THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961—66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 13th October, 1964.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.00 o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., *(Speaker)*; Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. C. E. TALMA, *(Minister of Communications and Works)*; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries)*; Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, *(Chairman of Committees)*; and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, *(Minister of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Development)*.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meetings held on the 25th August, 1964, and 6th October, 1964, respectively, have been duly circulated amongst hon. members, and if there is no objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. *(A Pause)*.

There being no objection, I declare the Minutes of both of those Meetings to be now duly confirmed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD and Mr. S. E. SEALEY entered the House and took their seats.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a copy of the Accounts and Statements for the month of April, 1964, as prepared by the Accountant General.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Annual Report of the Commissioner of Police of Barbados for the year 1962.

Report on Vital Statistics and Registrations for the year 1962.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for six months ended 30th September, 1964.

Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados and the amounts received from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts, for the period ended 31st March, 1964, in respect of Schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Report on the Probation Service for the year, 1962.

Mr. HOLDER entered the House and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance:

Resolution to place sums not exceeding in the aggregate $200,000 at the disposal of the Government for the purpose of advancing funds to the Regional Council of Ministers and the new East Caribbean Currency Authority, to meet preliminary expenses in connection with the Authority.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Resolution to approve that the sum of $12,000 provided in the Capital Estimates 1964-65 under Head 4 Water Supplies, Item 4 — Mechanical Equipment be now used for the purchase of an additional mobile Air Compressor Unit with loader, angle dozer and ancillary equipment.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance:

A Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Public Treasury and appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1964.

Mr. MOTTLEY entered the House and took his seat.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next Meeting in order to deal with the Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

QUESTION

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

Will Government consider purchasing Union Tenantry and Branchbury Tenantry in the parish of St. Joseph for the purpose of providing security of tenure for, and ultimately sale of the said tenantries to, the tenants thereof? 12.25 p.m.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the

Public Treasury and appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1964, be now read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the first Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I leave the Chair, may I mention in connection with the Reports of Select Committees that it is expected that later in the day leave will be sought to lay the Report of the Select Committee which was appointed to consider and report on a Bill to authorise Esso Standard Oil S.A. Limited to erect a jetty at Half Moon Fort, St. Lucy.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1964-65 No. 32

Head 10 – Accountant General – was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 10 – Accountant General – stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Head 17B – Meteorological Service – was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 17B – Meteorological Service – stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Head 21 – Prisons – was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move Head 21 – Prisons – stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Head 29 – Town and Country Planning – was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 29 – Town and Country Planning – stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Head 30 – Waterworks – was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 30 – Waterworks – stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Head 47 – Subsidies and Grants – was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 47 – Subsidies and Grants – stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think we are all happy that the Government has seen to our suggestion to let our sympathy to the people of the neighbouring colony of Guadeloupe who suffered during the hurricane be shown in a more tangible way, and we strongly support this $5,000. It might look small; but coming from a small country like Barbados whose resources are limited, it shows that we have still pushed our hands into our pockets and made a contribution. I commend the Government, because there is always a feeling that because they are not a British West Indian colony, nothing should be done. On this occasion I must say that we over here support the Government on this stand, and we hope this will go a long way to show that friendship which exists between the different speaking peoples in these parts.

The question that Head 47, Subsidies and Grants, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

1 – Annexed Estimates – Post Office – was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that 1 – Annexed Estimates – Post Office – stand part of the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of $14,616 do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1964-65 – No. 31

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of $132,895, and as the Addendum sets out, it is a revote. Hon. members will remember that the sum of $230,000 was included in the Capital Estimates for 1963-64, under Head 8 – Communications – Item 13, Car park, for the construction of a car park on the inner basin of the Careenage. Work on the project commenced late in the financial year and $182,895 lapsed at the end of the year. Of this amount only $50,000 was revoted in the Capital Estimates for the present financial year under Head 8 – Communications – Item 1, Car Park, and it is necessary to revote the remainder of $132,895 for the continuation of the project.

Now this amount is made up as follows: Purchase of steel sheet piling, $95,000; cost of marl fill, $27,300; and driving of piles etc., $10,595. I may mention that the indent for the supply of the steel sheet piling – which of course was forwarded to the Crown Agents in December, 1963, and at that time it was promised that in two months' time this steel sheet piling would be furnished: but unfortunately, it was not received in time. It has now been received and the steel sheet piling is now available and has to be paid for. That is the residue of equipment needed in order to complete the car park.

12.35 p.m.

The delay has been caused by the late arrival of the steel sheet piling. Now that the sheet piling has arrived, we are asking for the revote of $132,895 in order to complete the work. This is in keeping with the sum of $230,000 which was voted by the Legislature at first for the project. We

are only asking for this revote in order to carry on the work.

I beg to move that the sum of $132,895 be now revoted.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, sometimes delay causes danger, but at times delay also gives us the opportunity for reflection upon something. It is not that I am attempting to reflect on a vote of the House, but this revote gives us the opportunity for reconsideration of the question of provision for car parking facilities. In this country, people will have to learn that sooner or later the people who cannot afford to buy cars will have to pay for them. It is done in every country of the world.

As I have said, sometimes delay causes danger, but it also gives us the opportunity to reconsider what might have been a mistake. There is an old saying of "killing two birds with one stone". Now, Sir, I have been watching the development of this project for some time. We have to provide the necessary space for the parking of cars, and looking around the City of Bridgetown, I see warehouses which were abandoned and which have been bought up and renovated into modern stores. I have been watching the development of my City, and I began to think - and, as you know, Mr. Chairman, I wend my way through all the highways and hedges of the City; therefore, if the Hon. Leader of the House, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and his Government will give me a hearing, I am suggesting to them that they kill two birds with one stone.

When I went through the areas of Golden Square and Church Village thinking on the matter, I concluded that coupled with slum clearance could be the question of the provision of car parks. It would have been a wonderful opportunity for us to clear the Golden Square which is a stone throw o[f] the present Careenage and the Church Village area a[nd] turn these areas into car parks.

Sir, I wonder if the Government would give consideration to this matter. If we are not too far gone with this project, we can withdraw this and take the money to clear part of the slums of the Golden Square and Church Village and turn that land into car parks.

The Hon. Minister must be aware that there is a terrible situation in those areas and they should be cleared. Those areas would also make splendid car parks. I feel myself, with the opinion of members of my Party, that slum clearance should be dealt with promptly and should be the future policy of the Government. We are not satisfied with the mere filling of the Careenage as such for car parking, and that that will be of lasting benefit for the country. We are not saying that it is a nuisance when you are doing this. We feel that the job which the Government is doing as regards the reclamation of the Constitution Swamp is one of the finest projects which has been tackled by this Government, but at the same time it has not been brought home to us, when we are filling in that part of the Careenage, that that is part of the project of reclamation of the Constitution Swamp. It has been merely brought home to us that it is for the purpose of making a car park.

Sir, as we see it, day after day you find a greater number of cars coming into this country, and the problems which the people are having are to find convenient areas to park them; and coupled with the absence of proper sidewalks, people will have to walk some distance to their places of business or where they do their shopping. Therefore, we hope that in the next attempt made by this Government at finding spaces for car parks, this Government will kill two birds with one stone, that is to say, they will clear slums by taking away the houses and turning those areas into car parks.

Sir, I support the Resolution: but I, myself, was somewhat worried because for some months I have seen this steel sheet piling on the ground and I know that that can cause decay to the sheets. I do hope that the Hon. Minister will take what I have said today and feel that we are attempting to co-operate with this problem of finding places for car parks by having slum clearance along with it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the hon. member for the suggestion which he has made, but in this particular case the steel sheet piling lying along the Careenage is reaching a stage of decay. This steel sheet piling is not only for the car parking space there, but also for the purpose of making repairs to the Wharf along Cavans Lane. As I have said, the cost of this sheet piling is $95,000, so that money has to be spent in any case in that area in order to maintain the Careenage, and further work has to be done. As I have said, the time has expired and the whole thing is being undermined.

As to the hon. member's suggestion as regards slum clearance, admirable as it is, yet in this particular case money has to be spent in the putting down of sheet piling and reinforcing the present Careenage because it has reached the stage where it cannot continue to remain in that stage any longer.
12.45 p.m.

More money will have to be spent not only in that area, but in another area, and more steel piling has to be obtained for other work in the Careenage. Therefore I say that this amount of $95,000 will have to be spent in any case.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think that on this question of the provision of this car park, I would like to say something. It does not matter so much as to the amount of money which will be spent on this idea of utilising the Careenage or part of it as a car park, because I think that this question was the subject of a lot of theories. However, it was good imagination on the part of those responsible for creating this facility in the City as that open basin was, in many parts, an area of polluted water, and none of the aesthetic things about which we speak was really there. I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister that in Barbados, people are very difficult or they find it very difficult to change and move from one mode of thinking to another. It seems to me that this question of parking will become a real problem in the future, and it should be tackled very energetically and forcefully at the beginning so that certain ills can be removed. I am not a believer in having in a City like Bridgetown, a small City like this, an elaborate bus area where buses can be parked continuously. Somebody must have some commonsense to say something about this. I am suggesting that the parking places for buses should be at points outside of the City so that you would not have these buses converging at the same point. You can have a certain area outside the City for the parking of buses and so relieve this large area of land in the City for more practical purposes. Because it was the custom in days gone by for buses to come to Bridgetown from various areas of the island and park until 4 o'clock, nowadays you have about 200 buses and you are carrying along the same mediaeval practice which was started some years ago.

On this question of parking, the Hon. Minister of Communications, and indeed the Government, should adopt a policy which is in keeping with change and the times, and they should get right down to the idea that it is not good business to continue what is being carried on at the present time. You know that a bus is going to pass a certain route and you can get it. It is no inconvenience to the travelling public because people do not want to sit down in the buses and wait, but they want the buses to be ready when they are going to leave. It looks to me, Sir, as if it is a waste of time and everything else to have what I may call a number of man hours being wasted in having buses being parked in the middle of a little City like Bridgetown, when they should be rotated and parked in respective areas, instead of being parked in this little City, where it would not be a question of acquiring land for this purpose.

