
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1961

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 25th July, 1961.

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

PRESENT

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

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meeting held on 11th July, 1961 have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed.

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

PAPERS LAID

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

Annual report of the Barbados Regiment for the year 1st April, 1959 to 31st March, 1960.

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for twelve months ended 31st March, 1961.

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for one month ended 30th April, 1961.

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for three months ended 30th June, 1961.

Report by the Leeward Islands and Windward Islands Constitutional Conference held in London in June, 1961.

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

An account of the transactions in Rum in the several districts of the Island for the Quarter ended 30th June, 1961.

Report on the Training Scheme Fund for the financial year 1960-61.

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

Annual report of the Barbados Tourist Board for period 1st April, 1959 - 31st March, 1960.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Social Services, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Ninth Annual report of the Social Welfare Department for the period 1st January, 1959 to 31st December, 1959.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$38,600 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1961-62, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1961-62, No. 10 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve part of the funds provided in the Capital Estimates, 1961-62, of the Ministry of Communications, Works & Housing at Part II - Capital Expenditure Head VIII, Item 4, being used to effect urgent improvements at the Belmont-Martindale's Junction and the Cheapside area.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of a parcel of land situate at Melvin's Hill, St. Joseph for the purpose of highway improvement, and for the use and benefit of the public.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$6,730 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1961-62, Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1961-62 No. 11, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$4,471 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1961-62, Part I - Current as shown in the

762

Supplementary Estimate 1961-62, No. 12, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Question No. 42/1961, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy regarding the teaching of West Indian History in grant-aided secondary schools is ready.

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

QUESTIONS

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Health:-

Whether he is aware that a fee of Ten dollars (\$10) is being charged by the General Hospital Authorities for issuing a Medical Certificate in respect of any patient of that institution?

2. Will the Minister take immediate steps to ensure that such certificates are issued free of charge, or, at most, for the actual cost of stationery used for such purpose?

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

Is the Minister aware that over thirty (30) notices to quit have been issued on behalf of Mrs. Mable Eloise Went by her Solicitor as Agent in respect of house spots, situated at Clinkett's, in the parish of St. Lucy, requiring the tenants thereof to quit and deliver up possession, on the 31st day of January, 1962, of the spots aforementioned?

2. Is the Minister aware that, in many instances, these tenants have been in occupation of said spots for decades, and that in all instances, such tenants have nowhere suitable to remove to, if ejected from their present sites?

3. Will the Minister forthwith initiate negotiations for the purchase by Government of this property in order to:-

(a) ensure that this threat now held over the heads of such tenants be immediately dispelled, with the tenants being assured that they may continue as such on Government's acquisition of said property, and

(b) provide grounds for a Social Centre and cricket and football field for the western part of this parish? 12.25 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:

Whether he is aware of the lack of Sanitary Conveniences at Post Offices, especially at such Post Offices where Old Age Pensions are paid?

2. Will the Minister, without delay, take all necessary steps to alleviate such unsatisfactory state of affairs?

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, may I on a point of privilege draw to your attention the fact that up to now there has not been circulated - I do not know to what extent they have been printed - the Government's Development Programme for 1960-65 which was given notice of in this House as long ago as the 4th July, 1961. From what some of us have seen published about it, it is regarded more as the Government Election Manifesto. I do not know whether the Government Printery did not print enough copies to go around or whether the Government Printer thought it was less important to circulate such copies of this Plan to Members of Parliament or thought it more desirable in the first instance to give priority to other sources: but it strikes me as a sad reflection on the method in which things are done in this country that up to now Members of Parliament are not in receipt of this document which was

laid on the Table of this House on the 4th July, last - today is the 25 July - and despite the fact that this matter which stands in the name of the Hon. Premier is set down as No. 5 on the Order Paper.

I feel it incumbent on me to draw it forcibly to Your Honour's attention and to the attention of this Chamber, and I think it is gross contempt by whomsoever is responsible. We, of this Chamber, are the only persons responsible who have not been in receipt of a printed copy of this Plan. I take it that the Government Printer does not expect us to accept what we see in the newspapers as being official and authoritative. There should be some explanation forthcoming to Your Honour, and I think the quicker an apology is made to Your Honour about this matter, the better it would be for all concerned.

Government Business is held up as a result of the non-circulation of this document. May I also say that the first persons who should receive copies of this document are the Members of Parliament in whose Chamber the document was laid. Speaking for myself and for colleagues of my Party, not one of us has received a copy and I understand that we are not the least, as hon. members of other Parties have not received theirs.

I hope, Sir, that such action as you will take will prevent any recurrence of this, whereby this Chamber and members are treated with scant courtesy by those who are responsible for circulating these documents to hon. members after they are duly laid on the Table of this House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I would not like what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has just said to be regarded as a matter from the Official Opposition only; I would like to say that I have been in that position also where I have not received a copy of this Report. Later in this House, I am going to show that this is not the only privilege, but that there are other privileges which have been broken. When this matter was raised on a former occasion, it was regarded from what was said from the Speaker's Chair that it was giving the opening that these things could be circularized and people could use them as they freely pleased, and it has now become an open door for Parliament to be the last place to receive these documents because it is now the case that members of the public can get these things as soon as they are laid and it is not our privilege to receive them at that time.

However, Sir, I will show this House later on that not only the privileges of this House are broken in this matter, but even the debates of this House are being printed in newspapers before they are placed in this House.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I have seen in the newspapers publications of the Five Year Plan and I think that before such document should be published in the Press, it should be circularized among the members of this House. It does not look like co-operation in this way. It is not right that anyone should publish such a document before hon. members of this House, who have been sent here by the people of this Island, have put forward their suggestions to the Government, whether the Government receives their suggestions or not.

Mr. Speaker, publication of the Five Year Plan for 1960-65 has been spread abroad and I do not think it is right to this House; the Plan should be given consideration first by hon. members of this House. We should have sat down and passed our opinions and reasoned together on this matter before it was published in the press. Personally, I do not know really what is in the Five Year Plan because I have not received an official copy. As I have said, I do not think it is co-operation, and I do hope that the Government will make haste and issue to hon. members of this House copies of this document. I repeat that such things should not be published before they are in the hands of hon. members. Why should the public know the contents of the Five Year Plan before hon. members of this House of Assembly? Why is that? Is there a leakage? If there is a leakage, I hope it would be stopped and that proper adjustments would be made so that things would work right in the future.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would not mind if the hon. senior member for St. Peter would repeat what he had to say just now. I would just like to get it clear what the hon. member said.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I agreed with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and said that he was not alone in this matter. I also said that I believe that ruling which came from the Chair on the last occasion that a matter similar to this was being discussed gave the people an open door that they could receive these documents which are laid here before hon. members received them.
12.35 p.m.

I happen to be in that position where I have not received a copy of this document. I further stated that later on in the day I hope to bring to the attention of the House what I regard as a further breach of privilege, in that reports of debates in this House find their way in newspapers because persons are coming to this Chamber and are utilising the facilities and doing things to which Your Honour has not given any approval. I want to show later on where the matter coincides with one opening of the door leading to another. Those are the comments which I made.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to make a few remarks in relation to what has been said by hon. members. I take it that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has raised this point of privilege as soon as he saw that Order No. 5 on the Order Paper was to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the programme of development expenditure contained in the Development Plan 1960-65. I can assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that the Order appearing in today's Order Paper cannot be proceeded with for the simple reason that hon. members have not yet had their copies of the Development Plan 1960-65. Therefore, any fears which hon. members may have had as to a debate taking place on this Order are dispelled. I think that that would answer the question which has been posed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition; I believe that his question was raised because he might have thought that this item appearing on today's Order Paper meant that it might possibly be discussed today.

As far as the hon. senior member for St. Peter is concerned, he referred to some rulings which I made as to the publication of the Five Year Plan and suggested that that gave an open door to the publication of these documents by the Press. Let me assure this House, and the hon. senior member for St. Peter particularly, that I have not opened any door whatever. What I said on the last occasion was this: it has been the custom of the Government, simultaneous with the laying of papers in this House, to release them to the Press, and the Government releasing any document to the Press is something completely out of my jurisdiction. I have opened no door; that has been the custom obtaining here before I was Speaker of this House and probably before I was a boy. A copy of the Report of this Five Year Development Plan has been sent to the Government Printer; I understand that it is still in his safe keeping and it is being checked and proof-read. That is the position with this document as I understand it.

I hope that I have satisfied every hon. member that I have not opened any door; I do not intend to open any door and my action could never be to open any door which would allow the Press to print any document before it is put into the hands of hon. members. A release to the Press is something which is out of my hands altogether. When documents are put in my charge, they are sent as soon as possible to the Government Printer. I cannot treat this matter as a breach of privilege, in any case, not a breach of privilege for which this House would be responsible. Whatever a Government Minister might do in that respect is his responsibility; it is not that of the Speaker.

I have spoken very simply and I hope that every hon. member has understood what I have said. I remember telling this House that some document found its way into the hands of the Press before it was laid in this House.

That happened in 1961; I have no power over that. I do hope that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will have his fears dispelled as to any discussion taking place on this Order No. 5 on the Order Paper for today. I cannot anticipate what the hon. senior member for St. Peter is going to say later on, but I do assure him that there was no intention or action of opening the door in order that the Press might be able to publish any document before it gets into the hands of hon. members. I should like to say that I take my responsibility too seriously ever to be associated with anything of that sort.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1961-62 No. 8

HEAD XV - POLICE - ITEM 42 INCIDENTALS

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the first Resolution is a 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.

First of all, I am asking leave to make an amendment to the Schedule of this Resolution. Hon. members will see under Head XV - Police - that there is the Item 42 - Incidentals. I am asking leave to amend that Item to read "Item 83 - Medical Expenses."

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: As I was saying, this Resolution seeks to provide money to pay certain Medical Officers. These officers are Medical Officers for the Police whose duty it is according to Section 56 of the Police Act, 1908, to attend the Police and prisoners who take sick in the cells. Section 56 reads as follows:

"It shall be the duty of such medical men to visit, whenever necessary, the stations and hospitals under their charge, and prescribe for the men of the Force and persons confined in the police cells who may be reported unwell....."

The rest of the Section goes on with regard to the Fire Brigade. Now in 1953 it was brought to the attention of the Government that these men were examining people and that they were not required under the Police Act to examine such people; and in many cases there were people who were suspected of some criminal charge. I have in mind now examining cases of women where rape was suspected, and also examining drivers of motor cars who might be thought to be under the influence of alcohol. As time went on, these cases increased and the Police Surgeons according to the Act quite rightly said it was not their duty. That was brought to the attention of the Government in 1953, and in 1954 there was a policy decision which said that it was really not the duty of these Police Surgeons, and that when they examined these cases they should be paid extra for them.

However, Sir, somebody omitted to include the fees for these examination in the Estimates, so that for the

period from 1954 onwards, those doctors who should have been paid were not paid because there was no provision in the Estimates. That principle has been accepted by this House because in the Estimates of 1961-62 \$500 was included under medical expenses and the note says "increase to pay fees for medical practitioners"; so that was established and accepted by this House, and this amount now is really required to pay these doctors who have been doing these examinations since 1954 when there was a policy decision that they should be paid for work of this nature. This amount, Sir, clears off the board up to 31st December of this year, and anything coming after that will be paid from the \$500 which I have just mentioned.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, from the Addendum there is disclosed that it was in 1954 that a decision was arrived at that examination of persons in certain cases which are set out does not form part of the duties of Police Medical Officers as the services for which they should be paid fees; but the Addendum goes on to tell us that through an oversight payments were not made to all Police Medical Officers for such services, and in reference to Resolution No. 86/1960 mentioned in the third paragraph of the Addendum, we are reminded that "Incidentals" were supplemented by \$500 to provide for the payment of fees to Police Medical Officers for such services.

I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, how it has happened that these Medical Officers have remained quiet from 1954 to 31st March, 1959 in connection with these fees. It might well be your experience, Mr. Chairman, that doctors are not like lawyers when it comes to getting their fees; they do not make any sport about them, and I just cannot imagine these Practitioners sitting tight from 1954, a matter of about five or six years, without being the recipients of these fees, and yet we did not hear anything about them until now. I wonder if they have been writing continuously to the appropriate Government Department and whether their correspondence has been pigeon-holed, as seems to happen fairly often from time to time and year after year, until at last they have been unable to bear it any longer; and of course this is election year, Mr. Chairman, and Police Medical Officers can be quite effective politically. It may be that they too thank an election year just as members of the Public Service in order to get some redress for their grievances; but it seems a not inconsiderable sum that we are being asked to vote.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Hon. Minister of Finance could assist us with some sort of breakdown, at least 1954 how much, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958 to 31st March, 1959, how many doctors were involved and so on. It would be illuminating to get that information to explain why the amount should be as much as it is and for that long period of time. By now some of these doctors may well be dead. Certainly at least one Police Medical Officer who was functioning and very much alive in 1954 is no longer with us. I take it that steps will be taken to pay to the Executor of his estate such amounts as may be due for him. I have in mind of course the late lamented Dr. Aubrey Kirton who was a Police Medical Officer. There may well be another or more than one other Police Medical Officer whom I just do not have in mind. It is not an amount of course that we could refuse to vote.

12.55 p.m.

It was a policy decision that these matters do not come within the scope of Police Medical Officers. We, as the representatives of the taxpayers, are entitled to know and have a breakdown - to make it clearer to us than it is now and in a more detailed form - as to how much it is each year and whether the provision is being made, in the case of any Police Medical Officer who is deceased, for his estate to benefit from such amounts as were due to the doctor and would have to be paid to him if he were alive.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has asked certain questions. I have here before

me no names of doctors, but the different Police Stations. This applies to the Central Police Station for the years 1954 to 1959 inclusive as well as District "A", District "C", District "D", District "E", Holletown and Belmont. I also see the Police Stations at Worthing, Four Roads, Belleplaine, Hastings, Black Rock, the Bridge and Crab Hill mentioned. All these Police Stations apparently are involved. As I have said, I have not got the names of any doctor but probably the hon. member knows the Police Medical Officers in those areas are the persons who would benefit from this. As regards the point as to whether the estate of any doctor would benefit if that doctor is deceased, I would say, of course that would be so.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Hon. Minister of Finance for that assurance. There was one thing further to which I should refer and I wonder if the Hon. Premier can help me with the answer. It is this. In the case of suspected drunkenness, I have heard it said on many occasions that when the Police take such cases to the General Hospital, a doctor or certain doctors on duty have stated that that does not come within the scope of their duties and as a result have declined from examining such cases.

I wonder if any policy decision has been taken as to whether a doctor on the Hospital Staff is to regard it as part of his duties to examine a case of suspected drunkenness brought to the General Hospital by the Police. Some accident takes place and somebody has been found driving and suspected of doing so under the influence of alcohol. I have heard it stated by Police in the Witness Stand of the Law Courts that the particular doctor in the Casualty - or wherever it was - of the General Hospital refused to examine those cases because they did not regard it as part of their duty. If it were a part of their duty it might well be taken to the General Hospital and the taxpayers would say that there is additional expenditure which they have to pay in view of the policy decision of the Government in respect of extra remuneration for the Medical Officers there. However, I wonder if the Hon. Premier can help me now with that information or would be good enough to let me have it sometime in the near future.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, to answer the hon. member on that point, I would say that I do not know enough about it. What I do know is that if the Police reports to the doctor assigned to the Station - and there is always somebody deputising for the medical officer if he is not here - naturally, the doctor would have to examine the person brought there. I am not in a position to say, as the hon. member has said, that cases were taken to the General Hospital and a doctor or doctors there refused to examine them. If the hon. member insists and wants to know about that, I would enquire and let him know.

Mr. BRANCKER: I would be thankful if the Hon. Premier would supply that information.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the Resolution itself, there is a further mistake in the Schedule. The amount really voted is \$1,675 instead of \$3,000. The figure 3,000 in the column "Voted" is a mistake; it should be 1,675. I draw that to the attention of the Committee.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1961-62, No. 9

DEVELOPMENT OF ART

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave of the House to take this Resolution which stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services.

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

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that hon. members would have read the Addendum as regards this Resolution with respect to the development of Art. I should like to say that this is a decision which has been arrived at lately, but we are positively sure that not

only we of ourselves are aware of the need for the provision of opportunities whereby the individual would be able to pursue his God-given talent; from what transpires here on several occasions, I am perfectly convinced that hon. members on the other side of the Table are equally aware. 1.05 p.m.

During my life as a Teacher I have discovered that various fields after a time have become undeveloped merely because the possessors were rather unfortunate in not having the necessary financial assistance forthcoming from parents and /or guardians. Where the possession of talent for art is prevalent throughout this island, in many instances after the possessor had left school, he had no means of continuing his talent in art. Added to that is the fact that we subscribe to the view that Satan finds mischief for idle hands to do; and if these people cannot find the means of developing what they possess after they leave school, they often drift. I have no hesitation in commending the passing of this Resolution to hon. members. The Addendum points out that the Minister of Education can make use of an expert in this particular field in order to sharpen, or rather heighten, the capabilities of persons whom we employ in the teaching of art.

