THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1961

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 11th July, 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. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., *(Leader of the Opposition);* Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., *(Premier);* His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., *(Deputy Speaker);* Hon. R. G. MAPP, *(Minister of Communications, Works and Housing);* Mr. T. O. BRYAN, *(Chairman of Committees);* Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. F. E. MILLER, *(Minister of Social Services);* 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. G. E. S. STRAUGHN, J.P.

Prayers were read.

Mr. CORBIN entered the House and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting held on the 4th July, 1961, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members and unless there by any objection, these Minutes will now be taken as read and confirmed.

(A pause). There being no objection, the Minutes of this meeting are now taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

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

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure of the Barbados Savings Bank for the Half-year ended 31st December, 1960.

Statement of the sums of money paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police during the Quarter ended 31st March, 1961.

Report of the Auditor General on the accounts of the Colony for the year 1959-60.

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

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of money orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 31st May, 1961.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of $3,785 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. 8, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon: D. D. GARNER: On behalf of the Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled the "Customs Tariff (Conditions for Special Exemption from Duty) (Amendment) Regulations, 1961".

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Resolution to place the sum of $3,080 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. 9 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: A Bill to amend the Public Property Insurance Act, 1959.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: A Bill to amend the law with respect to the sale of fertilisers and feeding stuffs.

Also, 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 connected therewith.

REPLIES TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Question No. 48/1961, asked by the hon. junior member for St. James, regarding compensation to illegitimate children under the provisions of the Fatal Accidents Act, 1883, is now ready.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Question No. 17/1961, asked by the hon. junior member for St. John, regarding the installation of public toilets and baths at the beaches at Consett Bay, Martin's Bay and Bath in St. John, is now ready.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the Money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the Bill to amend the Public Property Insurance Act, 1959, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. D. D. GARNER, seconded by Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, the Bill to amend the law with respect to the sale of fertilisers and feeding stuffs, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. D. D. GARNER, seconded by Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, the 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, was read a first time.

12.25 p.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of absence for two months as from today on behalf of the hon. senior member for the City.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask on behalf of the hon. junior member for St. John for one month's leave of absence from his duties as a member of this House as from today.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER No. 5

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Orders Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 12, 13 and 14 under Government Business be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5.

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

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

CONGRATULATIONS TO MR. BRANCKER ON HONOUR OF Q.C.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, before we move to the Orders of the Day, I would like to crave the indulgence of the House to make a few remarks of congratulation to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition on the high honour which has been bestowed upon him. *(Cheers)* I believe that we are all aware that this honour is bestowed only in the case of lawyers who have given long service and who have also made some meritorious contribution not only to the Bar of this island, but to affairs generally. While, appropriately enough, the Courts have made fitting reference to the honour in the profession and sphere to which the hon. member belongs, it is in accordance with precedent that we, in this House, should pay tribute to the honour which has fallen upon him in respect of his services generally. It is only recently that we have had the post of Leader of the Opposition enshrined more or less in our Constitution, and I think that we will all agree that it is in accordance with the best democratic tradition and also in the role that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has a great contribution to make not only to the general atmosphere which prevails in this House and to the general standard of debate, but also to the standard of public conduct which usually takes the lead from this august Assembly.

I think that we all, regardless of our political views and the positions which we hold on the opposing side, will agree that to the high atmosphere which prevails in this House - I admit that we all depart from it on certain occasions and it does not mean that in that respect we are alone - to that high atmosphere the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has contributed. I want to pay him what I sincerely feel is a tribute to him. The first time that I have had any long association with the hon. member, apart from when he was in our Party on one or two occasions on this side of the House, and when I sat in the Police Courts, was when the hon. member had the honour of representing the island at the talks both in Trinidad and in the United Kingdom concerning the Federation. I want to say that in the hon. member's demeanour, in the way in which he assisted us, in the co-operation which he showed and in the sentiments which he expressed, we felt proud to have him along with us. We felt sure that his was a great contribution from Barbados generally and one of which all Barbadians should be proud. *(Cheers).*

We can fight at our political levels, but the hon. member's contribution shows that when we are representing the best interest of the island outside we can be united in representing the point of view of Barbados and putting it forward sincerely and honestly. I can only speak in the political sphere on this occasion. I know that lawyers are becoming as numerous as the leaves of Vallambrosa and I hope that this honour will always be preserved for those who have rendered meritorious services in upholding the high traditions of the Bar. With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I think I am reflecting the views of this House and I sincerely congratulate the hon. member on the honour which has been conferred upon him.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and my Party, I want to say that I congratulate the hon. junior member for St. Lucy on the award of Q.C. which has been bestowed upon him.

12.35 p.m.

As the Minister has stated, these awards go to Lawyers of long standing who have contributed something to public life, and more especially in the field of law. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy represented his parish continuously for 24 years. He is the oldest member in this House, and I am sure he had a great hand through the Law Society in contributing and assisting the Chief Justice in the revision of the law relating to the Judiciary.

It gives me particular pleasure to congratulate him because he was an old class mate of mine at Harrison College; we sat on the same bench and we attended private lessons together. I have always followed his career very carefully indeed; I have seen him mature quite considerably, and most recently since he has been Leader of the Opposition. He attends to his duties whether in the House or in Committee very assiduously, and if he cannot attend a meeting he sends an excuse, which is not often done by most public-spirited persons in Barbados.

I congratulate him on my behalf and my Party's, and I wish him further success in his field.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be lengthy, but I would like to offer the hon. member my warmest congratulations on the height he has now reached as an Attorney-at-Law, or as we have it in Barbados, a practising Barrister.

He and I have been associated for many years in a Party and I know of him, I know about him and I know him. He is one affable person and even though he differs from you or with you, he tries to retain that amount of friendship. In other words, Sir, although you differ with him outside, and although you differ from him in the House, yet you do not see that rancour that is shown in the House by some less fortunate members. That is the one thing that we must admire in him, and it is one thing in which others should do well to take a leaf out of his book. I think when he was awarded this meed of honour it was very fitting, because surely as a Barrister he has done well. As my colleague has said, he has tried his best to uphold the dignity of the legal profession, and as a politician, while we do not see eye to eye - we never hope to see eye to eye because human beings must differ - so long as we learn to respect each other's point of view, and we do it in a most graceful and respectful manner and let no bitterness come in because we differ in opinion, that is one thing I must say about him.

He and I, although we are not in the same Party, have retained that former friendship and I am sure that just as he is friendly with me he enjoys the friendship of every other member of this House, whether or not there is something apart from the face value. I am sure, Sir, that he has contributed something in this colony. He is not always right;

nobody can be always right; but nevertheless he has been a good citizen, he has been very useful in the law Courts, and the honour that has been bestowed upon him, I think, is well justified, and perhaps, if I may add, a little on the late side. Nevertheless he has been recognised and it is very fitting, and I share his joys at this moment.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it would be ungracious of me, a member of this Chamber but not being a member of any of the Parties, not to congratulate the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, who does not speak for me though I am a member of the Opposition. I am sure when he reads all these speeches, they are an excellent commendation and recommendation to the people of St. Lucy, and after hearing what the members of the Government have said, it would take more than brass for them to tell the people of St. Lucy that the hon. member is not fit to be a member of this Chamber, because anything other than the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would be an angel.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard that he is a man who has been in public life and has not made an enemy. He is more than human to have been in public life for 24 years and has not yet succeeded in making an enemy. I wonder what has happened to all his erstwhile enemies and if they no longer exist. When you are congratulating people, you do not say anything about them that would affect them adversely, and I feel sure that all of us share the general sentiment that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is a very affable person. I believe that affability is one of the Barbadian ingredients, and I do not think that he stands alone in being an affable Barbadian.

I would like to say that so far as his profession is concerned, he has merited his recognition in his profession, and we today are not paying him tribute in that light, because I am not competent to speak in his professional field; but as a Parliamentarian I can say that whether or not he has gained an enemy, it takes more than an ordinary member to be a member of an Assembly continuously for 24 years. That in itself is nearly a generation, and anyone who is still comparatively in his prime politically can say that he has added a greater portion of his life, or may I say, the best years of his life in the public service, and that is something for which we have to commend him, that at his age and at his time he saw the need to enter public life, and now that he has been awarded a Q.C. in his profession, it is fitting that he has lived long enough to achieve such an award. I would say too that it is a very good thing that he has lived long enough and has been a Parliamentarian long enough that he has — I would not say liquidated — but so brought all his opponents over to his side that he is now being regarded as the one example everyone should follow.

That is a recommendation, Mr. Speaker, which coming from the other side is one from which you will see the time should not be far distant when he should change places, and instead of being such a nice and affable person leading the Opposition, it is more appropriate that he should be leading the Government of Barbados.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the unanimity of sentiment which has surrounded the Leader of the Opposition in the speeches which we have heard cannot be added to by anything I might say on this occasion.

12.45 p.m.

Yet his colleagues could not possibly yield second place to others in paying tributes to him and I therefore cannot find so much to add as to augment.

Now, Sir, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and I have been more closely associated than any of our colleagues, with the possible exception of the hon. senior member for St. Philip; but I would like to say this. He has the unbounded confidence of all of us; and though it is not true that we are an army of Generals as is sometimes mentioned, I believe it is true to say that only he can lead us, and in saying that, I am paying tribute to those rare qualities which he possesses so as to be able to win all the Generals' support. I do not know of anybody else who can do it as well as he has done it, and for the five-year period which we have been together we have given him unhesitatingly our support — which is as much a tribute to him as to anybody else.

Personally, Sir, I have been associated with him in the representation of a constituency, and although I cannot pretend to have absorbed half or even a quarter of the tactics of campaigning and manoeuvrability and the ability to win an election even before it is fought as my colleague, yet at the same time I have to thank him indeed very much for the insights which I have gained into politics in the last seven years. While I cannot speak, of course, for others who are members of the same Party representing other constituencies, yet I do think that the two of us would be hard to beat for the manner in which we see eye to eye on all matters which affect the interest and welfare of our constituency. Therefore, the fact that he is the senior member of this House and has enjoyed an uninterrupted stay of twenty-four years is something of which he can be proud. We also congratulate him because he is a member who has done well outside of this Chamber in the profession of his choice and that has brought great credit on this House. And so, on behalf of his colleagues, I want most warmly and most affectionately to convey to him our best wishes and sincere congratulations on this reward which Her Majesty has been pleased to bestow upon him.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Hon. Leader of the Opposition on the honour that has been conferred upon him. I was out of the House when hon. members were making their congratulatory speeches; therefore, I do not know what has been said by the various speakers about him. But I know what I can say about him. For many years the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and I have been associated and he is one of my best friends. Politically, we have different views because we are in opposite camps, but that will never prevent us from associating ourselves as what I generally call it — two brothers. I do not know what can happen or what would happen to sever these connections as far as the hon. member and myself are concerned. He is one of those men whom you can always approach and he is always willing and ready — I would not say to give to everybody — to give me advice freely. As far as his profession is concerned, I will feel very safe, although I hope it will never happen, if I had to appear before the Chief Justice on a charge of murder when the hon. member has to plead for me because he is honest and sincere and I will say that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is one whom everyone can confide in and rely on to do his job and their case.

When I was coming into this Chamber, I heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter saying that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was affable and things of that sort and because of that he should be Leader of the Government, but I would say that he is so affable that he should always be in Opposition to the Government.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, for the short time which I have been in this House, I have found the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to be a very sincere man and one on whom I can rely. He has patience and is conversant with all organisations around this Table, and even in his debates, although he is forceful in all his points, he still retains the confidence of all sides of the House. Sometimes it shocks my modesty as to how well he keeps his *status quo* and because of his great qualities I was ever looking forward to some good result coming his way. I am very glad that the highest authority has seen his qualifications and dignity he will give justice to the Government and to the citizens throughout this Island of Barbados and I hope that in future, as a result of the honour which he has received, he will conduct himself in such a manner that he will not give us cause to regret the high distinction bestowed on him. There is no doubt that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is a man of ability, a man of dignity, a man of good faith and no better man than he could be the Leader of the Opposition. And we hope that with his ability, dignity and good faith that we will proceed from here, henceforth to higher things.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to say a few words to those hon. members who have spoken in such glowing terms of me, I will take this opportunity of so doing. I will not attempt to reply individually to what they have said but I am profoundly grateful for what has been spoken from the official mouthpiece of the Government Party, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, and what

he said on behalf of his Party and how he recalls some years ago that he and I worked in similar spheres although he has always been fortunate to be on the more lucrative side just as now I am still a struggling legal practitioner and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is over the Public Service in this Island as a Minister with his emoluments always certain, while I am always struggling and waiting to find out when the next brief would turn up. With regard to the junior member for Christ Church, of course, we were at school together, as was said, and it speaks well for our educational system for it to be heard today publicly that the rich and poor go side by side in the same classroom at Harrison College.

12.55 p.m.

The hon. junior member for St. Philip struck a personal note. That, of course, is deeply gratifying. I think that however profoundly he and I differ on points of view on political matters, we have always maintained that personal friendship which will make him feel that at any time that my Bank Manager would refuse to increase my overdraft, I could turn to my friend, the owner of Vale View plantation, the hon. junior member for St. Philip, for such assistance as will be necessary to keep my creditors at bay. *(Laughter)*

As to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, he is characteristically "frank"; I think one may name a member that way on an occasion such as this. I am thankful to him for what he has said in speaking on behalf of the entire Independent movement in this House. *(Laughter)* There could be no question of there being no unanimity of his Party in this House as to what he has said. My colleague, of course, is always good in making this kind of speech; he is even better in making this kind of speech than in making another type of speech. I do not think I need say "thanks" to a member in one's own party, but we realise how much we owe to each other.

Then His Honour the Deputy Speaker interposed and indicated what the Income Tax Commissioner does not seem fully to realise; that is, that one does so much gratuitous work in my profession which is so different, I am sure the Hon. Premier will agree, from the other learned profession, the medical one, that one cannot understand why it is expected that our returns should be like those either of the medical profession or of the junior branch of my profession, the Solicitors. One must do a lot of advising and other work *gratis* in the interest of the administration of justice so as to prevent people, who cannot afford to pay for legal help, from going wrong, especially in a country where there is no poor persons' aid. It is not that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph would have to have re-course to that aid.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there was the quota of the latest parliamentary adjunct to our Party, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. I am thankful to him for adding his characteristically sincere quota. I thank you Mr. Speaker, for the indulgence which you have granted hon. members and myself, which has made it possible for me to say how happy I am at these generous tributes which have been paid in respect of the Letters Patent which have recently been sent by the Head of the Commonwealth in respect of myself.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have listened to the eulogies which have been expressed on behalf of all sides of the House and I can say that this is one of the very few occasions when my task in an exceptionally easy and happy one. I do not think I could allow this occasion to go by and remain silent. It is usual for the House to indulge in this sort of thing. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has been a member of this House for a very long time; indeed he has been a member of this House for a longer time than any other sitting member now. That has been referred to by the hon. senior member for St. Peter as being a good politician. My association with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is as long as that of the hon. junior member for Christ Church. The hon. member, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and myself did not sit in the same place because I was older and on a different bench.

Before I entered this House of Assembly my association with the hon. member was of a good nature. Although my brand of politics was strictly different from theirs, we met quite freely and socially on many occasions before I became an active member of this House. The hon. member was a member of this House in those days, and I must join hon. members in commending him. I think that he deserves it and now that he is still in the prime of life, comparatively speaking, we hope that his reputation will be greatly enhanced. I am particularly happy when I hear the hon. junior member for St. Thomas say how useful the hon. member had been at the recent Federation talks, both in Trinidad and London, in his preference to the position which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has attained. As far as the hon. member's deportment in this House is concerned, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has always been a good example for members who are already in this House and those who may come into the House after now. We will always remember his activities, his qualities in this House and his 'taking silk' is a recognition of those fine qualities which he has displayed in and out of this Chamber.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on a question of privilege. On the Order Paper of the House for today, there is Item 15 which reads as follows:

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: To move the passing of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to approve the programme of development expenditure contained in the Development Plan 1960-65.

Notice of this Resolution was given on the 4th July, 1961.

Sir, I can only speak for myself on this point; I cannot speak for hon. members; but so far as I am personally aware, the Resolution of which notice was given last week has not yet been circulated to hon. members. It has not yet been received by them and I have no means of knowing whether it has been printed. Therefore, as far as hon. members of the House are currently aware, the text, terms and substance of this Resolution do not exist.

1.05 p.m.

My colleague informs me that whereas the Resolution itself has been circulated - I myself have not got a copy of it - the plan which is allied to the Resolution has not yet been circulated to hon. members. Whether or not it has been printed Your Honour will probably give directions to discover.

I notice, Sir, in a weekly newspaper, *"The Beacon"* of Saturday, July 8, 1961, Volumes XV No. 44 which on its own allegations is the paper of the Barbados Labour Party and the Barbados Workers' Union, a front page banner headline which says "Government embarks on Five-Year Plan" and under that "to provide 40,000 new jobs - home and abroad." The article begins as follows:-

"The Government has embarked on another Five Year Plan aimed at (1) reducing the present level of unemployment in the Island and providing jobs for those young persons who will be seeking entry into the labour force; (2) reducing poverty in the Island still further and raising the standard of living; (3) balancing the economy through diversification of production; and (4) raising the level of economic activity in the Island to the stage where further growth of the economy is automatically ensured and is self-sustaining."

This article goes on into the third column of the first page, then on to Page 4 for three complete columns, and then it continues on page 5 for about a quarter of a column, and says at the end of the transcript on page 5 "To Be Continued". Then I notice also in the daily paper, "The Advocate", of today's date another front-page article headed in banner headline "The Five-Year Plan Mystery, Angry MPs to ask about 'leak'." Just above that it says 'Government aims to spend $53 million - creating 40,000 new jobs in industry, agriculture, tourism and education."

