

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1961

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 8th August, 1961.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Mr. J. E. TBRANCKER, Q.C., (*Leader of the Opposition*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. T. O. BRYAN, (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, J.P., Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*) and Mr. J. W. CORBIN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting held on 1st August, 1961, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (*After a pause*). There being no objection, those Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

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

The Agricultural Credit Bank (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1961.

Annual Report of the Comptroller of Customs for the year 1960.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Annual Report of the Public Assistance Board for the period April 1960 - March 1961.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Leave Passages) (Amendment) Order, 1961".

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Payment of Passages) (Amendment) Order, 1961."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Agricultural Credit Bank (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1961."

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of two parcels of land in St. Joseph for the erection of communal baths.

Resolution to place the sum of \$2,005 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1961-62, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1961-62 No. 13 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: A Bill to amend the Mental Health Act, 1951.

A Bill to make further provision for the grant and payment of pensions and gratuities to certain employees of the Government of this Island.

A Bill to provide for the grant and payment of pensions and gratuities to persons who have been employed on a casual basis in the service of the Government.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: A Bill to repeal the Prisons Act, 1890, and to establish a Prison Service for the Island and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Question No. 47/1961, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, regarding the teaching of Economics in grant-aided Secondary Schools is ready.

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

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: There are Questions standing in the name of the hon. senior member for Christ Church whom I observe is not now in his place.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. senior member for Christ Church is unavoidably absent due to other very important and pressing business, I crave leave of the House to put the Questions standing in his name on his behalf:-

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

Is the Minister aware of the deplorable condition of the roads (including the cross roads) in Rendezvous Gardens, especially after a heavy shower of rain?

2. Will the Minister include these roads and cross roads in his present repair programme and cause the said roads and cross roads to be re-surfaced and rebuilt, and provision made for drainage facilities thereto?

3. Will the Minister see fit to come down without delay for a supplementary resolution for this purpose?

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

Is the Minister aware of the absence of water mains along certain Avenues in Hart's Gap, Christ Church?

2. Will the Minister cause the necessary survey to be made in all the said Avenues with a view to the establishment of such Government water mains for the householders in the area without any undue delay?

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

Is the Minister aware:

(a) that Mr. Quintyne Lashley of Sayes Court, Christ Church, has worked as Foreman of Sayes Court Agricultural Station for a continuous period of 15 1/2 years and upwards (without taking any long leave or regular annual holiday) and has not been paid a gratuity and/or reduced pension?

(b) does the Minister know that on the change over from C.D. & W. to the Barbados Government of these Agricultural Stations, assurance were given by the Director of Agriculture to the employees of these Stations (including the said Quintyne Lashley) that their services with C.D. & W. would be computed in the assessment of their pension rights?

(c) that the said Quintyne Lashley retired in February 1960 and that up to now (August 1961) has received neither a pension nor a gratuity for his 15 1/2 years of continuous service as aforementioned?

2. Will the Minister see that equity and justice are meted out to all employees (past and present) of his Departments irrespective of whether or not he belongs to the higher or lower brackets of the service?

Mr. GODDARD entered the House and took his seat, 12.25 p.m.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:

"Is the Minister aware that Mr. E. A. Bayley as Agent and Solicitor for Mr. F. L. Griffith (owner) has served the twenty-nine (29) Tenants, presently occupying House Spots at Belfield, Grazettes in the parish of St. Michael, with notices to quit and to deliver possession of same on 31st December, 1961?

2. Is the Minister aware that on account of the acute shortage of House Spots now obtaining in the said parish, these twenty-nine (29) Tenants can find no alternative sites to which they can remove their houses?

3. Will the Minister state what progress if any has been made to implement the Resolution passed in this House on 22nd November, 1960, requesting Government to initiate legislation for the purpose of ensuring greater security for Tenants in private owned Tenancies and protection from excessive increases in Rents?

4. Will the Minister use his good offices to expedite such legislation, so as to allay the fears and remove the threats

now confronting these and other Tenants in private owned Tenancies?"

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, a Bill to amend the Mental Health Act, 1951, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. F. E. MILLER, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, a Bill to repeal the Prisons Act, 1890, and to establish a Prison Service for the Island and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, a Bill to make provision for the grant and payment of pensions and gratuities to certain employees of the Government of this Island, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. F. E. MILLER, a Bill to provide for the grant and payment of pensions and gratuities to persons who have been employed on a casual basis in the service of the Government, was read a first time.

PRIVILEGE re NON-CIRCULATION OF DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, may I once again in a point of privilege draw to the attention of Your Honour and honourable members of this Chamber that up to now we have not been in receipt of our copies of the Resolution which was laid in this Chamber on 4th July, 1961 to approve the programme of development expenditure contained in the Development Plan, 1960-65? It was as long ago as the 4th July, and this is the fifth meeting since that date of this Chamber without honourable members being in possession of a copy of this Resolution.

Definitely, Mr. Speaker, the matter seems to me to call for action by yourself, or even if you suggest it, yourself fortified by the combined action of this House and its Speaker. There can be no excuse or reasonable explanation of the fact that five meetings ago a document was laid — and that is now No. 6 on the Order Paper. I quite appreciate there is no fear of any attempt being made to proceed with this matter in the absence of copies having been circulated, but there must be some excuse given to Your Honour, and, to this Chamber, as to why this most extraordinary lapse has occurred. Is it that the Government Printer is at fault and has not printed enough copies to supply members of Parliament? If so, let the criticism due him be meted out to him. Is it that the Colonial Postmaster or the Postmaster General — I do not at present remember the correct nomenclature — is at fault and has failed through his postmen to have the documents only circulated to members of Parliament? Whatever is the cause, Mr. Speaker, I submit that this delay is intolerable, inexcusable, unwarranted, unjustified and unprecedented in the annals of this Chamber, and the public through the Information Officer should be told on Rediffusion not later than tomorrow, and you, Mr. Speaker, should be informed not later than this afternoon what is the reason. Has the original draft been mislaid? Were there not sufficient copies published to ensure that members of Parliament would have each his own copy?

Mr. Speaker, one cannot imagine that because as soon as a Resolution is laid on the Table of this Chamber, that is the signal for a sufficient number of copies to be printed as to entitle every member of Parliament, of this Chamber as well as the Other Chamber, to have at least one copy. The twenty-four members of this Chamber are the first people who are entitled to have a printed copy and then members of the Upper Chamber, and any surplus copies — presumably they would not print as many copies as there are members — would go to the Press and other persons

who are normally entitled and those who can be regarded as entitled to copies of documents which have been laid on the Table of this House. This matter is going on too long, and one wonders if whoever is responsible for printing or circulating regards this matter as a joke. I trust it is not now either the Government Printer or the Postmaster General. I trust that he is not waiting for a general election to have it printed and circulated as the manifesto of the Government Party. Obviously that cannot be so, and presumably some reason why we are not in receipt after five meetings of a copy of this document which we should have received not later than the weekend following the same Tuesday, that is Tuesday, 4th July, when this document was laid, should be given.

I would ask that Your Honour use all the authority that lies in your power with the feeling that you are fortified by the wishes of members of this Chamber to ensure that if copies of this Resolution are not immediately, or within the next 48 hours, supplied to members of this Chamber, an adequate and reasonable excuse for the failure so to circulate be given to you, Sir, on behalf of every member of this House.
12.35 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in his condemnation of this matter and also as an analogy to draw to Your Honour's attention that there can be no excuse for this type of behaviour because we have in our possession as members of this Parliament — and I think all other members of West Indian Parliaments have also in their possession — a copy of the West Indian Constitutional Conference in London which is a document which would take a longer time to prepare than the Five Year Plan. We also have a report of the Leeward Islands Conference in our possession and all that goes to show that Her Majesty the Queen's Stationers have a sense of their constitutional obligations to people; and such documents which are sent to them for publication, they make it their business to have all the necessary arrangements made so that there can be no excuse.

There can be no excuse in a half cent place like Barbados of only 166 square miles and with 230,000 people, lots of whom are looking for jobs, that you cannot publish this document in five weeks. It is disgraceful and it shows a lack of what we are asking for, which is productivity. Here, from the highest level, you take five weeks to produce something; and the disgraceful part of it is that the document has been published up and down the country in the newspapers and the people who are entitled to have a copy of it as a matter of right cannot get a copy of it. That is where Parliament is being taken for a ride.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must begin by telling the House that I am suffering no apologies or excuses in this matter. Information has reached me at my office, because I made enquiries into this same matter, that the Government Printer was in, and may be still in, some sort of quandary over the text of this Report. The Government Printer has direct information from me that he must bring the text of what has been laid on the Table of this House. My office has been extremely busy about this matter about getting copies of what has been laid in this House. As far as I know that is where the matter rests.

STATEMENT BY SPEAKER *re* ARTICLE IN BEACON

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I call the first Order of the Day, hon. members may remember that at the last meeting the hon. senior member for St. Peter produced a copy of a debate in the newspaper, *Beacon*, and asked that certain investigations be made about that matter.

I have now to tell the House that following a Staff Meeting at my office, it has been discovered that some sort of irregularity has been made and consequent upon that, I intend to bring the matter before a meeting of the Debates Committee.

Mr. SEARLES TO ACT AS CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before you call the first Order of the day, I would like to move that the hon. junior member for St. James be appointed as Chairman of Committees in the absence of the Chairman of Committees.

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

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

RESUMPTION IN COMMITTEE ON MARKETING CORPORATION BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume Committee on a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Marketing Corporation charged with the duty of improving the growing and marketing of produce and for matters incidental thereto or connected therewith.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Bill, Mr. SEARLES in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the last occasion, Clause 10 was being debated and the hon. junior member for St. John was speaking. He is not in his place.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, during the discussion on this Clause, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture seems to have taken exception to hon. members requesting information on this matter; and his exception was based on the fact that if some of us agreed in principle to a measure such as this, then the question of the detail should not be the cause of much worry. But what we asked was not a matter of detail nor a matter of ordinary detail in so far as policy was concerned, but what should have been enunciated by the Hon. Minister in so far as what is Government's intention about the measure.

