THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

7th December, 1954.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*), Hon. G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., (*Premier*), Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*), Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*), Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of the Opposition*), Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*),

Prayers were read.

DOCUMENTS

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

Chief Secretary's Office,
Barbados.
3rd December, 1954.

Sir,

I am directed to inform you that at a meeting of the Governor-in-Executive Committee held on the 2nd December, 1954, Mr. James Cameron Tudor, having been elected as a member to serve in the General Assembly of the Island for the parish of St. Lucy consequent on the vacation of his seat by Mr. L. A. WILLIAMS, in accordance with the provisions of Section 49 of the Representation of the People Act, 1901, made the declaration of his qualifications and subscribed to the oath of allegiance.

I am,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
R. N. TURNER,
Chief Secretary.

Mrs. Bourne entered the House and took her seat.

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

The Legislative Council
to
The Honourable The House of Assembly

The Legislative Council have the honour to return to the honourable the House of Assembly the Bill intituled an Act to amend the Provost Marshal's Act, 1904, in respect of the Law relating to property taken in execution and incidental matters, which have been passed with the amendment which is shown written on the Bill.

J. D. CHANDLER,
President.

The Legislative Council Chamber,
30th November, 1954.

Mr. Barrow and Mr. Allder entered the House and took their seats.

Mr. SPEAKER: I beg to inform the House that I have received the following from the Clerk of this Assembly:—

"Juleville"
Maxwell Coast,
Christ Church.
7th December, 1954.

Sir,

I have influenza and am unable to perform my duties as Clerk to-day.

I am asking your Honourable Chamber to grant me leave as recommended in Doctor's Certificate sent along herewith and allow Mr. D. A. Banfield to act for me.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
D. LEE SARJEANT.

This has been accompanied by a certificate from Dr. E. L. Ward as to the nature of his illness.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that leave of absence for one week be granted to the Clerk.

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

NEW MEMBER TAKES SEAT

Mr. LEWIS: I rise on a point of Order. I consider the first duty of this House is to see that its personnel is completed. I do not think any vote should be taken in this House before such pro-

cedure has been carried out. No motion should be put before the House before the new member takes his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing to prevent the new member from entering the House and taking his seat.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I think I should say that no hon. member has any objection to any member coming into this House and taking his seat at any time. The hon. junior member for the City wants to create a precedent.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already pointed that out.

Preceded by the Marshal and escorted by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, (Mr. Brancker) and the hon. senior member for St. John (Mr. Allder) Mr. J. C. Tudor entered the House and took his seat amidst cheers.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have heard sounds of applause coming from strangers in the gallery. Let me tell strangers here and now that you are here on sufferance, and you cannot applaud. Do not let me hear any more of that.

ACTING DEPUTY CLERK APPOINTED

The question that the Clerk be granted one week's leave of absence was then put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Mr. D. A. Banfield be allowed to act for the Deputy Clerk, and the Deputy Clerk to act as the Clerk for to-day.

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

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to amend that motion to read "for one week as from today."

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

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

3.25 p.m.

PAPERS LAID

By command of His Excellency the Governor, Papers were laid as follows:—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 16 Order, 1954.

Hon. M. E. COX: Report of the Harbour and Shipping Master for the year 1953.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 16 Order, 1954."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $13,768 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55, Part I, Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1954-55 No. 29 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled "The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) No. 2 Regulations, 1954."

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to consider the money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

VESTRIES EXTENSION BILL

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take Order No. 2 as the first Order of the day.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the day therefore stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the continuance in office of Vestries and other local bodies until the coming into operation of the Local Government Act 1954, and to limit the appointment of officers until such time.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a Bill to amend the Vestry Act. Honourable members will remember that earlier this year the Local Government Bill was passed and that Bill is now law, but it has not yet been proclaimed. After consultation with some members of the Vestries who visited my Ministry a couple of weeks ago, it was thought that there should not be any Vestry elections in January, and that there should be the freezing of Vestrymen in their seats taking place. By that I mean, instead of having an election in January for the several Vestries, this Bill should provide that those Vestrymen who were elected at the last Vestry elections, should continue to occupy their seats as well as the Churchwarden; and certain Boards like the Board of Guardians should remain in their places. I am glad that the honourable senior member for the City has just arrived. Only this morning he came to see me in connection with a few points in this Bill which did not appear to be clear to him. It was pointed out that in Clause 2 there was an omission; and it is my intention when we go into Committee on this Bill to ask leave to amend that Clause. The members of the Westbury Cemetery Board are all Vestrymen and according to the law at present, they are elected at the first meeting of the Vestry; however by an oversight, the members of that Board were omitted from Clause 2 of this Bill.

Honourable members may ask, why it is that only the office of the Churchwarden and the Board of Guardians and members of the Westbury Cemetery Board are dealt with under this Bill, and not a Board like the Commissioners of Health. Well the Commissioners of Health are outside of this Bill. In St. Michael this Board is comprised of five Vestrymen and four non-Vestrymen; and it is true that non-Vestry members of this Board should not be operated against by this Bill. In the month of March when this Board is appointed and the Vestrymen so desire to change the personnel, where the non-Vestrymen are concerned they will still be able to do so.

Another point which worried the honourable senior member for the City was in connection with Clause 4 of this Bill, which makes provision for the filling of vacancies or probably the filling of those vacancies caused by retirement or death; and it was pointed out that this Clause makes provision for any occasion of that sort. Clause 4 of this Bill reads as follows:

"Nothing in this Act contained shall affect the operation of any provision of law concerning retirement or vacation of office or the filling of any casual vacancy in any of the offices referred to in section 2 of this Act, whether such casual vacancy is caused by death, retirement, vacation of office or otherwise."

The opportunity was also taken to make provision for certain acting appointments. I have in mind the Parochial Treasurer of St. Michael as well as the Parochial Treasurer of Christ Church. I believe that both of these gentlemen are retiring at the end of this month, and in consultation with the Attorney General and others, provision is made in this Bill for acting

appointments to be made until the Local Government comes into operation.

3.35 p.m.

That means sir, that the Parochial Treasurer of St. Michael or of Christ Church, or of any other Vestry in the Island, or any other Vestry Officer for that matter, will continue to act indefinitely until the Local Government Bill comes into operation.

Provision is also made that if any such acting appointment is confirmed, the period of acting will count for pension. Those Sir, are the most salient points of the Bill and I beg to move that it be now read a second time.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. HOLDER entered the House and took their seats while Hon. Dr. CUMMINS was speaking.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second the motion.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill is absolutely necessary under existing conditions. The only thing I am wondering is, why was it not introduced before. The Vestries are now on the point of getting ready for elections; notices have been out since the first week of December. I wonder, if the Central Government had not been approached by Committees of two Vestries as was stated by the Hon. Minister, whether we would have had this Bill at all.

The first of the three points covered in this Bill is the freezing or continuation of the present Vestries for another year or two years; and I did hope, that the Hon. Minister for Social Services would have given the House some indication as to what progress has been made from their end, or for bringing about or implementing the Maude Bill. Have they actually started? What has been done? I do know that information has been asked of the Vestries. That information is being returned now; but there is a lot of work to be done. If this Bill is to be implemented, I think that either a Committee or someone who knows the intricacies of Local Government, should collate the necessary information and try to put it into effect. It is time that this be done.

What has happened recently as regards two Vestries is, that two Parochial Treasurers resigned. We were about to fill those two jobs, but we felt that with the Maude Bill around the corner, and not knowing when it will come into operation, it would be wise to approach the Central Government and ask them how far they had got. I think that this Bill is a result of that approach. In Christ Church we put in an advertisement asking for applications for the Post of Parochial Treasurer and we got one single application for such an important post. The reason was, that people who would have applied did not know where they stood. The Vestry might appoint a Parochial Treasurer and within eighteen months he might be out. That is why we approached the Government, and that is why this Bill is before us today.

There were certain queries which I made as regards bye-elections, and I was assured that those points were covered by Clause 4. Boards that have been appointed are also covered by that Clause.

I do hope that when the Hon. Minister gets up again, he will reply to some of us. If there is any information that he can give to the House in public as to what progress has been made towards the implementation to the Maude Bill, we would be glad to know of it. Some people are guessing that the Bill will come into operation this year, and others say 1956. Our guess is that it will be in 1956 and not in 1955; but we would like to be enlightened as to whether the Government has actually made any progress.

Mr. CRAWFORD entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said, this Bill is a tiny one. There is a point I did not hear the hon. Introducer mention. Vestries are elected yearly, and I would like to know whether this Bill is for one year. (Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Section 2 shows it.)

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, when I first got this Bill it worried me somewhat; but because, I suppose, of the genial disposition of the Hon. Minister of Social Services, one is never afraid to approach him. One wished that you could say the same thing of some of the other Ministers. As the Hon. Minister rightly said, this Bill extends the life of the Vestries until such time as the Local Government Bill comes into operation by proclamation of His Excellency the Governor. To use the Hon. Minister's term, the Bill "freezes" certain posts and the election of Vestries as well as other posts held by elected Vestrymen up to and until that date.