Now the article in the daily paper is a partly slanting comment on the fact that the details of the alleged Five-Year Plan appeared in the Government Party's Paper and

partly also an attempt on the part of the *Advocate* to release some details on the Plan itself. Now, Sir, I wish to emphasise first of all that hon. members of this Chamber certainly on this side, have not received detailed copies of the Five-Year Plan, and so far as we know only a Resolution to approve of the Plan is before the House, at least on the Order Paper and scheduled to be debated at some future time. It is the greatest possible discourtesy, therefore, that the Government's newspaper and the daily newspaper should both be able to give details of a project of which notice has been given in this House, but which has not yet been circulated to hon. members.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that as we approach self-Government, we have got to be more than careful in observing Parliamentary rectitude and propriety, and I want to warn hon. members opposite that the mere possession of a majority as a voting machine to get measures through does not thereby confer entitlement to do what the Government likes. I want to tell hon. members opposite that they are as much Ministers of the Crown as Mr. MacMillan, Mrs. Bandaranaike or Mr. Diefenbaker, and that any action by Ministers of the Crown, by their subordinates or by their colleagues in a political Party which reflects discredit upon Parliamentary procedure and Parliamentary etiquette is an action wanting in sincerity to the Crown. They are the Queen's Ministers, they exercise executive authority of the Crown and they have to be more careful than people who are not Ministers to see that these things do not happen.

I am not saying, Mr. Speaker, that it is deliberate Cabinet policy that the details of the Five-Year Plan should have appeared in the *Beacon*, but some Minister opposite certainly took it upon himself with or without consultation with his colleagues, to release in a Party newspaper for purely Party propoganda purposes a Government document which should first of all be seen by members of this House since notice of it was given to hon. members of this Chamber, and it was only given a week before. I think it is very, very reprehensible; it should never have happened, and it show us just where the wind is blowing. I do not think any amount of excuse can really wipe out the harm that has been done, and I want therefore to emphasise that I believe that if there was one occasion where the privileges of this House as a House were set at nought deliberately, it is on this occasion, because on previous occasions Ministers of the Government could truthfully have stated that they had no control over the issue under dispute, and that the thing had happened not with their connivance or even with their knowledge; but that excuse is taken away and cannot be used in this case. The matter first appeared in the Government Party's newspaper, and it could only have appeared with the sanction of a Minister; and if a Minister, whichever one of them it was.....

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, as Leader of the House and a member of the Government, I really cannot sit here and let the hon. member repeat what he has already said to the effect that it could only have appeared with the sanction of the Minister. After a copy has been laid on the Table of this House, he takes it upon himself to make a very serious allegation of which I know nothing at all, and he has absolutely no grounds for making such an allegation.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I reject entirely what has been said by the hon. member who has just sat down. When a document has been laid in this House, it is technically in Your Honour's possession, and Your Honour's custody of it is exercised through the Clerk; therefore no hon. member could retrieve it from the Clerk's possession without Your Honour's permission. If the Minister therefore says that none of them is responsible for the publication in "The Beacon", the responsibility must rest with Your Honour's office. It is not a matter of beating around the bush. I say without fear of contradiction that in a Party newspaper a Government document could only appear with the sanction of a Minister or Ministers. I am not prepared to say that the Cabinet had to meet to take a decision on that, but I am prepared to say that the Minister would have to sanctify it. It could not just happen like that, because even another member of the Party in power could not get hold of the copy which has been laid before the House until the Speaker's permission was sought. It is either one thing or the other.

1.15 p.m.

Either unknown to the Speaker, or with the Speaker's permission, the document has been used as publication in a Party's newspaper, or a Minister of the Government connected with the Party in power has authorised and sanctioned the publication of the document, or it was very rudely and reprehensibly done when the document was sent by Your Honour's permission to the Government Printery, somehow or the other it got out of the possession of the Government Printer and found itself in the hands of another printery.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I would not like the hon. member to appear to be alone in this matter. It is true that I do not read the *Beacon* although it is owned by the Workers' Union. This matter was drawn to my attention by reading another newspaper and now I am made aware by what the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has said. It is true that I have often spoken about constitutional propriety in this House. Hon. members and the public of Barbados do not seem to be interested in constitutional propriety and that is why things like this can take place.

The Hon. Minister who rose on a point of order to the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has said something about beating around the bush. It is an open secret that the Hon. Minister of Communications sits in here because he has nothing much to do as a Minister and writes down every word of a speech by an hon. member, distorts it as he likes and then puts it in the *Beacon*. The *Beacon* has no reporter in here and you get a different version of what takes place in here from that given in other newspapers which have shorthand writers.

What has caused this? A resolution was brought down here last Tuesday by the Government in connection with the new Five-Year Development Plan for 1960-65 and it is an open secret that the Government has a copy of the Five-Year Development Plan for 1960-65 and they know what it is all about and the Hon. Minister of Communications knowing what it is wrote about it in the *Beacon*. It is not a question of your arguing if you can call somebody's name. The Hon. Minister of Communications is responsible for the policy of the *Beacon*. It is true that I can close down the *Beacon* tomorrow. We of the Workers Union have paid $11,000 for the *Beacon* and we can "nail up the door" at any time we like; but it is only that I am waiting until the most appropriate occasion to embarrass them.

I repeat that you cannot talk about propriety now because the Government's Party is noted for breaking all the rules of constitutional propriety whenever it suits them. The people who support them do so because it is like vested interest; the people say: "I can be outvoted or be on bad terms with them if I go against them."

Sir, you can get anything taking place in this Island. The hon. member talks about independence. I am glad that I am independent because I do not have to look to anybody to see if they say this or that. I only say this. With independence coming to us and with what we have experienced — and today we have had a lot of encomiums paid to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition — we have seen in this Chamber where a man's rights, his constitutional privileges — and that is so from the Speakership back down — have been mutilated by the Government benches; therefore, do not think that they are going to do different from what they have done. You only have to be in a position in which they want to grudge you and you will see that they will crush you without any question of propriety.

The reason for this thing happening is because they are trying to beat the gun not only to beat the other newspapers but to beat the other members of the House who are not of their Party. No motion has been made with respect to the outcome of the Federation talks; they have not said anything about having a debate on that and yet this is the second time we are meeting since those talks have been completed. They have not said anything about that, but you can get in the *Beacon* this talk on this coming

Five-Year Development Plan because they feel that they are late and they want to catch somebody by what they say they are going to do in that Five-Year Development Plan. Because of that, you get the Minister writing about this matter. It is known that the Minister of Communications writes the things which appear in the *Beacon* and I will go as far as to say that the Governor knows it. Nowadays, you get Governors agreeing with everything that is being done.

Sir, your constitutional rights will be taken away from you if you do not speak about it. The hon. member talked of beating around the bush. I say that we should not beat around the bush. This article was not written by Mr. Walters or anybody else at the *Beacon*. The *Beacon* is not a company. Members of the Government say that they pull money out of their pockets to keep the *Beacon* running. You can very well see that it is nothing more than an organ of the Ministers. When their pictures are not in it, you can see the picture of the Prime Minister of the West Indies. Do not beat around the bush to say that it is not done with the knowledge of the Cabinet. The Cabinet likes to have somebody like the Minister of Communications doing that kind of work.

Mr. GODDARD: Sir, I must protest against the manner in which this document appeared in one newspaper and not in the others and when that paper happened to be an organ of the Government Party. The first time I knew anything about this matter was when someone phoned me yesterday and told me that it appeared in the *Beacon*. I do get a copy of the *Beacon* newspaper but I did not read it.

Sir, we are really making so many breaches of the privileges of this House and especially by hon. members of the Government that they are only setting up a precedent that if other Governments get into power, then members of that Government will realise the standard which they have set. However, this breach to me is the most appalling of all. For a Government to have allowed a document which has not yet been presented to the House to be presented to their paper and published in it.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The document was presented to this House. It was laid on the Table last Tuesday.

Mr. GODDARD: A Resolution dealing with it was given notice of, but we have not got the details of that document. That is as far as I know. Was it laid here?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. GODDARD: I am told that it has not been printed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, not as yet.

Mr. GODDARD: I do say that an explanation should be made to this House today of how this matter happened to be published in the *Beacon*. If it were published with the knowledge of a Minister not only should an apology be made to the House but also to the Speaker, and some steps should be taken to see that such a thing does not recur. I say that we are only setting up a very bad example.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, these are very strange proceedings. Of course, it does not amaze me or the members on this side of the House, I remember some few months ago — and it was alluded to in this House — reading both in the *Advocate* and the *Trinidad Guardian* of questions which had been tabled by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy concerning some important matter. I could not remember receiving any copy of those questions and when I enquired, I found out that none of those questions were tabled at all.
1.25 p.m.
Now, Sir, here are newspapers.....

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. The hon. member is entirely inaccurate. The facts are as follows:

Questions were given notice of by myself, but before the House met, through some means, the text of the questions appeared in the newspaper; but notice was given of the questions and copies of the questions of which I gave notice were here as the property of the House.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Exactly.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. The hon. member did not say that. He said that he enquired if copies of the questions were present in this House.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: So far as I know, they never appeared. The hon. member either tabled them or he probably withdrew them.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. The hon. member is inaccurate. There was no question of those questions being withdrawn. They were processed in the ordinary course of time.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: That needs to be verified. Nevertheless, the hon. member has borne out the fact that the questions were laid and they appeared in the newspapers. Did a Minister hand them to the Press? Was it the Ministers who were guilty of constitutional impropriety, if it is constitutional impropriety? I will show by allusion to the debates of this House, that all of this talk about constitutional impropriety with regard to the part publication of a document which has been laid in this House, is so much nonsense. If hon. members do not read their parliamentary practice, is that my fault? It is their responsibility to do that. I have heard allusions made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter to this newspaper and myself. The hon. member said something about being nasty and he said he would shut it down. If the hon. member wants to use this opportunity to shut down a newspaper, that is his business. What we are dealing with here is, as has been pointed out, whether this is a question of a breach of privilege or not. Far from that, a reference to "Mays" will show that if this matter got into the hands of the newspaper by means which were entirely proper and constitutional, that is quite in order.

In the Fifteenth Edition of "May's Parliamentary Practice" Chapter 12 on page 262 under the heading "Distribution of Papers", this is what is stated: First of all, it sets out how copies of Parliamentary Papers may be delivered, and so on, and then this is what is says:-

"The Vote Office is charged with the delivery of printed papers to Members of the House, who should leave their addresses at that office, in order that papers may be forwarded to them, either during the session or in the recess." As soon as a document is laid it becomes a Parliamentary paper. It goes on:-

"All parliamentary papers are available to Members on application to the Vote Office, either personally, or by means of a special form supplied for the purpose."

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The hon. member is reading something; perhaps the Clerks have given him something on which he is not clear. I said it is constitutional impropriety because no Vote Office has any authority from Your Honour to deliver a single copy of anything to any newspaper before it comes back to you. Reading from "May's" does not help us. That was a copy laid to be printed; it is not like the Report of the Director of Medical Services of which anybody can get a copy. It would be a question of collusion between the Clerks, the Ministers and Your Honour that the *Beacon* could get that copy to be published on Saturday.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Is that a point of order? I have not said that Your Honour gave instructions to hand this copy to the Press; I am saying that as long as a document is laid on the Table of the House, any member of the House can ask for a copy of it. It was not a Minister or member of this Government on this side of the House....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. If an hon. member had asked for the copy, he would have been asking for the only document of the House and the Clerk has no authority to hand that copy to anybody.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just to allay the fears of the hon. member, I would like to say this: what happened was that a single copy was laid last Tuesday and an hon. member of this House asked to see that copy and he was shown it from his seat in the House. It never left this Office.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I am saying that it is the privilege of any member of the House to ask for the copy which was laid and look at it. It is so much "baloney" for the hon. member to say what he has said, if "baloney" is a Parliamentary word. There was a clear case of impropriety in so far as the Daily Newspaper and the *Trinidad Guardian* are concerned. The hon. member said that the document was laid on the Table but hon. members did not have it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just in order to be accurate. The question was sent by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy to the Clerk's Office.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: It was not tabled. Is Your Honour implying that?

Mr. SPEAKER: It was sent to the Clerk's Office and it was in charge of the Clerk's Office. This question would have been read out in the House.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: It is a good thing that Your Honour has said that; otherwise it would have been a clear case of a breach of privilege.
1.35 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I think you should correct the hon. member. Your Honour says that no question can be asked of another member before it gets your approval. When that question is put in to be answered, the Rules do not tie down member from giving it to a newspaper, and it is no breach of privilege so far as members are concerned. We can print as many copies of the question as we like so long as we ask it, and give them to anybody we like. We can give a question to a newspaper the same day we ask it.

Mr. SPEAKER: A question is asked only when it is asked here. In other words, it can be in the office and not be asked; therefore it is not asked until it is asked here in the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: There is nothing to prevent a member from printing a question and intimating that it will be asked tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a good thing for a newspaper in another colony to say that these questions had been asked in the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: What we want the hon. member to get clear is that asking a question is one thing, but comments on it are a different thing. We are not talking about comments. A document which is a Government document belongs to this House, but a member's questions are not documents and he can give them out as he likes.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a difference. If a member intends to ask a certain question and he sends a copy of it here to the office, I have to veto or approve that question, and at the next meeting of the House when the question has been approved by me it is then asked. There can be no variation from that question; but there is a danger if before a question is actually asked here by the member, a newspaper prints that question as being asked by the member. There is that difference.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I must intervene here on a point of explanation. I am glad you said what you did in the last sentence, because the fact was, so far as I remember, that the newspaper said it was the intention of Mr. Cameron Tudor to ask the question, because I think the exception taken to the publication was that the questions appeared in the newspapers before I had read them out from my place in this House, and therefore it was said that it was my intention to ask. That is the whole point about it, but that has nothing at all to do with this, and I would not like the hon. member to get away with that. It is nothing to do with a Cabinet document laid on the floor of this House, part of Government's policy, then printed in a Government's newspaper when hon. members have not seen it. That is the point at issue and no amount of white-washing can get him away from that.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member is being dishonest.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue like this unless it is going to be broken up. I therefore take exception to what he has said and ask that he be requested by Your Honour to withdraw.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Let him withdraw his remarks about white-washing and then I would not accuse him of dishonesty.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing new in the word "white-washing"; it only means toning down; but "dishonesty" is a different thing altogether. I will ask the hon. member to withdraw the word "dishonest".

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I withdraw the word. The hon. member challenges the whole procedure and brings it under a motion of privilege, but when a document is laid, it becomes the property of this House; it is no longer the property of the Government or Cabinet. What is the difference between a Cabinet document becoming a document of this House and questions becoming documents of this House?

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of explanation, the difference is this: in the case of the Five-Year Plan, somebody on that side used the special privilege and knowledge of it to anticipate the circulation of it and to have it printed in a newspaper controlled by the Party in power.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: How is that a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think we have had quite enough of that. If the Minister can add nothing new, I think we have to come to some understanding in this matter.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I have not finished yet, Sir. I think when we reach the day when a Government Minister allows members to speak freely and say all kinds of things, where we are interrupted not once but every minute, then it will become impossible to carry on as far as Parliament should carry on. Sir, all documents that are laid in this House become the property of this House, and it is only on those grounds that constitutional propriety is involved, in this case constitutional propriety being that something was published before it was circulated. It is only on those grounds with documents of this House that any question of privilege can arise, and it is on that basis that I am arguing that it is on all-fours, and therefore it strengthens our case when we say that members of the House cannot come in on one occasion and try to make black white, and on another occasion try to make white black.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is only one thing before us. The matter of questions is not now before us. If members wanted to raise that, they would have raised it specifically; so let us deal with this specifically.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I must point out that a lot of political hot air has been made of this and I am replying to it. If Mr. Speaker does not want me to reply, he can indicate to me and I will sit; but I must reply to those personal accusations which are serious. I am showing a thing which only we on this side can show, and it is that this document could have been obtained by any member of this House and made available to anybody else without our knowledge. Just as the questions were given out not by members on this side on a previous occasion when they were not laid on the Table of the House and appeared in the newspaper as questions laid in the House.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I had better rise. The Hon. Minister, I think, is speaking from his memory. If you

were speaking from documentary evidence I would have to regard it in a different light, but the House must remember that when hon. members are just speaking from memory in relation to something that happened months ago, how can I regard it? The hon. member is speaking from memory. I myself do not remember how it was put in the newspaper, whether it was the intention of Mr. So-and-So to ask or whether Mr. So-and-So had asked the question. What I do remember is the historicity, and by that I mean this: that it was the intention that these questions would be asked appeared on the pages of the newspaper or more than one newspaper before those questions were actually read out in this House. That is the historicity of it. Now as to the particular presentation of it, any hon. member who speaks about that without having that copy in his hands is just speaking from memory, so how can hon. members expect me to regard what they are saying?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On that point, Sir, I hope Your Honour will refurbish your memory on the point that was raised by the Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would not trust to my memory.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. senior member for St. Michael got up and raised that it appeared in the newspaper and Your Honour confirmed it looked like a breach of privilege. It is not a matter of quoting from memory. It was not challenged when the Leader of the House raised it as a breach of privilege of this House; it was admitted that it was more or less a breach of privilege. I am saying, Sir, that the Leader of the House on the occasion challenged the propriety of it on the basis that these questions were not tabled; but in this particular case, this was tabled, and in May's it is pointed out that any member can call for it and give it out. To accuse members of the Government of being the only people to have access to these papers and being the only people to give *"The Beacon"* is not true. It is not in accordance with the facts and it is not in accordance with the constitutional privileges and practice; so members are ignorant of the constitutional privileges when they say that.
1.45 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Is the Hon. Minister suggesting here that a member of this House can go and take up the copy of the Five-Year Development Plan which was laid in this House and carry it home? Where are you going to get a copy from? I am suggesting that when a document is laid in this House, copies of it have to be printed. Your Honour is aware that certain things are laid but they are not printed. The Hon. Minister is talking as if we could have the copy of the Five-Year Plan, carry it home and bring it back on Wednesday.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, I will go on. Any member can have a copy.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order again. The Hon. Minister says that any member can come in here and get a copy. How can it be so if they are not printed and circulated? Is he saying that I can come in here, take up one copy, carry it home and bring it back?

