THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 12th, June 1951

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3 o'clock p.m. today

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., Messrs. R. G. MAPP, M. E. COX, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E., and F. C. GODDARD

Prayers were read.

Mr. CRAWFORD entered the House and took his seat.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 29th May, 1951, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Message from the Honourable the Legislative Council returning the Bill intituled an Act to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year 1951, and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax, with an amendment.

Messrs. ADAMS, MOTTLEY and ALLDER entered the House and took their seats.

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $8,680 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951—52, Part I—Current as shown in Supplementary Estimates 1951—52, No. 8, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $960 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive-Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951—52, Part I—Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimates 1951—52, No. 9, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $10,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951—52, Part I—Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimates 1951—52, No. 10, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Messrs. BETHELL and WARD entered the House and took their seats.

Mr. ADAMS: A Bill intituled an Act to provide for the exemption from payment of motor vehicles tax or licence of United States of America Consular Officers.

Mr. ADAMS: A Bill intituled an Act to amend the Executive Committee Act, 1891.

Dr. CUMMINS: A Bill intituled an Act to amend the Apprenticeship Bursaries Act, 1928.

Mr. BRANCKER entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at the next meeting to consider the last money Resolution of which I have just given notice and also of my intention to ask leave to move for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal later in the day with the first two money Resolutions of which I have just given notice.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE

Mr. CRAWFORD: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly respectfully suggest that provision shall be made at the earliest date for maternity protection for women employed in industrial and commercial undertakings and accordingly request the introduction of legislation to prohibit the employment of women in specified undertakings for a specified period before and after confinement; to afford them the right to leave work on production of a medical certificate stating that confinement will take place within this specified period and to entitle them to a percentage of their salaries for the entire period before and after confinement; maternity leave

to be extended on the presentation of a medical certificate to the effect that as a result of pregnancy or confinement, the woman is unable to resume work at the expiration of the specified period.

QUESTIONS

Mr. CRAWFORD: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:—

Will the Government cause to be published at the earliest date possible a comprehensive report in explanation of the present position with regard to the implementation of the recommendations by Mr. George Roddam, M.Inst., E.E., in his Report on the Ground Water Resources of Barbados?

2. Will the Government please state the cost of the construction of the well at Warleigh and the reason for its abandonment?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to have the Roddam Report implemented before the expiration of the current 3-year contract of the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department?

Mr. CRAWFORD: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:

In view of:—

(a) the continuous increase in the number of children attending elementary schools and the absolute inability of teachers in many schools efficiently to cope with abnormally large classes;

(b) the unsatisfactory conditions, including lack of adequate accommodation, under which teachers are expected to perform their duties,

(c) the availability of suitable candidates for entry into the teaching service of the colony.

Will the Government please take immediate steps to place the establishment of teachers on a more satisfactory basis by increasing the number?

Mr. MAPP on behalf of Mr. MILLER: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House of Assembly:—

1. Is Government aware of the inconvenience the 'Bus-travelling public is made to suffer, occasioned by the poor service rendered by 'Bus concessionaires who now enjoy monopoly?

2. Is Government aware of the number of Schoolchildren left at 'Bus Stops daily, some arriving at school hours after school has been started, and some having to return home for that day, thereby being denied the unbroken continuity which is important to Education?

3. If the answer to (1) and (2) is in the affirmative, will Government employ immediately, all possible means to rectify this sad state of affairs?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the following Bills were read a first time:—

A Bill intituled an Act to provide for the exemption from payment of motor vehicles tax or license of United States of America Consular Officers.

A Bill intituled an Act to amend the Executive Committee Act, 1891.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. Cox, a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Apprenticeship Bursaries Act, 1928, was read a first time.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal with the first two money Resolutions of which I gave notice earlier in the day.

There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

ORDERS POSTPONED

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to postpone the consideration of the first seven Orders of the Day.

Mr. LEWIS: A regards leave being granted the honourable member to postpone the consideration of these Orders, I want to say that we have lapsed from the good custom of fixing the Order Paper before the House is adjourned; I think that that is a custom to which we should adhere. The Order Paper is not now fixed before the adjournment and the result is that every Tuesday the consideration of Orders has to be postponed. If a little attention is paid to fixing the Order Paper we will be able to come here knowing what is to be done first. I repeat that the custom of fixing the Order Paper is one to which we should adhere.

There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member to postpone the consideration of the Orders.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave that Committee of Supply together with the Resolutions for $960 and $8,680 respectively, of which I gave notice earlier today, and of which there are cyclo-styled copies, be taken as the first Order of the Day.

There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day now stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Mr. BRYAN came into the Committee and took his seat.

EXPENSES *re* ENQUIRY INTO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PRINCESS ALICE PLAYING FIELD

Mr. ADAMS: The first Resolution with which I shall deal, Mr. Chairman, is one for $960 to provide for the expenses of holding a public enquiry into the establishment of the Princess Alice Playing Field. The Government has been unable to come down with this Resolution before, but it feels that, in respect of a matter of so great importance, especially as the name of a member of the Government has been mentioned in connection therewith, it is essential that a thorough investigation should be conducted into the affairs of the Princess Alice Playing Field, and that the tribunal which is to be set up should be an impartial one. The Government has been in touch with a judicial officer outside the island and it has been computed that his remuneration plus the length of time he would have to stay in Barbados to conduct this enquiry would be covered by this sum of $960. We are therefore asking the Legislature to approve of this sum. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. WILKINSON: I feel that this Resolution is an urgent one. Of course, I have not had the time to consult any of my colleagues in connection with it, but I am quite certain that they will vote for the Resolution. There have been so many rumours going around with regard to the affairs of the Princess Alice Playing Field that I, personally, feel that the Government is quite right to have this enquiry instituted. I am glad to learn that it has been decided to engage the services of someone outside the island in connection with the enquiry; I feel that this enquiry will be entirely impartial.

Mr. ALLDER: I daresay that all public minded people in this colony will be proud to know that the Government is taking steps to have an investigation carried out in respect of all public matters especially where accusations have been made and where public funds are involved. but in the past we have had several Committees set up to carry out investigations in respect of various matters pertaining to the well-being of the colony and they have all ended up as whitewash and corruption continued. Within recent years we have had a definite breaking down of public morals and no definite step was taken to stop it. I have heard the view expressed in public that these investigation Committees are just whitewash so as to allow the culprits to go free to practice their corruption further. I would like greater scrutiny and more investigation to take place in this colony; it is not only a question of the Princess Alice Playing Field but there are other matters which have been brought to public notice, matters which do not go down to the credit of the colony. I have been informed that not very long ago an important officer of this Government who was on the staff of Harrison College, drew the taxpayers' money for nearly two years when that gentleman did not have the qualifications required for his job: that matter was made a public issue and the officer only left the colony on Sunday. He was here after the public knew that it was on false pretences that he got his job and no action has been taken to bring that individual to justice. There have been several other cases in which some of the employees have been appointed by the Government and others by subsidiary Boards which are run with public funds, and I feel that the Goverment should make sure that when officers are employed the taxpayers are not fleeced. The Government should take action in respect of all corruption and malpractices which have been taking place for some time now.