The area which is now being used for the parking of buses could be re-designed so that the buses could go in and out without any difficulty to the people, and in turn the people would know what time the buses were coming in and

they would wait for them rather than our having this practice of providing parking places for these buses. If the owners of these buses want to have parking places, they must provide garages. You do not want to have a bus parked in the stand from 12.00 o'clock (noon) to 4.00 o'clock in the afternoon. I think that some attention should be paid to bring this matter into line with commonsense and with the needs of the community. I hope that the suggestion I have made will commend itself to those who are in authority.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I agree with what the hon. member who has just sat down has said, but he omitted to say this. It has been drawn to my attention that there is a very stupid practice to which the hon. member has referred - and I have seen it myself - that if a bus is to leave the area at 4.00 o'clock p.m. and ten minutes before that time it is jam-packed with people, that bus will remain there until 4.00 o'clock p.m. That seems to me to be absolutely nonsensical. I am told, and I have gone in the bus stand and seen it myself, that you have the "limers" and sometimes the private concessionaires will give instructions for the buses to move on. I repeat, Sir, that it is a very nonsensical thing that the buses are packed down at ten minutes to four, but they must wait until 4.00 o'clock before they are moved. We are now providing somewhere for fifty and sixty buses to be parked, and I quite agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that something must be done in this matter. We have been saying all the time that this old question of parking is a question which must be tackled, and people who own motor cars must realise that they will have to pay for parking their cars. In the United States of America big executives realise this, and they use their cars at the weekend and use taxis for going to work.

On the question of the transport service, something must be done and I hope that the Hon. Minister will look very carefully into the matter. It is absolute stupidity that if a bus has to leave at 4.00 o'clock, people must be punished because at ten minutes to 4 o'clock the bus is full and that bus cannot leave until 4 o'clock. I hope that the Hon. Minister will look very carefully into this matter. You have dozens of school children waiting to get into the bus, and if it is raining these children must remain there until 4 o'clock. I repeat that this is absolute stupidity.
12.55 p.m.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Chairman, I think I would be lacking in my duty if I did not say something on this Resolution for a car park which is before the House. For the benefit of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown who has been saying that it is stupidity for a bus packed with passengers before 4 o'clock to wait until 4 o'clock before leaving, I should like him to know that buses in this country are operated by schedule; therefore it is not a question of a bus leaving as soon as it comes in. If the buses left just after they came in, then you would not need a time table. If one is working and wants to catch a bus at 4 o'clock or 5 o'clock and it pulls out before the scheduled hour, then you would hear complaints being made to the Director of Highways and Transport.

For the benefit of the hon. senior member for St. Peter who feels that there should be no place to park buses in the City, I should like him to know that people from the rural parishes like St. Joseph come into town during the morning hours, and the buses have to wait until later in the day when these people are again ready for the country. It is a different case, Mr. Chairman, with the buses which operate in the City, because they do not want a parking place at all. When it comes to the buses from the country, you must have some place for them to park. I just wanted to make the position clear, but I have no more comments to make.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I may have omitted to say that my remarks referred primarily to the buses on the short routes in St. Michael. It is a different matter with the buses plying in the country which must leave at 3 o'clock or 4 o'clock as the case may be. I was referring to the buses on the short routes where you have two or three in the bus stand at the same time that are packed with people, but the officers do now allow them to move until the sheduled hour, while the children are screaming to get home. There are schedules and regulations, and if necessary you must amend them. I will draw further to your attention that if you went to America you would see a bus going to Connecticut, but there is no bus stand provided for 30 or 40 buses. The company provides its own bus stand, which is absolutely correct.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to turn this into an argument because it is a question of opinion. What I said was that you should have a system where the buses were rotated. It does not mean that you would bring this into operation tomorrow morning without having discussion on it. You would have time tables by all means, but they would mean from what place the time table operates. The time table would operate from another point, and you would know at what point you would get a bus. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has rightly said that even with the buses which serve the rural areas, you would know at what point to get them. The hon. member would know that if you are in New York City you do not go to a bus terminal and say you are going to Washington or expect to pass the street and get a bus. You go where the owners have the buses that go to Washington. It is only that we have a different concept here. Bus owners in the United States and other big countries provide their own bus stands. If you want to catch a Greyhound, you do not wait in the streets, and expect that there is some place the public has built for you; it is something which the owners have built for themselves, and you go and take a bus and go off. It is true that here everything must be done by the Government. A person does not stay a whole day to catch a bus. Some country buses are in the bus stand continuously from after a certain hour until in the afternoon, and there is an area of land in Fairchild Street for them. Why should that be so?

With regard to the buses which go to Speightstown, who says that a bus must remain in the Lower Green and you must have such a wide area of land for them to park? You have the Rocklyn buses and other buses lined up like a parade in the Lower Green. Why should that be so? At any rate, the buses that are leaving on the hour do not arrive there at the time. There is this idea that the buses must be there, and people go and buy food and put in the buses as if they are glorified restaurants, which means that you are providing facilities other than transport. If you had to work on that basis, you would have to build a harbour as big as Barbados to accommodate all the ships that came here and had to line up and wait. Mr. Chairman, it is convenient that people should be able to go and get a bus, but you do not have to have an open stand in the City. You should have the stand where it would not affect anybody in the City, and any waiting period should be out of the City, while the moving period would be in the City so that you save land. It is a matter of commonsense. You do not have any problem if you are meeting at ten different places outside the City, but you have a problem if you converge inside the City. People come from work around 4 o'clock, and I have the experience from my office which is next to the bus stand of seeing them scramble, as in other parts of the world, to get a bus between shop closing time and 5.30 p.m. The problem therefore lasts for 90 minutes or two hours. You have areas of land being utilised for that purpose, and I find that buses are parked here in the City that need not park. Their parking time could be outside the City and their moving time inside the City.

The hon. member spoke about people catching a bus on time, but this would not prevent them from catching a bus at 4 o'clock or whatever hour they care. My view therefore is that if the buses, which are very big these days, were moving through the bus stand, you would have more land and more space available for parking.
1.05 p.m.

The reason why I said that, is because the buses which are being parked in Fairchild Street need not be parked there; you can find a terminal for them outside of the City. I would say that if buses were moving through the City only, you will not need any bus terminal there and you will have that area available for the parking of cars. There is a very convenient area outside of the City and it would relieve a

lot of the congestion over on the other side of the City so that you could have a better flow of traffic and so that you could have a more rigid regulation on this side.

However, Sir, this does not mean that you can impose that suggestion on the community and the person who is now running transport without discussion. This is not a plan. This is only a suggestion which you can take and find out if it is going to work. I hope the Hon. Minister will not take it as a plan. It is a suggestion which can be worked upon.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who has just spoken has anticipated the Government's policy on this matter. Hon. members will be pleased to know that the question of provision of more car parking space, the question of bus terminals being put outside of the City and so on as well as the question of instituting a system of passengers queuing have been before the Central Planning Committee for quite a number of weeks. This question deals with all the basic matters which have been raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter who really outlined some of Government's policy on this matter; therefore, I am very heartened to hear the hon. member confirming our views and our policy. We realise that we should have a type of system whereby buses should not be called on to wait stationary in the Bus terminal but that they should pass through the City, take up passengers at given points and carry them to their place of destination. In that way less buses will be needed, in the first instance, and you would be able also to keep a flow of traffic all the time. That is more or less the sort of system which you see in London and other big countries. In those countries there are no terminals in the City for buses; the buses only come into the City and take up passengers at various points and various centres. Therefore, Sir, the points which were raised about not having bus terminals in the City is what the Government is considering now, and so far as the country buses are concerned, like those which travel through St. Andrew and St. Lucy, it may be convenient to park them near the Marketing Corporation because by putting them in that area they would boost the trade in that area and also prevent them from passing through the town. They can pass through Eagle Hall and down President Kennedy's Drive to the Marketing Corporation.

Sir, all these points have been considered. Both hon. members who spoke anticipated the Government, I do not think I need explain anything further; I only will say that the question of the reorganisation of the transport system is receiving very close attention by this Government, and more especially on the question of more car parks and more terminals for buses out of the town. I can give hon. members the assurance that in another few weeks this Government would be bringing something here on the floor of the House - it may be a Resolution - to establish more car parks and for new terminals on other areas for buses. One of them may be in the area of the Marketing Corporation.

Sir, I would also like to mention that, as far as the subject matter of this Resolution dealing with the establishment of a car park is concerned, this is only part and parcel of the scheme which is known as the Constitution River Scheme. This scheme is being implemented and completed in various phases. They have put down a new bridge by Queen's Park and there will be an extension to the Victoria Bridge so that two new lanes will be provided. All that is part and parcel of the Constitution River Reclamation Plan. The Victoria Bridge will be extended to provide two lanes so as to give greater facility to the travelling public.

Sir, these are the main points involved and I am asking now that this Resolution be now agreed to.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1964-65 No. 33

CANE TRACKS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, hon. members will remember that a Resolution was passed on the floor of this House on 5th March, 1963 whereby it was agreed that Government should assist small caneholders by providing roads and tracks to facilitate the haulage of their canes to factories. This Resolution was passed and I think I had better read that Resolution. It reads as follows:-

WHEREAS the small cane growers of the Island are sustaining heavy losses on the reaping of their canes yearly, due mainly to the absence of properly shaped roads and tracks where the lorries can drive and stop along the side of their land to take the canes to the Factory.

AND WHEREAS the increased cost of labour has made it more difficult for them to head the canes long distances to reach the lorries.

BE IT RESOLVED that this House call on Government to assist these small cane growers of the Island, by instructing the Honourable Minister of Communications, Works and Housing to request the services of the Director of Highways and Transport to have these roads and tracks reshaped immediately with tractors or bulldozers, giving priority to St. Joseph, St. Andrew and the neighbouring parishes of St. Thomas and St. John.

1.15 p.m.

That was the Resolution which was passed on 5th March, 1963. The Government is having a survey made in accordance with the terms of that Resolution, but that survey involves an island-wide investigation in order to define the areas, so that the survey has proved to be a lengthy one and, in actual fact, it has not yet been completed. Meanwhile in order to assist the small cane farmers in applying fertilisers to their canes and so on, a token vote of $1,000 was agreed upon by my Ministry and the Cabinet in order to expedite the work of dealing with the most urgent and difficult cases, It is for that reason that we are not waiting for this survey which has taken quite a number of months, because it is a question of going through the entire areas in St. Andrew, St. Thomas, St. Joseph and St. John in order to find out where the bad tracks and roads are. It will take some time for a survey like that to be completed; therefore, I feel that until such time that such a survey is completed, we would make this start. We happen to know that there are hundreds of tenantries calling for attention in this respect. For anybody to try to hold up this operation so that accurate estimates of all the bad tenantries can be submitted - that would not be in order. It is a question of making an estimate to deal with the urgent cases to begin with.