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I apologise for rising again but this matter is more serious than the hon. member opposite would have us to believe.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that on a point of order?

Mr. TUDOR: Yes Sir, I was saying that the inferences are very serious indeed.

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

The Honourable House has been discussing what appears to certain members as being a breach of privilege after having read a recent article appearing in the *Beacon* and a comment on that article in the Daily *Advocate* newspaper. The gist of the article was in relation to the Five-Year Development Plan for 1960-65.

One can only present the parliamentary position. The parliamentary position is this, relative to the distribution of papers laid in this House. A member of Government lays a document and the Clerk receives that document - usually, two copies of it. One is kept for the use of the Library and the other goes to the Government Printing Office as soon as possible. That is to say, when the House meets on Tuesdays and a document is laid, a copy of it is sent to the Government Printer on Wednesday morning. That is what happened in this case. Two copies were sent to this House; one was deposited in the Library and the other was sent on Wednesday morning to the Government Printer.

Now, as soon as a copy of a document is laid in this House, it is available to hon. members: that is to say, members may see it but they are not allowed to take that copy away. This paper which I now hold in my hand is the second copy, which is the Library document, of the Barbados Development Plan for 1960-65. I understand that this paper has not left the precincts of this House.

The position is this. The custom has been that when the Government releases a document here, it is their custom to release that document simultaneously to the Press and when I say the Press, I mean the Press and not a section of the Press. It is not the Speaker's business what the Government does with the documents; in other words, it is no business of mine whether the Government released to the *Beacon*, to the *Truth*, to the *Advocate* or to the *Daily News* or to whatever newspaper it may be, any document. In this case, as regards this report which appeared in the *Beacon* newspaper, I do not know how the copy got there, but following the usual custom it may have been released. There was an occasion quite recently when the Government released something to the newspapers and they thought that it had been laid, but actually what happened was that the matter appeared in the Press before it was laid in this House. It was not a mistake of this House; it was the mistake of somebody else.

I do not consider this matter to be a breach in this sense because I have no responsibility as to how it is released to the Press. As far as this House is concerned and as far as my office is concerned, the document is in the hands of the Government Printer and hon. members will have to await their copies in order to get a perusal of this matter. Speaking about the availability of documents, a document is available to members of this House as soon as it is laid. Last Tuesday, a member sitting in his place called for a copy of this very document — the Five Year Development Plan for 1960-65 — and he was handed the copy and he read it. I do not want to be offensive but the hon. member who asked for that copy is an hon. member, who, I am positively sure, would not ask for it to make a release to the *Beacon*. As I have said, I cannot look at this matter as a breach of privilege of this House. It may be a breach, but not a breach of this House.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:- To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grants of sums of money for the service of the colony.

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

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1961-62, No. 7

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, as the Addendum sets out, hon. members will remember that at the opening

of the Legislative Session, 1961, His Excellency informed the House that an application had been made to the United Nations for expert geological advice in the matter of the further development of our water resources.

During the last ten years, it is a fact that the consumption of water in this Island has increased at a tremendous rate. Ten years ago, we consumed less than 5,000,000 gallons per day, but today, it is over 11,000,000 gallons per day consumed, and that means in order to cope with this ever increasing demand that we have constantly to be on the alert and constantly to look for and find out sources from which we can develop this water.
1.55 p.m.

That means that such a thing as research by experts, such as geologists, is very, very necessary. Earlier in the year we made application to the United Nations. We have had a little trouble in obtaining expert advice in the research which we sought. It is only recently that we managed to secure the services of Dr. Martin-Kaye, the Federal Geologist. At that time he was advising the Government of Jamaica or one of the Governments of the Leeward Islands. It was through his advice that we have got this Resolution before the House. Dr. Martin-Kaye felt that we should get the equipment necessary so that the expert could go ahead with his research. He has set out what he felt was necessary and what would be required by the research unit. We have to buy a Land Rover and certain equipment for the geologist, items such as a submersible test pump, and so on. We have to convert a room into an office and we are making provision for the additional equipment which Dr. Martin-Kaye said would be necessary to be used by the geologist when he arrives. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask to what extent this Resolution fits in with the Report of Dr. Senn who said that we had large areas of water, but it was a question of getting the water to the surface. Is this Resolution a sort of complement to that?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: This Resolution follows the report of Dr. Senn. Towards the end of Dr. Senn's Report he said that we should follow it up in the future with the geologist inasmuch as his report was not final.

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

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. L. StA., THORNE, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. L. StA. THORNE in each case, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

PHOTOGRAPH OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the sitting of the House is suspended, I should like to inform hon. members that the *Daily News* would like to have a photograph of the House after the suspension. *(After a pause).* The photographer wants to have a photograph during the normal sitting of the House.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

At this stage, it now being 2 p.m. of the Clock,

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

On re-assembling,

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum present and I ask that the bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. The Reply to Question No. 48, standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. James, is ready.

COMPENSATION UNDER THE FATAL ACCIDENTS ACT

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Government aware that at present illegitimate children of a deceased father are unable to receive any compensation under the provisions of the Fatal Accidents Act?

2. Will the Government consider taking immediate steps to amend the law so as to permit illegitimate children to benefit under the Act?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the hon. member's question is as follows:-

1. Yes, Sir.

2. The Government considers that the law should be amended so as to permit illegitimate children to benefit by the Fatal Accidents Act and will turn its attention to the question at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with the Reply which has been given by the Hon. Premier, and I do hope that in the near future we will have the matter implemented.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 17, asked by the hon. junior member for St. John, is ready to be dealt with. I observe that the hon. member is not now in his place.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1. There is no answer.

RESOLUTION *re* ALLEVIATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day under Private Members' Business is to resume debate on a Resolution *re* short term and long term measures for the alleviation of unemployment. The hon. junior member for St. Andrew was speaking at 4.30 p.m. on the last occasion when Government Business was resumed.

(After a pause).

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. junior member for St. Andrew was speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member want to speak on this Resolution before the hon. introducer replies?
2.35 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, this debate has not been a particularly enlightening one. There has been all too apparent, especially behind the hon. Introducer's speech, an attempt to introduce a note which is not unexpected, but certainly which is aline to anyone who aims at getting his facts correct and presenting a true picture to the public. Now Sir, far from it being correct that the Government has been callous – the hon. member's intentions were clear as to present to the public, especially to the workers who were displaced that this Government has been callous in its approach to their plight – we have made it abundantly clear in all our public pronouncements that the plight of these displaced workers is uppermost in our thoughts, and that we were not laying down our arms about it, and I will prove it here.

I first want to substantiate what I have said, and that is what I accused the member of. He is ignoring the true facts and the truth. In his speech he laid a general charge against Ministers generally and against one or two in particular which I will refute by facts. For instance, the reference to the Premier. I am not answering for the Premier now; I am only speaking because the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour is absent, and as Leader of the House I am deputising; but he accused the Premier at the time of laying the blocks at the Deep Water Harbour of saying in a vague general way that this thing would settle itself. These were the words of the Premier on that occasion. "When the Harbour goes into operation, then we will have a certain amount of headaches."

Obviously, headaches do not happen to people who are not concerned. It is when you are concerned that you get headaches. "I am speaking of labour which will be dislocated as a result of the operation of this Harbour." This is a quotation from the Official Record and from the *Advocate*. It goes on as follows:- "Already we are trying certain fields of endeavour." Mr. Speaker, do you want more precise and exact terms than those? What the Premier was referring to at that time was not only certain local fields, but also more specifically the endeavour by the Minister of Labour when he visited England and visited certain industrialists and Dock Companies who at that time told us officially that there was a shortage of Dock Labour and they might be able to employ some displaced Dock Workers there.

The Premier said: "Already we are trying certain fields of endeavour. We hope when the time comes we will be able to say to the men: "we have got this for you". "

You could not want anything more positive than that; but to judge by the hon. member's remarks, that at no time in all our public pronouncements has any member of the Government said anything whatever more than some vague remark that this thing would settle itself, is a bit over-bearing. We can differ in politics in many respects, but when you deliberately annotate that people who all their lives have served a movement and who have devoted themselves at some sacrifice to furthering the cause of the under-dog do not care a brass farthing about what happens, it is more than can be accepted. Tell us, Mr. Speaker, that you do not agree with what we have been doing or trying to do; tell us that we should do more - because that is expected of a politician; but do not distort things. Do not say that we have not exerted any care or concern when indeed everything shows that we have. The truth is that the opposite has been taking place.

If hon. members will refer to one of the most comprehensive and positive documents produced on unemployment in this Island, the Cumper Report, they will see that for the first time we have made some systematic attempt in Government to deal in some logical and far-seeing way with this project. At no time in Barbados have we ever had any research on the problem of unemployment, the absorption of labour, the possibilities of absorption, or the approach Government should take. At no time have we had in the history of this Island any worthwhile study made of it until we began to do something positively about it, and we brought Mr. Cumper here, who is well acknowledged as an expert. One of the things that Mr. Cumper commented on was this matter of displaced workers, and the difficulties which may be presented by displacement of labour in this island. That is nothing that is confined to Barbados; it is a process that is taking place throughout the world. In Jamaica recently a big factory, the Mollymunsk Factory began to mechanise on a great scale, and 2,000 workers were laid off.

If you listened to the hon. member you would believe that through the process of bulk shipment of sugar and the construction of the Deep Water Harbour simultaneously, we had this dislocation which does not take place in any other place. That is what he said.

2.45 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member accused me of distortion. I will deal with the matter raised about what the Premier said when I make my reply. This is what I said. I said that in no part of the world has there ever been a Deep Water Harbour and bulk installation built simultaneously to operate. I challenge the Hon. Minister to say that he can call any part of the world that has done these two things simultaneously.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: That is purely academic. What does it prove? How many parts of the world have Deep Water Harbours like ours? Other countries have been shipping by bulk and you have the same problem in Puerto Rico and to a greater extent than we have it here. I say that at Mollymunsk Factory, Jamaica, you had 2,000 workers laid off. (A VOICE: You have three million people in Jamaica.) They have over 20% of their labour force unemployed. In Jamaica, they have 30% of their labour force unemployed.

I take it what the hon. member is looking at and telling the workers is: "here it is, you have a big market of unemployed people." He shows up the problem in a unique way. All he wants to do is to add to the problem and to say that we are doing nothing to aid with the problem. I am saying that we have not done anything in any way that is different from other people. We are not callous and have not been callous and indifferent: and when you take our situation and compare it with that of Trinidad and Jamaica, you will see that what the Opposition is talking about has absolutely nothing to do with the problem. Of course, we do not want to be complacent. Barbadians are an intelligent people and they will criticise anybody in power. We, of the Government, are not aloof from criticism: but when you denigrate us in the eyes of other people and say that Barbados is lagging behind other people, it is not true. Look at the statistics in Jamaica. I am not going to bring out secrets: but every time you talk, you hear about these serious problems in spite of the industrial progress which is going on in that country. Look at the trek of the people of that country to England and the proportion of the labour force which is idle. Look at it in Trinidad and in Jamaica. Look at your figure supported by Dr. Williams, the Premier of Trinidad himself, and if they are less than here, they are very little less.

In Trinidad they quoted some figure of 50,000 unemployed recently. Our recent census suggests that employment in Barbados has risen from 73,900 in 1955 to 84,300 in 1960. That is, in five years you had an increase in the employment figures of over 10,000. Over the same period, the number of people unemployed but available for work went down from 18,300 to 16,000. That is, the proportion of the labour force has fallen by 1%. Trinidad is about the same thing and Jamaica is about the same thing.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order. Do not put employment figures as labour force figures because it is stupid for the Hon. Minister to say that employment has risen by 10%. The Hon. Minister is talking about the employment force, that is to say, people who are eligible for employment.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, I have said that the percentage of the labour force, that is to say, the people who are eligible for employment.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, the hon. member said that the employment figures had risen from 73,000 to 84,000 which would give you the impression that you provided 10,000 jobs in five years. I am challenging the hon. member that you have not provided 10,000 jobs in five years.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, these figures are produced by the Statistician. I am saying that in comparison, the figures produced by the Statistician will show that what the hon. member said is not true and that we are not in an unfavourable position as regards our position with the others. I will quote again. A preliminary examination of the recent census data relating to the labour force suggests that employment in the Island has risen from 73,900 in 1955 to 84,300 in 1960. I am quoting from the report. That means 10,000 in five years. If you do not go by statistics, what are you going by? Over the same period the number of people unemployed but who were available

for work fell from 18,300 to 16,600. That is what I have said.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, in comparison with other figures obtaining in this area, our figures will show that we have nothing to be ashamed of. In fact, we have boldly adopted a policy which is similar to that in Puerto Rico. That is to say, while doing everything in the Five Year Development Plan, we will continue to do more. We are providing incentives to industries and investments at the same time that we are trying to keep the population figures down by encouraging birth control. That is what happened in Puerto Rico.

Let us face facts. I remember in Trinidad quite recently, when the American Mission was there that we met members of that Mission and we had a talk in Queen's Park Hotel. I had a talk with one of the coloured representatives of that Mission who is a labour man concerned with housing and is an adviser to one of the Secretaries for Housing in the U.S.A. Cabinet.
2.55 p.m.
I remember that he told us what a plight Puerto Rico would be in if it were not for birth control and emigration to the United States of America. I believe that in the United States of America there are more Puerto Ricans than there are in San Juan. In spite of the millions of dollars which have been invested every year, they could not cope with the population and the pressure which they have had from year to year. You get that state of affairs in Jamaica and in all developed countries. You have to mechanise. All hon. members know that, due to the fact that we were mechanising in the sugar industry, less and work has been available in this island. You get people working two or three days a week as compared with four or five days before. The figures of unemployment in the sugar industry are going up, but can any hon. member say that we should stop the processes which are going on? If somebody wants to bring in machinery to cut canes we will then have to say "No." That is where we have to draw a line; but as to the ordinary, mechanical process whereby you get more out of the land, should we stop machines from operating because it results in more unemployment? That is a preposterous argument; there is nothing to justify any accusation that we have been lax, careless or thoughtless about the effects of this mechanization on the workers of this island.

If hon. members will examine the Beasley Report on which our last Five Year Plan was based, they will see where the Report specifically calls attention to the need of a Deep Water Harbour. The Report says that the construction of a Deep Water Harbour is a *sine quo non* of any industrial development or of any development of this island. This is what Professor Beasley said in his Report:-

"As was indicated earlier, Barbados cannot be considered as un underdeveloped country; heavy borrowing for "primary development" is consequently ruled out. The one definite major project of development under review is the construction of a deep water harbour.

Various proposals for the provision of deep water facilities in Barbados have been discussed for more than a generation; the technical aspects of the matter were examined in detail by the consulting engineers in 1948, and that examination was followed by a valuable report by Sir Douglas Ritchie. He established the superiority of what is generally known as "the North Scheme," analysed the financial implications of this scheme and offered proposals for the constitution of a Port Authority. The questions arising here are, how would the deep water harbour affect the economy of Barbados as a whole and what is the capacity of the Government of Barbados to deal with considerable financial burden of a major project of this nature?

As Sir Douglas Ritchie observes, public and commercial opinion in Barbados in now convinced of the necessity for improvement in the facilities available for handling cargo; commercial interests now concerned with the operation of the system of lighterage agree that the delays and additional costs of doublehandling cargo have become increasing burdens upon trade.

It is probable that many Barbadians are inadequately informed of the economic handicaps which the island suffers on account of its lack of deep water facilities.

(a) for some years past the harbour arrangements have been the subject of unfavourable report by shipowners and a considerable volume of entrepot trade has been diverted to other ports which offer more modern facilities.

(b) the system of handling cargo by lighterage clearly adds considerably to the cost and this increased cost is passed on through wholesaler and retailer goods to the individual consumer."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, do you want anything clearer than that? We have been accused of doing nothing about bringing down the cost of living, but do you want anything clearer than this authority which tells us about the effect of the use of lighterage in the handling of goods? I repeat: "the system of handling cargo by lighterage clearly adds considerably to the cost and this increased cost is passed on through wholesaler and retailer to form a permanent additional costs of goods to the individual consumer."

The Report goes on: "(c) from the shipowners' point of view, the time absorbed in extra "turning round" is a serious additional operation cost and induces him to concentrate so far as possible on other ports.

It should also be borne in mind that experiments are being carried out in the bulk loading of sugar and, if, as seems probable, these prove successful financially, Barbados would be severely handicapped competitively, since the additional costs of handling the commodity locally would have to be deducted from the returns to producers. Reference may also be made to the potential development of an oil industry and the growth of the tourist trade, both of which would make increased demands for modern harbour facilities.

Now it is clear that a modern harbour provides a general service for the benefit of trade and commerce and to the advantage of the final consumer or producer - but because the economic advantages are for the most part indirect and dispersed throughout the community, it is normally difficult to recoup an adequate portion of these gains in the form of sufficient revenues to establish a Port Authority as an ordinary profit-making commercial concern. It would indeed be contrary to sound policy economically to attempt this. What is required is clearly that the services of a modern port should be made available as efficiently and as cheaply as possible; it should not in itself be regarded as nor operated as a profit-making concern. The general objective should be that the net earnings of the port provide a moderate return upon its capital cost.

