

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1960

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 16th June, 1960.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 noon today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*); Mr. T. W. MILLER; Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc.; and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 31st May, 1960, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed.

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

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month ended 31st January, 1960.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I thought it was well known that in the absence of the hon. senior member for St. Michael, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas was the Leader of the House. I thought that some pronouncement had been made to that effect.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the Premier ever made an announcement to the House that in the absence of the Leader, the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing would act as Deputy Leader?

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, may I on a point of order say that I have never on this side heard such a pronouncement made nor has my colleague on my immediate right?

Mr. SPEAKER: The House will take it that that announcement which the Premier has just made assures

the House that a pronouncement was made by him some time previously.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Approved Estimates, 1960-61.

Also,

The Registration of Electors Expenses Regulations, 1960.

The Representation of the People Election Expenses Regulations, 1960.

The Local Government Election Expenses Regulations, 1960.

Barbados Statistical Service Selected Monthly Indicators - February and March, 1960.

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

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of money orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General and the amounts due by the various Post Offices etc. to 30th April, 1960.

There are also three Statements which I would like to read and lay on Government policy. One is on the administration of the Port after the construction of the Deep Water Harbour; one is on the future of the Transport service of the island and the other concerns bunkering facilities, and I would like to ask permission of the House to read them.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Report of the Department of Education for the period 1st September, 1954 to 31st August, 1959.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled "The Customs Tariff (Conditions for Special Exemption from Duty) (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations, 1960."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Question No. 1/1960 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy regarding appointments to the Magisterial Bench is now ready.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Question No. 30/1960 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy regarding the erection of a new District Post Office in St. Lucy is now ready.
12.25 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the following statements:-

STATEMENT re GOVERNMENT'S POLICY ON FUTURE OF TRANSPORT SERVICE

First of all, Sir, is this statement of Government's policy on the future of the Transport Service.

The road and transport facilities of the Island are a public service and a Government responsibility, and it is the Government's duty to see that both are planned in the best interests of the Island's economy and of the community. To serve the public must be the first consideration.

2. The continuation of the present Transport Board service or its expansion into an integrated all-Island service depends in large part, on the following:-

- (i) adequate management;
- (ii) the possibility of raising finance;
- (iii) good management/employee relationships; and
- (iv) the co-operation of the workers and the public.

The necessary steps are being taken to achieve these objectives and thereby increase the efficiency of the Board. These will be vigorously pursued.

3. Whether the Island's services are integrated into one concession and a unified system to be operated by the Transport Board or by a privately owned concern will depend on the outcome of these steps and the success of these efforts. A recent survey of Omnibus Operations in this Island is now being studied. Any future decision will be made on the basis of what can be offered by alternative operators in the way of services to the community and at what cost to the public.

4. 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. Traffic and Vehicles must conform to the available roads. It is therefore proposed that the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937, should be amended to provide for, amongst other things:-

- (i) the introduction of more stringent road regulations with heavier penalties for speeding, dangerous driving, illegal parking, etc.
- (ii) the tightening up of the present safety regulations and the stringency of annual motor vehicle inspections.
- (iii) the establishment of a Barbados Licensing Authority to centralise the issuance of safety and other inspections certificates and licences.
- (iv) the establishment of limits on the size and weight of all classes of vehicles.
- (v) new definitions of taxis and special categories of vehicle for hire and the obligations and limitations to be placed on their use.
- (vi) 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.

5. Other passenger-carrying vehicles will not be allowed to compete with licensed bus services on routes that are adequately serviced.

6. Special permits will be issued for the operation of goods and other vehicles.

That, Sir, is the first statement.

There is another statement on the policy for the administration of the Port consequent upon the construction of the Deep Water Harbour.

It is as follows:-

STATEMENT OF POLICY FOR ADMINISTRATION OF PORT

In June, 1959, the Government agreed in principle on the following policy for the Administration of the Deep Water Harbour:

- (a) that the Port as a whole, including the Careenage, should be administered by the Port Manager acting as chief executive officer, and that the Port Department should be self-accounting;
- (b) that the Port Advisory Board, to be styled the Barbados Harbour Board, should be set up, comprising of not more than six members under the chairmanship of the Port Manager;
- (c) a Landing and Shipping Company should be formed by those companies at present working cargo, to operate under licence in the Port and to continue to function as heretofore. The Company would be required to find the funds to mechanise the handling of cargo and the charges made by the Company would be subject to the approval of the Port Manager in consultation with his advisory Board;
- (d) the Loading of sugar would be undertaken by a Company operating under licence and comprised of members of the sugar industry. The Company would be required to fully insure the installation in the name of the Executive Committee and to pay a fixed annual rental for the sugar store plus a fee per ton, exclusive of Port Charges, for the sugar off loaded into ships. A Replacement Fund would be set up from the revenue derived from the rental and be used to replace the bulk sugar installation in due course. The off-loading equipment and sugar store would have to be serviced and maintained by the Company and the fees paid for the sugar loaded on to ships would accrue to Port revenue.

The Government also concluded that the proposal that a lease on the bulk sugar installation should be granted to the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association (Inc.) should be approved in principle.

The Government further concluded that a policy statement should be prepared to be laid in the House of Assembly setting out the Government's proposal and that the necessary legislation to give legal effect to the policy should also be prepared.

2. As a result of the above decision, the following was stated by His Excellency the Governor at the Opening of the Legislative Session, 1960:-

"My Government has decided that initially the harbour will be administered by the Port Manager who will be assisted by a Harbour Advisory Board. This arrangement will obtain only during the formative period, after which my Government proposes to review the administrative arrangements so as to ensure the efficient administration of the Port".

3. During the recent visit of Sir Eric Millbourn and Captain Alistair Smith, they advised the Government on a number of matters connected with the Deep Water Harbour. In regard to the administration of the harbour, however, Sir Eric has proposed that this should be run as a department of Government under the Ministry of Communications, Works and Housing, and that there should be an Advisory Board appointed by the Minister to advise him on matters relating to the Port.

