print without finding any information or any ray of hope that may possibly be gathered from it as to the future of public passenger transport in this island.

Specifically to revert as I just intimated to paragraph 4 Mr. Speaker, which states that there is no justification

for the provision of high speed roads in Barbados, where the saving of five minutes on a half hour's journey cannot be multiplied many times, with that statement of the Minister there is not the slightest disagreement on the part of the Official Opposition, and it is a pity that outstanding people in this island who drive their own cars - I am not saying especially Ministers or even Police Inspectors, but it is a pity that people as a whole in this island in the class to which there is a tendency to look for an example would not bear in mind that there is no justification for the provision of high speed roads where the saving of five minutes on a half hour's journey cannot be multiplied many times. So there is a promise in paragraph 4 that the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act 1937 would be amended to provide for various things especially the limits on the size and weight of all classes of vehicles. Of course, what we are up against in respect of sub-paragraph (iv) of paragraph 4 may be rather late in the day because we have now vehicles in this island, the Leylands and the Mercedes Benz, the Chevrolets and Studebakers - I think I have seen one of them used by a local Minister, which is to me of a size and weight which might well have been prohibited coming in to this island. After all what a Minister can do, a lay reader should be allowed to do, and we do see these very large, luxurious and extravagantly priced cars used by people of course who can afford them, but whom the present Government might feel very diffident of offending by calling on them to take such vehicles off the road, and in respect of the particular type of bus with its size instead of having an upstairs bus. Of course I know what may be said about them - the question of overhanging trees and telephone and electric wires. That is a matter which may be overlooked but the size of these buses from the standpoint of their width do not fit in with the average width of the roads of this island. When two of these large buses meet on the average road in this island, the whole road is closed to traffic, and especially when the buses are going in opposite directions and a driver of one begins a short conversation with the driver of the other, and

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, did the hon. member say that the trees overhang the buses but you can overlook the trees?

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I hope I did not use the word "overhang". I know what it is, Mr. Speaker; the Minister wants us to realise that he has now arrived in the House, so we take due notice; but the interest of the Minister is being well looked after by the Minister of Education, and also by a possible future Minister in the event of any reshuffle taking place. Unfortunately I do not think it would be my friend the hon. junior member for St. Michael, (*Laughter*), yet I am not giving up hope. Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's.

In respect, Mr. Speaker, of the more stringent road regulations, and in respect of heavier penalties for speeding and dangerous driving of which this Statement speaks, I understand from certain people who have driven certain of these buses, in particular the Mercedes Benz, that it is almost impossible to drive them within the local speed limit of this island in high gear. I would be glad to hear when the Minister replies whether he has been similarly informed or has information along the same lines, because these German buses are built for travelling for hundreds of miles; they do not make stoppages every forty yards or so. They are built to carry people from one end of Germany to another - West to East and South to North - from Hamburg to Berlin, and it is very difficult if not impossible, in the high gear to maintain a speed within the speed limit of the island. I have been told by members of the local constabulary, when these buses first started on the road and they saw how they were travelling, that they began to follow them and to report; but when they satisfied themselves that such reports would be unfair, unjust and unreasonable and that the buses were not built to travel at the maximum speed allowed by the Laws of Barbados as distinct from the Laws of Germany, they ceased to take any more cognisance of the rate at which they travelled along the roads unless they appeared to be travelling at an absolutely excessive and ridiculous rate.

In considering further paragraph 4 of the Statement, Mr. Speaker, I must say that not only did the tabling of the recent motion result, however much it may be denied, in the laying of this Statement, but it also resulted in the Government Information Officer busying himself over Rediffusion one night in expounding the policy of this Minister and thereby exposing the lack of policy of this Ministry in connection with the transport service of the Island.

3.15 p.m.

So paragraph 6 of Section 4 speaks of additional Police powers for the enforcement of the regulations including up-to-date methods of driver testing, both initially and, if necessary at more frequent intervals and for on-the-spot road checks for alcohol consumption where suspected.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member has referred to a statement by the Information Officer on a Statement on Government's policy. Is the hon. member aware that the statement included a Statement of Policy to this effect that vehicles commonly known as pickups would be allowed to operate as goods vehicles? Is he also aware of the Act passed by this House in 1955 by which these vehicles do or should operate as goods vehicles though not as passenger carrying vehicles?

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I always appreciate your latitude even if it given to hon. members on the opposite side, because fairplay characterises the good working of a democratic Parliament. However, I never realised that a point of order consists of two questions as have been the case with the point of order by the Hon. Minister, and what is more, none of those questions had anything to do with the statement which I was making at the time. I was dealing with Paragraph 6 of Section 4 of a Statement of Government's Policy on the future of the Transport service of the Island. I did not know when one becomes a Minister without a dog collar that one must of necessity lose complete touch with the people in the island and the movement and the suffering of poor people of this colony.

Mr. Speaker, fancy anyone suggesting because he is right on the top story of the building known as Adam's Castle and looking at the Caribbean and not at the teeming mass of poor people that the reason why they allow you to renew your permit is because you would put luggage in a pickup and do your travelling elsewhere. The whole idea of your carrying luggage in a pickup is that when you are travelling, at the end of your journey, you will have the luggage with you. It is like my putting money in the bank. Imagine someone from St. Lucy without adequate comprehensive insurance putting money in their luggage in a pickup and then travelling by something else. Who is to keep watch on the luggage?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Is the hon. member trying to imply that there is some provision under the Act or some new policy of the Government whereby these vehicles will not be allowed to carry people who own the goods? May I say that that is not so.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has not said so. He has not implied so - at least, not yet.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I understand him to imply that when he said: "How do we expect...."

Mr. SPEAKER: That was in reply to you. What he said was that the Hon. Minister actually did not make a point of order; he got up and asked questions and it was from one of them that the hon. member made certain inferences. He has not implied anything yet.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If he infers that that is the present situation today, that is the wrong inference. The point of order is that this House has passed regulations by which these vehicles are to operate as goods vehicles.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order; that is a point of explanation.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Well, Sir, I rose on a point of explanation. In all this there is a lot of propaganda. The hon. member knows it. He was in Court on one occasion when some person was charged and he once argued about this.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that applies to this case.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I will depart from that. I will say that since 1955 the regulations prohibited vehicles known as pickups from carrying passengers in the sense that the passengers are paying passengers. They are not supposed to pay as passengers; they pay for carrying their goods. These vehicles are in fact goods vehicles and we give them permission to say that so many people are to accompany their goods on that vehicle.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister has all of my sympathy. I can appreciate the reasons for his "jitteriness", but I am looking forward to his explaining to us, whether he chooses to do so by a point of order or a point of explanation, or when the time comes for him to speak, the reasons for the circular letter which went out to these pick-up owners saying that the permits in respect of which they were asking to be renewed would not be renewed after the 31st of July this year.

Mr. Speaker, you will remember how that legislation of 1955 of which I spoke and which I re-read in this Chamber a fortnight ago, when it was first before the House, was passed in the teeth of unrelenting opposition by my friends on this side.

Sir, there only remains for me to refer again to paragraph 6 of Section 4 which deals with additional Police powers for the enforcement of the Regulations including up-to-date methods of driver testing both initially and, if necessary, at more frequent intervals and for on-the-spot road tests for alcohol consumption where suspected. I wonder if that is to be taken that there is intention of having people, who have already been given drivers' licenses, retested either as to ascertaining whether they still retain their driving skill because of advancing years or whether it is for reasons of testing their knowledge about the newly restricted areas and things of that kind. I wonder if it is a theoretical or practical test? This paragraph speaks of additional Police powers which may well be powers to call them in for a test after so many years in order to satisfy the Police that after those years, that person is fit to drive.

3.25 p.m.

Such a test one would not have any objection to; but naturally, the person who is testing the eyesight must be provided by the Government, and the test, so far as the driver is concerned, should be obtainable free of charge. I am interested in what is contemplated - and no doubt we will know more about it when this amending Bill comes down - in relation to on-the-spot road checks for alcoholic consumption. After this Statement was published I heard a dealer in alcohol goods say that as soon as this amending Act is on the Statute Book, he expects greater consumption of the beverage known as Vodka from his store, because this is one beverage which, according to him, leaves no smell or any suggestion that the person who has taken it has been imbibing any sort of alcohol at all. It is the only form of alcohol which leaves no trace of any kind whatsoever on the breath of the user. However, that is on the lighter side of the matter; but as to these on-the-spot road checks, in the absence of medical opinion, they might well be very, very dangerous and might lead to serious miscarriages of justice. As it is, you would have to consider, if such things were really to be taking place, that they might well lead to an increase in the number of magistrates and the introduction of a certain number of Traffic Courts to deal with traffic cases, at least as many as they are councils in the island, one for the North, one for the South and one for the Metropolitan area, because the number of such cases would obviously create an intolerable burden on the present existing system of summary courts in this island.

As you know, Sir, it is difficult now, if not impossible, to have the present courts adequately staffed

by people within the age limit and by people who have the legal qualifications. One hears rumours of elderly gentlemen from B.G. or somebody from St. Vincent being brought in, in order to ensure that the courts will be adequately staffed in view of the promotion and resignation of members who have been holding on for so long, and holding very well, the positions in this island of magisterial posts. If you introduce these tests for alcoholic consumption, if you introduce these road regulations, let the Minister for Justice realise what the Minister of Communications is putting him in for. He is putting him in for at least three more Traffic Courts in the Metropolitan, Northern and Southern areas in order to deal with traffic cases. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: More work for lawyers.)

I think I have dealt with the main aspects of the policy and have set out the views of the Official Opposition in respect of what should be done in order to ameliorate the existing conditions in respect of public passenger transport. In other words, we have presented the case to the Minister of Communications; we have given him sound, reliable advice. He can accept it possibly in gratitude and adopt it as his own idea and baby; if it is put into effect we do not mind. Let there be, as a result of this motion, an improved state of public passenger transport on the one hand, and on the other hand, the Director of Highways and Transport's directive be postponed for at least twelve months; in respect of the buses, let a Commission be appointed along the lines which I have suggested.

That is the main burden of this motion of censure; it is the reason for our taking the step we did in bringing this matter before Parliament in the strongest and most decisive manner possible under the Constitution which we now have. It is a good thing, Mr. Speaker, that we have our Parliament, that we have our system, our Standing Orders and our Rules so that we can bring a matter like this, such a burning, vexed question in this whole community in the constitutional manner such as we have done before this Chamber. Let it be perfectly plain that there is no question of any compromise. We have introduced this debate in the only manner in which a Parliament can show how strongly it feels about the running of a particular Ministry, that is, by a motion such as this, a motion of "No confidence". It may well be that the Hon. Minister feels that it should not be a question of dealing with him first, but that it should be a question of another Minister. (Laughter)

The rest of the motion deals with one or two other matters. As to Seawell Airport, what is disturbing our minds is the fact that we have been informed that there is a list, an exclusive list, of persons who are allowed with Government's approval and sanction to go from the terminal building to the plane which has just arrived or is about to depart.

3.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, only those persons may, with the sanction of the Cabinet and the Minister, go to see a friend or a relative off or to receive an incoming relative or friend between the terminal building and the aeroplane. If that is so, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad if the hon. member would confirm that what we have heard is correct. If it is not so, I look forward to him saying in absolutely unconditional and unreserved terms that there is no such list; it is simply a matter for the discretion of the Director of Civil Aviation or the person under him at the Airport to give permission. Mr. X may go and see his daughter off or Mrs. Y may go to meet her husband coming on a plane, and we would just look forward to having some information on that.

Rumours are very strong. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it has gone as far as this; we understand that a member of Parliament, of the elected branch, on one occasion went from the building to the plane in order to see a child off with the permission of the Manager of that particular airline, whether it was Pan American, British West Indies Airways, or Venezuela Airlines. I understand that after that incident happened legal advice was sought as to whether a prosecution might have been

successfully initiated against the member of Parliament for walking from the terminal building to the particular plane with the permission of the Manager of the particular airline. What we object to, Mr. Speaker, if that should be true, is the fact that there should be no such exclusive list in a democratic community; all or none. Either anybody with the permission of the Manager may go - black, green, white or yellow - or anybody, irrespective of colour, race, creed, religion or high status - Ministerial status, judicial status or any other kind of status. I would allow one exception, Mr. Speaker, in the case of the Representative of Her Majesty the Queen because we are of the British Commonwealth of Nations; that is still a fact and we owe our respect to the Head of that Commonwealth. Even in the Republic of India, the Head of the Commonwealth to which India still belongs has been invited to pay an official state visit to that country early next year; but apart from the Representative of the Queen no person in my submission should be permitted or should have his or her name inserted on a list of persons who along with Government's concurrence may travel from the terminal building to the plane when the vast majority of Her Majesty's humble and particularly coloured subjects in this Island would not be permitted so to travel even with the consent of the Manager of the particular plane because of the existence of this list, if there be such a list.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want the hon. member to get it perfectly clear and I want to understand what the hon. member means without a shadow of a doubt. The hon. member is saying that with the exception of the Head of the Administration, to wit, His Excellency the Governor, there.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been told that the Reporter is having some difficulty in hearing the hon. member who is speaking; so if hon. members who are in conversation would speak in lower tones, I think that would be appreciated by the Reporter.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is saying that with the exception of the Head of the Administration or His Excellency the Governor or whatever you might care to call him, no other member of the Government or no other person should be allowed on any occasion or for any reason whatever to go from the terminal building to the plane. Is that what the hon. member is saying?

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I am saying that if there is to be a veto on certain persons as against certain other persons walking, with the permission of the Manager of the particular airline to which the waiting plane is connected, to meet a child or a husband or wife as the case may be, that veto should extend to everybody. There should be no discrimination of any class or kind whatsoever with the one exception, if there is going to be a veto, of either the Head or the Representative of the Head of the Commonwealth of Nations to which we still happen to belong. I do not favour a veto at all; but if there is going to be a veto, there should not be a dozen selected exclusive, preferred individuals; whether it be the caterer of this House or a Minister of this House it does not matter. There should be no class discrimination exercised as a matter of Government policy in respect of a taxpayer's airport. Just as the one person who in this Chamber we respect, not only because we must, but we do it even if we did not have to, is Mr. Speaker, so also when we are dealing in the outside of Parliament, the one person who so long as we are in the Commonwealth we must respect and put on a higher plane - not Ministers because they come and go, they resign or they do not resign, they are reshuffled or they are not reshuffled - is the Representative of the Head of the Commonwealth, who is entitled to be placed in a different category; but otherwise no list of twelve persons, six Ministers with portfolio, one Minister without portfolio, one Chief Justice, one caterer of Parliament and so on, could never be justified in a democratic age.