As I have said before, I was somewhat worried as to what would be the position with a Vestry if say during the year, a Vestry which had been elected with ten, lost a member through death or otherwise. I was given an assurance by the Hon. Minister who is always willing to listen, that the Bill provides in Section 4 for such Vacancies.

As the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said, those of us who are acquainted with Parochial Administration felt as the Objects and Reasons point out, that it would be foolish, not knowing when the Maude Bill will come into operation, to make certain appointments. By the provisions of this Bill, you will be able to save the money of the taxpayers, because we will be spared the inconvenience of appointing, say Parochial Treasurers at high salaries and then discovering under the new set-up, that they either did not have enough work to do or that they had more work to do.

This Bill will allow Vestries of the Island to make temporary appointments; and we think that this is right, because there would be no point in making permanent appointments where people would be entitled to security under the Parochial Security of Tenure Act.

3.45 p.m.

We entirely agree with the Objects and Reasons of the Bill. As the Honourable Minister of Social Services has rightly said, there was one omission and that has been an amendment to make provision for another body which comprises of Vestrymen. It is well that other members of this Chamber who are members of Local Government bodies, should know that Section 4 of this Bill really gives the right to make provision for the appointments to the various Boards of Vestries which generally take place during the month of March. As I have said before, we have much pleasure in supporting the Bill. As the Honourable Minister of Social Services has said, there is all probability that the new Local Government Act will come into effect at the beginning of 1956. There is no chance of this new Act coming into operation before; therefore, I hope Government will apprise the public as to what progress is being made with respect to it from time to time. As far as we are concerned again, we have much pleasure in supporting the Bill. There is one point which I would just like to bring to the attention of this House. This Bill is a bit late because, it is from the beginning of this month that the Vestries according to the Vestries Act, begin to make provision to notify parishioners as to the place where they have to assemble to elect

Vestrymen for the preceding year, and where they will have to vote should there be an election. Nevertheless, as has been argued by the Honourable Premier, this Chamber can do no wrong, but it does make mistakes sometimes. Sir, although this Bill is a bit late, it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I endorse what has been said already. However on my reading the Bill, section three does seem a bit ambiguous. It reads as follows:—

3. Subject as otherwise in this Act provided, any appointment, duty or other function which it is provided by the Vestries Act, 1911 or any other law is to be made, carried out or performed upon, or subsequent to the election or appointment of Churchwardens, Vestrymen or Boards of Guardians, shall be made carried out or performed in the same manner and at or within the same time as would have been the case had this Act not been passed, and a poll for the election of Vestrymen been held in accordance with the provisions of the Vestries Act, 1911.

(A VOICE: Section 4 clears up all that.) I have heard in an aside that section 4 covers this difficulty. However, I still want the Honourable Minister of Social Services to know that provision for these things are very important. The Vestries really want to know exactly what is their position, and what they must do.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, if I am the only member, I must say I cannot see any reason for this Bill. We take it that the Local Government Act will not be brought into effect until the beginning of a calendar year, therefore, if it will not be brought into effect on the 1st January 1955, then it will not be brought into effect until January 1956. I do not think it is intended to carry on the parochial year from the 24th March of any year, therefore, I see no reason for the Bill. As a matter of fact, sir, you are really continuing in office Vestrymen of the various Vestries in order to avoid an election. How many Vestries have had contested elections since the Maude Bill became practical politics? Very few, if any. Even if they had any money which is to be spent on the contesting of elections it will be spent in Barbados; it will not be spent in St. Vincent, St. Lucia. India or anywhere else. Personally, I see no reason at all for the Vestries Elections not taking the course of the law; and that has been borne out by the fact that after the first Monday or the second Monday in January, as the case may be, if there is a death of a Vestryman in any one of the various parishes, you will have to hold a bye-election. I therefore cannot see the sense of this Bill.

There is one thing which should have engaged the attention of the Government. If the Vestrymen are not to be elected, then they have no right to tax the people. I really would like to see the Government taking the opportunity, if it were possible to provide in this Bill for the new system of taxation to come into operation next year. Let the Vestrymen who are there assist the Government with it. I think that would be a splendid gesture. It would be a good thing to have the old Vestrymen there to give advice on that assessment. As you it is for the Income Tax office to supply the various Vestries with the figures for assessment so that they can lay rates; therefore if Vestrymen want to remain in office without being re-elected then it would be a good thing to tell them "you must tax the people with the figures we give you" now that we are instituting at this time a new system of returns. We should let the Vestrymen lay the rates on the figures given them by the Income Tax office. I think it would be a good thing for the Income Tax office to get itself ready to supply the figures, so that when the Maude Bill comes into operation, this difficulty of assessment by the new method would be got over. I think, that will be one of the most difficult things for the new Councils and Corporation to get over. Sir, if you are continuing with the old Vestrymen in office, then give them the assessment on which to lay rates.

I can quite see that this Bill is the result of appeals made to the Government by Vestries as to what should be done. But, even as the honourable junior member for Christ Church has said, there has been a vacancy in the office of the Parochial Treasurer in the parish of Christ Church, and as everybody knows, although the Maude Bill may not come into effect until 1956, you are not going to get somebody applying for the post under the exciting conditions.

3.55 p.m.

Mr. BRYAN entered the House and took his seat.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I want to assure the hon. jun. member for Christ Church, that the Government did not wait until it was approached by representatives of the Vestries of St. Michael and Christ Church to think of this Bill. As a member of fact, this Bill should have been introduced a week earlier; but after these two bodies had approached me to discuss the matter concerning the Vestry, I felt that I should postpone the introduction of the Bill and discuss the other phases of the matter. It is not true to say that if the Vestries had not moved in this matter, we would not have had this Bill before us to-day. I suppose the hon. member will be surprised to know that all the Vestries have not supplied the information for which the Government has asked. There are still four or five Vestries who have not supplied the information for which the Government has asked. However, we cannot do anything to force their hands; we have asked them to supply us with certain information, but they have not yet done so. As a result of that, some delay has been caused in this matter. Apart from that, we realise that this Bill is a complicated Bill; we are trying to get some assistance from people who are knowledgeable as to the working of these Local Government Acts; but that does not hold us up as much as the inability to get the information which we have asked of these four or five Vestries.

There was some point asked by the hon. jun. member for St. Andrew about the filling of vacancies. I explained that when dealing with Clause 4 of this Bill, and I think that point has been pretty well published. Clause 4 of the Bill makes provision for the holding of bye-elections in case any Vestryman should die or retire.

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

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I asked a question during the debate on the second reading of this Bill and I thought the hon. member had taken note of it, and that he would tell me that it could be done or it not be done.

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, Clause 2 needs an amendment. I ask leave to insert after the word "Island" in line four, the words "and the members of the Westbury Cemetry Board in office".

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Hon. Dr.CUMMINS: With that amendment, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

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

The motion was put and agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 5 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee with an amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

4.05 p.m.

BILL TO AMEND DENTAL REGISTRATION ACT.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 4 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Service: to move the second reading of the Bill to amend the Dental Registration Act, 1923.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Order is a Bill to amend the Dental Registration Act, 1923. As the first paragraph of the Objects and Reasons show, under Section 2 (2) of the Dental Registration Act, 1923—23, the Board of Assessors for the profession of Dental practitioners consists of the Medical Assessors appointed under the Medical Registration Act, 1911—6 and one Dental Practitioner appointed annually by the Governor. That is the law as it now stands.

The Dentists, and I think quite rightly so, feel that they should have adequate representation on this Board. It now consists of one Dentist and two Doctors, and the interests of the Dental profession are not adequately served. If, Sir, we are working as a democratic community, I think it is fair that the Dentists should have a bigger voice and that the Act should be accordingly amended. Not long ago, we had a similar situation in Jamaica where the Dentists made a protest; and the Act was amended to give the Dentists of Jamaica a bigger voice in their own affairs. This Bill seeks to change representation now to two dentists, and one medical doctor, with the Director of Medical Services as Chairman of the Board *ex officio*.

Also, opportunity is taken under Clause 3 to increase the registration fee from $2.40 to $10. Those are the two main points of the Bill, and I beg to move that it be now read a second time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second the motion.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to see this Bill. You will remember, that I was the member who asked the question about Medical Practitioners turning dentists in this colony, and the Government replied to me that the Act permitted it. In other words, any Medical Practitioner could practise dentistry from to-morrow or any time as he pleases. I know that the dentists did not look kindly on the one Medical Practitioner who turned dentist; and that was my reason for asking the question. The honourable introducer of this Bill said that it is a good thing to have a preponderance of Dental Practitioners on the Registration Board. I look at that in two ways.

Hon Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: On a point of Order. I did not use the word preponderance.