Mr. DOWDING came into the Committee and took his seat while Mr. ALLDER was speaking.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTES *Re* MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES AND POST OFFICE

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is one to place the sum of $8,680 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1951—52, Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplemnetary Estimates, 1951—52, No. 8 which form the Schedule to this Resolution. As hon. members will see from their cyclo-styled copies, the sum of $1,200 is required for the payment of fees to the King's Solicitor; the sum of $3,480 is required to meet the expenses of the representation of the colony at the Festival of Britain and the sum of $4,000 is required in respect of an order for a stock of postage stamps. The notes to these items explain the position with regard to each item. As regards the first item there is an outstanding account in respect of fees for advice in connection with the oil negotiations. As regards the second item, hon. members will see that the amount is too little (Laughter) and regards the last item, there has been a great sale of postage stamps and the postal authorities have asked that this sum of $4,000 be provided most urgently. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman—As regards item 2, "Representation of the Colony at the Festival of Britain, $3,480," the note says that this amount is required to meet the expenses of the two representatives of Barbados at the Festival of Britain, and the expenses are made up as follows:—Return Air Passages, $2,580; Subsistence Allowances, $870 and Flight Insurance, $30. I am not questioning the allocation of these amounts; I suppose that it has been fixed on the basis of what the Government feels it can afford to spend, but I am not happy over the entire position. I think that this is a matter on which the House should re-consider its decision. It appears to me that we can still afford at this time, and with the peculiar conditions which exist in this colony, to send this $3,480 on an absolutely unnecessary matter like this. It is true that all the colonies would like to have a representative at the Festival of Britain, but, at the same time one has got to bear in mind the financial position of the colony, its commitments and its economic position, generally speaking. Up to about two months ago when this matter was first mooted, we anticipated that 4,000 workers would have left this colony to work in the United States of America, and since then the number of workers has been reduced to 2,000. Even if the 4,000 workers had emigrated to the United States there still would have been considerable unemployment in the island; and now that the number of workers has been reduced by one-half, the number of the unemployed has been increased thereby. I am of the opinion that, in view of the distressing situation in which a large number of people now find themselves, we should not vote this appreciable sum of money for an unnecessary affair like this. This sum of $3,480 would employ about 40 people for about ten weeks at, say, $8.50 per week. An hon. members says, and I agree with him, that we could make a start with the Constitution Swamp and we could repair some tenantry roads. In any case, this money could be spent to greater advantage to the colony. I am not at all averse to spending money for people of this colony to go to any part of the world, provided that some practical advantage is going to follow and provided that the colony will get some benefit from it. We are in the habit of sitting here and, without any opposition at all, voting appreciable sums of money for the purpose of defraying the travelling expenses of officials and members of the Government when, evidently the money is going to be well spent; but this is merely a gesture. Whether or not we have one or two representatives or no representative at all at the Festival of Britain is of little importance to this colony. A gesture of this sort is all right if we can afford to spend this money; if we had sent 10,000 or 12,000 men to America or if we had large-scale projects to absorb the unemployed, if we had made a proper start towards doing a lot of things which we have left undone, then we could with an easy conscience support this Resolution. Whether I stand alone or not, I am not easy in my mind about this matter; it is impossible on mature reflection not to regard this expenditure as an abso-

lute waste of public funds. The fact that the Crown Colonies or other colonies with semi-representative institutions are sending up representatives to the Festival of Britain is of little importance to me; the point is whether we can afford to do it or not. We want elementary schools all over this island and the cry on the part of the Government is: Where is the money to come from? Well, I echo the cry: Where is the money to come from if the little we do have we are going to fritter away on an unimportant matter like this?

Mr. GARNER came into the Committee and took his seat while Mr. CRAWFORD was speaking.

Mr. ADAMS: This House has already agreed to send representatives to the Festival of Britain and the hon member is attacking that. Let him say that $15 a day for subsistence allowance is too much, but how can he attack a principle when he has already agreed to it?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I began by saying that I am not questioning the allocation of the money at all and I also said that the House should reconsider its decision in this matter. I went on to say that we expected to send 4,000 workers to America and now we are only sending 2,000. (A MEMBER: That is no fault of ours). That is no fault of ours but it is our business to find work for people, if we can, because they are unemployed. We spent $11,000 on a molasses excursion to Canada last year and we have not heard anything about it. Nobody opposed that expenditure because we thought that the result would be of some advantage to the colony. We have spent money before and since that on trips like this from which we thought, perhaps quite wrongly, that we might have derived some results; but there is nothing to be gained so far as we know, from having two representatives of Barbados at the Festival of Britain. This is a gesture which we can afford to make under normal conditions when we have our prospects for emigration, little unemployment and a full Treasury; but with conditions as they are now I most emphatically do affirm that I do not think we would be right in implementing this matter. I know that the House did make the decision some time ago that representatives of Barbados should attend the Festival of Britain, but conditions have changed since then; and the fact that that decision was made does not mean that it was a correct one.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must draw the hon. member's attention to what is now before us. The decision that representatives of Barbados should attend the Festival of Britain has already been made whether it is right or wrong, and I do not think the hon. member should go back to that now. Rule 123 of the Rules of this House states:—"No member may reflect upon any vote of the House except for the purpose of moving that such a vote be rescinded."

Mr. CRAWFORD: If that is giving any trouble, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this amount of $3,480 be deleted. The House agreed to send delegates to the Festival of Britain at one meeting and at a subsequent meeting the delegates were selected. I maintain that if for no other reason than the fact that the relief of our unemployed which we expected to get is not materialising to the extent we expected it to materialise, we should give very careful consideration as to how we expend what monies we have; and, first and foremost we should pay attention to the question of finding relief work for the people of the colony. I am sure that there is no member sitting around this Table who would say that he is voting this money with an easy conscience. Either of these two representatives could go on this mission or take a trip around the world, so that the fact that they might have to put their hands into their pockets is neither here nor there. I do feel that honourable members should give a little more serious consideration to this matter; this is not a gesture for which we should not vote if we saw our way to do it easily. I would be glad to hear somebody tell us some of the advantages to be derived from our sending representatives up there at this time.

Mr. ADAMS: I am sorry that the honourable member has spoken as he has spoken. I do not want to take the credit to myself, but on a previous occasion when I could not remain as a delegate from this colony for the whole period of the engagement, I suggested that the honourable member should take my place. I was rather flattered by the fact that persons outside the colony knew that the honourable member's political stand was opposed to mine and members of my Party were rather surprised, but I did that because I thought it was a good sign for Barbados' politics.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is not fair. I did not cast any personal reflection in this matter; I never said anything about individuals. Personalities have nothing to do with the matter.

Mr. ADAMS: I have not accused the honourable member of casting any personal reflection. I was merely saying that I was a member of a Committee along with other West Indians and when I found it impossible to remain for the whole period of the engagement I suggested that the honourable member should take my place. I thought I was doing right. I regret that the honourable member has made the speech he has made because I may not be able to remain the whole period at the Festival of Britain and it may not be possible for the honourable member to take my place again. (Mr. CRAWFORD: I would decline that offer). Possibly the honourable senior member for St. John might take my place, but it appears to me as if that honourable member is opposed to spending money on sending out people to represent the colony so that again I might be sorry that I nominated him to take my place.

Mr. ALLDER: Reference has been made to me in this debate; however, I intended raising the same point which the honourable junior member for St. Philip has raised. I am not ashamed of being known as one who dislikes the wanton expenditure of funds, which does not help the colony. Everybody knows that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph likes to use a hammer to kill an ant. Never in my political career have I expressed the desire to have anything free and cheap; I have never intimated that I would like to have a free trip anywhere. As regards this Resolution I have reflected on the history of this particular session of this House and, Mr. Chairman, I have noticed that it has been a session of paying passages; there has been no more than a passage Government in a passage session paying passages for nothing beneficial. (Laughter). I want to be serious whether honourable members laugh or not; whether the Rules of this House prevent any reflection on any previous decision of the House or not; I always say that what a man has done he should be able, under the law of circumstances, to undo. Although the British Government is expected to pay the cost of maintenance of the two representatives of this colony at the Festival of Britain, yet we are still being asked to forward them $15 a day as pocket money. Since we have had to spend so much money in paying the passages of delegations, the colony has not, as far as possible, benefited from such delegations, and not only I, myself, but several members of the public have been interested in the delegation which cost this Government $11,000 last year on a vital

issue which affects this colony, the question of the export of fancy molasses———

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to stick to the Resolution which is before us and leave the molasses question out.

Mr. ALLDER: One is wondering what the Report of the molasses delegation will look like.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member ber not to deal with that delegation.

Mr. ALLDER: But you have permitted other honourable members to refer to that delegation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I rule the honourable member out of order in dealing with that delegation.

Mr. ALLDER: We have spent a lot of money on that delegation and the Report has not come before us———

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to stick to this Resolution and not deal with anything else.