I have nothing personal against any of the individuals, but it is just a principle. If one caterer, why not another

caterer? If one Minister, why not another Minister, a real Minister with a genuine capital "M", a Minister who has really studied for the Ministry and who is really fit for a Ministry? There should be no such list at all; but if there is going to be a veto it should be on everybody except the Head of the Commonwealth or the Queen's Representative. Of course, one does not hear *so to voce* remarks although they are more audible than many speeches, but Heads of Commonwealth only change on death and abdication, and of course in Republican countries it is still death, but it is a shorter death than we are accustomed to in the type of community which we still feel we are blessed to be living in.

3.45 p.m.

Certainly, the Ministers should feel that they are blessed in living in a community of this kind.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there is Clause (c) "generally". I leave that in my motion for any matter which has not been specifically dealt with. That can include general inspection, passenger transport, taxis and other vehicles which have to be inspected before they are re-licensed. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a tremendous bottle-neck at the Highways and Transport in respect of inspection of vehicles, and many vehicle owners or drivers are liable to be charged for having their vehicles on the roads without their licences renewed because there is not the opportunity of having their vehicles inspected. The Licensing Authority does not renew the licence unless he is satisfied that the vehicles have been inspected. That is so far as owners of vehicles are subject to added inspection are concerned.

The answer to that is simple. Increase the number of Inspectors of the Department of Highways and Transport. Invite this Chamber and in fact Parliament as a whole to approve of an Order to increase the number of Inspectors under the present Order, which I still believe is two - and that is the same number as it was eighteen years ago when this Department was first instituted. If there is one hard working man in that Department, it is the junior Inspector of Highways and Transport. I know that because I am called to many accidents in a week and I see him there all the time. Being the junior, the senior may be less available than the junior and, in fact the senior can tell the junior to go to an accident. You, Mr. Speaker, set a first-class example as to how the senior should work. Although you have under you the Hon. Deputy Speaker, you remain in the Chair actually all the time unless you are forced to leave. However, Sir, the work which these Inspectors are required to perform and which certainly the junior Inspector has to perform is tremendous. On one occasion I met him at an accident at 12 o'clock and at 2 o'clock that night and at the third accident to which I was called at 4.30 o'clock he was there also. After a sleepless night, can anyone expect these Inspectors to do their work the next morning? What will happen to an owner of a vehicle which should be licensed at a certain time if, through no failure of his but because there are so many vehicles to be inspected, he cannot get his vehicle inspected and because of that the licensing authority quite rightly has refused to renew the licence?

This is a simple matter and the Hon. Minister does not appear to make up his mind quite easily or within a number of years. If he makes up his mind, legislation can be provided in this Chamber for at least a 50 percent increase in the Inspectors of that Department. I know, speaking for members of my Party, that we will support it and the Minister can rest assured that his backbenchers will not know what is happening when that Resolution is passed.

Sir, I think that most of the points which I have in mind have been covered, but just let me leave this one word with the Minister of Communications. Up to now, that uneven and difficult stretch of road known as the Sandy Lane diversion has shown no signs of improvement, and nothing has been done to it since we protested in this House about its condition. It seems that the fact that they have one year before turning it over completely to the Government has encouraged them to feel that they can hold on until the eleventh month before they do anything with

that road in order to make it passable and comfortable for the persons who as a result of that diversion have been prevented from having the use of that exquisitely conditioned road, beautifully situated in the trees of Sandy Lane.

I beg, Mr. Speaker, formally to move the passing of this Resolution which reads as follows:-

Be it resolved that this House has **NO CONFIDENCE** in the Policy of the Ministry of Communications as to its Administration of -

- (a) Public Passenger Transport, including its present attitude towards motor vans, known as "pick-ups";
- (b) Seawell Airport; and
- (c) Generally.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the motion which has been moved, I would like, first of all, to congratulate my colleague on his endurance. What has been achieved in this House today by my colleague and on the two previous occasions on which he has spoken on this matter, I cannot remember any precedent for a matter of this sort. I have known for instance, that in the House of Commons, as regards motions of censure, the actual moving of the motion lasted an hour by the person moving it. We have just totalled up the number of hours which our colleague has taken on this motion and we have found that he has spoken at least five hours on it.

Now he has covered, and covered well, the substance and burden of the Opposition complaint against the Government on this issue and in the course of time, the hon. junior member for St. John would speak more fully and present more of our case.
3.55 p.m.

It remains for me, in seconding the motion, merely to draw the attention to the House to this point. Some people think that a motion of "no confidence" in a Minister is an example which we show of personal feelings; they vaguely understand that if a motion of "no confidence" is carried in any Parliament, the Minister, of course, is expected to resign. That is true, but they imagine that those who support such a motion against a Minister are necessarily wishing to deprive that Minister of his job and of his daily bread. I wish to say that no such motive operates in our minds; we are yet to see the majority on the other side of the House rise to a sense of responsibility.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I wonder if the hon. member would give us the authority for the statement which he has made. I have always been made to understand that a motion of "no confidence" against a Minister is a motion against the Government inasmuch as the Government is the Government collectively. I wish the hon. member to give the House his authority for saying that a motion against a Minister is only a motion against that Minister and not against the Government.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, it is not difficult to enlighten the hon. member on that point. Before I answer the question, I would like to say that I would like to see all of them resign (*Cheers*.) However, in answer to the Hon. Minister's question I would say that a resignation from an adverse vote of confidence against a Minister could be effective both on his account, or, if in the opinion of the Premier the Government should resign, then the Government should resign. There can be no hard and fast rule about that. (*ASIDES*.)

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to inform hon. members that the asides from this side of the House are too loud.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not need the approbation of members on the other side; the very fact that they disagree with me tells me that I am right. There are numerous cases on the point which has been raised by the Hon. Minister. There was the famous Crickle Down case....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. That is not fair. There was no vote of "no confidence" in the House of Commons against the Minister of Agriculture in that case. We are not children.

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall not allow the House to be engaged in any battle over differences of interpretation which are academic. I should like the hon. senior member for St. Lucy to get on with the motion and leave the academics to school boys. They should not be conducted in Parliament.

Mr. TUDOR: The point is this: The hon. member is entirely wrong in his approach and attitude to the matter. The point at issue is this, and I must touch on it so as to enlighten hon. members. The Cabinet works on collective responsibility and therefore both theoretically and practically if a Cabinet Minister is under attack, the Government collectively show their feelings about it by all of them resigning. The Hon. Minister is certainly not the only authority on this matter. Anyhow, I am not saying that because we are moving a vote of censure against a Minister, we are opposed to him holding the particular Ministry; our attitude is rather above that. We feel that responsibility must lie somewhere. Where, under the Cabinet system, are you going to place responsibility, if you cannot pin-point it to the person who is in charge of a Department? So long as you have responsible Government, the Minister who heads a Department must take his chances in defending his policy.

I was about to say that there is even no danger of the particular Minister being forced to resign because it is unlikely, under the Party system, that the majority of the Party would withdraw their confidence in the Minister; but because the motion may be defeated there is no reason why it should not be moved. The defeat, possible or probable, of a motion of censure is not a good reason for not moving it. You can only, speaking parliamentarily, keep the Ministers on their toes and get them to render strict accountability for the action and policy of the Departments by motions of censure. We feel, therefore, that a very good public service is being done by this motion. It will be for the Minister to defend his policy as best he can, but he will have to explain several things to the House in defending his policy; he will have to explain why it is that even up to now nobody understands what the transport policy is. The public will want reassurance on several matters, not the least important of which is this. Will the Minister take the pick-ups off the road? The Minister allowed us to know that when the regulations are brought into force, luggage, and persons conveying luggage will be taken on the pick-ups but not any passengers.
4.05 p.m.

I would like him to explain when he has the chance to reply how it is that people travelling with their own luggage on pick-ups are not necessarily passengers; and how he proposes - by what means or by what administrative measures - to separate passengers from passengers who are merely accompanying their luggage. Does he not see for instance, if he takes it seriously that if that is the distinction he draws, the pick-ups can still continue to run, the only difference being that every person who uses them will carry along something with him or her. It will be sufficient for anybody to get into a pick-up, take up even an object as small and convenient to carry as a cucumber and say it is luggage. If that is what the Minister means and the distinction he draws, the Regulations are vexatious and frivolous and he will have to think again if he wants to convince the public of the good faith of the Department in this matter.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that there is rather more to it than that. I believe myself that this attempt on the part of Government to restrict travel by pick-up and by van is part of a possible long-term plan to make the Transport Board pay or to make it a paying concern. In other words, it seems to be the Minister's contention that the Transport Board will be a profitable concern only when all other agencies of whatever sort which rival it and offer it competition are either abolished or kept at bay, and that

if you remove the vans and pickups which also cater to the public, by that fact alone you will enable the Transport Board to do more of the trade, and therefore you will be able to ensure it greater profit. But, Mr. Speaker, if that is the Minister's justification for what he proposes to do, it is naive and silly in the extreme; for the economy of this island depends in some measure on what is done by the pickups and by the vans and to restrict them on the excuse, if that is an excuse, that the Transport Board will have a greater opportunity to profit, would be to take bread out of the mouths of small people in order to guarantee the existence of a public corporation; and I do not know that it is any part of the duty of the Government, this House or of any public agency to take away from the small man in order that big public corporations should exist.

It does seem to me, the more I look at it, that the main contention in support of the Minister's appeal, indeed the main defence against the attack coming from this side, must be along those lines, and it is necessary to do all these things in order that the Transport Board might exist; if the vans and pick-ups have got to be restricted and curtailed, a lot of regulations have got to be brought in and a lot of things done in order that the Transport Board would have as free a hand as possible to progress. That seems to me to be the strength of the argument which Government is offering, and that being the case, the Minister will have to more than justify his policy. I do not think that members on the opposite side realise how disturbed and how agitated the public in certain parishes is about this matter, and there is no way in which it seems to me it can be brought home to members opposite, especially on the Ministerial chairs, what a serious thing is being contemplated. It is not sufficient to re-assure the public that pick-ups will still be operating in some form, for what the travelling public wants is a clear and unequivocal assurance that those who are hawkers and other members of the travelling public who use this means of conveyance will not be hamstrung in any way, and that the Regulations under which they will operate are such as can be obeyed without loss or inconvenience. That assurance is not yet forthcoming, and consequently in the Northern parishes pick-up owners and the users of pickups are both of them under an apprehension and are very embittered and angry over what seems to be a threat hanging over their heads. That is why we on this side make no apology whatever for the strictures which we have put against the Minister for his policy on this occasion.

If the Minister is claiming, Mr. Speaker, that his policy and the policy of his Department is not sufficiently understood, that is certainly not our fault. That is a misfortune, if misfortune it is, which is shared by large numbers of the travelling public. The Minister's policy, as it seems to us is to keep the Transport Board going at all costs, and to do that anything which might militate against it is not allowed to exist; but we cannot concur with the Government in that issue. We cannot agree with them that in order to keep the Transport Board going, it is necessary to hamstring and inconvenience large numbers of people and owners of smaller vehicles which might have played their part in the convenience and comfort to the travelling public, and I think that this Government should owe and should pay its debt of gratitude to the pickup owners who because of their mere existence have saved this island from the chaos which would naturally have resulted in the early days of public transport if they had not been in existence.

It is a bad policy, Mr. Speaker, to want to repay such a large debt of gratitude by a policy which allows these people and their customers less freedom than they had before. Only the other day I was talking to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and he surprised and astonished me by saying that he himself had driven from St. Peter in a pickup that very morning and I could not help reminding him that if his Party had their way, he might have had to walk. I asked him - I do not know if he will assist me in this - to use his good offices on

the members of his Party to prevent this calamity from falling on us, because he himself might be greatly inconvenienced when he is in his Local Government constituency and wants to get back to town if his car is not working.

4.15 p.m.

So there is a member of the Government Party himself - not a very good case, but certainly it is not a bad one - saying that he himself on that occasion travelled in a pickup; and at least I do not think he was carrying any luggage. At any rate, he bore testimony of their good uses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we want to see and hear from the Government is this. We want to understand just what their transport policy is. The issuing of Regulations dealing with a particular aspect of public transport is not a sufficient indication of what they are doing. You have to issue Regulations from time to time, especially if there be changes of policy. But Regulations about tightening up on efficient driving, on road safety, on things like seeing that vehicles which are put on the road are serviceable - all of these are in order and have to be issued from time to time; but they are not the most important aspects of transport policy. We have asked the Hon. Minister of Communications in this House, at least three times to my memory, what is his general overall policy. When we first asked him, it was not given to us on reasons which we think we could say were sufficient to indicate that Government was seeking advice from its expert, and when that advice had come in, then the Government would be in a position to issue its policy. What we had got a month or two after was also a statement of a sort on it, but it did not cover all the aspects of the transport problem, and I do not suppose that it was meant to do it; therefore, there were gaps in the Government's policy, and it was for the Minister to fill those gaps by making information available not only for members of this House but for the general public on what Government policy is in this respect. If the owners of certain vehicles run away with the idea that Government is playing some harm against them and that certain measures which Government is going to introduce would work some harm to those people, can you blame the people for thinking so? It seems to me that the Hon. Minister of Communications has fallen down badly on his duty of not keeping the public fully informed. We are accustomed of being refused the information which we seek to enquire, but the travelling public should know where they get off and what they should expect. That is the least which we expect the Minister ought to do. There is great dissatisfaction over all aspects of this matter and it will never be solved if the Minister and his colleagues are complacent and smug about it and believe that because there is no immediate or imminent danger of the Government being overthrown that these things do not matter. They matter and matter a lot. The greatest service the Government can render the people is to let them know fearlessly what is happening. Even if there is justification for certain aspects of Government's policy as regards transport, all that justification, as long as it is obscure and people do not know sufficiently what is being planned, will be of no use.