Although the matter is not regarded as being dealt with in any scientific manner in that we have not got the whole thing delineated, it is a question of getting ahead with this matter as quickly as possible. We are asking for a token vote of $1,000 in the first instance, having accepted the principle of the repair of these roads through the canefields once and for all. This principle has been accepted and assistance has been given in the past through the Soil Conservation Board by the Ministry of Agriculture, and not so much through the Ministry of Communications and Works. There was no provision to pay the drivers of tractors, for fuel and for certain expenses which could not be avoided. All I am trying to tell hon. members is that what has been done has been done by the Soil Conservation Board and the Scotland Factory. This is the first time that provision like this has been made in the Estimates for work of this nature to be done. This is merely a token vote to endorse the policy and to see that a certain amount of money is set aside for this purpose. I hope that they survey which is being conducted by the Department of Highways and Transport will be ready at the time of the Estimates and that we will be able to include a substantial sum for carrying out the future programme.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have said enough on this matter. I know it is somewhat awkward for hon. members who represent the parishes of St. Joseph and St. Andrew in that this work is being carried out for the hilly parts of the country, but it will be a great boon to the owners in these areas.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I have listened very attentively to the Hon. Minister who has introduced this Resolution and I note that he has said that this is only a token vote. Now, Sir, that Resolution was passed on 5th March, 1963. Today is the 13th October, 1964 and we are asked for a token vote now, which means that the Minister intends to make a start.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, that is the sort of thing which one cannot understand. I have explained that this is the first time that provision like this is being made in the Estimates. I happen to know intimately that such work has been conducted already by the Soil Conservation Board and the Manager of the Scotland Factory, but not out of money provided in the Estimates as such. It is not that this is the first time that work like this is being done. Therefore, Sir, what sort of slant is this which the hon. member is trying to put on? I have stated quite plainly what the position is.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Minister seems to be very hot, but the day is very cool for me. I do not want to get hot with him. He has said that this work has been done by the Manager of Haggatts Factory and the Soil Conservation Board. Well, Sir, I would like the Minister to tell us how many tracks or roads have been done by these people and how many are they in each parish. I know that the Hon. Minister is in a position to tell us where this work was done by these people. I would like him to tell us that.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is one of the representatives of the parish of St. Joseph. He is the first hon. member who raised this matter in here, but then he could not submit the name of any road or track which was to be done. He could not do anything like that; but now he has the audacity to rise to his feet and ask me how many of these roads or tracks have been done by the Soil Conservation Board and the Manager of Haggatts Factory.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I thought that the Hon. Minister has risen to reply, but he has not done so. In fact, it does seem to me as if he wants to fight.
1.25 p.m.

I only asked how many roads have been done, but he said they have not been done yet. He says I could not submit a list of the roads, but I can remember that on the floor of the House the last Minister asked for these roads. It is not my job to go about looking for roads; that concerns the Department of Highways and Transport. Some time ago the Department of Highways and Transport was making a survey and I myself took one of the officers to a particular place in St. Joseph, in Spa Hill, but up to now nothing has been done, but the Minister is telling me that a survey is being carried out. I will go further now and say that a member of the same Government Party and a member of this House was going through the parishes and cutting roads with a bulldozer; yet the Minister says that they are awaiting the survey. This Resolution calls for $1,000 to cut tracks. What kind of tracks are you going to cut? How wide and how long will they be? You do not want tracks to bring out canes on a lorry. Tracks are small pathways between one man's land and another.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I do not understand the argument of the hon. member.

Mr. SMITH: On what has the Hon. Minister risen? He should wait until I am finished.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I went to the trouble of reading the terms of the Resolution which brought about the bringing down of this Supplementary Resolution for $1,000 in order to get moving on this particular matter. We are making an innovation; for the first time we are doing something to help these people, and the hon. member is behaving as if this is the first time he has heard. With regard to the roads and tracks, they would not be of one dimension; everything depends on the nature of conditions. What is the object of asking such silly questions as "how wide are the tracks"? If the hon. member himself could not tell us how many tracks there were in St. Joseph, how could I from my office say how wide and how long they will be? That is the crux of his absurdity. The hon. member represents St. Joseph, and he cannot help us with how many tracks or roads need doing, but now that we are coming to get the roads done, he wants to be absurd and preposterous. Either you want the roads done, or you don't. Do you want to block and resist the Resolution which would help to get the roads done? What sort of masquerade is going on?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, you are in the Chair to rule, and when you get a Minister setting such an example before this Honourable House, you should call him to order and not let him get there and believe he is making sport. If the Minister wants me to reply to him, I will stray from this Resolution and do so, and then you will see everyone of them over there getting up. I am not afraid of any of them over there, and if the Minister is going to put himself in that category, I will fold it up now, because I had a lot of respect for him.

Now, the Minister tells us that this sum of $1,000 is a token vote. This is October and the survey is not yet ready. The crop will soon be starting and he does not know how many roads will be done to help these people. When he is ready the people will have to head out the canes as before, but he still brings the Resolution here today to let the people know that he is willing to help them, though this was before him or his Government since March last year. I have already told him that I understand that someone was going around cutting these roads and tracks, and I wanted to know from him how many were done in each parish, but up to now the Minister has not replied. If he does not know, let him say so. He is Minister in charge of the whole Department, and if he does not know his job, I cannot be responsible for that.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, these tracks were cut by the Soil Conservation Board and the Manager of the Scotland Factory, but no provision as such has ever been made save now for having roads and tracks done, and it is just a question of accommodation and doing something to these tracks as soon as possible at this time in order to assist the small cane farmers in the area. I think there were eight or nine done, but the hon. member has asked for a list of names of the tracks, when he has not been able to provide any information for St. Joseph. For his benefit, I would say that eight or nine were done by the Soil Conservation Board and the Manager of the Scotland Factory, but not by the Highways and Transport Department, because there is no provision as such anywhere in the Estimates for any work of that nature at all. It is only now, for the first time that this token vote of $1,000 has been brought down here, that we can do this work. We agreed to the principle of having a vote of that nature, but after we have completed this long drawn out survey, we will then know how much money should be included in the Estimates to be able to do these tracks and roads. We would never be able to do all the roads in St. Joseph, St. Thomas, St. Andrew and St. John. It is just like the tenantry roads. We will do the ones that have been granted priority and the ones which we think will be of the most economic benefit to the island. We cannot do all the tenantry roads this year, next year or for another ten years, but we will do as many as possible in the shortest possible time and those which merit immediate attention.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is behaving quite differently now. He has now begun to answer the questions, but just now he got up as if he wanted to fight, and I could not understand that at all. He said that about nine roads have been done, but he is still withholding from the House whether they were done in St. Thomas, St. Joseph or St. John, or whether they were all done in St. Andrew. If he knows that nine were done, he should be in a position to say where they were done, but he has drawn the Manager of the Scotland Factory and the Soil Conservation Board into it.
1.35 p.m.

It would make me to believe now that the only thing which has been done has been done in St. Andrew and nowhere else, because the Soil Conservation Officer and the Manager of the Scotland Factory would be interested just because they want help with their programme. I do not know if the Hon. Minister is ashamed to let the House know that the little which has been done has only been done in St. Andrew. All that he is dwelling on is the Manager of the Scotland Area and the Soil Conservation Officer. He is saying that I should tell them what tracks are to be done. Is it for me that I should write the Inspector, or Minister of Roads or the Director of Highways and Transport to know how many roads have been done in the parish? That is not my job. If you were to ask the Hon. Minister how many tenantry roads are to be done in Christ Church, he would not be able to say offhand. He would only know when any of his constituents come to him and ask him; therefore it is only silly for him to be saying that I should know. Does the Hon. Minister know that I have to work for a living? Does he think I am a pimp? I do not have to look into his face to see when he is vexed or pleased. No man can tell me if I do not do this that I will have to go. I do not have to stifle my conscience; therefore, when the Hon. Minister is going to say these things about me.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I rise on a point of order. I have not said anything of the hon. member; I only said that he should know the needs of his constituency and assist us with the number of roads or tracks which he wants done. What is strange is that, now that we are doing something concrete and constructive, the hon. member is saying this and that. Now that we are getting money for the provision of roads and tracks, the hon. member is offering opposition to that.

Mr. SMITH: I am not offering opposition to anything. It is the attitude of the Minister I resent, and I never expected it. Now, Sir, what I am saying is this. This sum of $1,000 would make one believe that this is all that you are spending on this matter and I asked the question. The Hon. Minister then jumped up and said what the Soil Conservation Officer and the Manager of the Scotland area had requested of the present Government at the time. Therefore, the present Government is now about to make a start because they are now asking for $1,000.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. When he says that the Government is now about to make a start, he is probably thinking of one or two roads which he wants done in St. Joseph. I said that a start has been made in the Scotland area and nine roads have been done. A start has been made. The hon. member said that since the 5th March, 1963, nothing was done; something has been done, but not under any proper vote. We have done some of the roads under the Soil Conservation Scheme. Anyone who heard the hon. member say what he did would think that nothing has been done at all and a start is only now to begin. That is not so. It is only that from now we will be working under the correct vote. The Department would be able to do that sort of work now because hitherto there was no vote for the purpose.

I will just read part of this communique relative to the matter. "The Department of Agriculture has been requested to carry out a survey in accordance with the terms of the Resolution and submit the terms and costs involved. By its very nature, involving, as it does, an island-wide investigation over undefined areas, such a survey has proved lengthy and in fact has not been completed. It is hoped that some progress will be made in time to enable the Ministry of Agriculture to include provision in the 1965-66 Draft Estimates."

The whole thing is put on a proper basis in that provision is being made under the Estimates, and in order to get something done we have brought down this, what I would call, token vote. We are not awaiting the results of the survey because I know that this is an urgent matter, and the Cabinet knows it too; therefore, we have come down with this token vote. We have come down with this $1,000 to get things started. I do not see why this Resolution should call for any opposition. In fact, as I see it, there is no opposition to it at all.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, would I oppose a Resolution of this sort? When I say that this vote was only for $1,000 I wondered to know what this $1,000 was for. It did not mention anything of any token vote. The Hon. Minister told us that you can call it a token vote. You can bring down a Resolution for one single dollar as a token vote for doing something, and as long as we agree to it, if the expenditure on the thing amounts to $10 million, we agreed to the spending of $10 million.

If it is a token vote, the Government has not yet started anything. That is how I take it. How can any person take it otherwise? A token vote means that you are asking the House to agree to the principle of the repairing of these roads and putting them in order; therefore, when you agree to this $1,000, you agreed to all.