This person would be employed for a short period of, say, one year, in the first instance, and if the matter proves worthwhile and if the individual gives satisfactory service, then we will ask that the period of his service be extended. The amount of money which has been asked for here will cover the cost of travelling and salary and the provision of material which is to be used. I thought that the file would have been coming here with the Premier's files and therefore unfortunately, I am not in a position to give hon. members a break-down of this amount. However, if I am allowed to depend upon my memory in respect of what happened when this matter was considered at Cabinet level, I would say that I have a vague idea of what the travelling allowance would be sixty dollars per month and the cost of material would be negligible. We are not going to do any top-notch work as a start; we will be making use of crayons, shop paper and that sort of thing. Therefore, the cost of material would not be very high. The salary of the Officer would be anywhere around \$200 or \$240 a month. I would prefer to get the facts from the file and give them to hon. members later on. There is hardly anything more for me to say on this matter because it is not a matter which could be considered as being controversial. I have much pleasure in moving that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who has just sat down is quite correct in saying that there is no controversy in this matter; indeed there could not be any controversy in it. There will, of course, be some criticism from myself, which criticism will be by no means destructive, and it might guide the Minister in matters of this sort. In the first place, as I have said in another connection, if you are dealing with a matter which affects a lot of people, and you want to encourage a particular form of activity, the very first thing you ought to do is to allow people to know that it is an activity in which they can engage and that you will help them in it. What I mean is this: it is true that there is a lot of artistic talent among young people and the Government's policy, initiated some years ago at Combermere School, has borne a lot of fruit. It was a happy idea to have encouraged the teaching of and instruction in art at Combermere School by the appointment of Mr. Carl Broodhagen. That happy event had two objects; one was to stimulate interest in painting and sketching among the young people and also to pay public recognition to very distinguished Barbadian Artists. This happy plan of Mr. Broodhagen in teaching interested pupils has more than justified the outlay which has been spent on it. Also in another connection although of a similar nature, was the decision at Combermere and other schools to encourage a greater musical appreciation in the employment of Mr. James Millington to teach violin music, and Mr. Gerald Hudson had been doing that with singing in one or two schools before that. What we are doing now therefore is in one sense a continuation of that practice on a wider basis.

My criticism is this: I fear that we cannot get as much out of this matter as we deserve because we have not yet

made it clear to young people that artistic talent is something which we really want to foster in this island. It is true that there are a number of cultural organisations which exist for music and otherwise. It is true that the Barbados Arts Council is rendering yeoman service in appreciation of these matters and it has encouraged interest by bringing before the public distinguished artists who are usually excellent poets from overseas and at the same time it encourages local talent. But much more than that is needed. In the first place, we live in an age in an island where the capacity and ability to earn one's living has broken down with parents of young people and it is no use saying on the one hand that you want to encourage artistic appreciation and artistic interests if parents feel at the same time that no future lies in that direction; it has got to be made clear that the encouragement which the community is giving to young people in artistic fields is equal to that which the Government will give to young people in other chosen fields. In other words, if you really and seriously want to encourage the arts, you have got to award scholarships. As much as you have talented painters, sculptors and sketchers their knowledge and outlook can affect their techniques, and just as there is opportunity for doctors, agricultural experts, scientists and other persons, parents must feel that this inclination, this expression of the development of their particular talent, will never debar in any way their children or their wards from earning a living.

That brings us to another point.
1.15 p.m.

I am afraid at the moment that West Indian Society, Mr. Chairman, is not sufficiently appreciative of the arts. Only the other day I was reading a statement by Mr. Jan Carew, a very brilliant Guianese novelist - and I believe his sentiments have been echoed by Mr. Lamming - to the effect that the climate of thinking in the West Indies is not sufficiently well developed for West Indian artists to live at home. Now these people do not mean that the community is too small; they do not mean that because the reading public in the West Indies is not as large as elsewhere, it prevents them from living at home; what they mean is that they do not discover enough dynamism and enough pulsating life in the community to encourage the artist to give of his best.

While it is a profitable exercise maybe to have an Art teacher and encourage young people to be able to bring out their talent and develop it, at the same time the community itself has got to do very much more to make the young artists feel that what they are reflecting and putting on canvass, in music or in rhyme is an accurate reflection of the life of the community around them. If the community is alive and is going places, the artist will reflect that prosperity and that pulsating life, so that the Minister cannot just rest on the appointment of an Art teacher. He should not approach this matter so hesitantly as to say he will appoint a man for one year to see how it goes on. This is something really big and really important, and I cannot imagine, Mr. Chairman, any artist who is worth his salt taking without misgiving an assignment of this nature on these terms.

I do not know, of course, whom the Minister of Social Services proposes to appoint in the first place, but I do hope that the Ministry of Education will take a more active interest in this matter than the Minister himself seems to indicate. If you really want in the first place to give public recognition to the splendid work which has been done by Barbadian artists - and there are about half a dozen of them who are really good - the first thing you need to do is to make them feel that they are people who are worthwhile in our community. While it may seem that \$240 a month is a princely sum to offer to someone starting a venture like this, if the man or woman who is to be appointed really knows what he or she is worth, he will very soon tell Government that Government is underpaying him. You cannot of course compute in dollars and cents what an artist is really worth; but if you wish to give status to the teacher himself, you should pay him at least what you pay a specialist in one of the First Grade Secondary Schools. That is the first approach you should make; and you need not and should not appear hesitant or shame-faced in a matter like this. If he is a good painter or a good sculptor, you cannot compute in monetary terms what he or she is really worth, but at least

you have a workable rule by regarding him or her as a specialist, and paying him at least what you would pay a specialist teacher in a comparable field. That is how I feel about it.

The last point I want to make is this: while it is true that there has not yet been any great outcry or demand on the part of our people for training in the Arts, it is certain that they will as soon as Independence comes and there is national consciousness as well as a more positive awareness of the cultural contribution which the West Indies as a multi-racial society can make to the life of the world, and young people are going to clamour for more opportunities to develop their talents. We should not wait until that time to let it be known that we are prepared to reward genuine talent by the offer of scholarships; therefore the best job and the first job an Art teacher should set himself to is a fact-finding one - how much talent there is, of what kind, how is it distributed, how can it be channelled and how can the persons who possess it be suitably trained.

I would not be surprised at all if within a couple of years we found ourselves sending our people to State Schools of Fine Arts in the United Kingdom or similar schools and academies in the North American continent, or urging upon the University College of the West Indies to have a School of Art established. All of that is going to come and our community should be made clear of what rich rewards there are for people who want to enrich its cultural life. The Minister, I am afraid, is a bit hesitant and apparently a little apologetic. There is no reason to be. This is a good thing; and with imagination and boldness quite a lot can come out of it because we really want to see our people do it, though we suspect that they can do much. If we can induce painters, sculptors and craftsmen to hold their own and reflect a variety of West Indian life, that is as great a contribution as we would be reasonably expected to make in our time and generation.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister replies, I would like to make a few observations and I would ask him if he could give us a little more detail if he has it. If I ask for the detail it certainly is not from the point of view of embarrassing him; it would be chiefly because we are so deeply interested in this project. Can we know, Sir, if it is expected that we would be getting a Barbadian or West Indian to do this job? Can we expect that we may be seconding one of our Barbadian artists to this position? I am not saying that the Ministry of Social Services has already made an appointment, but I would just like to know what might be the general feeling. I should also like to know a little more of the mechanics of how this Art teacher would be going about the work which is assigned to him or her. Would you be making use of all the material you find around your Social Centres? Would the people be expected to make some subscription or contribution to the Art classes? Would you be taking material or personnel from the various Youth groups that you have with your Social Department, and as I mentioned already, will they be expected to make some contribution? I am not saying that with the idea that I believe the classes should be entirely free. I do not subscribe to the idea that they should be entirely free or that they should be charged. It is a matter of how the Art teacher and the Social Welfare Department work which would be a reflection of the joint Ministries of Education and Social Services in going about tackling this problem.

Again, I would like to ask whether it would be a general kind of Art teacher, or whether we are expected to get a kind of specialist in one particular branch of the Arts. 1.25 p.m.

As I have said, these are just some of the details and the mechanics for operating a scheme like this which the Minister might or might not have. I am certain that he will admit, as I think he indicated in his opening remarks, that there is justification to think that this is a matter of further education; so I hope he would further be able to enlighten us on these details.

Sir, I would like to close with a general observation. I regard this as just another part or pattern of our social development. I consider that a government in a self-

governing territory should be able to generate that kind of cultural leadership which is necessary, and I believe that this is just a start in that direction. I would like to emphasize that I consider a problem like this has to be tackled boldly, resolutely, comprehensively and unhesitatingly. In that respect, I tend to go along with other points of view. There might be good reasons for a one-year contract for the person to carry out this scheme and certainly if it is a one-year contract you will have some local person in mind rather than some person from overseas. However, I would like to see it included in the Government's policy for further education so that we could easily tackle it in a more comprehensive manner. I take it that the answer would be that this is just a pilot scheme: but even if it is a pilot scheme as to how you would want to pursue the matter in the future, I want it to be noted that this is the general feeling in which we want you to go in the future.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I have nothing against this Resolution but I would like to give some suggestions with respect to this matter of education. I would say that we do need an Art Teacher in this Island.

What has caused me to speak on this Resolution is that I have been made to understand that at some Secondary Schools which are not under the Government's jurisdiction, some of the teachers and masters are taking advantage of the pupils, and are telling them that they have to pay \$1.00 a term towards their learning to repair their school-master's car. You can very well see what that would mean to a school with 400 boys.

I think the time has come, whether it is this Government - or another in power - but I hope that whatever Government it is, will provide suitable secondary schools where our children can be taught properly because there is no doubt that Private Secondary Schools of today are taking advantage of the community and the only possible means of stopping it is for the Government to build more secondary schools which would be able to accommodate the school population of Barbados. In that way, they would be able to get teachers who would guide and lead the children in the right way.

I say that you should bring down Art teachers regardless of whether they come from Hong Kong or not. Of course, if Barbados can produce them we will use them; but if our Island cannot produce them, we must get them from Hong Kong or any other part of the world. I have been throughout the length and breadth of Barbados and I have heard the cries of poor Barbadians when the time comes for them to pay the school fees for their children. They have to pay exorbitant fees to Private Secondary Schools because this Government does not have sufficient secondary schools for the children. I hope the time will come when Government will build more secondary schools. Sir, if I go a little off the mark, I hope you will give me a little latitude.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am trying.

Mr. CORBIN: As far as I remember, Sir, the fee at the Alleyne School which is in my parish is \$6.00 a term and in Private Secondary Schools, the fee is between \$18 and \$20 a term.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think I have given the hon. member sufficient latitude. Let us get back to the Resolution.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, I am trying to build my point in the right way. Sir, I hope that all hon. members will support this Resolution which is before us and will do so unanimously. It would be a help to our educational system. It would help the children. We know that there are some children who leave school and just knock around; therefore, we should think of the best way and methods for educating our children. This is a means of controlling them from going astray. As I was saying, I hope the time will come when this Government will be able to have all private schools abolished and will be able to take over the whole educational system and be responsible entirely for it so that we would not have to be commenting on this and that.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply to one or two points which were made by the respec-

dive speakers on this matter. As regards the point which was made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, I thought that when I was introducing this Resolution I said that I take it that hon. members had read the Addendum and were conversant with what was stated, but I have discovered that it does not seem that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has read the Addendum.

The Addendum states:

"The Government has for some time been concerned at the need which exists in a large section of the community for a greater understanding of and participation in the development of art. Provision exists in some of the secondary schools for the development of individual artistic talents and in many primary schools the teaching of elementary drawing and paintings has for some years been a part of the curriculum."

1.35 p.m.

The Addendum to this Resolution goes on to state this:-

"There is, however, a need for the net to be spread much wider afield to try and attract the interest of the many young people in the community among whom there must be a great deal of natural talent and for whom little opportunity exists for developing their talent after they leave school."

It is not a matter of the Government not knowing what is required; it is definitely what is set out here; it is not only the teachers with whom we are dealing in this way, but we also want to provide facilities for persons who are out of school, whether they are children or grown-ups, and we intend to spread the net as far afield as is humanly possible. To confirm what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said, this is a pilot scheme. We are not prepared more or less to put ourselves in a position where we find that we are making remarkable provision and then we do not get the necessary patronage.

In connection with the figures which have been quoted, I particularly said that they were tentative figures. When hon. members reflect on the fact that this Resolution really concerns the Ministry of Social Services, I think that they will be willing to agree that the absence of the file can be pardonable. I have not got the file here but I have just tried to give hon. members a breakdown of this amount. I want to convince hon. members that this scheme is under the Ministry of Social Services and that the Hon. Minister will push it as far as he possibly can. We are prepared wherever possible to make as much use as we are allowed to make of the services of this particular person when he has been appointed. Relative to the question as to whether the students will be called upon to bear expenses or not, my own feeling is that they will not be called upon so to do.

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply, one with an amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ORDERS POSTPONED

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to postpone Orders Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5, and that Order No. 6 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

ESTATE AND SUCCESSION DUTIES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Estate and Succession Duties Act, 1941.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Order, as hon. members will see, is a Bill to amend the Estate and Succession Duties Act, 1941. Hon. members will realise that for many years now, since 1957, the Government has been saying this: "Debentures purchased under this issue will be accepted at par in payment of death duties by the Commissioner of Inland Revenue where they form part of the assets of an estate liable to death duties." It is felt that, as the Act now stands, it is doubtful whether the Revenue Department is really authorised to do that. This Bill therefore seeks to amend the Estate and Succession Duties Act, 1941, in order to remove any doubt which may exist in the matter and it sets out quite clearly what the Commissioner of Inland Revenue is authorised and shall have power to do. This is a short Bill. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. 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.

The two Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

1.45 p.m.

CUSTOMS TARIFF (CONDITIONS FOR SPECIAL EXEMPTION FROM DUTY) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1961.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 7 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House to move the passing of a Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled "The Customs Tariff (Conditions for Special Exemption from Duty) (Amendment) Regulations, 1961."

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, in this Resolution, members will see that there is a slight amendment to provide for discretionary powers to be given to the Comptroller of Customs in so far as exporting or re-exporting goods which are brought into the island duty-free are concerned. As the Addendum points out, Sir, under the Customs Tariff (Conditions for Special Exemption from Duty) Regulations, certain items and materials for the manufacture of clothing and so on are allowed to be imported into the island duty-free with the understanding that these items must be utilised within a period of two years. Automatically after two years have expired these items are subject or liable to duty.

We have recently amended these Regulations to give the Comptroller of Customs certain discretionary powers. In other words, the Comptroller can, if he thinks fit, and in the interest of the community, extend that period of two years for any time he thinks reasonable. If after that these goods are not utilised, duty will have to be paid on these goods. No mention was made of the question of exporting or re-exporting these goods. It has been represented to the Ministry that certain items or materials for the making of clothing have been imported which have not been used up; the fashion and type of cloth having been changed makes it dif-

difficult for the manufacturers to get rid of that material. The manufacturers however, are in a position to sell that cloth outside of the island. As you know, Sir, models change from time to time, and the type of material which people like or dislike, as the case may be; and there will no doubt be at times cloth which does not fit into the modern trend or pattern of things. That has been our experience: and, as I said, it has been represented to us and the manufacturers have asked that consideration be given to the non-payment of duty if those materials are to be re-exported.

For that reason, this Resolution is before the House, and it merely seeks to give the Comptroller that power to allow these goods to be exported out of the island without having to pay duty. It has been the principle of the Government - or one of the principles of this Government - and maybe former Governments - to allow items which come into the island but which were not consumed in the island to be exported without having to pay duty, and in some cases where the items were dutiable, a refund was given to the importers of these items. This is in keeping with the principle enunciated years ago and the policy of the Government not to impose duty on items which are re-exported.

With those remarks, 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 will take this opportunity to draw to the attention of the Government and of this House that there is no general objection to this amendment. What I would like to point out to the Government is that we are fast approaching a period in which the whole Trade Act, Customs Duties, and Pioneer Status should be examined in the light of reality.

Mr. Speaker, printing is one of those things which should be given exemption. I say that, and I hope the Government will bear the full burden of their responsibility in this matter when I have finished pointing out to them certain patent errors. Printing today is in need of this type of protection, because when you compare the wages of Printers with the wages of these people, you cannot allow such wage-earners to become unemployed while you encourage people to pay \$8, \$9 and \$10 a week and in some instances there is nothing approximating a living standard.
1.55 p.m.

There is nothing approximating a living standard wage in these businesses.