New buses have come in and the Minister denied having ordered them when we asked him at a particular time. Of the affairs of this Statutory Board which is run so closely like a Government Department the Minister did not know, and much as his denials were printed in the Daily Press stating that he did not know and he could give no information on this matter, yet the people from whom the buses were ordered categorically stated that they had received orders from the Barbados Transport Board to provide buses for the transport service. To show you how things work in this Island, there was no sort of public indignation or public outcry over the fact that the Minister may have been misleading the House. It may have seemed to him at the time to be a good policy to deny or withhold knowledge on a matter like that while certain negotiations were going on, but it is certainly not one of the principles of responsible Government to do that.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not hear correctly or audibly what the member said. Did he say that the Minister was misleading the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister wants to know from the hon. senior member for St. Lucy if he said that the Minister was misleading the House.

Mr. TUDOR: I do not believe that the House was misled by the Hon. Minister on that occasion.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I am glad he says that. I misled nobody. It was quite clear what I said at the time. There was no attempt to mislead anybody or to mislead the House.

Mr. TUDOR: That is not true. Of course, the records will show all this. There was a Press denial that no order had been placed for buses, but an order had been placed because the manufacturers or whoever were responsible for sending the buses here said that they had received an order. At least it was published to that effect.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, because the hon. member sees something written - -

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want any comment on this. I just want the hon. member to say that he was misunderstood.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I am denying that I was misleading or attempting to mislead the House. I am only saying from what I saw that there was no order made.

Mr. TUDOR: Let me refresh the Hon. Minister's memory. This was not a news item. This was a press release from the United Kingdom and from the United Kingdom Information Office; and if, therefore, it came from that source, they must have got that news from the manufacturers. If the Minister at the time of his being asked a question did not know that these orders had been placed or did not know anything about it - -

Hon. R. G. MAPP: That is not so, Sir; I said that no order was placed.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Hon. Minister of Communications had said that no orders had been placed and the Press release stated that an order had been placed and their interpretation of it is that the Minister knew, that is a matter for legal interpretation.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I said no order had been placed.

Mr. TUDOR: If the Minister says that no order had been placed and within a very short time after, the buses started coming how did we get them so quickly?

Mr. SPEAKER: I can tell the hon. member that he may have had sufficient information to conclude that the Minister knew, but in this case any hon. member must have enough information to impute, according to Rule 26. The hon. member may have that circumstantial evidence to bring him to a personal conclusion, but no hon. member can impute anything to any other member at all. I do not mean only to a Minister.

Mr. TUDOR: The point is that if it is true that no buses had been ordered, it is strange that no attempt was made by the Minister to give a full public denial at the time the press release appeared. As far as I understand, the denial which the Minister gave us was given us in here in response to a question, but it was not a public denial made as soon as the information appeared through the United Kingdom Information Office.

4.25 p.m.

There was a time lapse between the publication of the notice that buses had been ordered, and the denial which was given on the floor of this House, and that denial was not spontaneously given in a Ministerial statement; it was given in response to long questioning by hon. members on this side. But, Mr. Speaker, for argument's sake, let us accept the Minister's view that no buses had been ordered within his knowledge. It is very strange, Mr. Speaker, that a Minister - well, it would be unfair for a Minister to be held accountable for answer-

ing questions and the general responsibility for a Statutory Board, if the members of the Board could, by implication, withhold from the Minister's file information such as that; or if they could proceed to order buses or imply ordering them, or make enquiries about ordering them without keeping the Minister fully informed. If we accept the Minister's view of it, it means that the Transport Board went ahead on its own without reference to him in a matter in which he would have to be most closely involved - the matter of transport policy. It is a question of which you believe; it is either one or the other, and if the latter is nearer to the truth, then the Minister deserves to be dealt with by way of censure for not keeping a sufficiently firm finger on a Board which should keep the bit between its teeth and which is likely to cause embarrassment. The Minister cannot on the one hand deny responsibility and let it be thought that the Board acted without reference to him and kept him in the dark where he was forced to deny something which the Board, if it were asked, would have admitted.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It being now 4.30 p.m. of the clock, the House reverts to the consideration of Government Business.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, before the House reverts to Government Business, I am asking leave to give notice of some questions.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave at this stage to give notice of questions which he did not have the opportunity of giving earlier today. Unless there be any objection, leave will be granted the hon. member. *(After a pause.)* There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. member.

Mr. TALMA: The questions are as follows:-

To enquire of the Honourable Premier:-

Will Government consider the setting up of a Committee with the guidance and assistance of the necessary experts from overseas (if necessary) for the purpose of considering, working out and establishing a Compulsory Insurance Scheme for all types of workers based on the lines of the National Insurance Act (1946-57) of the United Kingdom?

2. Does Government realise that a Compulsory Insurance Scheme is the method adopted by the United Kingdom in implementing the "Beveridge Plan" for National Assistance, National Health and also Security for old Age &c.?

To enquire of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:-

Is the Minister aware of the present plight of the average Boatowner and Fisherman owing to the uneconomic prices which are paid for fish generally and Flying Fish, in particular?

2. Will the Minister state in precise terms the reason for the total break-down or unreasonable delay in setting up,

(a) the central Fish Cold Storage Plant in Bridgetown; and,

(b) the Short term Cold Storage at each of the District Fish Markets (or other District Markets), especially those at Speightstown and Oistins?

3. In view of the present state of affairs, will Government immediately reduce the rate of instalments for repayment of loans, and also extend the time-limit for repayment of such loans proportionately, by say, a further period of at least four years?

To enquire of the Honourable Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:-

Does the Government realise the necessity of establishing a further series of Traffic Lights at numerous other Street Corners both in the City and suburbs, now that an experimental stage has proved successful?

2. Does the Government know that Traffic Lights have been in use on a large scale in most enlightened countries for very many years past?

3. Will Government consider establishing such Traffic Lights in the immediate future at, among other sites, corner Cullogen Road and Pine Road, bottom Government Hill, corner Dayrells Road and Hastings Road, bottom Oistins Hill near Plaza Oistins, Top Oistins Hill, St. Patrick's corner, St. David's corner, Junction Kendall Hill and Maxwell Top Road, Bank Hall corner, Cr. Hindsbury Road and Bridge Road, Milk Market Corner, Corner Westbury Road and Fontabelle?

To enquire of the Honourable Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:-

Is the Honourable Minister aware that there are approximately 3,000 vacancies at present in the London Transport Service for the Greater London area in the United Kingdom?

2. Will the Minister take the appropriate action immediately by personal contact, preferably, or otherwise, to secure an increased Quota for Barbadian Workers in the London Transport Service and in other avenues of employment in the United Kingdom?

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: On the suspension of the sitting for lunch, the House was in Committee of Supply.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1960-61, No. 9

HEAD XXIII - MEDICAL (6) HEALTH CENTRES

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was last in Committee of Supply, we were considering Head XXIII of the Schedule of a Resolution for the sum of \$13,769. The hon. senior member for the City was speaking on Item 70 -- Eradication of Yellow Fever Mosquito. I observe that the hon. member is not in his seat.

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

4.35 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1960-61, No. 9.

Head XXIX - Miscellaneous - was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, there are, as you will see, two items under this Head which are both new. One is for the sum of \$1,152 and the other is for \$23. As you will see from the explanatory note, this is in connection with the University College undergraduates who came here recently. There were four Barbadian students included in the party and this Government is asked to make a contribution of \$288 towards the expenses of each Barbadian student; therefore the amount required is \$1,152.

The other Item, Mr. Chairman, is for \$23 which was incurred during the visit of the Princess here some time ago. The firms failed to submit their vouchers within the appropriate time, that is, before the financial year ended, and as a result that money lapsed. We are therefore asking for \$23 to pay these firms. I would like to say quite frankly, Sir, that we have on several occasions appealed to the various firms to send in their accounts before the end of the financial year, but on several occasions they had failed to do so. I wonder if one of these days we could not have some

legislation which would allow that money to lapse in the Treasury. I believe if we pass some legislation like that, firms would send in their accounts before the end of the financial year.

I beg to move that Head XXIX - Miscellaneous, stand part.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, in seconding the Resolution pertaining to Item 73 - U.C.W.I. Undergraduates Caribbean Tour - I should like to add a little more than what appears in the note. This request before this Hon. House is because of the fact that the undergraduates of the U.C.W.I. realise the need for broadening their education, and they undertook to arrange a tour which had as its object the familiarisation with different parts of the Caribbean territory and study of conditions. These young enthusiastic, energetic students visited Barbados last week and we are now being asked to assist and give them a subsidy of \$1,152. Of course I am positively sure that you will have no doubts in your minds as to the value of such an undertaking and that you will find no difficulty in sanctioning the motion.

I beg to second the motion.

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the Resolution for \$13,769 was passed.

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee and asked for leave to sit again and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded in each case by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

THE ALIENS (LAND-HOLDING) ACT, 1960.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No.2 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture: to move the second reading of a Bill to regulate the holding of land by aliens and companies under alien control.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: This Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which is called The Aliens (Land-holding) Act, 1960, has as its object the regulating of holding of land in the island by aliens and companies under alien control. It goes on to say that in the main, the Bill seeks to provide that after the commencement of the Act aliens, namely persons who are not British subjects, and companies under alien control may only hold land in the island on licence granted by the Executive Committee and subject to such conditions as may be prescribed therein. Consequentially, the Bill provides for forfeiture, with certain exceptions, of any lands held by unlicensed persons. Provisions are also included for the registration of licences and for matters connected with procedure to be followed in respect of proceedings before the Supreme Court.

Now, Sir, this Act, so far as I am concerned, is long overdue. In nearly all of the neighbouring colonies which more or less comprise the Federation, they have already on their Statute Book an Alien Land-holding Act, and for some reason or other, we did not make our position clear in this regard; but as events have shown, Sir, it is very necessary to have such an Act on the Statute Book. This Act is not to deprive aliens from holding land in this colony, but the fact is that this Government must know who they are, how much they are going to own and for what purpose they are going to own this land.

4.45 p.m.

In other words, Sir, Barbados is a small country of 166 square miles and we cannot afford even at this late hour to allow foreigners to come in and own a considerable amount of our land when in truth and in fact there is not enough to go around so far as our local people are concerned. We feel that, although we are late in this attempt, a very useful purpose will be served because I think every-

body in Barbados knows today that there are these wealthy people coming in from abroad who have money to spend and to whom money has no object; and with the advertisements all abroad of this island's fine beaches and its good climatic conditions, a lot of wealthy people would like to come here and do business. Some obviously would go into agriculture and there are some, I know, who would like to build hotels and go in for many other commercial ventures.

We are not against foreign capital or aliens for that matter, but what this Government is saying is that we want to know who they are, where they are from, how much land they want and what business are they going to embark on. Already we have on the Statute Book that aliens are not allowed to vote, they are not allowed to take a seat in the House of Assembly and there are also a lot of things which they are not allowed to do. When we bring down this Bill to regulate the holding of land by aliens and companies under alien control and to say that an alien cannot hold land without a license, it is nothing new; it is something long overdue.

I do not think it has much bearing on the political upheavals in these parts, but even then we have got to be very careful. We have got to make sure that the people who come here to reside are not going to push us in the unfortunate position as regards other countries surrounding us. But I am not at the moment concerned about that. As Minister of Agriculture, it is my duty to see to it that the land in Barbados remains in the hands of Barbadians. That is my duty. It is my duty to see that all of the agricultural land, unless there are very good reasons for it otherwise, remains in agriculture so that with our increasing population, we would be able to feed those people who reside on this island. Quite apart from that, there are some very wealthy people who have been taking excursions into this country and because of their wealth, they have been offering fantastic prices for bits of land here and there and that is not confined only to the beaches. It is going further afield; and I want to assure this honourable House that so long as I have the honour to fill the seat which I now occupy, no absentee proprietor would be able to dominate in Barbados. I have been always against absentee proprietorship. I am still against it and so long as I occupy this position no absentee proprietors would be able to engage in any business in Barbados. As I have said before, Barbados is a small country. We have a limited amount of arable land.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think that even the Hon. Minister himself must realise that he has to be very careful in his choice of words. Does he want to say that no absentee proprietor should engage in business in this country? If he said that he made a mistake. He cannot be so silly.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I really meant to say was that no alien absentee proprietor would be able to hold land. I am dealing with that. That is what I said.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, again. I hate to interrupt the hon. member but this is a very important and far reaching Bill. If the Government means from what the Minister has said that no alien absentee proprietor can own land in the country, it means for instance that if this Bill was enforced six or eight months ago, there would be no Sandy Lane Company.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: I rise on a point of explanation, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want the hon. member to be very clear, because as I have said this is going to have very far-reaching effects on the country.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Does the hon. member know that the people who own Sandy Lane are British subjects?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Not all of them.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: He should realise that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. They are not all British subjects. It is a company and some of them are aliens.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Even if that were so, this is going to rectify that state of affairs because it is not the right thing to do. We must know who they are and what they are doing. I am not making any apologies to the hon. member.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I again rise on a point of order. I am not asking apologies from him; I am asking for information.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: In truth and in fact, Sandy Lane is a British company. Nevertheless, despite what the hon. member has to say, this Bill seeks to do what has not been done, and I am saying most emphatically that we have reached the point where we are not going to allow aliens to come into the country and buy up the land and control it to the detriment of the people of Barbados. That is what it means in so many words.

If the hon. member takes a little time to read the Bill, he would see that we are not going to prevent aliens from coming in to own land, but we are limiting them to a lease of five acres of land. This is the 20th Century. People are coming from all over the world with a lot of wealth paying fantastic prices for land and the local people cannot compete against them. I am saying that Barbados must remain for Barbadians. Never mind how poor we are, we are not going to sell our birthright. I am saying that most emphatically. Selling all your land to people who can buy it does not mean that the country is going to benefit from it. We want the people of Barbados to have pride in their country even although it is a small portion of land acreage which they own.

We are saying that the time has come now when we want to know who those people who come to buy our land are. That is the Government's policy today as enunciated through me. I want to know, when you want to buy an estate, who you are, what you want it for and whether you are an alien. You must register. You must have a license before you can own land.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister seems to be addressing hon. members personally. Please address the Chair; do not take notice of asides.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this is no time to twist things or to be smart about things. We have reached the point where we have got to control aliens coming into the country. Everybody knows that Barbados has wonderful beaches and a good climate. We are very near to the South American border and we know that there are political disturbances there. We have it on record that some aliens from those countries may come here. In fact, negotiations have been made already. 4.55 p.m.