4. In putting forward the above proposal, Sir Eric Millbourn has written inter alia:-

"I understand that Government has already announced its intention of setting up a Port Department within the Ministry of Communications, Works and Housing for the administration and control of the Port

and in due course you propose to form a Harbour Advisory Board to assist you in these matters. I confirm the advice I have already given, namely, that in my view this method of administering the Port of Bridgetown is the most suitable and economic that can be devised and I would not, in the circumstances peculiar to this Island, suggest the setting up of a Statutory Board of Authority.

The one main advantage of retaining the administration and control of the Port within the Governmental machine lies in being able to give such other services which the Department may require from time to time from other Departments and avoiding the establishment of a separate organisation which because of the limited size of the Port and its operation would be difficult to justify. I refer particularly to engineering and accounting services.

In order to avoid the criticism so often levelled against a Government Department having the control of what is primarily a commercial function I would suggest that the Port Department of the Ministry of Communications has a certain amount of autonomy particularly in regard to its finances. In my view the Port Department should have its own yearly estimates of revenue and expenditure and should produce its own annual accounts and that these accounts should make provision for the normal items to be found in a trading balance sheet.

The Harbour Advisory Board referred to above should consist of the following:-

Firstly an independent chairman to be appointed by the Minister. This person need not necessarily be connected with the trade of the Port or, indeed, with any commercial activity, but should hold a position of standing and be respected in the community generally.

The members of the Board will consist of two representatives of the shipping interests, two representatives of commercial interests, two representatives of trading interests and one representative of organised labour.

The Port Manager would be in attendance at all meetings to supply information and advice when called upon to do so but would have no vote in any decision which might be taken."

5. Sir Eric Millbourn's proposals for the Administration of the Port varies from the decision set out in paragraph 1 above, mainly in that he has recommended replacing the Port Manager as Chairman of the Advisory Board by an independent person and that the Port Manager should act purely as an adviser to the Board and will have no vote in any decision which may be taken.

6. It is proposed to adopt the policy set out above for the Administration of the Deep Water Harbour.

The third statement is with regard to the award of the tender for the bunkering facilities in the Deep Water Harbour.

STATEMENT re BUNKERING FACILITIES IN DEEP WATER HARBOUR

Consequent upon its decision to construct the Deep Water Harbour, the Government considered the matter of the provision of bunkering facilities in the new harbour and invited tenders for the provision of the necessary facilities.

2. In reply to the invitations for tenders, applications were received from Mobil International Oil Company, in association with the Barbados Union Oil Company, and from ESSO Standard Oil Company, S.A.

3. ESSO Standard Oil, S.A., has been awarded the tender for bunkering facilities in the new Deep Water Harbour.

4. The main advantage which will accrue from the provision of bunkering facilities in Barbados are as follows:

- (a) Increased Revenue from fees which will be levied on marine fuel.
- (b) Increased revenue by way of income tax.
- (c) Increased Customs revenue.
- (d) Employment opportunities for a number of workers; and
- (e) The attraction to Barbados of shipping lines which do not now call here.

5. Esso will construct three main pipelines to form a network throughout the new pier area for refuelling ships. A platform, extending from the breakwater with adjacent mooring facilities, will be constructed on the Carlisle Bay side of the new harbour at which tankers will unload fuel supplies. The bunkering installation will make it possible for five ships to be refuelled at the pier area, at the same time in the Deep Water Harbour area and at the outside platform in Carlisle Bay.

6. A storage terminal also will be constructed in the vicinity of the Deep Water Harbour and this will control the flow of marine fuels through the pipelines to the ships.

7. The provision of this facility will result in substantial financial benefit to the Island.

8. The Government records its appreciation of the assistance given by Mr. G. W. Cadbury and Mr. Arthur Brown, Director of the Economic Planning Unit, Jamaica, in the negotiations and determination of the award.

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 grants of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1960-61, No. 4

TRANSIT SHED FOR DEEP WATER HARBOUR

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, as hon. members will see from the Addendum to the Resolution, it is proposed to erect a third transit shed for the Deep Water Harbour. This was not in the original plan but it was recommended subsequent to the visit of Sir Eric Millbourn and Capt. Smith and we feel that this third transit shed should be erected in order mainly to take charge of inter-island cargo.
12.35 p.m.

I want to make it quite clear to the Committee that transit sheds are to be transit sheds. I know that there is an opinion in this island that transit sheds should be permanent sheds. We do not intend to have transit sheds to be permanent sheds; goods will flow through these sheds as quickly as possible. Since the Harbour has been entered upon and the formulation of decisions on it, we have envisaged the building up of inter-island traffic and after discussing the matter with Sir Eric Millbourn and Captain Smith, we have decided that this third shed should be erected in order to facilitate inter-island shipping.

The area is 21,600 square feet. I would like to point out to the Committee the estimated cargo at present is

160,000 tons inward and the outward cargo is 163,000 tons. Of course, the outward cargo varies according to the tonnage of sugar produced.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite willing to give the Committee any information which they may desire. I believe that this Resolution will commend itself to the Committee in view of the fact that technical experts have gone into this matter. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister has said that the transit sheds will not be permanent sheds, but he has not given us any information as to what he means by a transit shed, as to the maximum duration for which a transit shed is to be a transit shed, whether it is to be for a week, a month, a year or what. What is the difference between a transit shed and a permanent shed as far as this particular matter is concerned? It is all very well for the Minister to say that a transit shed is a transit shed and a permanent shed is a permanent shed, but we are not any wiser except by reference to the Oxford Dictionary. We would like to know what is the policy of the Government; how long, how many days or weeks it is before a transit shed becomes a permanent one?