The Hon. Minister is opposing it by telling me that it is a token vote because he said that he made a start. Here it is; if any person reads this outside, he will say that the boys are now beginning. This is a big scheme because I know we have passed $1.00 already as a token vote and when we ended up, millions of dollars were spent on the scheme. If the Hon. Minister is asking for a token vote of $1,000, you can see that this would be a very big scheme. I would just ask the Hon. Minister one question. Now, this is a token vote for putting in order cane tracks, as the Hon. Minister has said. Will any of these roads be finished in time to help those poor cane farmers for the 1965 crops? 1.45 p.m.

I should like to ask this question; apart from the farmers who are sending their canes to Haggatts Factory and who are using certain roads, will any of these other roads be constructed to help others? I can clearly see that they are only cutting roads on lands where the farmers will be carrying their canes to Haggatts Factory. I would not be surprised if the farmers are told that if they are not going to send their canes to Haggatts Factory, they will not be getting these roads cut.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to deal with this matter in this manner at all. The Government is responsible for the hon. member's behaviour too. The hon. member has been aided in a debate like this and you will see why I say that. In ordinary circumstances, no sane person could make the speech which the hon. member has made, and I think that the Hon. Minister has said too much. Whenever you speak of or mention the word "token", you mean something different from what this Resolution is. I think that a parliamentarian should be knowledgeable; he should know what Parliament is doing, how it operates and he should not make himself, in a matter like this, a spectacle of justifiable ridicule.

What we are dealing with is a vote for $1,000 — and not a token vote - for the purpose of repairing roads; but the Hon. Minister, in presenting this Resolution, stated that this $1,000 represents a token vote. In that context, a token vote means that you have to spend $50,000 $6,000 or $90,000 and you are starting with $1,000. That is to be a token of the total amount which you intend to undertake; it means that you are not yet ready with everything. The Hon. Minister was at pains to give a full explanation of what the scheme is all about. One must be charitable at times and give the Ministers credit for beginning to do what we have asked them to do, and not try to oppose them on every conceivable occasion even when the opposition is groundless. I would say that I am very pleased to see that this Resolution has come down. I am also pleased to hear the Hon. Minister say that urgent and important cases should not be kept waiting. I would say that other Ministers should say what the Hon. Minister of Communications has said. I should like to say this, that with all the cane tracks you have, you will not have another cane crop until the Minister of Labour acts like the Minister of Communications. We are back in this situation because two months ago the Minister of Labour has been sitting down on something which this

country is urgently in need of. When you come to cane tracks they will be of an infinitesimal nature as compared with issues which are facing the island, and the Hon. Minister is sitting down on something which is going to pull down this country. On an important matter affecting this country the Minister is sitting down for two months! One side is saying: "We are not going to talk with you". If I was a different man, the hon. member would not now be talking about cutting road tracks. Some of the same members of this Chamber who have created a situation in this island are now saying that they are sorry about it. I want to compliment the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works for acting urgently in this matter and saying that we cannot wait any longer. I believe that some people like to see how the coin will spin when it reached the ground, but I would say that some captains, when they wait for that, do not see the coin spinning at all.

One member of the Chamber was present at the meeting and he had a classic demonstration of what will come. If anybody is in doubt about that, let him ask the hon. junior member for St. John and that hon. member will tell him. When you come to these microscopic issues like the cutting of cane tracks in order to assist the peasants in getting out their canes to the factories, I want to say that in this age you have to think about bringing out canes by putting at the disposal of the cane farmers the type of equipment which will bring out the canes in different circumstances. The days when people are heading out canes will soon be over because the people will object to heading out canes, and you will have to give them the facilities so that the canes will be dropped at the bottom and hauled up to the top. Those of us who want to perpetuate this method of dealing with canes are looking for our foreparents to be resurrected. The same people who are asking the Government to spend this money in order to maintain a critical situation, should be in the vanguard of putting forward things which should be the means of lifting the canes. It will cost a lot of money if you want a woman to do a job which a cow or a horse has stopped doing.

We have substituted the human element for the animal element instead of using the internal combustion engine. You want the type of mechanisation which will remove the drudgery out of labour; you want mechanisation which will also remove the inhumanity out of labour. Now we are talking about cutting cane tracks as a means of getting the canes out of the cane fields. I do not consider that, in this in this age of ours, we should go on perpetuating these things which are completely out of consonance with the age in which we are living and out of consonance with the age of commonsense. I say that I compliment the Government in this matter because the Government has had a Resolution

1.55 p.m.

I take this opportunity to point out that I would be failing in my duty if I did not bring to his attention a matter, especially when he makes the statement about urgency, I am sure that as Minister of Agriculture he would not mind my saying it, because the Union has written him a letter. There are some destitute people in St. Andrew from the Scotland area where Government made a decision to own the Scotland factory. You have to decide on what basis you own the factory; if not, soon and very soon the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and others from the area will bring a Resolution asking you: "What about the people you have not paid at Scotland?". Only last week some went to the doorstep of the Minister of Communications asking about money. These are the things that are urgent, and these are the things that the politicians will exploit if you do not have a powerful and strong Trade Union.

Mr. Chairman, I will say quite bluntly and clearly that any Minister of Labour who in an island like Barbados sits down on a matter in the Sugar Industry for two months without moving is either playing the game of indifference to the situation, or wants to be wise after the event had taken place. There is absolutely no excuse for any employer in the sugar industry to be waiting for two months to see if we are playing their game. Somebody is playing somebody's game, and this exposure will have to be made sooner or later, which will be a rude awakening to all.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if when I stand I will be intimidated by members of this House or otherwise. If they do not want to hear me when I rise to speak, they can leave.

Now I was somewhat shocked and appalled at the conduct of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph in some remarks he made which are not becoming the member for St. Joseph. I have been noticing that from the time the hon. junior member for St. Joseph read an editorial in the "Advocate", he seems to think he is an authority on every subject; but what is more surprising is that he knows nothing about anything and very little about something.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being after 2 o'clock p.m., automatically this sitting is suspended until 2.30 p.m.

On Resumption:

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time, but there are no answers ready, I am advised.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am going to move the suspension of the Standing Orders. I did not do it earlier because I did not think it was necessary. If you glance at the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, you will see that under Private Members' Business.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I have carefully perused the Order Paper.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I understand that the hon. junior member for Christ Church wants to do Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: He has intimated that to me already.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: We have no objection to that.

I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, since the Notices were given this morning, I have been informed that one of the Resolutions of which notice was given today is a matter of some urgency. We have had copies circulated to hon. members, and I am going to ask leave that this matter be dealt with sometime during today's sitting. We are going to accede to the request of the hon. junior member for Christ Church if his motion is in order, but I thought it was still before Select Committee. Whether that be dealt with or not, I am giving notice of my intention to the House to deal with this Resolution when next we go into Committee of Supply. Copies have been circulated, I understand.

Mr. SPEAKER: They have been circulated to every hon. member except the Speaker.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Report of the Select Comm ttee appointed to consider and report on a Bill to authorise Esso Standard Oil S.A. Limited to erect a jetty at Half Moon Fort, St. Lucy.

Mr. SPEAKER: I accept that.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House resume Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the House while in Committee to deal with the Resolution for a sum not exceeding in the aggregate $200,000 for the purpose of advancing funds to the Regional Council of Ministers and the new East Caribbean Currency Authority when it is established to meet preliminary expenses in connection with the Authority, including the cost of notes. Notice of this Resolution was given earlier today.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

2.40 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before the suspension, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas was about to address the Chair.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I was saying that since the hon. junior member for St. Joseph read an editorial in the *Advocate* newspaper, he thinks that he is an authority on every subject. If a stranger entered this Chamber today and heard the hon. member carrying on as he did, that stranger would believe that sugar canes were only planted in the Island of Barbados since this Government came into power. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph was a member of the Government which was in power previously, for 17 years, and at that time they never thought that there was need to cut cane tracks in that area so that the peasants could get their canes. They always said that they were helping the poor but never thought of cutting any cane tracks so that the poor farmers could get some of their canes out of these backward areas.

One would have thought that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would have been only too glad to laud this Government on such a venture and that he would not be getting up today and vituperating and seeing not the point which the Hon. Minister was making.

Sir, I have a lot to do with the cutting of these cane tracks. The hon. member said that it was the job of the people from the Highways and Transport to go out and have a survey. That is not true. That is not their duty. It is the duty of any good representative who represents an agricultural constituency to find out from their constituents their needs. It is the people's duty to go to their representatives and tell them their needs. Mr. Chairman, you know very well that they are coming to you and me and drawing it to our attention. I do not know where the hon. member got his misguided information from. Of course, when people want to criticise, they get up and say anything. As I have said before in this Chamber, it is the duty of the Opposition to make the Government in power as uncomfortable as it can, but it is not the duty of the Opposition to criticise just for the same of criticising.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph got up and said not one thing which makes sense to any person. Of course, the Hon. Minister of Education should be blamed for some of these things because as Minister of Education, he should make it compulsory that there should be education for all adults who need it. Of course, if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would not learn anything before, he could not learn at this stage: but he should be somewhere where he could not be disrupting the smooth running of this Chamber. I spent the last elections, most of the time, in trying to get in this Chamber. This election I will spend most of my time trying to keep the hon. member out of this Chamber.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I should not waste my time replying to the hon. member. The hon. member referred to an article in the *Advocate*. How does he know whether I read it or not. He went on to say that the Hon. Minister of Education should bring in some Resolution to teach adults. When the Hon. Minister of Educating brings in such a Resolution, that hon. member would be the first to go.

What I was saying just now is this. It would be only an hon. member like him who would say that I oppose this Resolution. I only asked questions. The hon. member does not know when questions are asked. What has happened to the hon. member? He does not understand. It is hard to make him understand but I cannot help it. The hon. member does not have to reply for a Minister because he is not getting paid to do it. He is not bound to get up and reply to anything. The hon. member knocked the job out of the hands of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. He robbed him of it.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member; in fact, I am glad to interrupt him. I want to draw to your attention that the hon. member said that I have robbed somebody out of something. As far as I know, I have not robbed anybody out of anything.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I only want to clear up this matter. I am not objecting to the Resolution; I am only waiting on the Hon. Minister to let me know if any of these roads would be finished in time for any of the peasants to get out their crop during the 1965 crop season. That is all I want to hear from the Minister. (A VOICE: Do not answer him.)