Mr. LEWIS: If the Hon. Minister says what word he used, he will probably see that it means the same thing; so it is better that he does not worry to repeat it. If you have the D.M.S. as Chairman of the Board, and you then have two dental practitioners and one Medical Practitioner, the preponderance is on the Dental side. It is possible that if the registration of a lawyer depended on the other lawyers accepting him, they might keep him out saying that the Bar is overcrowded already. I do not know if the dentists will do the same thing, but I know that they do not look kindly on the Medical practitioners who have turned dentists. I do not know if they will be jealous not only of their profession, but of the restriction of their practice, and restrict the number of practitioners who can register. Perhaps it would not be a bad idea to have it so constituted that they would be five members of the Board—two from either side and the Chairman.

That is all I have to say. I am not in position to say whether it is right or wrong to allow medical practitioners to turn dentists.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and agreed to.

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and agreed to.

Clause 3 was called.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I think that in the life of this House, we were discussing the registration of hawkers and the Bill was dropped. I am speaking now of this registration fee. It is not something that the Government will get any great deal of revenue from. It is not a certificate to practice. I am not saying that Dentists should not for the purpose of practising pay $10 to register; but if the cost to the Government is not more than the 10 shillings paid now, why increase the fee? I do not see that obstacles should be put in the way of people registering to practice dentistry or anything else. It is true that if we make the fee $25 they will find it and pay it; but this is not the type of taxation that we want to impose on people

They probably will not pay it more than once, it is true; but it will not cost you anything to register them. Why go beyond 10/-? What does a doctor pay to register now?

4.15 p.m.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT came into the Committee and took his seat.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman,—I take the entirely opposite view from the previous speaker. because, this provision is for persons who are well able to pay that amount and who can afford to contribute to the revenue of this colony. After all, we should encourage the Government in collecting taxation and taking more money out of the pockets of those people who are in a position to pay. Hawkers are in a different position to Dental Practitioners. Hawkers are in the same position as taxi-drivers; but Dental Practitioners are on all fours in making money with Medical Practitioners. I say again, that $10 is not too much for a Dental practitioner to pay for registration. If for certain purposes you have to find ways to bring in increase

money, then this is one of the obvious sources to adopt to bring in money.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak on this Clause; but after listening to the honourable member who has just sat down, I just got up to say I wonder whether he realises when he talks about Dental practitioners being able to pay this fee, that the same thing should apply to Barristers. This is the only country where Barristers are registered and allowed to practise without paying a fee. Barristers like doctors also make a fortune out of the people although some do not display that they are making a fortune I am very serious about this. I take the opposite view to my colleague. I believe the time has come when this country should see to it that Opticians are registered. As a matter of fact, you should have an Act similar to that of Trinidad for Opticians, because you get a lot of quacks in that profession and they are very dangerous to young people. The Honourable Minister of Social Services knows that what I am talking is true; therefore, I hope he will soon bring down a Bill for the registration of Opticians. I say again, that the honourable senior member for St. Lucy knows very well that Barristers make as much money as dental surgeons.

Mr. BRANCKER: I would just like to tell the honourable member, that other countries are proposing to follow the practice of Barbados by eliminating the registration fee which they charge Barristers for being introduced at the Bar. As you can see, some of us cannot afford to be whole time Barristers; we have to be politicians. Others have to go outside in order to earn a livelihood

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

On the Motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox Mr. Chairman, reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. SPEAKER, the Government proposes to go back to Item No. 1.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the Service of the Colony.

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

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

The question was put and agreed to.

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

Resolution for $30,000 for Princess Margaret's Visit

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of $30,000 to be spent in connection with the visit of Princess Margaret. The Addendum if fairly full, but there might be some Item which hon. members might need more information than is given in the Addendum. I may say that a great deal of care has been taken in connection with the amount to be granted to each of these Items. There have been sub-Committees dealing with each of the Items. A sub-Committee dealt with decorations, another with illuminations, another with the Children's rally at the Garrison Savannah, another with the Police side of it, and so on. I will take the Items in order. The decorations and illuminations are not for Government House alone, but for Trafalgar square including the Cenotaph, the Lord Nelson monument and these Public Buildings. While the calculations have been comparatively dealt with very carefully I say that in this sense—the attempt has been made to calculate on the cheaper side, but in rounding off figures, you may find that $1,740 is rounded off at $1,800 or $1,900.

As I have said, there have been several sub-committees and these sub-committees reported to the full Committee and then the full Committee sent up its findings to the Executive Committee, and before the Executive Committee sent down this Resolution every item was carefully checked. In some instances the figures have been altered by the Executive Committee — some up, and some down.

As I have said, as regards the decorations and illuminations, the illuminations are both for Government House and the Public Buildings. As regards the estimate for the children's rally at the Savannah, I would say that anestimate was made at first for only 6,000 children. However, it was felt that provision for only that number would create a great deal of jealousy and heart burn on behalf of some parents, if you just chose 50 children out of a school of 400; but I may point out, that the number of children was limited to available transport to bring them from the country to the Garrison Savannah. The children's rally will take place on the last afternoon of the Princess' visit; and provision is made not only for the transport of children from various parts of the country to the Garrison Savannah, but for giving them refreshment also which would be cakes, sweets and soft drink. I wish to anticipate criticisms by saying early, that tenders will be called for the supply of these items.

4.25 p.m.

It is proposed to ask the Princess to plant a tree, and we may get her approval for naming the new school at Six Cross Roads as the "Princess Margaret School"; in which case it is proposed to ask her to name the school. If she approves of its being called the "Princess Margaret School" it is proposed to ask her to unveil a plaque to commemorate her unveiling. I believe that Item No. 5 has caused some hon. members some worry. Item No. 5 includes one or two things which do not appear in the Addendum to the Resolution. It is proposed to hire 400 Island Constables. There will be two drives in addition to the private drive, and inasmuch as the first day will be a Bank Holiday, it is expected that there will be great crowds. The estimate has been made by the Police on the strength of past experience. To those people who feel that the Government does nothing to find even temporary employment for the unemployed, I am sure that there will not be any objection to the employment of 400 Island Constables at 5/- a day. It is impossible to conceive the Police Force controlling the crowds on an occasion of this sort.

To go back to Item 3 for a minute. It is likely that the school children will be between eleven and twelve thousand. Continuing with the employment of these 400 men. It is suggested that 5/- a day is little. Their duty will be to aid the Police in keeping the crowds in order. These men will not be employed all day long.

There are some Items which are not very clearly set out in the Addendum to this Resolution in connection with the extra expenditure on the Police. There is the inclusion of the hire of three buses from 6 a.m. on the first day until 8 p.m. on the twelfth,—that is $480; there is the purchase of 1,760 yards of rope at fifty cents per lb. The experience of the Police is, that two or three men with a rope is much better than several men without a rope. Then there is radio-telephone. A firm has agreed to rent two radio-telephone units to be installed, one in the car of the Commissioner of Police and the other in a Police car. They will be of a different frequency from those which are used by the Police Force. They will cost $230. Then there are six twelve volt batteries at $420 and an extra battery will be bought for the use of Police vehicles. The subsistence allowance of non-commissioned officers and men will be roughly $500; then there will be transport of the Royal party which will mean an additional car to the Governor's official car. I will tell the Committee (in case they do not know already) that the Princess' entourage will be thirteen persons. The reception at Government is estimated at more than 1,000 people being invited; and it was rather surprising to me, but I am assured that it will cost $2 a head. That amount seems to be small; but the Executive Committee has been assured that this matter can be done for that amount. As regards sundry works and services, it is proposed to give special gratuities for those who will have to be working more than normally. In addition, there is office equipment for the Royal party to be fitted. Ship to shore communications are to be included in this item No. 8. If this sum appears to hon. members to be great, I would just like to remind them of the length of time that the Princess is going to be here, the number of school children we are treating, and that the use of extra island constables has all swollen these figures. Hon. members will also understand that it is not because $30,000 is being asked for, that of necessity nothing is going to be spent which is not already foreseen. I will put in this way: we estimate as low as possible for that which we can foresee, and we have made provision for the unforeseeable. In the course of this debate I may be asked 'why this, why that, why not something else." Everything which has been suggested to be done has to be put before the Princess herself, and a skeleton programme was arranged between the Governor and Clarence House while he was in London. It has been suggested that we should ask the Y.M.C.A., the Y.W.C.A., and so on; but all these suggestions have been put up to the Private Secretary and then to the Princess.

4.35 p.m.

Nothing that we have done is other than what has met her approval. Things have been suggested and have been turned down for one thing or another; chiefly because, she will have a terrific programme throughout the West Indies. For instance, one of the drives that we proposed would have taken nearly two hours; and it was said, we should cut it down to one hour and a half. We tried and could not get it down to less than one and three quarter hours, and we were told that when they said an hour and a half, they meant an hour and a half.