I thought that the Minister would have said something to allay our fears since this matter is one which relates to the departure of the Port Manager. I did not hear very clearly what the Minister told us in the statement which he made a short while ago; but it would be of interest, not to say of importance, to know in connection with the Deep Water Harbour, transit sheds and so on, something about the position of the Port Manager. We have read something about it in the newspaper but we would like to have some information forthcoming from the Government so that we would be able to know what is really happening.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is asking us to vote the sum of \$144,000 to meet the cost of an additional transit shed at the Deep Water Harbour site. The Deep Water Harbour is supposed to cost this island something in the region of £5 million, certainly between £4 million and £5 million. I do not know if we have had any accurate revised Estimate, as to the cost of the erection of the Harbour. The cost of the two transit sheds, as far as I can understand, which were originally planned was inclusive. The Minister has said with the sagacity and clarity of exposition to which he is usually accustomed, leaving every one completely in the dark, that a transit shed is going to be a transit shed. That is an identity and not an allegation. I am sure that 90% of the people of this Chamber are still completely unaware of what the policy of the Government is going to be in this matter. As I understand it, the purpose of transit sheds, although the Minister does not understand what the purpose of it is, and I wonder if the staff in his Department does him the courtesy of reading the Minutes in order that he may give us an understanding of what is going on, is that goods will be deposited in these sheds and then they will be placed in bonds or warehouses until they are collected by the merchants. I understand that the purpose of these sheds is purely for the purpose of providing shelter for goods immediately after they are discharged as cargo from the ships which come alongside the Deep Water Harbour. In that event Mr. Chairman, if the sheds, as the Minister says, are going to be for the storage of cargo for such a transitional period between the time of off-loading and their being placed in permanent bonds, I would like to ask the Minister now what provision is being made at the Deep Water Harbour for permanent bonds, whether the Government intends to perpetuate the iniquitous system which prevails now and which does not even prevail in any civilised country in any part of the world whereby private business people are allowed to keep goods in bonds and in warehouses and make charges for that revenue which should be more justifiably accruing to the Government of the island.

Mr. Chairman, if we put up an investment of \$24 million or \$25 million and we are only going to provide transit

sheds, I would like to know what policy the Minister has for erecting permanent bonds and warehouses where cargoes would be under the surveillance and supervision of the Customs officials, and that revenue would be coming into the island. I hope that he will not come back to the House and say that he has now discovered that they need permanent warehouses; I hope he will not be inveigled into the position of allowing goods to be put into private warehouses any longer. It is a most inadequate and iniquitous system and it deprives the Treasury of revenue which it deserves, especially for an expenditure of a sum of the magnitude of \$25 million. If you build a transit shed and goods will have to be cleared within ten days, let us say if you are going to erect permanent bonds, I advise the Minister that it would be far better for us to invest this \$144,000 in the erection of permanent bonds to start with; but I do hope that the total cost of the Deep Water Harbour will not be like the cost of the Transport Board where, after we have outlaid this enormous amount of money, he will come back and say that we need money for the erection of bonds.

12.45 p.m.

Now what I thought the Minister would have done would have been this: set out his policy in relation to Government bonds and Government ware-houses and test the operation of the Deep Water Harbour with two transit sheds. The solution as far as I can see it, Mr. Chairman, of a congestion is to clear the transit sheds quickly. If you put up another transit shed, you are going to encourage people to leave goods in there longer than they should leave them. You are putting up another transit shed because it appears to me that you have no policy as regards Government bonds and warehouses, and surely you should try to accelerate the flow of cargo through the transit sheds, and try to make out with the two which you have there already. You are defeating your own purpose when, before the Harbour was even built and we have any idea of the volume of traffic which these sheds will have to cope with, you come at this stage to spend an additional \$144,000. Why does the Minister not wait and see whether there is going to be any saving effect in the cost of construction of the Deep Water Harbour? He does not do any of these things, he tells us nothing of the bonds and warehouses, and we do not know if the country is going to have to pay the ransom of high transit warehouse charges to private business people when that revenue should be accruing to the Treasury of this island.

The Minister gets up and says that a transit shed is going to be a transit shed. That seems to me to be an argument in favour of not having another one; but it is only when he envisages a situation where goods are going to be deposited in these transit sheds and left there interminably that we need additional accommodation. We do not know the amount of traffic which is going to use the Harbour. You can only justify this if you have ten or fifteen ships unloading there in one day. We are running the Government of this island by a lot of birds of passage who come through here and fly by night. I do not want to call any names because I do not want to say anything disparaging about people who in all honesty come to assist the Ministers in their incompetence; but how is it that the same Sir Eric Millbourn who was in at the very foundation of the plans for the Deep Water Harbour, before the Harbour is completed can come back and advise the Government that they want an additional transit shed? If Sir Eric Millbourn had come to advise Government that they needed a slipway for fishing boats and needed a dock yard constructed by Government to be leased to some competent authorities, I would understand because they would be an innovation; but he is coming back and telling us that we need another transit shed.

Mr. Chairman, we have Construction Engineers; we have Consulting Engineers, Coode and Partners; we had Sir John Ritchie from the Port of London Authority; we had Sir Eric Millbourn and we had a Port Manager managing a port that did not exist, so much so that his contract has been exhausted. The Port is not completed but you had a man getting \$1,000 to run a Port that is non-existent. That is like appointing a Hotel Manager to run a hotel that has not yet been built. That is like the Trinidad

Government appointing a Manager for the Trinidad Hilton up-side-down Hotel and paying him money from 1950 until now, and up to now they do not know if the Hotel is going to be completed. They will have to wait and see whether the hotel will become a reality. They have not done that; but the Barbados Government in its wisdom has been paying a Port Manager who has been here over three years. His contract has been exhausted, he goes back to England and the Port is not completed yet; not one ship has gone into the Harbour and he has been drawing \$1,000. What kind of nonsense is that? Is that the way the affairs of the people of this country should be conducted? I do not think so.