Here it is: a layman is advising a practical man or a legal man. He is telling the Minister not to answer me. When you get behaviour of this sort, how can one expect anything good? The hon. member does not even know that I am insulting him. The hon. member is telling the Minister not to answer. All that I am asking the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works is to tell me before this Resolution is passed if any of those roads will be ready in time for the 1965 crop season in order that those cane farmers can get out their cane crop.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat surprised myself to think that all that we are doing is to listen to a duel and allowing members to take up the time of this House by engaging in a war. I take it that you gather that people generally, all over the island would read this Resolution and the first question after they read it would be, "What can you do with $1,000?" The Hon. Minister talked of a Resolution which was passed on the 5th March, 1963, when the House of Assembly called on the Government to assist the small cane farmers by the cutting of these cane tracks in order that they could haul out their canes.

Mr. Chairman, do you think that with the vastness of this Island, this money could even make a start in putting one road in order? The sum of $1,000 could not even do a driveway in a respectable garage. What would $1,000 do? Mr. Chairman, presuming you want to concern yourself with the validity of this Resolution, you are thinking of the vastness of this Island and you come to Parliament to engage in a debate as to this amount of $1,000 for putting in order cane tracks.

2.50 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister got up to make an explanation in connection with that matter, but the hon. member was not in his place at the time. The hon. member is now going beyond the explanation which the Hon. Minister gave in his absence. I would suggest that the hon. member refer to his colleague in order to be enlightened as to what the Hon. Minister did say.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the Hon. Minister could say anything different from what has been set out in the Addendum to this Resolution. We are still dealing with this sum of $1,000 and we are talking about cane tracks and roads to assist the farmers. I would be happy if you would say what the Hon. Minister did say. Is this amount of $1,000 to indicate that they are only asking for this sum now and later on they will be calling for $1 million?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is a token vote.

Mr. MILLER: If we have a Technical Department, surely this sum of $1,000 could only be dealing with one Department. This matter would involve the cost of travelling for the staff of the Department so as to find out where these roads are. What is meant by a token vote? With four months still to go, is this amount to cover the cost of these roads? I take it that these roads would be provided in time for the next crop. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is a stalwart; that is generally accepted, but the Minister on the other side is reducing this whole thing to a farce. Do you mean to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has no idea of the cost of these roads but you are in a position to say that you want to help these poor cane farmers who are suffering for all of this time? *(ASIDES)* The hon. member has a poor knowledge of the position. He has been sitting in this Chamber for all this time, and I thought that he would have been enlightened so that he could bring forward all the ideas which they had. Outside the Chamber, they rely on us to bring forward these ideas. It is our business, the business of the Opposition, to make them uncomfortable. What are we coming to? We are debating a legitimate Resolution for $1,000 for the purpose of repairing these roads, but we are told that this is a token vote because the Hon. Minister has come up against our attack.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order. It is not a question of making roads; it is a question of cutting cane tracks so that the sum of $1,000 will go a long way. It is not a question of constructing roads as such which would normally fall within the province of the Department of Highways and Transport; it is just a question of cutting tracks between cane fields, and therefore the hon. member must not confuse two things, which he is now doing. Of course, the hon. member was not here when the explanation was given, but he could have asked his colleague what was said at that time. I do not intend to say the same thing six times; it was the hon. member's duty to be here on time.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member said that this money is required for the purpose of cutting cane tracks. The Addendum to the Resolution states that in a Resolution passed on 5th March, 1963, the House of Assembly called on the Government to assist the small cane growers of the island by providing roads and tracks to facilitate the haulage of their canes to the factories. The Addendum does not state anything about any token vote. You have had that in mind with some sub-conscious thinking. There is no track which would go over 300 feet for which you would need a bulldozer and which would cost $1,000. The hon. Minister has confirmed that this is not a question of a token vote, but this is money which is required for cutting roads and tracks.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member had been here, he would have heard that this money is, in truth and in fact, a token vote for the purpose of cutting these tracks through the cane fields so as to assist the cane farmers. The amount is not fixed to provide two or three cane tracks; we are making a start now in order to get the work done, and between now and the end of the year we will carry out this work. If we were to wait until the survey was completed, the whole thing would be held up and the peasants would suffer thereby. In the hilly areas we will have cane tracks but, in principle, we are dealing with the most needy cases first. We will bring down proper estimates when the survey comes down and we will know how much we need to start with. We are dealing with these areas and we are accommodating the cane farmers by making a start now.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, again I say that this is not a token vote. It is not a token vote because the Hon. Minister says he wants to use the money now prior to the opening of the next crop. That is what the Hon. Minister has said. That is the crux of the whole debate. This money is required for the purpose of cutting these cane tracks and roads for the purpose of assisting the farmers, and the amount which is now required is $1,000. What can you do with $1,000? 3.00 p.m.

The whole idea is to get ahead with this business now and before the crop. We know that the money will not be available until March next year; so the equipment, the roads and tracks will not be available. Again, all these things defeat your examination if you want to be critical about it. The Resolution says that this is for providing roads and tracks, but this sum of $1,000 cannot do it. The Minister confirms that he wants to use it immediately before the crop and underwrite the poor cane farmers. The minimum width should be 14 feet to facilitate one truck; so you cannot talk about a cane track. A track through a cane field never existed in this country. The crux of the debate is whether or not this is a token vote to indicate to the Department that money was being provided in the Estimates after having an idea of the number of roads in the various parishes. I suppose that numbers will have a tremendous influence in the decision when it comes to taking a vote, but for the sake of history it is my duty to state that $1,000 could not be enough for roads and tracks even in a country like Italy where you have marble roads and tiles. If the Minister had this in mind, why did he not come for $40,000? This is our main industry and represents 92% of the country's economy, and we are bound to support it.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rose to speak before the question was put.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member would give way, I did see the Hon. Minister on his feet first.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not responsible for that.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: In so far as this debate is concerned, Mr. Chairman, I think it is so much waste of time. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas in a very excellent contribution to the debate has already summarised all that need be said. To begin with, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works has outlined the Government's position in introducing this Resolution. He further went on to say that his Ministry, the Ministry of Agriculture, had some time last year agreed to place at the disposal of the Soil Conservation Authority a tractor to be utilised for the purpose of cutting cane tracks in certain areas, and that about nine of these cane tracks had been cut at no direct cost to the Treasury in so far as the Resolution specifically for this expenditure was concerned. In other words the two Ministries collaborated, made the tractor available, and roads had already been cut in St. Thomas, St. Joseph and St. Andrew. The cost of these roads, I understand, is around 43 cents a square foot which is reasonably inexpensive, and the House is being asked for the first time today to provide specifically from the Public Treasury the sum of $1,000 further to carry on this work, and that this money be made available before the start of the next crop. In view of all that, most of the remarks on the other side of the Table are completely superfluous and balderdash, and the crux of the matter, as the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has pointed out, is that we are now for the very first time, so to speak, in the entire history of the Island, hearing about the necessity for cutting these cane tracks.

Mr. Chairman, all the years when the hon. junior member for St. George was a Minister, and when the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was a member of the Government Party, not one single whisper had been raised about the necessity for cutting cane tracks to assist small farmers in getting canes out. You never heard a word about it though the hon. junior member for St. George was a member of the Cabinet for a number of years; they never directed attention to this matter. Now that the matter has been drawn to our attention, action has been taken on it, we are providing further action, and we are now hearing all this unnecessary talk.

What brought me to my feet, however, were the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Peter criticising the Ministry with regard to the situation arising out of the failure of his Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation to reach agreement as to out-of-crop wages, and quite characteristically he endeavours to place the blame on the Ministry of Labour which is under my control.

What are the facts, Sir? On the 25th August the Ministry was informed that the Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation had reached an impasse with regard to negotiations for settling out-of-crop wages. As it was my duty, I immediately informed the appropriate authorities. Previous to that, five days before on the 20th August, the Union at the 23rd Annual Conference had passed the following Resolution:

"Whereas the Commission of Enquiry to investigate the Sugar Industry since September 1962 is still awaited, and such delay is against the best interest of all concerned;

BE IT RESOVED that the 23rd Annual Delegate Conference of the Workers Union call upon the Government to take urgent steps to have the Report of the Commission of Enquiry released before the beginning of the next crop season."

The Government itself had some time before appointed the Commission of Enquiry to enquire into certain phases of the Sugar Industry, and the Union, not unlike the Government, was concerned over the delay in the Report of this Commission. With regard to the dispute, my first step was to notify the appropriate authorities, and my next step was to enquire what was the position with regard to the Report of the Commission of Enquiry already set up by the Government, and my Ministry was informed on the 13th September what was the position with regard to this Report.

Now naturally, Sir, neither the Government nor anybody interested in the Treasury of this Island would want to delay action of any sort in this matter. Similarly as the Union was concerned on August 25 in finding out the fate of the Report, so was I concerned to find out what stage it had reached, and whether we could expect it within the time in which it might be useful with regard to the settlement of the dispute which had arisen between the Union and the Federation. The fact that I have been accused of not having paid appropriate attention to the matter does not worry me at all, because although public memory is short, it is not so short in this House or elsewhere not to recall that it was at my suggestion that the Government had originally appointed the Commission of Enquiry.
3.10 p.m.

My interest in the agricultural workers is second to none. There is nobody else in the Island or out of it who can convince anybody that that is not so. Both the Workers Union and the Employers Federation at none of their discussions about this proposed Board of Enquiry suggested a name to the Commissioner, I, myself, recommended four or five years ago the name of Mr. Goldenberg. Mr. Goldenberg is an outstanding economist and his services do not come cheaply. I am not prepared to state at this stage what his services would cost, but I am sure that every single hon. member of this House would express a degree of astonishment as to what it would cost to get Mr. Goldenberg at this stage. It would cost a lot of money: and because of the fact that we spent an appreciable sum on the Farley Enquiry, I, myself, would not feel justified to spend at this stage, such an appreciable sum. I will go so far as to say that under the present circumstances almost any amount of money we would be glad to spend to justify that the industry is carried on in the most satisfactory and harmonious way possible. It was only on the 5th September, about twelve days ago that I was informed of the position of the Farley Report. It is true that the position of this country presents a certain amount of difficulty in matters of this sort, and the fact that there is a young Union along with this Union means that the older Union should naturally be more cautious - and I would not say anything more at this stage - in its approach to finalising it. While I appreciate the position, the urgency and importance of this matter, yet still when it comes to the overall picture and especially when the Government is already in possession of information which would be of assistance to both parties, the Government would be completely unaware of its position if it committed itself to the undertaking expressed by the Union.

I am not saying at this stage that the Report which we have or expect to get would enable the parties to settle the matter. But I want to assure both parties that there is not a single member of this Chamber or of this community in the urban or rural areas who would believe for a single second that I would lend myself, either through indifference or for any other reason, to any delay in the settling of the dispute knowing the background in these matters; therefore, at this stage, I am merely endeavouring to bring the Committee up-to-date on the matter under point. The Government is just as concerned or more than concerned in a matter of this sort.