I have in my possession here a copy of an agreement with one of the printing houses of this Island, and yesterday I concluded an agreement with another: and in all cases these printing establishments pay wages above the ordinary level. At the *Advocate* Printing Office they are paying a senior linotypist \$50 a week and a journeyman linotypist \$40 a week. Because of this, the Government should not let work go out of Barbados so as to cause redundancy in this trade.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. What has printing to do with the Resolution before us?

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, would you regard that as a point of order or a point of stupidity? Can any hon. member seriously say that printing has nothing to do with the Resolution before us when that Resolution deals with the Trade Act in which you exempt certain people from paying customs duty? I am pointing out that the printing trade is one in which you should give exemptions from customs duty. I really do not want to raise my blood pressure too early; I want to reserve it until later.

The Hon. Minister introduced this Resolution and asked the House to approve of it. I said that the whole question of Customs Duty, Pioneer status and all of those things should be examined and I went on to say that I am taking this opportunity to point out that in the printing trade where some of these facilities and privileges, as are contained in this Resolution, are not granted, the trade is threatened with re-

dundancy and that I am asking the Government to look into this matter because, as an example, the wages paid in the printing industry are higher than wages paid in some of those businesses which you allow customs duty. I then went on to give an example and said that I have a copy of an agreement between the *Advocate* newspaper and the Union and the *Advocate* was paying a senior linotypist \$50 a week and journeyman \$40 a week. I said that in this printing trade you have a situation in which certain printing which could have been done in this island is not being done and is sent overseas and that must of necessity lead to redundancy in the trade.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

On re-assembling,

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

The Bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

TEACHING OF WEST INDIAN HISTORY IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. The first is Question No. 42 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:

Is the Minister aware that:-

- (1) West Indian History is now being taught at G.C.E. "O" Level in some Grant-aided Secondary Schools?
- (2) some of the Teachers, though competent to teach it, have, nevertheless, little acquaintance with the other territories of the Federation?

2. Would the Minister, therefore, be prepared to explore with his opposite numbers in other territories, the possibility of exchange familiarisation tours during the summer vacation?

3. If the Minister is willing to explore such possibility and if his exploration prove successful, will he give the earliest intimation to all the schools concerned?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the questions which have been asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, the answers are as follows:

"1. (1) Yes, Sir. (ii) It is quite possible that some of the teachers are not familiar with all the other territories of the Federation."

"2. I have some doubt of the value of such tours for the purpose of teaching history. I prefer to arrange for participation in conferences and seminars as was done last year when the Schools were represented at a conference held in Trinidad on the teaching of W.I. History under the auspices of U.C.W.I. This was the second of its kind, the first being held in Barbados in 1957 when 42 local teachers took part."

"3. This Government is not in a position at present to promise substantial financial aid, but I am willing to do what I can to support any familiarisation tour for teachers which seem likely to be of lasting benefit to schools in Barbados."

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the first supplementary question is this. In view of the fact that the Hon. Minister has had four months to answer this question, would he say whether in that time he made any contact with his opposite members in other Governments or with the appropriate

Minister in the Federal Government or with a member of the U.C.W.I., or all of them on this question?

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like the hon. member to clarify the question a bit by explaining what he means by the meaning of "contact". I think the answers given are very, very clear. I said that to provide the assistance as is being done we had two such conferences. Then I went on to say that if there is any possibility of getting the finance I would be willing to do what I can to support familiarisation tours. Therefore, I have not made any contact with anybody in any colony in respect to these tours.

Mr. TUDOR: Sir, I further would like to ask whether at these conferences such as the one which was held in 1959 and the one which was held last year, there were included teachers of History in Private Secondary Schools as well as teachers in the Grant-aided Secondary Schools? 2.35 p.m.

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, speaking offhand, I am not in a position to say whether teachers of other schools were there. What I do know is that there is no objection to teachers of private schools taking part.

Mr. TUDOR: When the Minister says that there is no objection to teachers of Private Schools taking part, does he mean that it is the policy of the Government to encourage them to do so?

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: It is a question of Government policy being formulated, but, speaking as Minister of Education, I would have no objection to that.

Mr. TUDOR: I take it then that if and when the next one comes up, the Minister will be prepared to allow it to be known to these schools that they may take part if they so wish.

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: As soon as the policy of the Government is formulated, I will give consideration to what the hon. member has suggested.

Mr. STRAUGHN: With reference to the conference which the Hon. Minister mentioned earlier, would he say whether it is envisaged that these Conferences either sponsored by Federal Government or by the U.C.W.I., which would be included in the Federal Government, will be regular Conferences or whether they will just be held when somebody thinks that there is need for them?

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: As a result of past events, I feel that these Conferences will be annual fixtures.

Mr. TUDOR: Failing the exchange of familiarisation tours and as a supplement to the seminars and conferences which are held from time to time, would the Minister consider having all possible use made of films of West Indian life, for exchange within the territories, on West Indian education including our own territory?

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: I would be very much in favour of such a measure being launched.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the replies to further questions are not yet ready.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business, Order No. 1. (After a pause)

RESOLUTION re MEASURES FOR THE ALLEVIATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 is to resume debate on a Resolution relative to short term and long term measures for the alleviation of unemployment. Does any other hon. member want to speak on this item before the hon. Mover replies?

Mr. STRAUGHN: Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I am quite certain that everyone in this House and outside of it would consider that the problems which have been adumbrated by the Mover of this Resolution and also by the Hon. Minister of Communications, are problems in our midst. I do not think that anyone would tend to believe that they are insuperable or even terrible; they are big problems and with resolution, foresight and hardwork, I think they can be solved. The Resolution which the hon. senior member for St. Peter has brought before this House is in connection with the establishment of the Deep Water Harbour and the immediate dislocation of labour on the waterfront; it is also in connection with other contingencies such as certain sugar factories and so forth. I would like to say that even although this is a problem which immediately hits the island, I would interpret it as just to be a part of this total problem of unemployment, underemployment and industrial development. If I may use the topography of this place as an example, when one is coming over the Swing Bridge, the first thing that hits one's eye about the Public Buildings is the clock; but when you get into the precincts of these Buildings you will find that the clock is just an important part but not necessarily the biggest part of the fabric of this building. I picture this problem of the immediate dislocation of labour on the waterfront in the same pattern. Obviously, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, as the chief representative of the official Trade Union in this island, is viewing this matter with justifiable concern. The Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, when he spoke on the last occasion, showed that the Government was not dragging its feet in relation to this problem. I am very pleased to see that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is showing this dynamic interest as he would certainly want it to be interpreted, because my recollection goes back to about two years ago when I made some comments on this problem as a result of the Deep Water Harbour in this very House. It was in answer to some Resolution which had been brought down here, and the hon. member asked what was the Government doing about it; he said that the Government had not told us how they were going to operate the Harbour. My reply was that just in view of the circumstances it was important; I said that I would not like to tell anybody that the problems which will come out of the opening of this Deep Water Harbour are problems purely for the Government as such; I consider the Deep Water Harbour as it is, and as it will be developed, to be everybody's problem. I would expect the Government to be working on the mechanics of operation and of the consequences which would follow on the opening of the Deep Water Harbour. I would expect the commercial interests to give the matter some study. Just before I made those remarks, the commercial interests had just reported that they had studied the information which some delegation of theirs had brought to them; I think it was a survey team which they had sent to visit other parts of the world. I said that I would expect the Union, as the Official Representative of the workers and an integral part of this composite picture, to be working on some detailed memorandum on the problems and how they would suggest that these problems would be tackled. I do not know if the hon. member was in a bad mood at that particular time or what, but his immediate reply to me was this: "Don't mind what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said; his remarks are just superficial." Well, they might have been superficial then, but I do not think they could be taken as being superficial now. However, the consequence of the Deep Water Harbour is everybody's problem. I would not have the information available and I would not, even if I had it available, be able to go into the details and the statistics as to the number of people or the amount of money involved and things like that.

2.45 p.m.

I believe the Union and the Ministry of Labour should have these particular details at their fingertips. Yesterday I was trying to get hold of what I would have thought to be comparative figures of the cost of harbours in other parts of the world in relation to the total budget of other countries. I did not get the figures I expected, and therefore, as I said, I will speak in general terms.

This harbour costing \$28 million is a big project. It involves a lot of things and a lot of people. I do not think there is any country in the world that has undertaken a

project which was really equivalent to the total year's budget of that country. I do not know if there has ever been. However, I want to get to what I consider the fundamentals of the situation, and it is the people involved. I would place my emphasis right here Mr. Speaker, and it is this: let the Union even though it is late, let the commercial interests even though it is late, and let the Government even though it is late understand that for the total benefit and progress of Barbados and the West Indies, we must pay particular interest to the development of our human resources in this island.

Now you might say that to solve the immediate problems of these workers down there you should open the East Coast Road and start building houses and let people get work. There is a tendency so often in Barbados, when you ask somebody what kind of work he can do, to be told that he is willing to do any kind of work. That is the most immediate answer which you hear so often. If one has lived in an industrial community as I have for eight years, and you have seen machines turning all around you, knowing that one Department might close down and others open up, you will realise that as people in an industrial community or who are trying to industrialise, we will have to think in these terms. People will need to have the requisite skills by which they will be able to take advantage of any changes in the industrial market, and therefore when you reach a situation in which you find that you have a labour force, a substantial fraction of which is in no way highly skilled, you see the problem which faces you now in its true proportion, because you are saying that you should embark on a new project which will employ these people and any other people. We seem to forget immediately that just as you might decide to embark on a project within a matter of minutes and might even gather your material within a matter of weeks or months, it does not necessarily mean that you can gather the skilled work force you are looking for probably within a matter of many months or years.

Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that there are not short term projects that can be indulged in, as the Hon. Minister of Communications referred to which the Government was considering; but as I said, I want to feel that a concerted effort is made particularly by the three units that I consider to be the most important operating factors in this whole issue, and those are the Government, commercial interests and the Union particularly. I believe that public opinion would back up any project like that in which it felt that you made a concerted effort so to develop the skills of your work forces that if and when - and I should not say "if" any longer, I should say "when" - and as soon as you do embark on any projects of an industrial nature or where you can utilise your work force, you would not have to open the doors of a factory and then say you do not have any people to work in it, or that you have a lot of people outside the doors, but you cannot bring them inside because they cannot do the work.

I have said on previous occasions, and I think figures and events have proved that to be correct, that the Barbadian individual worker could be a good investment for development. I have checked figures of ours which show that we are a good community which would be willing to undertake any project or submit to any training that is essential to that kind of development. I do not want us to become complacent as we have done in generations past and in a pre-technological society, and I feel that because we had good skilled workers in the horse and buggy days, that in this jet age we can become good workers on the technological transition which takes place at a faster rate, and which puts additional pressure on everybody involved to make sure that you develop the skills of your work force with the greatest haste. Learning and teaching take a much longer time than a lot of people would like to admit or understand; but because the fact that it takes that length of time means that we should have been working earlier. Let it be understood that we must work harder and faster to develop the skills of the people, because whatever project you think about, fundamentally it is going to come to the same thing. We do not want to get the answers we get nowadays, "Well, Skipper, I am willing to do any kind of work." That is the kind of answer that comes in a non-industrial community; but when you develop your community

to a higher industrial level, you find that people will be able to say that they have skills for this kind of thing and that kind of thing, and in general the industrial climate of the place would be of such, and the educational programme and the social development programme should be so geared to it that you would find people fitting into any industrial change or development which you have in the place.

I say, Sir, that we do not gainsay the immediate or the urgent aspects of this problem, and we do not in any way deny it; but I should not like to feel that it is left unsaid or unthought of that the real basic problem we have is to be sure that we do develop the personnel and the work force involved that they can take advantage of any change that we bring about. When I said earlier that I considered the Barbadian work force to be a good investment, I will give just two examples that straight away come to my mind. In the Northern District Council an executive on the Sandy Lane project told us that they had got through what they had embarked on more quickly than they had anticipated and it cost less than they had originally budgeted for. That was said in the presence of a number of us. I knew it was the same development work which had taken place on the Mill Reef in Antigua and I knew that they did not pay any lower wages than they paid there; but it meant this to me: it meant that they had good, adequate and skilled provision from the foreman level right up and it also meant that they had a reasonably good and adaptable work force with which to get through their project.

2.55 p.m.

It might also mean that they had a good climate because I think the hon. senior member for St. Peter would know that up to a few years ago, masons and bricklayers were the highest paid artisans in the U.S.A., but being in the building trade, they do not get continuous work throughout the year. From what I know, it has something to do with the climate. As I have said, there is need for a good and adaptable work force.

Sir, we opened the Deep Water Harbour some months before the scheduled time. It pays a contractor if he finishes work before the scheduled time. Every contractor, if he makes a contract, if it is a contract to be finished in eighteen months or two years, likes to finish it four months before the scheduled time. I think that by and large we have had done a pretty good job of the harbour. We have heard a representative of Messrs. Costain Limited admit that besides the fact that you had a very co-ordinating plan and proper planning and engineering and besides the fact that you had good foreman supervision, you also had available quite a good adaptable work force. He said that we found in a reasonable short time Barbadian labour which was able to make use of heavy equipment almost accident free. I have been associated with heavy industry for eight years of my formative life, and I can tell you that we paid particular regard to the safety measures and that workers would be able to operate accident free. It means so much in the last analysis as regards general efficiency and insurance.

Sir, those remarks certainly struck me very forcibly. If we admit in general that we have a reasonably good work force to work with, it should give us all the more encouragement. Now that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is in his place, I want to bring him in to say that we should take a resolute stand in this matter and see that there should be proper development of the work force of this island. I would like to feel that the Workers Union in which the hon. member would be particularly interested would adopt a policy of concentrating not only on your own building which is important - it certainly gives you dignity and zest to carry on with your work - you should concentrate not only on your bargaining about wages and working conditions for members of your Union, but also for the future if you can give as much encouragement and enlightenment to your present members to see to it that their skills would be so developed that when you have a problem like this it does not catch you with your hands down and it does not catch you in the position that the very people whom you want to help, you cannot give them the help you can because they cannot make use of it. I consider that a problem for any industry, for workers representatives and for Government.

Sir, there is a little aspect to this particular problem. We have a slightly different facet from what I am acquainted with in other industrial communities. By that I mean it has been necessary for one reason or the other, for Government to be providing the money given to the Displaced Workers Allowance Board. The kind of problem with which I am acquainted is the type that in big industrial communities you will find because of some technological change or some reason of decreasing your work force, that a section of industry would be closing down, that the employers themselves in collaboration with the workers; representatives would have already worked out a plan, what they call in American industry, a lay-off plan; and that you do not think of giving your moral support to this technological change unless and until you know that they have given some consideration to the way in which they would treat the workers who would be laid off.

Sir, I am particularly proud, when I look around Barbados and see some of my colleagues and comrades who had worked in Aruba and other oil companies in those parts, to find that some of them are in the taxi business or doing some form of business. They have been able to take their lay-off allowance and invest it in something. It is a fact that these workers who would find themselves laid off are people to whom you would not only have to give their regular benefits but also they must be given this lump sum for lay-off so that when they are laid off they would be able to get off to a new start in life. I do not know what other hon. members of this House would say on this problem which I have just mentioned, but it shocks me a bit when people tell me that they have worked at Sandy Lane and when they thought they would have been given some lay-off allowance, they have not got any. I do not know if these people have been speaking the truth, but here it is: the Government had to make some sort of provision for the workers who would be laid off as a result of the coming into operation of the Deep Water Harbour. I do not know why Government should have had to foot this Bill alone when there were so many other organisations. I am only saying on a point of principle that it certainly shocks me that people who work not far from where I live tell me: "I worked at Sandy Lane and I have not seen anything coming out of it yet." It strikes me as very strange because I am accustomed that before any project closes down, it is known to the workers and everybody what allowances are provided for them because the people in business say that putting them out of work was no fault of their own.

3.05 p.m.

I take it as something for granted; I start with that as a basis. You can understand therefore that it shocks me when people say that they are not getting anything. The Minister and the representative of the Union may have some more details to add, but that is my attitude and reaction when people tell me that they have no allowance.

Getting back to the point of the Resolution which is before us, I said that I was trying to get some detailed figures yesterday but I did not succeed in getting the kind of figures which I wanted; yet there is a general principle on which I would like to operate and on which I would like to see a debate of this nature proceed. It is not that one is not in favour of any particular motion which somebody has moved, but it is that I do consider that the real base of this matter is to be sure that all possible effort, and a really heavy effort, be made for the development of personnel involved. If you make that kind of effort, then all sections of the community are encouraged and told that they are expected to make that effort in the general development of the work forces of this island.