It follows from this conception of the general economic services rendered by a modern harbour operated by an efficient Port Authority, that the particular case for the costly construction of a deep water harbour in Barbados rests upon a number of more or less simultaneous developments of other activities. The merits of the harbour project cannot be studied in isolation from the economy as a whole; the project has to be fitted in to a more comprehensive economic programme."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is absolute nonsense to think in terms of industrialisation or providing jobs until you have built the Deep Water Harbour. It became quite clear to us that if we want to provide more trade for this island, which means so much to our economy - if we want to increase our prosperity - we would first have to have that Harbour built; it was on that concept that we entered upon our second Five Year Plan. All this was formulated around the major project which was the construction of the Deep Water Harbour. We could not allow a logical process which we have followed from the time that we started our Five Year Plans to run helter-skelter simply because we were faced with this problem. As Professor Beasley said, you cannot look at these things in isolation one from the other; they fit into the general pattern and it is no use talking about planning and running helter-skelter because that will upset the whole of

our planning. We had to fit all these little bits into this big pattern.
3.05 p.m.

There is no longer the old concept of Government not planning and going on from day to day and year to year. Planning is the whole negation of patchwork. Having set out in our second Five-Year Plan to conceive a Deep Water Harbour, development in the light of having a Deep Water Harbour is different from when we did not have a Harbour, and then we came to our third Five-Year Plan, and it is no mere coincidence that our third Five-Year Plan has been published at the completion of the Harbour.

When the Harbour was entered upon, Mr. Speaker, no one thought at that time that it would have been finished before August or September of this year. Even the contractors themselves, I believe, were a bit astonished at the speed. Of course it is a tribute to local labour and also the fact that we had good conditions. The Island has been fortunate as a whole; but no one could foresee when it was started upon that it would be finished before the contractual date which is the end of August this year, and we had timed the Five-Year Plan, even if we had to advance certain projects into it as a short-term remedy to deal with those workers who had been displaced, to coincide with the then target date of the completion of the Harbour. I repeat it is no coincidence that this third Five-Year Plan has come at this time. The Government cannot be thinking in terms of planning on a day-to-day basis like a house-keeper who goes along from hour to hour; they have to think in terms of a person who plans ahead or like other modern Governments have done. We cannot afford because the Harbour was finished before the scheduled time and because we have this problem on our hands to jettison our whole project of planning. We decided to stay within our concept of planning for five years because we felt it was best not only for the particular workers, but for Barbados as a whole.

It is quite easy, Mr. Speaker, to lose your head over these problems; it is quite easy to say we are going to do this, that and the other; but we might find ourselves more out to sea than if we did not construct a Deep Water Harbour at all; so we decided to keep our feet on dry ground. Although it has been a bit difficult to bring up some instalments of the Plan hurriedly this year or do more this year than we would have been able to do because of the prolonged droughts of the last two years, nevertheless we have advanced some of the capital projects which we had in mind in order to cope with the situation which has arisen this year. If hon. members will examine that Five-Year Plan, I am sure that they cannot with any honesty accuse this Government of being lax or not giving any thought to this matter. We regard it as part of a whole project; we do not regard it in isolation, and we feel that if we had done otherwise, then we would have defeated our objective and the very thing that we wanted, that is, providing more facilities and better employment opportunities for workers as a whole.

I am not going to say anything now which will intrude upon the Premier's remarks when he comes to deal with the Deep Water Harbour, but I am sure he will pardon me if I say it is the policy of this Government in embarking upon projects in the Five-Year Plan that priority will be given to displaced workers in the Harbour. You cannot turn a man into a carpenter or a mason overnight. You cannot ask him to be a labourer and work on the road. We had this problem with the displaced workers from molasses. It is not every worker who would do everything though he would be registered and you would send him for a job, and the hon. senior member for Christ Church knows that. You will ask him to take certain jobs, but do you think he will take them? He prefers to remain and draw his weekly money and get a job he likes now and then.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that workers were sent for jobs and refused them.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: How would the hon. member be aware? Was he Minister of Labour? He had hardly anything to do with that problem. There was some weekly newspaper which said that the men barged into an office; whose office was it except the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Labour? The hon. member was responsible for agriculture and had to deal with it more so than any other member of the Government, and when the problem came about at first he was more directly concerned.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order, this matter was dealt with by me. It was after my term of office that it was transferred to the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Labour, and the files will prove that.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: After what term of office? Is the hon. member going out of his head? Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is a bit hard of hearing; he does not understand what I was saying. He was Minister of Agriculture at the time and when the concept of a Board came about and the funds were paid out, he was more directly concerned than any other Minister, but after that in dealing with displaced workers when they wanted work, registering for work and payments to them, that came under my Ministry, and I know what I am talking about. Very often they would be sent for jobs and they would refuse to take those particular jobs. I do not expect the hon. member to know that, so why does he get up and interrupt me on that point? I know about it because I dealt with labour then, and that is the only reason why I referred to it.

It is all right to get up and make suggestions. Two suggestions from the other side were slum clearance and roads. Those are two of the easiest things anybody could get up and say, but we have been carrying out those processes in the last Five-Year Plan and it is no different in the next Five-Year Plan. Every Five-Year Plan includes not only projects such as roads and slum clearance, but many other projects, and any reference to the Five-Year Plan will show not only dealing with those two aspects, but a multitude of other projects, as well as broadening the entire development of this Island and the processes of development which can give rise to a greater amount of employment than occurs today.
3.15 p.m.
What I have been trying to say and emphasise is that the Deep Water Harbour is the thing which he is playing on. I have heard people who should know better say: "I think the Government has not been doing anything." Some people are repeating what the same hon. member of the Opposition has been saying. You have been told by some members of the Opposition that this is most important and this must come first; you must complete this before you come with further plans which can so develop the Island that you can so absorb not only those who are displaced but those who are looking for work to do.

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

I have not heard any very logical reasoning by those members to substantiate this accusation, that Government has not given thought to all these problems either from a short time or long term point of view. We have, I repeat, not only thought about it, but we have been working on it. The Cumper Report will reveal our method of approach in examining it. Hon. members who have read this Report which was laid in 1955 will see where Mr. George Cumper stated this:

"The problem of technological unemployment - the displacement of specialised workers from their jobs by a change in the technique of production - is peculiarly difficult in Barbados where occupational distinctions are so rigid as to impede the transfer out of dying occupations to an even greater degree than elsewhere, and since the economy is not expanding sufficiently rapidly to open up new job opportunities for the displaced. The displaced worker may therefore suffer severe privation. This problem has already arisen in the case of the coopers whose trade was made obsolete by the bulk shipment of molasses."

The hon. senior member for St. Peter is asking *sotto voce*, what has this to do with the Deep Water Harbour.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You cannot turn a displaced worker into a shoemaker. Mr. George Cumper is talking about displaced tradesmen and about employment as a whole.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is a bit too dogmatic on things which he cannot appreciate. Why does he not sit down and take his place? Mr. George Cumper referred to coopers in similar circumstances. The hon. member said: "here it is that you have a Deep Water Harbour and bulk shipment of sugar." One led up to the other. Is that a different analogy of what Mr. Cumper was talking about? Mr. Cumper goes on to say:-

It is likely to arise in the future in occupations such as lightermen, which depend on the present organisation of the harbour and will therefore be displaced by the Deep Water Harbour Scheme."

The hon. member would not even allow me to complete what Mr. Cumper was saying. Mr. Cumper examined the problem and it is nothing new. It was not examined by people using propaganda and using it for political purposes and getting up and saying what comes to their mouths and who have a political grouse or want to say something personal.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I did not quote what the Hon. Premier said. I said that the Hon. Premier in his speech said that he heard that there was going to be displacement. I challenge him to say that this is not so.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I quoted what the hon. member said. Let him look at the *Advocate* newspaper. It is very strange that all the newspapers reported incorrectly. He said: "When the harbour comes into operation then we will have a certain amount of headaches. I am speaking of labour which will be dislocated as a result of the operation of this harbour."

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I do not live out of the Hon. Premier nor does he support me. The Hon. Premier cannot come over here and slap me. The Hon. Minister said that I said something which the Hon. Premier did not say. I challenge him to deny that in the recording given over Rediffusion on the Government Information Service time the Hon. Premier said that he heard there was going to be displacement. I can appreciate the Hon. Premier's position because his position as a Minister is vested interest. His whole life is bound up in it - not mine.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, I believe that I can live a life of my own. In spite of the interruptions by the hon. member, Mr. Cumper goes on to say:-

"In the case of molasses the question was simplified by the fact that only one specialised export was concerned, so that there seemed a rough justice in imposing a cess. In the case of the harbour all export and import trade will be affected to some extent, and the benefits of the change will affect the whole population in a lowering of the price of imports and raising of the yield from exports - unless the importing houses are in so strong a monopolistic position that they can claim the whole of the decrease in costs as extra profit, which does not seem probable. Provided, therefore, that the Government is satisfied that the benefits of more efficient harbour service will in fact be passed on to the public, I recommend that any displacement allowance made to lightermen and others in the same case be paid from general revenue."

The hon. senior member for St. Peter as General Secretary of the Trade Union should have known about that. He discussed it. All along, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have worked on the basis that there would be this displacement. We never sat down and folded our arms about it. We knew that there would have been the setting up of this fund to help the workers. It is easy to say that we should set up this fund and done this before. We took this advice and provided, as Mr. Cumper recommended, for this fund to help them and to tide them over this difficult period and the Workers' Union co-operated in that. In the interim, there would be unemployment. Whoever thought that in the interim you could do something to absorb labour? No one would think so.

3.25 p.m.

In Jamaica, they had the same problem and it has taken time to be dealt with. I did not see the Unions getting into any flurry over the matter; the Government worked on an industrial plan and priority was given to these workers. All this talk about the construction of roads, slum clearance, the erection of more schools - all of that comes into our Plan. When the House has accepted that Plan, then we can get down to brass tacks. You can draw up certain items and we have decided that, as I said before, displaced workers will be given priority in connection with these projects. I have heard absolutely nothing emanating from the other side which would show that they have more brains that we have on this side. There has been absolutely nothing in concrete terms other than this attempt to give the idea that this Government has been lax, and has been sitting down and has done nothing about these workers. I do not speak generally because there have been only two speakers on this Resolution and it may be that other hon. members on the opposite side feel that they had nothing to add and that what has been said is just hot air. I would not have spoken in these terms if hon. members had made any attempt to quote us properly. However, in this context, what has been said is only hot air.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in spite of what we have heard, the Cumper Report deals specifically with what would happen when the Deep Water Harbour has been constructed. This is what the Report says:-

"If there is a great addition to employment through the construction of the deep water harbour some similar action may have to be considered. If the general employment situation has by them improved appreciably, it may be possible to allow those thrown out of employmeny by the ending of construction work to find their own place in the labour force. If, as seems likely, there will be no obvious prospect of their immediate re-employment, it would be prudent to attempt some provision for easing their displacement."

That is our whole intention in this plan, the immediate employment for forty thousand new people, taking into account that one job has a multiplier effect of probably five or six. If you provide work for 16,000 people, that will have a multiplier effect of 48,000 or 64,000. I do not think that I need quote anything more from this Report in order to show that, as long ago as 1955, we have put up to Mr. Cumper that we have taken some action in this matter. We have not been lax or thoughtless, but we have been giving very strict attention to this situation which would have arisen as a result of the construction of the Deep Water Harbour.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think I need say anything more now because a lot of ideas will come up when we are discussing the Five Year Plan. As I have already said, these displaced workers will be given priority in this Plan. As the Hon. Minister of Labour made it clear, priority will be given to all displaced workers in the filling of jobs in the United States of America and in other places abroad. We quite realise that we have an obligation to these people and their familes; we have carried out this project because we appreciated that it was in the interest of the island to do so. We realise that in order to boost the country or in order to industrialise to any extent, we must have the Deep Water Harbour. Every member of the House supported that contention and the public has come around to accept it. It is therefore a matter of planning ably, wisely and well as to how we can absorb the displaced workers who have been thrown out of employment as result of the construction of this Harbour. We have made not only short-term but long-term plans to do so. I believe it is a fact that today, as in all other underdeveloped countries, we, in Barbados face very grave problems in so far as unemployment is concerned. I also believe that, given the co-operation of this community, given their wholehearted support, we can make attempts which will redound to the credit of Barbados as a whole.

It is all to apparent what the evils of unemployment and underemployment are. There is no doubt about it that when we have such a labour force as we have today, employers can take advantage of workers and pay them all kinds of rates which cannot possibly cope with the requirements of the cost of living. Today all kinds of malpractices are being carried out, which I am sure, would not take place if it had not been for this over-production field, in so far as the labour force is concerned. We are all aware of the tremendous job with which we are faced. We can only tackle it by co-operation on behalf of the community as a whole. Puerto Rico has tackled their problem; it is true that they had the help of the industrialists of the United States and they are a part of the United States Customs Area, so that goods flowing from Puerto Rico into the United States market are not saddled with customs duty. Those things assisted Puerto Rico: but they also had the whole-hearted co-operation of the people in whatever they did to solve this problem. The people went into the fight; whatever was carried out under the authority of the Government, they had the support of the community, and they had that drive which alone could mean success in planning and in driving ahead in order to overcome their problems. These problems are very severe in an underdeveloped community; there is no part of the world where an underdeveloped community has not faced similar problems.
3.35 p.m.

India has come a long way because of the assistance she has received and is receiving from big countries that can afford it, countries like the United States, Great Britain and even Soviet Russia. They have all contributed to assist India, but India, a former Colonial territory, still has millions of unemployed and still has a long way to go before she can cope with the problem. The same thing applies to Africa. All the new emerging territories are faced with this problem. Ghana is tackling it in a constructive way. They have now undertaken the vast Volta River project in which I notice pound for pound they are getting some $84 million from outside sources, Western democracies and the United Nations and from, I think, the World Bank. They are driving ahead with the Volta River project which will mean a tremendous boost to the country as a whole and will assist them in dealing with their unemployment problem.

I foresee, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if the West Indies as a whole were to approach this problem which obtains in every one of the units without exception in the same manner instead of the piece-meal way in which we are doing it, we would make leaps and strides ahead just as Africa and India are doing. Unfortunately we have a phased customs union and we will not for ten years be able to approach the matter in a collective way at all. We will go along in our separate little economies and by our separate little selves, and we will to a large extent be defeating our own purposes. We have studied the problems that face Jamaica.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, are we discussing the White Paper? The hon. member is talking about a phased customs union. What is that to do with the Resolution? I realise you are not aware about what he is speaking.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May I ask what the hon. member is interrrupting on?

Mr. WALCOTT: I am interrupting to inform you that I am speaking on a point of order and to point out, if you are not aware, that the hon. member is talking about something that is in the White Paper which is not before us, and which has nothing to do with the Resolution about finding work for displaced people.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If the hon. member cannot appreciate big things, why does he not keep quiet? He talks about short term and long term measures but he can only think within the context of Barbados. The hon. member during his speech talked about Dr. Williams doing this and Mr. Manley doing that, but we must stay in Barbados.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I never went outside Barbados.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If he cannot take it let him remain quiet.

Mr. WALCOTT: If I cannot take what? There is nothing in which I am involved personally. What I am saying is that the hon. member is talking about a phased customs union, and that has nothing to do with this particular Resolution before the House.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Let me tell the hon. member if he does not know it.....

Mr. WALCOTT: What the hon. member is talking about is in the White Paper to be discussed. Why does he not put a motion to discuss it if he wants to discuss it?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member thinks he is around his Council table.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Council of the Barbados Workers' Union put you there.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just now the hon. member took his seat and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas got up; then you jumped up again without addressing the Chair or saying on what you intended speaking.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I realised you were not paying the attention I thought you should have been paying.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, from a long range point of view the whole issue of unemployment is a customs union. If we had customs union, the number of industries that would spring up not only in Trinidad but in Barbados would be three or four times what they are in less than five years. How can you talk about long term measures or project rationally and sensibly unless you talk in such terms? I really must be excused if I look at it in a comprehensive way and not in a narrow way, because my mind does not work that way. If hon. members minds work that way, that is their business; but in this matter you cannot think narrowly, you have to think in a broad way. I am saying that just as other undeveloped countries faced this same problem and tackled it with a wide conception and not with a narrow vision, I am sure that all these units in the Caribbean faced with this problem must face it in the same way. That is the argument I am introducing, and it is the argument that follows from history and from a study of what is happening in countries abroad.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I lay no claims to being narrow and pinning myself down to local problems because I know it is not a local problem at all. I quoted Mollymunsk just as the hon. member quoted Dr. Williams is doing in Trinidad and accused us of not doing this, that and the other when Jamaica is doing so much, and in Jamaica 2,000 workers were thrown out of employment at Mollymunsk. They have not all moved into other jobs; so you have increasing numbers of unemployed being thrown on the labour market, and for that reason they do not want other people coming to compete with them. Is that not part and parcel of the present problem? It is when we look at it for purely political and propaganda ends that we lose sight of the problem as a whole and cannot find the necessary measures with which to cope, because we are not examining it on the right basis. The hon. member does not appreciate that. Everything I have said is relevant to what we are discussing. He has talked not only about short term measures, and I am saying what is necessary to take care not only of the problems which will arise now but those which will arise in the future. If you cannot appreciate that, you should not be in here.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot be blamed for saying that. It is bound to arise; otherwise you are faced with competitive markets in this world, and nobody need tell you to stand still. You have to go forward and you cannot go forward in isolation; if you think in isolation, you will be going for-

ward in isolation. If you do not want to stay behind in isolation, you have to go ahead with the others and think broadly. If the hon. member cannot think along that line he is trying to fool the people. So long as you talk about long term measures, I am examining it from a long term point of view. All the West Indian Units are going to face this problem to a greater degree in years to come. We have the European Common Market facing us. Is that not involved? You talk about unemployment and long term measures for unemployment; so don't we have to prepare for a possible day when we do not have a protective market in Britain? 3.45 p.m.