A VOICE: Does this have anything to do with the Resolution? What is it for?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am allowing the hon. member to speak.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: While all this is not the subject matter of the Resolution, Mr. Chairman, you allowed a certain amount of comment on it and I, as Minister of Trade and Labour, am entitled to reply. The Government appreciates the full significance of this matter and the Government is leaving no stone unturned to provide the basis, if it can, because certain things may arise, for the necessary information to be given to both parties to the dispute so as to resolve it in the most harmonious and expeditious manner; and, therefore, there is no reason for the accusation without justification that the Minister of Labour is in any way culpable for the delay in bringing this matter to a further conclusion. These are not matters which can be settled overnight, and in the normal course of circumstances a matter like this takes time. I want hon. members to rest assured that this matter is in the hands of the Government and that the Government, more than any party to the dispute, is concerned with a speedy settlement to it, and that the Government, as it has been in all cases of this sort, is prepared to leave no stone unturned to ensure a speedy settlement of the matter to the complete satisfaction of both parties.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I raised this matter of the sugar industry under this Resolution and I did it deliberately. All I said I will repeat and with even greater force. I have absolutely no apology for saying that this calculated delay was done at the Ministry's level; therefore, the Hon. Minister of Labour must bear responsibility for it. If the Hon. Minister acknowledges that there are two trade unions in the sugar industry, that is his business. He can deal with two, but if he thinks that he has two to deal with, he is going to have the biggest joke of his life.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am not concerned with two trade unions. What I said was that the existence of another trade union in the Island might not be without its influence on matters of this sort.
3.20 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I say that the Minister and his Ministry and the Government are free to think whatever they like about another Trade Union and the sugar industry. If that is the thinking which is conditioning the minds of the Government, the Ministry and the employers, well then, they can wait until they get their true lesson. I left this island on the 6th August, 1964, and the same nonsense which these employers spoke to the Trade Union is the same nonsense that the bus owners spoke - only in a different form; that is, that they are not negotiating out - of-crop wages until the Union discusses the matters of crop wages and production bonus. If the hon. member thinks that he can spend this money in bringing down Mr. Goldenberg as a Commission of Enquiry, I would like to ask him this question: do we want a Commission of Enquiry to tell us anything when an employer is telling us that he is not

negotiating with us unless we tell him this or that? Who is going to sit down at that Commission of Enquiry? The Hon. Minister has said that his position in the sugar industry is second to none. If he is in any doubt or worry as to what my position is in the sugar industry, I will give him the answer in a few weeks' time. I say, however, that if he as Minister of Labour will sit down on a matter for two months, a matter which affects the island's industry, and talk about Mr. Goldenberg and the Farley Commission — what is that to do with conditions of employment?

We will not accept any findings of any Commission of Enquiry telling us what wages we should accept. Which Commission will tell us what wages we should negotiate? Are we fools so that you can say that you will push the Farley Commission on us? I have documentary evidence which I will not reveal at this time because this is not an enquiry and it would be very embarrassing if I were to do that. For the sake of peace and solidarity in a wider sense, I try to exercise an amount of tolerance in matters such as this one, but sometimes you have to call a spade a spade. The Hon. Minister's reply today is a perfect indication of the fact that he is totally ignorant about industrial relations and what a Minister should do. He is looking through the backdoor of a Commission which sat two years ago to deal with a matter in which you are talking about crop wages in 1964. That Commission sat in 1962. We passed Resolutions on the 2nd August dealing with many things such as mechanisation, co-operatives, cane fires and so on. We also passed a Resolution in relation to British Guiana and about the Farley Commission saying that this Commission was set up since 1962 and the Report is still being awaited. We want to hear what the Commission said in a broad way. We were told that we should wait for the Farley Commission. We nearly had a breakdown in this island when one of the sugar magnates said that the Report of the Farley Commission would have come out in a month and they started to drag their feet because the Minister of Labour told Mr. Mahon that they would get the Report of the Commission in two months' time, and the sugar people played the fool for a long time. I can bring Mr. Eaton and put him on oath.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I do not care whom he brings. At no time was I in a position to say when the Farley Report was expected. I had nothing to do with the Farley Report, and the first time I discussed this matter with the Minister of Communications and other Ministers was around November last year. So I do not care what somebody said that somebody else told him. I can read the exact Minute. It reads as follows:-

"Please ascertain the date of the submission of the Farley Report." That was to the Ministry of Agriculture.

Mr. WALCOTT: That was 1962.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is the 29th September, 1964, - about 11 days ago.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is two years after the event I am talking about. When this Commission was appointed in 1962, the sugar people broke off negotiations with the Barbados Workers' Union under the guise that they are not negotiating with the Union because, if they did that, it would prejudice the sitting of the Commission of Enquiry. I said what I said just now because that is bound to be denied. I communicated with the Commission in 1962 and when it was said when the Report would come out, they did the same thing as the same sugar people today. I went out in June and the crop started in 1963. We said that we would not start the crop in 1963 until we got all of these issues settled. I am bound to get that reply from the Hon. Minister because when you have to name so many people, it is easy for the person whom you are going to pin down to give that reply. These people were encouraged in their behaviour and they felt that they could delay the Union. They were encouraged, aided and abetted by people in high places, but it is a question of the workers doing something for the economic prop. These people gave a lot of encouragement to other people in this country to undermine the Trade Union and the workers. We are the ones who are putting forward the proposals on behalf of the workers. If the minister has a second Union to speak for the workers he can appoint any Commission of Enquiry he likes. I am not here to do the Minister's job, but any Minister would know that it is his duty to call the people in the dispute and find some means of reconciliation at this point.

3.30 p.m.

Did the Minister not read that in England a Minister called in the people when they had a railway problem, Mr. Bevan called in people in connection with the Post Office, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer called in people? They did not set up a Commission of Enquiry before they tried to see what they could do in an issue which came under their direct control, or to see if the warring parties had any issue between them that could be reconciled at that point. Who is asking the Minister to set up a Commission of Enquiry? I have passed the stage in my industrial life of making the industrial people believe that I will bring in a third party. They have to sit down and we have the means of making them sit down; and all the encouragement that can be given to any Union, when we have made a decision to do what we intend to do in five days' time, let them or anybody else do what they feel like. This action will be different from the windfall issue where politicians and everybody became involved, and walked around telling people that somebody wanted to hold on to their money. That myth has been exploded among the workers themselves, and you can sift the chaff from the wheat, and the honest from the dishonest, and they see who can represent them.

This is the last appeal I am making, and I make it to the Minister because he has enough opportunity to act directly in a matter like this. What is the Farley Report going to reveal that the employers are saying that they are not talking out-of-crop wages unless we talk production bonus and crop wages for 1965? This is the tenth month in the year since out-of-crop wages have been put to them, and they have the audacity to tell us they are not talking with us. If we bring the whole country to a stand-still, people will talk about irresponsibility. How irresponsible could we be if we gave them all this time to reconcile matters? I left this Island on 6th August for fully two months, and this issue is still undecided. People pay a very high price for peace - a World War; I do not want to pay that kind of price for peace in the sugar industry. If the Minister feels that the sugar industry is vital to this country, it is vital to both sides. He says that his interest is second to none, but his interest should be an interest in what is current, and what is current is that the workers have put forward proposals through their accredited representative for an increase in wages and better conditions of employment, and as Minister of Labour that is the field in which he has responsibility to act. All we ask him is to act now, and not look through the window for the Farley Report or the Goldenberg Report. I am the responsible head of the Trade Union, and if anybody wants to talk with the Trade Union, he has to talk to me; there is nobody else to speak on behalf of the Union. I am the accredited leader of the Barbados Workers Union, and anybody who believes he can speak to anybody through a window beside me has a very sad time coming.

Mr. Chairman, the employers have to sit down around a table, and we are not going to stand any nonsense about their telling us on what basis they will sit down to negotiate. We exercise our responsibility in this community under great stress and strain, greater than any Minister of Government. When the hon. member talks about another Union, no other Union can force us to do everything we do not want to do. This industry has gone up $11 million since the last agreement, and if we have to go by another basis, it has gone up by $16 million. The Government published an economic survey some time ago which stated that the value of the sugar industry was $47 million as against $31 million. We are asking for one-third on our basic out-of-crop wages, but some of these idiots who know nothing about what the costs have been say that we are asking for something that is unreasonable. We say that if that is an issue to be decided, let them decide it with us; but do not say they are not talking out-of-crop wages unless we talk production bonus. That type of unilateral basis is all right for the employers, but I know they will listen to hear what more we

have to say. You are one of those doubting Thomases; but if you want to see what type of power the other Union has, we will show you.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I merely want to assure the Chamber of the complete accuracy of my earlier remarks since the hon. member has said that they are not concerned with any Board of Enquiry, and what they want is a resumption of negotiations. This is a report made to me by the Labour Commissioner of the meeting held between the Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation. "The Union delegation then said that in view of the stand taken by the Federation, they had no alternative but to state that a Trade dispute existed between the two parties on the question of out-of-crop wages, and to ask the Acting Labour Commissioner to refer the matter to the appropriate authorities so that a Board of Enquiry under the provisions of the Trade Disputes (Arbitration and Enquiry) Act, 1939 (6) into the matter could be set up." This is what the Labour Commissioner reported to me that the Union told him. I was not at the meeting; so therefore I had to go by the information I got from the Labour Commissioner. In other words, Sir, both parties to the dispute had requested a Board of Enquiry. Now I am hearing for the first time today that what the Union wants is a resumption of negotiations on their terms. At no time was it reported to the Ministry that negotiations broke down on the basis that the Union and the Federation failed to agree on the basis or the terms for negotiations. The Union said a trade dispute existed and they wanted a Board of Enquiry, and it was on this assumption that we were proceeding in the Ministry.

In so far as the two Unions are concerned, I do not want any demonstration of authority as to which Union is effective and which is not; I have already seen that on more than one occasion. What I am saying is this: in so far as I am concerned, I really have said on more than one occasion that I could not appreciate the apprehension of one Union against the other, because my information was that if there were not two Unions, negotiations would have been completed. When you have two Unions, naturally one is looking over the shoulder to see what the other is doing, and this is where the trouble starts in any community.
3.40 p.m.