When you talk about short-term or long-term projects or industrial development, with the sure and certain knowledge that you have been making the human base, that you will develop the human resources, you can go ahead with more confidence in facing the future. You do not think that the future is something awesome, but you think of the present. My closing remarks on this matter is that one would vote for the Government or otherwise in a matter of this sort; it is only to say that you will have confidence that the present Labour Government or any other Party would be able to handle this problem. That is how you start with problems; you show that you have the confidence of dealing

with them; but there is a lot of consideration to be given to the details. I want to say, as I have said so often before, that I regard this problem as everybody's problem. I was saying that two years ago. I do not want to be a prophet, but now I see that the chickens are really coming home to roost. You need to give a fillip to industrial development, first of all to the development of your people. I have said several times before that I regard the Minister of Education as my Minister of Development. I cannot repeat that too often; let us apply our human resources and these problems will fall into their proper perspective. I say: let the present time be a time of challenge; do not let the future be a damp and awesome spectacle.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, on the fourth July.... (Mr. SPEAKER knocked the gavel.)

Mr. SPEAKER: From the records I notice that on the 4th July at 4.30 p.m. of the clock, the hon. member was speaking when Government Business was resumed. The hon. member began to speak but he had not resumed his speech. I think that the hon. member may only speak now with the leave of the House.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to continue to speak on this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to continue to speak on this Resolution, he having begun to speak on it, but having to stop when Government Business was resumed on the 4th July. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the hon. member. (After a Pause) There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. member.

Mr. CORBIN: This Resolution is a very important one and that is why I would like to continue to speak on it. This Resolution is in connection with short-term and long-term measures for the alleviation of unemployment. We understand that the Deep Water Harbour has come into operation and that has caused lots of people to be out of work. We do not want to comment any more on the Deep Water Harbour because that has already been finished; if it is a success we have to be satisfied, and if it is not a success we have to be satisfied because it has already been completed. However, we do hope that it will be a success. It is now our duty to find ways and means of relieving unemployment; we have to put our suggestions together and work out the best ways and means of relieving unemployment. It is useless our getting here and elaborating on everything; it is just a question of our putting forward our suggestions; whether the Government accepts them or not, we have to put them forward.

Mr. Speaker, the first of my suggestions to the Government is that they should erect a cement factory in this island, which would relieve lots of the unemployed. This is something to which displaced workers as a result of the Deep Water Harbour are accustomed; they are accustomed to be lifting and loading materials. If we had such a factory in this island, we would not have to buy cement from other countries; on the other hand, we would be able to supply the neighbouring countries with cement and that would be a boon to this country. I believe that in view of the greater development which is taking place in this island, we will have to use a great quantity of cement; and if, as I said, we could provide it, we would not have to purchase it from any other country. Therefore, a cement factory would be a great help to this island for the alleviation of the unemployment situation.

3.15 p.m.

Another suggestion which I should like to bring to the attention of the Government is the erection of the East Coast Road. The day that the East Coast Road comes into operation, the Government of Barbados will see the great help it will be to the economy of this country and to the relief of the unemployed. When I speak about the East Coast Road, I do not mean a road from Bridgetown to St. Andrew; I am speaking of a road from St. Andrew to Cattlewash. If there were a road which could get us from St. Andrew to Cattlewash, it would be a great boon to this country.

Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of people with millions of dollars in their hands waiting to invest on that East

Coast Road which I am certain would be of help to the entire island. It would help the masons, carpenters, painters and domestic servants if that road were erected. If this Government can find employment for the unemployed, especially those who have been displaced from the Deep Water Harbour, we would not have to give them a pension. You only give a man a pension when you cannot find work for him.

I would suggest also to this Government the building of secondary schools. Mr. Speaker, I am thinking of those people who are displaced and who still have to educate their children. You may not have the privilege, Mr. Speaker, as I do in travelling around the island, but oftentimes when I pass through Roebuck Street or Broad Street during school hours, I see ten or fifteen young girls walking up and down, and I would approach one and say "honey, what is wrong? Why are you not at school?" She would say that her mother was not able to pay the school fee, and she could not enter the school. There are parents who have two or three children being educated at private secondary schools and have to pay \$20 a term for each of them, which is \$60. When the time comes to pay these fees, the parents are hard put to get that money. If there were more public secondary schools the parents would only be paying \$18 for the three children, because I am certain that at the Alleyne School in my parish the fee is \$6 and some cents; so what it takes to send one child to a private secondary school would pay for three children at a public secondary school. It would be a great relief to these people if the Government would build more secondary schools. You know, Sir, as a man of understanding how hard it is for those people.

As another suggestion the Government should build tenantry roads and relieve those poor people who have to head their canes. They would be able to plant more canes which would in turn strengthen the economy of this island. There would be more cane and more sugar and more money would be coming in. Hundreds of thousands of tons of cane could be planted in the Northern District if there were more roads, and I am sure that it would benefit the island as a whole. It is all right to sit down in the Ministerial Buildings, but the people have sent us here as representatives in the House of Assembly to weigh their grievances before the Government in order to relieve them of the burden which they have to bear. If the Government does not take our suggestions, it is a matter for them, I am certain that if they do the things which I have pointed out to them, it would help to relieve those poor people who are suffering night and day.

Mr. Speaker, there are several things which this Government can do to help the people. They should have restrictions to stop the wealthy people from sending their money outside this country to invest in other countries. The money which these people have accumulated over many years should be invested in Barbados to help Barbadians, but they send the money all over the world where it is invested. We have chosen Ministers in this Government to look after the welfare of the people and not to sleep and slumber. It is their duty to do the best they can. The educational system should be the sole responsibility of the Government; the State should be responsible for the education of every child in Barbados, and therefore the private schools which make millions of dollars should be taken over.

I have been made to understand, Mr. Speaker, that at some of the private schools, the Headmasters are buying an old car on the pretence of teaching the children mechanical engineering and taking a dollar from each boy. If the school has 1,000 boys, that means he will collect \$1,000 and for the three terms of the year \$3,000 would be going into these school-masters' pockets. The Government, I am sure, has a Technical Institute which can cater for that and stop them from making themselves rich overnight and robbing the poor people because their children have to be educated. The Government should take these schools out of their hands, and the only way they can do that is by building about six secondary schools, no matter what they cost. This would assist those poor people who have to walk naked and go starving in order to educate their children, and I would be glad to see the time come when Government will not be afraid to do so. If this Government returns to power or if

any other Government comes into power, I would like to see these things done whether John Wesley Corbin be in existence or not. I hope that this Resolution will be agreed to, and I hope that every member especially those of the Government will see the wisdom in the suggestions I have put forward and benefit that would accrue to the community if they were embarked upon. Remember as I aforesaid that these things are done not by words nor by tongue, but by deeds and truths.

3.25 p.m.

Many a time we hear that the Government did this and that, but when we look forward, we see that they did nothing. In any kind of Resolution, you should bring down money for the construction of the East Coast Road, but you do not hear anything more of it. I say again, not by words, not by tongue, but by deeds and the people will respect you.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this latitude.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am not at all prepared to tire this House with any long speech on this question because I think that as far as this Government is concerned it can be truthfully said throughout the Island and the West Indies and may be throughout the outside world by those who have been keeping abreast of the times that this Government has done more to assist unemployment and underemployment than any other Government - barring none - in the world. This Government has completely transformed the whole pattern of the social and economic pattern of this island. No other Government has attempted, let alone getting near, what this Government has done and therefore, I do not think it is necessary to speak at any length on this question, especially, when no doubt, it is painfully obvious to all of us who are aware of the pattern of things today that this is no doubt a question which is nothing more than just embarrassment or attempted embarrassment of the Government or political vote catching.

The Resolution reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS the construction and operation of the new Bridgetown Harbour has increased the numbers of unemployed workers;

"AND WHEREAS there is no immediate work programme to provide alternative employment for displaced workers;

"BE IT RESOLVED that the House of Assembly request the Government to take urgent and positive action to provide employment as a short time and long term measure for the unemployed;

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the short time action should take the form of some slum clearance in the City of Bridgetown and increased expenditure on tenantry roads and public works throughout the Island;

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the long term action should be the establishment of a National Committee representing all elements in the community with wide terms of reference to study a programme for industrial and economic expansion with a view to creating greater employment opportunities for the community."

Now, I think I am correct in saying that even before there was a Ministerial Government, the member who, I understand, is responsible for this Resolution, was connected with the Government and was responsible for this portfolio although it was not Ministerial Government. He would admit that the Government had a programme and it was the very first Government in this Island which brought a programme to this House of repairing tenantry roads. Before this Government came into power, not one single tenantry road in this Island was repaired. The first lot of tenantry roads started to be repaired, if I remember correctly, in 1947. It is our programme to repair tenantry roads, to extend the water service throughout the Island, and so on. So, to do these things, you are bound to increase your expenditure. I think that we are well aware of the fact that expenditure so far as Government is concerned can only be based on increased production. As soon as you have increased production, there is more revenue coming to the

Island, there is a rise in the national income and then the Government can take more. I think I am correct in saying that Professor Beasley when he wrote his report pointed out that this Government was taking too much of the national revenue by way of taxation. We were not convinced that we were taking too much and when he based his revenue on a crop of 130,000 tons, we said that we were prepared to go as high as 150,000 tons and eventually, it was much more than that. I only say that unless and until you can have greater productivity, the spending power cannot be increased because the same people who will tell you that you should increase expenditure on these various items as are contained in this Resolution are the same people who would come in here and say that we are not giving you sufficient allowances by way of income tax. They will go on to say that our allowances are too low as compared with Trinidad and other places.

Now, Sir, what is the position? This Government is not a government of mere words. It is all well and good to get up and talk a lot of talk, propaganda, demagoguery and make all those flamboyant speeches, and so on, but what this Government does rather than talk is to settle down to business and see what best we can do in the interest of this Island as a whole.

Our Five Year Development Programme which is before this House would no doubt convince even some of our vilest opponents that this Government is not sleeping, and this Government has planned a programme which if put into operation would inevitably bring progress to this Island and at the same time give improvement to the workers and the people as a whole. Some people have gone as far as saying that the programme is a very good one but another Government should implement it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Do you think it is fair that you have pointed out that Item No. 5 on the Order Paper is a Resolution to deal with the Development Plan and the hon. member is allowed to make a speech in which he is developing points on a matter which we have not even been treated with the courtesy to receive? Why should the hon. member be allowed to develop that point? What is said in the Resolution about the Five Year Development Plan? The Hon. Minister should not be permitted to bring that in the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is correct to say that the Hon. Minister developed his speech on the Five Year Plan. He has made some reference and he said that when that is implemented people will see that the Government is not sleeping. Then he went a little further and said what other people are saying about the Plan in regard to its being implemented by somebody else. I would not say that I have allowed him to develop a speech on the Five Year Plan.
3.35 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is for Your Honour to rule. I do not think it is for any member to discuss what somebody says in relation to something which is not before us.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has to admit that remarks have been made on matters which are soon to be before the House. I do not think that the Hon. Minister has trespassed in that connection as yet.

Hon. M. E. COX: I thank Your Honour for that. I would like to say this before going further; I have been a member of this House since 1944 and I know the Rules of this House. I may be accused of killing somebody but I certainly cannot be accused of breaking the Rules of the House. I have not specifically referred to any item in this Five Year Plan at all; I have merely, in passing, said what one or two people might have said about the Five Year Plan. I stick to the Rules of this House even to my own detriment.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member has made a very discouraging remark when he says that he sticks to the Rules of the House to his own embarrassment. Does the hon. member imply that he is embarrassed when he sticks to the Rules of this House?

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to say that when we were discussing another matter, the hon. senior member for St.

Peter strayed and brought in matter which does not concern the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the hon. member do that today?

Hon. M. E. COX: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: My opinion was that he was not straying. That is all.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am afraid that that was not made clear to the House. However, I do not want to incur the wrath of anybody; what I am trying to say is that this Government, no matter what might be said of it by other people, has a purposeful, positive policy; it is not like Parties or groups of people who, no doubt, at times, like to appeal to the imagination of people. I almost said that this Government is not like people who put out the sort of platitudinous stuff which is served up at times to the sheep who look out for food which they never get. What is the position? This question of the displacement of workers was discussed on several occasions with the Barbados Workers' Union, the Government and the employers, and the hon. member who has sponsored this motion was the leader of the delegation of the Barbados Workers' Union on every occasion. I would like to say that on no occasion was the question of finding alternative employment for these people or anybody else raised by the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The hon. member is famous for these repeated distortions of conversations between the Union and the Government. The Union and the Government never had any discussion whatever about finding employment for the workers. The only discussion which the Union was called upon to have with the Government was the question of the quantum of compensation to be paid to the workers. It was not for the Union to discuss how much was being done for displaced workers, and then the hon. member introduced another matter. I should like to say that he has a letter from the Union to meet a delegation from us on this matter and he has not, up to this date, said whether he will receive the delegation or not.

Hon. M. E. COX: What the hon. member has said is just what I said. He regards that as an untruth, but he has confirmed what I said. This matter was discussed on several occasions. I pointed out to this House on the last occasion when I was responsible for introducing a Resolution to assist these displaced people, that I would like to know if and when the Union ever proposed something similar to what was done by the West Coast to the employers of this island. As the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said not so long ago, it is not a matter for the Government alone to deal with this problem. As far as some members of the Opposition are concerned, the Government has no policy or sense or anything, but when it suits them to say it, the Government must have all the sense, the ability and everything else. This question which we are discussing is something which concerns this island; it concerns every sector of the island. It concerns private enterprise, the Union and the Government and I am surprised to think that an organisation such as the Barbados Workers' Union which claims to be an entity and a greater entity even than the Government, would come to the Government and say: "Oh, everything is on you. You are responsible for everything." We are bankrupt of any ideas, we have no foresight or anything like that, but we must do everything! I would not have expected that from the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I believe that the hon. member is referring to me. The Resolution asks for the setting up of a National Committee. I do not think that the hon. member should make the same mistake as another hon. member when he can see what is set out in the body of the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would think that with the claims of the Union to be foremost in the struggle for the improvement, the advancement and the upliftment of the workers, it would have some positive idea to put forward in a scheme such as this or any other scheme (Mr. WALCOTT: Do you want a revolution to shoot people?) What is the position?

I am not listening to the hon. member; the Union has thrown things into the lap of the Government, so to speak. What do you mean by the setting up of a National Committee? Setting up a National Committee to do what? To say how much money you want to spend or how many schools should be built? Do you want anybody outside of the Government to tell us what more we should do and what we want, especially when it comes from those who want to bury us alive? I am arguing that at no time has the Union done anything similar to what was done in the case of the West Coast for the longshoremen when they were put out of work as the result of technological operation.

3.45 p.m.

I have read this in the House already, I have read it on public platforms and I am going to read it again. This is October, 1960, not forty years ago, but last year.

"The Agreement between the Longshoremen's Union and the Waterfront Employers on the West Coast carries a joint attack on the employment problems of automation into new ground - a pioneering operation that will be closely watched by labour and management in every industry.

"In purely material terms the deal appears to involve a shrewd gamble by the employers that cost savings, which will come from mechanised operations and the more effective use of labour, will more than cover payments that the employers will have to make to compensate workers for losses due to automation.

"By all odds the most striking feature of the new agreement is the freedom it gives the employers to deploy their working forces in the most efficient way, without any of the so-called make-work and feather bedding restrictions imposed on them by the Union. The Agreement also permits the employers to install labour-saving machinery and methods in the loading and unloading of vessels free of Union opposition." Now this is the important part. "In return for these unprecedented concessions to progress by the Union, the employers have agreed to contribute a total of \$27.5 million over a period of 5 1/2 years to an automation Fund."

I ask: what has the Barbados Workers' Union done to bring the employers, the Shipping and Mercantile Association, into the realisation that some of these people who are now displaced have been employed by them for over 30 or 40 years? What has it done to make them know that now that these people are displaced they should make a contribution to help? (Mr. WALCOTT: Why did you not tell them so when you gave them the contract?) That is exactly what the Longshoremen's Union in West Coast did to the employers as far as I can see, Mr. Speaker; therefore the Government of this country had absolutely nothing to do with those negotiations.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Government of Barbados gave the contract to Port Contractors Limited and the Barbados Union knew nothing about it. The Minister knows that they offered the contract to the people without any stipulation whatever in it as to what they should do. He and the employers failed in their business and he now wants the Union to take up where they failed.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. The hon. member will have ample time to reply.

Hon. M. E. COX: I know that, Mr. Speaker, but I am contesting that. I am not prepared to reply to any abuse that is thrown on me; I am going to ignore it because I know that abuse is the weapon of a fool, and can never be the substitute for argument. I am not in that anymore, if I ever used to be in it. All I am saying is that at the very first meeting which we had with the employers and the Union, the matter was put to them by the Government that they should make a contribution. The matter was put by myself and the Financial Secretary that they should make a contribution, but the answer to that was that the Government was responsible for this exercise, that it was the Government that was putting people out of work, and therefore Government should foot the whole Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, that is not so, Sir. The reply was that it was a national project in the interest of the community and therefore the community must pay for it.