Now, it is not for me to get information for the House; it is for the Minister himself to get that information. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that I would have to draw to this Committee's attention, information that is available to the Government on this matter and it is information which strikes at the root of this Marketing Corporation Bill. It is information contained in a pamphlet called "A National Accounts Study of the Economy of Barbados" and I will make particular reference to the kind of thing which we want to know. We asked how many depots were to be set up and certain other information. I asked the Hon. Minister whether he could state in broad terms the financial implications of this matter and I also asked what is the Government's policy in relation to the price factor. I would like to know if you are setting up a Marketing Corporation, whether Government policy is to give the Board the power to purchase all that is being produced.

Clause 10 says that it shall be the duty of the Corporation to stimulate, facilitate and improve the production, marketing and processing produce in the Island, particularly for the benefit of the producer.

Are you going to buy all that the producers can produce? That must not be left to the Board. If the Minister says that that is a matter for the Board, he does not know what he is talking about? You cannot ask us to pass a Bill and then leave these important matters to the Board. You must say that if you ask peasants to grow okras, yams and sweet potatoes, there will be a market for all that they grow. You are not going to ask them to grow them and then have them left in the ground.

What I asked the Minister for is what I have had to search for myself. Now, in this pamphlet "A National Accounts Study of the Economy of Barbados", on page 180, it says:-

12.45 p.m.
"On the whole as far as individual items of our gross domestic product table are concerned, the weakest links in the chain are in the estimates of subsistence, agriculture, construction, distribution and commerce, rent and services. Without a doubt, separate surveys of distribution and an extensive survey of housing are badly needed. While

consumption figures for subsidiary agriculture can usefully provide the means of cross-checking production figures, they cannot be looked upon as a substitute for good production estimates. A great deal of scope exists for the undertaking of a series of sample survey on agriculture in order to obtain more information about the peasant sector."

I have read that passage in order to show that people have given study to this matter, and it is not beyond the Minister's knowledge when this is something of which he himself must be aware. When a simple question is put to him, he must be capable of answering it. It is not for us to think of what I would regard as sub-standard conduct in legislative matters when a Minister himself is incapable of giving an answer to a question which directly affects the legislation which he wants to put through the Assembly. That is pathetic. I have figures to show that, from the point of view of the gross domestic product and from the items which the hon. member has given to this House which deal with agriculture, these things come under a head which is set out here; "Factor cost of the Gross Domestic Product by Industrial origin". This head deals with fishing, agriculture, ground provisions, fruit and vegetables, milk, meat poultry and eggs. When you take an example of this, you will find that in 1955 the gross domestic product of the things which the Minister is asking us to deal with, was \$8.7 million and in 1956 the figure was \$10.2 million. As against this background, we are asking what are the financial implications involved in setting up something like this, so that we do not have any vague generalisations.

Mr. Chairman, in this pamphlet there is plenty of information, but the information for which we are asking we cannot get from this book because this is not Government policy. We want to know what is the economic or financial position in which you want to put us; are you giving the Board power or do you know what power you will give to the Board? Can you tell this Committee that you are going to stimulate the growth of these products so as to allow the small producers to be clear in their minds that no longer will the present economy suffer from marketing?

The hon. member said that the sugar industry is well organized; anybody who grows canes knows that he has a market for his canes, whether that market is high or low. He does not have the problem that the canes will be in the ground and he cannot cut them. We want to know what is the Government's policy as regards this question of marketing. Are you going to guarantee the people who produce crops markets for their crops? That is a simple question; that is not anything for the Board to decide; that is something for the Government to decide. The Government should decide that every producer will have a market for his products. If you have a cold storage plant and you have the fish and a marketing organization, you must tell every fisherman that whatever catch he brings in, there is a market for it unless he wants a price which is above what can be regarded as the market price.

We do not want you to state what the minimum price will be, but we are asking if you will have a guaranteed market. Sugar has a guaranteed market in the United Kingdom as far as 1967; therefore we do not have to worry about that. As I have said, the Minister has said that some members have agreed with this Bill, I agree with it; I agree that it is long overdue, but in agreeing with the Bill we do not want it to be like a Federation Bill. Are you ready for all the implications that a co-operative marketing organization will require? What is the use of encouraging production and then there is no market for the produce? That kills the system. For instance, nobody will grow yams - I do not refer to the plantations now because there is no question of compulsion with a man who has half an acre of land; you compel plantations comprising ten acres of over to plant ground provisions; but if you are stimulating production in the case of the small man, you are going to ask him to produce cattle and so on, and the question is what market or markets are you going to offer him? You take the question of meat; it is a fact that two-thirds of the meat which is slaughtered in Barbados is slaughtered outside the market; two-thirds of the people who slaughter animals sell their meat outside any market; therefore if you are putting for-

ward this matter and you are not clear in your mind about it, you are not going to get any meat because the people who slaughter animals are conservative in their minds. Farmers all over the world are conservative and the same conservatism which holds them to the land is the same sort of conservatism which will make them say: "Let me know what I am growing; I must know what you are going to pay for it."

12.55 p.m.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that the Hon. Minister must be prepared to get down to fundamentals. It is really a shame that in Barbados this sort of mediocre atmosphere exists in Parliamentary conduct and you do not want to let anybody know that you are prepared for what you are doing. You are doing as if when we ask questions in this Chamber we are being inquisitive about somebody's business, forgetting that this is the highest Parliament and the institution for passing law in this land.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot take our responsibilities lightly. If the Minister has not given this the sort of thought that he should, let him say so; but do not let him tell us that he cannot give us this information, while at the same time he is telling us that he is doing something to develop the country. You are trying to develop the country and cannot give us simple facts about development! What we want to know, Mr. Chairman, is what producer is going to produce unless we can say from here that part of this is Government's policy, that the producers will have guaranteed markets for the things they are going to produce. You, Mr. Chairman, are in the production business yourself, and you would plant what you feel you can get a market for. You would not plant things for which you would not get a market, and if you were compelled to plant things for which there is no market, you would ask what is going to happen. The whole object of this Bill is to buttress that idea.

If you say that the gross domestic product is \$1 million, and put it against your imports - which in this book I do not have - you will find that the consumption value is something like \$32 million. If your gross domestic product is \$1 million and your consumption value is \$32 million, there is a lot you have to make up for. Mr. Chairman, you do not grow things to feed people; that aspect of it is for the Government. A man with land does not grow things to feed anybody, he grows them to feed himself; so it starts as a subsistence economy. The people who grow things in half an acre of land put by some for themselves. They store yams under the bed and put down peas; so they start off with their own self-preservation. They will sell the surpluses because with them it is not an economic crop; it is a subsistence crop. He may be a man working as a carpenter or a mason, and planting is only subsidiary to his other work. These things go to feeding him and reducing his living costs.

If you are going to stimulate this growth among such persons, you have to encourage them by letting them know that even if they grow more than they can eat, there is a market for the additional growth. That is why we ask whether you will guarantee a price. The hon. member seems not to understand that in the context of the Bill. We have a guaranteed price for sugar because it is negotiated from year to year; so we do not have to worry. After you fix the price it is guaranteed to you. All we ask now, Mr. Chairman, is whether in setting up a Marketing Corporation locally the Government is going to exercise the same attitude. Is it the policy of the Government to tell us you are going to do that? Moreover we want to give some idea as to how you are going to start the Board and what are the financial implications that come to you.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister should tell us if he told the Cabinet what the financial implications would mean to start this off. That is the sort of thinking we require in legislation and if the Minister cannot do that, he cannot really meet the requirements of 1961.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, in supporting this Bill, we all realise that this is just the framework, the details of which will come after; but any Minister who presents a Bill of this nature should have the background of how it came

into being. He said that the Director of Agriculture was not responsible for this Bill; therefore I presume that it might have been some other authority, whoever is responsible for marketing in the West Indies, because this is something other than agriculture. Although the purpose of this Bill is primarily for the producer, more effort will have to be placed on marketing than at present, because this is a matter of distribution and selling by which the producer will benefit.

One of the main reasons why people do not produce more milk, eggs, and things of that sort in Barbados or in any country is because of the difficulty of marketing. That is a separate phase entirely, and if the marketing can be taken over for these producers as is conceived in this Bill, you can make it easy for them to produce by giving them a guaranteed price. What we are asking the Minister is what discussions he has had with the Marketing Adviser who produced this Bill, and whether he told the Minister that it would be essential to subsidise at times or from time to time the producer. I say that that would be necessary. In other words, you have to have a price guaranteed to the producer. You cannot guarantee every item of produce, but you may say that next year during the months of January to May the Government will guarantee to all registered producers of, say, tomatoes a minimum price of 15 cents or 20 cents as the case may be; but in doing so they would have to come to a certain standard and grade which would be done by the Board.

Mr. Chairman, we are not asking the Minister for any more details on this. All we ask is whether he has conceived that it will be necessary to underwrite the producer, and if so what is it likely to cost. In the absence of the Five-Year Plan have you provided in the next five years a sum for that purpose? We have not seen the Five-Year Plan and you may have it in there. You look into the air as if that is a preposterous question, but you should have that from the experience of your discussions on this Bill. I would not bring a Bill here without that knowledge if I were a Minister. I would have to discuss that with the person who asked me to bring this or who influenced me to bring it, because you have said that it is not from the Agricultural Department but from the Marketing Association. What did they tell you? Is it necessary to finance? (Hon. D. D. GARNER: You sound childish.) Have you got in the Five-Year Plan a sum to support, underwrite and prop the producer in getting started in this matter?

1.05 p.m.

In the absence of that, you will be going very slowly indeed. You may prevent people from exporting and even from selling locally, but you will be worse off to encourage the producer to grow food and better food, and when he has done that, you have not guaranteed him a price by which he cannot lose by so doing. Bear in mind that if he loses this year he will not plant next year.