We have arrived at the point where we say: "We have an open door and an open welcome, but if you want to buy land, we have a small area and we want to know who you are and we must control the sale of the land." That is all this Bill seeks to do; it does not begin to stop any alien from coming into this colony, but we say: "If you have money and you can upset the price of land so that the people in Barbados who have slender means cannot afford to compete against you, we want to know something about that".

As far as the matter of absentee proprietorship is concerned, we are not unaware that in one or two cases land is held by members perhaps of the Royal Family. Well, that is before our time; therefore, if that went on, that is nothing to do with us now. We have arrived at the point where we are saying today: "If you, Mr. Alien, want to come in with your money and you want to buy land whether for agricultural purposes or for tourism you must first have a licence from the Governor-in-Executive Committee. We have got to know who you are; we have to know about your *bona fides* and then you will get the all-clear."

On the question of Sandy Lane, all hon. members should be aware - as a matter of fact we do not know who are the real owners of that property.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not going to allow the hon. Minister to talk about Sandy Lane, because I am not going to allow any other hon. member to do so.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: What I was saying about that is that, up to now, we have not been able to control the companies which are coming here; we do not know who they are and, in many cases, we do not know what are their motives. I should like to ask this question: Must the Government sit idly by and allow land in this colony to be sold to aliens and we do not know what is going on? That is not done in this Twentieth Century. It would surprise hon. members of this House to know that, in the smaller islands such a law, as we are now bringing forward, is on their Statute Books. All the other units of this Federation have such a law on their Statute Books and I must say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this Bill has been copied *verbatim* from the laws of other islands, especially Trinidad; those who have had the Bill sent to them will notice that it is really copied from the Trinidad Act. I have no fear that we are doing something which is wrong because this policy is being carried out, not now, but years ago, in all of the other West Indian Islands. This Bill is copied word for word from the Trinidad Act, as I have already said.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, one will readily see that this Bill is divided into four parts. The first part deals with the restrictions on the ownership of land and mortgages by aliens; the second part deals with provisions as to companies under alien control; the third part deals with restrictions on trusts in favour of aliens and the last part deals with procedure and evidence. This Bill has no animus, no prejudice or anything of that nature in it; all it has to offer is the safeguard that people do not come in here and buy so much land that they can influence certain things in this country. As I have said before, and I will repeat for the last time, any law-abiding alien can come here and reside; Barbados is open to him. So far as we are concerned, we welcome foreign capital in Barbados; but as far as our land policy is concerned, we say that we must know who these people are because, heretofore, they did not have to tell us anything about it. Two people could go in for a deal and on the first day, perhaps, hundreds of acres of land could change hands and we need not know anything about it. All we are saying today is that if you are selling your land, the Government must know something about it. If the *bona fides* is all right, if the land is to be developed in the interest of the country, that is all well and good; but if the land is not to be developed in the interest of Barbadians, the alien will never get it.

Barbados is a small island with just as much agricultural land to feed the population. We are faced with serious problems, whether we are aware of that fact or not. Every year the population is increasing and we must realise that the ownership of land is something to do with our population. If you are wide awake and you are planning ahead, you must bring about laws which will keep your economy intact and which will help to keep people on the land. I do not wish to say much more on this Bill because I believe hon. members will have their say on it; but I now commend this Bill to hon. members as one which has been on the Statute Book of other islands for some time. I repeat that it has four stages which hon. members will no doubt have read. It does nothing against anybody, but it is the Government's opinion that we should have control of land in this country; we feel that it is very necessary for us to fall into line with other islands in the Federation. 5.05 p.m.

I don't think I can say much more, because I might have to reply at a later stage. There is only one point I want to make quite clear before I sit down and it is this: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question might arise as to the legality or illegality of any foreigner or any alien who has been negotiating the sale or the purchase of land before the Act came into being. Well, Sir, I was at pains to get

the records straight, and as you will see from the Bill he is allowed a period of three months in which to finalise his business, and then he will notify the Governor-in-Executive Committee, and of course everything will be finalised, because he had an interest already in the land and his equitable rights would be preserved. So one has no fear about that particular clause. Furthermore, Sir, this Bill does not render any hardship on anybody.

I am not going to say anymore, but will leave it to hon. members to say how they feel about it. If they feel there is any hardship on anybody, they should say so; but so far as Government policy is concerned we see nothing amiss in this Act. If it is good for the other West Indian islands, Trinidad particularly where you have got capital flowing in and all the other things, it is also good for us. We have nothing but agriculture here, so that even if we balance off a little bit of our land to get a little tourism or to diversify our economy, that does not mean we are going to allow all of our land to go into that use. We will never take our land out of agricultural production, because, say whatever you may, people must always be fed from the land. I do not care how much tourism or commercial activities you have you must have agricultural land in order to feed your people; and it is my duty to see to it that agricultural land is preserved for the people of this colony and to feed them too, so that while we might be late in bringing this Act forward, yet I can assure hon. members that it is better late than never.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise in the first place to support the general principle of this Bill, though today in detail, I find myself from a conscience point of view unable to support the passing of this Bill today. The Bill appears good and innocent, but if examined in detail preferably by someone - and this is not being sarcastic - who has a fairly good legal background, one will see the dangers and pitfalls which are likely to attend the operation of this Bill in actual practice. At this stage, although I know the Minister and the Government have the best interest of the community at heart in matters of this nature and the general feeling would be to protect the rights of Barbadians in particular, and British citizens in general, more especially in securing access to the beaches and the Government acquiring beach lands - I am thinking of something positive and not negative - I must make a few comments.

When you pass this Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and you say that all these things must be issued before certain things can take place, you leave open the unlicensed alien who has unrestricted rights to go unchallenged in so far as five acres of land is concerned. He is unrestricted in so far as five acres is concerned to own the land although the word "acquire" was used, and "acquire" can only mean "purchase" in the legal sense; to use the word "acquire" in dealing with unlicensed aliens is however a mistake or bad draughtsmanship, because an unlicensed alien is given the right to rent or lease land from year to year not exceeding five acres.

What I want to draw to the attention of this House is that the whole object of this Bill can be pushed aside because an unlicensed alien is given the right to rent land from year to year, and you can call it a perpetually renewable lease, and all perpetually renewable leases under the English Law of Property Act of 1925 and the Law of Property (Amendment) Act of 1926 have been converted into terms of two thousand years; so when you give an unlicensed alien the right to rent this land from year to year it is tantamount to a perpetually renewable lease in all phases of law including English law today which under the Property Act of 1925 and the Property Amendment Act of 1926 is termed as a period of two thousand years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what more do you want? If you are not going to buy a plantation and cut it up in lots and

speculate, it means that an unlicensed alien would have as much right as an alien who is receiving a licence from the Governor-in-Executive Committee, because an unlicensed alien would be able to rent this land from year to year of not more than five acres on which he can carry on his business or trade or use for his residence or for any purpose. This just prevents the owner of the land from dividing up and selling freehold; so the lease on the face of this Bill will give him a perpetually renewable lease, and in England today all perpetually renewable leases have been converted into terms of two thousand years. If therefore an unlicensed alien can do all of that to the land, he is in almost as good a position as the *de facto* owner of the land, the alien who has permission from the Governor-in-Executive Committee to own land or the alien controlled company or the other set who are entitled.

While I give that as my general statement at this stage, I want to go into the history of this matter because I want a full appreciation to be made of this Bill. I have gone to the trouble of doing a little research in this matter and I have prepared a few things which with Your Honour's permission would add gusto and give some sort of background to this matter, at least so far as its history is concerned. If that is not appreciated in the full sense, at least few members of this Chamber will have taken the trouble to get a fair understanding and a fair working knowledge of what we are doing today, and with Your Honour's permission I am asking you to allow me to refer to some of these historical points from time to time.

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

5.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I was at the point where I made a few general remarks on the principles of the Bill and I was just about to commence arguments which would ultimately culminate in my making a motion which I hope would receive the support of the Hon. Minister, because it is all in the interest of Barbados and in the interest of protecting the beach lands and preserving them and it is taking more positive steps to see that these lands remain intact. In the case of people who have houses on such land my motion would give some measure of protection to them.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to inform the hon. member that legislation dealing with beaches is embodied in a more comprehensive Act and will soon be presented to this House.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, unlike the Hon. Minister, I was at the stage where I wanted to give the House some sort of history on such matters, and such pieces of similar legislation in the United Kingdom and other enlightened countries on this matter. I have gone to the trouble of making certain notes which I hope Your Honour will allow me to use. They are all historical and I would like to give them to the House in a manner which would be very authoritative. We are dealing with the history of this Bill. I agree with the Hon. Minister that such legislation exists in some of the other islands, but although this is so, yet I feel certain that if you were to compare our legislation with similar legislation in other countries, you will find that there are marked discrepancies. It is all right to make a few adjustments and general statements, but you must get down to the Bill and understand it. There are a lot of pitfalls in this Bill and good intentions will not help. The Bill itself undermines good intentions.

Mr. Speaker, the history of this matter is a long drawn out one. In England it was by the Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act of 1898 that this matter was first tackled but the provisions of that Act were so circumvented that the result was that that Act was never really utilised to the fullest extent because many corporations were formed and granted licenses and other statutory corporations were put on.

It is known that by Part I of the Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act which is the modern equivalent to older

statutes a corporation cannot hold land unless it has a license from the Crown or some Statutory Authority. In this Act, we have the word "forfeited". That is if you fail to get a license, then the land is forfeited by the Crown. The word "forfeited" means liable to be forfeited. In other words, the land does not automatically go to the Crown but the Crown has to do something positive for the forfeiture to take place. The land is not vested in the Crown unless the Crown chooses to enact a forfeiture. I wanted to explain that because it may be thought that the land is automatically vested in the Crown.

There are many exceptions, as I mentioned just now, but the most notable exception is to a trading corporation of a British class to hold land and the Act has not often come into play. The other exception is of companies registered under the Companies Act or any of the Acts which the Companies Act replaces, except companies which are involved in the acquisition of gain. They cannot hold more than two acres of land without the sanction of the Board of Trade. And in England all the overseas companies have to go through the same formalities. A Barbadian Company is a foreign company or an alien company, so far as the Laws of England are concerned; that is to say, a company registered in Barbados, whether incorporated in a British possession or a foreign country cannot hold land in England without filing certain particulars and statements with the Registrar of Companies.

What we are attempting here to do today, is really amending the Companies Act of 1910 by incorporating Sections 407, 408 and 409 of the English Companies Act of 1948. That is what we are doing in reality. I have here a book on company law and you will see that actually they are incorporating Sections 407, 408 and 409 of the English Companies Act of 1948 though they are not doing it in a full and complete way; they are only doing it in a half-and-half way and in some cases in a slipshod manner.

I will refer you to this, for instance. A Trading Company registered under the Companies Act having power to hold land has also the power to dispose of land but in the case of municipal corporations - and I am sorry that the hon. senior member for the City is not here to hear this - they can only sell or mortgage their land, or grant a lease of it, say, for a period of seven years with the sanction of the Ministry of Housing and Local Government. We are therefore, in fact amending the Companies Act of 1910 in accordance with Section 407, 408 and 409 of the English Companies Act of 1948. And as I mentioned just now, although you are doing that, the insertion of the amendments is not properly done.

Now, I am reading from the paragraph: "Companies established outside of Great Britain."

5.25 p.m.

They refer to particulars in the Companies Act, but they do not say what the particulars are. These are the particulars: (a) A certified copy of the charter, statute or memorandum and articles of the company, or other instrument defining the constitution of the company, and, if the instrument is not written in the English language, a certified translation of it. (b) A list of the directors and secretary, with the same particulars as are required in the case of an English company. (c) The name and address of a person resident in Great Britain authorised to accept, on behalf of the company, service of process and notices.

A place of business includes a share transfer or share registration office; but a company which only employs agents within Great Britain, and has no office, has not established a place of business. That is Section 407. Whereas Sections 407 and 408 have been incorporated in a slipshod manner, in the case of Section 409 that has been omitted altogether. Section 409 says this:-

"Every such company must also:-

Every calendar year make out a balance sheet and profit and loss account in the same form, and containing the same particulars as an English company

is required to make out, and deliver it to the Registrar for registration. If the balance sheet is not written in English, a certificated translation must be annexed."

2. In every prospectus inviting subscription for shares or debentures in Great Britain, state the country in which it is incorporated."

Attempts have been made to incorporate Sections 407 and 408. Section 408 says this:-

"An oversea company which has complied with the requirements of Section 407 set out above has the same power to hold lands in the United Kingdom as if it were incorporated under the Companies Act, 1948."

As I have already said, a clumsy attempt has been made to incorporate these Sections in the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to ask the hon. member what is the name of the work from which he is quoting.

Mr. TALMA: It is "The Principles of Company Law by His Honour Judge J. Charlesworth, LL.D., Sixth Edition, published by Stevens & Sons Ltd. London. And if Your Honour would like to know the pages, they are pages 34 and 35. I was saying, Sir, that a clumsy attempt has been made by the Legal Draughtsman of this colony to amend the Companies Act, 1910, to bring it into line, in this particular respect, with the Companies Act, 1948, in England. Section 409 has been omitted altogether and that is the sort of draftsmanship which goes on here. I will deal with that later on because the Companies Act is being amended in the next Measure of before us. That Act has to be amended so as to bring it into line with what is before us now; one is consequential on, and as a result of, the other.

Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with Sections 407, 408 and 409 of the Companies Act, 1948. While supporting the general principle of this Bill, I must at this very early part of this speech warn this House of the numerous pitfalls and dangers which will attend on the operation of this Bill. Indeed, on further reflection on this particular matter, and in the interest of British subjects, generally speaking, and in the interest of Barbadians in particular, I think that this Bill should be amended, modified, and, in my opinion, referred to a Select Committee. I know that the practice and custom nowadays since the introduction of the Ministerial System, is to try and avoid having Select Committees appointed. I have had that personal experience when I was a Minister. The practice is to avoid the appointment of Select Committees, but if the Government were to act wisely they would agree to the appointment of a Select Committee to consider this Bill because it is full of pitfalls. Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I will make a motion to that effect so that the Bill can be gone through with the assistance of the legal talent in this House. We can utilise that at least for the benefit of Barbadians, especially when it is given free, *gratis* and for nothing. (Laughter) I hope that the Minister in charge will see the reason why I am pursuing this course and will agree to meet us half way by being in agreement with what is reasonable and sensible and in the interest of the Minister himself.