Hon. M. E. COX: If I were to tell a lie on a human being, I would have my head cut off.

Mr. WALCOTT: Then you would not have a body.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have said on several occasions and I repeat now that lies are for children who are afraid or who fear that they would be flogged; they are not for me. I am quite willing at any time, if I make a mistake or say something that somebody can prove is not true, to apologise and withdraw. I was Chairman of that Meeting and I say and repeat that we put it to the people in no uncertain manner that the workers had served many years with them. I go further and say that in so far as the higher up workers are concerned, they are not going to suffer because their employers accept the liability for a pension and things of that sort; but where the lightermen, porters and people like those were concerned, we were told that this is a national issue, that the Government has brought about this thing, and therefore the Government should foot the whole Bill. Look at the difference in the attitude now towards workers in another country. Though this may worry some people when I repeat it, the employers put up \$27.5 million to help these workers.

What is the Deep Water Harbour today? (Mr. WALCOTT: Is that automation, you idiot?) If I am.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, the hon. member makes a comparison. As you said, I have the right to reply, but the hon. member is talking about automation and talks about the Deep Water Harbour. There is no comparison. He should know that building a Deep Water Harbour cannot be compared with putting in a truck or a lorry; that is part of your own business. The decision to build a Deep Water Harbour was Government's and not the employers'.

Hon. M. E. COX: I suppose at a later stage he will tell us what is automation and what are technological changes. (Mr. WALCOTT: It is my job to teach you that.) I have said on several occasions that if I want to be taught, with all due deference to the gentleman, I must seek the assistance of somebody who was taught.
3.55 p.m.

However, I think that those who are learned and are taught will understand what I mean.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said and pointed out what is the position as to the Deep Water Harbour as regards redundancy. You do not want all these people now. That redundancy is a result of the technological change which was made as a result of the construction of the Deep Water Harbour.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Before the Deep Water Harbour was built, was that a pre-condition of the Deep Water Harbour?

Mr. SPEAKER: May I say that those are not points of order? They can all be noted and replied to by the hon. member.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, having failed to bring those people to their senses and having failed to instil in them a sense of justice and fairplay to the workers who were employed by them for all of these years, the hon. member comes into this House and say, "let us pass this Resolution and have a National Committee to tell us this and that." I do not want to say that this is all nonsense, but this Government in the limit of its finances has been for years working on slum clearance and road repairs. One can look back and see the estates which the Government purchased from time to time and the nice bungalows, small though they may be, which have been built by the Government in which these people now lived as compared with the shacks and huts in which they lived some years

ago. One only has to go across by the Pine Housing Estate or the Bay Estate and see those buildings. To come and tell us that this Resolution is all this programme to have more slum clearance is playing up to the gullible and non-thinking and those who are less knowledgeable with a view to influencing what will no doubt be coming up a little later this year.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I am not going to be long; I just want to bring out one or two points. To get up in here and talk about this National Committee, what can this National Committee do? The Resolution states:-

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the long term action should be the establishment of a National Committee representing all elements in the community...."

I would like to see what this National Committee would come and say. What proposals have they in mind to overshadow or supersede those which the Government has in mind and has already implemented? This is just a waste of good precious time which hard-working Ministers have already put in this set-up.

As I have said, my Ministry is responsible for labour. Even some of my enemies I have heard say how great are the improvements by Government in recent years in finding employment for people outside. What is our programme? In 1959 when I came back from England, I pointed out that we could do much better if we started a training scheme for some of our people to go on the London Transport. The Hon. Minister of Education who is a very co-operative gentleman was ready and willing to do anything to help the people of this Island and as soon as it was passed on to him, he started to work and everybody can see the results.

I have not had the chance to tell this House yet, but much as you talk about Trinidad and all the other places, Trinidad with all the oil gushing out of it, Trinidad with all its asphalt and all its pitch, still has an unemployment population of over 38,000. Both Trinidad and Jamaica are now setting themselves up in England trying to get in on the scheme on which we have been since 1955. When I was in England recently, I had discussions with the Executive Officers of the London Transport who are responsible for recruiting our people and people as a whole for the London Transport. One of their officers told me that to his surprise he was asked to come to the office and when he got to his office, he found there the Prime Minister of the West Indies, the Premier of Jamaica and the Premier of Trinidad. What was the question of the Chief Minister of Trinidad? Can you help us with a scheme similar to that which you have for Barbados? How is it that Barbados has got in on this scheme and we cannot get in on it?" I am not going to tell you the answer which he gave them. The Minister from Mauritius was also there on this same question and trying to get in on this same scheme. That was represented to me. I am not saying what the reply was. I will only say that so far as we are concerned, we still have a good opportunity of getting a lot of our people out of the Island on this scheme. These Governments are now trying to do what we have been doing since 1955.

Sir, I would like to say this in so far as displaced workers are concerned. The hon. member knows that during these discussions with him he was told that priority would be given to these displaced people in so far as Government employment is concerned. (Mr. WALCOTT: We asked for it.)

4.05 p.m.

The hon. member cannot begin to dream to be as interested in the people as I am. He was told in no uncertain manner that instructions are given to the Labour Department to give priority treatment to these people because we know what it means for people going to the United States of America to work on farms and so on. (Mr. WALCOTT: We asked for it.) If the hon. member says that they asked for it, he will remember that a similar thing was done for coopers when he was supposed to be responsible. Although the hon. member was responsible we asked for something then. However, to get the trappings of the newspaper and so forth,

the hon. member says that the Government is doing nothing to help these people. He says that we must set up this big committee with all of these people many of whom have absolutely no interest in the working classes of this island. They are just issuing propaganda and no doubt they are opportunists. I think that some of us know well how these committees operate; they take two years before any report is made and then no recommendation is forthcoming.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, while the Government will not ignore any sensible, reasonable and feasible suggestion which may be made from time to time by anybody for the alleviation of this problem, whether it be made by the Opposition, by an opponent or a friend, while the Government will be willing to listen to any suggestion or proposal which may be made from time to time by our opponents, or friends or our supporters. I want to make it crystal clear, that as far as we are concerned, we know what the people want. We know what is good for the people and we know how to get it for them and we are getting it for them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any hon. member desire to speak before the mover of this Resolution replies?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, when I introduced this Resolution I had no intention of causing the sort of exhibition which the Ministers of this Government have given, because one would have thought that a Resolution which calls for finding jobs for the jobless, a Resolution which puts idle hands to work, would have been accepted by anybody as a matter of compassion, or if nothing more, as a matter of commonsense. The last hon. member who spoke on this Resolution has accused me of being an opportunist; he just plays with words.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, I am interrupting the hon. member at this stage and I will not interrupt him at any other stage, even if he calls me a murderer. I did not call the hon. member an opportunist; I referred to opportunists.

Mr. WALCOTT: If in your speech you are replying to something that has been proposed, if you are replying to the person who proposed that thing and you say that it is the sort of thing which opportunists do, whom do you mean? Do you mean somebody far away or the person who has brought forward the matter? This will not be the first time or the last time that the Government will have to tell people that I am an opportunist. When I have finished, they will see how many opportunists there are in Barbados from the point of view of the answer they have to give to this Resolution. They are either giving the answer to this Resolution in here or they will tell us what they are doing otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, you are very tolerant in this matter. If I make a statement here now, I will say that I believe it is your tolerance which has enabled you to retain your office as Speaker for so long. I would like to see you continue as Speaker, although your colleagues in your own Party - I know the sort of inflictions which we will have if you are not there. We do not allude to newspapers, but I will bring in the "Beacon" on Saturday in this debate in order to show you that when I accuse hon. members of the Government of dishonesty, I have every right to do so supported by reports which have been taken from this House of Assembly and which have not yet been published. I am going to ask Your Honour to ask the Clerk to examine the statements made in this newspaper as compared with reported statements which have not been published, and to find out how they come to be here. I want an investigation to be made so as to know how a verbatim report can appear in a newspaper which coincides word for word with things which have been said in here.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, one would not have thought that this Resolution would have caused this exhibition by hon. members who are accusing me of doing nothing. I want to say that lost love is something which you cannot repair. I remember that the Hon. Minister of Labour went so far as to tell my wife that he could handle me. Anyhow, that was nothing derogatory. I will put my neck to the block

that my wife is not a liar; I say that with twenty-two years' experience. Anybody can make any comparison. If we went into the debates - I will not allude to debates which have been passed; however, we passed a Resolution on the Displacement Bill and why should the hon. member allude to that as to say that the Bill has come to the House as if the Union was saying that we did not agree with it, or were telling the Government not to do it?

4.15 p.m.

The Hon. Minister knows that when it comes to the question of people losing employment as a result of the Deep Water Harbour, that was one of your decisions for building it, not the employers', because some of the employers have to be displaced too. I am not here to make any case for the employers, but the employers cannot operate at the Deep Water Harbour as they were operating before; so the employers did not put in automation. What the hon. member said about West Coast is quite right, and if we were placed in similar circumstances here we would have done the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. member this: why did the hon. member as Minister send to the Union and ask us if we would agree to spending \$2 million in erecting a bulk storage installation for the employers? Why did he not tell them that it was their business to put it up and not ask us whether we would release \$2 million out of the Rehabilitation Fund? That was a capital venture and it was their business to put it up. The Minister did not tell them to put it up; he came and asked us if we were going to release the money from the Price Stabilisation Fund.

Two days ago, Mr. Speaker, I had discussions with the same Hon. Minister about a proposal for the sugar industry, and yet he can come here today and try to give the impression that I and the Union are people who would not ask the employers to pay. Two days ago the Minister knows that I said to the employers that they were getting \$2 million to put up a bulk installation and I regarded that a levy should be made from that; today he is suggesting that I was one who was willing to let the employers go free. He knows that years ago before the Deep Water Harbour the question of severance pay was a policy of the Trade Union Movement. One of the biggest demonstrations which this island has even seen took place in 1948 over the late Mr. Lewis who was a member of this House of Assembly. He was dismissed after working for 27 or 28 years and should have been paid by the employers. How can the Minister come today and say that we did not ask the employers to do it, but that we asked the Government?

Mr. Speaker, I am a man with commonsense and character. How can I go to employers under the circumstances of the Deep Water Harbour and ask employers to pay redundancy money as a result of this development? What leg would I have to stand on? I would make myself look like a fool. What the hon. member does not understand is that for every Trade Union and every man all over the world, automation and technological changes are changes which you are responsible for. The Hon. Minister knows that even now the Barbados Workers' Union has put before him a proposal which the sugar manufacturers of this island have agreed to, that where they have technological changes inside their factories - that is where you take up a mill and put in a mill, or you take down a hoist and put up a hoist - they, the employers, will pay severance pay. That is something that has been settled with the Union. You would not expect this where something is done of a broad character as in the case of the Deep Water Harbour, because you do not build a Deep Water Harbour every week, every five years or every 20 years. Why should the hon. member go back to the building of the Deep Water Harbour? I am not going back to the building of the Deep Water Harbour.

What I would say is this, Mr. Speaker: members of the Government regarded the building of the Deep Water Harbour as some political bogey, some booby trap; they thought that this booby trap of the Deep Water Harbour was some political thing to embrace you. I am not worried about them, but they are worrying about this seat in an election.

They are more worried about the coming election than I am because they want to get back in power and they want to put me out of this little seat here. I am batting on a little wicket that is playing fairly good, and they are worried when they get at the other end, because they are wondering if the ball is shooting, kicking or rising. When the election comes, I will deal with them; I will not deal with them in here, I have too much ammunition. I have enough ammunition to deal with them; and I am not going to say what the Premier came and told me already about this election. Do not worry about me in an election; you did a lot to get me out of the Union but you failed. Let us deal with the Resolution which deals with workers and with people who are unemployed.

The Government says, Mr. Speaker, that they have a Five Year Plan. I am not vexed with them for having a Five Year Plan that will put people in work in 1965, but people are unemployed now. I am going to show these booby traps and the ignoramus statements made by the Minister of Communications. This book is called "Social and Economic Studies" and it is something that was published by the Government. Some lady came here and made a report and in it on page 150 this is what she says:-

"In conclusion we may say that the development plan as a whole leaves much to be desired especially in the field of economic development and the concomitants of such developments, e.g. efficient systems of communications, power, etc. Especially is this important in view of the island's economic background described in the first paragraph of this chapter."

I ask: what is your plan as a consequence of the Deep Water Harbour to absorb the people who are now displaced. Let me put it this way, Mr. Speaker: you build a Deep Water Harbour and you are now charging \$6 per ton for landing cargo because you have to pay for the Port. You said you wanted more efficiency and that ships were turning around too slowly, and you wanted them to turn around faster. Are you asking us to go down to the Deep Water Harbour with old pots and pans and old wheel-barrow? You have to carry equipment down there.

The Hon. Minister of Trade talked about learning. I cannot ignore the things that people write and leave behind. Reading is my hobby and I love it. They brought a manpower survey bubble here to tell people they provided 10,000 jobs in five years' time. This is what is shown in this book entitled "Labour Policies in the West Indies". It is an L.L.O. publication which I think was done by Mr. Matthews and some other gentleman, but they do not usually put in the names. It is an official document which relates to the year 1942. I will read as follows:-

"The following estimates of occupational distribution in 1942 were made by the Economic Adviser to the Comptroller for Development and Welfare in a National Income survey:

4.25 p.m.

"Agricultural labourers (nearly all sugar workers, 21,000; Fishermen, 1,500; Sugar Factories, 5,000; Other factories and public utilities, 2,000; dock workers and porters, 2,000; transport (including taxis), 2,000; artisans (carpenters, masons, coopers, etc.), shop assistants, 5,000; Government and other clerks, 5,000; dressmaking, etc., 4,000; Police, 600; Assistant teachers, 700; Road works, etc., 600; Government and parochial employees not elsewhere included, 1,000; domestic servants, 20,000; hucksters, etc., 6,000; all other (say) 1,500; making a total of 82,900."

Let us go in for an analysis. The population in 1942 was in the vicinity of 200,000. In 1949 it was 209,000 and today, it is 236,000. It will thus be seen that the population has risen since 1949 by 27,000 people. They say that their present labour force is 84,000 which is just over 2,000 above that of 1942 which is a period of 19 years. They say that they have found 10,000 jobs for the people in the last five years and in the next five years they propose to find 40,000 jobs.

HOUSE REVERTS TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

HOUSE RESUMES ON CUSTOMS TARIFF REGULATIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: On the suspension, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, the point which I was making was that we are amending the Trade Act and I was at pains to point out that this is an appropriate time to give consideration to all these exemptions, because what is not known here is that there are exemptions given to the sugar industry, exemptions given to the Barbados Electric Company and to some other people.

I also pointed out — and this is taking a realistic view — that the people in the printing trade with the exception of those of the *Beacon* work for good wages. Of course it is said that the *Beacon* is a co-operative. We are very generous to the *Beacon*. We had to borrow \$11,000 from the Bank to pay for it and the interest on that sum is more than the \$15 a month which they are paying us.

I am asking the Government to make an examination of the printing business. You sent the Laws of Barbados outside to be printed. A senior linotypist at the Advocate gets \$50 a week and a journeyman linotypist gets \$40 a week. I told one of them that I feel the printing trade should be given some relief. You should examine that trade because you should not allow a trade or business which can pay such good wages to have redundancy taking place. When you get redundancy in a business like that which is paying such wages it would be very difficult to get the workers of that business absorbed. If you have a man who gets \$50 a week as a linotypist being unemployed as a result of redundancy, tell me what job you can give him. Years of training have put those people in that position. They are doing skilled trades. These trades take months for the people to get skilled in them; therefore, if they are out through redundancy, there is no hope for them.

You should examine the printing trade and see what relief, what exemptions you can give to the trade. I am not asking the Government to do anything unusual. A Mission came here from Jamaica and made a report, and in that report the Mission recommended that one of the things which we should do is to consider what you want for new industries and that your existing industries should be given some relief also if they deserve it. The report went on to state that from the point of view of the territories concerned, it would seem as if no interest was taken either in the replacement or extension of the plant which was just as important as the establishment of a so-called pioneer industry. That is what one of the industrialists who came here found out. Therefore, if you have a trade like the printing trade in which some of the people who are getting good wages are being laid off, you must consider, if you are giving an industry relief, if you can do that to this trade in order that the owners may retain their employees. I made that request in relation to foundries and I understand that something has been done to relieve the foundries. Some of these people with established industries and trade who have been operating here for some time pay their workers better than some of these new industries which have been recently established. As a matter of fact, some of these new industries want to exploit the workers; therefore, I do not think if you give exemptions to industries which are already established that it is anything unreasonable and unjust. The Government has nothing to lose by doing so. It is better to have a man employed than to have him unemployed. You lose when he is unemployed because he is not making any contribution to society.