What are the crops you envisage you will have to be so treated that you will have to grant him a guaranteed price? I do not expect that you have to do it on something like okras, thyme or parsley, but I am thinking of the basic items such as cabbages, carrots and beets. You will have to do it on such items. You are an agriculturist; I am not; I can tell you more of the marketing side. I will say that that is the more important side because the producer today has to do his own marketing, but because he is not in the position to do it you propose to do it for him. You propose to do it by setting up this Authority. I say that it is a wise step but the two must go together. Do not try to reply if you do not have the answers.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who has just spoken was so childish: I would say that he was not his true self just now. I would like to tell him what I feel about how he behaved. When good questions are put to me I will answer them: but when foolish, childish questions are asked I will treat them the way which they deserve.

I think that all are agreed that there is a necessity for this Bill. What are we doing today? We are asking the House to agree in principle to this Bill. We are not asking for a cent. If and when we come to ask you to unlock the Treasury

of this Government, we will have to bring to you plans and policy matters. This is establishing the principle. We are asking you to allow us to go ahead; we are not asking you for one cent. This is just a Bill to give us the right to go ahead and organise. We cannot organise without the Bill becoming law. If you have a Police Bill, you do not ask what the funds will be or nor how many policemen you must have. A Police Bill does not say that. Those things are done by orders. I hear all of this talk and I am surprised to think that old parliamentarians who have been in here all the time would be so misled as to ask what I cannot give a true picture about.

I am asking this Committee to pass this Bill so that we can formulate things. How can I formulate a Board and decide on a policy unless I know that this law is on the Statute Book? This is enabling legislation and the policy depends upon the amount of discussions on the subject matter by the people who know. It is so elementary that I did not think I would have had to go over this today. As I have said, this is an enabling Bill without which I can do nothing. I have not asked for one cent out of the Treasury to implement one thing. When I ask for one cent, then you can ask me those questions which you are putting to me now; call me dense, an ignoramus or an idiot or anything you care; I cannot tell you one thing more than what I am telling you now. I cannot tell you anything more because we have not got to that point and hon. members know that too.

Sir, when I saw a business man get up in here and make himself so ridiculous I felt that he should have shown more intelligence. We want the authority for us to go ahead and work out all of those things of which hon. members enquired. You cannot do it when we have no authority. We are not amending an Act; this Bill is creating an Act. This is the first time such a Bill has come here. I may be dense, an ignoramus or the biggest idiot but I cannot understand what hon. members are aiming at. I say for the last time that this is an enabling Bill and until we get this Bill passed we cannot discuss with a Board what is the likely cost.

Mr. WALCOTT: We accept that. All it shows is that the Hon. Minister did not know what he was talking about in the first instance. The Hon. Minister said that we will find provisions for this in the Five-Year Plan. He does not know what he is saying. How can you tell us in passing a Bill that you will find the financial implications in the Five-Year Plan?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I think the hon. member will recall that there is a token amount in this year's Estimates for marketing.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not talking anything about any token vote; I am talking about a positive statement which the Hon. Minister made when this Bill was introduced. He said that provision for this is in the Five-Year Development Plan. Of course, Mr. Chairman, you know what I said about that Plan. I do not want to repeat what I said about it now. At any rate, the Hon. Minister was asked: "what are the financial implications" and he said in reply: "look in the Five-Year Plan."

Now, he is telling me about a token vote. Whenever you find that they are losing arguments and you find them flat-footed and not capable of giving an answer, you find them just using words. If the Hon. Minister wants a Solicitor, he had better go to a solicitor and let him advise him. What is enabling legislation? A Resolution is enabling legislation. Everything in here is legislation. A Bill is legislation, a Resolution is legislation, because you cannot do anything if you do not legislate it. This Bill is to set up a Marketing Corporation and in the setting up of this Marketing Corporation the Government's policy must be indicated at the time of the passing of this Bill. We are not asking for the functions of the Board in detail. Do not tell us that you do not know what your policy is. That is what the Hon. Minister is saying. They have no policy. Do you know the reason why they have got in a hurry to pass this Bill? It is just for the reason to accommodate some West Indians who will be coming here soon to attend some cocktail party.

1.15 p.m.

Is that the reason why you are passing this? Are you passing it to show that you have a Marketing Corporation? I would not call the hon. member an idiot; that would be superfluous; but I say he would be an imbecile to expect us to accept what he says, that is, that he is incapable today of telling us what is the Government's policy in relation to this Bill. If he does not know what is the Government's policy, then it is pathetic that he is passing a Bill and he cannot say that their policy is so and so. Some Barbadians like to get names. In a cane-cutting report, a Commission made a recommendation using the Latin phrase *ad hoc* in relation to bonus. The agricultural workers would want to know who is *ad hoc*; they want to know if he is a cane cutter! (Laughter)

Mr. Chairman, let us go stage by stage in this matter. The Government comes down with a Bill to set up the Transport Board; you are only giving this Board power to do this and that, but the Government must know before they agree in Cabinet what the thing implies. You do not send down a Bill just as you send down a picture.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. The hon. member is quarrelling so much, I am not quarrelling with anybody; I am correcting something which the hon. member has just said. That is high blood pressure!

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not sitting down to give way to that sort of thing. I am not having that sort of exhibition. Let the hon. member get to the point and do not beat around the bush.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I am speaking on a point of order. The hon. member said that this Bill was got up so as to accommodate some marketing organisation.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is a point of stupidity and interruption.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is speaking on a point of order.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Since August 26, 1959, we cabled to the Federal Secretary asking that Major Biggs come up here and discuss this matter with us. This is how the cable reads:

Mr. WALCOTT: That is not a point of order. The hon. member can reply when I am finished; he cannot rise on a point of order and read something now. I am asking if this matter was got up in view of some conference which they are going to have next week. After all, this is not a Tea Meeting and the Chairman is not somebody who is using a lot of Latin phrases which he knows nothing about. The hon. member has put his foot further in; in 1959 Major Biggs advised them on something and since two years ago you have not yet been able to make up your mind as to this matter. Can you say whether you are setting up a marketing organisation and you will guarantee all the people who come within the scope of this Bill with a home for the things which they will produce? That is what I asked the hon. member, but he is beating about the bush in old Barbadian fashion. You are referring to the old grandfather of a man when all the man wants from you is a sixpence. It is the Government's duty to state its policy as regards the legislation which it is passing; it is not for us to be prodding the Government. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to see these gesticulations from the Chair; they interrupt me. We are all so ignorant of some things; we would be ignorant of nuclear energy. If an hon. member says something, the Chairman must be able to listen calmly without making these gesticulations. We are in Parliament, not in any Tea Meeting.

The hon. member said that it could not be expected of him to tell us what is the Government's policy on this matter because this is only enabling legislation. I should like to say that enabling legislation was also passed in order to set up the Transport Board or the Housing Authority, but you must know what your policy is if you are setting up these Boards. What do you mean by stimulating production? All we are asking is this: what is the Government's policy with regard to the stimulation which they are

putting before the small holders? Are you going to guarantee the purchase of their products? You rely on the experts, but an expert can tell a fool easily; the more an expert is an expert, the more he will find out that a fool is a fool. If the expert finds that a man is not an ordinary fool but a compound fool, the more he will treat him as such. If the Minister cannot tell you what could be told you by an ordinary man who is opening a shop - well, is your policy "in God we trust"? We are asking the hon. member to tell us what is the policy of the Government. The Board has to be appointed, but the policy has to be enunciated. In the United Kingdom there is a Minister of Transport, Railways and buses are nationalised, but in so far as the policy is concerned, that is a matter for the Minister. The former Premier of Barbados, when we were dealing with the increase in bus fares, said "over my dead body" which means that he is not dead yet. I do not want him to die in any particular hurry but death is something which is inevitable; but the former Premier said that only over his dead body will we get any increase in bus fares.

1.25 p.m.

That goes to show that though they did not control the Board as a Board, the policy of the Government was that there would be no increase in bus fares. Bus fares have gone up and he is still alive. That is only a passing reference.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture said he was going to shock and stun us with legislation. He has certainly stunned me because he is telling me that he cannot tell us what his policy is in a Bill he is passing and that it will have to be left to the Board. He said that this is only enabling legislation. In passing the Displacement Allowance Bill, the Government laid down the terms and did not leave it to the Board to determine what they wanted. You decided that long ago and left the details to be worked out by the Board, because the Minister does not decide how much money a person will get. When asked how much money this measure would cost, the Minister should be able to give us some idea of the financial implications. That does not mean giving us every penny, but at least he could give us some broad idea about what they intend to do in setting up the Board. The Government should be able to tell us what they intend to do and where they intend to set up depots.

The Government, Mr. Chairman, has just asked a man to investigate into the salaries of Barbados with terms of reference which would take into account the economy of the island, which means that you are subjecting him to a point further than which he cannot go; that is to say, to a point where he sees the economy in his opinion cannot stand a salary increase that would impose something greater than what you have already indicated to him; but you did not tell him how much money to pay the Post Master General, the Governor or anybody else. The Government has given terms of reference taking into account the economy of the Island and safeguards itself on that. We asked the Minister what are the implications. The Government should know what are the implications, because when the Board is set up it may be asking for money, and therefore we want to know what are the limits and how far the Government intends to go.

Mr. Chairman, the Government has a Five Year Plan, and you heard the Minister of Communications say that they must plan. Did they send down this without planning? Is this not in your Five Year Plan? The Minister slipped up because when he was asked about the financial implications, he said that we would find it in the Five Year Development Plan; but when we pinned him down, he could not answer. The Five Year Plan is supposed to be a document for us to discuss, and though we have not yet reached that he is anticipating a debate by passing legislation which he says involves financial implications in the Five Year Plan. Now that we ask him to tell us what are the financial implications which he has just put into the Five Year Plan to support this Bill, we find that there are none. It was a fabrication when he said that these things were in the Five Year Development Plan, and he has now caught himself that there is no such financial provision. That is the type of political prostitution that we get.