Unless we can stand on our own feet and compete with other countries, are we not saying that we are content to be a little backwash? How else are you going to compete? If it is employment for your workers, are you going to send them to England when at some future date England is going to stop them? Should we not approach this matter in a more comprehensive way instead of in a piecemeal or patchwork way? That is all I am saying and trying to address to hon. members' minds. I repeat, you cannot go forward in isolation and expect that we can cope with these problems, nor can we look at them in isolation and fool people that this Government by itself can do something about this matter. Let us face it. We are faced with tremendous problems. We have a highly organised society. We are not a tribal society like some parts of Africa. I am not decrying anything when I say that. An Englishman told me the other day something about English people coming to the West Indies and that some people when they come to the West Indies think that they are coming to a place where people live in tribes. They do not know that they are coming to a place where people are highly organised. Therefore, you cannot plan in a piecemeal fashion or in a small way, nor can you tell people that we can cope with this thing in a narrow world of our own. We have to deal with it on a highly organised basis. We have to deal with people who live up to Western standards, and so long as you deal with them on a point of view of efficiency, you are going to have workers in markets like this who would want jobs. You cannot multiply jobs fast enough to deal with the multiplying problem. Do you think that you can say to the sugar factories, go back to the old method of making sugar and employ more workers, so that you will not have problems like this? As long as you have to go in for these modern methods, you will have problems like this. Perhaps, those hon. members cannot look at it like that. They must remember that they are not talking to themselves alone: they are talking to members of this House.

I do not want power for power's sake. Any day that I am not returned to this Chamber, I will serve in another direction. The hon. member is power mad, and will not appreciate the arguments which I am putting up. I am not power mad: I am part and parcel of the Government. Every time the hon. member gets up, he abuses this Government. He says that the Government is doing nothing. He wants to destroy this Government. I am here to reply to him and to fight him and I am going to do my duty. If I fail, good fortune for him. If I fail, I will try again; so do not let him get away with all this pretence. We all know his purpose. He made it quite clear.

I say this further. On this matter the hon. member is playing the role of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think you saw the picture of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. If he says that of me, I am going to get very nasty with him. It means - Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde - that he was one thing as a doctor and then another thing as Mr. Hyde. If I am a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, the Hon. Minister is a Judas.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, I go ahead. I am accustomed to his mouthings. He always stabs in the back.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, do not worry to knock with your gavel; it will break up. He is telling somebody that they are a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. Whom do you think you are dealing with? Let us have it out. Call the Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter is breaking the Rules.

Mr. WALCOTT: You talk of my breaking all the rules today. You talk about personal reflection on members. Whom has the Minister called a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde? He should be in prison instead of talking like that. The Hon. Minister has a relative with all sorts of shady records. Whom do you think you are talking to?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you stood there and heard him talk about Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and you took no notice about it. I am ready for anything now. You have sat back and said nothing. Do you think he called members a gentleman?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. You noticed that I was standing and you know the Rules of this House.

Mr. WALCOTT: I think that you should know that you should not allow members to insult other hon. members. You are a member of that Party and that is why you did not stop him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member got up and said to me: "You may not have seen the picture." I do not know a thing about it.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is the sort of Deputy Speaker whom we have.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You went on to say: "If I am Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, you are Judas" Well, you have taken your own satisfaction by using your own remarks in reply. Now, you have jumped up again.

Mr. WALCOTT: You are presiding over a fight. What did you rise for? You do not remember that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is the last time that I am going to stand on my feet to preserve order in this House. I have an authority to use and I am going to use it. If the hon. member persists in such behaviour in ignoring the Chair - I am not threatening you, I am just letting you know -

Mr. WALCOTT: The people have elected me here.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is the last time. If you persists in such behaviour, I will name you.

Mr. WALCOTT: If you are afraid that the people of St. Joseph will put you out of here, I am not afraid.
3.55 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I say these things because a lot has been said which would give the idea to the public that while the Government is being supported in this matter, yet this Government is so very callous and hard-hearted in its attitude to the workers, that it does not care what happens to them. That is why I make these remarks. I was going to say that when we saw the headlines that I saw in the United Kingdom, they could only have arisen because certain facts were not known to the public or even to the newspaper concerned. We have not said anything for the sake of peace; we have been warned over and over again in this wise: 'For goodness' sake, do not say or do anything which might give the appearance abroad that the Harbour was started on a wrong footing; that you have had rows with the Trade Union and so on." That is the only reason why we have kept quiet; otherwise we could have said a lot of what we told the Trade Union. In the way in which we couched our language, we could have referred to a particular paragraph in the letter and so on. I say that that particular newspaper did not know the facts. We have never said anything about it; even now I am not saying anything further than what I have briefly hinted at. I may say that if we are pushed too far, we may have to say it and give the facts and say why we made such statements as I made just now. Nevertheless, we are taking things quietly for the good of the country. The people who have the best interests of the country at heart have told us over and over again that we should not get into the way of saying: that Labour and ourselves are at loggerheads.

The contract will soon be coming to an end; if you want to attract the particular man whose contract is coming to Barbados, let us allow by-gones to be by-gones, even although it appears as if we are on the wrong side. All along we have done everything to the benefit of the country. The hon. member said that we have gone on a public platform and drawn everything into politics; he has made a point in my office and that is why I said that we will have to have a recording machine. None of our pronouncements would give anybody the idea that we were approaching this matter lightly, dismissing it and saying that things will take care of themselves. What man in the political field would say that these things will settle themselves? We have only made reference to the matter in Queen's Park after reference was made to it by the hon. member. It is not we who made this matter a political issue; we have been looking at this thing.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The hon. member is saying that I told him something. I had no meeting in connection with any political matter; therefore, the hon. member is untrue. We had one meeting on the 3rd January, 1961, and the Reports are there. Do not let the hon. member worry to say that I had to do anything in conversation.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member, in introducing this Resolution, referred to a conversation which we had in my office and I said that he had taken certain things out of their context. All I am saying is that the hon. member started quoting from that conversation and I said that he should have had a recording machine because he was taking certain things out of their context. He said that we were the people who were making politics out of this matter. If no reference had been made to the meeting which took place in my office, I would not have made any reference to it. I am getting the record straight.

As I was saying all along, we have gone about this matter not on any personal basis; if we wanted to be personal we could have paid money to the Advisory Board. We brought in the Advisory Board, we put no obstruction in the way and we gave no indication that we wanted certain individuals on the Board. We kept quiet purely in the interest of Barbados. Sometimes my family attack me and I do not worry about it. I am a mild man: but when you hear me make a statement like that, you will know that something took place which has caused me to speak in the way in which I spoke. I am not being unduly modest but when I speak on political platforms I hardly make any reference of that sort. I repeat that I felt very troubled about this matter, because at no time have we approached the matter in any personal manner or anything of that sort. We have been going along and trying to co-operate. But if hon. members want to make politics out of the matter, we have to reply; when people come down to such a level and treat an important matter in this way, we cannot remain silent.

I have never flinched from my duties and I do not intend to do so now. Mr. Deputy Speaker, more will be said about this matter in the near future, but I think I have said enough to indicate that both from the short range point of view and the long term point of view, we are not in any way complacent. We are not folding our arms and sitting back and allowing things to take care of themselves. 4.05 p.m.

We are fitting all our efforts into the process of planning which was started years before I was in Government and when the hon. member was in Government, and we are continuing that process. We will give priority to the workers. We will draw up certain of these plans so that care can be taken in the more immediate future of them, and at the same time we are dealing on a comprehensive basis. We are looking in a Federal way at this particular problem. In fact I am looking at it that way and it is the only basis in which it can be looked upon because it is not a light matter; it only happens now to be the water-front workers, but it may be some other workers next week. In Jamaica it was the sugar industry, and in Trinidad it may be something else, probably the oil fields. You will see recently where the oil fields have been laying them off in the same process of the installation of machinery. The same thing is happening throughout the area; it is not a problem which is peculiar to Barbados and because of that Barbados has not jettisoned and thrown aside its process of planning and said that we are going to bring down $1 million or $2 million out of the air to start roads or engage in a slum clearance scheme because this problem has arisen. They have fitted this into a pattern as a whole; they have conceived it from every angle from which it can be conceived as part and parcel of a problem that is big and calls for some big attempt or conception.

I have replied on this occasion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I understand that the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour who has been devoting special attention to this problem and has made it part and parcel of his effort recently abroad to find some employment for persons, would like to say a word on this; so I intend to break off soon and let him carry on. I do not want it to be felt when I say that this Government is thinking only in terms of emigration, but I want to make it quite clear that emigration is a 'must'. It is a 'must' with Puerto Rico, it a 'must; with Jamaica and it is a 'must' with Trinidad. Obviously we do not pin everything on it, but when members examine the forthcoming Five-Year Plan and everything that has been done, they will see how throughout there has been a basis pattern of development throughout all these stages of planning. After the erection of the Harbour, then we move on to the next stage, get more jobs, increased pay, better communications, better handling facilities, a quicker turn around of ships and industrial sites near to the Harbour. Those, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will add to our economy and attract more and more secondary industries.

I repeat, however, that we must in the meantime lay stress on emigration. It has been the keynote in the whole Governmental policy in a place like Puerto Rico; it is absolutely necessary in the case of another Unit Government such as Jamaica. When we were in England the matter was stressed over and over again by all the Leaders that if the doors are closed now, God knows what will happen. The Leader of the Jamaica Government and the Leader of the Trinidad Government have stressed it and one has emphasised that if the doors were closed now, one does not know what will happen because we cannot hope to cope on our own resources. They realise the necessity for emigration. We realise how important it is to have these avenues open. I am not saying that it is the answer, because we do not want to get rid of the skilled persons; we want to have jobs for them locally.

When a young man comes to me and says he does not see any prospects here for him and has to go abroad, I feel depressed. When a man tells you that and you feel he should have an opportunity here, you can only feel depressed. The facts are there. It has happened in Jamaica and in Montserrat, because they just simply cannot cope. We must look for avenues abroad, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and there is no use overlooking that fact. Puerto Rico has emphasised over and over again the value of emigration to the United States.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, now the hon. member is standing up there and really playing for time. The hon. member is talking about Puerto Rico, but if he is finished speaking you should call upon him to close the debate. What is Puerto Rico to do with this question? We have voted $400,000 for emigration, but you are allowing the hon. member to ramble all over and waste a lot of time. Do you not know that he made that speech eight or nine times and you are still allowing him to go on and talk about Puerto Rico?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I am very glad to hear that all of us will be short and to the point in future, but I will continue with my speech, however irritating it may be to hon. members.

I repeat, Sir, that although we realise the drawbacks, we still have to look on emigration as a source of employment, and it is in that respect that some pronouncement was made here some time ago, and the Minister of Labour has been making some efforts in the United Kingdom and in America in order to assist in this problem. I regard it as part and parcel of a big problem which is bound to take place throughout the area, not only on the waterfront but

right throughout all processes of employment. It has been happening in the sugar industry and it will continue to happen. It is happening in America and throughout the world. I do not regard this as anything because it is election time, and we are trying to tell people they have this business and do not know what to do with it. We are not looking at it as a particular means of propaganda; we are looking at it in a comprehensive way; we are looking at it as a matter to be tackled like other serious matters such as under-employment in the sugar industry.
4.15 p.m.

We have people coming to us who only get two days' work. They want work in the Government departments because, what man can live on two days' work? He can hardly live on five days' work. They want to get away from it; so this is not the only problem with which we are faced. That is why we came down here in a big way with a plan which we hope would provide work not only for those displaced workers but other workers as well.

I hope by the way in which I have approached this matter it would be an enlightenment to any person who have heard the approach made by certain members opposite. It is true that the other side is a bit divided. The hon. senior member for Christ Church referred to some *sotto voce* remark made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip. The hon. senior member for St. Philip did not agree to this Resolution. He said that no Committee should be set up: so part of that Party seems to have disagreed and part seems to think that a Committee should be set up. Of course, the Party opposite is more famous for its deviations than its unifications. (Mr. TUDOR: We are free.) I am very glad to hear that they are free and undisciplined. I do not know that that is the way you should run a Party; nevertheless, I still point that out for the benefit of hon. members and other persons who did not observe it that there was a little difference in their way of thinking on the approach to this problem. I do not know who is reflecting the official view of the members opposite; I do not know if it is the hon. senior member for Christ Church or the hon. senior member for St. Philip. What sense is there in setting up a Committee? Of course, the hon. senior member for St. Philip will stay away and the others will vote for it. The Committee will have to rely on the same machinery that the Government has to rely on if they want statistical advice and it will comprise most likely of the persons who have already taken part in this matter.

So far as getting down to slum clearance and emigration, those are things which we are already pursuing as well as the repairing of roads. The hon. senior member for Christ Church is saying that we should set up a Committee. We have our planning unit and we have had the advice of Mr. George Cadbury who was adviser to the Jamaica Government. Of course, we have access to certain facts which hon. members opposite will not have.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Minister is filibustering; so I am going to help him. If the Hon. Minister knew anything of what he is reading, he would not say what he is saying. There is nothing in this Resolution that the Committee was asked to do; there is nothing about short time planning. What the Government has to answer today is what is the Government doing for the unemployed. As much as we are waiting to see, you will soon see.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: When the hon. member gets a copy of the Five-Year Plan, he can read it. It is doing much more than he ever did when he was a member of the Government. What has he done?

Mr. WALCOTT: When I was a member of the Government, we did not have a Deep Water Harbour and the people were not displaced.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: That is quite so, but the Deep Water Harbour is going to lead to further employment. Everybody knows that. It is going to lead to a lot of further employment. A lot of trade is going to come here and enquiries about industries have already been made to us. The hon. member thinks that we have put what we have in the Development plan for sport. The workers have seen what we are doing and I am replying as regards what we are doing. I am saying that what we are doing is more than what he is doing.

Mr. WALCOTT: What more do you want me to do? Look at what I have done. Look over this country and you will see what we have done. Up to yesterday, I had to run down all of you for $500.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: And yet you will not put us out of the place. We can produce receipts, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is talking of the place over in Nelson Street. Who started the Headquarters in Nelson Street?

Mr. WALCOTT: I can help both of you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is breaking the rules of the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: I say that I see that the Hon. Minister and the Deputy Speaker are out for filibustering; so I am helping both of you.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, in respect of what I am saying, I will quote from the Five-Year Development Plan. Any member can have access to it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, let us filibuster. I rise on a point of order. You can tell when some animals are in a playing mood from when they are not. When they are not playing, you see their tails straightened out ready to spring at something. The Hon. Minister says that he is going to quote from the Plan and if you look at your Order Paper at Item No. 15 of Government Business, you will see that it speaks of a Resolution in which the Premier proposes to introduce.....

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

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister says that he is now going to quote something from the Five-Year Plan.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. The hon. member must take his seat.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Order No. 15 of Government Business reads as follows:-

"Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: To move the passing of the following Resolution:-"

"Resolution to approve the programme of development expenditure contained in the Development Plan 1960-65."

There is a rule in here that you cannot deal with an Order which is on the Order Paper before you reach it. The Hon. Minister now says that he is going to read from that Plan.
4.25 p.m.
No member can deal with an Order which is on the Order Paper before we reach it. The hon. member says that he is reading from that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter.....

Mr. WALCOTT: The Rules of the House say that he cannot do it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member take his seat? The hon. senior member for St. Thomas said that he was going to read from it, but he did not. You did not give the hon. senior member for St. Thomas the chance to do so.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: It has been said that one of the aspects of economic development is that work is found for the displaced workers. The only way.....

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 4.30 p.m. of the clock and the House will revert to the consideration of Government Business.

REGISTERED SUGAR FACTORIES SMOKE CONTROL BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:- To move the House into Committee on a Bill to provide a means whereby sugar factories may be safeguarded against actions of nuisance and applications for interlocutory injunctions in respect of nuisances occasioned by the emission of smoke and to regulate the emission of smoke from sugar factories afforded such protection.

When this Bill was under consideration on the last occasion there were two motions before the House. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries moved that the House go into Committee on the Bill, and the hon. senior member for Christ Church moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the moment of interruption on the last occasion I was speaking and I had not yet finished; I had only started to speak; I was seconding the motion made by my colleague. I was arguing that the Bill before the House should be sent to a Select Committee for the following reasons; and I had just begun to develop an argument on the first of those reasons. I was going on to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that since it appears to be the purpose of this Bill to take away from individuals the right to seek legal remedy against sugar factories for nuisances created by smoke and soot, the House should consider very carefully whether it is prepared to condone the taking away of the rights of individuals. I pointed out that it would be best for outside evidence and opinions to be heard by members of the House on this vital point as to whether the public of this island would be made to sacrifice in the surrender of such a practice.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is all very well to say that the Local Government Councils would have the right to prosecute sugar factories, but suppose they did not choose to do so! We have not been told whether individuals will have the privilege of influencing a Local Government authority to prosecute a sugar factory. That is another reason why this Bill should be sent to a Select Committee. If the rights of individuals are going to be taken away and vested in the Local Government authorities, what guarantee have we got that Mr. "X", who has been damaged by smoke or soot from a sugar factory, could influence or persuade his Local Government authority to act on his behalf? Does the law say what pressure should be brought to bear on Local Government authorities by a citizen who has reason to complain? This Legislature, would, in my opinion, be acting *ultra vires* if it attempted to take away the rights of the ordinary citizens without permitting those who are involved to give reasons as to why their rights should not be taken away.