Sir, I do not see how any member can say that this has nothing to do with the Resolution before us because the Resolution has something to do with the Trade Act. There is no objection to the Resolution before us, but what I am doing is to draw attention to these other matters.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, before you put the question, I merely rise to repeat what I said earlier that this has absolutely nothing to do with any printing plant. 4.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member does not mean that that is a challenge to the Chair. I do not think that the hon. member strayed for one minute. In my view, this is a question of dealing with the Regulations which follow on the Trade Act, Section 119, and certain concessions are granted. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is only asking that certain concessions be granted. That is my view; if the hon. member has a different opinion from that, he is quite entitled to it.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have said that I always obeyed the Chair whether the Chair is right or wrong. I believe I can prove to the satisfaction of the House that this matter is nothing to do with printing. If you read the Addendum.....

Mr. SPEAKER: This Resolution is nothing to do with the printing; with that I agree.

Hon. M. E. COX: Perhaps I can explain it in a few words. As far as the printeries are concerned, as a matter of fact, I thought that the hon. member had raised this point, he being so closely connected with this matter. I think that some of the printers were members of the Union and at one time, the hon. member was slated to be Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour. I thought he would have known that as far as the printeries are concerned, all machinery, paper and otherwise are allowed to come into this island free of duty. Therefore, even if there had been some reme.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I do not think that the hon. member should give the impression that because printeries use paper, it comes in free of duty. Paper of all sorts comes in free of duty, quite apart from any exemption given to machinery as such.

Hon. M. E. COX: What point of order is that? Where did I go wrong?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Where the hon. member went wrong is this: He said that machinery and paper for printeries come into this island free of duty. Does that mean that because the printeries use paper, the paper comes in free of duty? Whoever uses paper, whether it be a printery or not, will get it free of duty.

Hon. M. E. COX: Does that in any way indicate that what I said was not true? Has he tried to clarify what I said just now that the paper comes in duty free? We are not dealing with any other paper at this stage. I am replying to the point made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, but the hon. senior member for St. Philip is so anxious to defend what is the indefensible that he tries to make himself appear silly in a thing like that. (Mr. CRAWFORD: You have not got to try.) I would not like to answer the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must address the Chair.

Hon. M. E. COX: How can the wages which are paid by the *Advocate* or otherwise get into this matter? If the hon. member wants to demonstrate that the Union has succeeded in getting increased wages for people, I think he should do that in a debate which may be appropriate later on or he can do it outside on the platform. This is a Resolution that seeks to give discretionary power to the Comptroller of Customs to allow material which was brought into this island duty free but which was not used in the manufacture of clothes to be exported or re-exported without having to pay any duty.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Could I ask the Minister, with leave of the House, something on this matter?

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

Public
PUBLIC PROPERTY INSURANCE (AMENDMENT)
BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:—To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Public Property Insurance Act, 1959.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Public Property Insurance Act, 1959, and it seeks to do it in the following way as set out in the "Objects and Reasons". There is a Committee which is called the Standing Insurance Committee and its main duty is to effect and maintain policies of insurance on public property other than public buildings and on property which may not be public property but which is used by the Government. This Bill also seeks to clarify the position with regard to the composition of the General Insurance Fund and the payments to be made thereto; in certain cases the duty of this Standing Insurance Committee is to remove the restriction which limited payments from the Fund to cases where death, injury or damage was caused by the use of a motor vehicle on a public road. This Bill also seeks to enable the Standing Insurance Committee to hold negotiations into the loss or destruction of or damage to private property as well as public property where the damage is caused by a Government-owned motor vehicle or vessel; and also to provide for the annual audit by the Auditor General of all accounts kept in connection with the General Insurance Fund.

There is no change in principle; these amendments are either by way of deletion and insertions but, there is no change in principle. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

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

4.45 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 7 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. 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. St. A. THORNE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS
ACT, 1961

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 9 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the law with respect to the sale of fertilisers and feeding stuffs.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to repeal the Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Act, 1894. This Bill as you will see from the Objects and Reasons is a new Bill and seeks among other things to bring the manufacturers, all the wholesalers or retailers of fertilisers and feeding stuffs to a certain standard as perhaps obtains in other parts of the world. The Act of 1894 is not up to date, and therefore instead of amending it we thought best to repeal it by the introduction of this new Act. There are some old clauses which are retained, but many new ones have been brought in.

As you will see from the Objects and Reasons, Sir, there are a number of things which we seek to do. I should say at the outset that this does not mean that there will be any hardship imposed on anybody who imports, wholesales

or retails fertilisers or feeding stuffs, but we do want them to conform to certain standards. We want to give the people who use fertilisers in their land and kitchen gardens a guarantee that when they buy a certain item that item will be up to a certain standard, and those people who are engaged in the livestock or poultry industry or any such industry will have the best products to buy and they will be safeguarded by the Department of Agriculture. Few people know that there are some feeds which are sold more cheaply having the same name as another feed, but the ingredients are not the same and that makes all the difference in the world. Some people argue sometimes that they can buy such and such a feed at 6 cents per pound while so-and-so was charging them 12 cents a pound; but there is feed and feed.

This law, therefore, seeks to make it imperative that the manufacturer, whether he is a local manufacturer or a foreign manufacturer, gives a detailed statement of the ingredients he is going to put in his feeds, and when the purchaser buys his feeds he must be told what he is paying for.

Now, Sir, when you come to think at least of the poultry industry in Barbados, Barbadians like most other people are trying to raise poultry on a large scale; and if there are any poultry-keepers within the area of my voice or around this Table, they will know that there is such a thing in Barbados now as the broiler industry, and if you want the maximum profit you must use the best feeds. We must not therefore allow these people who would like to manufacture feed or even import a certain brand of feed to get away with a cheap feed, and then the person who has invested his money and is looking for a livelihood because of the industry in which he is engaged finds himself losing money.

This Bill seeks to rectify all that. With regard to fertilisers, so much is dependent in Barbados on them in the sugar industry. Without fertilisers, I believe that the sugar crop in this island would be halved from my experience, so that if we do not see to it in no uncertain manner that the fertilisers we receive here from abroad are what they should be and what they are labelled to be, we might find ourselves spending enormous sums on an inferior item.

4.55 p.m.

This Bill seeks to rectify all of these things. It is the latest information that we can gather and I would almost say that this Bill is non-controversial. We have had some of the best scientists, locally and abroad, to give their opinion on it and I think that it is a good Bill and it is one in the interest of the people whose business it is to work land and to engage in animal husbandry. The Objects and Reasons state:

The object of this Bill is to repeal the Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Act, 1894, and to re-enact more comprehensive legislation pertaining to the said subjects.

In the Bill fertilizers and feeding stuffs are defined, and it is required that any person importing, manufacturing, selling or offering for sale any of those substances shall register the same in the Register of Fertilizers and Feeding Stuffs to be kept by the Director of Agriculture, who may refuse to register any fertilizer or feeding stuff—

- (a) if in his opinion the brand or name would tend to deceive or mislead a purchaser in respect of its composition or utility value;
- (b) under a brand or name incidental with or in the opinion of the Director likely to be confused with a brand or name already applied to a registered fertilizer or feeding stuff, as the case may be;
- (c) if the specific name of each and every ingredient used in its manufacture be not stated;
- (d) if any sample required to be submitted by the applicant is found not to accord with the provisions of this Act or the regulations hereunder.

Therefore, you will see briefly stated here what are the requirements of this new Bill.

From time to time, we have had certain feeding stuffs which were not of the best quality. Of course, we have had no law to control those people. We have had some so-called feed-mixers who every now and again get a little "off flour" and "off meal" — old members of the trade know what I mean — and they would get together and mix up a little thing with some other stuff and sell it as good feed. We feel that the time has come to seriously put a stop to this thing and see to it that when a customer goes into a shop or a wholesaler goes into a store, he can ask the dealer to submit a composition of the contents or the proteins that the feed is made up of. We are making a law that it must be given to him and if it is not given to him that that dealer would be cut off the register.

Now, before anyone can import feeding stuffs or a fertilizer, the agent or manufacturer must register all of the ingredients which it contains, the percentages, and so on, with the Director of Agriculture. As I have said, I think that this is a good Bill and I hardly think it is controversial. I know that the people who are in this business will appreciate the effort on the part of the Government to see to it that when they invest their money, they should get the best feeding stuffs available.

When it comes to fertilizers, I do not know, nor have I heard, of any merchants playing any rascality. For years now, I have been a fairly large buyer of fertilizers and I think we more or less get what we pay for. The contents are all written on the bag and you see what it is made up of. Quite recently, we had some tested and although one does not want to go into that too much, it was up to scratch. It was really what it was said to be. We are saying that in the field of fertilizers we have had no complaints but in the field of feeding stuffs we have had many complaints. We have a lot of wayside mixers who are just trying to work out a little thing and that must be stopped. People who invest money in broilers or layers should, when they go to a store for a certain feeding stuff get it so that they can get the results they want from their undertaking. It is a fact that some people are making a business in dealing in poultry and, naturally, if they are making a business of that, they must get the returns which they expect and it is the duty of the Government to see that they get it.

Sir, I commend this Bill to hon. members. I think it is a good Bill and I think that it is high time that the old Act of 1894 should be repealed by this new Act.

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, what needs to be said on this matter, first and foremost, is that if you are going to industrialise a country there must be acceptance of the fact that our local industries must conform to certain specific standards whether it be feeding stuffs or fertilizers or anything else. Industrial development can only succeed in Barbados if the products we manufacture conform to the general standards set for those particular things.

In this respect, therefore, Mr. Speaker, what would become increasingly important and necessary is an establishment of a Bureau of Standards to control manufacturing on a general scale in the country. This is more or less an essential pre-requisite in a wholesale embarkation on industrial development in the Island.

Now, having said that, I have made it perfectly clear, therefore, that I myself endorse any effort to see that the public of Barbados does not suffer at the hands of any industrialist in the Island simply because of the absence of legislation to compel a conformity to such standards. 5.05 p.m.

However, one must have noticed a remarkable implication in the speech of the hon. Introducer of the Bill. In his remarks on the question of manufacturers of feeding stuffs, conforming to the required standards, he said nothing in comparison with what he said with reference to the manufacturers of fertilizers. I think that the implication with

regard to feeding stuffs was made by this omission. This is what the hon. member said in so far as the manufacture of fertilizers is concerned; he said that, so far as he knew, there have been no rackets or there has been no attempt.....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. I never used the word rackets. I said that no complaints have come to us.

Mr. SPEAKER: No rascality.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Let us use the hon. member's words, that there has been no rascality in the matter of fertilizers. So far as he knew, the manufacturers of fertilizers were conforming to the required standards; therefore the implication is that in the manufacture of feeding stuffs, there must have been some rascality so that the Government has found it necessary to tighten up legislation in so far as the manufacture of these feeding stuffs is concerned.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. I told this House that there have been complaints by people that there were those who would buy meal and flour and offer it to the public for sale.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I did not hear that. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: Well!) I prefaced my remarks by saying that, of course there was a Bureau of Standards being set up and so forth, but the Government has to be very careful that while, on the one hand, it protects the community yet, on the other hand, it does not play in the hands of the big monopolists. It depends to a great extent upon the source from which these complaints which have reached the Government have emanated. Most of us know that there are a few people in this island who have been making a living from buying split peas or rice unfit for human consumption.....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. Perhaps it is a good thing for me to tell the hon. member at this stage that we have had samples taken of some feeds and we have found sand in some of the samples. I mean sand from the beach.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not, for a moment, saying anything against this matter. I began by endorsing this standardisation, but I say that you have to guard against two extremes. A few small people have been mixing peas, rice and meal unfit for human consumption and selling feeding stuffs to other people. If they have been abusing the position and foisting feeding stuffs on the public below the standard required, then, by all means, they should be penalised and the public must be protected against spending good money for bad stuff. However, at the same time, I do not want the Government to be stampeded into taking any action against, or indeed setting up obstacles in the way of, small people who are making an honest living, merely at the behest of the big people who want to monopolise everything for themselves. The big man, because he has the money to put down a big plant, feels that every small person must be squeezed out and he must get everything for himself. Those are the things which we have to watch sometimes.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. I do not think that the hon. member has really read this Bill; otherwise he would not have said that. Anybody can manufacture these things provided that he conforms to these standards. He is free to do that in Barbados where democracy is at work. This is not anything which is being done for one individual or for one group of people; we are encouraging these things, but we say that you must conform to these standards.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is exactly what I have told the hon. member, but he does not seem to understand what I said. By all means, let us protect the public and fix our standards but still let us think carefully of the sources of complaints, and when it comes.....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. I want to let hon. members know that complaints have come from the buying public, those who keep cattle, pigs and so on.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This matter needs such necessary information that it should not require elucidation from the hon. member; this is information which the hon. member should have vouchsafed in introducing the Bill, so that one would not have to wonder as to the reason for its introduction. In introducing a Bill of this nature, you should put all the background information at the disposal of this House. You would expect the Government to take these steps. The Bill has its merits: but we do not want to protect monopolists; and if they do not know it, you have to tell them what can happen and what has been happening in this country. In this feeding stuffs business, there have been attempts made by people to manufacture feeding stuffs which would have conformed to the highest possible standards, but would-be monopolists have squeezed out these people. While we are saying that this is a democracy, on the other hand, let us understand that it is not democracy for one or two people. The small man who wants to invest in a small way to manufacture an article should not have any obstacles placed in his way except those which are in the interest of the public.

5.15 p.m.

In Section three of this Bill, it is said that "no person shall import into or manufacture, distribute, sell or offer, expose or hold in possession for sale in this island any fertilizer or feeding stuff which has not first been registered with and had a registration number assigned to it by the Director." The sub-section then sets out the manner in which applications for registration or renewal shall be made. Then in sub-section 3 you have "the Director may refuse to register any fertilizer or feeding stuff if in his opinion the brand or name would tend to deceive or mislead a purchaser in respect of its composition or utility value."

Well, now, that has nothing at all to do with quality. In other words, Sir, the quality may conform to the required standard, but if in the opinion of the Director the brand or name would tend to deceive or mislead a purchaser in respect of its composition or utility value, the Director can refuse to register it. Nobody is suggesting for a moment that any small manufacturer in Barbados should, by putting a brand name similar to a popular brand try to deceive the public, but that is industry on the whole, Mr. Speaker. You need no greater example than the position of Coca Cola and Pepsi Cola. Pepsi Cola has a similar brand name to Coca Cola, and there have been endless tests in Court. As a matter of fact, Coca Cola has spent millions of dollars trying to shut down Pepsi Cola, because they believe that because the brand name is similar to theirs, it tends to deceive the public into buying one for the other and what not. But the American bureau have upheld that since the formula for Pepsi Cola is different from that for Coca Cola, both are manufacturers.

Here, Mr. Speaker, the Director has very wide powers to refuse to register a feeding industry or fertilizer industry, not because the composition does not conform to the required standards but merely because the brand name would tend to deceive or mislead the purchaser. I agree with some of the other sub-sections under Section 3.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should now be talking on the principle of the Bill and not on the Sections. Any talk on the Sections should be during the Committee stage.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I am talking about refers to the principle of the Bill. It is in this respect that the Bill does not only say: that you must conform to certain standards to get a licence; the principle of the Bill itself is this: that you must conform to certain standards, and you must not have a brand or name which in the opinion of the Director will tend to mislead or deceive a purchaser, or you must not have a brand name identical or in the opinion of the Director likely to be confused with a brand name already applied to a registered fertilizer.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member reading from the Objects and Reasons or from a particular section?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am reading from the Objects and Reasons which of course are repeated in certain sections of the Bill. This is where I fear that the Government has

to proceed very carefully to see that small producers are not penalised. It is not a question of sand or other injurious articles being placed into the feedstuff, and it is left to the Director to decide whether he thinks that the brand names will be confused or whether he thinks they will confuse somebody.

When it comes to the feeding stuffs for chickens, broilers and what not, in America there are so many dozen chows; everything for chicken feed is a chow and certainly the buying public may be confused with one or the other; but so long as they conform to the manufacturing standards set down by the American Bureau of Standards, they are on the market. I do not think that a man who is establishing an industry for himself is going to be so stupid as not to try and establish it on its own merits; but certain sections of the Bill will put such wide power in the hand of the Director as to cause undue consideration on the part of any thinking person in this matter. It is true that if the Director refuses to give a licence you can appeal to a Judge of the Supreme Court in Chambers, but in many cases in the case of small people the legal expenses involved in going to the Supreme Court are more than a deterrent sometimes in fighting for what people consider to be their rights. That is where big monopolists so often get more than what they are entitled to, not because the law might not come down on the side of small men, but because the small men find it financially impossible to establish his rights by recourse to law courts.

From what I know of the background of the feeding industry in this country, I feel fully justified in saying that there are going to be people who will be quite prepared to satisfy the requirements of the law and turn out an article in no way injurious to animals of any kind, but, Mr. Speaker, may find themselves prevented from doing so by some of the other provisions of this Bill.