It is not good enough, Mr. Chairman, to come here and give us the impression that something is done and then when we put them to the point they cannot answer, and start to

back away from the statements they made. We agree with the principle of the Bill and I would say that it is something which is long overdue, but we get this sort of sub-standard intelligence which is being exhibited by a Minister. He is asking what we expect him to give us. Imagine him chiding us over here for asking childish questions. He reminds me of two boys, one of which was a relative of mine. In doing lessons, one boy asked the other to spell "winter"; the boy said "w-i-n-t-o". The boy in turn asked the other to spell "British Honduras" because he thought he was right, and therefore if he could spell the word right, the other boy should be able to spell his too.

The Minister is chiding us and saying that we are childish for asking what is his policy in relation to setting up a Marketing Corporation. We are saying that he is not only childish, he is pre-natal. When you look at the Ministers over there, you will see that the price which we have to pay for democracy is high. A Minister walking about day in and day out should be prepared to come here and answer at a flash questions that are put to him; but he tells us that this is only enabling legislation, and cannot answer simple questions on what is Government's policy in relation to setting up a Marketing Corporation to stimulate the production he talked about. Did you copy this from Jamaica or Trinidad and so do not know what their policy was? It is no wonder when you send this kind of Fourth Eleven Team to Eric Williams and Manley that they have to come back here and you do not hear anything from them; they get bowled out for nought; they cannot even take guard because they are accustomed to a bad wicket at home and when they get on a good wicket they cannot get off to any start! I asked the Minister what is going to be Government's policy, but he asked whether we expect him to tell us that before the Board is set up and that this is only enabling legislation. He is like an undertaker saying that he cannot bury a person before he dies, but he is only doing something to enable him to be able to bury the dead. We are passing a law, and if you read the Bill, you will see that there are a lot of restrictive measures. I am not worried about those. One member said that this is going to prevent hawkers and hucksters from selling, but I have not got to that part of it. What we want to know is if a man with half an acre or an acre of land is going to do this whether you are going to give him a market for his produce.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a rural constituency. I take my politics differently and when I go with this Bill to the peasants and people in St. Peter, far from encouraging them I will tell them not to plant one thing until they know what they are getting, and they will listen to me. If you want co-operation in these things, you must not only think of over there, you have to get co-operation from over here. Co-operation is not a one-sided affair. If you want to get the peasants with you, you cannot get them by passing anything on paper; you have to get the peasants by getting those of us in here who represent them to make them feel that you are doing something in their interest, and if you cannot satisfy us, you would not be satisfying them. I have been representing a rural constituency for 16 years, longer than any of the members in here, and you can look around and see how many members have been in here for 16 consecutive years; so you can ask anybody in my constituency whether I know what I am talking about.

1.35 p.m.

I have represented a rural constituency longer than the hon. member. The hon. member has been in here the same time as I but he has been in the wilderness for five years. Remember, if he went in the wilderness for a period of five years he cannot be representing the views of the people as I have been because they have not put me in the wilderness yet.

When you are passing legislation, you are not passing legislation for the parish of St. Philip; you are passing it for the Island of Barbados. I happen to be one of the representatives, and I say this without boasting, that I happen to be a national character. Do not think that mine is a silent voice; it is a little more vociferous than he thinks. When it comes to these questions and you cannot answer them, all it shows is that you are not prepared for the responsibility which you are shouldering. Why come and say that you do not know? This is something which has been approved by

the Cabinet. We are stopping colonialism but we have a different kind of colonialism. We are having "Bajan" or "parish pump" colonialism. You ask a Minister a simple question and he cannot answer it.

I can see that there is something further than this. The simple beauties are over there. The hon. member over there says that you can bring down and you can pass. Whatever you bring down you can pass; but in this Bill you are depending on the producers to co-operate with you. The hon. member has said that the producers will co-operate. I say that you may sow but you may not reap.

The Hon. Minister says that we are asking childish questions. He looks at big men and say that we are asking childish questions. Do you think we have come in here to ask the Minister personal questions? We ask questions on a debate when we are aware that you have not answered something or you have not given us information on certain things. We ask your policy so far as the financial implications are as regards this matter. We have got no answer.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may read from this pamphlet which was written by Jeanette Bethell, this is what she says:-

"The need for development planning requires up to date information about the sectors of the colony and any attempt to diversify the economy of the Island can only be made with a background to more adequate information."

I did not write that. An economist wrote that. I intend to quote something else from this pamphlet on another measure which is to come up before us.

It is this same paucity of information that we are lacking from the Island's point of view and from the Minister's point of view when you ask a question which relates to something that the public should know, and the Minister says we must wait until the Five Year Plan comes before you or until the Board is set up. According to him, we will have to wait until a Board is set up to get that information. It comes to this, Mr. Chairman, when you go down to St. James and have a meeting in Orange Hill, you will tell the people: "We have passed a Bill to set up a Marketing Corporation but you will know about it when the Board is set up. My Government does not know about it."

That is not a Board's decision; that is a Government's decision. The Government has to be in a position to say that every pound of greens which you produce they are going to buy. You have to tell the public what you mean to do by passing this. Every time you grow cassava or yams, the Government should be prepared to say that we are going to set up a marketing organisation to purchase it from you.

The Hon. Minister talked about stopping importation of Irish potatoes and getting the people of this country to use more sweet potatoes. You cannot force people to eat all sweet potatoes in this enlightened age. It takes more fuel to cook a pound of sweet potatoes than a pound of Irish potatoes and, as a matter of fact, an ordinary working man cannot go and buy a pound of sweet potatoes and cook it as a meal; he has to go and buy a pint of rice because that will divide up more. The economy of working out a food diet is not worked out by people in Universities but by the hardships of life. If you put some money which some women in St. Andrew or in St. James get in the hands of some of these mathematicians at the University to work out a diet for a week, they would go mad and you will have to send them all to the Mental Hospital! They would not be able to do it. This economy by women of this Island is worked out through necessity; and the hardships of life force them to be some of the greatest mathematicians in the world. They can get some flour and salt fish to work out just as Our Master got the loaves and fishes to work out to feed the 5,000 people.

What are you going to offer the producers? That concerns the policy of the Government. The Minister says that he cannot answer that. If anybody is childish, it is the Minister. He is not only childish but he has not been born yet.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, when a reasonable question is asked in this House of Assembly by any member of

any Minister, I think the Minister should be in a position to give a reasonable answer and by so doing it will stop all this continually asking questions and bickering over things. 1.45 p.m.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church has asked a question as to whether the Minister will provide the money to meet the needs of the growers of provisions. The Minister only needed to say "Yes" or "No" to that question and he has no right using these sarcastic remarks. I really thought better of him.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. When did I use any sarcastic remarks? I have answered the questions repeatedly. On what occasion did I use any sarcastic remarks? I tried to make every hon. member understand that money is not involved in the passing of this Bill, not at this stage.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I am here to make my suggestions. I am saying that if a question is put to you, a soft answer turns away wrath. The hon. member is a Minister and he should put forward a better example; he should control himself by good words rather than by arguing. This is not a money Resolution; I am aware of that; but the point is that the Minister is in a position to say "yes" or "no" and let an end be put to all this debate. You should not encourage evil in order to find a solution to eradicate that evil; you should be able to ward off evil by words of consolation and not invoke wrath. A Minister is an important man and therefore he should always have a solution to meet any problem which arises in this House. By so doing he will be able to bring down the biggest man who may have the greatest wrath for him. I think that the Minister should be more temperate in his remarks; I have never heard him like that. I hope that in the future the Ministers will conduct themselves better in this House and be a guide to others.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I do not think it is fair to hon. members to get away with their attitude in this matter. On the last occasion I was at pains to point out that Section 11 of this Bill (Mr. WALCOTT: We are dealing with Section 10). I was saying, Sir, that I was at pains to say that all that the hon. member wanted to know is set out in Section 11 of this Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The hon. member cannot read Section 11 because that is the next Section.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: All that we have been arguing and hon. members have been asking.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The hon. member cannot read Section 11. We are dealing with Section 10 now; the hon. member can only make reference to Section 11.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Section 11 is only an explanation that the hon. member is offering.

Mr. WALCOTT: Section 10 is under consideration by this Committee, not Section 11. The hon. member has referred to Section 11 already and we disagreed with him.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Even although the hon. member said that we are now dealing with Section 10, I can still read Section 10 (h); it says this: It shall be the duty of the Corporation -

"To secure the most favourable arrangements for the purchase, handling, transportation, storage, exportation shipping, marketing and sale of produce whether in the Island or out of the Island, and in particular to assist agricultural and fishery co-operative societies to dispose of their produce to the best advantage;"

Then if hon. members were to look at sub-paragraph (e) of Clause 11 they will see that it states that the Corporation shall have power to enter into contracts for the purchase and sale of produce upon such terms and conditions as the Corporation may think fit. Do you want anything more plainly set out than that? There are no politics in this matter; this is a service. When you come to a matter of policy, that will have to be gone into; when the matter goes before the Cabinet, then I can come back and tell this honourable House what the policy will be. When it is

settled by the Cabinet that we will do this and that, I will come down to this House with whatever has been decided.

Mr. WALCOTT: In his closing remarks the hon. member is saying that the Cabinet has agreed to a marketing Bill, but he has no policy as to marketing. He has absolutely none and that is a tragedy. The hon. member is telling us that he has brought down something here and the Cabinet has no policy on it; therefore the Government, when this Bill is passed, has no policy. It only has a Bill but no marketing policy. You are passing a Bill to set up a corporation but you have no policy on it. Is that not stupidity? Where, in any other part of the world, would you have a Minister admitting that he has a Bill to be passed but he has no policy? Are you talking about holly-hocks? Are you talking about Mary having a little lamb? Can a Minister get up in Parliament and tell you that the Government has a Bill but it has no policy? Can a Minister say that they will have a policy when they come down to the House for money? Imagine a Minister having no policy in relation to a Bill! I am suggesting that as soon as you reach the stage of having a Bill you must know your policy on what you are passing. As a matter of fact, long before you reach the stage of having a Bill you should have your policy worked out. One Government comes into power and says: "Our policy is to nationalise". In your Manifesto you set out what your policy is; and you have not got your Bill yet. I would more expect the Minister to say "Our policy is so and so but we have not yet had time to enunciate such policy." Imagine a Minister saying that they had time to initiate a Bill but not to set out their policy! You do not have to be unprepared about your policy; you either have a policy or you have none.