Mr. ALLDER: We cannot continue to spend so much money just for the purpose of sending a couple of people to the Mother Country; our position definitely does not permit us to do that. If you give consideration to our local needs, you cannot, in the true sense of the word, continue to vote such sums of money without paying regard to what effect it will have on the colony. That must have a damaging effect on the resources of the colony; whatever you say, if you vote this money now and you spend $11,000 at one time and $4,800 at another time just to pay the passage of some individual or individuals, that method is not as farsighted as another one which would be of greater economy. Just last week I was told that a function took place at an institution and the medical officer who was presenting certificates, rebuked the Government for their lethargy in forcing things to be carried on under such adverse conditions plus the fact that at that institution two and three people have had to be put in one bed. The cost of passages is what prevents us from giving satisfaction to the sick and from allowing them the opportunity of getting proper rest.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the honourable member to stick to the Resolution which is before us. If you ramble all over the place I will have to call on the Speaker. You must stick to this Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: If you want to call on the Speaker nobody can prevent you from doing that; but I think I am definitely in order. If I am asked to support the passing of this Resolution I have to think of it and relate it to other things in the colony so as to help me to decide what stand I will take. I doubt that you will want me just to vote the money.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have already agreed to vote the money because you have agreed to these representatives being sent to the Festival of Britain.

Mr. ALLDER: However, it is wrong for us to be spending money so often for the purpose of giving a few people what is considered to be a joy ride. We should spend money—

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. It is difficult for the honourable member to abide by the Rules of this House, but, Mr. Chairman, are you going to allow him to break Rule 123 over and over again?

Mr. ALLDER: I do not mind these interruptions. I am wondering how many more times we will be asked to vote similar sums of money as we have been voting in the past 2½ years. Somebody has to call a halt; I suppose some honourable members feel that might should overrule right but objection must be taken when shortsightedness is let loose. I know that partly every honourable member expects at one time or another to benefit from such visits which are sponsored by the local Government or the British Government and financed by the taxpayers, and so you might not get justice done to a Resolution of this sort; but if the honourable junior member for St. Philip has made a motion for a reduction of the amount of the Resolution, I shall, in duty bound, second that motion, not because our thoughts have been moulded in the same pattern, but I feel that this is a case when we must reflect on and assist our resources before we can venture on expenditure of this sort. To me this is just like an uncontrolled home; the children are hungry and dirty and an indiscriminate parent decides to go on a pleasure trip at high cost! No one can say that with a great amount of dissatisfaction in this colony, with rife unemployment—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: For the last time I am asking the honourable member to stick to the Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: The unemployment position in this colony is serious; too many people are uncertain of a means of livelihood, too many people are looking to the generosity of good government to help them out of their present plight. Too many people are begging for pittances when they should be exerting their energies in order to gain a livelihood for themselves, which in turn would prevent their children from having a similar experience. With the position as it is, the only alternative is for a Socialist minded Government, or a Labour Government or government by the people and for the people as it is claimed, to maintain the greatest measure of economy so as to see that out of every dollar which passes through the colony, at least a couple of those who are hungry should get if it is only temporary relief. However much you want to maintain the old traditions, they do not permit you to have a greater number of satisfied people especially of those who have brought you into power. I have listened to the Labour members at mass meetings and I have prayed that when they come to this House they would maintain the feelings which they expressed at those meetings—feelings which they expressed up to last night; but they adopt a Jekyll and Hyde attitude and people continue to suffer. If you want to convince the suffering people that you alone can direct the ship of state to the promised land—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member going to have a mass meeting now? I ask you to stick to this Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: There is no particular circle drawn around the Resolution. I am dealing with the resources of the colony and whether we can afford to spend this money. I must draw your attention to the difficulties which confront the colony. I was hoping that even 1% of the general feelings expressed by the Labour members would have been carried out in this House relative to matters of this sort. How can things continue like this? I thought that sufficient a number of honourable members would have been so mindful of their responsibility as to support the motion for the deletion of this item. In case they do not support this motion and the Government is permitted to embark upon this added expenditure, it will be a question of people enjoying themselves in England while others are suffering.

Messrs. GILL, REECE and Mr. MILLER came into the Committee and took their seats.

Mr. LEWIS: While I must agree that the honourable junior member for St. Philip had the right to move the deletion of this vote as a matter of rescinding a previous decision of the House, I think that

the circumstances of the case make it difficult for me to believe that the reasons which have been given for making that motion are the real reasons behind the making of the motion and the seconding of it. I was not in the House at the time when the House agreed to sending representatives to the Festival of Britain, but it is a considerable time since the House agreed to do so. I do not remember reading of any honourable member at that time asking what would be the cost of sending these representatives to the Festival of Britain, but, as the honourable senior member for St. John rightly says, every member of the House probably wanted the turn to fall to him; therefore no question of cost came into the matter at all. This particular Resolution gave honourable members the opportunity, if they were honest in their reasons for the proposed rescindment of the decision of the House to have given the House proper notice of their intention rather than hold a political meeting for voicing their views. Last Tuesday this Resolution came before the House, and it was postponed on one particular point only, and that was that honourable members wanted to know what the subsistance allowance would be. If I had the opportunity which this Resolution afforded and held the view of the two honourable members who have spoken—

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not like to interrupt the honourable member when he is speaking, but before he develops that point I merely want to say that I was not here last Tuesday when the Resolution was introduced.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member is not the only member who feels as he feels; the honourable member has had a seconder of his motion, and therefore he must not take my remarks as pointing only in his direction. I do not expect the honourable member to accept what I would do, but if I wanted to see this amount deleted I would have given notice of my intention to treat it in that way; but the Government was certainly left with the impression that if it was explained how this $870 for subsistence allowances was made up, the amount would be voted.

I would like to say that long before this matter of the representation of Barbados at the Festival of Britain came before us, two people were occupying one bed at the General Hospital; and before this Resolution was before the House last Tuesday, a Message was presented to this House saying that the number of workers going to the United States of America would be reduced. Therefore the acceptance of the invitation to send representatives to the Festival of Britain has nothing to do with either of these two matters I do not think that either of these matters could be used as the real reason for the suggested deletion of this vote. There is no doubt that the deplorable condition which have been outlined by hon. members would appeal to each and every one of us, but the time when you are encouraging the Government to incur expense is the right time to mention these things, if you are so deeply interested in the people: you should not deliberately sit in this House and be a party to incurring expense, either by taking part in the debate or giving silent consent, and then at the eleventh hour move that an amount be deleted. It is not a year ago that a similar vote came before this House, and we knew what it would cost to send out people. Let us hope that we will pay the cheapest passages, but to wait to see the actual amount of money put down on paper is a very false way of showing your interest in the starving and sick people of this colony. The honourable members who moved and seconded the motion for the deletion of this amount cannot possibly have the interest of the starving and sick people of this colony at heart more than anybody else; and to make a display of those feelings on a matter like this, must of necessity, mark them as being absolutely insincere in the views which they have expressed here today.

Mr. DOWDING: I am a bit worried about this Resolution, but I realise that the House has already agreed to sending representatives to the Festival of Britain and in principle the matter is a *fait accompli*. However, if we were to take stock of the numerous occasions on which this colony is called upon to meet expenses of this nature out of the taxpayers' money, it does seem to me that it is necessary for us to be careful in respect of any vote of this sort. I speak under correction, but I cannot remember that any previous vote of this nature included an amount for the insurance of the person or persons travelling either by plane or boat. If this is a precedent, it is, in my opinion, going a little too far: if we are going to take cognizance of what I call the personal risks of persons, I think that there is a great possibility that in the future we will have to face a much greater expenditure in respect of these matters: we might also have to provide insurance in the case of persons travelling by rail or motor car and we might have to face bills for compensation in the event of disablement or death. I think that, at this stage, we should take stock not only as to whether this colony is capable of constantly bearing these expenses, but as to whether the colony can afford to begin to insure persons, who, when one thinks of it, are going to enjoy the privilege. I should like the honourable introducer of this Resolution to explain whether the principle of providing flight insurance has been adopted before or if it is the intention of the Government to adopt it and whether the Government do not think that they are adopting a precedent which might lead to the expenditure of vast sums of money. I hope that the honourable member will explain that matter, because I do not feel that we should be very careful as to the expenditure of money when we take into consideration the size of this colony and the magnitude to which these expenses have gone.