5.25 p.m.

One hopes that any Director responsible for interpreting the provisions will do so in the fairest manner possible and with the definite understanding that legislation of this sort has not been enacted to provide a field day for the monopolists, but to give everybody in the community a fair chance to make a living according to the conditions regulated by law as regards quality and what not.

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

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

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I would just like to ask this question. Would the small dealers in this field of fertilizers be exploited if they seek registration? I do not know. To my mind although this Bill certainly has much to recommend it, yet it seems as though if it is not properly administered you would create a monopoly. That is my interpretation of the Bill. Under the guise of raising certain standards and regularising everything, unless it is impartially administered it would tend to create a monopoly.

Section 3 reads as follows:-

"No person shall import into, or manufacture, distribute, sell or offer, expose or hold in possession for sale in this Island any fertiliser or feeding stuff which has not first been registered with and had a registration number assigned to it by the Director."

"(2) Applications for registration or renewal thereof shall be made to the Director -

- (a) in the case of articles to be imported into this Island, by the person first importing the article; and
- (b) in the case of articles to be manufactured in this Island, by the person first manufacturing the article,

and such applications shall be in such form and manner and shall set forth such particulars and comply with such conditions as may from time to time be prescribed.

"(3) The Director may refuse to register any fertiliser or feeding stuff -

- (a) if in his opinion the brand or name would tend to deceive or mislead a purchaser in respect of its composition or utility value;
- (b) under a brand or name identical with or in the opinion of the Director likely to be confused with a brand or name already applied to a registered fertiliser or feeding stuff, as the case may be;
- (c) if the specific name of each and every ingredient used in its manufacture be not stated;
- (d) if any sample required to be submitted by the applicant is found not to accord with the provisions of this Act or the regulations hereunder."

On the face of this Clause, Mr. Chairman, unless a Director is willing to have you registered, well then, you will have to go out of business. That is how it seems to me. I would like to have some assurance from the Hon. Minister that the small dealer in feeding stuffs and others who are in that business would not be affected by this section of the Bill.

The Object of this Bill is to repeal the Fertilizers and Feeding Stuffs Act, 1894, and to re-enact more comprehensive legislation pertaining to the said subjects. I want to make sure that the people in this line of business would not be affected adversely by this new Bill. If they have to go through a lot of red tape on account of this new Bill and there is no knowing how far the Director would exercise his power, there is no knowing how many small businesses would be affected by this Bill which in truth and in fact seems more intent to create a monopoly than anything else.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the hon. member has made any point to which I should reply. What he says does not make any sense; it is not practical when one reads the Bill. This is what we say in Clause 3:-

"3. (1) No person shall import into, or manufacture, distribute, sell or offer, expose or hold in possession for sale in this Island any fertiliser or feeding stuff which has not first been registered with and had a registration number assigned to it by the Director."

What is wrong with that? We rule this country and we say what we want done. There are certain standards which we want maintained and we are seeing to it that they are maintained. If it is a big man and he does not maintain these standards he will not be allowed. If he is a small man and he does not maintain these standards, he will not be allowed to sell. Nothing at all is wrong with this section. The Government has to rule and this law seeks to help people whom we want to help. We have to see to it that the people who are dealing in poultry farms and animals get value for their money when they go to buy feeding stuffs and that is what this Bill seeks to do. If a dealer in these feeding stuffs sells a ton a day, he has to conform to these provisions. If he sells a half ton or a half pint, he has to conform to these provisions. This is to be the law of the land irrespective of if it hurts some big man or if it hurts some small man. As I have said, if you

are going in for the poultry business and you are investing in that to get profits, you must get value for your money. We are not hiding under any shadow. You either get out of business or you conform to the provisions of this Bill. People spend a lot of money in cattle and chicks and somebody comes along and sells them some spurious article. Why should that be so? This is such a worthwhile Bill that it should be passed without any comment. As a matter of fact, I think that instead of criticism of it, the hon. member should be making congratulatory remarks. This is protecting people from others who have no sense of reason and who want quick money.

5.35 p.m.

This is a good Bill and we will see to it that it is enacted as quickly as possible and is carried out in every detail, because we have had a lot of complaints and we will stop them.

Mr. TALMA: No one contests the fact that the Bill has value in it. I am only asking the Minister to give some assurance that while he is attempting to raise the standards of the feeding stuffs, no hardship will be meted out to the small dealer. Instead of giving that assurance, the Hon. Minister harangues in his usual style. If the Minister had read Sub-clause (3) of Clause 3 of this Bill, he would see the weight of my argument. This Sub-clause says this:-

"The Director may refuse to register any fertiliser or feeding stuff:-

- (a) if in his opinion the brand or name would tend to deceive or mislead a purchaser in respect of its composition or utility value;"

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Read a little further.

Mr. TALMA: I am going to read a little further. In other words, those who are in this line of business may be forced out of business. Look at how this Section has been worded; it says that if, in the opinion of the Director, the brand or name would tend to deceive or mislead a purchaser in respect of the composition of the fertiliser or its utility value, registration may be refused. In other words, if there is one brand that brand must have a complete monopoly. Is that another way of saying the same thing? If you mean that, then write that in the Bill, but do not use the language which has been used here. What has been set out here is just a pun on words. This is the old, Conservative way of writing legislation. Nobody can interpret what is meant by that phrase "if in his opinion the brand or name would tend to deceive or mislead a purchaser in respect of its composition or utility value." If you want to create a monopoly, do so plainly, but not in this indirect way. The Section says that the Director may refuse to register any fertiliser or feeding stuffs:-

- (a) if in his opinion the brand or name would tend to deceive or mislead a purchaser in respect of its composition or utility value;
- (b) under a brand or name identical with or in the opinion of the Director likely to be confused with a brand or name already applied to a registered fertiliser or feeding stuff, as the case may be;
- (c) if the specific name of each and every ingredient used in its manufacture be not stated;
- (d) if any sample required to be submitted by the applicant is found not to accord with the provisions of this Act or the regulations hereunder.

I agree with sub-paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) but as far as sub-paragraph (a) is concerned, that is bad legislation. You cannot pass legislation like that. If you are dealing with somebody who has never seen anything about legislation, then you can use that sort of stuff. I repeat that that is bad legislation in sub-paragraph (a); you do not know how to draft it, but you do it in this way.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What has happened is this: The Introducer of the Bill is concerning himself with what he calls

spurious ingredients. His harangue, as the hon. senior member for Christ Church has termed it, is based on the assumption that the only manner in which you would be refused registration if you are fleecing the public by putting spurious ingredients in the composition of the feeding stuffs.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. I did not say that that is the only thing; I said that it is one of the things. I said that where one man or a group of men get together and want to manufacture feeding stuffs he has or they have to conform with these regulations and these standards. That is what I said.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Let us take chicken feed, for instance; let us take Purina Chows and a dozen other chows. Because they are all called chows, the Director may say: "We will not give any other chow a licence," although the other chows may be entirely different.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. The Director is a trained man; he is a technologist, he has qualifications and he has integrity as well.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Coca-Cola is different from Pepsi-Cola, but they are contesting the legality of putting Pepsi-Cola on the market because both are Colas. You have the African Cola and you have the one from Germany. You have many Colas based on the Coca-Cola formula but the taste is slightly different. If you go into a Court and your formula is not the same as Coca-Cola, nobody can stop you. As to the question as to whether the brand name may tend to deceive the public, no Director of Agriculture is going to be involved in a matter of that sort. All over the United States of America, Courts have been reversing the decisions of other Courts on this question with special reference to Coca-Cola, Pepsi-Cola and other Colas. If it were merely a question of the other three provisions of this section, it would be all well and good; that is to say, the identical brand name, or if a person refused to give the formula or if the samples required to be submitted are not in accordance with the standards required, you can refuse to register a fertiliser or a feeding stuff. But when you come to sub-paragraph (a) of sub-section (3) which says that the Director may refuse to register any fertiliser or feeding stuff if, in his opinion, the brand or name would tend to deceive or mislead a purchaser in respect of its composition or utility value, that is nothing at all to do with the quality. It is nothing at all to do with spurious or non-spurious ingredients.

5.45 p.m.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, your ingredients can conform to all the required standards; it can be a most nutritious product on the market; it can be of the utmost value to feeding stock, but merely on this question of brand name the Director can refuse to register it. That is the point we are contending. We give you all three of the other sub-sections: you must submit samples, your ingredients must conform, and you must not have an identical brand name; but we are not prepared, Mr. Chairman, to support subsection 3 (a) of section 3. As a matter of fact, ask either one of them to interpret the section, Mr. Chairman, Ask them to tell this Committee how the brand or name could deceive or mislead a purchaser in respect of its utility value. It is manifestly not easy to interpret and we are not going to support it.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the more I look at this Section the more I become convinced that we are correct. Now if the object of this Bill is to protect certain people who are in this line of business, certainly this is hardly the appropriate method.....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order, did I hear the hon. member saying this is to protect people who are already in this business?

Mr. TALMA: I said if it is.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I am saying emphatically it is not.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I want to bring to the attention of the Minister and the Committee as a whole

that already we have in existence a Patent and Trade Marks Act on the Statute Book. Now if this article is of a certain trademark or trade name or if it is thought desirable that it should be patented, already we have on the Statute Book a Patent and Trade Marks Act, a Trade Names Act, Business Names Act and so on. Is it that this Act in sub-section 3 of Section 3 will supersede the Patent and Trade Marks Act? What we are trying to do here is to vest in the Director of Agriculture certain powers and duties which are already vested in the Registrar of the Supreme Court of this Island. If he is to exercise his discretion to find out whether the brand or the name would tend to deceive or mislead the purchasers in respect of its composition or utility value, then he is performing the duties already vested in the Registrar of the Supreme Court of this Island; so you have two authorities doing similar work. In whom does the final authority rest? Is it that you will have one authority competing against the other? That is how it looks to me.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this sub-clause 3 (a) should be taken out altogether because you are trying to vest in the Director of Agriculture certain duties which are already vested in the Registrar of the Supreme Court of this Island. If the manufacturer or manufacturers have an article they want to protect, they should have it registered as a trademark or a trade name, or in other words, have it patented. If they have it patented, then no one can infringe their patent rights; on the other hand if you try to work it this way, though you see later on in the Bill that they speak about warranties in Clause 5, there are no real warranties in reality and there are very difficult to be applied. I am saying, therefore, that the power which is being vested in the Director is unnecessary. Subsection 3 (a) of Section 3 reads as follows:-

"The Director may refuse to register any fertiliser or feeding stuff -

(a) if in his opinion the brand or name would tend to deceive or mislead a purchaser in respect of its composition or utility value;"

That is vesting too much power in the Director. If you have people who have an article which is good and which should not be infringed by virtue of its being registered and patented, then go through the regular process; but if you have some fake article, do not rely on the cover and the protection under this Bill. If you have a valid and good feeding stuff or fertiliser as the case may be, go ahead as other businessmen have to do and have the article patented and registered in the proper way and in the regular way, and do not seek protection under sub-clause 3 (a) by vesting in the Director certain powers which it is doubtful how he can exercise and which cannot be interpreted at all one way or another, because everything depends on the opinion of the Director. That is not how legislation is done. My submission is that this is giving the Director too much power.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have given enough reasons why sub-clause 3 (a) should be deleted. Whether or not they support it does not matter; but I think it is my duty if I see something glaringly wrong to make a motion and attempt having it taken out. If they want to leave it in, let them do so; they have a majority.

I beg to move that sub-clause 3 (a) of Clause 3 be deleted. It is a bad bit of legislation, it cannot be interpreted by anybody at all, it cannot be enforced impartially and no one knows what it really means; and in the first analysis provision is already made on the Statute Book of this Island for registration of trade names, business names, trademarks and having articles of this nature patented. 5.55 p.m.

If you have all that already, why should you bring this here? This is just a means of confusing the issue and vesting more power in the Director of Agriculture.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I really was not going to reply, but the answer is so simple. Who is going to obtain it without the necessary analysis? The Chemist at the

Department must see what those ingredients are and he must draw up a certificate. The dealer must produce samples. He cannot have something patented without the knowledge of the Director of Agriculture. How could he go and get it patented? There must be some authority to have it patented.

Mr. TALMA: I rise on a point of order. You submit a sample to the Analyst to be analysed. This is making legislation to protect the dealer.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The hon. member is only just trying to oppose. He is just trying to delay tactics. I will just make one analogy. Suppose Mr. A had a feeding stuff registered as B-R-Y-A-N and another fellow comes along and sees Mr. A. getting good sales for this brand of feed and because of that, he says: "I am going to register this one which I have as B-R-I-A-N." It is a difference, but it sounds the same way. They are two different words. It is just the same as you get one feed called "Premier" and another one called "Premiere". The Director has a right to say to the fellow bringing the latter: "Oh no, I cannot allow that, you are confusing the issue." I hope that would satisfy the hon. member.

The Director has a right to see to all of these things. It is something in the interest of the people; and when we are grown up, we should see to it that we do not make ourselves look stupid. You are either right or wrong. We are trying to protect the average man in the street when he is going to buy his feeding stuffs. We are trying to see to it that he gets the best for his money; but because the hon. senior member for Christ Church is in the Opposition he is saying that we are trying to protect a monopolist when in truth and in fact every Barbadian has a right to begin a business. All we are saying is that before you sell feeding stuffs to the public, you must conform with the law of Barbados. All we are saying - and we are saying it most emphatically - is that if you want to sell feeding stuffs to the buying public, straighten up and come right. That is all this Bill means. The average Barbadian is an intelligent human being and he knows that this piece of legislation is for his good. I have known people who got mixed up with brands of feeding stuffs and with the prices too. There are some feeding stuffs which are imported comprised of a certain nutritional value and which carry a certain amount of protein, and there are certain other feeding stuffs which are lacking in these ingredients but actually carry the same name. I pay five cents for one brand and you pay twelve cents for the other; yet you do not get your animal to thrive as well as I do. All this is so elementary. This is no fight, Sir.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member has read the Bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the matter to which the Hon. Minister is referring is covered by another section of the Bill, not by this Section with which we are dealing. This is the way this Section reads:

"The Director may refuse to register any fertiliser or feeding stuff - (a) if in his opinion the brand or name would tend to deceive or mislead a purchaser in respect of its composition or utility value:"

Then you go on to the one which we are talking about. It says that he can refuse to register - (b) under a brand or name identical with or in the opinion of the Director likely to be confused with a brand or name already applied to a registered fertiliser or feeding stuff, as the case may be.

In other words, under (b), you cannot have B-R-Y-A-N and B-R-I-A-N. The one to which the hon. senior member for Christ Church is referring is a different thing. If you do not want to give the Director of Agriculture the power to abuse his authority, well then, you do not want (a) and (b) at all. Paragraph (b) is quite enough to prevent any similar or identical name from being used. I am telling you that (a) is the same sort of thing that causes all of this legalistic confusion with names of brands. One Court says one thing and another Court says another thing.

I am supporting the motion to delete (a) because (a) is bound to lead to further confusion. You are quite covered with the samples under (c) and (d). As a matter of fact, you have to submit the specific name of each and every ingredient used in the manufacture of the article under (c) and we also agree with (d) - if any sample required to be submitted by the applicant is found not to accord with the provisions of this Act or the Regulations, then the Director should refuse to register.
6.05 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the Bill. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:-

AYES: Hon'bles Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M. E. COX, D. D. GARNER, R. G. MAPP, L. St.A. THORNE, Messrs. HOLDER and SEARLES - 7

NOES: Mr. TALMA and Mr. CRAWFORD - 2

The question was resolved in the affirmative.

The question that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 4 was called and passed.

Clause 5 was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to move that Clause 5 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Hon. Minister with his great knowledge, to explain sub-clause (4) of this Clause to this Committee. This is what the Sub-clause says:-

"No action or any such warranty as is mentioned in this section shall lie for any mis-statement therein as to particulars of the nature, substance or quality of the article, or as to the amount of any ingredient, where the mis-statement does not exceed the limits of variation (if any) prescribed under this Act in relation to such particulars or amounts, but where the mis-statement exceeds such limits, the rights of the purchaser under the warranty shall not be affected by such limits."

I would like the Hon. Minister to explain how any person would be able to take advantage of these implied warranties which are set out in Section 5 of this Bill. In this Section it is stated that written warranties must be given by the sellers that the particulars contained in the statutory statements are correct; and any written document other than a statutory statement descriptive of the article shall have effect as a warranty by the seller that the facts stated are correct. I would like the Hon. Minister to explain this Section in order to get an understanding as to how and when any person who is aggrieved would have a right of action under these implied warranties.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: All I would say about that is that there is provision in this Act for any of these persons to receive justice through the Courts. Any person who thinks that he is aggrieved can get justice in the Courts.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I am trying to save debate by giving the Hon. Minister an opportunity to explain this Section, but if the matter goes on for another half of an hour he would say that we are trying to hold him back. In Clause 5 of this Bill this is what is stated in Sub-clause (1):-

"A statutory statement given by the seller of any such article as aforesaid shall, notwithstanding any contract or notice to the contrary, have effect as a written warranty by the seller that the particulars contained in the statutory statement are correct."