1.55 p.m.

If a man asks you today whether you are a Catholic, Anglican or Baptist, you do not ask him for a little chance to think which you are, because you pass by the Roman Catholic Church on Wednesday mornings, and you pass by the Baptist on Saturdays.

Well, I have seen poor exhibitions, but I must say to the Minister that I am a most disappointed man in his absolute superficiality about legislation. For him to say to us today that we are going to know the policy of the Government on the Marketing Corporation when they come to us for money is the biggest piece of political ignorance that has ever been exhibited even in a mock House. Before I came here, we used to have mock Houses, and I am going to pass a Resolution to let us have a mock House so that members can have exercises outside. To say that you have no policy in passing such a momentous Bill is tragic. Since 1959 he discussed this matter with Major Biggs and up to this day he does not know the policy. He does not know that policy is not determined by the amount of money you can have. The amount of money you can have is determined by policy and how much you want to do. Education policy is not determined by the number of schools you are going to build; it is what you have in mind about education. The amount you can have is dictated by the Treasury and not by your policy. Your policy may be free education or free meals, but because you do not have the money to carry out this policy, it does not mean that your policy is not free meals. I cannot understand a man telling me that his policy is to be enunciated when he comes down with a money Resolution. When the Cabinet met on this Bill, was it having a Sunday School outing? Were you on the beach or were you thinking of a Marketing Organisation?

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

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

On resumption:

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that there is no Quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Question Time was called.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 47 was asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy whom I observe is not in his place.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Private Members' Business was called.

Orders Nos. 1 to 20 inclusive, were called.

HOUSE RESUMES GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The House will now revert to Government Business.

On the Suspension, the House was in Committee.

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

HOUSE RESUMES DEBATE ON MARKETING CORPORATION BILL

The question that Clause 10 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 11 to 19 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. D. D. GARNER, seconded by Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, 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. L. St.A. THORNE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

2.35 p.m.

THE PIONEER INDUSTRIES BILL, 1961

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Pioneer Industries Act, 1958.

Hon. M. E. COX: Hon. members will see from the Objects and Reasons of this Bill that this is consequential to the Income Tax (Amendment) Act which came into force in July this year. Hon. members will remember that the Income Tax (Amendment) Bill made clear in the Objects and Reasons that in so far as industrial buildings are concerned which were not granted certain allowances, provision was made in that Bill for a balancing allowance and a balancing charge to be made in respect of those buildings. Hon. members will also remember the annual allowance which was made in respect of buildings.

As far as pioneer industries legislation is concerned, this amendment to the Act of 1958 ensures that persons who are given pioneer status should not enjoy those benefits; therefore, from paragraph 1 of the Objects and Reasons members will see in the first place that Section 2 of the Pioneer Industries Act is amended so as to ensure that after any tax holiday or partial tax holiday has been enjoyed under that Act, all necessary calculations or notional calculations will have been made in respect of the allowances or charge abovementioned. Provision for that is made by the inclusion of the following to be numbered subsection (3) of Section 2 of the Pioneer Industries Act:

"(3) For the purposes of this Act, any reference in this Act, other than in the First Schedule hereto, to annual allowances, a balancing allowance or balancing charge in respect of machinery or plant shall be deemed to include a reference to annual allowances, a balancing allowance or balancing charge in respect of industrial buildings or structures as defined in section 12A of the Income Tax Act, 1921 and in relation to any such allowance or charge so included, any reference in this Act, other than in the First Schedule hereto, to machinery or plant shall be read and construed as a reference to industrial buildings or structures as so defined."

Clause 3 of this Bill amends Section 17 of the Pioneer Industries Act so as to include an initial allowance and an investment allowance which are not provided for the Pioneer Industries Act as it stands today.

Hon. members will see that Clause 4 of the Bill amends Section 19 of the Pioneer Industries Act and that gives the

Commissioner of Inland Revenue the power to decide what profits should be declared to be exempted profits or gains under the Pioneer Industries Act. In other words, as the Act now stands, a pioneer producer can decide what are exempted profits. For example, there may be a case where there is more than one undertaking being carried on under the same name. If you think of an undertaking like the Barbados Concrete Products, some of those products are given pioneer status, like tiles and things of that sort: but in so far as the making of blocks is concerned, the manufacture of which is not granted pioneer industry concession, the Company if it so desires can manipulate those two products and the Commissioner under the Act has the power to decide what is what as far as profits are concerned; and therefore this amendment to the Section.

Perhaps paragraphs (a) and (b) of Clause 4 are the most important part of this amended Bill.

If hon. members look at paragraph (a) of Clause 4, that amendment will give the Commissioner the power to decide what are the profits. I will read the last few lines of the new sub-section (3) with paragraph (a):-

.....if he considers that such amount relates to a transaction entered into by the pioneer manufacturer otherwise than in the normal course of manufacture and sale of the pioneer product of which the pioneer manufacturer is declared to be the pioneer manufacturer thereof with the object either -

- (a) of inflating the profits or gains in any year in which the profits or gains from the manufacture and sale of the pioneer product were, in virtue of the provisions of this Act, either wholly or partially exempt from income tax;

In other words, if, for example, there are two products produced by one business or company, as the case may be, the possibility may arise where for example the item is not a pioneer item or product, the cost of that raw material which may be sold to the manufacturer for the purpose of manufacturing a pioneer product might be very small or below production cost. In that case the owner may be able to show - during those years that he is exempted from income tax, local government tax, etc. - very high profits on those pioneer goods during that period since he did not have to pay income tax.

On the other hand, there is where paragraph (b) of sub-section (3) which is in Clause 4 applies:-

- (b) of artificially reducing the profits or gains in any in which the profits or gains from the manufacture and sale of the pioneer product are not in virtue of the provisions of this Act wholly exempt from income tax."

In other words, if the product is not wholly exempt from the provisions of the Income Tax Act, the manufacturer could inflate the cost of the manufacture of that item which would permit him to pay a lower rate of income tax.

Later on, hon. members will see at the end of that Section that the marginal note is to be expanded. It is now to read as follows:-

"Maintenance of separate account for income tax free profits and gains and payment therefrom of certain dividends free of income tax."

If any hon. member looks back at the Pioneer Industries Act, they will see why it becomes necessary for this amendment to be included in this Bill.

Under Clause 5 which amends Section 2 of the principal Act, hon. members will see that there is an addition to sub-section 1. That addition includes tools, plant machinery, pipes, conveyor belts or other appliances of a light nature. That is done because under the Pioneer Industries Act, 1958, those items were not included; only industrial buildings were provided for.

2.45 p.m.

The essence of that is this; the buildings used for the production of pioneer products cannot be used for any other purpose under the Act unless permission is given by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. That Act does not, however, include the use of tools, plant and machinery; therefore this Section amends Section 32 of the Act, 1959; so as to include plant, machinery and so on.

In this very Section hon. members will see that provision can be given, when this Bill is passed, to a pioneer manufacturer to manufacture goods other than those which are provided for under the Pioneer Industries Legislation. When that permission is given, it is given with the understanding that the Governor-in-Executive Committee can insist upon the pioneer manufacturer to pay the Customs Duty which he would have had to normally pay if the items had been imported for use in the manufacture of any article which was not declared a pioneer product. In other words, if you are manufacturing now, under your pioneer status, something which was not included or given pioneer status, that article can also be manufactured with the understanding that, as to that part of the duty in respect of the tools, machinery or the building or the items which are used for the construction and finishing of the building, the Commissioner of Inland Revenue would have power to make the pioneer manufacturer pay a proportionate part of the duty which he would have had to pay had it not been for the fact that such concession was granted under the Pioneer Industries Legislation.

Mr. Speaker, that is more or less the whole gist of this Bill, and unless hon. members would like to know anything further about it, I have nothing further to say at this stage. However, if any questions are asked, I would be quite willing to answer them. I hope hon. members were following my explanation of this Bill as I tried to put it before the House. I have much pleasure in moving that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the hon. Introducer of this Bill would disclose to this House if a Cement Company, which one has read of in the Press recently, is one which would come within the scope of this Bill, and whether the hon. member already has that Company in his mind. One notices or observes a certain synchronization of dates in the actual proceeding with this Bill and the announcement of the advent of this Company and its operations in this island. As we know, this Bill has been on the Order Paper since the 24th May, 1961, but only today is it made Order No. 2 and we are proceeding with it instantly. There seems to be no objection to the general purposes which have been outlined in this Bill and therefore there could be no objection to its second reading. However, as a matter of great interest, I would seek information as to whether this Cement Company whose activities are now being widely advertised, is known by the Hon. Minister to be interested in the passage of this Bill, and if the Minister has in mind proceeding with this Bill because the activities of this Company are being foremost in his mind.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is "No". I should like to assure the hon. member that although I read newspapers as regularly as time permits me to do, I am never guided by newspaper reports, because they are so misleading, more particularly those in Barbados. I am reminded that there may be one, although I am not sure there is one. (Laughter) Anyhow, Sir, the position is that in the Pioneer Industries legislation, the manufacture of cement has already been declared to be a pioneer product. The question as to whether or not some interested person, as I saw in the newspaper, is putting down a cement factory in Barbados, has absolutely no bearing on this Bill.

Perhaps I should say at this stage, for the benefit of some hon. members, that the business of the Government cannot be done in any rush. The Government has to plan its business and make sure that when it presents anything to this House, whatever it presents stands up to the severest scrutiny. Some people seem to think that the Government can easily bring down anything as if it is a matter of private business. I would like to say that every individual

has the right to criticise the Government and whenever any criticism is made, the Government has to explain its position to the satisfaction, not of the gullible people, but to the satisfaction of the intelligent, sensible people who are found in the corporate life of this country and that of other countries.