We in this House, Mr. Chairman, are supposed to be watch-dogs of the Public Purse. Now they do not have \$180—I have spoken of this with the Minister of Education—to pave the floor of the wash-room at Lodge School to prevent the students from getting 'athlete's foot' when the whole place is flooded at night. The Financial Secretary of the Government in his wisdom cut that clean out of the Estimates, because they are supposed to be \$1 1/4 million short on their revenue and expenditure account this year. They do not have any money to do this or that, but before the Harbour is completed, the same Sir Eric Millbourn who was in a position to make arithmetical calculations—because it is only a question of arithmetic; it is not a question of any atomic science or anything like that, how many tons of cargo pass through here in a day, how fast can we get the cargo moving—now advises Government to build another transit shed. Has he been to a night school since he made his calculations so that he knows more arithmetic than he knew a few years ago? He is asking us to give \$144,000, a sum which could give free secondary education to all the Government-aided secondary schools with another \$20,000 or \$30,000. It would take about \$170,000 to give free secondary education.

Mr. Chairman, the Harbour will not be used until some time late next year. Why not wait and see, since you have Architects, Construction Engineers, Harbour planners, the Millbourns, Ritchies and Smiths, Port Managers and everybody how many bags of sugar—perhaps I should say bags of flour because sugar will not be going out in bags—will pass through the transit sheds? You cannot calculate at this stage what the traffic will be. You can say on our present figures that the amount of cargo coming into the island over a weekly period is so much, but you knew that ten years ago. If you see how your trans-shipment trade is building up after the Deep Water Harbour is in operation, there is nothing in coming to say you cannot speed up the passage of this traffic any more because there is a limit to human endurance and to the endurance of the electorate, therefore you need another transit shed because things are booming. No member of the House would get up and say you should have done it before. But how can Government which is short of money in the revenue account come for \$144,000 when they do not have \$180 for Lodge School? They do not have money to give children an additional biscuit for lunch and give free secondary education; so how can they afford to pay a Port Manager? I do not want to make any reflection on anybody, but I understand the purpose of appointing a Port Manager is to make sure that certain people from certain countries get these jobs, and that the Port Manager was rolling the pitch for all the people who will invade us when the Harbour is completed. That is the rumour around town and you cannot stop people from saying these things. 12.55 p.m.

What was the Port Manager doing for the past three years, I do not know. I can tell you that a lot of people in Barbados do not even know that they have had a Port Manager, but that is the kind of situation with which we have to put up for another few years because they now have the opportunity of voting this \$144,000. They have the majority.

I would also like to know what kind of accounting genius they have got. They have a Permanent Secretary to the Deep Water Harbour but neither Messrs R. Costain nor Messrs. Coode, Vaughan-Lee, Frank, & Gwyther, does not even know. What kind of accounting genius have they got at this stage to say that the harbour will not cost \$1 million

less than what they have stated it will cost? Therefore, what is the point of bringing in a Resolution like this for \$144,000? So far as the work on the Deep Water Harbour has proceeded, they have only spent half the money which they expect it would cost; therefore, if they have any money left over, surely, they can build this transit shed with that. But what there is about this is that it will be a steel building and you want to get a contract; therefore, you will have to pay for it and that is the secret of a lot of this unjustifiable expenditure which is inflicted on the people of this island.

I do not want to say anything more at this stage. I think we ought to examine and scrutinise these Resolutions very carefully.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks to provide a sum of \$144,000 so as to build another transit shed at the Deep Water Harbour. We need it according to what has been stated by the Hon. Minister. If the former surveyor made a mistake and did not see it necessary to have three transit sheds, but since then the Government has brought down an expert who is to lead them into a knowledge of things dealing with this harbour and what they would have to get for the future and he has told them of the need for this shed and they now see fit to ask for a grant of \$144,000 to build another transit shed, we cannot give against it. The reason why we cannot give against it is because we know when cargo comes into this country, we cannot wait to see if we have room enough to store it. We must have sufficient room to store it and if the Government sees fit to have now another transit shed for storing cargo which is coming into this country, I think they would be wise in bringing down this Resolution to make provision for it. I think if we are in need of it that the eyes of the Government would be wise in providing for it because we know that commodities coming into this country are more valuable than education or any such thing because foodstuffs are very essential to this community.

The Government has asked for an expert to review the plans which have been formulated and he has advised them to provide another transit shed to secure the cargo which is expected to come into this country and they have brought down this Resolution to make provision for that. I will not be one to vote against this Resolution because the Government is responsible for everything that is taking place in this country and if they are not wise, time will tell. I think that every Government that is in charge of a country should have enough vision about what is to take place; so, Sir, I agree with this Resolution for \$144,000 for the building of this transit shed. The meaning of this word "transit shed" is that it is to be a shed which would be in a position to receive cargo which is coming into this country. We cannot leave that cargo on the shore or on the side of the wharf. If in the course of time, we find that the two transit sheds which were asked for before prove to be enough and the one which is asked for now is not necessary, we can question then why we were asked to vote for it and the Government could be criticised for the building of this one. But we cannot wait to see whether these two are enough if the expert says that you want another. I rather agree with your having three than to have two which will not be enough. Therefore, I must say that I agree 100% with the vote which is before us.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, let me ask the Hon. Minister this question. I offer no objection at all to this Resolution. As a matter of fact, I agree with the sentiments of the last hon. member who spoke. We accept the fact that it is necessary to have this transit shed; but surely the Hon. Minister could have told us something more as regards the capacity and the construction of the shed. As hon. members know, this shed would be constructed on reclaimed land and I think it is laid down in engineering circles that construction must go along certain lines when it comes to constructing on reclaimed land of not less than five years.