So as I have said, sir, everything had to be put up for her approval; and certain things, admirable in themselves, were turned down. I say that so as to anticipate that we should have done this, that and the other, and that there were other things which could be done and which are better than what is proposed to be done. The Princess has expressed the desire to meet school children and to see some portion of the Island in a drive, and they have insisted that the drive should not be longer than an hour and a half. At this stage I cannot help the Committee with any more information. If there are any specific questions asked me I will give any additional information that I have.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second the motion.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I have one or two questions to ask the honourable member. First of all, I do not think that the greatest detractors of the Government will question our loyalty to the British Throne. I am saying, that when I myself anticipated listening to the opposition of certain items, they would not make me question the loyalty of members of this House. When I preface my remarks like that, it is really no apology for anything that I will say; because, I know that persons on the other side of the Table are quite capable of recklessly misinterpreting and distorting what might be said on this side of the House.

Now sir, this Resolution is for $30,000. This gracious lady is visiting Barbados, and I think that it is part of our duty to show our appreciation of the British Throne by entertaining her, and that we should do the best that we can and within the means of our revenue. It might be argued that other countries whose revenue might be ten or twelve times that of Barbados, proposed to spend such and such an amount. I feel that we should not take that as a guide. We must take as a guide what Barbados can afford to spend.

We should have decorations. I make no apologies to anyone for saying that. Let this be understood: if any criticisms are made by me (I am speaking personally now) there is to be no idea that I want to be on a committee. I want that to be clearly understood. Decorations are to cost $3,000, and the explanation given by the honourable member is that there will have to be the lighting of various buildings, lighting of Government House, decorations etc., and the using of flags which we had for the coronation and the like. I am not objecting to any decorations. I feel that we must decorate. We must show that spirit of appreciation and loyalty; and we can best show it by decorations, flags, bunting, lights etc. I believe that the most humble of us will show our appreciation in that way.

As far as illuminations are concerned, we must assume that those responsible have got some figures to put before us; so merely to say that these figures are too high without being able to prove that they are too high, would be a waste of time. As far as entertaining of children are concerned, and which will cost $12,000, I do not care who gets up and say that I am criticising it. I am accustomed to entertaining children of Bridgetown, and I know what it costs. I observed that the honourable member for St. George was at pains to go and instruct the Premier, and I believe it was particularly on this matter. (Mr. BARROW: Which member for St. George?)

I heard the Hon. Minister say that it might cause heart-burning if you took 50 children from a school and 50 children only. Will the honourable member tell us, as far as this rally at the Savannah is concerned, how many children you propose to entertain, and what method you will use in selecting them? Do you propose to select 100 or 200 from each school? It seems to me that you will still cause heart burning. One wonders whether this is the best way of doing this.

My view is, that if you are going to entertain children or the youth of Barbados at all, you should not entertain some and not the others. I am prepared on an occasion such as this to suggest certain changes, and to suggest taking money from certain items and spending it on others. On such an occasion as this, you want to create a certain impression in the minds of children. It is a sister of the reigning monarch who is visiting us, and you should not allow a schoolmaster to take 200 or 300 children out of the 400 children of a school and leave the others at home. That will mean that those children who have no shoes and who might appear to be unwanted, will not have an opportunity to go to the Garrison because they do not have clothes to put on or money to get in a bus and find their way there. If you are going to entertain children you should entertain them, and obliterate from their minds the idea that they are growing up in poverty. If you want to get them out of Communism you must entertain them right from the bottom. I know my people. If I were in that Government, I would not bring down that idea in spite of the fact that the honourable junior member for St. George is on that Committee.

It is nonsense to say you are going to each school and select a few children. That is what it is going to be and nothing else. If the Government anticipated that anyone on this side of the House would oppose spending money to entertain children they were wrong. When it comes to entertaining children, all of us will agree.

4.45 p.m.

Can the Hon. Minister tell me what is the actual number of School children on the rolls of the various schools, including the first and second grade schools. At the cessation of the last war, that was one of the first things I put to the then Director of Education. Mr. Howard Hayden. One of the first questions I put to him was that we are not only interested in the school children who go to school, (those who are on the rolls) but we also interested in those who do not go to school. I told him if he could not find the number who do not go to school, then I will give him the number.

As regards to the entertainment of those school children, it will only be given to the select few, those whose parents can afford to get some nice clothes for them to go to the Garrison Savannah. Those parents who cannot afford to do such a thing, their children will be left at the bottom of St. Lucy. Mr. Chairman, one thing I am going to make sure of and that is, the children of the people of the City of Bridgetown get to the Garrison Savannah on that memorable day. We will even break the barrier if needs be. No Police Force will be able to prevent the crowd of children from the City from ducking under the ropes up there. I am sure honourable members and the Government will appreciate the fact that you must, if you propose to entertain children, get the number of a certain age group which is on the rolls in the first place to find out how many you will have to entertain. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph referred to the fact that they will be given a bun and some soft drink. When I was a boy I had to be given more than a bun. I do not know why the honourable member suggested that Government will call for tenders for the supply of these refreshments. Sir, if you are only giving them a Ju-C it is no point in calling for tenders for that. When the Hon. Premier says so, he was only drawing a red herring across the trail. That is beside the point.

Sir, I see $250 is set down for the expenses in connection with the tree planting and naming of the school at Six Cross Roads. That is absolutely too much for that item. Are you planting it by helicopter or plane? If the Hon. Premier had to go there to plant a tree would it cost so much. Are we going to entertain out of that amount up there. I presume that the Government will go up there in their motor cars. I ask again: are we going to have an entertainment there? Will there be a party at the school? I am going to suggest that $200 out of that money can be put to the entertainment of children. I cannot take $250 for the tree planting and naming of that School, unless you are spending $200 in putting silver underneath the tree. Is the tree going to be "a pride of India", a mahogany tree or what? (A VOICE: "Pride of Barbados".) "Pride of Barbados" is too small a tree to be planted on that occasion. At any rate sir, the tree is already taken care of by the Department of Agriculture. I am saying again that this amount of money for this item is too much, and I wonder if the Hon. Minister of Agriculture saw it. Surely if he has seen it, he would have said that it was too much; therefore I suggest we should spend $50 on that item and the $200 which remains be put to the entertainment of school children.

I see, Mr. Chairman, $5,000 being set down for Policing requirements. I am going to say this to the Hon. Premier: the honourable member could not have been serious when he told us that this was for Police protection, because he knows very well that the people of Barbados are more British than the people of England itself. Let me say that the Princess has no chance of being hurt in this Island. I again say that the loyalty of the people of Barbados is greater than the people of England itself.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If the honourable member will just give way for a minute, I would just like to say something in reference to what he remarked on my saying that this is for Police protection. The day when Princess Margaret will land is a Bank-holiday Does the honourable member think that with the large crowd which will be in Broad Street when she lands, there will be no rush? There is no question of Police protection in the way the honourable member is thinking.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Apparently the Hon Premier has not been thinking. The hotch-spotch crowd which is supposed to make up these things, thinks in terms that Barbadians are a barbarous people and people who would run amuck.

For what do you want $5,000? You have a large Police Force, a Volunteer Force, Boys Scouts, Girl Guides, Church Lads' Brigades, and every one of them can be pressed into service on that great occasion. I am sure everyone of them would be proud to be pressed into service on this auspicious occasion. There is no Island Constable in this island who is unemployed, therefore, there is nothing about this helping the unemployed. You will have to take Island Constables from their jobs to put them into service on this occasion.

Mr. Chairman, I will not vote one cent for this Item. Certainly you do not want 400 Island Constables for this occasion. I say again, some people (English people of course) have an idea that Barbadians are a barbarous people, or that we have Communists here. A lot of people feel that unless you are not in the Government, you are not loyal; therefore, you want 400 Island Constables to supplement the Police Force for that occasion. Do you really have 400 Island Constables in this island, or are you going to make them now? I doubt you have them. Every other watchman is an island constable. Let me also say, that it is stated that you are paying these Island Constables at the rate of five shillings a day. If the Hon. Leader of the Opposi-

tion were to attempt to hire Island Constables at the Marine Hotel at the rate of five shillings per day, the Barbados Workers Union will throw off the roof Five shillings per day! You are really out of touch!

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Perhaps I have made one or two omissions. I have already spoken of the drives which the Princess will be taking. One is to the Health Centre in Speightstown, you must have Island Constables in Speightstown. When we say that these Constables will be getting five sholling a day, they will be paid for all four days; and you must also bear in mind that they may only be doing an hour's work for the day. Let me say that in every village we are hoping the people will come out to greet the Princess, and you will certainly need an Island Constable at this or that corner to keep the crowds in order.