The purpose of this Bill was discussed early last year and the Government has so many things to do that items have, more or less, to take their turn. I want to assure the hon. member that this Bill has absolutely nothing to do with the Company to which he has referred. I know that more than one company is talking about the establishment of a cement factory in Barbados. Some people have been talking of bringing in the unfinished product; some people have been talking about bringing clinka here. We have talked with a number of people in respect of all sorts of items and schemes from time to time, but I would again like to assure the hon. member that nothing as regards this cement factory has fructified up to now. I do not know if and when it will fructify.

2.55 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. member was introducing the Bill as I was not here earlier, and with the permission of the House, I would like to speak at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave of the House to speak on this Bill since he was not in his place at the time of its introduction.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I would like members to know that none of us want to stifle any debate, but I am not prepared to accommodate members when they are in the House and should be in here when debates are going on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member object?

Hon. M. E. COX: I am not going to object, but I want my position to be known.

Mr. SPEAKER: Since there is no objection, leave is granted the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister should be aware that it is 3 o'clock, and normally this would not be Government Time but Private Members' Time, and if an hon. member did not know that there were no questions to be answered between 2.30 p.m. and 3.15 p.m., he would not expect Government to be doing the second Order of the Day under Government Business. I would agree to what he said if it were after 4.30 p.m., so I am not asking for any concession from the point of view of doing more than what has been granted to hon. members.

Mr. Speaker, my comments on this are similar comments to those I made on another matter in that I am not against the principle of what this Pioneer Industries Amendment seeks to do, but I think it is time that the Government should give a progress Report. I was not in here when the Minister spoke, but I think the Government should give a progress Report on Pioneer Industries in order that we might know what is the present position with regard to Pioneer Industries. That is to say, how many industries have started under the Pioneer Industries Act and how many of them have fallen out. I know that some of them have fallen by the way, and it should be made clear to the House what is the position.

There is no point in passing Pioneer legislation, Mr. Speaker, and then the Minister does not say from time to time what is the position. One would go on believing that Pioneer Industries are really developing along the lines for which we pass legislation. That is something we are entitled to know.

On a former occasion I made mention that an Industrial Mission came here and said that Government should look into the question not only of people starting pioneer industries, but of established industries, and I mentioned then that the Government should pay attention to certain things like the Printing Trade. I was not here but I read a Report

in which the Hon. Minister said that the Printing Trade gets this sort of thing. Well I do not like to deal with newspaper Reports.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, I do not know what the hon. member is referring to, but I should like to assure him that this is the only time I am going to rise even if he speaks for the whole day. I could not have said that the Printing Trade gets this type of thing, because it is not free from income tax or Local Government tax. I think I know my set-up as well as anybody else. What I did say and will contend is that the Printing Industry or Trade is allowed to import all of its equipment into the Island duty-free, and there is no question of re-exporting any item of machinery which came into the island and then having any refund, as the Bill which I have before the House and the Resolution at the time sought to do. Everything in connection with printing is allowed into the Island duty free and has been allowed long before I happened to have been a member of this House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it takes a little time for people's minds to really become analytical. I am making the point which I made on the last occasion because there was a dispute here in the Printing Industry in 1956 and Professor Beasley was the arbitrator. One of the things which he asked the Government to do was to give these people certain concessions. I like to be able to know what I am talking about. All we were trying to draw to the attention of the Government was a statement in the Report made by The Industrial Mission from the United Kingdom which came to Barbados, Trinidad and Jamaica. That Mission invited the Governments to look into established industries and treat them in a way that would help them to continue, and on the last occasion, I drew to the House's attention the particular section of the Report which dealt with established industries, and that was paragraph 36 of the Report. I said that the reason for that was that owing to certain phases in the Printing Trade, the average wages paid were higher than the average wages paid in some of these Pioneer Industries, and that you should do something to help them.

I do not know if the Minister has given any attention to that; but there is no point in saying that this Bill is to deal with income tax and the other Bill was to deal with re-exports. The important thing you have to consider is that you are now making concessions, Mr. Speaker, and what I am asking the Minister is whether it is too late or too early to examine this matter. Barbados is in a unique position *vis-à-vis* the other places in relation to this question of trade, industry and the like, and if the Minister takes objection to those things, I do not care.

I would like the Minister to get it clear in his mind that he is not elected a Minister; he is elected a member of the House and I am elected a member of the House. He becomes a Minister after an election takes place, and it is only a matter of who joins together in the House and says they are going to form the Government.
3.05 p.m.

I want the hon. member to understand that he has no more right to speak on behalf of things than I have. If I make a study of something which is under his portfolio, all he has to do is to answer my question.

I say that the printing trade is one which you should examine in the light of what is taking place in the industry and the whole idea of giving examination to it is in order to arrest it from problems which now face it. One of these problems is redundancy and anybody who knows what redundancy is will know that that is a very hard problem to be faced with in Barbados.

In the book by Jeanette Bethell, "A National Account Study of the Economy of Barbados", you will find this is written and I am very grateful for this information. There is something in this book which should commend itself to the Government because it speaks of these same questions which today are exercising our minds. I have noted one or two of the things that I want to bring to the attention of this House on this whole question of pioneer industries. The

Hon. Minister should realise that you cannot accuse the people at universities for criticising the Government because they do not go in for that. They just make a critical examination of things. This is what is written:-

"One of the most important purposes served by pioneer legislation is to help create an atmosphere conducive to investment and to demonstrate the willingness of government to give positive assistance to new industries. However, since one of the most important factors influencing any investment decision is the expectation of profitability of the enterprise rather than the level of tax on realised profits, the instability of labour conditions, a high level of labour costs resulting from low labour productivity due to lack of skill on the part of the labour force, unavailability of cheap raw materials both local and imported, the non-existence of "external economies" (cheap and adequate power and transport facilities) and lack of markets may be of far greater importance to the investor. Provided that some attention is paid to these different aspects simultaneously, pioneer legislation will appear in its proper perspective, as part of a general programme for making investment more attractive."

Then it goes on:

"In Barbados little attention has been paid so far to the possibilities of increasing the pace of industrial development by the provision, for example, of building sites and the setting up of factories which could later be taken over and used by private investors. There has also been no serious effort to interest investors in what the island has to offer as a centre for industry, as has been done in Jamaica and Trinidad. Lack of knowledge on the part of the would-be investor about the possibilities for industrial development in the island constitutes a drawback, especially when there is so much competition in the area as a whole in trying to attract investment from abroad."

This is a critique on the pioneer industries, not a criticism but an examination of it. What I find to be appalling in Barbados is that the present Government thinks that nobody in this Island has any right to interfere in this pioneer industry. For example, there is a beer factory and I have not heard the Hon. Minister making any pronouncement as regards people coming here and opening pioneer industries nor has he made any pronouncement as regards their relationship with workers, as Mr. Isaacs of Jamaica has done. That is to say, these people can come here, open up a pioneer industry and look for cheap labour. We have seen that the beer industry is started at pioneer status. Nobody has asked the Hon. Minister to say more than anybody else has said. We had a Mission coming from Jamaica last year and they warned us that when some of the pioneer people come down we give them concessions and as soon as the concession period is out, they ask for a longer period and after that, you do not hear anything more of them.

I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Trade what is the position as regards the shoe factory. Those are things he should know. If a pioneer industry has gone out of business or anything of that kind, you should examine it. This Island has a population of 230,000 people and although that does not allow for too many fashions for a pioneer industry in shoe manufacturing, in a community which is not a barefooted community where a shoe factory would be working against a difficulty, we should know what is the position as regards that shoe factory. Why should we not know what is the position as regards that factory when we come to amending legislation to the Pioneer Industries Act? Why should we not know how many new industries have started and succeeded and how many have started and failed? I do not think anyone should say that these are things which the Government should know of alone. No one can accuse me of saying that these things are for the Government alone because some time ago, setting my views out I said that Barbados required a national committee to meet at these various levels and create a sort of industrial climate. I said that you want an industrial council so that you could merge all of the Boards dealing with the creation of industries such as the Tourist Board, the De-

velopment Board and the Hotel Industries Board. The book from which I read just now says that Barbados has a particular need for this particular type of thing if financial co-operation similar to what you have in Trinidad is to take place. These are not statements which I have made out of my head. It says that Barbados should follow the pattern of some of the other sister territories in having financial co-operation, in having a merger of these things which I say are a means of stimulating these things. These are things which I want to draw to the attention of the Government. Can you give us statements about the wage earning forces of the people to whom you are giving pioneer status? 3.15 p.m.

Let us have some knowledge that they are employing people and what is the employment. I commend this study to hon. members and they will see how money is distributed in Barbados. You have the distribution of money in the Banks; you have to know that so many people are working for wages and how many are working for salaries. Let us know more about this question of whom we are helping. If we find that you are helping some people and you are not helping others, let us examine that situation and then we will be able to make an assessment. I say that from the point of view of my own experience, I am in favour of helping a man who is paying proper wages; as to any business which is paying good wages, the Government must see that the business does not go out of operation. A man who works for \$40 or \$50 a week is less a charge on the community than a man who is working for \$12 or \$15 a week. When these things are drawn to the attention of the Government, the Government must examine them. If you have to give more money for printing so as to keep the work here, let us examine that. A man who is working for \$40 or \$50 a week is paying his doctor's bill and he can send his child to a secondary school. Those are the people who are pulling their weight because they are doing things which a man who is working for \$12 or \$15 a week cannot do. If you are helping industries where the labour content is not as great as in other industries, and where the wages paid are not as good as in other cases, then you should examine that position.