The purpose of a Select Committee would not be to hold up the passage of the Bill, although some delay would be pursuing its labours; but its purpose would be to ensure that, literally, nobody who has an interest in a matter like this, is prevented from expressing his opinion, no matter where he lives. The purpose of a Select Committee would be to ensure that no individual is separated from his legal rights without his knowing quite clearly and emphatically how he has to exercise his rights in the future. We have no right to take away from individuals the right to sue or prosecute owners of sugar factories if soot and ash from those factories are damaging their health, their property, their food or whatever it may be.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I may be on firmer ground here. I was saying that it is a pressing problem in our constituency. I pointed out that Fairfield Factory is situated in a pivotal position, adjacent to several districts where residents live. Only the other night I had a long conversation with the Rector of the parish because I wanted to be sure of my facts, and he disclosed to me that since this crop has finished, the Church Authorities have already removed from the roof of the parish Church, thirteen 200lb bags of soot. I will tell you what it is like when people are worshipping in the Church during the crop time. You cannot sit in any part of the Church without having your clothes dirtied. If you were to see people from Hannays – there is old Caroline Griffith among them – going into the Church with newspapers in their hands, you would feel that these people were going to wrap up something or to read the newspapers as an alternative to listening to the sermon. But no; it is just that they are going to sit in the Church and they are going to prevent their dresses from being dirtied. That goes on all the time. And when the Sacred Elements are on the Altar, the priest dare not uncover the Chalice unless he looks up and makes sure that he covers it up again as quickly as possible. Every single communicant on every Sunday in the Church takes in the blessed elements some soot and ash from Fairfield Factory, with the Body and the Blood.

4.35 p.m.

You can ask anybody from Nestfield, Benthams, Hannays or Trents, and they will tell you what a disgusting thing it is. It is true – and I ought to disclose this to the House because you have to give justice on all sides – the owners of Fairfield Factory are not by any means indifferent to this problem which has been created over the years, the nuisance which the factory causes in the hail of soot and ash which fall for at least five months of the year all over these four districts, and they do give £50 every year to the Rector of the Parish Church for the purpose of washing and cleaning.

If we had this Bill before a Select Committee and you summoned Father Fry before the Select Committee, he would tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it costs him sometimes three times as much as the donation from the owners of Fairfield to clean the Church. As I said, only this year they removed thirteen bags of ashes and soot from the roof. That is nothing to do with what has been falling on people, on the pews and all over the Church every single day for the whole crop time.

Now, Mr. Ward compensates the Church to a certain extent because the Church is a corporate body; they are the people whom you can see; the people who run it are recognisable and it is easy to send a cheque for $240 a year to the Vicar. But what about the old people in Trents, Hannays and Benthams who every Sunday and sometimes twice a night in the week as they go to Church get their clothes soiled beyond repair and cleaning sometimes, and who in their own houses for a considerable portion of the whole crop time have to shut the windows on one side for fear that soot and ash will get into their pots and cooking utensils? That is exactly the problem.

Now, Mr. Ward has never, so far as I know, ordered his Attorneys to offer compensation to all the residents of all the four districts, and I may equally say that none of the residents has had the money, because they are all poor people, being agricultural workers in these areas and perhaps not the necessary advice as to how to proceed against the nuisance; but it was probably felt that the Church Authorities could sue the owners of Fairfield Factory and so that meagre compensation was offered. It was not enough, but at least the Church got something to help clean the fabric of its building. Four hundred or five hundred people living around the factory get nothing, and that is why I would like this Bill before a Select Committee, because what happens in the Fairfield area might surely happen in the districts which surround other sugar estates in this island. I should not like a sugar factory to get away with creating a nuisance by paying a fine of only $25 when what the soot and ash does to any individual is worth more than $25 in damage, even to a single individual, every crop time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we cannot afford to let these people think that the sugar factories are to get away with murder, and the purpose of the Select Committee is not only to hear from individuals with the experience what their actual trouble is every year. I am not even thinking now entirely of people in my constituency; I would like everybody who is interested in this matter and who can express himself or herself forcibly and not waste the time of the Select Committee to come before a Select Committee of this House. I would like even the sugar factories and their representatives to appear before the Select Committee and show cause why severe penalties should not be

imposed on them, or explain what makes it impossible for them to put in the kind of machinery which would cause smoke abatement; but I am not prepared to allow this age old grievance of my constituents to go unmentioned, because it was a grievance long before I started to represent them.

The very first thing that was drawn to my attention in St. Lucy was the fact that people got their clothes soiled in Church and they could not open their windows for ten or twelve weeks in the crop season in Nestfield or Benthams. It is because of that that I want this sort of grievance aired, and I would like members of all sides of this House to be represented on Select Committee to investigate the genuineness of these claims. It is because of these grievances that I would like members of this House to hear — and I speak only from my personal knowledge, I cannot speak of other parts of the island — at first hand a report from the Rector of the Parish Church of the trouble he has had every year, what he has had this year, and how inadequate is the compensation which he gets from Fairfield to clean the Church, and to let him bring along half a dozen of his poorest parishioners who live around to let them tell you what they have suffered. I am sure that at the shortest possible notice he could find six people who could bring without having to search for them, samples of ruined clothing, or ruined household furniture, of ruined books, of everything which has been ruined in consequence of the nuisance caused by Fairfield Factory. Though the Church is compensated, albeit inadequately Caroline Griffith and the others are not. There are too many of them, and the owners of Fairfield Factory do not enquire how many people are inconvenienced each year. Hundreds are inconvenienced every year and no compensation is offered to them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you cannot worship in the Church and sit down without soiling your clothes in the most grievous manner possible, and it is therefore for those two main reasons that I urge this House to consider sending this Bill to Select Committee. It would be a gross injustice to people of this island if a right were taken away from them and nothing given in return, and it would be still grosser injustice if those who suffer by the nuisance of ash and smoke from factories have their rights taken away without being heard in their own defence.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I must agree with some of the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy with regard to the safeguard of smoke and ash from the various sugar factories in the island. We realise that the factories have been working for many years in this country and the wind comes from the North, South and West and blows the stuff all over the island. As the sugar industry in Barbados is our main means of existence, we have to safeguard the factories, but people also have to be safeguarded. Even in St. Simon's where I live I am certain that some of the people cannot wash their clothes unless they go to another district because of the ash from the factory covering their land. We know that the factories have to reap canes and we depend on them, but what I would urge Government to do is to ask the factory owners to control the ash and smoke which are emitted from the factories.
4.45 p.m.
But remember, when they spend the money it will be taken out of every man who plants canes in Barbados. There is no factory owner who is going to pull his pocket to spend one penny. That means that every man who plants canes will pay for it. Therefore, I urge the Government to make a loan to factory owners if they want money to purchase such material to eradicate this smoke and I am sure they will be able to pay it back to Government from time to time. They will pay it back even if they take it from the proceeds of the poor peasant owners, but by so doing it will not be a burden until after a few years.

Sir, I am agreeing that this Bill should be sent to a Select Committee. I am agreeing that protection should be given not only to tourists but to the inhabitants of the colony of Barbados. As I passed St. Simons, and looked around, the peoples' houses there were full of ashes. You see ashes around the houses and in the houses; therefore, some protection should be given them. When I lived in St. Lucy, the same thing happened. In St. Lucy the smoke and ashes flow from the factory nearby into St. Lucy's Church. I am certain that they keep a man daily during the crop season at the Church to sweep away the dust and ashes and to brush the seats, but despite all that he does, he cannot keep away the ashes from out of the Church. I know that the owners pay so much for the cleaning of the Church, but that is not satisfactory enough. St. Lucy's Parish Church is one of the oldest in Barbados. Some safeguard or protection should be made against this ash. Of course, I do not agree that people should come here and put their houses below factories and seek an interlocutory injunction against the factory owner. I do not agree to that at all. They should not go and put down their houses below the factories when the factories were there for so many years. They should go on the East Coast and erect their houses. However, we should protect the people as well as the factories. I am urging the Government to take steps to see that these factory owners put in some machinery to eradicate this ash so that the people would rest more comfortably, and live better and that they would not have so much offence during the crop season.

The question that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Messrs. CORBIN, TUDOR and TALMA - 3.

NOES: Mr. BRYAN, Hon'bles D. D. GARNER, Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, F. E. MILLER, L. St. A. THORNE, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. SEARLES and HOLDER - 8.

The question that Mr. SPEAKER do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 17 were called separately and passed.
4.55 p.m.

Clauses 18 and 19 were called and passed.

The two Schedules were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. D. D. GARNER, seconded by Hon. L. StA. THORNE, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. D. D. GARNER, seconded by Hon. L. StA. THORNE in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PENSIONS (PENSIONABLE OFFICES) (AMENDMENT) ORDER

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1961."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Order is a Resolution to approve an Order relating to the Civil Service. In some cases there are changes of title in certain offices, and in other cases, there is the deletion of some the substitution of others. Firstly, there is the Chief Secretary's Office. It is true that very soon from now the office of Chief Secretary will be abolished, but in the Schedule to this Order hon. members are being asked to agree to certain amendments which we have seen it fit to make. Under the Head "Chief Secretary", after the words "Confidential Records Officer" there are to be added the words "Training Officer" and "Economist". I think that in the Schedule, hon. members will see the word "Economist"

alongside of the word "Training Officer". Of course that is a mistake. I will ask that that be changed. I understand from the Clerk that new Orders have been printed in the correct way. Hon. members will see that there are two posts and not one as would appear from the original Schedule.

Then we come to the Head "Harbour and Shipping Master". Under that Head there is now a new title, "Port Management", and hon. members will see the staff which is required for the management for the Port. It is as follows:-

"Harbour Master, Harbour and Shipping Master, Senior Berthing Master, Tug Marine Engineer, Tug Master, Berthing Master, Executive Secretary, Assistant Executive Secretary, Shore Boatswain, Master, Water Boats, Signalman."

The next Head is "Government Markets". Under that Head, after the office of "Repairer of Scales" we are asked to add the office of "Assistant Supervisor."

The next Head is "Education". Under this Head, in respect of Erdiston College, we are asked to delete the following:-

"Vice-Principal (Men) Erdiston College, Vice-Principal (Women) Erdiston College, Woman Tutor, Erdiston College, Porter-Messenger, Erdiston College." After the Office "Assistant Accountant", we are asked to add the following:-

"Senior Tutor, Erdiston College, Tutor, Erdiston College, Driver-Messenger, Erdiston College."

The next Head is "Medical". Under (a) general we are asked to delete the Office of "Chief Sanitary Inspector". I think that hon. members will remember that with the coming into operation of the Local Government Act, there is no longer the need for the title "Chief Sanitary Inspector". He is now called the Chief Public Health Inspector. The other changes under this Head are as follows: For "Assistant to Chief Sanitary Inspector and Sanitary Inspector - R.S.I., substitute "Assistant to Chief Public Health Inspector, Public Health Inspector - R.S.I. After "Accounts Clerk", add "Chief Public Health Inspector." (c) Mental Hospital; for "Head Nurse", substitute "Senior Sister". After "Porter", add "Senior Charge Male Nurse, Sister, Driver."

Under the Head "Barbados Regiment", we are asked to delete the office, "Technical Sergeant".

Under the Head "Department of Civil Aviation", after the office "Air Traffic Control Officer Grade III" add "Air Traffic Control Officer Grade I, Airport Supervisor."

Over the page the Schedule is continued. Under the Head, "Public Assistance", and the Head "Town and Country Planning Office" and the posts "Assistant Town and Country Planning Officer, Planning Assistant, Senior Inspector and Inspector."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, those are the officers which are covered by this Order. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LEASE OF LAND TO ESSO STANDARD OIL S.A. LIMITED AT THE DEEP WATER HARBOUR

Mr. DEPUTY 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 lease of the Executive Committee to Esso Standard Oil S.A. Limited of parcel of land, part of the Deep Water Harbour, containing by admeasurement 10,000 square feet for the operation of the bunkering facilities in the new Harbour.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, hon. members will remember that in June last year I laid a Statement in connection with the award of tenders for bunkering facilities at the Deep Water Harbour. I will read the Statement again in order to refresh the minds of hon. members. It is as follows:-

"Consequent on the decision to construct the Harbour, the Government considered the provision of bunkering facilities and invited tenders for the provision of these facilities. We informed the House that Esso Standard Oil S.A. Limited was awarded the tender for bunkering facilities in the Harbour."

5.05 p.m.

We set out for the benefit of the House the main advantages which would accrue from the provision of these facilities. There will be increased revenue from fees to be levied on marine fuel; increased revenue by way of income tax; increased customs revenue; employment opportunities for a number of workers and the attraction to Barbados of shipping lines which do not now call here. As hon. members will remember, we said that Esso will construct three main pipelines to form a network throughout the new Port area for the refuelling of ships, platform extending from the breakwater, mooring facilities, construction on the Carlisle side so that tankers can unload fuel supplies, and the bunkering installation would make, if possible, for five ships to be refuelled in that area at one time. There is also a storage terminal to be constructed in the vicinity of the Harbour, and that would control the flow of fuel through the pipelines into the ships.

Indeed, we have to thank Mr. Cadbury and Mr. Brown for assisting in determining the award. I would like to say that the negotiations on this matter were long, intricate, involved and demanding, and we were very fortunate in obtaining the services of these two gentlemen who have had experience in similar negotiations in Jamaica, in the case of Mr. Brown, and of Jamaica and other parts of the world, in the case of Mr. Cadbury. We were very fortunate to have their advice and assistance in this matter, and in deciding on the award which was made, as usual, by the Tenders Committee of the Government, assisted, as I said, by these two gentlemen. Since then, we have had prolonged talks and negotiations over the form of the contract to be drawn up, and this has now been completed and laid on the Table of this House.

If hon. members will refer to the Agreement they will see that it is a very comprehensive document with the usual precise terms that you find in legal Agreements, and I will just go through some of the major points in the Agreement for the benefit of hon. members. You will see that in the Concession Rights granted by us that they will be able to import, export and otherwise deal in marine fuel and oils; to import all marine goods from any foreign source and re-deliver the same as ships' bunkers and ships' suppliers; to sell at such prices as reflect market conditions as well as sufficiently competitive prices to attract a large volume of bunkering business. That is particularly important because we are competing specially in this area with an island like Trinidad, and if we do anything which would push the rates and prices over what is charged in Trinidad, then the ships will continue to call at Trinidad and we will not be competitive. We have to bear in mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that while it is true that we are on a route which ships plying, say, to South America, North America or from Europe going to South America could find much more favourable than Trinidad's, yet we have to keep competitive prices; otherwise it would not pay ships to call here. They would rather go there because they would be saving money by going out of their way to Trinidad rather than come here because of the difference in prices. Tankers discharging or loading would be exempt from Harbour dues except charges for physical Port services actually rendered during the period of the Agreement; machinery imported for construction would be free of duty

and re-exported. That is what we did with the Deep Water Harbour, and that is what we are doing here. They will bring in only skilled craftsmen and technical and administrative personnel.

If members refer to another Clause later on they will see that preference must be given to Barbadians in the staffing of the bunkering operation so long as suitable persons are available. They can only bring in a skilled person that is not available locally; otherwise they must employ Barbadians. They enjoy parity of treatment with any other similar company. Esso will enjoy the same rights of benefit that we may grant to any Company or Corporation for bunkering vessels. That is the only basis on which a Company would come here; otherwise we would not be granting them facilities if after entering what is a $3 million project we allow somebody to come in and compete unfairly. They can make collections, dispose of them and also make remittances to the U.S.A. provided they continue to meet their financial liability to Government. Article 3 deals with Easements and Licences; Article 4 with Covenants and Concessions.

Hon. members will see that we will receive from Esso a yearly amount of $2,400 payable in advance quarterly; monthly sums at the following rates: 17 cents a barrel of imported 42 United States gallons of marine fuel delivered by pipeline to ships in the Harbour or at its terminal; or 7 cents a barrel delivered elsewhere by barge. The rates are tied to United States dollars and they would pay not less than $60,000 a year in our currency. We expect of course that that would be far exceeded because so many ships will be attracted to the area that the number of gallons will rise considerably in future, and we expect the revenue will far exceed that. I need not say anymore. There were only two tenders at the time and Esso was far in advance of the other tender, and the Tenders Board had no difficulty in awarding the contract to Esso.

Now, Sir, this Resolution is simply in respect of the land on which they will set up certain facilities in respect of this operation, and I do not think it will call for any long debate. The piece of land is absolutely necessary as far as this operation is concerned.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

5.15 p.m.

ORDERS NOS. 5, 6 and 7 POSTPONED

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave that Orders Nos. 5 and 6 be postponed.

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave that Order No. 7 be postponed.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ORDER, 1961.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 8 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1961."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order relates to certain changes of staff consequent on the constitutional changes which have been effected. As hon. members know, the office of Chief Secretary has been abolished and because of that, it will be necessary to reallocate the duties of that office and to reorganise the establishment of the Secretariat. The office of Chief Secretary has been abolished and there will be the replacement of the two posts of Assistant Chief Secretary by the following two posts - one Chief Personnel Officer at a salary of $8,160 and one Chief Establishment Officer at a salary of $8,160. This is just a change of title because the same officers who are holding the posts now will go on to hold these new posts. It is only because you do not now have the post of Chief Secretary that you cannot have the posts of Assistant Chief Secretary.

There is also to be, as hon. member can see at paragraph (c), the replacement of the post of Cabinet Secretary at a salary of $8,160, by a post of Permanent Secretary, at the same salary.

The Cabinet Secretary is paid for performing the duties to the Cabinet only. By this change to Permanent Secretary, he will still be the Cabinet Secretary, but will also be able to perform the duties of a Permanent Secretary. He will also be a Permanent Secretary to the Premier's Office.