4.55 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I rather say, that the Island Constables will be employed just for a few hours. As soon as they go to the station and you register them for Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, you will tell them that you only want them for two hours and after that they can go. My contention is that you do not need 400 Island Constables; and if the honourable member will say the strength of the Police Force is such that you want to employ a couple of Island Constables in the City at the landing, that is all well and good. It is a fact that the gracious lady has refused to drive in a touring car? This lady will be leaving Bridgetown for the Health Centre at 30 miles an hour, or 20 miles an hour, or ten miles an hour if you like. She is being driven to this Health Centre and of course crowds will be going out to see her. I am hoping that it is not correct to say, that you cannot take a chance in this country in driving in a touring car. (Laughter) I am asking if that is correct; I hope it is not so. What I am saying is this: let us say that this gracious lady is driving in a 'Sedan" car at 10 miles an hour between Bridgetown and the Health Centre in Speightstown, you will have the cavalry, constables and mobile units of the Police. Has the honourable member ever seen a marathon? Will there be more interest than that? I say "yes" On the road between Bridgetown and Speightstown you will have Police transport going in front. I say that Barbadians will always respect the uniform of Her Majesty. If you use a Volunteer at Eagle Hall corner he will be able to keep back more people than any Island Constable. I say that you do not want these Island Constables. I urge on all of us who have the right to vote freely, not to support the use of these Island Constables. I contend that according to the honourable member's figuring, 400 Island Constables at £1 four days is £400, roughly $2,000. I am in agreement with you in entertaining the Princess, but I am not in agreement with the abject non-sense with which you have come in here. I repeat that 400 Island Constables are absolutely unnecessary; you could put that $2,000 to entertainment; and I say that you can call in any Youth Organization. Is there going to be much difference in the mentality of the Barbadian, as between the landing here of Princess Margaret and that of Princess Alice? I say "No," therefore why do you want these 400 Island Constables? The day on which the Princess is landing you will have your Volunteers and members of the Police Force: I say that anything you have in uniform is against these 400 Island Constables. If you are employing these people at 5 shillings a day, that is not sufficient; my argument is that this $2.000 could be used for entertaining school children. I do not question the amounts of $250 which is being used for the transportation of this gracious lady; and as the honourable Minister has said, when it comes to the question of treating these children, they are advertising for tenders to see who will get the contract for treating these children. As to the job of carrying around people in the cars, I am sure that Your Honour's firm will tender for that.

5.05 p.m.

I am saying, sir, that no one would oppose the spending of this $250 for travelling. There is the question, as the Premier said, of thirteen people on the Entertainment Committee and the like who must go around. I see no objection to that.

In respect to the entertainment at Government House, entertainment is a very expensive thing. For entertainment at Government House on this occasion $2,500 is put down. That is not too expensive if members of the general public are being invited. The honourable member said something about 1,000 people are to be invited. I must say that a correspondent in the daily Press really captured me. I believe myself that on an occasion like this, invitations should be issued right down the line. This is an occasion when we as citizens of the Empire, have an opportunity of meeting the sister of the reigning monarch. I am saying this now: some of us in here would not have a chance of going to Government House's gate if we were not members of this House; and I am including myself in that. Were it not for the people of this country who put me here, I would not have a chance. Of course speaking personally, my being invited or not is immaterial; but as a member of this House I look on it as a duty.

I say that on such an occasion, be they blue-blooded aristocracy or not, all must be on the same level. I hope you will not see what I saw,—when they had something in the Square they issued invitations right down on the St. James Coast and left out a lot of respectable Barbadians, and some of the people whom they invited did not even come. I am not opposing the spending of $2,500 for a public reception; but a public reception must mean that respectable people, (and I mean people who have not had the misfortune of going to prison) —respectable people of all walks of live should be invited.

The honourable junior member for St. Andrew has informed me, (and he should know because he is from the blue blood) that it used to be customary in the old days when members of the Royal family came to Barbados, in the days when people like the honourable member and the Leader of the Opposition were all in power, that there would be a grand ball in this Chamber. I believe that the Princess should see things as they are locally. (A MEMBER: Bring in the Steel Band?) Of course she should hear a Steel Band. As I was saying, it used to be the custom in those days to have a grand ball in this Chamber to which members of the Legislature and the Heads of Departments were invited.

Something tells me, that they are bound to shun a thing like that on an occasion of this sort. As I have said, I have been informed of that by the honourable junior member for St. Andrew. He was here in those days. He could not have been left out. I observe that on the occasion of the visit of Princess Margaret the only public entertainment will be a cocktail party (because that it what it is) going up and shaking hands, showing homage and loyalty, and walking around the crowd and meeting a few selected people.

I ask this: why is it that on this occasion, no attempt is being made to have a ball or reception of the nature which I have mentioned? The answer is obvious. I leave it for the Ministers to say what the answer is. I repeat that I am not criticising the spending of $2,500 on the entertainment at Government House. I counsel honourable members on this side of the table that what we want to be satisfied about is: that the invitations are issued right down the line.

I come now to Sundry Works and Services at Government House. What is this $600.00 for? I do not remember the Premier mentioning that. This includes fittings, office equipment, telephones, ship to shore communications etc. Those are only so many words. As far as the ship to shore and telephone communications are concerned, we have them already in the island. The Police and the Harbour Master's Office have them. You have a Government Electrical Department and a Government Electrical Inspector.

As far as fitting of office and provision of office equipment is concerned, am I to understand that when we voted a couple thousand dollars for Government House the other day, we did not include those things? I think that I am right in saying that the Premier mentioned on that occasion, that there would be these numbers of people along with the Princess and that there would have to be office arrangements, equipment etc. I believe I am right in saying, that the necessary money has already been voted in this respect. (Mr. ADAMS: And I am a lunatic.) Look at the speech of the Premier and you will see. I am saying that $500.00 of this money can go to the entertainment of the children. I am at a loss to understand this.

I now come to Items 9 and 10, Mr. Chairman, Unforeseeable expenses and Contingencies. I would like the Premier to explain the difference between the two. I cannot vote for that. Unforeseeable expenses, $2,000 and Contingencies, $2,500. What is the difference? I cannot vote for that.

5.15 p.m.

Miscellaneous, incidentals, contingencies, unforeseen expenses. You are making provision in this vote for all of those things. I am not an auditor, but I see reports and statements of accounts. You have set down $4,500 out of this total of $30,000 for those things. They are honourable members in this Chamber who will say that if you have planned so carefully upon this matter as you have said, you will not need $4,500 for unforeseen expenses and contingencies. As a matter of fact, you should not put down the two things "contingencies" and "unforeseen expenses." One is the other. That must have been a mistake. I believe it is a mistake. If it is not a mistake, then it is something designed to fool honourable members of this Chamber. No one in business would set aside $4,500 for contingencies and unforeseen expenses in an estimate of only $30,000. Surely honourable members of the Government know that what I am saying is correct. Of course, if you are going in for an expenditure up to $30,000, there would be some little thing which must crop up in your spending what you did not make provision for; therefore you must put something down for "incidentals" or for "unforeseen expenses," but you do not set aside something for both. Speaking for myself and I believe for the other intelligent members of this House, we cannot see how you can on a vote for $30,000 with just a few items set down, also put down $4,500 which is nearly one-sixth of the amount for contingencies and unforeseen expenses. That is contrary to all reasonable thinking. It is not the general practice. It is out of proportion.

If, according to my own argument, you must have the treating of all school children, (and I think all of us would agree with that) you must not differentiate by only bringing a few to the Garrison, you can take it at so much per head for entertainment, and work out a figure according to the school rolls. (A VOICE: You are talking too long). Certainly I can talk as long as I like! I am trying to hammer home this suggestion of mine to the Government. I will repeat, that if I were a representative of the parish of St. Lucy or St. John, and you had brought only half of the children in those parishes to the Garrison for the rally. I would say to the people that because the Labour Party did not win a seat in St. Lucy they did not want to feed all the children. My Colleague and myself are going to make sure that all the children in the City will go up there.

Before I sit, I want to make this clear: I will vote for this $30,000, providing that the Government will agree that $2,000 from Policing requirements should go to the treating of children. As I have said, it is not necessary to have Island Constables when you have Volunteers and Boy Scouts who would be glad for the opportunity of being pressed into service. Again, of the $250 which is set down for tree planting, I do not consider it will be necessary for more than $50 to be spent; and the other $200 can also go to the treatment of children. I will also agree to the Resolution provided that the $600 which is set down to be spent on Sundry Works and Services at Government House, is cut out. As a matter of fact, I recall that we have voted for fittings and so on for Government House already. Of that amount $500 can go to the treating of children. I will also agree to the Resolution providing that $500 out of the $4,500 which is set down against the items "contingencies" and "unforeseen expenses" is only put to one of those amounts and the other $4,000 be put to the treating of children. As you can see, you will be getting the whole sum of $30,000, but we in this Chamber will be satisfied that you are spending the greater portion of than amount on the children of this country, and that will create a lasting impression. I am prepared to vote for the amount on those grounds.