There are certain warranties; and when you talk about warranties you automatically give an aggrieved party the right to sue for damages. Although on the face of this Bill it speaks about warranties, yet when you look at Sub-clause (4), you will see that the right of action is almost taken away so that the whole thing is a farce. It raises your hopes to be able to bring an action for damages in Sub-clause (1), but when you come to Sub-clause (4) you will see that this is what is stated:-

"No action on any such warranty as is mentioned in this section shall lie for any mis-statement therein as to particulars of the nature, substance or quality of the article, or as to the amount of any ingredient, where the mis-statement does not exceed the limits of variation (if any) prescribed under this Act in relation to such particulars or amounts, but where the mis-statement exceeds such limits, the rights of the purchaser under the warranty shall not be affected by such limits."

In other words, what are the limits? Will the Hon. Minister explain that? I am trying to point out to the Minister that there are certain warranties raised in this Clause which will suggest a right of action, but that right of action is taken away in Sub-clause (4). For the benefit of this Committee, I would like the Minister to explain what are the limits referred to in Sub-clause (4).

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, they are just what is stated here.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the limits are not set out; nobody knows what the limits are. I am asking the Minister if there are any limits of variation because the Section says "limits of variation (if any)."

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The Chemists will tell you all about that.

Mr. TALMA: This is legislation under which an aggrieved party can bring an action for damages as to the particulars of quality or fitness or as to the description of the article. As a result of a breach of any of these things, an aggrieved party has a right of action, but under Sub-clause (4) that right of action is taken away. The Minister cannot explain that.

The question that Clause 5 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 6 to 9 inclusive were called and passed, 6.15 p.m.

Clauses 10 to 23 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 24 was called. It reads as follows:-

24. (1) The Governor-in-Executive Committee may make regulations for prescribing anything which under this Act is required or authorised to be prescribed, and generally for carrying this Act into operation, and in particular such regulations may provide:-

- (a) for varying any of the Schedules to this Act;
- (b) for prescribing the manner in which articles required to be marked under this Act are to be marked and the nature of such marks;
- (c) for prescribing the limits of variation for the purposes of this Act;
- (d) for prescribing the manner in which samples are to be taken and dealt with in cases where under this Act they are taken in the prescribed manner.
- (e) as to the method in which analysis for determining the percentages of particular substances are to be made;

(f) as to the form of certificates to be given by analytical officers;

and where any Schedule is varied by regulations so made, this Act shall have effect as if the Schedule as so varied were substituted for the Schedule contained in this Act.

(2) All regulations made under this section shall be laid before both Houses of the Legislature as soon as may be after they are made and if within the period of forty days beginning with the day on which any such regulations are so laid before it either House of the Legislature resolves that the regulations be annulled, they shall thenceforth be void, but without prejudice to the validity of anything previously done thereunder or to the making of new regulations.

Provided that in reckoning any such period of forty days no account shall be taken of any time during which the Legislature is dissolved or prorogued.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 24 stand part.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Now Clause 24, Mr. Chairman, gives the Governor-in-Executive Committee power to make the Regulations for prescribing a number of things; prescribing the manner in which the articles are required to be marketed; prescribing the limits of variation for the purposes of the Act and this refers to the point raised by the hon. senior member for Christ Church just now, as well as to the question of submission of analyses for determining the percentage of certain substances to be made and what not.

Under the Section which we passed earlier which we were opposing — that is, subsection 3(a) of Section 3 — a manufacturer has to submit the specific name of each and every ingredient used in the manufacture of the article. In other words, he has to disclose the entire formula to the Director. Under this Section Regulations are made for these things I have already outlined, but now there is no protection at all for the formula. If a manufacturer submits a formula to the Director of Agriculture or to the Bureau of Standards or something like that, some protection should be given in respect of the formula submitted. Let us get it clear; a lot of dissatisfaction in this island with reference to the manufacture of feed stuff springs from the fact that a small manufacturer does not disclose the ingredients of what he produces. His feeding stuff is required to be of a certain standard. It is better very often than the other feed stuff produced, but because of the competition they want to get it off the market.

Under this Bill, Mr. Chairman, he is going to have to submit to the Director of Agriculture before he can get it registered a list of every single item he uses in the manufacture of his feed, but he has no protection against anybody in the Department taking up his formula and giving somebody a copy. I am not at all quite satisfied in my own mind up to now — as a matter of fact I do not know, I have not taken the trouble to find out — I had no reason to — how the Bureau of Standards operate; but there must be some protection, Mr. Chairman, for a manufacturer who submits the details of the formula he is using to any Registration Bureau against someone making the details of his formula available to competitors. What I am saying is common knowledge in Bridgetown, and everybody knows that people who are very interested in legislation of this sort are interested in it because of certain competition they are sustaining.

It is not so much a question, Mr. Chairman, I submit in this particular case, of any complaints over quality; it is a question of complaints over not knowing what this

particular manufacturer uses as his formula; and the moment he has to declare the formula in the manner specified under the Act, the possibility exists that it may leak out to competitors, and the privileged position which this manufacturer or the manufacturers now enjoy because their formulae are kept secret, they would no longer enjoy. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that there should be some protection for formulae submitted under legislation of this sort.

The question that Clause 24 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

6.25 p.m.

Clauses 25 to 27 inclusive were called separately and passed.

The First Schedule was called and passed.

The Second Schedule was called and passed.

The Third Schedule was called and passed.

The Fourth Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. D. D. GARNER, seconded by Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. D. D. GARNER seconded by Hon. R. G. MAPP, in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE BARBADOS MARKETING CORPORATION BILL, 1961.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:-

Second reading of a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Marketing Corporation charged with the duty of improving the growing and marketing of produce and for matters incidental thereto or connected therewith.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill to provide for the establishment of a Marketing Corporation in the Island is wider than the one previously completed. This Bill is long overdue and it has a lot to offer to the entire population in that it seeks to revolutionise the system of agriculture and marketing in Barbados. This is the first of its kind in Barbados and it is not an overnight Bill; it has to be taken in conjunction with all of the plans which this Government has for Barbados. These plans aim at the development of the entire country, and agriculture being our greatest employer and source of revenue, it needs to be protected and developed.

One might ask what they are trying to do in 1961 which has not been done before because this Island has been an agricultural community for the past 300 years or more. But I would like to think that the person who would be able enough to ask that question would be just like Rip Van Winkle and not alive to the needs of the hour.

We have found out in our Development Plans — those who have gone before and those who are working on them now — that a lot depends on your agricultural productivity. It is not enough for the Government to ask farmers to grow more food. It is not enough for us to say, do this and do that; we must find the means whereby people who are engaged in agriculture, whether they be engaged with the harder foodstuffs or the finer vegetables, would be able to get a proper market for their goods.

In Barbados, as I have said before, we have reached the stage where we realise that unless we organise so that we can get the optimum results, instead of going forward

we will go backward. If we who are in agriculture believe that we can depend on haphazard methods any longer, we are fooling ourselves. The Sugar Industry as such enjoys a proper form of organisation and proper marketing facilities. Food crops, unlike the Sugar Industry, have no such organisation; we depend on the flux of the trade. We would like to see it organised on a proper basis and not to let it run its own way. We think, too, that if we ask the farmers of this country to plant a certain percentage of their lands in food crops it is only right that we at least give them a hand in selling the produce.

Now, Sir, the story of marketing in Barbados is a long one. I think hon. members are aware that Committee after Committee sat on this business. Several Committees sat on this matter and from time to time they reported; but nobody heretofore seemed to have grasped or taken the opportunity to grasp the significance of what a proper marketing organisation would mean to these people who produce the food.

6.35 p.m.

Now, Sir, this Corporation — if hon. members have read this Bill they would have seen — will have fairly wide powers. It is to be Government-sponsored and it is to do a lot of things. Hon. members are aware that we are having a fish cold storage plant, we are enlarging the abattoir and we are engaging in a few other things which this Corporation will have to administer; hence the need for this Corporation. Nothing is wrong with an organized marketing body; you have to be in the co-operative world where the co-operators organize their marketing facilities for their own betterment. You have organisation in big businesses; but in Barbados, the poor planter, the poor peasant, even some of the big planters too, have no guidance in the matter. They have no organization as such, and any disorganized group is doomed to failure, whether it is in agriculture, politics, music or whatever it is. The world is moving in an organized manner today, so much so that you see not only the East and West getting organized, but some of the Easterners are in line with the Westerners and they organize with the Westerners. For man's protection he organizes and for the distribution of food we say that the time has come when we should organize the producers of this food.

When a farmer concentrates on the cultivation and harvesting of his crop, it is very hard for him to deal with the marketing end of it as well. Marketing is a specialised field; in seasons of the year there are certain business deals and there is a certain business acumen in carrying out sales. You have a sales campaign, you have sales talk; you talk about the quality of commodities and all of these things have to be done if you want to get the greatest results. If you let people go on loosely and do not create the authority whereby they will have the means of the disposal of their product, instead of our getting more food we will get less food. In the Department of Agriculture we have been carrying on certain campaigns from time to time; there is the famous "Grow More Food" Campaign. People say that you ask them to grow more food and then a glut is created, but very often, there is no glut as such. There may be a glut in St. Philip but Christ Church is doing without; there may be a glut in St. Andrew but St. George is doing without. In attempting to carry out this marketing organization, we are trying to channel our products in a more central spot where sales promotion will be carried out, not only for the benefit of the planter but also for the benefit of the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I said a while ago that I would return to the problem of the hucksters and I think I will do that at this juncture. The proverbial huckster goes out on Monday and he or she carries products in his cart or tray. He does not get back out but he starts to sell the following day. He must get two days' pay because two days' work is involved because of the means of transportation; hence the consumer has to pay for that. There is no central spot for the sale of these products, there is no marketing organization; so the hucksters feel that when they have one day's work and it takes them two or three days to dispose of their goods, they must bear all the burden; whereas, if you had a central depot so that they could come to town and

dispose of all their products on the same day, their overhead charges will be smaller. We are not trying by the stroke of any pen to eliminate the hucksters; we are trying to organize and help them and we are also trying to help the poor buyer. (ASIDES.) Somebody is saying that we want to eliminate these hucksters and that is why I am making this statement. (Mr. WALCOTT: They will be eliminated gradually.) It will take time to do it. "Time like an ever rolling stream, bears all its sons away". I was saying, Sir, that it is not our intention to eliminate the hucksters, but time will do all these things. In some years from now you will not see anybody walking about with a tray on her head. I am not saying whether we can eliminate them or not, because with legislation you can do most things; but we are not eliminating these hucksters.

This Bill seeks to create an Authority which will have the power to do certain things. I am reminded of a meeting with certain businessmen from British Guiana and of hearing them say that they were very surprised to come to Barbados and see that plantains which, on certain occasions are so cheap, were so expensive. I think that the time has come when a proper marketing organization should rectify some of these wrongs. We know that the fishermen find it very hard to get rid of their heavy catches; we have to bear them in mind and this marketing organization will also help to take care of them.

I heard an hon. member say something about co-operatives. Well, I would like to report to this House that the co-operative among the fishermen is going wonderfully well. When we first started, there were a lot of doubting Thomases who said "Oh no; you cannot organize these people"; but we have got around to the matter and we are making a good job of it. It is surprising that we have some very knowledgeable people joining in the co-operative movement when it comes to the fishermen.

6.45 p.m.

As time goes on, by doing all these things you will find that Barbados will be gradually having a more buoyant economy. This Marketing Organization will help to do that. Where heretofore people expected fishermen to go out to sea and try to catch as many fish as they could and come back to land to sell what is known as dinner fish, we are trying to remove all those things now. We are trying to organize them and I think we have very good plans for so doing. It is true that I cannot disclose everything here now. (Mr. WALCOTT: Why?) Because they are not all finalised; but they will be presented in due course. I do hope, Sir, that every hon. member here has given thought to this Bill because some of them do not read a Bill until they come here and hear them for the first time. (Mr. WALCOTT: Only the Ministers do that.) I hope they have read it and appreciated it, because I can assure you, Sir, that there is nothing here to hurt one single soul in Barbados; it is for the upliftment of everybody. There will be more food — better nutrition and cheaper food.

Let me say this, Mr. Speaker. It must not be felt in certain quarters that agriculturalists do not need an economic price for their goods. In every society, people tend to feel that no agriculturalist needs anything and that he can live on the least that could be provided for him. If you look around Barbados, you will see that this is changing today if it has not already changed. If you go to any of the secondary schools, you will find the children of these agricultural labourers. They see that you are asking Government for more money as salary, and the moment you ask for more they will want more money for the food they produce. They are not going to stay in the hot, broiling sun and provide cheap food. Some people do not appreciate the amount of hard labour and sweat that goes into producing food; I do want people to appreciate the effort that is made to produce food. We do not want a huckster to get more than what she should be paid for the product. I have known people to have bought string beans at 8 cents a pound and sold them at 30 cents a pound. With this Marketing Corporation all that will be wiped out.

I do not know that I need say more on this. I think that hon. members are pleased. (Mr. WALCOTT: This is D-Day for you.) I told hon. members that I had some legislation to bring down here. This is an effort to help

farmers and the general public, and the keynote for this is organisation. I am prepared to organise it, and wherever I am there has got to be organisation. In fact one has only to look around the island and see that where there was chaos there is now organisation, and some of the greatest Government opponents who said all sorts of things about the Bay Street market have to eat that up in shame, because out of disorder we have created order and organised the people.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this to the Honourable House for the good of this country, for the development of Barbados and for more locally grown food to be eaten. I see no reason why tomatoes should be sold at 60 cents a pound; they are not worth it. I know I will have the honour to carry out these instructions because the Government will be returned to power again unless something goes wrong. Only a miracle can stop that; and we intend to make planters plant more tomatoes and things of that sort. Why should a girl who is going home from work an afternoon buy half pound of tomatoes? Why should it be a delicacy? When she buys half a pound for 30 cents, what is that? She had better be buying caviar. We are going to give the people better protection and with a Marketing Organisation in Bridgetown, these people will know where to sell their produce. Aback of this we have the export market before our eyes. We cannot stay here and let this land remain idle.

Mr. Speaker, I have information which I do not want to disclose here. We must diversify our crops and encourage people to buy much more of the local food than they do now. I am not trying to change eating habits at all, but I would still give a warning. In England potato is a national crop and in many other places, and they eat their potatoes and are proud of them. A lot of people in Barbados did not know anything about Irish potatoes until they started to get more money. The dogs knew more about Irish potatoes than the working class people. We have made it possible for people to buy them today, but we do not tell them to buy Irish potatoes and leave our locally grown yams and potatoes to rot under the cellar. What is the difference between an Irish potato and a good soft eating yam with a piece of salt fish or flying fish? People leave buying yams at 4 cents or 5 cents a pound and go to the shop and credit two pounds of Irish potatoes for 32 cents, and yet they say they do not get enough money. All these things will be controlled. Today Irish potatoes are 14 cents a pound, and with 8 cents or 10 cents people can buy a little more food which is grown locally.

6.55 p.m.

Sir, quite recently I was invited by a certain planter to visit his plantation. I am not going to call any names. He did not have any pea-tree or any sort of grain growing around his land. Why should Barbadians refuse to buy their own local green peas and prefer to buy a pint of split peas or whole peas which are imported? These things need to be gone into. If you buy locally grown foods, it would be a means of more money circulating in the Island and I have always said that you buy imported food at the expense of the local producer. It is time for us to think over these things because if you want to raise the economy of this Island, you must make it possible to circulate more money here and stop importing so much.

In bringing down this Bill, Sir, we have taken a comprehensive view; I would say that we have taken a look into the future. I am sure that what we have brought down today would not only benefit us but would benefit posterity. We want to make people aware that when they buy locally grown foodstuffs they are helping to employ the local farmer. So often I have repeated on the floor of this House this statement that I have found so much dignity in the land. All over the world, there are farmers. It is a dignified job and I will go as far as to say that they are some of the most healthy people and the reason for it is that they live close to nature, they get the sun's rays; therefore, they do not suffer from the various diseases which people who keep away from the sun get.

Sir, I am not going into the clauses of this Bill but I would like to draw to the attention of this Honourable House what is the object of this Bill. The object of this

Bill is to provide for the establishment of a Marketing Corporation in the Island charged with the duty of improving the growing, production and marketing of fruit, vegetables and other praedial produce, milk, livestock, poultry and fish.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7.00 p.m. o'clock.....

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to adjourn at this stage.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 1st August, 1961, at 12 o'clock (noon).

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

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

7.03 p.m.