Mr. ADAMS: I can appreciate how the honourable junior member for St. James must feel because I have had the unhappy experience of having undisciplined juniors in the ranks of the Party which I have the honour to lead. I am sure that the honourable junior member for St. James must be feeling in his heart what petty, stupid remarks have just been made. I am going to help the merchants to get more Canadian dollars, and if this Resolution were for that matter alone nobody would question this amount of $30 for flight insurance; but I am also attending the Festival of Britain, and it is time that somebody talk back as bluntly as possible on these matters. When the sugar producers went to pull their chestnuts out of the fire, you heard: "Insure them, put them in the best hotels." but now the honourable junior member for St. George gets up and questions this flight insurance of $30; he should think a little before he talks rot. Is it too much for a Government to ask for $30 to insure the life of a representative whom it is sending to improve the economic condition of a unit of the West Indies? There is a Rule of the Colonial Office that when Colonial Officials go abroad on Government business they are insured. Colonel Michelin was insured when he went to Canada. The honourable junior member for St. Philip and the honourable senior member for St. John can be excused since they were born that way; but the honourable junior member for St. George has more intelligence than that. It is time that we cease being petty in matters of his sort. I have paid my own in-

surance on previous occasions; I believe that last year the sugar delegates, the honourable senior member for St. Thomas and myself, like every other West Indian delegate who went on that delegation, were insured because of the practice of insuring persons who go abroad on Government business. The honourable junior member for St. George believes in what he says, unlike the honourable junior member for St. Philip and the honourable senior member for St. John who merely make splashes in order that they may appear in the newspapers. I appeal to the honourable junior member for St. George to see that he has let himself down by questioning an item of this sort in an Assembly like this, in connection with the matter of sending representatives to Great Britain. I would like to say that except on one occasion when I went to a meeting of the I.L.O., I have always been out of pocket as a result of attending those meetings; so that a subsistence allowance of $15 a day is nothing to boast about when you are with other people and find yourself having to pay for a round of drinks. The honourable junior member for the City did not know that while the honourable junior member for St. Philip was not present at the voting in connection with this matter, the honourable senior member for St. John, on a division, voted for it.

Mr. ALLDER: I prefaced my remarks by saying that whatever a man has done he can undo if, in the light of circumstances, it appears that that should be the case.

Mr. ADAMS: If I had not brought out that point would the Committee have remembered it? If the honourable member wanted to be courageous and honest, he would have said: "I have made a mistake in agreeing to the passing of the Address."

Mr. ALLDER: I am not quite clear as to what took place when the Address was introduced in this House. I cannot remember whether the matter went to a division; but if I voted for the Address on a division, that shows that the House was not unanimous when approval was given to the matter.

Mr: ADAMS: The honourable member has admitted that he was in favour of this matter, but he says that anybody can change his mind. All I am saying is this: the honourable member might have said that he was in favour of this proposal originally, that he voted for the Reply to the Message from the Governor asking whether the House approved of representatives being sent to the Festival of Britain, but he made a mistake. The House made a nomination and inserted the name of the person whom they selected. But the honourable member has not said that; he is always at pains to try to improve the lot of the people; he is always talking about the poor people whom he represents and whom no other honourable member represents.

Mr. CRAWFORD: As far as the honourable senior member for St. John is concerned, he can take care of himself. In so far as I am concerned, I am glad to hear that I was born in that certain way, and I hope that I will remain in the way in which I was born. I am not one of those who change their politics every five years; I am not a politician who was one day a Conservative, another day a Labourite, another day a Liberal and God knows what next. I hope that I will always remain the same. Last Tuesday when the House postponed the consideration of this Resolution I was not here; this has slipped the memory of the honourable senior member for St. John, but I remember asking him about voting on this Resolution and when I came into the House, the question for the postponement of the Resolution was being put. I said that I was glad that the consideration of the Resolution was postponed because I wanted to speak on the matter. It would take a very peculiar mentality to get up here and insinuate that relieving the congestion at the General Hospital or at any other institution in this colony hangs upon sending representatives to the Festival of Britain. I never said that; what I did say was that if the House had decided to accept the invitation to send representatives to the Festival of Britain whether that decision was correct or not, things which have transpired since then are of sufficient importance to make the House change that decision. The number of workers going to the United States of America has been cut in half and we should be very careful as to how we spend funds in the circumstances I said that we might well consider changing our decision in this matter since the representation of Barbados at the Festival of Britain is of no importance to the colony. I am confirmed in my view that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph regards the federation of the West Indies as being unimportant because if he makes the comparison between sending delegates as a gesture to attend the Festival of Britain and sending a delegate to attend a conference in respect of the federation of the West Indies, we cannot come to any other conclusion than that he regards the federation of the West Indies in the same unimportant and flimsy light. If we sit here to vote money for any important matter from which the colony will derive benefit, not one question will be raised about the matter; but I am yet to hear any honourable member who is supporting the passing of this Resolution suggest how the colony can benefit from our sending these two delegates to attend the Festival of Britain.

As regards the question of insurance, so far as I know, anybody who leaves this island to attend a conference abroad, insures himself, and the insurance covers the period of time between his embarkation at Seawell and his return to the colony. I am not concerned as to whether the hon. junior member for St. George was right in raising the question of insurance or not; if the Government has now decided to pay for things like that, later on they will pay for something more. I am not saying whether a subsistence allowance of $15 a day is sufficient for a member or not; I never questioned the allocation. What I was thinking of is not whether $15 a day can buy whiskies and sodas; I was drawing to the attention of the Committee that there are several thousand people in this island who do not see $15 a month for food or clothing. In my opinion, we should think in terms of using all the money we have now for the relief of unemployment. That is my opinion and I express it; I will not have anybody casting any aspersion on my *bona fides* and telling me that I did not oppose this Resolution last Tuesday and I am being insincere. In matters of this sort I do not think I have adopted any other attitude than what I have adopted to-day.

With regard to the suggestion which has been made that hon. members wanted themselves to be selected to represent Barbados at the Festival of Britain, that certainly does not apply to me, because I, personally, do not have the slightest desire to go to England. I am keen on seeing France, Germany and Spain, but I had no desire to see England and that from my childhood. It is not that I prefer Germany to England, but I believe that there is more to be seen in Germany. The suggestion which has been made along the line I have just mentioned is really monstrous in so far as I am concerned. If hon. members really feel that the present financial position of this colony is so rosy, that the unemployment situation is so satisfactory and that all things being considered, we can afford to throw away

this $3,480, well, let them vote this money. I claim the right to record my vote in opposition and I defy anybody to tell me that I am not entitled to entertain the opinion I have expressed.

Mr. WILKINSON: At this stage, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

The question that the Chairman do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

REPLIES LAID

On re-assembling,

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay the Replies to Question No. 69, standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip; and the Replies to Question No. 80, standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to lay the Replies to Question No. 79, also standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTES *re* MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES AND POST OFFICE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee of Supply before the adjournment, we were considering a Resolution to place the sum of $8,680 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1951—52, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1951—52, No. 8, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTES *re* CONSTRUCTION OF NEW RUNWAY AT SEAWELL AIRPORT

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is one to place the sum of $186,429 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951—52, Part II—Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951—52, No. 7, which form the Schedule to the Resolution. This Resolution is rather voluminous and comprehensive. As hon. members will see from the Addendum, the original estimate for the construction of the new runway at Seawell was $1,680,000, but that estimate was reduced in the light of further investigation. After the rains interfered with the construction of the runway, we came back to the original estimate of $1,680,000. The Addendum states: "The Secretary of State for the Colonies approved of this amount being met from the allocation of Colonial Development and Welfare funds. The construction has taken 16 months to complete as against an anticipated 10 months due largely to abnormal weather conditions, and other unforeseen factors. It was originally thought that the rock excavated along the runway could be used as back fill. Later experience however proved that a large portion was not suitable. This necessitated the use of clean rock from borrow pits. On this item alone the actual cost has exceeded the estimate by $260,459. The overall cost will be $80,000 in excess of the estimate. That is an increase of 1% on the original estimates or 5% on the revised estimate. It is intended to charge this amount to the General Revenue balance so as to preserve the balance of the Colonial Development and Welfare allocation for financing major development projects." The question was raised as to whether Colonial Development and Welfare Funds should be used or whether this amount of $80,000 should come out of general revenue, and it was decided that this money should come out of general revenue. The addendum goes on to state:

"The resealing of the runway is in no way part of the original contract and would normally take place two to three years after construction. It is considered that the date for resealing should be advanced as the asphaltic premix concrete has not fully dried and hardened because of the abnormal weather conditions prevailing during the construction. It is therefore intended to take advantage of the first spell of dry weather which may occur to have this work carried out."