Can the Hon. Minister tell us what the construction will be and the capacity of this transit shed? As a matter

of fact, we should have been given that in the Addendum to the Resolution.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the last hon. member, first of all, I do not think he was in here when I elaborated on the Addendum somewhat. I pointed out that it was principally to take care of the inter-island trade and that Sir Eric Millbourn and Captain Smith had advised us that it would be necessary.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not interested in that.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If the Hon. member would just give me a hearing.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I just feel that this Resolution is necessary and, as I have said, I agree with the views expressed by the last hon. member. I just want to know something of its construction and its capacity. I did not ask what it is for.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I thought you had asked what it is for.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Just tell me something as regards its construction and the capacity of it.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: It measures 360 feet by 60 feet. That is the overall area.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Tell me something of its height; a warehouse depends on cubit feet also.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I am getting the facts for the hon. member.

1.05 p.m.

I will get the information for the hon. member. The total area of the three sheds is 102,600 square feet. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that there is very much more to which I have to reply. The hon. member who last spoke has answered completely the hon. junior member for St. John. It is a simple construction.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of explanation. I was most co-operative when I got up to speak; as a matter of fact, I thought it was a simple question. It is not absolutely necessary, but I should just like to say that as a member of this House, I am entitled to know the capacity. The Minister told me the area and I said that you generally give the length and the width and the height, because you know the capacity in that way; but to say that it is a simple construction, is not good enough. This building could be constructed of plastic but the Minister should not aggravate the situation. I am not particularly interested in talking about this matter, but do not let the Minister say that this is a simple construction. Anything of a simple construction cannot cost \$144,000; I do not think it is fair to say that this is a simple construction.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I told the hon. member that I will get the information for him, but this is similar to the sheds which are already down there. I do not know if the hon. member has seen them. I have to search for the information which the hon. member wants.

As I was saying, Sir, I do not think it is really necessary to reply to the hon. junior member for St. John because the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has, in very simple language, done so. It is a good thing that the hon. member is not running the Government; imagine the hon. member telling us that the Government should build warehouses. Instead of building a transit shed we should build warehouses and that to do otherwise would be to waste money. The hon. member really talked such profound ignorance that I do not think I should prolong this debate to reply to him.

I think that the House has gone through the appointment of the Port Manager and so on. Why should this Government wait until the last minute to appoint somebody to advise it as to the administration? There are offices to be set up, legislation to be passed and charges to be made;

we must wait until the Port is completed and then get somebody to advise us! That is the kind of Government with which the hon. member would be associated. If the hon. member wants to carry on with that sort of Government he will have to try very hard, but I think he will have to be over there for sometime. You are going to erect permanent warehouses in which you are going to stock merchants' goods; instead of having transit sheds the hon. member will wait until the Port is set up before he gets somebody to advise him. I think that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew answered the hon. member quite simply; if the Government were to wait until the last minute in order to get this advice - as a matter of fact, we should get in these cargoes and let them pass through as quickly as possible; we should build warehouses specifically to allow these cargoes to go through and then the House would be told later on what time the goods would be allowed to occupy these transit sheds.

We have been given this advice and if we do not carry it out, when the Harbour is constructed we will find that there will be confusion as has happened in Trinidad more often than not. All of these things should be forestalled and avoided if we take the advice of people who know about Harbours. Of course, the hon. member is one of those who forecast that we could not get the money for the construction of this Harbour and therefore we are accustomed to his prophecies which do not work out. I do not think I will have very much more to say on this matter.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I did not think I would have lived to see the day when the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing would talk about anybody else's ignorance. Now the hon. member seems to think that because he elects to kow-tow to one particular individual and he finds himself elevated to a situation for which he is not suitable temperamentally, educationally, by native ability or otherwise, he can arrogate to himself the right to pontificate on matters which he is completely innocent of understanding (Hon. R. G. MAPP: You kow-tow to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.) The hon. member had better ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what I told him. Anyhow, let us get down to the facts of this case. The hon. member said that the hon. junior member for St. Michael has replied to me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. Michael is in the Chair.

Mr. BARROW: I meant the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. As the Hon. Minister has said, the hon. member has replied to me, but I understand the hon. junior member for St. Andrew to say that the Government had an adviser to come here and advise them. My point is that the Government always had somebody to come down and advise them. If an expert tells them something, it is nothing to do with the finances of Barbados; we need not function as the elected representatives of the people; all we have to do is to rubberstamp whatever the experts tell us, the people who do not pay any taxes here at all.
1.15 p.m.

In other words, we need not have a House of Assembly at all; let Sir Eric Millbourn run the country and that is the end of the matter if you develop his argument to its logical conclusion. The hon. member for St. Thomas is so feeble-minded that he has to shelter behind the argument of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew.

Now what I have been saying is this: the hon. member for St. Thomas goes on to say that we should not wait to see what volume of traffic will pass through the Harbour, but we have to accept the advice from our experts. They only accept the advice of the experts when they tell them to throw away money, but when Mr. Stevens told them not to build a market in Bay Street and used his power as Town Planner, they did not elect to accept.

Mr. Chairman, I would be grateful if the hon. senior member for the City would conduct his debate outside the Chamber or wait until I have finished speaking. This is not Cumberland Street.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I can conduct my debate wherever I like.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are two hon. members on the floor.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, what does the hon. member mean by telling me to conduct my debate outside the Chamber? I conduct my debate where I like and as I like.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the Rules of the House...

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not care about any Rules.

Mr. BARROW: The Rules of the House do not permit of two members to speak at the same time or for any member to so carry on conversation with his neighbour as to interrupt the conduct of the debate. If the hon. member wants me to use his kind of language, I would use what he invites me to say. He tells me I should say "shut up". He does not understand Parliamentary niceties; so I would ask the member to dry up or shut up.