I do not suggest that you should abandon certain wages. We try to encourage people to pay good wages; but you will understand that, when you look at the size of the hotels and the cost of the hotels, the wages earned by the people in this business are not high as compared with the ones whom I have just mentioned. I do not deal with tips and gratuities; I am talking about basic wages. I think that this House would be well advised to make a study of what has been said of the business of our pioneer industries. This is a recent study and it should be drawn to the attention of hon. members that everything is not as easy sailing as they think. How many of these pioneer industries, which have been given pioneer status within the last six years, are still in existence and how many of them have gone out of existence? I am not getting into the cement business, but I do feel that we have in existence industries to which concessions have been given; the Minister has given concessions to the Foundries, but one of the Foundries did not carry any lay-off whatever in 1960. Men work for wages at the rate of sixteen or eighteen cents an hour; some of them work for a dollar an hour. I speak with knowledge of the industrial climate. Moreover, I think that the Ministry of Trade is not sufficiently geared to face the impact of these new situations, and unless there is some co-ordination in respect of the Tourist Board, the Development Board and other Boards - it is not that we do not want these Boards, but there should be a Development Council co-ordinating the various elements in the over-all situation. Let us think in terms of the various aspects, so that all of these things can go to a corporation in which you have policy laid down. We want to study finance. This book is entitled "Social and Economic Status" and it deals with a national accounts study of the banks; our present position is that we are tied to sterling and what the Chancellor of the Exchequer wants in the United Kingdom, whether it suits us or not, creates a situation for us. This book speaks about the amount of money you lend out at interest rates; it is not a political document. As I said, it deals with the social and economic status and it is a study of Barbados.

These are things which hon. members must read, Hon. members, as leaders, must read these things. It seems to

me that if these things are ignored now, you will reach the stage where you are working on an *ad hoc* basis each time. When we raise these matters, we are told that this is nothing to do with income tax. I think we have reached the stage now where we require the whole answer to this question. I say that the whole purpose of the Government in having pioneer legislation is to encourage industrial development with a view to creating greater prosperity. If that is so, then the Government should reverse its policy as to the decision which it has taken about sending work out of Barbados. You cannot ask investors to come here in one breath and in another breath you send the work which you have to be done out of Barbados. To me that does not make any sense. Our balance of payment is such that we have to create more employment inside, not less employment and more imports. The Minister of Labour should be the last person, in our peculiar circumstances, where we have to be knocking for every cent and getting everybody employed to the maximum - in fact, he should be the last person in the world to send out of the country any job which can be done in the country, even if it costs more money to do that job. In this book this lady has warned that it is better for Barbadians to invest their money in Barbados at a lower rate of interest from the point of view of the social content or to have what it creates, than to invest our money outside at the expense of creating more unemployment within. We are quite in agreement with everything which is set out here in this Bill, but the Government should, as a matter of commonsense, realise that we are in too precarious a position not to agree that every possible job which can be done in Barbados should be reserved for every able-bodied man who is able to work. 3.25 p.m.

In the Printing Industry, I would say this: I doubt very much that the Minister would bring a Bill or a Resolution which stemmed at creating more employment at the expense of something becoming dearer. We passed pioneer legislation to protect shirt manufacturers, but you can get shirts from Hong Kong and Japan cheaper in this Island than any shirt which the Elite Factory can make. We can get margarine from other parts of the world cheaper than all the margarine we can make; but we do these things in order to protect local industry and as a means of creating employment. It is better for us to pay a little more for a shirt from a factory which employs somebody in Barbados than to send to Hong Kong for the shirt and keep somebody here unemployed.

The Minister of Trade has received printers already, I believe, on this question of the Printing Trade, and I would expect that their views as poor men and women involved should mean something. However, that matter will be taken up again with the Minister from another quarter, and we look forward to see what is the attitude of the Government in those matters. I feel on the pioneer industry that the Minister should give the House and the public of Barbados a progress Report so that we can become up-to-date on this matter and there is no guessing about it. I think he owes it to the public.

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SEARLES being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, 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. M. E. COX, seconded in each case by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION re HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve part of the funds provided in the Capital Estimates, 1961-62 of the Ministry of Communications, Works and Housing at Part II - Capital Expenditure Head VIII, Item 4 being used to effect urgent road improvements at the Belmont-Martindale's Junction and the Cheapside area.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of Order No. 3 in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Trade is asking leave to take charge of Order No. 3 in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I am sorry, Sir, that the Hon. Minister is not in his place..... (Mr. WALCOTT: Just now you told me that I should be in here; he is a Minister and should be in here also.) A Minister has more than one thing to do at the same time and is not as free as a Trade Union Leader. The most a Trade Unionist has to do is talk; but a Minister has to think, talk and act. (Mr. WALCOTT: Well, how does Mapp manage then?) *(Laughter)*

Mr. Speaker, I think hon. members are aware that as far as the Deep Water Harbour is concerned, quite a few road improvements have to be carried out in order to bring about some sort of symmetry in this scheme. The roads have to be widened and so on to facilitate the traffic which passes around these areas leading into the Harbour. The Addendum explains quite clearly, concisely and otherwise the purpose of this Resolution. It reads as follows:-

The sum of \$320,000, provided in the 1961-62 Capital Estimates, at Head VIII, Item 4, for highway improvements includes a revote of \$242,000 for the special purpose of improving the following road junctions:-

Eagle Hall, Hindsbury Road, Fairfield-Welches, Government Hill, Collymore Rock - Culloden and Bank Hall.

In view of the urgent need for road improvements in the Cheapside area and at the Belmont-Martindale's junction, it is proposed to defer the Bank Hall, Government Hill and Collymore Rock - Culloden projects and instead to carry out the improvements necessary in the Cheapside area and at the Belmont-Martindale's junction, at an estimated cost of \$67,000 and \$60,000 respectively.
3.35 p.m.

I think, Sir, that explains clearly the purpose of this Resolution and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, despite what the Hon. Minister said, I do not wholeheartedly agree. I doubt very much that there is anything which takes precedence to a member coming here because if something takes precedence to our coming here, then we do not have to seek the suffrage of the people any longer. It is for that reason that I did not accept the apology made by the Hon. Minister for the Hon. Minister of Communications not being present to present this Bill. I am sorry that the Minister of Communications is not here because the Hon. Minister of Trade can say that he is not in a position to answer things which I may put to him.

However, I think that the Government will be well advised to immediately get on to the job and to do something with the highway along the North approach to the Harbour. That approach does not enhance the general appearance of

the Island. We all know what back premises are like: so we do not like to have back premises to the front. That is actually what is taking place now. May be the Government has plans about the lighting and what not of that road, but it is still a comparatively dangerous road from the point of view of travelling at night without the proper street lights on it.

I am not a road construction engineer but I am sorry that the policy was not taken to make carriage ways along that road. I think the experts say that if you have a wider street there is no question of encroachment when you have lanes for traffic to pass. Some countries with these wider streets put the lights in the middle of the street. I am sure that Your Honour is aware of that and you will also say that it facilitates travelling. As a matter of fact, most all of the Ministers are not strange to that situation in London. I am sometimes shocked to see that Ministers make occasional visits overseas and you do not see from these visits something percolating into the projects of the colony.

I would like to draw to the attention of the House that there was a lot of anxiety in getting the new Deep Water Harbour started and you heard that it was because of the workers you could not get things started as if it were the workers who were keeping back things and it was not a question of not having buildings ready.

Now, we were down there since the 3rd July and you find that what concerns the workers is always left as the last to be done. All the approach roads for the other people are levelled off, but you will find that they have left that for the workers to be the last to be done and they have to walk over rough stones to get to their building. The Port Manager and the others can at least drive a motor car in, but on that road where the workers are, you will find that that part is still rugged. I have to drive over this rugged path with some difficulty to get to them. You have this idea that what concerns the workers can always remain until the last to be done. It is just as when you are building a house. You find that they leave the servants' quarters for the last to be done and if those quarters are done first they become the workshop and they are the last to be vacated by the contractors. I would like to see something done about this road. Then as regards the other places to the back of the Cemetery, I think something can be done about them so as to enhance the appearance. I go further and say that the Government should think seriously about the whole resiting of that area. I would say from the Fontabelle end until you reach the Eagle Hall end you should do something about that part because the next ten years you may find that you have too many problems. You should think of resiting and revamping that area so as to enhance the whole area. Make a proper site of it. Tidy the houses up. I think that that is a very good approach to the problem there and one which should commend itself to the Government. You should not think of only putting a few galvanised sheets to the back of the houses which are there now. Give it a new look.

Mr. BRANCKER: This matter is not under the portfolio of the Hon. Minister of Trade but I wonder if he can give us the reason why as regards these particular projects - the Bank Hall, Government Hill and Collymore Rock - Culloden projects - it is felt they can be deferred for yet a longer period. After all, they were decided on some time ago. As the Addendum states, of the sum of \$320,000 provided in the 1961-62 Capital Estimates, at Head VIII, Item 4, for highway improvements, it includes a revote of \$242,000 for the special purpose of improving these road junctions. At the time when it was first decided to improve these road junctions - the Bank Hall, Government Hill and Collymore Rock-Culloden - they were thought to be essential. Does Government feel that it is less essential now to deal with them? Does Government feel to give way to them in order to deal with the improvements necessary in the Cheapside area and at the Belmont-Martindale's junction that it is the better thing to do? One would have expected Government to decide to ask this Chamber to pass a Resolution not only to enable them to do these junctions but also to ask this Chamber for supplies in order that we may do the additional one at Cheapside.

Sir, what really caused the holdup in respect of those which they have decided to defer and which sometime ago

we sanctioned funds to carry them out? Is it that these works are more difficult than the average and the Head of the Department finds himself with a problem which does not find easy solution to him?

3.45 p.m.