Let me say, if the Government is adamant over the way in which this money must be spent, (that is that $5,000 should be spent towards policing requirements) I will not vote for this Resolution. Sir, I await to hear what the Honourable Premier has to say. It is no sense my making a flambuoyant speech in this Chamber on this matter, or my saying that you should not vote any money at all. That will be nonsensical; and there is no point in anybody saying that.

5.25 p.m.

The sister of the Monarch is important to Barbados and we must offer her some from of entertainment. Whether it is nonsense or not, it is our duty to offer her some form of entertainment; however, we are not to be extravagant in our form of entertainment in order to create any false impression. I could make a speech here tonight and say that I will not vote one cent for this entertainment; we could possibly do like British Guiana or British Honduras; but we should let the Government know that if we are spending this money for the entertainment of the Princess, we must let these people who can appreciate the benefit get it. These people will be the coming generation. I say that the Government should agree to changing these figures, because we cannot impress upon anybody that you

need 400 Island Constables to keep back people when this gracious lady is going on a drive. The Premier has said that this drive will take an hour and a half. If he is saying that this is the Government's policy, the Government has decided on this, and if he is saying that this is going to be his policy and we cannot change it, then I will say here that this has really been given to them; and if they are going to be adamant and say that they are not changing this policy, I will vote against this Resolution.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am going to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again. But before doing so (in order to prevent honourable members from going off the rails as the honourable member has done) I shall just like to ask whether the honourable member has read the word "provisional" and ignored it? The word "contingencies" merely means that you estimate that a thing costs six cents when it cost eight cents. On the other hand "unforeseen expenses" may be something which might come in afterwards. I omitted to say that at St. Philip more school children will be gathering there too. When we have made complete estimates of transport, (and it may be that what was not proposed in other cases may have to be done) that is where unforeseen expenses may come in. If suggestions are made here and they seem to be reasonable, then those suggestions will be passed on to the separate Sub-committees for detailed investigation and passed on to the full Committee, and they will come out of "unforeseen expenses." In view of the fact that it is late I do not propose to say answer the honourable members extensively; but I want to make this point before the tea interval is taken. It is not a question of our being adamant; some of these items have to be ordered immediately, and therefore we were at pains to say that this is the provisional break down; but out of the $2,000 "unforseeable expenses" more school children may be roped in in a different way. We have to disrupt the bus services and we have to invoke the aid of "pirate" buses for the transportation of school children from various parts of the island to the Garrison. I do not propose to say anything more now. I now beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

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

The motion was put and agreed to.

The Chairman reported and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

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

The motion was put and agreed to and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

5.40 p.m..

On Resumption.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY RESUMED

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 in the Chair.

Resolution for the Entertainment of the Princess

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,— I suppose that I will have to reply to at least half a dozen speakers; but rather than unwittingly forgetting any point, I will reply to the hon. senior member for the City now and in doing so, I may perhaps give explanations which may save some other hon. members asking questions.

As regards the $250.00 for the Six Cross Roads affair, that includes the putting up of a barrier, the making of an enclosure, building a ramp from the roadway to the grass verge, having a temporary car park and decorations there. All these details have been carefully worked out; but in view of a conversation which I had with the hon. member during the tea interval, I want to point out that as regards the Island Constables, the committee thought that it would not be wise to use Island Constables all of whom may be living in St. Michael, and to have to transport them to Holetown or Speightstown to hold the crowds in check that may congregate. It is felt that it would be better to have special constables for the occasion. That is not to say that some Island Constables may not be used too. It is computed that there will be need for 400 constables to be used in the various parishes through which the drives will take place.

As regards the hon. member's suggestion about the Volunteers, (I suppose he means the Barbados Regiment) I will say that the Police, the Scouts, the Guides and all those have special functions assigned to them on that occasion. There is nothing extraordinary in the proposal for special constables. In every country it happens on occasions of this sort, that your ordinary Police Force cannot cope and you must invoke the aid of constables, some of whom may be special constables only for the particular occasion.

Again I give the hon. member the assurance, (and I draw it to the Committee's attention) that these proposals are provisional. What the Princess is going to do in Barbados she has done before, and she will do it in all the other islands that she visits. If she has expressed a desire to have a rally of children, what can we say but the Garrison Savannah? The question of transporting some 24,000 children is out of the question. Transportation is a very serious matter. We know that we will have to use buses and ask people to send lorries etc. The normal bus services are going to be seriously disrupted. Some will go off their route for several hours. All those things have been taken into consideration; but I do assure the hon. member that I will put up as a recommendation to the committee, the suggestion that we entertain the other children who may not be included in the rally at the Garrison. That is something that can come under Unforeseen Expenses.

I am not trying to flatter this Committee, but I thought that when I used a term 'provisional' it would be understood by hon. members. It is not an afterthought, nor am I saying this from fear of criticism. The word "provisional" means provisional. Hon. members are expected when a Resolution of this kind comes before them, to make suggestions if they can suggest things that have been overlooked. A Sub-committee made suggestions as far as these proposals are concerned, and the bigger committee added some suggestions and took off some. The bigger committee in turn reported to Executive Committee and they also made amendments. We come to the Legislature which has to vote the money, and the Government sees that even now there is need of further amendments. So any reasonable suggestion that is made will be passed on to the committee as a recommendation.

There is much in the suggestion of the hon. senior member for the City,—that those children who cannot attend the rally should also get a lemonade, Ju-c,

or Coke, or whatever evil stuff is sold under the title of "soft drinks".

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman,—I am sorry that the hon. senior member for the City is not in his seat, because I want to make a slight reference to what he had to say in connection with this matter. The hon. member is closely connected with a number of civic and other organisations, and much of what he said, reminded me of a sort of committee meeting of a Friendly Society or some such organisation planning to entertain its members, or perhaps of some Sunday School committee thinking in terms of a Sunday School treat. It was certainly not appropriate to plans by a Government of a small country, prepared to extend some sort of welcome to a relative of the reigning monarch.

Now I think, sir, that the very tone and level of the Government's thinking were demonstrated by two remarks of the Hon. Introducer of this Resolution.

6.15 p.m.

Sir, two remarks made by the hon. member demonstrated exactly what the Government had in mind in connection with this matter, and how it thinks in matters of this sort. The first remark which the hon. member made was, that he expected some sort of criticism with regard to whether or not we should have tenders to supply soft drinks on the occasion for those children whom we are proposing to entertain. Can you imagine, sir, that the Government of a small colony like this, which is living to some extent on the charity of the British Government and depending on free grants from time to time and subventions from the British Government itself, preparing to spend as much as $30,000 merely to welcome the sister of the reigning Queen; and the Leader of the Government saying that he anticipates criticism merely on whether or not the Government will be calling tenders for the supply of soft drinks to school children? Well, sir, that is the sort of criticism which the Hon. Premier anticipates. The other remark which the hon. member made and which reveals how the Government thinks on these matters, is the self-congratulatory remark which he made with regard to the employment of 400 Island Constables in connection with the Royal visit as a method of relieving unemployment. The Hon. Premier said, the Government is always accused of doing nothing to relieve unemployment, but here we are going to employ 400 Island Constables for four days at five shillings per day. Can you imagine that in this 20th century's way of thinking, that a Colonial Government would congratulate itself because it is going to dish out five shillings per day to Island Constables to be posted along a certain route for a Royal Princess to pass? If the £400 which these constables would cost were being spent on some sort of public works project or on something substantial, then you could say that the Government is spending £400 in something which would be a monument to the visit of Princess Margaret. But merely to jingle out a few shillings to constables and to congratulate themselves on it, seems to me to be the high water mark of Government's stupidity. Are these constables really necessary? As the hon. sen. member for the City pointed out, these constables are completely unnecessary. As he and other persons who want to think would readily see, the Volunteers, the Boy Scouts, the Girl Guides and the Church Lad Brigades should have been pressed into service if it were thought that additional Police assistance would be needed either to control the crowd, or to patrol the route along which the Royal lady would pass. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph admitted that they would not be placed there for Police protection in the fullest sense of the term. Knowing what we do of Barbadian crowds, I think that even for the purpose which these constables are wanted, they would not be necessary. Barbados is not like Kenya where the natives were kept in subjection for years; nor is it like Buganda where the British have overthrown the Kabaka. It is not even like British Guiana where they have taken away the Constitution. This is Barbados where the people are law abiding and even more than that. They are meek and long suffering; therefore, the Royal lady can drive from one part of Barbados to another in absolute comfort. All she might meet with are the curious stares of people who for the greater part are idling, and who will be thronging the wayside to catch a glimpse of her as she passes, and perhaps to make a comment over the fact that Government is wasting so much money on entertaining her when they, the people, need some of the money so badly.