When the Town Planning Officer advised the Ministers not to put a Market in Bay Street - he says he must accept the advice of experts - did they accept his advice then? They talk about experts advising them because they are incompetent and incapable of making decisions for themselves. But what I am trying to point out is the inconsistency of a man of Sir Eric Millbourn's stature coming before the Harbour is completed and telling us that we need another transit shed. I do not say that warehouses and bonds should be erected to the dereliction of the transit sheds; it is a question of withholding the spending of this money until we know the volume of traffic coming through the transit sheds, and I say that right now we should be planning as to our policy on letting private business do the warehousing and bonding. In no other country in the world can you find private bonds. Why could Government not get revenue from that? I do not say that we should build warehouses and bonds as an alternative to transit sheds.

I asked the Minister to explain what his policy would be because I have not heard anything said on that, and I should not like to see the iniquitous practice of private businessmen making money out of people who have to import goods into this island by putting them in private warehouses. After all, Mr. Chairman, there are 92 acres of land down at the Deep Water Harbour. Land is not readily available in the City of Bridgetown. The big interests in this island monopolise all the warehousing capacity and bond houses at the present moment, and that should not be. The Government of this country should try to collect every available penny in revenue from warehousing and bonding of goods, and the hon. member finds that is absurd. There is only one thing I would find absurd if I were in his position and that is the invention of a mirror, because that would show up all the absurdities that there are or the grossest absurdity.

When the hon. member tries to side-track a debate, refuses to answer questions and refuses up to now to disclose Government policy about warehousing, I am saying as a fact that you have in Barbados a system which does not obtain in any civilised country in the world whereby private businessmen are allowed to bond goods which have not been brought through Customs. I say further that the community is held up to ransom by the exorbitant warehousing duties - the hon. junior member for the City who is a businessman can tell them something about this - which are charged by private business people, because there are no Government warehouses available in the Port of Bridgetown or in Carlisle Bay. That is the position today. I further went on to postulate, Mr. Chairman, that in view of the fact that Sir Eric Millbourn had been in at the inception of the planning of the Deep Water Harbour, how it is without any visible increase in the volume of shipping coming into the island, without awaiting to see what the traffic through these transit sheds will be or what the efficiency of the people handling the goods in order to speed up the progress through the transit sheds would be, he could commit the Treasury of this island to the further

expenditure of \$144,000 for the Deep Water Harbour when only a figure of \$12 million had been spent up to now and we do not know if we are going to come out under the estimate or over it. I do not see anything absurd about that, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to inform the hon. junior member for St. Andrew and the hon. member for St. Thomas that I do not intend to abdicate my right as a representative of the people to any imported Englishman, Chinese, Outer Mongolian or any other expert they choose to bring to Barbados. If they are deficient and incapable of running the Government of this island and have to import people who do not pay taxes, who are birds of passage and who may be experts in their own 2 x 4 cubby-hole, that does not make them experts in Barbados; the experts sit in this House of Assembly and can be found outside in the Green and in Fairchild Street.

Mr. Chairman, it is only a question of arithmetical planning, vision, and foresight; it is not a question for experts, and Sir Eric Millbourn had an opportunity because he was here four years ago. At all stages he was intimately connected with the planning of the Deep Water Harbour and he is not in a position today to cause us to be committed to the further expenditure of \$144,000 because nothing has happened. The Minister of Communications thought they should have a man to advise them what to do; I know they need advice at all levels; they need advice as to when to wake up and when to go to sleep, far less on things they are not accustomed to doing. They are not fit for a task such as running the Government of Barbados; therefore they have to go to England and ask somebody something or bring somebody here. Barbados is only a small plantation of 166 square miles, and there are ranchers in Brazil and places like that running ranches of two and three million acres with no Financial Secretary and Permanent Secretary and all that nonsense. We have to be realistic about these things.

I have met people and I know people who have plantations of 500,000 and one million acres and run them themselves; they do not need five Ministers to assist them to do that, and they have as many people and heads of cattle living on them as the whole population of Barbados; so what is all this about Sir Eric Millbourn and Sir John Ritchie? Of course, on a technical matter you need technical advice, but a transit shed is not a technical matter. The Hon. Minister says of course we must have a Port Manager without a port because he is to tell us what kind of staff he will need and so on.
1.25 p.m.

Now, they sent a delegation which consisted of Mr. K. R. Hunte, Mr. Walcott and Mr. C. R. C. Springer to Trinidad to see what was the set up there. Do you need anybody to pay a salary for three years to tell you that? Is it not a fact that the same gentleman, Commodore Cochrane, told them that they had nothing for him to do and they fired him? They say that the expenditure on his salary was justified. Do you have to pay a man a salary for three years for that? I ask members of the Government this point blank question and as a matter of course, any member of the Government's Party who has the courage can answer it. Is it not a fact that Commodore Cochrane had nothing to do? Was he fired or did he resign?

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1960-61 No.5

ACQUISITION OF LAND IN TEMPLE YARD

Hon. R. G. MAPP: This next Resolution is for \$85,426 to acquire land adjoining the Cheapside Market called Temple Yard. This land is well known to hon. members. As hon. members will see from the Addendum to the Resolution, the object of the purchase is a very laudable one and it is very desirable. We have had on more than one occasion long and at times bitter debates on the facilities in the Cheapside Market and hon. members have called for an extension of the facilities. Therefore, I think the majority of hon. members will agree with (a) to extend

the Cheapside Market and provide safe and ready access for pedestrians, private and service vehicles. I think that hon. members will agree that there is need for proper market facilities. This can be solved only by the purchase of this property.

The purchase of this property will also provide, as set out at (b) adequate bus and car parking facilities in the area; (c) contribute towards an effective communication and traffic system; and (d) create open space for amenity purposes.

This is an area which has been highly recommended from a town planning point of view. The purchase of it is not only beneficial for those immediate objectives which I have just outlined but also for the purpose of providing what I would call a lung which is so necessary in that part of the City.