As hon. members can see at paragraph (d), there will be the creation of two additional posts of Administrative Assistant at a salary rising from $3,528 the minimum, to $4,392 the maximum. As is set out in the Addendum, the two additional posts of Administrative Assistant are required for the Ministry of the Premier. One post will be allocated to the Cabinet and General Section and the other to the Finance Section. Especially during the preparation of the Estimates, you have to borrow assistants - and this has been happening year after year for the last few years - from the Accountant General's office. Naturally, that office is also short staffed and there is dissatisfaction; therefore, it is decided because of that and pressure of other work to have these officers in these posts who would be constantly in the office of the Financial Secretary and in the Ministry to expedite the work of those offices.

In the case of the Cabinet Secretary, it is proposed that the duties of Cabinet Secretary should be performed by a Permanent Secretary who would also be Permanent Secretary to the Premier. The present Permanent Secretary will be confined to certain work on Home Affairs, that is, certain duties in connection with Home Affairs which were performed by the Chief Secretary's Office will now be transferred to the Premier's Office and the present Permanent Secretary which is the Cabinet Secretary will deal with other matters of the Cabinet. Hon. members will see that although we are having these changes yet it will result in a saving of $4,464 per annum at minimum salaries.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO SANCTION THE MARINE FUEL (EXPORTATION FEES) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1961.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour: To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled "The Marine Fuel (Exportation Fees) (Amendment) Regulations, 1961".

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Sir, this Resolution stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade. I am asking leave to take charge of it for him.

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a very insignificant matter; nevertheless, it is significant enough to come to the House to make an amendment to the Marine Fuel (Exportation Fees) Regulations which were laid earlier in this House. Since then, we have come to find out that certain small craft which were included were not meant to be included; hence this amendment.

The Addendum states it very clearly. It reads as follows:

"The Marine Fuel (Exportation Fees) (Amendment) Regulations, 1961 have been laid in the Legislature."

"The Marine Fuel (Exportation Fees) Regulations, 1960, prescribed the fees payable in respect of marine fuel supplied to ships. In their present form these regulations cover ships of all types including small craft such as tugs, barges, fishing launches and similar craft. It was not however intended that bunkering fees should be payable in respect of small craft and the amending regulations therefore exlude from the scope of the Regulations small craft as defined in the Barbados Harbour Regulations, 1961."

The object of this is to prevent these small craft from paying these charges which other ships are called upon to pay. It was never intended that these small craft should pay these fees.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE AN OVERDRAFT FOR THE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour: To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve under the provisions of subsection (1) of section 18 of the Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950, the borrowing of an overdraft at a commercial bank of an amount not exceeding $100,000 for the purpose of continuing its programme of renovating and expanding the gas distribution system.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of Order No. 10.

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

5.25 p.m.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution is necessary so that the Natural Gas Corporation can continue to do the work which they are doing, that is to say, laying mains in certain districts. This is one of the things which will help the unemployment situation inasmuch as people will be working on the laying of the pipes and so on. As hon. members are aware, this Corporation has been granted authority to borrow money, but for some reason or other, we have not yet dealt with the new Five Year Plan and money which will be coming to the Company is more or less tied up in that Five Year Plan. I had some figures to show to the House in what districts this Corporation is carrying out this work; I have not got the figures here, unfortunately, but I do want to emphasise to the House the importance of this Resolution because of the fact that it will supply the much-needed employment to unskilled workers. We also want to get this gas going to the homes of the people in the various districts.

I do not think that there is anything more I need to say on this matter because the Addendum to this Resolution is quite full and it explains everything. We do want this Corporation to go ahead with this work which will provide the means, as I have already said, of workers getting some work to do. I now formally beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not opposing the passing of this Resolution, but my chief reason for speaking now is that while the Natural Gas Corporation is putting down mains all over Bridgetown, St. James, Christ Church and in these residential areas, I am wondering if the Hon. Minister can inform us as to what time they expect to extend this gas to the Northern District areas such as Speightstown and other places. What I am saying is that the gas which they are using is coming from St. Andrew and they are installing it in St. Michael, Christ Church and various other parishes. I would like to see them run these mains straight until they get to Speightstown in order to help the people in the Northern District areas? Why are they concentrating in Christ Church and in these other parts of the island and that the people in Speightstown are no people? In St. Andrew we are producing the material and yet we cannot use it; we are producing the necessary material and some of the people down there are still burning cow's manure. The big man does not have to clean his pot because he depends on his natural gas, but we who are poor people cannot get it. I do hope that in the early future I will see them run that gas in Speightstown and that they will take the necessary steps whereby we will get some of this gas in St. Andrew.

How do they look at the poor people in the Northern District? It is hard on them that they are not being treated in the way in which they should be treated. Even as regards the Barbados Light and Power Company, we cannot get any electric light. I wonder what they are thinking of the poor people. There are certain people in St. Andrew who can use gas and electricity and I am sorry to think that an advantage is being taken of these poor people. I think that the Government should press on the Barbados Light and Power Company Limited that they have the whole place illuminated.

Some time ago, I thought that we would have had Barbados like a steamship; that is, with lights all around it; I thought so when we heard that we would get all this electricity. Do you mean to say that in a little area like this, 21 x 14 miles, we cannot get the whole place illuminated? I am wondering what is wrong. If the Barbados Light and Power Company would take in more shareholders, I am quite certain that they would have all the money they want; but they only think of a few big fowls and therefore the light cannot be installed throughout the island. These big fellows want all the shares for themselves; meanwhile the island is kept in darkness. I say that we should press for the whole island being illuminated; we are willing to lend the money for that purpose. Why are you keeping us in darkness, with some people still burning kerosene oil and during some nights when they awake they have to take a stick to get the soot out of their noses?

5.35 p.m.

We are producing about 50 casks a day of some of the best oil in the world; the only place I understand that has oil like this is Texas in the United States. You can draw oil from Spring Vale and put it in your car without refining it, but you are taking all the oil from us and leaving us in the dark. We cannot see in these places.

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

Mr. Speaker, I was speaking in relation to the Natural Gas Company. I do not oppose the money which appears in this Resolution because I know it is needed, but what I am saying is that a main should be run to Speightstown to relieve the plight of the people in the Northern District Council. We would be able to get gas to cook, iron and do most things. You know, Sir, that the soot from the kerosene oil makes it necessary for you to have to clean your pots, and the servants nowadays say that they are not cleaning them anymore. Why can't we have the same facilities as other places? We are producing this gas in our parish and where you see a big man's house there is natural gas in it, while we in the Northern District Council from where it is coming cannot get it. The Company belongs to the Government and they should see that we share alike the benefits of what Barbados produces.

We would be glad to know, Mr. Speaker, that there is gas extended to Speightstown, and I am sure that lots of people there would utilise it, and by so doing the Company would get more money coming to them and more work would be provided for labourers. The Company should try to extend its lines to distribute the gas among the poor people in Barbados, and we would enjoy it with all our hearts.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like the Hon. Introducer of this measure to give us some progress Report. In a matter like this in which an amount of money is being asked for, there is this cursory manner in which you pass

over a Resolution of this importance with all that has been inserted in it. The new bait is that it is going to produce employment for the unemployed. I know that the Government is bound to talk about employment for the unemployed now; it is imperative and if you do not do it you cannot survive, because there are people who are unemployed who do not wait on you to do something for them. They will do it in this age. What we would like to know in this matter since the hon. member speaks about employment is what do you intend to expend on employment in this context about which you talked. We know, Mr. Speaker, that the number of people employed by the Gas Company apart from its regular number of people who are more or less permanently employed and would be on the permanent establishment would depend on the simultaneous expansion it makes, and it is done, I understand, in the main by contract labour. I have no means of knowing how it is paid for, but it is the type of labour in digging up roads, opening mains and of laying new mains.

The Resolution, Mr. Speaker, states quite briefly that $1 million were raised and of that $300,000 were raised by issues of debenture stock. We would like to know who are these people, and how many debenture holders there are, and what was the difficulty in getting more stock holders. The Government said that they borrowed $700,000 of the money, and I would like to know what money the Government has not expended or invested that could be utilised for investment purposes in the Gas Company. We want to know also what returns this company is paying, what dividends, and what these debentures are worth. We would like to know that so that we can begin to get some idea of how the company is operated. I think we are entitled to know that. There is no point in saying that the Corporation raised $300,000 in debenture stock and you have borrowed $700,000 and lent them. We want to know what dividends the company is paying, how it compares with others and so forth.

The point which the hon. junior member for St. Andrew raised about the expansion is a good one. We should be told in what way, in what areas, in what instances there will be extensions, and how many miles will be laid down. Are the gas stocks available to give everybody who would want gas in Barbados? If the stocks are available, what are the hindrances which prevent them from getting gas? I would tell the hon. member not to let us carry on this policy with the Gas Company as we do with the Electric Company which tells people that they have to write a requisition in order to get light. There are certain areas which we regard as main arterial areas in which it should be part of the policy of Government to lay down water and light and not ask anybody to send in a request. There is no question of asking anybody in Speightstown where you live, Mr. Speaker, to write a request if they want light, water or gas. All of the public utility services should, as a matter of course, pass along the main highways, and I only regard that requests should come from remote areas, from someone living say, in Endeavour or somewhere up to the tip of Sion Hill or where the Buccaneer Club was; or if somebody wants to go to the most isolated part of St. Philip to live, or Pico Teneriffe, you would not expect the services up there; but certainly they should be in the populated parts of the country.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is water at Pico Teneriffe.

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, Sir, but as you will know, we would not demand services at Pico Teneriffe as we would for Speightstown or Ashton Hall because they are in the hub of a large population; so we say that as a matter of course, a request should come from far places. The hon. member's point should be well taken. I do not know to what extent the Gas Company runs along the St. James coast and to Speightstown, but as it is a built-up area, I feel that this facility should be there, and in our own life time we can see what sort of build-up it has got.

I think the Minister should be prepared to give us some idea so that the public would know the extent to which this facility is being used. There was a time when I was a boy when gas was regarded as exclusive because of the amount of money available to certain people, but there are civil servants now who are better off than they were before and who come from a different segment of society than their predecessors, and they are in a position to utilise these services. I feel that people with higher incomes utilising these services should provide employment for people who would be needing employment. I heard the idea expressed today of giving priority to people, and I also heard the stupidity about lightermen not being able to do this work.

5.45 p.m.

When the Hon. Minister says that, what I would like to know is this. Has he any policy over the employment given out by this Company? Can the Government ask these people to give any types of people employment? If so, to what extent have they done so? What method have they done to get employment for these types of people? I think the Hon. Minister should be prepared to tell us something about it.

The reason why I asked about it is this. Here it is we talk a lot about independence and in this Chamber we are members who are elected, and we do not always get from Ministers the information which we ask. But then when you read the debates of the Other Place, you find that members of that Chamber are vouchsafed with more information than we get.

I hope the Hon. Minister will give us something about the financial side of this company. The Addendum says:

"Pending the raising of the loan the Governor-in-Executive Committee was authorised to advance from the Public Treasury to the Corporation sums not exceeding a total of $1 million. Of this $1 million the Corporation raised $300,000 by issue of debenture stock, the remaining $700,000 was borrowed from the Government which raised this sum and re-lent it to the Corporation under the authority of Resolution No. 71/1959."

Let us know something about the programme. Let us know something about these debentures which you have raised and what dividends you have made on them. Let us know something about the plans in so far as the expansion of this company is concerned.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that the Gas Company was almost a derelict and that gas was leaking all over the place, and we had to make new plans and install new pipes wherever the old pipes were laid before. It has been an enormous strain on the company to maintain what it is doing today, far less to pay dividends, and it will be a long time before it is able to pay dividends because there is a big programme of work to be done. They have taken over dead stock and we are now trying to resurrect the company, so to speak.

Sir, I will tell the hon. senior member for St. Peter that I did not really think we would have got as far as this Resolution today. I have some facts which, if it were earlier in the day I could obtain. I have told the hon. member what I know and what I have asked the company for. If the hon. member cares to take my word for it, he can have all the information he wants tomorrow morning. I know that this is not the whole programme and that they have been doing work in many districts. They have not concluded. They might not have asked us to give them this authority to get this overdraft, had it not been for a delay in the Five Year Plan. If hon. members will look in the new Five Year Plan, they will see that there is some money allocated for the extension of this work and to carry on the various projects. They have asked for this overdraft because they do not want to have a break in the laying of the mains.

I do not think the hon. member should be too "catchy" about providing employment. We have been always trying to provide employment wherever we can; therefore, I do not think the hon. member should lay too much emphasis on that. I do want to tell the hon. member this. The reason for their coming for this authority to get an overdraft is to continue work just in those places where they were laying mains. There is a temporary break and they want to carry on so as to carry this gas to those districts.

As regards the point raised by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, I will say that we too would like to have

gas and electricity spread all over the Island but it is a matter of finance. We too are thinking along that line. When you are spending $100,000, you have to think of the economic districts; that is to say, you have to think of laying these mains first in those districts where you will get the greatest amount of business; therefore, you will have to cater first to those districts in which you have people with the spending power to install gas. As the hon. member ought to know, a householder must have a proper stove in which the gas must flow; therefore, if you take it to certain isolated districts, very few people are going to avail themselves of it.

I do want to assure the hon. member that he is not alone in his view. We feel strongly about the Barbados Light and Power Company. I can assure the hon. member that some of the things which he fears we want to remedy and we have plans to bring them about in the next Five Year Plan. When he gets his copy he will see that we are not sleeping, but thinking for the distant future.

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

5.55 p.m.

REGISTRATION OFFICE BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:- To move the second reading of a Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Registration Office.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone this Order.

Mr. WALCOTT: I should like to enquire as to why is the hon. member postponing this Order.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the position is this. Only this morning it was brought to my attention that this matter should be standing in my name. I am not prepared to deal with it any further than what is set out in the Bill, unless hon. members want to proceed with it without having.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. On this question of Registration I doubt very much whether the information regarding registration is as adequate as it should be. I have had the experience that when they post up lists in shops..... *(Pause)* I should like to draw to the Hon. Premier's attention that in places where the Voters' list has been posted, there is nothing beside that list, not even a placard, to show anything about that list. I have discovered that some people do not know what to do if they do not see their names on the list; they do not know how to get their names on the list. I think that all of us are interested in this matter, whether we are accused of playing politics or not, but you have to play politics if you are playing on these wickets; otherwise you will get your stumps dug out before you move your bat. I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Premier that the Officer in charge of this registration should have a placard informing the people that if they do not find their names on the list, they can go to the nearest place and inform them of it. I do not think that we, as representatives of the people, should be going around doing these things; it is not good enough just to have this list posted up.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing has asked leave to postpone this Order and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted. *(After a Pause.)*

There being no objection, leave is granted.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill....

Mr. SPEAKER: Leave has been granted for the postponement of this Order, unless the Hon. Minister wants to withdraw his motion.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw that motion.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill is to consolidate the law relating to the Registration Office, to amend the fees payable for the recording of plots and to make provision for the payment of fees with respect to the copying of plots. Speaking generally, it has been brought to the attention of the Government that quite a few mistakes have been made with regard to plots to which very often there is no title, and a lot of these suits could be avoided by having proper registration of plots of land. This Bill is designed to correct those mistakes. Under the Act of 1903, the fee for recording a plot regardless of its size and nature was fixed at $2.40. This fixed fee of $2.40 is considered unsatisfactory in view of the disparity in the sizes of the various plots to be recorded. I think that that is obvious; you charge the same fee for recording a plot comprising half an acre of land as you will charge for one comprising ten acres of land. Therefore, there is really some disparity there.

The Objects and Reasons of this Bill go on to state that there is no provision in the Act for the payment of copyists who were employed under the provisions of Section 2 of the Act to assist the Registrar with the copying of the said plots. This Bill provides:-

(a) that the fee for recording a plot by filing of copy thereof be $2.50; and

(b) for the Registrar to fix a fee not exceeding $50.00 in respect of both the copying and the recording of plots.

Clause 4(1) and the second and third items in the Schedule of this Bill seek to provide for this accordingly.

Opportunity has been taken to delete the provisions relating to the fees for copying voters lists and for taxing bills of costs in the Court of Error from section 2 and the Schedule to the Act respectively.

In view of the decimal system now operating in this Island, opportunity has also been taken to revise and adjust the scale of fees in the Schedule to this Bill accordingly.

Those are the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to this Bill. I think that some time ago we passed a Resolution dealing with the microfilming of documents, which is a more modern method of dealing with these things. In New York somebody asked me to delve into this business and the person discovered that it was easier for people in New York to get information relative to the City of New York than it was for me to get information in Barbados. We still have the old, ancient method of having to wade through books and it was said that we would have to erect a building like City Hall, New York, if we go on with these heavy documents. It is felt that photostatic copies should be used and you would have more recordings and prints made of documents; that is a good job to be done but you will have to set up the machinery for doing it. I would suggest to the Hon. Premier that we should try as much as we can to get these things done more easily.

You have to ask yourselves if this system can be related to more modern methods; the question of cost may be prohibitive, but it is a question of getting these records done expeditiously. This matter came to me just by accident on one occasion because it is really not my field.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, in attempting to shed a little light on this question of the microfilming of documents and the recommendations which were being carried out sometime ago, I should like to inform the hon. member that the work which was selected to be done con-

sisted of newspapers and official documents. That has all been completed and provision will be made, or is being made, to make certain of those films available to the general public. We have to get some apparatus to be used for the purpose.
6.05 p.m.
These films are all stored, and what is more there is a measure afoot to provide training for a local man who could, after having been trained by us, carry out operations in connection with the filming of other documents which are important.