This morning about 11 o'clock, and in the presence of my Permanent Secretary, preparatory to a similar approach to the Union, I asked Mr. Darnley Lewis, the Secretary of the Employers' Federation, whether he thought any useful purpose will be served by bringing the two groups together, and Mr. Lewis replied by saying that so far as things are, he did not think it would serve any useful purpose. In other words, despite the fact that I have been told in the most emphatic terms by the Labour Commissioner that both sides want the matter to go to a Board of Enquiry, I asked the Secretary of the Employers' Federation this morning if he thought any useful purpose would be served by bringing the two groups together and he said that he did not think any useful purpose would be served. If we had been told a few minutes ago that the basis of the dispute is a renewal of the negotiations and, secondly, to negotiate on certain terms, that is entirely a different matter. But, as I have said, the delay in dealing with this matter from the point of view of the Ministry - and I will not say any more on that now - is in view of the fact that we do not want any more Board of Enquiries, and we were doing everything possible to avoid the setting up of further enquiries; but if at any time either party to the dispute makes it clear that resumption of negotiations will serve any useful purpose, I will be the first to have the differences of opinion ironed out between the Union and the Federation as to what matters they want to discuss, and whether this is the time to discuss them. Out-of-crop wages and all of those things are additional avenues to be explored.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order. I do not want the Hon. Minister of Labour to be labouring under any mis-apprehension. I am not responsible for what the Labour Commissioner wrote to him. But what I can tell him is that the fact that the matter went to the Labour Commissioner is because we did not agree on out-of-crop wages; therefore, it could not go to the Ministry. In the final analysis I made it clear and told the Employers' Federation that we were not going to negotiate on out-of-crop wages. Am I a fool to discuss something which is gone? Neither can I discuss anything to come because the negotiators for the sugar agreement have not even left to go to England to discuss the price. We are not now negotiating. We went to the Labour Department on that matter, and if the Labour Commissioner wrote the Ministry, he may have written then on that basis; but the question is, do we accept what he wrote them.

A commission was set up on the Advocate strike nearly ten years ago, but we did not accept it. That was ten years ago when we were not as strong as we are today. The Labour Commissioner can write whatever he likes. The situation is that we are not going to accept the employers telling us how they are going to negotiate. The economy of the sugar industry is in our hands too. They can do as they please: but we can use the residual powers which we have.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: When two parties to a dispute do not agree, you can call in a third party. That is how the Labour Commissioner came in. The Labour Commissioner did not come in at that stage because both parties were insisting: but when two parties to a dispute do not agreee, in the course of a time the third party comes in. If they feel a trade dispute exists and the matter is referred to a Board of Enquiry or a tribunal, well then, the Labour Commissioner comes in. If in this case the hon. member is telling me that he has no confidence in the Labour Commissioner, that is an entirely different matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Minister cannot put it that way, because I do not want to bring the Labour Commissioner into this for certain good reasons. What I want to draw to the Ministers or what has been written to the Ministers is that if no agreement was reached, that is the conclusion which they reached, and when a trade dispute exists, it is left to the Minister. It is true that no Government can set up a Board of Enquiry unless by the authority of the Governor; but no Governor sets up any Board of Enquiry; he only acts through the Ministry. Therefore, it is for the Minister himself to make sure and satisfy himself that this is a matter on which he is going to advise the Governor to set up a Board of Enquiry. Do you think that the Governor can be so crazy as to set up a Board of Enquiry without the advice of the Minister?

All I say is that the Minister had the minutes to know what to do. My charge is that you, the Minister, did not treat this matter with the urgency it deserved and, therefore, you are culpable. You had too much preoccupation in this matter about some other Union, and it is going to break in a way which you will have no idea of how it is coming.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: So far as I am concerned, we have weathered all the storms. Some storms are storms in a teapot. The Ministry has taken every necessary and possible step in this matter on the basis of information which it had from beginning to end. I said that when I spoke to the Secretary of the Employers Federation, I, myself, thought from what he told me that it was a waste of time to bring the two parties together.
3.50 p.m.

One is either powerful or impotent; but whether it is powerful or impotent, I have my opinion about that. That is not the question at all.

Mr. WALCOTT: There is no such thing as two Unions making representation for wages. We are not waiting to hear that you are selling fish and we are asking for more. There is one Union which is making representation. We are not dealing with any mushroom people. The best thing for us to do is to give lessons in these things. *(ASIDES.)*

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: It affects the action of the Union.

Mr. WALCOTT: How could it?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: You will hear in due course. This apprehension is completely unjustified. *(ASIDES)*. I mean the apprehension of one Union being afraid of the other. If any representation is made to me, and I feel that the resumption of negotiations would serve any useful purpose, I would be the first person to agree. I am saying that this debate has served a very advantageous purpose. Regardless of whether or not he was told that a Board of Enquiry was demanded by both parties, it seems to me that at least one party was quite willing to resume negotiations. They have asked me for a detailed breakdown of what it would cost to bring Mr. Goldenberg here, and I may say that what we have heard in this debate today is the biggest joke we could hear. We have been thinking of people who would head the Board of Enquiry. Just two weeks ago I asked for the terms under which Mr. Goldenberg would come. He wanted boarding expenses, a fee while he was away from Montreal and while he was here; he wanted a fee to cover all the secretarial and other services in Montreal - all of this information I collected about two weeks ago because the information in the Ministry is that both sides demanded a Board of Enquiry. When the debate was started in here today I told the Hon. Premier that I hoped to get this question clarified because I did not want to recommend any Board of Enquiry.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I only want to set the record straight. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas has said that if anyone were to sit in here and hear me speak on this Resolution, one would think that only the small cane farmers had canes this year. Well, Sir, I would not take the hon. member seriously, but when the Hon. Minister of Trade says the same thing, I would have to take him seriously, although it seems to me that the two of them are the same. Steps were taken by the last Government to get the peasants' canes out of these areas. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas does not even know how to sit in a chair - I mean politically - but the Hon. Minister of Trade should know how to do that. A member of a Government Party would not have to come on the floor of this House and have a Resolution passed or to pose a question asking his Government to repair certain roads or widen any bend or any corner. What that member would have to do is this: when his Party meets he would call on the Minister responsible and ask him to have a particular road widened or to have a particular tenantry road repaired. That would be the duty of a member of a Government Party to a Minister of the Government, so that the people or even the members of this House would not know anything about that. A member of a Government Party would not have to display himself.

Mr. Chairman, the roads in St. Joseph which were repaired when the last Government was in power are as follows:- Vaughan's Road, Foster Hall, School Road, Newton Road, Church Village, Horton Road, Cadogan Road, Coward Road, Spa, Fruitful Hill, Mascoll Road, Shuffler's Road, Yearwood Road, Union Road, Airy Hill, Thorne Road, Surinam Road, Horse Hill and Cleavers Hill. All of these roads were done during the regime of the last Government. I would not have to come on the floor of this House and ask that these roads be done; the people have the roads and they are quite satisfied with them. I think that this Government should teach its backbenchers what to do: and if that were done, nobody would have to do anything in these matters.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I should like to let the hon. member know that we are talking about providing roads and cutting cane tracks so as to facilitate the small cane growers with the haulage of their canes to the factories. This sum of money is required for the purpose of cutting these cane tracks and roads to assist these farmers. We are not talking about repairing tenantry roads. Tenantry roads are entirely different from cane tracks. This Resolution has nothing to do with the repair of tenantry roads at all.

4.00 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, how does he know? He is talking as if he has to cut the canes.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I do not want to prolong the debate. These tracks between two estates have no names, and what we have cut in St. Joseph and St. Andrew had no names.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Minister said that the Soil Conservation Board cut these tracks; now he is saying the ones that they cut. There are tracks leading from the Spa through to Parks, but the Minister said they are tenantry roads. He does not want to hear the truth somehow, but I will tell it. There are roads being cut, and I will take him there next Sunday afternoon and show him. If anybody lives there, I will give him $500, and if nobody lives there, he can give me $5.

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

RESOLUTION *re* ADVANCE TO REGIONAL COUNCIL OF MINISTERS AND EAST CARIBBEAN CURRENCY AUTHORITY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution was circulated today for a sum not exceeding $200,000. This is for advancing money to the Regional Council of Ministers with regard to the new East Caribbean Currency Authority. The Addendum explains the whole thing - that the Governments of Trinidad and Tobago and British Guiana having decided to issue their own currency, the existing British Caribbean Currency Board has to be dissolved, and the Eastern Caribbean territories with the exception of Grenada have agreed to form a new currency Authority, and this will be laid before the Legislature with a Bill to ratify it.

The preliminary expenses, including the cost of notes, have to be advanced by the Seven Governments concerned, and in due course repaid by the Authority. The seven Governments are: Barbados, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, St. Kitts, Dominica, Montserrat and Antigua.

Pending the establishment of the Authority, the responsibility for the preliminary arrangements rests with the Regional Council of Ministers acting on behalf of the several Governments, and any surplus funds received from the existing British Caribbean Board are on deposit in the Treasury and the proposed advance can therefore be made without recourse to other revenue.

In other words, we are merely financing the issue of the new currency notes by this new East Caribbean Authority, and this money has to be paid from the Treasury to the Regional Council of Ministers for the purpose.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I take it, Sir, that as a novice in a matter of this sort, the Minister should be able to enlighten me and the House. I notice that Grenada will not be coming in. The Addendum states that Trinidad and Tobago and British Guiana have decided to issue their own currency, and you are going to issue a new currency for the East Caribbean Territories. I take it that with these territories still being colonial territories, the issue of these notes will still be linked with the British Currency. I wonder if the Minister could give us that assurance?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is aware that when all the territories were together, all these notes had the endorsement of the British Treasury, and he has no reason to fear that the Seven Island Governments would act in any contrary spirit on this occasion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I accept the hon. member's explanation, but the reason why I asked the question is that the Addendum states that the other Eastern Caribbean territories, with the exception of Grenada, have agreed to form a new currency Authority, and this Agreement will also soon be signed and laid before the Legislature with a Bill to ratify it. The explanation which the Minister has given

has allayed the fears I had when I read the Addendum, but what would be the position with these notes in the Eastern Caribbean if Grenada does not join up with Trinidad? I wonder if the Minister in the absence of the Hon. Premier who is Minister of Finance could enlighten us. I accept what the hon. member has said about these notes being linked with the British Treasury, because as soon as you attempt to issue new Treasury notes, most certainly they must depend on some backing. You do not just print enough dollar bills and issue them; you must have the necessary collateral so that they are valuable outside of this area having the backing of one of the metropolitan areas. I hope the assurance which the hon. member has given is founded on absolute fact.