I anticipate one question and I will answer it now. The land consists of 19,968 square feet which works out a little over \$4.00 per square foot. I will tell hon. members that the price was arrived at after comparison with the prevailing prices in the area and the owners came down to what the Government suggested and an amicable settlement was achieved.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. T. W. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I am in favour of this Resolution and anything which I say now, I do not want to be taken as a criticism of the Government because it is not intended as such by me. I remember well enough, about two or three years ago, when I was a member of the St. Michael's Vestry that the Government sent a letter to the Vestry or the Sanitary Board asking us to name sites to provide District Markets. Mr. Chairman, you will remember that the now Cheapside Market was a market before, but it was abandoned as a market and converted into a rum bond. It was around that time that they asked the Vestry to submit sites for District Markets that we went into the market very carefully and fully and recommended to them who are now members of the same Government - although I was not a member of the Government Party in the House so to speak - this same site of Temple Yard.

I can say beyond any shadow of doubt that the Temple Yard site was then owned by the present owners and the site was recommended to the St. Michael's Vestry at a sale price of \$2.00 a square foot. Now, today we are told that you are purchasing the same amount of land at a little over \$4.00 a square foot. The only point which I am making now is that of the old saying: "A stitch in time saves nine."

Mr. Chairman, if three years ago the Government had acted on the advice of the then Vestry and acquired this land, we would have been saving today a little over \$42,000. However, even though the Government was late in coming to a decision of acquiring this land, I still appreciate today the purchase of it at double the cost because it is obvious to hon. members the congestion which takes place at the Cheapside Market by having taken the hucksters and what not off the streets. However, the purchase of this land will also mean, if the wall around it is removed, that the Cheapside Market would be much cooler. I compliment the Government for bringing down this Resolution today, but I regret that they have not done so two or three years ago.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to make two or three points on this Resolution. My colleague made mention of the point that as a member of the Commissioners of Health of St. Michael he recalled that as a result of a communication between the Government and the Commissioners of Health of St. Michael, now the Municipality, we recommended the Temple Yard site which the Government is now purchasing to be suitable for a District Market. Of course, it is not part of his job to tell this Committee what part I played in convincing my colleagues then that this was the right site. All that I have to say today is that I told you so.

The Hon. Minister said that they have the advice of the Town and Country Planning Officer that this is the right site. I only refer to that because it is rather paradoxical to say at one time that "we have been advised by him that this is the correct site" and then on the other hand, when he advised them that Bay Street was not a proper place to put a fish market, you get the Minister getting up and saying: "we do not mind what he says; we are going to put one there." They do not mind whether they stop traffic flowing along there by the putting of the fish market there; they are still going to put it there. (Mr. STRAUGHN: You agreed with that Resolution then.)
1.35 p.m.

I told the House that the Town and Country Planning Officer had told them not to do this thing and they said that they did not care what the Town and Country Planning Officer said, they were going to do it. Let us forget that for the time being, anyhow (*Laughter*). I see that the hon. member is laughing but he does not know what he is laughing at. The Addendum to this item states that it is proposed to purchase 19,968 square feet of land in Temple Yard adjoining the Cheapside Market and a small building standing thereon. I notice that the Minister in charge of this Resolution was very brief in introducing it. He was right in this respect because he could not deny the fact that three years ago we recommended the purchase of land in this vicinity at a cost of \$2 a foot. The newspaper with which the hon. member has to do, and in his usual style, was nasty enough to suggest that because I am a real estate broker, I had an axe to grind and I wanted to sell this Temple Yard land which was the property of the Cooperage. My colleague told them that \$2 a foot was cheap and today you are paying once and a half more for this land. Personally, whether it be also Mr. Stevens or anybody else - I have been on this spot with the Minister of Agriculture and I am very happy to say that I was very pleased when he assured me that they were doing every possible thing to extend this Market. When I was approached by the hawkers who asked "Don't you think it is a wrong thing to make us sit in the sun and the rain," the Minister said that the Government was considering this site which we had recommended some years ago.

I should like to say that markets should be erected in keeping with the customs and habits of the people in the community. People come to the municipality by buses with their trays and so on. We have not yet reached the stage when hawkers offer their ware as is done in other countries. I could ask the Minister a few technical questions and I do not think he could answer them. According to public health standards, a certain area of space per person is allowed to people who are selling articles in a market and I would suggest to the Minister that he has to buy another area of land. What happens with our meat sellers and potato sellers and what are we going to do with them? Are we going to drive them out of business? When we took a census of these markets a few years ago, and of every spot where people were offering their goods for sale, the number of hawkers who were offering their wares, the number of donkey carts, mule carts and pick-ups, we said that the evergreen trees which are now standing there should not be destroyed. I did not criticise the change which was made at this market; I rather commended the architect for the change which he has made down there because he has given it a wonderful new look; but if you look around the streets in this area which you are purchasing today - the hon. member will appreciate the fact that his constituents come in there with their donkey carts and therefore they must find somewhere to put these animals. As I said just now, I suggested at the time when we made our recommendation, that the trees should be allowed to remain and further that Temple Yard be made a one-way street. The Commissioners of Highways acquired that area and made it a street and that was not so long ago. I do not see the necessity for Temple Yard to remain anything but a one-way street.

In arriving at our decision to tell the Government what we felt about the matter, we had the Commissioner of Police along with us in the matter. I want to say that the present Government is thinking that the Government is for them and the Prison is for the Opposition. They seem to ask: "Can anything good come out of Nazareth?" Nothing which

the Opposition suggests should be accepted. In the newspaper with which the Minister has something to do, reference was made to the fact, and I repeat it, that because I was Chairman of the Commissioners of Health and I was a real estate broker, I was interested in trying to sell the Government some land; but nowadays they are paying one and a half times as much for this land as they would have paid then.