With regard to the proposal which is first and foremost to entertain 12,000 school children at the Garrison Savannah, I cannot for the life of me see why or how such a suggestion should be entertained by the Legislature. We were told earlier that the Royal Princess expressed the view of seeing some school children; that is all. Well now, if she expresses her view to see some school children, could not she be taken to some schools along the routes she will be taking in her drives around the island? I cannot think of anything better than say, if she is travelling on the route to St. Philip, her stopping at St. Giles Boys' School and seeing the school children there and the benches on which the Hon. Premier sat as a school boy, or any other elementary school along the route, rather than for you to be picking up twelve thousand school children all over the island at an unnecessary waste of public funds, to bring to the Garrison Savannah perhaps for only a Ju-C and and a Bun. Can anybody on that side of the Table believe that today a Ju-C and a Bun mean anything to any school child by the way of refreshment? Can the Government see that the money which they will be setting aside to provide this refreshment is being actually thrown away? I believe if the Royal Princess wants to see some elementary school children, they should take her to one or two or three elementary schools and let her see them there; but to pay private buses and to pick up lorries, cars and what-not to carry some of the school children to the Garrison Savannah, and taking into consideration also that children being what they are, it is bound to be a cause for dissatisfaction; it is bound to be a waste of public funds to do that. You would not think, Mr. Chairman, that this proposal emanated from the Government and from a colony in which when there are vacancies at the only secondary schools for girls in the Metropolitan parishes, there are over 400 applicants for 28 places; also when there are vacancies at the Metropolitan Secondary school for boys, there are also a greater number of applicants for similar places.

Sir, you will agree with me if you are aware of that. It would be far better for money like this which we proposed to spend in this manner, to be spent on adding another wing to one or both of those schools or providing more accommodation somewhere or the other for those children who desire to go to secondary schools. You can call it if you like, the Princess Margaret wing.

6.25 p.m.

But I do not think we should throw away money in engaging pick-ups to carry children to the Garrison for Coca-Colas. Within the last three or four years the Government has frittered away over

$120,000 on matters like this; for the Coronation we voted over $85,000, $10,000 first and then $75,000; for this visit of Princess Margaret we will vote $37,000 including the $7,000 which we voted last week, and God knows how much more will have to be voted. However within the last three or four years, we have spent over $120,000 in a mistaken idea of what constitutes loyalty to the British Throne. We have not got a single piece of wood erected anywhere in Barbados out of this money, as a monument to show for any of this expenditure. Money is being thrown into the air in the way of fire-works, treating school children and the like, and this is a Government which cannot live without charity from the Imperial Government; and in addition to that, we cannot even provide proper educational or any other sort of facilities for the people. As regards the speech made by the hon. senior member for the City, the money should be provided by some organisation which he represents, but not for him to tell us that far from spending too much you are spending too little. You are taking up school children to the Garrison for a Coco-Cola or Canada Dry, and is this the way in which members of the Colonial Legislature can think of spending the little money it has? Do you think it is anything of any importance to a child under the age of 8, 9 or 10 years to remember in later life that he was taken in a little pick-up to the Garrison when Princess Margaret came here and was treated to a bun, when that same boy will not be able to enter a Secondary School because there is no accommodation for him? Do you think that the parents of these children will be satisfied with our spending this money in this fashion? I say that many parents will not allow the children to go up there at all. A lot of these pick-ups, pirate buses and what-not, will have to be utilised in order to get these 12,000 children to the Garrison; and I cannot imagine a more colossal waste of funds in carrying these children to the Garrison because Princess Margaret expresses a desire to see these children. Of course that is what one would expect from the ignorant Committees which we have to prepare the programme for the visit of Princess Margaret.

Let us consider this matter as carefully as we can. We have to thank God that Princess Margaret did not say that she wanted to see all the dogs or some of the dogs and cats; because, the Government would have taken up all the dogs and cats they could find, and carry them to the Garrison Savannah in carts! That is what they would do! If Princess Margaret wants to see these children, then let her go to the schools and see them; but not to take up 12,000 and carry them to the Garrison and give them a Coco-Cola or Canada Dry. I am utterly flabbergasted and disgusted to think that the Committee could have entertained that idea, and to find that the Government has endorsed it.

6.35 p.m.

We have not got money to throw away foolishly. The children cannot get to the Garrison by flying. They have to be taken there and it cost money. In any case it is a stupid idea to carry them there. The general thinking of the Government in this matter completely appals me; this is a law abiding country, not some obscure South American Republic. One of the items says 1,760 yards of rope; and the Premier with pride said it would cost 50 cents per pound. I imagine that the rope will be used to line the route so as to keep back the crowds from pressing on the hem of Princess Margaret's garment. I can understand the expenditure on this rope if I were told, that after the Princess left, the Ministers would hang themselves with it. If that were so I would understand it. To tell me that we are to buy, among all the other nonsensical suggestions, 1,760 yards of rope is past my comprehension. What will we do with it when the Princess is gone? Of course, as things are in this country, with unemployment, privation and what-not, I imagine that there will be a lot of suicides eventually, and perhaps the Government will be able to offer the rope free to persons who want to commit suicide.

I say seriously that I know that nothing that will be said here to-night on this side of the House, will change the Governments views on this matter, or radically alter their way of thinking. This is the way that they have been conditioned to think. If they have been conditioned to think that way, it is because they have forced themselves to think that way. Every member of the Committee and some members of the Government, from the Governor back down will be hoping for, and expecting some Royal recognition after the good lady has gone. So therefore in order to curry favour with those who hand out these imperial favours, we can expect to see this country committed to any kind of expenditure. But those of us like myself, (and I am sure like others who see things in their right perspective) will certainly marvel at the facilities at which the Government has proposed to spend $30,000 merely because Princess Margaret has expressed a desire to visit Barbados.

I would not mind spending $50,000 if it were going to be spent in a manner which future generations would applaud; if it were going to be spent on something which we could see? if it were going to be spent on some school, some building, something tangible; but not when you will spend $3,000 on decorations, $1,900 on illuminations, flags and bunting, and a few electric lights do not cost such a lot of money. All that you want are a few illuminations in the centre of the City and at Government House. After all, she is not the reigning monarch. She is only a sister of the Queen. We have to have some sense of proportion.

The last time that we came to this House asking for expenditure of Government money on what we regarded as a crying necessity for the Island, we were told that every single cent is allocated to the Deep Water Harbour. We were further told that the British Government knows that. If we do not want to establish a reputation for being incapable of thinking rationally, can we go to borrow money in Great Britain and even beg for some to erect such an important necessity as a Deep Water Harbour, when we can pick up $30,000 and throw it away on nothing at all? By all means let the Royal lady come; and by all means have a reception at Government House. Have some public welcome; take her around the island and show her all that you can and let her leave. We will be delighted to see her and will perhaps feel flattered by her visit, because the fact that she has been here must be of some economic value to the country from the point of view of attracting tourists, visitors and what-not. But let us not lose our heads so completely as to regard it as a necessity to spend this money in this manner on her visit.

I cannot imagine three people in this House who would regard this money as not being too much What did we spend when Princess Alice or The Princess Royal came here? As far as I remember after the Princess Royal left sometime this year or late last year, we passed a Resolution to reimburse the Acting Governor for out of pocket expenses in connection with her visit. I do not think that Resolution was for more than $1,300. Using that as a sort of basis, and multiplying it as much as we like, we should be able

to reach some figure within reason which would represent the maximum amount we should spend on the visit of Princess Margaret. As far as I am concerned, if I am spending over $5,000 I want it to be spent on something that I can see, not on frippery and fireworks. I do not see we have anything to rejoice about so that we must expend money on fireworks and that sort of thing, merely because Princess Margaret is coming here; except, she had brought the glad news that her country had expressed its willingness to take some thousands of our unemployed. Then we would give her a quarter of the Treasury if she wanted it. But when she is coming here purely on a social visit as any other tourist would come, and merely because she happens to be the sister of the reigning monarch, we must spend all this money, is entirely beyond my comprehension; and I could never condone it.

I want to suggest more seriously that we should refuse to ratify the proposals before us. We should express ourselves as being in favour of expending a reasonable amount in some of the directions suggested here in the Resolution, and if we are to spend the remainder in connection with the visit let it be on something to commemorate the visit; something that we can point our fingers to with pride in the future and say "We erected that, or we did that when Princess Margaret honoured the island by putting her foot on its shores." But let us not spend $12,000 on more sweet drinks and buns for school children at the Garrison, and on transporting them there, and on fireworks, illuminations, special policing, and that sort of nonsense.

6.45 p.m.