5.35 p.m.

Indeed, Sir, when you examine this Bill, you would see in Clause 3 the question of an unlicensed alien. Let me just explain plainly. The object of this Bill is that an alien or alien company must secure a licence from the Governor-in-Executive Committee before he can own land, and the object of these new sections which are being incorporated into the Companies Act is to bring all that in line with this specific Act. In other words, you are doing one thing twice; you are putting on the Statute Book a separate and distinct Bill and you are also bringing in consequential amendments to the Companies Act.

I agree entirely, as far as the alien and the alien control company are concerned that they need to secure a licence from the Governor-in-Executive Committee, and that as far as an unlicensed alien is concerned he

should not be able to go scot free, because that is what we are doing here; and if you were to study Clause 3 and other Clauses which come after properly, you will see that the unlicensed alien is allowed to have a perpetually renewable lease from year to year, and under the English law, it is regarded as a term of two thousand years. If you refer to Clause 3 (1), you will see that it reads as follows:-

"Subject to the provisions of this Act, neither land in the Island nor a mortgage on land in this Island, shall after the commencement of this Act, be held by an unlicensed alien, and any land or mortgage so held shall be forfeited to the Executive Committee.

(2) provided that -

I do not know if hon. members have studied this Bill carefully. It says land may be acquired and held by an unlicensed alien. What does "acquire" mean? Obviously "acquire" is the wrong word on the face of it. You do not have to be a lawyer or trained in law to understand that. "Acquire" means to "purchase" and any Third Form boy would tell you that. Does the Minister realise that the word "acquire" means to "purchase", or to "own" as the owner and not the tenant? Do you realise how ambiguous and wrong on the face of it this Bill appears to be? You are cutting across the whole principle of this Bill because you are giving an unlicensed alien the right to acquire and hold land, and that is what you are trying to prevent. No matter how opposed to this Party the Minister may be, yet he has to accept fundamental things. Land may be "acquired and held by an unlicensed alien for an annual tenancy or for any less interest for the purposes of his residence, trade, business, but an unlicensed alien shall not so hold more than five acres of land in all." So the unlicensed alien does not have to go to the Executive Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member explained how he is protecting the rights of Barbadians and all that; he would like to; but apparently he has not studied the Bill, because he would not be doing that in effect if this Bill passes. No matter how anxious you are to protect Barbadians and their rights, you would not be doing it by passing this; you would be doing a grave injustice and throwing them away. If you pass this, you are doing them a great disservice; so with all the good intentions and all the jumping up, you would be throwing them away, and I would not sit here and allow it to pass and not explain thoroughly and in detail to the members of my Party and to the House generally the implications of this Bill.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, the word "acquire" must come out, because an unlicensed alien cannot be allowed to acquire land at all. That is not the intention of this Bill. They will be allowed to rent land on a yearly tenancy of not more than five acres, and I warn the Minister here and now that that whenever he creates a tenancy from year to year, it can be interpreted by shrewd and crafty lawyers to mean a perpetually renewable lease which goes on indefinitely, and all perpetually renewable leases in England today - and the hon. junior member for St. John will correct me if I am wrong - have been converted into terms of two thousand years. If an unlicensed alien has a term of two thousand years over five acres of land, that is just as good as ownership; he would never have it any better; so if you want them never to have it any better, you can pass this.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order, the hon. member is ranting and raving and saying lots of things.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Both hon. members will now sit down. As soon as there is the slightest sign of confusion, silence will follow. The hon. junior member for St. Philip will be allowed to make his point of order, and then the senior member for Christ Church will follow with his point of order, but I am unable to hear two points of order at the same time; I am not so competent yet.

Hon. D.D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the Clause so that the hon. member might appreciate the position.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member is going to read anything, he must read something which is pertinent to the most recent remarks of the speaker who has just sat down.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Sir, I am reading from Clause 3 section 2 (a) which reads as follows:-

"Land may be acquired and held by an unlicensed alien on an annual tenancy or for any less interest for the purposes of his residence, trade, business, but an unlicensed alien shall not hold more than five acres of land in all."

Why does the hon. member not read the whole thing so that it makes sense? He has been reading to make the thing look foolish.

Mr. SPEAKER: As far as I am concerned, interpretation belongs to the Judges and not to me.
5.45 p.m.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member referred to my ranting and raving. I am afraid that I have not got into his category yet. I cannot emulate him. I am trying to explain the general principles of this Bill which apparently the Minister has not comprehended up to now. That is all I am trying to do. I am trying to do his work here.

The Hon. Minister simply read the Clause which I had drawn to his attention. He did exactly what I did and I had better read it the third time in order to explain what I was trying to do just now. It reads as follows:-

"Subject to the provisions of this Act, neither land in the Island nor a mortgage on land in the Island shall, after the commencement of this Act, be held by an unlicensed alien, and any land or mortgage so held shall be forfeited to the Executive Committee."

It goes on and say "provided that". What that means in other words is that what I have just read does not apply here.

"Provided that land may be acquired." The word "acquire" means to purchase. Perhaps, the Hon. Minister may not even be able to understand that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will not address the Hon. Minister: he must address the House.

Mr. TALMA: It goes on:

"Provided that land may be acquired and held by an unlicensed alien on an annual tenancy or for any less interest for the purposes of his residence, trade, business, but an unlicensed alien shall not so hold more than five acres of land in all."

Whether he may be purchasing land for speculating purposes, like purchasing a plantation and dividing it up into lots on a speculation basis, unless he goes in the normal way and gets his license as this Bill intends him to do, he cannot hold it; but if, say, he wants land for other purposes, say he wants five acres of land in the sea-coast to open up a hotel, he can enter into a lease for say, five years or he can enter into a lease from year to year because that lease would be regarded in law today as a renewable lease and it could be renewed to a term of 2,000 years. A lease for 2,000 years is just as good as your owning the land. Therefore, if you lease land for 2,000 years, it means that you have complete control over that land not only for business but for residence also. You are doing this because you are here to protect the rights of Barbadians. But, Sir, in the next Section, you speak of unlicensed aliens who are given unrestricted rights to occupy land and to have land in

their possession whether for residence or business provided it does not exceed five acres.

However, Sir, it is not intended that they should be owners of the land although the word "acquire" has been used. As I have said, in law, the word "acquire" means to purchase, and if you get a shrewd lawyer in a case against you as to what the intention of the Bill was, he will say that the intention was to allow them to own the land because the word "acquire" was used.

Sir, it is for that reason that I am asking the Hon. Minister to see that this Bill be sent to a Select Committee. If you go foolhardily and hit your head against a wall, do not blame this Party. We are trying to enlighten you along legal channels.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, what further can you do with land unless you want to sell it or divide it up? Mr. Speaker, you must realise that the time must come, if an alien control company or even an unlicensed company has all these powers to hold land, for any Socialist Government to protect the interest of Barbadians by acquiring beach lands wherever they are and to use them for housing purposes and for beach purposes for the people. The time has come for the Government to see after that. The Hon. Minister explained that another Bill is coming down to deal with that. Whenever there is any such land offered for sale the Government should be given the first opportunity. You have to see that the Government be given priority to purchase land along the seashore in whatever site, in whatever parish it may be, not only in St. James, Christ Church or St. Michael but on an islandwide basis because unless we have that, unless the Government steps in at this stage, the time is not far distant when the people of Barbados would be denied the right and privilege of entering certain beaches of this island.

I am imploring the Hon. Minister to take heed and send this matter to Select Committee. I have not at this stage gone into all the numerous points which I have here before me. I have not really gone into all the amendments which I propose to make and all the suggestions and reasons why this Bill should be referred to Select Committee. I will only say that the Bill is badly drafted and although the Hon. Minister may have the best intentions to protect Barbadians and to protect the interest of British subjects, generally speaking - I have no doubt he has those intentions - yet he is not going to get that by passing this Bill in its present form. I will say that if you want to do a disservice to Barbados, ignore what has been told you and pass this Bill in its present form.

I beg to move that this Bill be referred to Select Committee.
5.55 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: I think it would be good if the Minister would accept that suggestion and I will second it. I heard the Minister's speech and I am not opposed to the general intention of the Bill, but I do not agree with the Hon. Minister's premise. In my view, his premise is false and therefore his conclusions must fall on those grounds. The Hon. Minister started off with the general platform speech which one would make outside the House, that it is the intention of his Government to control land and see that land feeds the people in Barbados; that these people do not come in and take away our land and he will see that land remains in agricultural production. That was his general premise, but this Bill has nothing to do with that at all. It is complete nonsense to make a speech like the one which the Hon. Minister has made in an Assembly. At one stage, the Minister said that he was speaking to the people of Barbados, but in here you are speaking to a smaller group of people. You must realise that you are not speaking on a platform where you will make involved statements which we do not understand. The stupidity of the argument ----

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like the hon. member to try and avoid speaking to the Minister and speak to the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: I directed my statements to the Minister in respect of the remarks made by the Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member used the pronoun "you" not so long ago.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am sorry, Sir, but the statement made by the Minister is bound to be a stupid one. There is nothing to prevent a Canadian from coming here now and buying the whole of Barbados. An absentee proprietor can buy the whole of Barbados; a man who is living in Wales, Cardiff or Yorkshire, who is going to buy land in Barbados, does not go to the Governor-in-Executive Committee for that permission. In the next breath the hon. member said that he did not know anything about the Sandy Lane affair. This is no land policy which you are creating. (*Cheers from the Opposition benches.*) Since the Minister has been Minister of Agriculture I have seen agricultural lands being utilised for the purpose for which he had previously said it would not have been utilised. As regards Heywoods, the Minister of Communications said that Heywoods was agricultural land and there was no intention of using it otherwise; but subsequent events have proved that that could not have been so; again the Minister of Agriculture was also Minister when Wildey was converted into a Brewery. We therefore have Sandy Lane converted into an hotel and Heywoods is being used for the same purpose. Is it not therefore monumental nonsense for the Minister to speak about putting lands out of agricultural production? There will be an occasion when I will draw conclusions about what Ministers have said about land utilisation. When you were asking for land for other types of utilisation hon. members protested against the use of such land on the ground that it was land for agricultural production.

I should like to say that all over the world people protect themselves against aliens. We go to the United States of America and we are treated as aliens; you cannot get a job unless you have this, that and the other. So also is the position in France; all countries have legislation for the purpose of protecting their people at home; but the Hon. Minister said that this protection is against these aliens who are likely to buy up the land. What are the figures of land which aliens own in Barbados? They are infinitesimal. What seems likely to me is that when you narrow down this matter, there is the likelihood of improper practices being carried out because you are not setting up any Government institution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I should like to draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that under Rule 41, the motion made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church would be out of order. Rule 41 says this:-

"When a Bill has been read a second time, it shall on motion be committed to a Committee of the whole House, unless the House on motion commits it to Select Committee. A motion for committal to a Select Committee shall not require notice, must be made immediately after the Bill has been read a second time, and may be proposed by any Member."

According to that Rule, the motion for referring the Bill to a Select Committee can only be made after the Bill has been read a second time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will read the Rule. It says this:

"When a Bill has been read a second time, it shall on motion be committed to a Committee of the whole House, ..." That is the normal procedure in this House. The normal procedure is that when a Bill is read a second time it automatically goes to a Select Committee. The rule goes on "Unless the House on motion commits it to a Select Committee." That is what is happening now.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would still like to go further. In order for a Bill to be referred to a Select Committee a motion must be made immediately after the Bill has been read a second time and it may be proposed by any

member. A motion for referring a Bill to Select Committee must be made after the Bill has been read a second time. That is what the House agreed to.
6.05 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: That means this; it has to be made before it goes into Committee.

Hon. M. E. COX: It merely says after a Bill has been read a second time, and the Bill can only be read a second time when speeches are over and you put the motion.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is "passed" and not "read".

Hon. M. E. COX: What is the second reading then?

Mr. WALCOTT: You read a Bill by getting up and making the motion and somebody seconding it.

Hon. M. E. COX: That has not been the custom. After the Bill is read a second time, then the motion is made that the Bill be sent to Select Committee.

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot make that motion after it has passed.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order, ...

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not need any assistance. The hon. member is out of order. The hon. member's point can only be that he considers the second reading ended when all the second reading speeches have been completed. Now how is Mr. Speaker to know that all the second reading speeches are complete? The motion cannot be put until then. Hon. members may continue to speak on the second reading of the Bill, but, Mr. Speaker cannot refuse the motion. Hon. members may continue to speak on this round of speeches which are really second reading speeches. Hon. members seem anxious to get up when Mr. Speaker is speaking, but I am saying that the motion shall not be put until the hon. members' speeches are exhausted. The hon. member for Christ Church was not out of order because he moved that this be sent to Select Committee at this stage. Hon. members on this side should so organise their speeches that they may have them all exhausted and the motion for the second reading may come at the end, but I cannot see how I can refuse to acknowledge that a motion for Select Committee has been made.

Hon. M. E. COX: With Your Honour's permission, may I ask Your Honour, if the motion for a Select Committee is carried before the Bill is read a second time, what will take place? What are you sending to Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER consulted with the Clerk.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I am in a position after having consulted with my Clerk to interpret the Rule. I will read it very slowly for hon. members to follow because unfortunately copies are not yet printed.

"When a Bill has been read a second time, it shall on motion be committed to a Committee of the whole House ..."

In other words, that must follow; the motion to send it to Select Committee must follow immediately after the second reading; that is clearly understood.

"...unless the House" when it reaches the Committee stage and after the motion for going into ordinary Committee as we understand it "on motion commits it to a Select Committee."