The Addendum to this Resolution goes on to state that the object of the purchase of this land is to extend the Cheapside Market and provide safe and ready access for pedestrians, private and service vehicles. I am now addressing my remarks to the Minister of Agriculture. The Inspectors could give the number of persons with their donkey carts and so on, and I suggest that the trees which should remain standing, would provide a wonderful site for the shelter of these animals.

1.45 p.m.

I am addressing my remarks principally to the Minister of Agriculture, and it is unfortunate that he is not in charge of this because he has gone through and seen what I have seen there. There are several hundred women sitting outside the front of the Cheapside Market on the principal shopping day because there is absolutely no room inside.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has repeated that so often, but I hope he will tell this Hon. Committee that there are those who come from inside and squat on the outside, and in some cases the sister is inside and the brother outside or the husband outside and the wife inside.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What difference does it make whether or not they are squatting? Am I telling an untruth when I say there are several thousands of people squatting outside and they have to pay? I have spoken to the Minister and we went through there together, and he will agree with me that for the number of persons at the front of the Market plus the number at the back of the Market 19,000 square feet - taking the average Public Health standard, if you are buying enough to house some of them plus some of the donkey carts and mule carts - to provide adequate bus and car parking facilities in the area is so much nonsense, and it is only put in to draw a red herring across the trail.

Mr. Chairman, nobody is going to object to your buying this, so why put in about providing adequate bus and car parking facilities? I wonder if the Minister has seen this! The street to the left will have to be widened, and the note goes on to say "to create open space for amenity purposes, etc." You get some of your Secretaries who are very good at using some good words putting them together and deciding that there is a number of members in the House of Assembly who unless you are a member of the Government Party are unacquainted with the works; otherwise they could not have put down to "create open space for amenity purposes, etc.", because there is absolutely no truth in it.

Now, Sir, I repeat at the risk of the Government saying I have something to sell that the property at the other side of the market should be acquired. In my opinion, this concerns the Minister of Communications and Works, and it should be acquired compulsorily if opposition is put up. This is the property of the Sampsons at the other side of the market which was originally the Petroleum Bond, and it is a tremendous area which you could use for parking space. If you had to be in that area as I happen to be every day where my office is, you would realise the difficulty there is in parking. No one can attempt to go in this area or to the market in a car at any time unless it is mid-week and mid-day; therefore if the Minister of Agriculture is satisfied, as I believe he is, because he has visited the site, that 19,000 square feet is not enough for the numbers which have been removed from Busby Alley, Swan Street and Milk-Market, I suggest to the Minister who is responsible for this that steps should be taken to acquire the other side for parking facilities. I understand the area is roughly 23,000 square feet or 24,000 square feet, and it would give the Government proper parking for cars at the market. Whatever you say or think, this market is still considered the oldest market in the area and is still doing a tremendous

lot of business, and I must at this stage commend the Architect and the planners and even Government for the way they have re-organised this market. But I must say that it was because I had faith in what the Minister of Agriculture told me when I was approached in the market. The Minister knows that if I had walked into that market and told the people not to pay one cent, he could have brought the whole Police Force, not one cent would have been collected. The Hon. Minister said he would lock me up, but he knows that if I had led that protest not one cent would have been collected; but I had confidence in his word when he said he would take immediate steps to acquire the Temple Yard area to support the market.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the Resolution, but I must say I told you so, and I have it on record; I have the *Beacon* with what they said about me, I have all communications and I have the facts that you could have bought the land at \$2.00 a square foot then and you refused.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I am not opposing this Resolution, but I would like to say a few words of consolation. The \$85,426 to meet the necessities of this Cheapside Market is needed, but I must say, as the hon. senior member for the City said, "a stitch in time saves nine." I am sorry that the Government at the time did not have the vision to purchase this land which would have saved us from such great expenditure today, but I am saying that the Government or the people who are in charge should look through this whole vicinity and erect markets in residential areas. We do not have to bring in an expert to tell us where to put a market. Bay Street is not a suitable place for a market, but on the other hand, a place that suits a market to relieve the congested markets in the City is Tweedside Road. The St. Philip market is unnecessary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am going to ask the hon. junior member for St. Andrew to stick to the Resolution which deals with the Cheapside Market and not to worry with the St. Philip Market.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for markets and I thought I could refer to any market in Barbados. The markets at Cheapside and Fairchild Street are necessary, but I am saying that we do not have to send for experts to tell us in Barbados where to put a market. We can walk over Barbados in a day and see the places that need a market, and I am saying that any one who is outside of the market in the sun should not have to pay one cent because there is no space for him inside, and therefore they should be given the privilege of selling outside to make a livelihood.

I do not see, Mr. Chairman, why there should be any comment at all on granting facilities for the Cheapside Market. We know they are needed but when we say that the Government should acquire more land, I deem the Government to be like a tailor; they should not try to measure for more cloth than would make the suit, and therefore if they do not have the money I do not see how they can do all these things. I support this Resolution to meet the necessities of the market at Cheapside and I hope there will be no more comment on this and that the money will be granted.

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

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded in each case by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

1.55 p.m.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am going to move the adjournment at this stage because hon. members of the House have pressing business to perform, that is, to attend the funeral of a close relative of a leading member of this House.

I therefore move the adjournment of the House until Tuesday next, 21st June, 1960 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I support that motion wholeheartedly, because it is the funeral of a relative of a most important member of this Chamber, and I also support it because I deprecated the action of this House at the

time in refusing to adjourn so that hon. members could attend the funeral of the late lamented Christopher Brathwaite. This is done now in order that we may pay our last tribute to a very close relative of a leading member of this Chamber; and despite the urgent business which we have on the Order Paper, yet, it is a matter of only five days until Tuesday next week when we can come and give these matters our undivided attention as from 12 o'clock noon of that day.

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

2.00 p.m.