4.10 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, apparently what was worrying the hon. member is the position with Grenada. Sir, I do not know what Grenada intends to do. So far as I know, the only West Indian Territory which talked about having their currency tied by conditions other than sterling is Jamaica. They said that it should be tied to the American dollar rather than sterling because of the fact that for trading and other purposes it would be useful to have the American dollar tied with that country; but under the present Government this matter has not been raised. The Eastern Caribbean Territories have always signified their intention of having their currency tied with sterling. When the Hon. Leader of the Opposition passed through Trinidad he would recall that the question was raised, but the Leaders of the Governments said that they were prepared to tie their currency with sterling.

The question that the Resolution for $200,000 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of four Resolutions in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

THE INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1964

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. John: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921, 1921-6.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Bill.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to provide additional incentive legislation to assist in the industrial development of this Island, and reference was made to it during the Budget proposals by the Hon. Premier. During the Budget Proposals the Hon. Premier said that there was a small additional concession which he proposed to be granted in respect of additional allowances, and he said that legislation would be introduced to deem any expenditure incurred before commencement of the business or trade to have been incurred on the day on which the trade or business commenced. Another encouragement which he proposed to be given to local industry was an increase from two per cent to three per cent in the allowance granted for industrial buildings. This will come into effect from the beginning of the ensuing assessment year, that is from 1st January, 1965.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Bill is to give effect to those proposals; it fixes the date for the coming into effect of the determination of these initial allowances and it also, as I have said, gives effect to the increase for industrial buildings. It is quite a simple matter, and all it seeks to do is to bring our industrial development more in line with other countries in the area, more especially Jamaica.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive, were called separately and passed.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

4.20 p.m.

TEACHERS (SECONDARY SCHOOLS) PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Teachers (Secondary Schools) Pensions Act, 1962.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order standing in the name of the Hon. Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made a request that he take charge of this Bill standing in the name of the Hon. Premier, and unless there be any objection, that request will be granted. *(After a pause).*

Hearing no objection, leave is granted and the hon. member may proceed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is designed to correct a slight error which took place when we passed the Teachers (Secondary Schools) Pensions Act, 1962. The error is a very slight one. Sometime when the greatest caution is exercised by the legal draughtsman, an error is made. The position is as follows:-

Paragraph (b) of subsection (2) of section 20 of the Teachers (Secondary Schools) Pensions Act, 1962 contains a reference to regulation twenty of the Act. This should really be a reference to subparagraph (b) of paragraph (2) of regulation 20.

This amending Bill is to correct that reference. There is nothing more to this Bill than that. I therefore beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: 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.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: 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 on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION re ESTIMATES OF THE PORT DEPARTMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:

A Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours' Act 1960 the sum of $150,000 required to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1964-65 as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as the Addendum to this Resolution sets out:-

"As a result of damage which was done to Harbour Installations by rough seas during 1963, certain reinforcement works have become necessary to secure the bulk sugar store and other Harbour Installations against similar action by the sea. Temporary repairs were carried out during 1963. It is proposed that these reinforcement works be done in phases and the sum of $150,000 has been released from the Price Stabilisation Reverse Fund for payment into the Harbour Fund to complete the first phase of the works. Expenditure from the Harbour Fund must have the approval of the Legislature. It is therefore necessary to supplement the Annexed Estimates - Port Department - Item 63, Static Facilities, so that this expenditure may be incurred."

In reality, Sir, this is money which has been granted from the Price stabilisation Reserve Fund which is being passed over to the Harbour Fund; but in order for the Harbour Department to spend this money, it must receive the sanction of the Legislature. It is for that reason that this Resolution has been brought here. I may mention that the repairs to the damage which has been done, or I should say, the final repairs to the damage which has been done by the rough seas in January, 1962, are estimated at $800,000. We are doing this work in phases and this is one of the most important phases of the repairs.
4.30 p.m.

In reality the break-water is being extended, steel sheet piling is being installed, and the whole area is being made more secure. It is felt that with the expenditure of this $150,000, the Harbour, Bulk Store, Tunnel and Transfer House will all be in a reasonably secure condition to withstand the rough seas in the foreseeable future; so that in truth and in fact the repairs which are being conducted now are of a final and substantial nature and not just temporary. Temporary repairs were done already, but these are the final repairs that are being done in various phases, and this is the most important phase of the work which is almost nearing completion.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to this Resolution because we realise that the Harbour is an investment in this country, but the Hon. Minister should be able to tell us something. This Harbour is just three years old, and you will appreciate the difficulty we had in the Opposition in finding out what was the cost of this Harbour or anything in the contract; but now that this Government is in power, they should enlighten us on some of these matters. We should like to know how long the guarantee was for, and whether the contractors are paying any portion of the cost of repairs now that these substantial repairs will be done. We should know whether in the original agreement it was set out that they should pay a portion of the cost of repairs within a certain time. Those of us who sat on the Committee were accused of building a Deep Water Harbour to put people out of work, but we took it in good faith. With a project of this magnitude, you never get the job done without having these little difficulties after. When we had the first break-through, we were told that it would cost a substantial sum. Fortunately it did not cost what we anticipated, but I take it that these repairs are necessary as a result of an error in the work of the contractors. Will the Minister tell us whether the contractors will be paying any portion of this money? I am asking these questions for the benefit of the public and the members of the House. I think the taxpayers should know because we spent a substantial sum of money. It is true that we got a good job done, but in all these cases you never pay unless you have a clause or proviso which says that if anything goes wrong within a certain period after completion, then the contractors have to pay whatever is the bond.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Minister will be able to enlighten us on it, because there was a time when we stood together in the Opposition, though in different camps, and pressed at every opportunity to find out something about the contract, because we had read something about it in the *Trinidad Guardian*. Now that the Minister is in charge of this portfolio, he should be able to tell us if we are going to spend this moeny, or if as a result of the agreement drawn up with the contactors on the one side and the Barbados Government on the other, the contractors have to pay a part of this money after three years.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Hon. Minister replies, is there any other hon. member who seeks enlightenment?

Mr. SMITH: Oh yes, Mr. Speaker. I am so much accustomed to the Minister jumping up and down that I thought it would happen now; I forgot you were in the Chair. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown wants to know if the contractors are going to pay some of the expenses. I too would like to know that because this has happened too soon.

Whilst we are on the Port, I should like to draw a matter to the Minister's attention. I do not know if it is due to the volume of business at the Port or the inadequacy of the labourers there, but you have to spend two or three days before you can get your packages. I am sure that last Friday I sent my man there for a parcel, and after spending the whole day he returned without it. I made sure and sent him early the next morning, but again he did not get it, and I would not like to tell you what I had to do eventually to get it. It is very difficult for business people to get even the people who do the freighting with lorries and carts to go there, because they say they lose too much time. When a man has to go there in the moring and then return in the afternoon, he loses a whole day's work; and besides that, you may want the particular goods in your store. I do not know what is wrong, but I hope the Minister will make a note of this and find out whether more men are needed. I admit that it would not be so every day, but the same way that ships are not held up in offloading, people should not be held up in getting their goods. If you have to employ extra labour, by all means do so, because we still have a lot of people on the unemployment list, and there are a lot of people who would be only too glad to work at this time with Christmas just around the corner. Whoever is responsible for the employment of labour should see to it that two or three extra gangs are employed to relieve the lorries when they arrive at the Port for the necessary goods.
4.40 p.m.

As I have said just now, it is difficult to get the freighters to go for it, and it is hard for the store to have people waiting for the goods and cannot get them. They will have to leave although the goods are in the Island. If they are in the Island, by all means they should be put into the various shops or stores. The Port is doing a good job; therefore the contractors or whoever is responsible should not mind paying out this money.

I hope that the Hon. Minister will go into the matter and find out what is responsible there that one has to be waiting two or three days in order to get their packages or goods.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I will answer the last hon. member who spoke, first. As to the question raised by him and which he has complained of, I would like him to know that the matter has not been drawn to Government's attention or to the Ministry: but it is a matter which I will take note of; and although he spoke of the Port Contractors who were the persons involved, yet I will see to it that the matter be drawn to their knowledge.

In so far as the matter raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, quite a number of questions he asked. I will say this. In the first place, the time limit or the guarantee had already expired; therefore, it fell to the Barbados Government to have the repairs done. After this damage was done we called in the Consultant Engineers who built the Harbour, and estimates were made. The estimated cost which was made was in the vicinity of $800,000. Now that the Department of Highways is actually handling the job, we are effecting great savings and we hope that the repairs will not amount to any $800,000, but that they will be more in the vicinity of $200,000. As I have said, the time limit had already expired and the expenses have to be borne by the Government.

This money is to come from the Price Stabilisation Fund, as they do not have the money to carry out these repairs.

As far as the actual work to be done now, I think I can agree with the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown when he intimated that it would appear to be an error in the first instance. If he has not said so, I am saying so. It seems to me that a very gross error was made in the designing and planning of this Harbour in that the most essential parts – the bulk sugar storage, the bulk installations and the various belts – were left exposed. The Port was hit at the point which was most vulnerable, and owing to an error all these vital parts were exposed to the elements. The Department of Highways and Transport is doing permanent repairs to it although that Department is short-staffed. We are working under-staffed, but we are doing work which should have been done by the contractors. That work was estimated to cost $800,000 by the contractors and engineers, but we are doing it for $200,000.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That brings Government Business to an end.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 20th October, 1964, at 2.30 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion for the adjournment, there is something which I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention. I think that members of this Honourable House are aware that we are preparing for a visit next month of His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh in connection with the official opening of the new Hospital. Hon. members are also aware that it is proposed that His Royal Highness should address both Houses of the Legislature if it is their desire to hear him, and I have every reason to believe that that will be so.

This House has not yet been seised as to matters connected therewith, and I wonder in connection with His Royal Highness' visit to this Chamber whether we should consider the appointment of a small Committee to go into all matters connected therewith because it is quite possible that we should be hearing from the Other Place of their proposals. I have just thrown out that suggestion because I think Your Honour would inform hon. members of what it is proposed to do as regards this House as distinct from the other part which the Other Place has to play.
4.50 p.m.

I think that the appointment of a small Select Committee for that purpose might be in order, but it would be as Your Honour pleases.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that hon. members are grateful to the Hon. Minister of Education for letting them know of the proposal that the two Chambers of the Legislature should meet His Royal Highness, the Duke of Edinburgh. I shall give the matter referred to by the Hon. Minister my urgent and immediate attention and steps will be taken thereon at the earliest possible opportunity.

The question is that this House now stand adjourned until this day week, Tuesday, 20th October, 1964, at 2.30 o'clock p.m. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "AYE", those against will please say "NO". I think the "AYES" have it. Accordingly, this House now stands adjourned until this day week at 2.30 o'clock p.m.
4.55 p.m.