When Mr. Wilson started this work, he said that the runway should be resealed within two or three years; he has now said that we should not wait until that time, but we should start when there is dry weather. The work cannot be started yet; it is however felt that the money should be made available so that the work can be done as soon as there is a spell of dry weather. The Addendum further states:

"When the 1951—52 Estimates were being prepared it was estimated that an amount of $1,420,000 out of the total estimated cost of $1,620,000 would have been spent by the end of March, 1951, and therefore only $200,000 was revoted. Expenditure at the end of the last financial year however amounted to only $1,337,571 and it is now necessary to revote the unexpended balance of $82,429. This amount will subsequently be refunded from funds provided under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act."

This $82,429 is merely a re-vote, but the $80,000 is a new sum. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: This House does not know the technical side of the construction of a runway; it does give one the impression that when we voted the money for the construction of the runway at Seawell we felt that the total amount which was set out would have constructed that runway. It is therefore surprising that we are now asked to vote this amount; no mention was made of the matter that shortly after the construction of the runway we would have to do something else. I want to suggest that in such negotiations the Government should go into matters thoroughly so as to make the House aware of what might be required at some later time. The note says that it was expected that the runway would have been put into use for about two or three years before it is resealed, and it is explained that because of the inclemency of the weather during the construction of the runway, it is necessary to do something which it was suggested would not have to be done until two or three years later. That is an in-

crease in the cost of the construction of the runway. We have to consider that in large countries where the climate is always damp although the rain may not be falling, runways are constructed, and I take it that our runway was constructed with experience gained from the construction of runways in places where the weather is always damp. I am suggesting to the Government that in future when they enter into a contract they should get down to the realities of the particular scheme so that we will not be met with any sudden demand. This sum which we are now asked to vote will not complete this work and we do not know how much this runway may cost us when we are finished. These matters leave room for questioning and I suggest that greater scrutiny should be exercised when negotiating matters of this sort. Every detail should be put before the public before a scheme is embarked upon.

Mr. MAPP: A part of the addendum to this Resolution to which I hope the Government attends very closely says this: "It was originally thought that the rock excavated along the runway could be used as back fill. Later experience however proved that a large portion was not suitable. This necessitated the use of clean rock from borrow pits." While I do not understand what is meant by "borrow pits", I understand that the contractors sent away the machinery some months ago which machinery included the crushers which crushed the stone which it was felt would be required at the runway. I do not know if this rock excavated along the runway was crushed and left up there; but if the Government find that the contractors made a mistake in excavating this rock and found later on that this large portion was not suitable, I hope that the contractors will be made to stand this loss.

I would mention that about four months ago I went to Seawell and a young man who was employed up there told me that everything was not all right with the people who had the contract for doing the work; he said that he would not be surprised if later on something was done to show that some mistake was made in so far as the runway is concerned. The Government is supposed to have had a Canadian engineer supervising the work, but we know how far these little things can go sometimes. I feel that if it can be proved that the contractors have made the mistake to which I have referred, then they should shoulder the loss. All the facts are not known to members of the House but they are available to the members of the Government and I hope that there has not been any hurried business. This part of the addendum which I have quoted seems to admit that later experience relative to this excavated rock has proved that somebody has made a mistake.

Mr. MILLER: I am not at all happy about what is being asked for in connection with this runway. I think I read somewhere that the Churchill-Roosevelt Road in Port-of-Spain cost something like seven times the original estimate. All Governments are placed in an awkward position when it comes to a question of contracts and there are several loopholes through which contractors can get out. In awarding a contract the Government must be careful; they should not necessarily select the cheapest contract. Any contractor will underestimate so as to get a contract; he will give an estimate when the amount should have been another 50% or 100%. In building a runway you are governed by certain standards; when you expect a certain tonnage at the airport it is necessary to take care as to what type of material you use. I say that any contractor would come to the Government and ask for a 25% on the original estimate. All Governments are placed in that position. It is easy for the contractors to say that this stone which has been referred to, is not suitable and ask for more money to purchase more stone, and it would be difficult for the Government to say that what the contractors say is not so. I would like to suggest that in future the Government should exercise greater care in selecting engineers for contracts of this sort. No one would have any idea of what the inflation of prices would bring about after 16 months; on the grounds I have mentioned, I do not know that you should criticise the Government, because they are always at the mercy of engineers. I suppose that we will have to vote this money and hope that we will have a good runway.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member has been fair and moderate in what he has suggested. A contractor will sometimes submit the lowest tender feeling that he has friends at court who will help him, and then come back later on and prove that he simply cannot get through with the work on that tender. That happens all day long and certain bodies have to say plainly: "If you miscalculate do not come back to us because the loss is yours." On the other hand it is not unkown for a contractor to submit a tender for, say, $2,000 with the hope of making two ends meet and then come back and ask for an extra $200 and the money is granted. I do not know whether the Legislature remembers that when it first voted money for the construction of the runway it specifically said that it was willing to vote any additional sum if the contractors found that it was necessary for the Legislature to do so. The original estimate for doing this work was $1,680,000 and it was thought that the work could be done for less money. Messrs. Harriman & Co.'s tender was for $1,295,000; the original estimate was reduced in view of the fact that Messrs. Harriman & Co. tendered at $1,295,000, but it was discovered that we had to go back up to the figure of $1,680,000. The Legislature agreed that the work should be proceeded with. I want to make this point: I do not know who is the bright young man who told the honourable junior member for St. Thomas that things are wrong at Seawell; we have to remember that the Canadian Department of Transport lent us Mr. Wilson free. We were told from Canada that Mr. Wilson is an excellent man, and it is difficult to imagine that Mr. Wilson, who has had experience is similar work in Canada and who acted as supervisor at Seawell, would not be watching the contractors carefully. This is what is stated in the Report on the work:—

"As to April 30, our contractor, J. N. Harriman & Co., Ltd., has made fair progress from the start of the job on February 5th. Admittedly progress has not been as good as originally planned because of the difficulties which the contractor has encountered with excavation. A peculiar combination of rock and soil has made excavation a problem unlike normal excavation with power equipment. The coral 'heads' outcropping from the soil as laid down in the folds of the rock have made anything like normal excavation progress impossible. Unfortunately, while the coral is comparatively soft, much of it is too tough to rip. Consequently, more blasting has been necessary than we estimated. Also, because of the peculiar combination of coral rock and soil, blasting is not as effective as usual, making repetitive blasting and excavation necessary."

That is what Mr. Wilson, the Supervisor, tells us. As far as the resealing is concerned it is not suggested that Messrs. Harriman & Co., the contractor,

has added on the cost of that work; the Director of Highways and Transport, who has produced the best roads in the British West Indies, is going to do that work. He knows how to reseal a surface. Right from the start Mr. Wilson told us that every new runway ought to be resealed for the sake of safety within two or three years; but he warned us that owing to the rains which have been falling we will have to reseal this runway much earlier than that, and suggested that we should do it as soon as we have better weather. However, it is not proposed to do the work this year, but the money is being asked for in case the weather changes. If it happens that we have dry weather, we will do this work this year.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. COX, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee of Supply were read a first and second time and agreed to.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO BILL RELATING TO PERSONS OF UNSOUND MIND ACCEPTED

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—I am asking leave that Item No. 8 be the next Order of the Day, and that the hon'ble senior member for St. Thomas deal with it instead of myself in whose name it stands.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, in moving that the House accept the amendments made by the Other Place to the Bill to amend the law relating to persons of unsound mind and for purposes connected therewith, I want to say that I have gone through the amendments and found that they constitute no material changes to the Bill as it left this Chamber. In most cases the changes are merely verbal. In sub-clause (4) of clause 12 dealing with voluntary patients, the Bill as it left the House made provision for a person to receive voluntary treatment in the Mental Hospital by giving the Superintendent 72 hours notice. In the Other Place it was changed to 24 hours. I do not think that there is much in that. Clause 13 deals with temporary treatment without certification. The Other Place has inserted the words "whether he is or is not capable of expressing himself" where the question of remaining for temporary treatment is concerned. In sub-clause 8 of the same clause the Other Place made a change which requires the Visiting Committee to visit a patient every month. As originally passed by the House provision was made for visiting the patient the first month after reception. The Other Place extended that to every succeeding month. As I have said, there are no material changes, and I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Mr. Cox seconded and the motion was carried *nem. con.*

On separate motions of Dr. CUMMINS and Mr. Cox the amendments were read a second and third time and agreed to.