I think that should be clearly understood by hon. members. In other words, I think the hon. member and the seconder really anticipated themselves by making the motion at that particular time. I hope I am well understood. The first thing that happens is the second reading and after that it shall be committed to a Committee of the whole House. That is the ordinary procedure

following the second reading speeches, but unfortunately it has not got to Committee. It cannot be done otherwise unless, and that means after the second reading stage, the House on motion again, which is the motion which was made too anticipatorily, commits it to a Select Committee. "A motion for committal to a Select Committee shall not require notice, it must be made immediately after the Bill has been read a second time" The Bill really has not yet been read a second time because I have not put the question; so the Leader of the House is quite right and has exercised his Parliamentary privilege.

What has really happened is this; it is most unfortunate that hon. members do not have copies of the Rules; otherwise I am sure the member for Christ Church seconded by the member for St. Peter would not at that stage have made the motion, because after the second reading the motion for sending it to Select Committee must follow. The motion for Select Committee cannot come before.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I fully appreciate your remarks and I gave my intention of moving the House into Select Committee while I was speaking. I want to draw to the attention of the House that each member only has an opportunity to speak once on the second reading; and unless you make your points then, you will not be able to

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion cannot be allowed at this stage, but I am sure two other members will make that motion. In fact the hon. member may do it again and the hon. member for St. Peter may second it again.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, what I would like to clarify - and it is in your time and we have been here a long time - is that a second reading speech is when the House is in Committee of the whole House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh no!

Mr. WALCOTT: When making a second reading speech you cannot at that stage make any other speech. You cannot make a speech on the second reading and get back up and say "I now beg to move that so and so" because after you have put the motion that this Bill be now read a second time, that closes all debate. There is no question of any member having any opportunity to speak after Your Honour rises to put the question that the Bill be now read a second time; so the advice tendered to you cannot work.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member reads the Rule as it stands, I know he will be perfectly convinced.

Mr. WALCOTT: If you put the question for the Bill to be read a second time and it is read a second time, no person can therefore speak at that stage. After the Bill has been read a second time, it is left then to the mover to decide (1) if he is going to proceed to take the Bill into Committee or (2) if he is not going to proceed to deal with the Bill further that day because the Mover can decide he is not proceeding any further with the Bill at that stage and it ends there; but for the long years I have been in this House whenever a motion is made to carry anything into Select Committee, it has to be done during the initial stage of the debate.
6.15 p.m.

How do you put the question? The question as to which motion you put first is left to the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Rule does not say so now.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not have my Rule Book, but I remember the Rules saying that we cannot make a motion at any time we wanted to do so and we did not have to give notice.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, no. At the correct time.

Mr. WALCOTT: From the point of procedure, at what stage do you put the motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like the hon. member to read the Rule. If he reads it, he would know when it is to be put.

Mr. WALCOTT: If the motion for the second reading is put, if the member did not get the opportunity to make the motion that the same Bill be sent to Select Committee, I do not see the opportunity of his doing so after the motion for the second reading has been put.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member remembers this as well as I do. Before we had this rule here, the motion for a Bill to be referred to Select Committee was regarded as an amendment to the motion that the House go into Committee on the Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: If the hon. member would just permit me --

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that I have said sufficient for him to understand.

Hon. M. E. COX: I just wanted to point out to the hon. member that as soon as the motion for the second reading is put, any member can get up and propose that the Bill be sent to a Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is repeating what I have just said.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will still exercise my right to speak. I made the point that the Hon. Minister who introduced this Bill said that what was behind this amendment was to protect Barbados and Barbadians from the sort of rapacious attitude of some aliens who are likely to come here and acquire all our land and leave us landless. I do not believe that you will find a dissentient voice in any part of the world towards the giving of the land rights to the people who are born in a country. In Nigeria, even a Britisher cannot own land. You have to be a Nigerian to own land because it is sold to you. In certain parts of Manhattan, an American cannot own land. You cannot pull down a building on land and sell the land to somebody.

I do not believe in freehold. I am an out-and-out Socialist. I do not believe in freehold because I think that man as such is an individual and, therefore, has no inherent right to ownership of land. That may not appeal to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. He is a Socialist except when it comes to an individual holding land. However, that has always been my view. When it comes to that view, I mean any land any part of the world. Who can tell me who owns the Himalayan Mountains? You can see what it is in relation to that when it comes to a small bit of land as Barbados. There is no inherent right to an individual owning land, but it is the sort of thing which we have come along and found.

What I want to tell the Hon. Minister is that he is not helping the community by saying that an alien should not own land, but a man who is a Canadian can own land here. In this country of Barbados when we fought absentee proprietors, it was not based on a question of their being aliens. They were Englishmen having the inherent right to own land here but it was against that very interest that we fought. The name "absentee" rings very badly in our ears. The Hon. Minister should not associate that with this Bill because aliens and absentee proprietors are poles apart. The people who own Dunscombe Plantation, the Belle or Colleton are not Barbadians, but they are not aliens.

In my view, this Bill is going to strike at a very small group of people within the context of people who want to own land here; and what the hon. senior member for Christ Church said is something with which I agree, and that is that it is not giving Barbadians any protection over owning land

from people coming from outside because people from outside at present can come here and own land. As the Bill is worded, when you have it that people who live in British Dominions are not referred to as aliens, of course, such people would be more interested in owning land here than people from Venezuela and such countries. We have a limited amount of land and owing to this limited amount, protection is necessary. The Hon. Minister should be prepared to say to all and sundry that the time has come when ownership of land must rest only with Barbadians. He should say to all and sundry that this is a small portion of land which we have here but if you want a piece of land to put a factory on, we will give you a lease for that but you cannot hold it in perpetuity. That should be said to all people coming from outside, whether they be aliens, Britishers, or Canadians. We do not have enough land to sell; therefore, we should see to it that any land which we have should only be sold to Barbadians. As I have said, in Nigeria which is one of the biggest territories in the Colonial Empire, no land is sold to anybody but Nigerians.

I do not agree with the premise which the Hon. Minister set out to base his argument on but I would be pleased to go along with him if he really means to carry out that policy that land in Barbados will be vested in the State and not residents. Whether they be British or otherwise, they will not be allowed to own it because when you have ownership of land on a freehold basis it passes down to all your heirs and successors.

6.25 p.m.

I say this; I believe that the Government in Barbados would be afraid to say that they feel that land in Barbados should be vested in the State, so that the investment you make would reside here. If they were to do that, they would have nothing to fear; but I do not like to hear the Hon. Minister say what he said, as if he were speaking to his constituents on the eve of an Election, so as to show them what he thinks. The Minister knows that he, as Minister of Agriculture, agreed to Heywoods being used for purposes other than agricultural and by persons who are not Barbadians. It is a free-hold sale and the owners can turn it over to whoever they like. The Hon. Minister also agreed to the Sandy Lane proposal. He made another sweeping statement, that Barbadians are fed from the land; but that is not so altogether. Barbadians are fed from the food which they can produce; but if the boats do not come to Barbados, the people will starve. It is rather that what the land produces pays for what we eat; therefore do not let us talk about this land reclamation. With our economy we cannot create the crops on the land or produce them to feed the population; we cannot even produce enough milk in Barbados to supply the needs of the Barbadian population unless we order evaporated milk from outside. We cannot produce meat in Barbados from the grazing and the cattle which we have. We have to diversify our economy so that we can find the wealth which the community can produce so as to provide these things. The policy of aliens not holding land in Barbados is bound up with our economic policy and the opportunity should be taken to say that the reason why we do not want aliens to hold land is for this and that reason.

We have asked that legislation be passed to protect the beaches, and when we pointed out that there is a danger that other beach lands are to be sold, you said that you are going to control the beach lands. It is needless for me to remind hon. members of this Chamber and those of the Ministerial Benches about this matter, because I am happy to know that you were present when it was pointed out to the Minister the feasibility of using some land. This land is not used for agricultural purposes and we said that it should have been used for Barbadians. I am happy to say that the purpose for which the land will be used is not for Barbadians but for Canadians, it may be, first. I have mentioned these things so that the Minister should not make the sweeping statement which he has made. He accused the hon. senior member for Christ Church for making rambling statements; I would not accuse the Hon. Minister of that, but I would say that he should be more precise as to the statements which he makes. His intentions may be good, but that is not the law which he is passing. They are passing a law to give them the right to give an alien a licence to purchase land:

but what I am afraid of in this community is this. Sometimes you pass a Bill like this giving authority to the Governor-in-Executive Committee to give this permission. The Cabinet is a body of political Ministers and I am of the considered opinion that, within the context of real self-government, such bodies as are set up should be set up on a basis on which the Cabinet becomes the final arbiter if there is any question of a dispute as to what the first body should say.

I would like to see a body of very high-standing officials or persons in the community having these rights and the Cabinet having the right of appeal in order that a person who is coming here should not be forced to find that he is *non persona grata* with a Minister or Ministers. That seems to be a relic of the old parish pump political days when the Vestries were running the parishes and they looked around to see to whom they could give a Scholarship, when they used to pat themselves on the back that they fought to get a Scholarship for somebody's son. I feel that such things should be memories in our constitutional life. In Britain, Cabinets do not like to say who will get a bit of land; do you think that Mr. Macmillan has any right to say that he gave a man some land in Welham Gardens or anything like that?

6.35 p.m.

Now I am afraid of that because lots of things have happened in the past and lots of things will happen in the future. When Ministers are supposed to be political people looking to the population for votes and to control things and in the same breath they are the people who are handing out things to people, that is not good enough. Why should a Minister be in a position to give a man a spot of land? Is it because he would be able to give you a piece too? I saw the type of correspondence which passed between a group of people who were interested in acquiring land in Barbados.

This is a small community and I heard the Minister in introducing this Bill say his job is not a job in which he can get money. I am sorry, Sir; it was not that Minister, it was the Minister of Social Services in making a reply. But the Minister in that context made a speech to the effect that he does not engage in a trade in which he can get money like real estate business. It looks to me as if the Ministers are now going in for a little brokerage business, because your job is to decide policy, set out the conditions under which aliens must have land and set up a Committee to carry out your policy so that you as Ministers would not have power to say: this is the man to get land. If I went somewhere and saw somebody who was interested in getting land and I told him to come to Barbados, when he goes to the Minister and is asked who introduced him and he tells the Minister, then the Minister can refuse to sell him the land. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid of that aspect of it, and that is not be any means accusing anyone; but as somebody said, I do not know if they hope to live for the next two thousand years; so I would like to see this done on a general basis, and that is why I would prefer to let us go into this in a thorough manner and not on the basis of what the other islands have passed. We should be satisfied that we can pass a law like this to be applicable to all non-residents in Barbados so that they are treated on the same basis.

I will say this to the Ministers: you will find that the day you lease land or rent land on leasehold, these abnormal and astronomical prices which people now ask for land will disappear because no sale would be involved. If a man does not have to go and purchase every square inch, there is not going to be any question of people charging £3 or £5 per square foot for land; and when the Government has to acquire land from people these fantastic prices would disappear, because there would be instances in which compensation would be involved. Land would not be sold at these fantastic prices when an amount of lease land is involved, and it would be an inroad into stopping this vicious system we have in Barbados where land has reached a price today which is out of proportion to reality and the economic situation that is existing in Barbados. That is to say, the price of land has outstripped the economy of Barbados by nearly twenty times, so that when you look at the price of land it bears no relationship to the economy that exists in Barbados over the years, and that is because land has been allow-

ed to fetch what price could be got, and it means that a man who has to buy a house is doing something out of proportion to what his income relates.

I hope that the Minister will see that those of us who are Socialists in philosophy regard any control of land use as in the best interest of the people; but this in itself does not do that. This is only a fringe and only deals with a very small minority of land holders at present in Barbados, and unfortunately the Minister did not say in his second reading speech what was the present position of aliens owning land in Barbados, so that we would know it has reached some alarming height.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, so much of what the hon. senior member for St. Peter said represents my own views on this matter that often during his speech I thought I must have been thinking aloud. To listen to the remarks of the Introducer of the Bill, one would have thought that the Government was initiating some important and far-reaching land reform policy. Despite his verbal outbursts, nothing could be further from the truth. As a matter of fact, all the Bill seeks to do is to say the manner in which aliens can own land, and it does not prohibit them from owning land.

All we can say, Mr. Speaker, is that the Minister's presentation of this Bill as regard emotionalism is a substitute for reason and commonsense. All this Bill says is that an alien who wants to own any land in the country must get a licence from the Executive Committee. That is all he has to do, and then when he has satisfied them, he will get a licence up to a maximum of five acres. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has so correctly said, the granting of a licence in this respect should not concern the Cabinet at all. All they are supposed to do, Mr. Speaker, is to lay down the policy under which people can acquire land, aliens or non-aliens, and leave it to the appropriate Department to carry out.

Now the hon. senior member for St. Peter said they should set up a Board. You do not need to set up a Board, Mr. Speaker, because every single piece of information that this Bill seeks to acquire is already asked for under the Town and Country Planning Legislation. You cannot sell a piece of land; you cannot divide it up for any purpose unless you have the permission of the Town and Country Planning Department, and people who are sensible, even when they are going to buy land, either rural or urban land, nowadays have the good sense to find out from the Town and Country Planning Department first whether they will be allowed to use the land for the purpose for which they buy it, because it is not beyond the knowledge of members of this House that people have actually acquired land for specific purposes and been told by the Town and Country Planning Department that it cannot be used for such. So to all intents and purposes, people who are coming in here to acquire land, aliens or non-aliens, have first to clear themselves with the Town and Country Planning Department. It is all well and good for the Minister to say that there are other islands in the area which have legislation of this sort, but that legislation was put on the Statute Book of those colonies before they had a Town and Country Planning Act like ours. 6.45 p.m.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the presence of the Town and Country Planning Act on your Statute Book renders this Bill almost unnecessary. As the Hon. Minister has said, this is a Bill; it is not an Act yet, and it lays down no fundamental reform in land ownership in this country. All that it is doing is this. If you are not a British subject and you come in here and want to buy a bit of land, you must be able to satisfy the Minister before you can buy it and, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, if they had something to do, they could not sit down in an office and do all these sorts of little things. Every single bit of legislation which we pass, we have the Ministers spending their time in having to administer it. If the Ministers are going to spend their time in going into all these things, well, then, they must have at least forty Ministers; if not, they would not be able to do it. You have it that the Hon.