It is well known that he is far from being a qualified road or civil engineer, but has he not got any assistants who can advise him if he is encountering any difficulty in respect of these projects? Or has it become a comparatively minor interest on the part of the Government to deal with these particular districts and so they have decided to defer them and concentrate on the Cheapside area and at the Belmont-Martindale's junction? I am moved to enquire of the Minister whether in his activities during this Election year he realises that he will not get the support of the people from the Bank Hall, Government Hill and Collymore-Rock - Culloden Districts and therefore he has decided to penalise those people by deferring these improvements. I am wondering if the Minister is aware, as we on this side are, of the strong feeling and the sentiments of the people of these districts towards the Barbados Labour Party as a whole, and these people are being penalised because they are not manifesting any interest in the return of the candidates of the Barbados Labour Party, which is the Government, in the Election which must take place this year. That would seem to me to be one possible reason for the deferring of these highway improvements. Any member of the Government Party would be wasting his time in trying to get votes in any of these districts where the highway improvements have been deferred. It would seem as if these people are being made to suffer after they had been looking forward to having these road junctions done. It is not only the people of these particular districts who feel in this way as to these road junctions, but people from all over the island. It may be a question of cutting one's nose to spoil one's face. However, the principle is hard to understand that after this long period of time, the Government has decided to defer these road projects instead of bringing down an omnibus Resolution to provide, not only a re-vote in respect of these junctions which have been decided upon so long ago, but also to cope with the Cheapside area and the Belmont-Martindale's junction. We are not, of course, opposing this Resolution for obvious reasons; if the hon. member is displaying the Government's lack of interest in the Bank Hall, Government Hill and Collymore Rock-Culloden projects, we must be as enthusiastic as possible in letting these people know how we appreciate their attitude and deplore the fact that these road junctions will be left undone for Heaven knows how long.

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not know where the Hon. Leader of the Opposition gets his information from as regards the attitude of the people in these areas to which he has referred, towards the Government. I would like to assure the hon. member here and now that his informant, as is perhaps customary, has again misled him and always will mislead him. That is the type of information for which he is looking and that is the type of information he will get from the particular individual or individuals who give him that information. I want to say that, as far as these districts are concerned, I would like to assure the hon. member that the people are as loyal in their support to the Barbados Labour Party as they have always been in any other places you can think of, Haggatt Hall notwithstanding.

As regards the point made about not proceeding with these particular junctions which were already agreed to, perhaps if the appropriate Minister were present, he might be able to give the situation in a more detailed form. I think the hon. member will recall that it was absolutely necessary for us to get on with that strip of runway at Seawell in order that the Jets could be accommodated as soon as possible. As a result of that, the machinery and equipment had to be diverted to Seawell in order to carry out that work. Again, Mr. Speaker, I think one of the reasons why this Cheapside area and Belmont-Martindale's junction were given priority is the fact that a businessman has been notified that it is the intention of the Government to widen that area and the Government does not want to hold up this individual for longer than it is absolutely necessary to do so, in order that he can find a business place otherwise. It is important that we get through with this area before the

other areas. Those are the reasons, as far as I remember - I do not know if the appropriate Minister has anything more recent than that - for our decision to give priority to these places in preference to the others which were before us.

Hon. members will recall that the Minister of Communications attempted, by making a statement to the House, to point out that it was proposed to use the finances which were provided for improvements in one area for improvements in another area and the House frowned upon that decision. As a result, we have had to bring down this abstract Resolution in order to deal with these projects. I do hope that the House will be satisfied with the information which I have given. I regret that the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing is not here, but we cannot all be here at all times.

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

ORDERS POSTPONED

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Orders Nos. 4, 5 and 6 and that Order No. 7 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

3.55 p.m.

RESOLUTION *re* EXCHANGE BETWEEN MESSRS. DA COSTA AND CO. LTD. AND THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 7 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the exchange between Messrs. DaCosta & Co. Ltd. and the Executive Committee of two parcels of land in the Wharf area for purposes of highway improvement.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with Order No. 7.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Trade is asking leave to take charge of Order No. 7, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted the Hon. Minister.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution similar to the one which was just passed. It is an exchange in addition to purchasing the area concerned belonging to DaCosta in exchange of 810 square feet of land belonging to the Government at present. The Addendum reads as follows:-

In keeping with the overall plan prepared by the Town and Country Planning Officer for the development of this area, Messrs. DaCosta and Co. Ltd. propose to reconstruct their property bounded by Hincks Street, Prince Alfred Street, the Wharf and Canary Street and divided by a road which is owned by the Executive Committee and is known as DaCosta's Alley. The reconstruction involves the closing of the road, which is superfluous to highway requirements.

As part of the transaction between the Executive Committee and Messrs. DaCosta and Co. Ltd. for the purchase by the Executive Committee of certain of the Company's property at Hincks Street, the Company will deliver to the Executive Committee two areas, approximately 810 square feet in area, on the Wharf and Canary Street, and the Executive Committee will in turn hand over to the Company the area, approximately 2,920 square feet, known as DaCosta's Alley.

I do not think it is necessary to add anything to that. It is plain and straightforward, and unless there is anything

members would like to know apart from what is set out in the Addendum, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution and the Addendum state that "in keeping with the overall plan prepared by the Town and Country Planning Officer for the development of this area". Maybe this overall plan might have been made known to the House when I was out of the Island, but I think it would be good to know what is the overall plan by the Town and Country Planning Officer for the development of this area. Does this area mean the vicinity of Hincks Street or the approach to the Deep Water Harbour area? What is going to happen on the quay side of the old Careenage? I do not know what is the planning for that part of Bridgetown, but, as I see it, some of the roads are superfluous, I believe that some of the roads in Broad Street are superfluous. (The hon. member was handed a copy of the Plan.)

I cannot stop to look at the Plan now, Mr. Speaker, but maybe the Minister can answer because he has had time to study the Plan. What I would like to know is whether the Plan for that area is a gradual blocking of some of these streets. You have built an approach road to the Deep Water Harbour, and as a layman I would say that I think the time has come when there should be some re-alignment, either by making the roads wider or by building sidewalks and giving up some of these streets. For example, there is a road behind the Market which was owned by the Feeds place, then when you travel less than 100 yards you get another road, then there is Cumberland Street and the street above Musson's. They become very good for parking purposes, but from the point of view of maintaining these roads in the new concept of things, it would be better to make a similar exchange with the owners, giving them a road while they give you some of their frontage. For practical purposes I do not see the necessity in these days for so many roads leading into the City. There are some three roads on one side and there is much confusion as to which is a "no-entry" road and which to turn into. There is a road by T. S. Garraway, one by Pitcher, one by the Elite Shirt Factory and one by Cumberland Street and there are others, so that before you travel what would be a normal couple of blocks, there are four roads. On the other side there is a road leading to the seaside where there is an old bridge and where, perhaps in the days of buggies and mules people used to go to get their produce. This is now a cul-de-sac because it leads nowhere.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when you should examine the City in that setting so that you can have wider lanes, and from the point of view of mobility of traffic, instead of having one-way streets, they would be wider and more traffic could pass both ways and save congestion. I feel that that could be done now that these buildings are no longer used for produce to the same extent. Some of the owners might not mind this sort of exchange or the method which you are utilising in this matter as a means of developing the area. I could not pretend that I could look at this plan now and make sense out of it, and I would like to know if there is any explanation that can be given on that score.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I was trying to read up quickly the information that is available. The hon. member will know that DaCosta's building has already been purchased and the area has already been developed. The building in which stock feed used to be mixed is the building involved, and this is only to make the exchange in so far as the 810 square feet of land in that area is concerned between the Government and DaCosta's so as to further improve the area. That is as much as I can say at this stage, and the Plan which the hon. member has before him sets out clearly what type of work will be done in the area to improve that area.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, this is not the area where the stock feed building was; it is the area where the warehouse offices were.

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

4.05 p.m.

RESOLUTION re COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT EAGLE HALL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing: To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of a parcel of land at Eagle Hall, St. Michael, for the purpose of highway improvement.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of an area of land described in the Schedule for the purpose of highway improvement at the entrance to the North Access Road to the Bridgetown Harbour. The Addendum states:

"Negotiations were commenced with the owner of this parcel of land who agreed to sell the same to the Executive Committee. There was some difficulty in deducing title and the owner subsequently agreed to allow the Executive Committee to take possession pending the completion of legal formalities. The owner is unable to give a good and marketable title and the use of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, is necessary in order for the Executive Committee to obtain an infeasible title."

The position, as hon. members know, is that the Government had to acquire a strip of land from Dr. Manning of the old "Bosvigo" place for road improvement to the Harbour. Under the compulsory acquisition law the Government can before negotiations are finalised declare an area to be an area necessary for the benefit of the Public and as soon as that is done and notice is served in the *Official Gazette*, the Government can move in and develop the area and after that make the necessary payment.

As the Addendum points out, the discussions have already taken place and negotiations to purchase have taken place; but in view of the fact that there was difficulty experienced in getting a title for this area, it became necessary for the Government to use the Land Acquisition Act of 1949 in order to purchase this land. That, Mr. Speaker, explains the purport of this Resolution.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

AMENDMENTS BY OTHER PLACE TO THE FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following:

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL TO

THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

The Legislative Council have the honour to return to the Honourable the House of Assembly the Bill to amend the law with respect to the sale of fertilisers and feeding stuffs which has been passed with amendments which are shown written on the Bill on pages 2 and 7 in respect of Clauses 2 and 4 (2).

H. G. MASSIAH,
President

Legislative Chamber,
8th August, 1961.

I may say that there are just two typographical errors. In the first instance you have "fertilisers" instead of "fertiliser" and in the second instance the word "a" has been left out between the words "give" and "statutory".

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I understand that it is the intention of the House to have these amendments agreed to forthwith.

I beg to move that these amendments be dealt with forthwith.

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

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I think it is within the knowledge of hon. members that there are only two typographical errors and therefore, it is not necessary to have them circulated as is customary.

I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

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

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS ENDS

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, that unfortunately, concludes Government Business for the Day. I say 'unfortunately' because when the Government comes to the House, it intends to work - and work very hard too. However, the amendments to the Police Bill have only been circulated today and I do not think hon. members have had the opportunity to go through them thoroughly. The Police Service Commission Bill is consequential to the other Bill; therefore, the two of those Bills have to be postponed until the next meeting.

As hon. members know, copies of the Five Year Plan have not yet been circulated; therefore, we cannot deal with the Resolution to approve of that Plan.

THE 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 next, 15th August, 1961 at 12 o'clock (noon).

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

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