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 8 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. StA. THORNE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

BARBADOS GENERAL HOSPITAL (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1961

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Barbados General Hospital Act, 1947.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill is very simple in nature; it is to amend the General Hospital Act, and bring it in line with what is required in modern trends. In the original Act the Attorney General is expected to institute proceedings as is done in other cases for and against the Crown, but I think you will remember that some time ago we decided that collections should be made at the General Hospital of unpaid fees, and now we are in an awkward position of going through the Court. The Attorney General is expected to handle all the cases, and we have come to amend the Act firstly to change the expression. Where hitherto you would think in terms of the Attorney General, today this will be handled by the Medical Superintendent of that Institution. In addition we want to add a new Clause 15 to the Hospital Act in order that collections can be made by the Medical Superintendent and not necessarily by the Attorney General, but, if it is at all necessary, that the Attorney General should continue to institute proceedings if and when he thinks necessary. I think it is a very simple amendment and it will certainly provide the necessary efficiency for the numerous cases we have in the collections at this Institution. With those remarks I hope I have satisfied the House.

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

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, from what I can see the amendment is a simple one from the point of view of the Objects and Reasons outlined, and of course from the point of view of the explanation given by the Minister. I understand that when this amendment is passed it will be possible for the Hospital authorities to collect outstanding fees due and owing to the Hospital for services rendered. I think it is quite in order.

There is another aspect, however, which worries me and on which I should like the Minister's explanation. It seems to be set out here quite clearly the powers of the Superintendent and of the Attorney General himself in instituting proceedings on behalf of the Hospital for the Crown against individuals. What I would like the Minister to tell me is what is the position now that the boot is on the other foot. Is the Medical Superintendent to accept responsibility when something happens in the Hospital to a private individual for which he wants to claim damages by law? Is the person then to be sued, the Medical Superintendent or the Attorney General? I do not want to institute any debate, but I would be very glad if the Minister could tell us if the Medical Superintendent is likewise to be the person liable to be sued for damages if persons have to sue the Crown.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister does not mind answering both questions at the same time, I would like to know who are these people owing the money. I understand that you do not charge poor people; so they would not owe. I really would like to know from what income groups these people come. I want to be very frank and say that if people go to the Hospital and do not want to go to the General Ward for free but want their friends to come and see them in the Pay Wards, then they should pay. I do not like to be hard with people for medical services because I have been to the Hospital and I had to fork out $10 before I got an X-Ray.
6.15 p.m.
They have the idea that when you are a member of the House of Assembly you do not pay for anything. I wish it were true. I went to the Hospital and I had to pay money for X-Ray treatment. I know it would be difficult for the Hon. Minister to chronicle the names. However, you say that a lot of money is owing to that institution. Is it from people who cannot pay, or is it from people from sophisticated places? I know that they have some people in Barbados who believe that they are born for the Tercentenary Ward. They do not have the five shillings a day money and they feel that if they go in the five shillings-a-day Pay Ward their friends would not come to see them. We must bring people to their senses. We know that they do not like to go in the general wards with Sarah Ann where you may find when you get there that they have already shared out the bed pans as if they were cakes or tea. These people suffer that sort of indignity in the general wards: but in the private wards, you do get more privileges.

Sir, I ask again, who are the people who owe this money? Give us some idea of the amount of money which is owing because I have heard that it is a very startling amount of income tax which is due to the Government. I feel very grievous to hear that all this money is due to the Government — especially that of income tax — and my own has been fully paid up. I will like the Hon. Minister to tell us if this money is owed by people of a certain source that you will have to write it off or whether it is owed by people who can pay and would not pay.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I did not think this at all necessary but since the hon. member has requested the information I will say this. The Objects and Reasons of this Bill is to substitute a new definition for the expression "Medical Superintendent" and to insert a new section to provide for proceedings for the recovery of fees to be brought by and in the name of the Medical Superintendent. The Attorney General will still retain the right to institute proceedings on behalf of the Crown in any case warranting his intervention.

In an attempt to answer the hon. senior member for St. Peter, you will remember some two or three years ago that I came to the House asking permission to make collections from people who owed amounts to the General Hospital. At that time it was something like $2,000 or probably more. The hon. member has asked to indicate the particular persons who used this facility of this institution. I will say that this facility of owing money is being used by people of the lower, the middle and even the upper brackets. I do not think the hon. member will ask me to say very much more than that. I will only say that it is from the people whom you will least expect would fail to pay that you

get most of the trouble. A similar thing takes place in the Waterworks Department. There are a number of people who use water who do not like to pay for it. Sometimes it leaves me morbid to think that they incur all of these debts to all these services which are subsidised to them. Let us take a person entering as a patient in the five shillings Pay Ward. The cost of food there is something like $1.46 for one item of food. I suppose it is like this all over the world. What is also unfortunate is that 20% of the collection is lost because it is paid to the collection agent. What is uncomfortable in this whole affair also is that the fee which is charged by the Surgeon is also tied up in this debt because the specialists are not paid until the collection is made. I hope I have answered the questions of the hon. senior member for St. Peter in a way to satisfy him.

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am taking this opportunity to throw this out to the Minister as a suggestion. I have been thinking that one of the things which we can do in Barbados to circumvent this problem of collecting fees — and we are doing it in the Union — is to make deductions from people's wages for the purpose. I do know that many employers make a deduction from their employee's wages for a thing like this. If you were to embark on a scheme like this, making a deduction equivalent to the people's wages, you might be able to abolish the idea of a thing like the Pay Ward and then you would not have to face the problem of collecting fees.

One of the reasons why some people run into difficulties with their medical bills is that sometimes the illness is prolonged and you get the normal excuse that they did not calculate that the time they would have spent in Hospital would have been so long. It is a fact that some people do have these problems and I think according to modern trends — and we are Socialists — that when it comes to medicine you should make provision for this.

I think the workers have come around to this idea because we of the Union have a section of the workers doing it, and I believe that you have certain organisations like our own. Because of that you can get more than 50% of your population subscribing to this. I can tell you that it is not going to take more than two or three weeks to get the whole sugar industry to agree to do this.

I just throw this out now that this question is raised. In my view, it is a commonsense thing to do and it is more helpful from the financial point of view because it provides you with a sum of money.

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

Clause 3 was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. F. E. MILLER, seconded by Hon. L. StA. THORNE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. F. E. MILLER, seconded by Hon. L. StA. THORNE in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

6.25 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PLACING OF A HIGHWAY UNDER THE CONTROL OF THE DIRECTOR OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT

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 placing of a highway in the Southern District Council area under the control of the Director of Highways and Transport.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, this matter arises out of the work which we have started and which has almost been completed at Seawell Airport, in the extension of the Runway in order to accommodate Jet Aircraft. We have extended the runway by 2,000 feet and the existing highway which heads from Highway 7 to Paragon and Seawell House has been crossed by the runway. We therefore have to provide another access from Paragon and Seawell House to Highway 7, and we are doing so by way of a road which is under the control of the Southern District Council. The Council have maintained that there will be a resulting increase in traffic over this road; it is at present not much used, but it will be used in future to a great extent. They have requested that, with the increased cost involved in the maintenance of this road, it be placed under the control of the Director of Highways and Transport in accordance with the provisions of Section 9 of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945.

This road is approximately 1.84 miles in length. It is estimated that the cost of reconstructing and realigning it will be $34,500 and the annual cost of maintaining it in repair will be $1,070. I do not think that there will be any difficulty presented to hon. members in agreeing to this Resolution.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question about the development of Seawell generally, in view of the fact that I do not know how near we went to a major accident or not. I happened to see that an aircraft of the Pan American Airways Company did not have much longer to go so as to end up on the other side. I would like to know what are the developments about Seawell in so far as the surrounding area is concerned, from the point of view of Jets landing here and also from the point of view of the whole area being utilised, having regard to Airports like London and Idlewild. It does seem to me that the Government will have to think in terms of acquiring more land up there, and it may be that Spencers may have to be utilised and the surrounding area so as to carry out the extension work which is necessary. It is true that this is not the business of the Government, but there are no proper facilities up there for passengers who would have to wait a long time on aircraft; I do not think it would be amiss if some construction of temporary lodgings at least were made up there.

I do not know how these migrant people do get by, but I understand that some of them have been at Seawell Airport, the flight has been cancelled and some of the Airlines are not responsible for putting up people for the night because they have not started on their journey. It means that some of these people are knocking about at this Airport. There are women among them too, and I would like to know what are the future prospects of building a guest house or something which could be used for the accommodation of these people. Some people come as far as from St. Lucy; they have no relatives in Christ Church and they do not want to wend their way all the way back to Bridgetown. The intran-

sit people, on the other hand, are accommodated by the Airlines. I think that the Government will have to buy more land up there; this is, of course, always an expensive process because it may be said that they are not pressed for the land. I am sure that if you had told some members of this House some five years ago that they had to provide for Jets they would have said that there is no use in doing that. There are some plans on the drawing board for aircraft which are going to travel at 2,000 miles an hour; these planes will be coming here and we are going to be asked to extend the runway for the purpose of accommodating them. I think that the time has come for making the Airport area an Airport area by and large, and have all the land which is necessary so that development can take place from time to time. Mr. Speaker, those are the things which have crossed my mind; I have been hearing that these flights I have mentioned are taking place.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has referred to this accident and I would like to say that in no way was it due to the conditions obtaining at Seawell. I have had a report from eye-witnesses and I have had other accounts to the effect that from where the plane landed it was coming in at a very fast rate of speed. I say no more about that. I have not ordered any investigation because there was no need for it.

6.35 p.m.

It was very obvious, Sir, that because of the speed at which he was coming in, an awkward situation might have arisen. I would like to say that it has been reported to me officially that in no way at all could the blame be due to the runway or any part of the facility provided at Seawell. But the extension up there is not yet finished; we are still continuing. I do not know if there was some other point that was raised, but I would like to say that all over the world it is known that the air expansion and progress, so to speak, in the air are going ahead at such a tremendous rate that it is very difficult to keep pace. There is always something happening, new developments taking place in aircraft, and Airports all over the world are put to it very hard to keep up.

I do know, Sir, that it is the business of Airline Companies themselves to put up places to accommodate guests. In Trinidad for instance, Pan American Airlines have a guest-house, and B.W.I.A. keep their guests at Belair. That is the usual system. It is a point which we will bear in mind, but unless it can pay this Government to do a thing like that, I do not think we can undertake it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is only one thing arising out of the incident to which the hon. senior member for St. Peter has referred.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member has to ask leave to speak since the Minister has replied.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is not so important. As a matter of fact, I only wanted to speak on what the Minister has said.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Rules of the House guide me, and for the hon. member to speak now he has to seek the permission of the House.

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 17 as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to take Order No. 17 as the next Order of the Day, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

THE BACTERIOLOGIST AND PATHOLOGIST (REPEAL) ACT, 1961

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 17 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the second reading of a Bill to repeal the Bacteriologist and Pathologist Act, 1934.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Again, Sir, this Bill is a very simple one, and I think the House is familiar with the Objects and Reasons. Back in 1934 it was thought necessary to create a new Act known as the Bacteriologist and Pathologist Act, 1934. In the order of things, it is no longer necessary to carry that office as a separate Department, and ever since it has been regarded as a Department of the Hospital. In an attempt to regularise things in that Institution, we are seeking the permission of the House through this Bill to bring this department under the functions of the Medical Superintendent as a further department to this Institution.

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the Scientists here are sort of worrying me. Sometimes you do not want a Bacteriologist and another time you do not want a Pathologist. Just as in the Agricultural Department at one time you do not want an Entomologist but a Chemist, and when you do not want a Chemist you want some other kind of scientific officer. I would like to know if by this method it is a rose by another name. I have had experience with these Departments anyhow, because if a Bacteriologist tells you that your blood is bad, you have to spend a lot of money. On one occasion I had to spend a lot of money, and I had to sue somebody for making me spend the kind of money I did. I would like to ask the Minister if we have a Pathologist and a Bacteriologist both of whom work in the Hospital now under the Medical Superintendent. The reason why I ask that, Mr. Speaker, is because these scientific people give a layman a lot of trouble. We would agree to this today and then the Minister may come back after two years and say that all over the world Bacteriologists never work under anybody, so you go and set up a Department by itself for him. Two years after that somebody comes along and says that a Pathologist is always a man to be put in a cage by himself and should never be with the Bacteriologist, and out he would go in a separate Department.

I hope, Sir, that the Minister has satisfied himself that he will not be pushed around any further and that this Department will remain where it is now, because I believe you get these professional jealousies. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because in my lifetime in this House of Assembly – and I think Your Honour will bear me out – if you went through the list of names at the Agricultural Department, you will find that names have appeared, disappeared and reappeared. I would like to know if that is the law we are going in for which would make it difficult if poor people like myself have to go and see a Bacteriologist or a Pathologist, because all it means is that we will have to pay him more money.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I would like to assure the hon. member that there is no attempt to change the title of the officer nor for that matter the number of the Staff of the Department. At the Hospital we have a Bacteriologist who is exclusively trained in bacteriology; a Pathologist is a Bacteriologist but with specialist qualifications when he becomes a Pathologist. That is beside the point at the moment because we are not toying with the Officers of that Department, but you will remember that in the Estimates that Department was under a separate Head and not tied to the Hospital. For a lot of reasons it was like this in 1934, but as I said earlier, it has outlived its intention, and it is now an integral part of the services of the Institution. It is for that reason that I want to change it and bring it as a Department of the Hospital under the Director of Medical Services rather than let it remain as a Unit standing on its own and not sharing the compound of the Institution. I hope I have answered the hon. member's questions.

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. F. E. MILLER, seconded by Hon. L. StA. THORNE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. F. E. MILLER, seconded by Hon. L. StA. THORNE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. F. E. MILLER, seconded in each case by Hon. L. StA. THORNE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

6.45 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE SALE OF LAND AT TEMPLE YARD

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 sale of land at Temple Yard and the leases of land attached to the Cheapside Market, to the Caribbean Development Company Limited.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, the Caribbean Development Company Limited has bought property in Cheapside on the south of the Cheapside Market and when they applied to the Town and Country Planning Officer, he imposed certain restrictions so as to give more frontage on the road and to make provision for proper sidewalks and so on. They had to set back this building to a considerable extent and because of that the Company applied to the Government to sell or lease it this parcel of land approximately 420 square feet which belongs to the Government at Temple Yard. This portion of land is of no use to the Government. It is just at the back of that building. I do not know if hon. members know of it but it is just a small bit of land just behind the Caribbean Company building and really and truly it is of no use to the Government. They came to us and told us "Well, give us more room to the back so that we can have adequate sidewalks and widen the road at that point."

There is also another piece of land to the north of the building which is just in front of the Market. It is 1,192 square feet and it is proposed to lease them that for a period of 25 years at the rate of $120 per annum. Again, that would not be taken away from the market area any of the amenities there. The strip of land will not be built over and the property of this company would be so constructed that you would have a proper sidewalk all along there. I want to assure members of that. I envisaged that the whole area would be improved and the road widened at that point. As laid down, the Town and Country Planning Officer saw to all of this planning. I would like to assure the House that all these things were done in the interest of the public.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like the Hon. Minister to tell me more about these things. That is why I said sometime ago that it would be a good idea to bring these leases here. All the ideas are not with the Cabinet. My view, Sir, is that the Cheapside Market is going to become too small in a very short time from now. I can see it with the development of things in Bridgetown. The Fairchild Street Market is gradually becoming too small and there is no point in selling land adjacent to places which you will have ultimately to develop. My plan would be that eventually you will have to buy Mr. Pickering's building there. Of course, I know that members of the Government Party would not like to buy out his property there but, as I have said, before you look around twice, all along there is going to be a big development area and because of that, if you want more land there, you will have to pay a lot of money for it. What I would do down there is this. I would build a road so that you could go from St. Mary's Church to the Deep Water Harbour. I would open up a proper frontage from Broad Street until you get to go to the Deep Water Harbour.

The Government has agreed to this lease and the Hon. Minister has said that the land there is of no use. I say that every square inch there you are going to find useful. I am sure that with the development which is going to take place within less than ten years, you will require that strip of land.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture has plans for a cold storage. He is going to find that as soon as he is going in for cold storage, he will have to give encouragement to people who can deposit a large number of things for cold storage.

6.55 p.m.

The Hon. Minister has mentioned Town and Country Planning and the phases of it I would like to know what policy there is about Town and Country Planning in relation to buildings. I am pleased to hear the hon. member talk about these buildings being pushed back. I am saying this for selfish reasons. We were offered £9,000 for the *Beacon* and they said that they were going up in Roebuck Street and put another millstone around their neck; they preferred to have two people to pay rather than having to pay one person. However, the Town and Country Planning Officer told the person who was doing this building that he had to push back the *Beacon* in Maughn's Alley. The people did not buy it, but I cannot understand the position. Now I see that at the corner of James Street, a building is going up in the same place. Alexander Bayley's building is going back the same place. I do not know whether the one on Bay Street has gone (Mr. CRAWFORD: The ground floor has gone back.) Yes, but the top remains in the same place. I have just mentioned these things and I do not know how long it will take for the Minister to reply to me. I know that people have been complaining about what they see in some instances.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Minister be able to reply in five minutes' time?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Yes, Sir. In so far as the points raised by the hon. member are concerned, I would like to tell him that I really do not have the answers to what he has asked; but I promise him that I will get the facts and lay a Statement.

Mr. WALCOTT: It seems to me that you are making some people push back their buildings and others do not do that.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: In the case of a major road it is laid down where the building should be. As soon as you remodel or do anything to a building, it must be such-and-such a distance from the highway.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day next week, Tuesday, 18th July, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 18th July, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

7.05 p.m.