BILL TO AMEND TRADE ACT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon'ble senior member for St. Michael—to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Trade Act, 1910.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker—As honourable members will remember, a Bill was passed by this House in 1950, allowing the British American Tobacco Company to erect a bond house for the storing of their tobacco and cigarettes. This bond was somewhere at Lodge Hill, Christ Church. As hon'ble members will see from the Objects and Reasons: "At present manufactured cigarettes and smoking tobaccos imported into the island must be bonded at the Government Spirit Bond. This bond is not considered the most suitable place for bonding cigarettes and tobacco for any lengthy period. The British American Tobacco Co., have erected a bond at their factory site which is more suitable for bonding such articles etc." I do not think it is necessary to say more, Mr. Speaker, as hon'ble members will see that it is a short Bill and the Objects and Reasons explain it fully. I move that it be read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker—Before the question is put, I would like to know whether this change over will cause a loss of revenue to the Government.

Motion that the Bill be read a second time was put and carried *nem. con.*

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker—I think that the honourable member should be answered by the Government, because he has raised an imporant point. For cigarettes as for rum a certain amount has to be paid for bonding. If this transfer is effected will they still have to pay the warehouse rent that they pay now?

Mr. ALLDER: I will thank the honourable member for Christ Church for putting the question as he has.

Mr. COX: The building belongs to the British American Tobacco Company. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

The motion was put and carried *nem. con.* The House went into Committee Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Clause 1 was read and passed.

Clause 2 was read.

Mr. Cox moved seconded by Dr. CUMMINS that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman—the question asked by the hon'ble senior member for St. John should have been answered. His Honour the Speaker seemed to have put the motion for the second reading before any answer was forthcoming.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member please address the Chair?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am addressing the Chair and I am also addressing the House. It is not my fault if someone does not answer a question. The honourable member asked a question and he is entitled to an answer. I sat in my chair and heard the honourable senior member for St. John thanking the honourable senior member for Christ Church for putting the question the way it should have been put.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do not twist it that way. Did not the honourable senior member for Christ Church answer the question?

Mr. MOTTLEY: The honourable senior member for St. John only thanked the honourable senior member for Christ Church for putting the question the right way. I apologise to you, sir, if it appeared to you that the honourable member had answered the question; because he speaks rather softly. But surely the honourable senior member for St. Michael can tell us whether the Government. if it amends the Trade Act in the way this Bill seeks to amend it, will collect rent from this bond instead of at the

Government Spirit Bond where this tobacco is now stored.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman—I do not know if I can bring any peace in this matter. When you import manufactured cigarettes or tobacco you have to take them to the Government Spirit Bond. While they are there, other products stored there may destroy all the original flavour of the cigarettes. The question is whether or not it is suitable to continue storing manufactured cigarettes at the Government Spirit Bond.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman—the honourable senior member for St. George does not seem to know what question I asked, or what the Bill is about.

Mr. MILLER: Does the honourable member for St. John believe that I am referring to him?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean the senior member for St. John, Mr. ALLDER, or the junior member for St. John Mr. BETHELL?

Mr. BETHELL. Mr. Chairman—I am not in the Tobacco Business. I have not said a word in this debate.

Mr. MILLER: I was not saying that the honourble member made a speech. It is true that some individuals may not have any knowledge of cigarettes. As I was saying sir, the Government is willing to allow this company to store tobacco in the bond prepared for it—a bond with controlled ventillation etc., to prevent the loss of the original flavour. The honourable member might be concerned with Trumpeters. We are thinking about imported cigarettes. All tobacco in the island is imported.

Mr. REECE: Mr. Chairman—it is obvious that the last honourable member who spoke did not read the Bill. He does not know what the principal Act says on the point. Tobacco is stored at the Government Spirit Bond. This Bill before the House seeks to allow the British American Tobacco Company to warehouse tobacco in their own bond. Now, what is the position? It should be in the Government Spirit Bond. But the Governor-in-Executive Committee allows certain manufacturers of spirits to bond them at a bond attached to the distillery. But this is allowed on one condition — that they pay into the Public Treasury the equivalent of the amount which they would have paid had the spirits been warehoused at the Government Spirit Bond. The question is whether this same principle will apply in the case of the British American Tobacco Company.

Mr. ALLDER: What motivated me in asking the question sir, was that I was thinking that the Government should be careful not to close the sources of its revenue, and I was not sure whether that would be the position in this case.

Mr. WARD: Sir, I think that the Government should have been in a position to answer a question of that sort. All of us know the position at the present moment. Government does not really have a proper spirit bond. I remember years ago saying that the Government should allow individuals to build their own bond houses if Government could not build a proper spirit bond of their own. I remember saying at that time that if we were allowed to build our own warehouses we should not have to pay to the Government the equivalent of the rent we would pay if we were storing spirits at the Government Spirit Bond. The Government Spokesman said that if that happened the Government would lose revenue. He said that if individuals built their own bonds they would still have to pay the equivalent. Many people put up their own bonds and continue to pay the equivalent. We do it at the West India Rum Refinery.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman—this matter is becoming a little confusing. The case of imported goods is different from that of goods manufactured in the island. Goods when they are not duty paid are under government supervision. So far as rum is concerned, I am wondering whether the hon'ble junior member for Christ Church is right in what he says. He seems to think that if the distillery has a bonded warehouse attached to it, the owner will have to pay to the Government the equivalent of the sum he would pay if he had bonded at the Government Spirit Bond. I do not think that that is so. What the Government gets is excise. As far as tobacco is concerned, duty has to be paid on it, because it is something that is imported into the island. That is different from collecting excise on something that is manufactured locally. I do not think that you can put tobacco on all fours with something like rum. You may be able to put it on all fours with something like flour. I think that where things like rum and tobacco are concerned Government really exercises greater control. It is something like the case of narcotics. Government has to know to the last ounce where they are stored. In the case of tobacco I have no doubt that if they have their own bond, Government should declare it a bond and not let them withdraw anything from it unless the duty be paid. As I understand it, if you bond anywhere else, the keys of these bonds have to sleep at the customs.

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman—The question asked was whether the Government would lose revenue. It is understood that inasmuch as the bond belongs to individuals, the loss of revenue will be $230.00 a year. As far as this bond is concerned, the Customs Officer will keep the keys and the owners will pay the transportation of the Customs Officers to and from the warehouse.

Mr. ALLDER: That is what I wanted to know. The Government will lose revenue. Now you may get another firm deciding to have their goods bonded at their own warehouse, and then you will be losing another source of revenue.

Mr. LEWIS: These people have built their own warehouse, and paid out a lot of money for labour. It is obvious that they are going to have to employ people to work in the warehouse. So, far from the Government losing money, the people of the country will benefit.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman—Frankly, I hope that the honourable senior member for St. Michael will pardon me. But I just noticed this. It is only an explanation of what we have already done. On January 25 last year the Government exempted leaf tobacco, and therefore they can store leaf tobacco in their own bond. They are now asking us to include manufactured cigarettes.

Mr. GODDARD: Sir, warehouse rent should be paid in the same way as if the tobacco was bonded at the Government Spirit Bond. Everyone knows that the latter is rotten with wood ants, and in their wisdom the Government is allowing the tobacco company to have a bond for their own convenience. But I do not see why the Government should lose the revenue which the company pays for bonding at the Government Spirit Bond. If you bond anything in the Government Spirit Bond for, say, two months, you get a return for a year's rent. Therefore, I think that the Government should see that the warehouse rent is paid even if some allowance is made.