Minister of Agriculture seems to be very happy in making that fantastic statement which he made just now that as long as he is Minister of Agriculture no agricultural land is going out of production. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter pointed out, that statement is so absurd and untrue. I am sure that anybody who passed along Collymore Rock and saw the excavators taking off about four feet of good rich, deep soil so as to make room for the Brewery which they are going to put on that site would wonder if we in this country are going mad.

Mr. Speaker, I was saying, Sir, that propaganda is no substitute for facts. This ceiling of five acres of land for alien ownership is neither here nor there. The average alien who comes here to buy a piece of land does not want five acres. If he comes to engage in trade, he will go to the Industrial Board and get as much as to put his factory on. No alien is coming here to buy five acres of land to plant in canes.

If you heard the Hon. Minister when he was jumping up and talking about controlling land, you would have thought that he had done something. The Hon. Minister has been in this Chamber for all these years when we on this side have implored successive Governments to put the ceiling on agricultural ownership in this country, that is to say, not to allow either aliens or non-aliens to own more than a given number of acres of land. From time to time, I have suggested that it should be 500 acres at the most, because in a small community like this you should not allow an individual or corporation to own more than 500 acres; and if the Government does that, they would be doing something. This Bill means absolutely nothing. Every single piece of information which this Bill seeks to obtain is obtainable in the Town and Country Planning Department. The only difference as regards this is that instead of sending it to the Town and Country Planning Department, it is sent to the Government

What we would consider a radical step for this Government to do would be if this Government had done what had been done in the area and come in and say to the people who own estates — the absentee proprietors — that the Government wanted to acquire the estates of those absentee proprietors for local ownership. You will not be expropriating their lands either. If you say that in consequence of our limited land ownership, we want to acquire 2,000 acres of land from those people at a fixed price, I am sure they would not object. But the Government has no conception of anything like that.

This Bill is meaningless propaganda, absolutely meaningless. You are saying that you are controlling ownership of land by aliens. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has pointed out, this Bill does not even apply to Canadians, Australians or Englishmen; it only applies to aliens and I submit that the percentage of aliens who are going to come here, with the possible exception of Americans, to acquire land is almost infinitesimal. The American Consul brought a property somewhere in Christ Church sometime ago. He wanted the house, not the land. If this policy of the Government was in force then, he would have to apply to them and he would have told them that he wanted a house to live in and they would have given him the licence to buy it. No alien is going to come here and want to acquire land.

I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in future before Government begins to pat itself on the back that it is doing something wonderful and before the Ministers come here with these emotionalistic outbursts and what not, they really find themselves into possession of something bold and far-reaching to the Legislature. Let us hear that the Barbados Government is at long last going to do what the Dominican Government, the Trinidadian Government, the Grenadian Government, the St. Vincent Government, the St. Kitts Government, the Antigua Government have been doing for the last fifteen or twenty years. Those Governments have been buying one or two plantations and making the same land available to the population of those islands. Let us hear this Government beginning to do the same thing to the land hungry population of this island so that when the

Minister starts to jump up we will be able to jump up with him.

Nearly about six months ago in the British House of Commons, the Secretary of State for the Colonies in a reply to a question said that nowadays a very fair portion of the sugar production of the Leeward Islands was produced by absentee proprietors.

6.55 p.m.

It is remarkable, Mr. Speaker, and very remarkable, that this is the only island in the entire West Indian Federation which, in the last twenty years or so, since political reform has taken place, has not made any important change, not even as to five per cent of the land ownership of the country. In 1960, as in 1937, the ownership of land in this country remains in the same position. None of us on this side of the Table would be so stupid as to recommend to the Government that they should embark on any large-scale ownership of land in this island even although it has been recommended from that side of the House that everybody should be given half an acre of land. None of us would be so stupid as to suggest that, but we certainly do feel that there should be some effort made at some time or other, to enable the people who are engaged in the actual cultivation of land in this country to derive something more from the cultivation of the land than wages. If the Government feels that this Bill is going to introduce any millenium in so far as change in our land ownership in the country is concerned, if they feel that this Bill will in any way contribute to

At this stage, it being now 7 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7 p.m. of the clock, this sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. of the clock. This sitting now stands suspended.

On re-assembling,

ALIENS (LAND-HOLDING) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: On the suspension of the sitting, the House was debating the second reading of a Bill to regulate the holding of land by aliens and companies under alien control. The hon. senior member for St. Philip was speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is hardly any point in further taking up the time of the House with this matter; to do so would be to put a significance to the Bill which it does not possess. I think that enough has been said to demonstrate to the House that the emotionalism and exuberance of the Minister in presenting the Measure were completely unfounded and that he himself, if not the Government, was labouring under a misapprehension as to its merits. The Bill makes no new departure in legislation of the kind in Barbados, since, as I have said earlier, most of the advantages which will accrue from it are already to be obtained from the new Town and Country Planning Act. Merely to copy what is said to be in existence in some of the other West Indian islands, at this stage, is of very little relative value to Barbados.

One thing I would like to be informed about is whether, in the legislation of which this Bill is said to be a copy, the applications for permission from aliens to acquire land are sent to what approximates in Barbados to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. If these applications are sent to what corresponds to our Executive Committee, I am sure that in most of the places where you find this type of legislation, you will not find a Town and Country Planning Act such as ours. What should be the position, as things stand in Barbados at this time, is that the Cabinet should formulate Regulations setting out the terms and conditions under which non-British subjects can acquire property in this country. Then the actual application of these Regulations should be left to the Town and Country Planning Department itself. Where a person is going to sell land, in his application for permission to divide the land, he is compelled by law to set out in detail the purpose for which he is cutting up the land and the purpose for which it will be used; so that the Government cannot say that the machinery does not exist in this respect.

No owner can sell any portion of land at all unless he sets out in detail why he is going to cut it up, the purpose

of it, the portion which he is selling, the purpose to which it will be put and what not. Since this information will have to be provided for in the Town and Country Planning Act, it is superfluous to call upon a person to submit to the Governor-in-Executive Committee an application in respect of the same portion of land. In the Bill before us, in order that an alien can have control of the land, he must have a licence from the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the Bill imposes conditions under which that alien may acquire this land. You have to tell the Governor-in-Executive Committee for what purpose you want the land, the purpose to which you are going to put it and all of that sort of thing.

7.50 p.m.

All of this information is already supplied to a Government Department by the vendor of the land; so what on earth do you want this duplication for? There might have been some useful purpose served by the introduction of this Bill long ago, that is, before the Town and Country Planning Office went into operation; but as it stands now, Sir, all this Bill will do is to give rise to more rumours, of remarkable correspondence from members of Government to would-be purchasers of land; and Mr. Speaker, it is not going to prevent a single alien from acquiring one single piece of land in this country, because, as I have said before, none of them is going to need more than five acres for any purpose.

Finally, Sir, since we have the word of the Minister that agricultural land is not to be further utilised in this country for non-agricultural purposes, is it too much to hope that there shall be no repetition of Heywoods except under the most exceptional circumstances, and that in future enterprises, such as breweries and what not, may not be sited on first-class agricultural land, since there is no doubt about it that similar sites from the point of view of water supplies can be developed elsewhere; that some effort will be made to see to it that agricultural land is put to the maximum possible use; that, more important still, some effort be made, Mr. Speaker, in the not distant future to see to it that absentee proprietors, aliens or non-aliens, be invited under satisfactory terms to dispossess themselves of their holdings here in the interest of acquisition by the native population? None of the absentee proprietors who own land in this island are by report such rabid imperialists that they would view in an unsatisfactory manner any attempt to expropriate their holdings under satisfactory conditions.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that Barbados has been more fortunate than most of the surrounding islands in this respect, and both in the pre- and post-emancipation period little of our land holdings were acquired by absentee proprietors as in Jamaica, Trinidad and what not; but it must also be said that unlike these islands there has been little or no attempt to embark upon worthwhile land settlement schemes, and the Minister would be well advised, as well as Government, to utilise some of their time and effort not in concerning themselves with fantasies and pursuing shadows and running to earth a few aliens who might want to acquire a few holdings in this country, but they should really concern themselves with making some of the valuable land in this country available to a larger section of the population.

There is no doubt at all, Mr. Speaker, over the circumstance that a large section of the population in this island would like to own a piece of land of its own. I believe there is still a group of plantations in the island, the ownership of which is in dispute and which I am not sure is put to the maximum agricultural use. I refer to the plantations - four or five of them - still owned, I think, by one or the other of two Panamanian Friendly Societies. The ownership was the subject of considerable legal dispute in recent years, and I am not sure whether or not it has been resolved one way or the other; but since some of the remarks of the Introducer of the Bill will lead to the deduction that the Government itself recognises land holding in the community, one hopes, Mr. Speaker, that some time and energy will be spent to investigate the position with regard to these Panamanian-held plantations, and some effort be made to acquire them either for the basis

of outright land settlement or acquisition by a public corporation and operation by agriculturalists, who apart from working for the wages which they will earn as operators of this plantation, shall be also entitled to some share of the annual profits produced thereby.

8.00 p.m.

The bone of contention is that so much or so great a portion of our entire agricultural labour force was being still compelled to operate or to pursue their task in agriculture purely under a wage system and without being entitled at all to any portion of the profits derived from the operation. Nowhere in the area is it so. It is not so in Dominica, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, or any of those colonies. It shall be, I assure you, the occasion for general rejoicing and the general satisfaction of members on this side of the Table if and when we do have before us a piece of legislation which symbolizes the embarkation of the Government upon real land reform and which generally constitutes a general departure in so far as land ownership in Barbados is concerned, and the restriction of the monopoly which now obtains in favour of a select few in this colony in so far as land ownership in this community is concerned.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, there are only four clauses of this Bill which I consider at this stage need careful investigation at the moment for the reasons which I intend to outline. It does not mean that the other clauses themselves do not need investigation at a later stage of the reading of the Bill before its passage, if it passes its second reading, but I consider the most dangerous provisions to be contained in the first four clauses and I intend to deal almost exclusively with these four clauses.

It is customary, Mr. Speaker, in countries where the essence of parliamentary democracy is better insisted on and more actively practised than it is in this far flung country of the British Commonwealth, and certainly one of the last declining parts of the British Empire to give a background - a historical, socialistic or economic background - to legislation when it is introduced in the Chamber. None of that has been vouchsafed to the members of this House except by the hon. senior member for Christ Church and I think that that hon. member was not in any way being immodest when he instructed the Minister of Agriculture that he was doing his job for him. Day after day, we come into this Chamber to be treated to a pointless, uninformative presentation of Bills from the Ministerial benches when you are enacting legislation of such far-reaching consequence as this legislation dealing with the purchasing of land. We on this side of the House feel that we are entitled to something a little less disjointed, a little less inept than the introductions which we get from time to time and particularly that which emanated from the Minister of Agriculture just now.

In the year 1957, much to my surprise, the Hon. Premier at that time introduced on the floor of this House a Bill intitled an Act to amend the Companies Act of 1910. It was passed on the 5th February, 1957 and is Chapter 24 of the Acts for that year. That Bill was presented by the then Minister of Trade. It was justified by the Premier without any acceptable explanation being given at the time of its passing. It is a very short Act and it is now part of the Statute Law of Barbados.

Now, the Companies Act of 1910 is one of the longest Acts outside of the Local Government Act on the Statute Book in this Island. It is an antiquated and almost obsolete Act. Similar legislation in the United Kingdom has been revised, codified and altered at least four or five times since 1910 and this Act was passed on the 1906 English Legislation and in that case we were only about four years behind hand.

Section 224 says that a company incorporated in the United Kingdom or any British possession which has filed with the Registrar the documents and particulars specified in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of subsection (1) of the last foregoing section - that is section 223 - shall have the same power to hold lands in the Island as if it were a company incorporated under this Act.

It will be very difficult, Mr. Speaker, for members on the other side of the House to appreciate that in so far as

the law of Barbados is concerned even English Law - and I say English advisedly - even the Law of Trinidad, the Law of St. Lucia and English Law - and I would like to qualify this to prior to the year 1625 - or the Law of Jamaica or any of the neighbouring colonies stands in no different position from the Law of Venezuela, the Union of Soviet Social Republics, the Law of Ghana, the Law of Japan and the Law of the United States of America, as far as we are concerned. They are foreign law and they have to be proved in the Courts of this island in the same way as a witness comes in Court and prove that the buses of the Transport Board are running on time; that is, on a simple question of fact. Of course, in the one case, it may be an undisputed fact and in the case of the Transport Board, it may be much in dispute. Very often, the land between opinion and fact cannot be easily demarcated.

Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of this island felt it necessary because of the constitutional set up of this island, as pointed out some four or five years ago, that a foreign company could not own property in Barbados except there is some statutory exemption for it.

8.10 p.m.

The occasion on which I made that observation was the occasion on which a Bill was introduced into this House, which in a very off-hand manner, mentioned that the United States Government was going to buy part and parcel of the island of Barbados. Then the Bill was amended by the then Premier so that the Admiralty would be able to deal with this land and they had to make a special provision to give the power to sell it to the Admiralty who would then sell it to the United States of America. The reason for that must be abundantly clear to anybody who gives any kind of reflection to matters of this kind. No country would allow a foreign corporation or other country to go into that territory and buy land. Let us take the Soviet Union as an illustration, which could set up a corporation and buy every plantation and estate in Barbados, in Jamaica, in Trinidad and the whole of Manhattan Island. Even if countries entertained a foreign country to own land - and the Africans were the only people who safeguarded themselves by making it clear that no alien could hold an estate in West Africa. I say all that in passing.

To get back to my main submission, it would mean that the Soviet Union could buy New York, if you were to allow foreign companies to extend into an island and buy property there. That is why I was the most surprised man in the world when, in 1957, the Government came to this House and amended Section 224 of the Companies Act and made it possible for any company to come into Barbados and buy land here. They are now seeing the folly of their ways. I have in my right hand the debate which took place in 1957 and the words used by the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour. After the Speaker, the now Premier had said that the next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, these were the words which the Hon. Minister used:-

"There is some doubt whether companies incorporated outside the Island elsewhere than in the United Kingdom or in a British possession have power to hold land in the Island. It is considered that such companies should have such power, subject to the granting of a licence by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. In order however to be able to hold land, such companies will have to comply with the requirements of Section 223 of the Companies Act, 1910 as to filing certain particulars with the Registrar as specified by the section in the same manner as companies incorporated in the United Kingdom or in a British possession are required to do in order to be able to hold land in this Island. Clause 3 of the Bill seeks to amend the Companies Act, 1910, to make the necessary provision. Opportunity has also been taken to provide for service of documents where default has been made in complying with the requirements of section 223 or in case there are no persons in the island on whom service can be effected."