Mr. COX: Let us say that these people are allowed to bond their tobacco at their own bond. The space that they formerly occupied at the Government

Spirit Bond can be rented to someone else. Therefore if you continue to collect rent from the tobacco company, you will be collecting rent for that space from two people.

Mr. GODDARD: These people pay three pence in the pound. It is a very big form of revenue for the Government. It is not just a question of renting space. You are collecting so much on every pound.

Mr. WARD: Is this building a spirit bond or a bond house for the tobacco company? After they have manufactured their stuff they can put it in their bond house before they start delivering. Duty will only be paid as soon as they start delivering it. If they are using it as a spirit bond, the Government should not lose money. We have to pay warehouse rent on every cask we store in our bonds just as if they were stored in the Government Spirit Bond. Government, therefore, should not allow the British-American Tobacco Company to get off without paying the equivalent of the warehouse rent. Government should not stand to lose by this company when the distilleries are not allowed a similar privilege. We rented Kingsland building and Wakefield, and the warehouse rent was supposed to cover what we were paying on them. If we are not sure about this matter, I think that we should postpone this Bill until we get the facts. I would not like to sit here and vote for this without knowing the facts.

Mr. ADAMS: To me it appears immoral to charge these people rent. Here it is you are compelling a man to use your warehouse so that he will not rob the revenue. In the case of leaf tobacco an exemption is asked for, and the Government agrees that there is a good case in asking for a change in the law. You are giving a man the right to say that he can use his own bond and the Government will keep the keys. He will pay the transportation of the Customs Officer every time that the latter comes up to the bond. Suppose that water was coming in and spoiling his stuff in the Government bond. You would have to pay him for destruction of the articles. Here the Government is telling the man that we are content to allow him to use his own bond. Can we still charge him as if he were renting our bond? I say it is immoral, and if we have been doing it up to now, we were carrying on from the immoral Conservative days.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—The honourable senior member for St. Lucy has made some points which leave even, I believe, the Government a bit confused. This question of $230.00 a year has me a bit worried. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that under the old Act you had to store all your imported raw tobacco and your manufactured cigarettes at the Government Spirit Bond. He said that we amended the Act giving the right to remove leaf tobacco from that bond,so that it would be stored at some other place. Now we are also going to allow this company to store cigarettes at some other place. Where? Just three miles out of the town, in their own bond. The honourable senior member for St. Lucy has explained that the policy of the Government in respect of rum is that the distillers pay the Government the equivalent of what they would pay if it was bonded at the Government Spirit Bond when they bond it at their own bonds. What I am worried about is this: we have been told—and I believe in good faith—that $230.00 a year is all that the Government collects from this company in respect of cigarettes stored at the Government Spirit Bond. I do not accept that. It must cost them some money for erecting their own bond to store these cigarettes. Do you ask us to believe that in order to avoid the sum of $230.00 a year these people will go to the expense of erecting a bond which will probably cost about £5,000? I agree with the honourable member for St. Lucy that we have not got enough explanation on this matter, and I view it with suspicion. I am going to move that we report progress and ask for leave to sit again. We are not opposed to the Bill, and I do not think that the honourable senior member for St. John is opposed to it. We are not opposed to giving the manufacturers of cigarettes the same option that we give to manufacturers of rum, if it is found that the Government Spirit Bond is unsuitable for the storing of cigarettes. But let the Government give us a better explanation. I move, sir, that we report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. WARD: What I would like to know is what the British-American Tobacco Company pay per pound as warehouse rent, so that we will know what we will lose or what we will not lose. The sum of $230.00 a year does seem a rather small amount. I think it is a mistake. We should know how much rent Government has been collecting from this company over the last three years, so that we can know how much we can afford to lose. I think that the Government will be wise to postpone consideration of this Bill. The information which the honourable senior member for St. Michael has may be wrong information. The right figure may be $2,330.

Mr. LEWIS: I will go back and say that this question of cigarettes and the question of rum should not be mixed up. Government gets excise duty on the rum. As far as building a warehouse and adding on another room in which to store cigarettes and tobacco is concerned, it will not take so much to add that other room. But I do not think that they would build a room merely to save $230.00 a year. This debate, in my opinion, is a very important one, and it has let the cat out of the bag about industrialisation you will run out for the sake of $230.00, when you end the Hotel Aids Bill. Here is an industry which are saying let these other people come in duty-free and with no taxes to pay for five years. You want to save $230.00 a year where this cigarette factory is concerned, but if another cigarette factory wanted to come in, they would be allowed, according to the proponents of the encouragement of industries idea, to come in duty free and to be exempted from income tax for five years. Honourable members should not allow themselves to be so illogical merely for the sake of criticising the Government. Here is an industry which employs people, and you are going to run it out. You want them to pay the equivalent of warehouse rent under the same policy as that employed with manufacturers of rum when you know that they are not the same thing. Duty is paid on things that are imported into the island. The honourable junior member for Christ Church knows that. Things imported cannot be placed on all fours with rum which is manufactured locally. Where rum is concerned, the Government charges you so much for so many gallons. I think that the explanation given by the Government is a reasonable one. If these people are going to be allowed to bond their tobacco and cigarettes in their own warehouse I do not see why they should be charged warehouse rent. What is peculiar is that this amendment does not seek to grant this facility of storing cigarettes and tobacco to other people besides the British-American Tobacco Company. I do not see why other people should not have the same facility once the Governor-in-Executive Committee could prove that the facility was being enjoyed under strict control by them.

Mr. ADAMS: I am asking the House not to agree to postpone this Bill. There is no explanation that the Government can give next Tuesday which has not been given to-day. Reference to the file shows

what we have already done. When the British-American Tobacco Company pointed out that the Spirit Bond was unsuitable for storing leaf tobacco, they asked us to amend the Act. We were advised that we would have to amend the Principal Act of 1910. By doing that, we lost $1,217. So this House is now straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. Revenue for a year from manufactured cigarettes was $227.30—$230.00 in round figures. That is all the information that the Government can give. There has been the suggestion that some other tobacco company might come along. The Comptroller of Customs says that he does not see any risk of that happening. It is on the advice of the Comptroller of Customs that the Government feels that it is reasonable to accede to the request for an exemption in the case of cigarettes, having already granted one in the case of leaf tobacco.

Mr. WARD: Sir, the honourable junior member for the City has said that on the one hand we talk about encouraging industries and on the other we are trying to kill them. I do not think that he is serious. If another tobacco company came in, you could not call that a new industry. That would only be competition. The new company should pay taxes from the start.

Mr. LEWIS: I never said we should let them bring in anything free. I said that the loss complained of in the case under discussion is a small one.

Mr. WARD: He said that the Hotel Industry would come in free. I do not see that the payment of $230.00 a year in rent would run out a big company like the British-American Tobacco Co. What I would like to ask the Leader of the House is this: if the Government is going to give these concessions to the British-American Tobacco Co., are they going to give similar concessions to the distilleries who put up their own bonds? If you are willing to give up a certain amount of revenue by one industry, surely you should be willing to give up some by others as well. I feel that we should be cautious and scrutinise this matter very carefully. You are giving this concession to a company that is established and that is making money; not to a new company. I do not feel that you should give that concesssion to the British-American Tobacco Co. If the present building is unsuitable for the bonding of cigarettes I feel that the Government should rent a building. The distilleries may come along and ask for the same concession, and then the Government may lose $20,000 or $30,000 a year.