The Minister dealt with Section 223 in the manner in which he understood it. Then in the next paragraph he said this:-

"The Government sought advice on the matter and the custom as operates in some other West Indian Islands is to

give such companies the right to hold property. But there are variations in the manner of doing it. In some of the neighbouring Islands, these foreign or alien companies have the same rights as natives or subjects, and in others a system applies whereby you must have a licence from the Executive Committee. It is felt that our Act should be amended to fit in with at least some of the other Islands which make it necessary for them to have a licence. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time."

That was the introduction of the Bill. The hon. senior member for St. Peter then made the same kind of strictures which I have ventilated here today. He said:-

"Mr. Speaker, the 'Objects and Reasons' of this Bill have been read by the Hon. Leader of the House, but that is something which we have read ourselves. He has not added anything to what we are told in the 'Objects and Reasons'. When you are not going to be told anything other than what is stated in the 'Objects and Reasons', I think that you need not come to the House at all."

I entirely endorse the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter on that occasion. The hon. member went on to say this:

"You can very well see that the reason why Colonial territories have passed this type of legislation is because they want to prevent absentee proprietorship. If that were not so, one of these days you would wake up and find yourself in the position of Liberia, which is a country that the Firestone Company owns. It is known that you do not allow companies outside of your own territory to hold land, but they can come and incorporate themselves in the territory for the purpose of doing business. If you allow them to come in and own land, it would mean that if you have four Rockefeller Institutes buying land in Barbados, then the next thing you will know is that all of your land is owned by people in the United States of America." (ASIDES).

The Hon. Minister is now being very vociferous but he was as meek as a lamb when the Bill was being introduced. The hon. senior member for St. Peter went on to say this:-

"You have changed things because you want to attract capital; yet still you do not want it to be like Liberia, and that is the reason why you are making this amendment."

I am saying that the first time the Minister knew anything about this was when the file was put into his hands."

The hon. member went on to ask: "Who are the companies". The hon. senior member for St. Philip spoke in much the same strain as he has spoken today and the now Minister without portfolio in the Federal Government, the former junior member for St. John said this:-

"Mr. Chairman, I cannot support the amendment by the hon. member and for this reason. I cannot conceive in the foreseeable future the type of Government which would permit a 500-acre ownership by any alien company. What I can foresee and conceive of is a thousand acre lot divided into acre pieces, rented out for market gardening on a long lease venture or for the use of canning companies."

Mr. Speaker, I am not necessarily adopting any statements made by any hon. member. The former junior member for St. John went on in that strain. Your Honour spoke on the Bill not *ex cathedra*, and this is what Your Honour said:-

"It is possible that ten applicants getting 500 acres would have a considerable amount of surface land of this colony."

And Your Honour went on to point out that there were deficiencies in the Bill. So much, Sir, for the historical background of the matter.

Now we come to this Bill which is before us and the provisions which it contains. As I understand it, this is the

rationale for the introduction of the amendment in 1957; as the Minister of Trade said, there was some doubt—and it appeared to subsist in his mind—as to whether an alien company could hold land in Barbados, and they were making it possible for aliens to hold land in Barbados.
8.20 p.m.

Well now, they come in with a Bill which in some degree restricts and confines the powers which they vested in these alien companies in 1957. Now, is this a case of their shutting the stable door after the horse has got out, or is it that they feel that the provisions for granting the licence were not clear, as indeed they were not, and that the Ministers, each and everyone of them, would have to be besieged and approached in order that these licences should be granted? Or is it that round about the year 1958 at the very time when the hon. member for St. Thomas, the Minister of Communications, was stating that they were not going to allow any agricultural land—I wish the Minister of Agriculture to listen to this particularly and not be distracted by the Minister on his right who is very distracting—to be taken out of production, and within twelve months we had the Sandy Lane project taking 383 acres or thereabouts out of cultivation, closing down the Sandy Lane Factory, putting members of the Barbados Workers Union and agricultural workers out of work and informing us that they would be employed as domestic servants? The ambition which the Government has for the people of Barbados is that we should all become the hewers of wood and the drawers of water.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order, the hon. member said the member for St. Thomas; which member for St. Thomas does he mean?

Mr. BARROW: You.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: When? Sit down, Sir.

Mr. BARROW: I refer to the hon. member who is now on his feet improperly.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: When did I ever say that no agricultural land would be taken out of production? The hon. member knows he is not telling the truth.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I would not even allow you to ask him to withdraw, but I have heard of the collective responsibility of Ministers. The Minister is now denying that he could have made such a statement, and the Minister of Agriculture today is giving us the assurance; so it seems to me that they are at cross purposes, because I am stating that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, the one who has just interrupted the debate, said it is the policy of the Government that no agricultural land should be taken out of production on more than one occasion.....

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I again repeat I have never made that statement. I am not responsible for the Minister of Agriculture. (Laughter by Opposition). I again repeat that I am accused of having said in here that agricultural land would never be taken out of production, but I know why the hon. member said it in relation to Sandy Lane. I know the dirty insinuations, but I want to catch one saying it outside and let me get evidence against him.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I have never accused the hon. member of getting money for anything. I made a statement that he said it on several occasions including when we were discussing Forde's pasture and the hon. senior member for St. Peter challenged him in connection with Heywoods. The hon. member knows when he says that I am making insinuations that I have documentary evidence that at that time he and three other Ministers—I will give you a background to this because it is in your constituency, Mr. Speaker,—were negotiating for the vesting of Heywoods Plantation approximately 150 to 153 acres, speaking under correction, in a Canadian Corporation. I am not making any insinuations; I am making bare statements of fact and I have not accused anybody of anything; I am giving a historical background. At that

time when the Ministers were besieging the agent for this Canadian Corporation or were being besieged by a mutual kind of arrangement, the late agent - because even on his death bed - and the gentleman is a gentleman by the name of Mr. Corbin - there was no Act on the Statute Book of Barbados. (A VOICE: How do you know?) The Doctor who chased you out is not dead nor the two nurses. The night the gentleman died, four of them were around his death bed. How does the hon. member know he is dead?

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 8.30 p.m., I must enquire of hon. members if this Bill is being considered as controversial.

Mr. TUDOR: Very controversial.

Mr. BARROW: I understand from colleagues that it is very controversial.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House may only proceed with any matter which is not controversial.

Hon. M. E. COX: If Your Honour will permit me, I would just like the hon. member.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is ended for the day. Members will refurbish their minds over the weekend and on the return they would be quite fit.

Hon. M. E. COX: We are accustomed to him.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order. 8.30 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: The Government would like to go on with some more of its business, and I am sorry that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has fallen into the trap because he is the very member who has on several occasions said in no uncertain manner that we do not do sufficient work. The hon. member has been saying recently that the Government would not do sufficient work. Now, the Government is willing to carry on and the hon. member is the first to say, "Oh no, we should not do anything more tonight."

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister cannot be true to say that I have said so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think he said the hon. senior member for St. Peter; I think he said the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. WALCOTT: He could not have meant me because I was surprised today when the House was in Committee of Supply that the Hon. Leader of the House failed to do the other Money Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member would appreciate that it is for the Government to do what business it wants to do. What about meeting tomorrow or Thursday?

Mr. WALCOTT: I have not made any objection to meeting any day. As a matter of fact, I am fresh. I have just come back from abroad.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would really like to find out from hon. members whether there is any other item which in their opinion is not controversial with which we can proceed at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: (To members of the Opposition) Is there any item uncontroversial with which we can proceed now?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Order No. 7.

Hon. M. E. COX: Well, Sir, put the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House says to put the question. The question is that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I think that there is a rule of the House which says that the closure of a debate cannot be moved until Your Honour is satisfied that every hon. member who wishes to speak has spoken.

I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention something else. You will see on the Order Paper under that item that I was speaking at the time of the moment of interruption and that the question was controversial; so it appears that if it were controversial then, it would be controversial now. We are still of that opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other item with which we can proceed?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, it shows how disjointed they are. The hon. senior member for St. Philip says Order No. 7. Now, another hon. member says that that is controversial. They are all running to form. Nobody knows what to do.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Philip who attempted to co-operate was not actually present when the House adjourned on the last occasion. He was competent or capable to suggest that we proceed with Order No. 7.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I asked what about Order No. 7. It is certainly a compliment for us to be slated that we are capable of having our own opinions and that we are not like sheep depending on a shepherd and following blindly, like the blind leading the blind.

Hon. M. E. COX: I was under the impression that the hon. senior member for St. Philip was the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. You can very well see what the future holds forth for them.

Sir, I would like to get some indications as to what we can proceed with. Perhaps, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is the best person to tell us what they are willing to proceed with.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Bill intituled an Act to amend the Fisheries Regulations Act, 1904, may safely be regarded as non-controversial.

Mr. SPEAKER: What Order is that?

Mr. BRANCKER: That is Order No. 4.

THE FISHERIES REGULATION BILL, 1960

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Agriculture can proceed with Order No. 4: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Fisheries Regulation Act, 1904.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I am thankful to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition for his being so amiable as to allow us to get ahead with some more work.

As hon. members will see from the Objects and Reasons of this Bill, it seeks to amend the Fisheries Regulation Act, 1904, mainly in three respects. In the first place, it makes it an offence for any person to be found in or near any of the coastal waters of the island in which there has been an explosion for the purpose of taking fish destroyed by such explosion or to cause or to be concerned in causing an explosion in such coastal waters by the use of dynamic or other explosive substance, while excepting the valid use of explosive in the sea with the permission of the Commissioner of Police.

Secondly, it makes it an offence for any person to have blasting equipment in a boat, and thirdly, it fixes a minimum penalty for offences relating to the dynamiting of fish. These three amendments are all considered necessary in the interest of the fishing industry of the island.

I think all hon. members will agree that nobody likes to know of anyone dynamiting fish. It is a hazard which kills some of the fishermen themselves. It kills hundreds

of thousands of young fish. It deprives the fisherman of doing their natural work. Nobody can see the right of it. I am not going to say much on this. All I would say is that it is in the interest of the public. I think that it is an absolute Barbadian piece of legislation and it is in the interest of everybody.

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

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: I beg to second that.
8.40 p.m.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I would say that I agree generally speaking, with the principle of this Bill in that the Minister has briefly explained that it seeks to amend the Fisheries Regulations Act, 1904, dealing mainly with the matter of dynamiting of fish. The general purpose of this Bill is praiseworthy, as one might say, but it is repressive legislation. It is legislation tantamount to the legislation dealing with praedial larceny, legislation with which you would expect a Conservative Government to come down. This is the kind of legislation like that making provision for Police dogs and things like that. One would have thought that the Hon. Minister would have come down with something constructive, something in connection with cold storage facilities.....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. I admit that the hon. member was out of the island for a little while and therefore he would not be *au fait* with what is taking place. However, I shall tell him that such legislation is coming down in the Five Year Plan.

Mr. TALMA: Well, even if I were here I would not have known that, because provision for cold storage facilities has been held up and put in the files since I was a Minister. I had the detailed plan worked out and, up to now, it has not been put into effect. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that if I had even been here I would not have known what the Minister has just said. This is typical of the old Conservative kind of legislation because fishermen who are found near a place where an explosion has occurred will be incarcerated and in many cases they may not know anything about the matter at all. This legislation is negative legislation to make criminals out of innocent and hard-working people. I am saying that this legislation, although it may appear to be necessary, is not necessary for the economic benefit of the average boatowner or fisherman who finds it difficult to secure economic prices for his fish, and is unable, in consequence of that, to make the payments of loans to the Government for his boat.

I would expect the Hon. Minister to pay some attention to what I have said and it would be far better if he were to devote more of his attention to assisting fishermen and boat-owners who are economically unable to repay their loans, than to bringing down this legislation which is obviously punitive in form. This legislation may be necessary but let us hope that it will not be passed and result in poor, innocent men who are trying to eke out a living in proper ways being taken advantage of. This bit of legislation is something which can be abused and made the object of oppression. (Laughter) It is alright for the Minister to laugh but innocent people can be put in prison and be made criminals by this legislation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the dynamiting of fish is an evil which has to be stamped out. It is destructive to the economy of the country and there could certainly be no commendation of the people who resort to the use of dynamite in order to catch fish in our waters. Therefore any legislation which seeks to stamp out the practice must receive the support of right-thinking people. In so far as this Bill seeks to tighten up this dangerous practice,

naturally we will support it; but the other section of the Bill is one which really must arouse some interest and concern.

The other important section of the Bill makes it an offence for the person in charge of a fishing boat to permit any other person not being the holder of a licence.....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. Oh, No, that is not this Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: As I said, Sir, the provision against the dynamiting of fish is to be supported but in the case of the other section, that is a horse of a different colour.

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

On the motion of Hon. D. D. GARNER, seconded by Hon. L. StA. THORNE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

8.55 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 9 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. D. D. GARNER seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 2nd August, 1960 at 12 noon.

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, I would like to enquire of the Minister of Education whether he thinks he will be able to proceed with that Civil Establishment Order which deals with Erdiston College next week, and whether he thinks he will have a number of answers to Questions which stand in my name.

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I give no undertaking that the Order will be ready, but I will have any number of questions ready for him.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the appropriate Ministers whether I could expect answers to Questions Nos. 20, 21, 22 and 23 which have been on the Order Paper for quite a long time. Three are to the Hon. Premier on the Mitchell Engineering Company, the history of the negotiations of the Electric Company and the purchasing power of the West Indian Dollar in Barbados from the year 1938 to the year 1959 taking the year 1939 as 100, and the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing on the Waterworks Department. (A VOICE: This is not the time for that.) How many Speakers do we have in this House? It is legitimate for any member of this House on the motion for adjournment to bring matters dealing with questions to the attention of Your Honour and to ask the Minister whether he can expect answers to the questions.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 2nd August, 1960 at 12 noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
8.58 p.m.