Mr. GODDARD: I think that the company should be allowed to put down their own warehouse. It is a great convenience for them. But I claim that they should be made to pay warehouse rent as against the privilege that they will be enjoying. It seems to me that Government is creating an open door for any other industry that comes along and asks for similar concessions. If this company is going to have the privilege of bonding their goods free, Government must expect that others will want to do the same. The honourable junior member for the City should know better. He used to work at a place that used to bond cotton and ship it out. He should not try to draw a red herring across the trail by talking about the encouragement of the Tourist Trade and new industries. To talk about trying to run out an established tobacco company is nonsense. They have a fine business; and anyone of us here would like to be in it. The Government has not given us sufficient grounds for their losing one dollar by this transaction, and I do not agree with it. We have already allowed them to bond bulk tobacco there at a loss to the Government. We should not allow manufactured cigarettes to go up there on the same terms. That company also imports manufactured English cigarettes. They carry them to the bond and take out so much for the trade in Bridgetown, and I think that warehouse rent should be paid on them. The honourable senior member for St. John asked a question that has thrown a lot of light on this matter. The honourable junior member for the City has tried to get around it. Today he is defending big merchants. Tomorrow night at the Park he will be cursing them.

Mr. ALLDER: According to the argument of the honourable junior member for the City this seems to be an indication of the Government's policy towards new industries and hotel aid. If that is so, the point raised by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy is understandable—asking that similar concessions be granted to the distilleries, and that the apparent discrimination against them in favour of this company should cease. It is easy to see that this company can monopolise the local cigarette market. If any other firm came to compete with them they could under-sell the other firm out of existence. I feel that they should contribute their due amount of revenue to the colony. I do not see that they need any special protection. As regards the suggestion about tobacco being damaged in the Spirit Bond. I remember once that the Government had to pay for goods that were damaged when they were stored underneath a tap. I do not feel that this company needs defending. They are without competition, and they distribute millions of cigarettes a year locally. No one knows how much they make, and no one knows if the amount stated here is the exact amount that the Government will be losing in the transaction. I think that they should be made to pay.

Mr. REECE: Sir, according to the figures given by the honourable Leader of the House, last year's amendment cost the Government over $1,200, and the proposed amendment will cause them to lose a further $230.00 a year. That to my mind is an infinitesimal sum compared with the size of this company. But it is not a small sum to lose when we consider that it is the Treasury of a poor country like Barbados. If the amount saved by the company would be passed on to the consumer, there might be some excuse for getting away from the general rule. If the company is getting the privilege of having a private bond, they should be content to pay into the Treasury the equivalent of what they would pay if they were using the Government Spirit Bond. That is the principle that has been acted upon in the past. There is a point of law which says that if a company owns a private bond it cannot charge rent. Only the Government can charge rent for the use of its bond. If the Government grants this privilege to the company of having its own bond, then unless it be agreed between the company and the Government that the former will continue to pay the equivalent of rent of the Government Spirit Bond nothing would be going into the Treasury. Such agreements were made in the past. Private companies such as distilleries agreed in the past that for the privilege of having their own private bond they would pay a sum equivalent to what they would pay if they stored their rum in the Government Spirit Bond. That has been the principle in the past, and I am surprised to hear my friend, the honourable Leader of the House say that that was an immoral practice. Is it immoral to collect money from the rich taxpayers for the benefit of the people as a whole? Here we have one of the biggest taxpayers getting this privilege, a privilege that is not granted to others which come within the same category. The amount saved by the com-

pany is so small that it cannot be passed on to the consumer by way of a reduction in the price of cigarettes. But with this privilege, the company will still be better off. We are making them a present of this amount. If the law has been amended so that we are allowing these people to erect their own bond and we cannot charge them rent, what about the other people who in the past entered into the agreement that if they erected their own bond they would pay into the Treasury the equivalent of the sum they would pay for rent at the Government Spirit Bond? There will be two situations obtaining. I do not think that any useful purpose will be served by debating this point further. The honourable Leader of the House says that he has given us all the figures available. If that is so, there is no use arguing further on this. We should decide on the principle to be adopted in the future. We should decide on whether such companies should continue to pay the equivalent spoken of in this debate, or whether they should merely pay the duty collected under the Customs Tariff Act. What the honourable member on my right (MR. WARD) is saying is that you should not have one set of taxpayers enjoying a privilege that others do not enjoy.

Mr. WARD: In the past we amended the Act, and as a result the Government lost $1,200. Now they stand to lose $230.00. We should realise that if this company erects a building for £6,000, they will recover that easily per year, apart from having the facilities that they will have. Then, you will have other companies thinking the same way, and the Government may find the Spirit Bond empty one of these days. I feel that the Government should be very wary in adopting this policy at the present moment. I am not in the Government, and of course they should know their own business. But I am only warning them. I think they should be very cautious in adopting this policy.

Mr. MILLER: I have a couple remarks to make. Let us examine the facts. It is a triumph of science when you get such modern conditions in a storage building as will protect tobacco. If you want to get more money out of a rich company, get it by some other method of taxation. Bring in a Bill for more income tax. If Government brings a Bill affecting all the people that import tobacco, no one will come to the House. We will not get a quorum. Or, perhaps, the Bill will be sent to a Select Committee. You want Government to build the East Coast Road.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are out of order.

Mr. MILLER: I thank you for your ruling, sir. To some honourable members it provides fun to see Government defeated. It is unfair in the interest of science—(laughter).

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to appeal to honourable members to behave.

Mr. MILLER: Science provides a new method of storing tobacco. Today man has conquered nature.

THE CHAIRMAN: Deal with the Bill.

Mr. MILLER: I see the wisdom of this Bill. I am appealing to honourable members to see the wisdom of letting this Bill pass so that a better type of cigarettes can be produced.

Mr. ADAMS: It is a pity that this debate has wandered so much. I would not have spoken again, but perhaps it is like speaking to a jury—you have to say one thing over and over again until it sinks in. Everyone has talked about an agreement between these people and the Executive Committee. Who would go to the capital expenditure of putting up his own warehouse if it will cost him the same amount as if he had left his stuff in the Government Spirit Bond? What the honourable junior member for Christ Church is perhaps getting confused with is a different thing. When the Government sometimes rented buildings in the past, I presume that they have had to pay a higher rent than commercial rent. They did not worry because they always then charged those who stored rum according to the rum that they stored. If the honourable member says that I am wrong let him mention one transaction in which the Government allowed someone to put up a building and then charged the same rent. Now that the bond of the British-American Tobacco Co. is ready, they will move up their leaf tobacco and the cigarettes also. While leaf tobacco is not being paid for, they pay on the cigarettes. If the principle was changed, it was changed in January last year. The decision to make the change was hotly opposed before it got here. The Comptroller of Customs was asked to give figures and reasons for this that and the other, and the possibility was envisaged of the rum people asking this or the other, and another tobacco firm coming in etc. When the Government saw that the amount involved in this case was only $230.00 a year, and when they saw the suitability of the bond, having already agreed to the principle of allowing them to store leaf tobacco, it was felt that it was the most natural thing to allow them to include manufactured cigarettes. It can do no harm for this to be passed now, and for the Executive to have reported to it the views of honourable members. If the House were to pass an address dealing with the matter the whole question will have to be considered. I am perfectly prepared to consider this anew in the future. I will take it up with the Executive if it is the wish of the House that this exemption should not be granted.

Mr. REECE: The honourable Leader of the House has asked me to cite instances of the use of the policy which I have mentioned. I can tell him that Mount Gay Distilleries Ltd. store rum in their own warehouse, and they have to pay the equivalent of rent of the Government Spirit Bond. The honourable member is a lawyer like myself. I am glad to be able to tell the public that he does not know any law.

Mr. WARD: The honourable Leader of the House is saying that no firm which owns its own bond has to pay warehouse rent. I am telling him that it was a principle that if a firm built its own bond to store its stuff it had to pay the equivalent of warehouse rent. That is the case with the West Indian Rum Refinery. I want the honourable member to realise that that is not a new policy.

On the motion being put that the Chairman do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again, the question was resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: MR. ALLDER, MR. MOTTLEY, MR. BETHELL, MR. DOWDING, MR. GILL, MR. HAYNES, MR. GODDARD, MR. WILKINSON, MR. WARD and MR. REECE—(10).

Noes: MR. SPEAKER, MR. MILLER, MR. MAPP, MR. BRYAN, MR. COX, DR. CUMMINS and MR. ADAMS—(7).

The CHAIRMAN reported, and MR. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

MR. ADAMS moved seconded by DR. CUMMINS that this House do now adjourn to this day week at 3 o'clock p.m., and the motion being put and carried *nem. con.* MR. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.