I am sure that the people of St. Philip will be pleased when the Royal Princess comes to the Six Cross Roads to plant the tree and to name the School there; but I do not think it will be surprising when she gets there, if some of the more intelligent people of that parish will allow her to know that the same Government which has planned to spend $37,000 on her visit, could not afford to put a secondary school in the parish; Government has only put up another elementary school. I say that because I now that the people of this country are not all fools. Certainly it cannot cost $37,000 in additional Capital Expenditure to convert the school which the Royal Lady is going to name and to plant a tree at that institution, to provide secondary educational facilities for a larger section of the children in this island. It does seem to me a waste of public funds to spend this money in fireworks, decorations and banners, and to throw it away in aerated drinks and buns for elementary school children. It does seem to me far better if it were spent to provide proper educational facilities for those school children. I say, sir, that this is a tragedy inasmuch as in the West Indies today these colonies are struggling for self-Government (within the Commonwealth it is true) but the struggle towards self-Government is hard because of our economic position. At no time more than this, do we need all our economic resources for building the framework for those institutions to promote the growth for self-government in these territories and to acquire the people to assume the responsibility of self-government. Therefore, we have not got the time or the money to be thrown away or to be frittered away unnecessarily in things which are unnecessary, whether it is a Royal visit or not. I maintain that our spending of the money in the direction which we are spending it in this Resolution, is absolutely tomfoolery. I go further and say if the position were reversed, and the British Royal Family occupied the position which the Government occupied to-day, they would have a greater sense of their responsibility than to throw away public funds in the manner in which we are proposing to do to-day. Sir, there can be no justification for the enormous waste of public funds by this Government within the last four years in matters similar to this. Sir, I want it made clear that if the money is to be spent, let it be spent on something which we can see, and which we would be proud of in the future.

Sir, I repeat that the proposal to carry school children to the Garrison Savannah should be abandoned. The Royal Princess should be taken to a school or two on one of her trips. Unless we are going to spend this money in a different manner, the amount to be voted could be wisely reduced.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, "Merit will suffer to pine in obscurity, and the public money was squandered on the most undeserving." This Government by its continual omissions on matters of this sort, is showing that it is not governing with justice and sympathy towards those who have put its members in power. Let me say at the outset, that our refusal to vote the total amount in this Resolution cannot and should not be taken as any measure of our disloyalty to the Royal Family. I do know that there are some who feel that we are more than loyal, and I can hardly think that the Royal Princess would like to know that we have strained ourselves to provide an admirable setting for her visit. I presume Sir, that she would prefer if she were given the opportunity to land here *in cognito* and be given the freedom of the City and the slums so that she could see real life as it is in this little island of ours. If I were a member of the Royal Family I would become disgusted with the false preparations which Colonial Governments (especially those who call themselves socialists) prepare for me. I would repeat the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Philip when he said that you should not give the British Government the impression that the island is so pauperised, that you cannot find money to finance the Social Services that are needed, nor that you cannot find the money to carry out the project of the Deep Water Harbour for which the West Indies are looking forward, nor should you say to the local people who have been assembling in groups and large numbers over the past few weeks hoping and beseeching you that the Government which they have put into power, and which should take their suffering conditions into consideration, cannot give them that assistance which they need even to relieve the colony of some of the thousands who are awaiting assistance and are in need and have the desire to go abroad where there are vacancies for work. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph must have expected that there would be some trouble as to the passing of this Resolution, because it was just two weeks ago when this Government was asked to give assistance to the young women that he said, we cannot lend money to Tom, Dick and Harry; and he has repeated that statement over and over again only in different words. It was only Monday of this week that a couple others and myself approached the Head of the Administration, as well as the Hon. Minister of Labour, and the same impression was given us along with other fabricated difficulties.

6.55 p.m.

Today, Sir, the same Government which cannot find the means of assisting people who are really in need of assistance and who are expecting it, is saying that it can find $30,000 only for a couple of hours' entertainment. I say it is only for a couple of hours, because that statement is based on facts. Her Royal Highness lands here at 11 or 12 o'clock, she passes through Trafalgar Square and goes to

Government House. The public ceases to see her until a couple of hours after when she goes for a drive, and then she is back at Government House. Then they will have dinner and a Cocktail Party and these things must cost up $30,000 ! Of course when the honourable senior member for St. Joseph wants to do something which he thinks the public would be vexed about, he adds to the Addendum something about provision of employment; just like when he wanted to erect Parliament buildings for $750,000, he put into that Addendum the provision about employment for the unemployed. Of course that is a bait and that catches honourable members; and the public is likely to feel that the millenium will come in as a result of the scheme which the Government proposes to carry out. The honourable member has his millions to vote as he directs them and the Resolution will pass. Even when the project is being carried out, you will find that a couple of people are employed, but the public purse is considerably empty and the thousands who had hoped for an opportunity have got to replace these things by increase taxation which the honourable member's Government has placed upon the consuming public. That goes on from week to week, and the honourable member does not get tired of mis-governing this colony. There are hopes that the honourable member would change his policy and adopt one in keeping with the slogans which he trots out to the public when he wants to get votes. You preach one thing on a platform, but then the legislation shows that your heart is far different from what you preach, and that it is devoid of sympathy. The best thing that the honourable member can do is to legislate for people; and he sees that this legislation is not to the effect of relieving the masses of the people of the burden which falls on them because of poverty. Let the honourable member point out item after item which had the effect of causing people to feel that the Government has changed from Reactionary to Labour. There are a couple of palliatives; but the honourable member is dumping money into the pockets of the rich.

The bait in this Resolution is that 12,000 school children will be treated at the Garrison; but no dignitary goes to the Garrison and spends more than half an hour or an hour; so that by the time that some of the school children get to the Garrison, Her Royal Highness will have departed. I should like to know what organisation will the honourable member set up to treat these children. It is far better to relieve some of the people from taxation which prevents them from giving their children a bun or a "Coke." Does the honourable member not feel, that it would be better if parents were left with this $30,000 in their pockets so that they could provide better things for their children, than to carry these children for all those miles to collect what? That is an affair of mice and men; would you not prefer your children to remain at at home, than be taken by all kinds of contraptions to the Garrison and be put among adults, some of them ruly and others unruly, just for the sake of getting a bun? The Government is so set up that when these occasions come about they are taken care of by people who do not know the needs of the community and therefore they select all kinds of nonsense which does not fit in with the proper running of the island. There is wisdom in all parts, but it has to be sought out; snobbishness will not help you to find that wisdom. I am told that the honourable junior member for St. George is a member of the Entertainment Committee and I am sure that if he is as sympathetic as he sometimes pretends to be to the underprivileged people, he could never sit as a member of any Committee and agree to these proposals which are contained in this Resolution. These proposals are not going to work, and we might as well save some of this money. I am not saying that I am so miserly in thought and action that I would not offer some friend a rum and ginger if he came to my home (I am sure that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will say that when he is replying. He is waiting to say that) nor am I saying that we should not spend some money in entertaining Her Royal Highness.

7.05 p.m.

To spend $30,000 is to tell the underprivileged people that you can truly do more for them, but you will not do it because of their wickedness. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph does not think, or these things would cross his thoughts when he is planning at the big house up the hill. I will let the honourable member know now that Barbadians will praise him forever if after the pleadings of hundreds of people assembled in Queen's Park a couple of weeks ago imploring assistance, he had taken that $30,000 and spent it to assist these people. He could do it however he likes. He could have called them up and give them two thirds of their passage money to England, and let their mothers pawn their houses with the Government so that the Government would be sure of getting back the money. Even if he gave them the money without the certainty of getting it back, it would still be an indication of gratitude on the part of the Government to those thousands of people who have put them there. Do you know how many people this $30,000 would send to England? It would send nearly 150 people according to the cost of passage per individual. But the hon. member prefers to make this gesture to a young lady who cannot bring forth a magic wand and throw him and his party back into power.

If you do a kindness to one Barbadian, it affects the feelings and the minds and sympathies of thousands of us; and we compensate you in return. But the proposals in this Resolution are devoid of any commonsense or business sense. Some while ago we had a lot of celebrations. The Coronation cost us thousands of pounds. There were buntings and other decorations too numerous to mention which were only used for a couple of days. The Public Works Department is responsible for the preservation of those things, and I will bet the hon. members in front of me that if they went to the stores of the Public Works Department they would find, if not all, nearly all of those buntings and other decorations. You must find them there. I have had a flag for over ten years which I bought during the Jubilee, and wherever I turn in my home, I find that flag and that is without giving it any special treatment. We must presume that the Public Work Department preserves those things for future use. Bring them out.

The hon. senior member for St. Philip mentioned that the Government is going to buy 1,760 yards of rope. Are they going to tie Barbados? I am sure that any business house in Bridgetown would have been proud to lend the Government sufficient rope to keep the crowds under control when they assembled to see Her Royal Highness. When that day is over, what will the Government do with all this rope? It will be money thrown away. The Hon. Premier, as if it were something to be proud about, trots out the statement about the rope costing 50 cents a pound.

The lumber which they are proposing to buy is another thing I want to speak about. I have seen that when people keep little "Singings" they go to

Plantations Ltd. who will lend or rent them lumber at a nominal rate. When functions are carried on in Queen's Park, even at the Exhibition, partly every stall owner has rented lumber from the lumber yards; and there are some civilians who are so monarchial minded, that they will make any sacrifice so long as it goes towards the entertainment of royalty.

I wonder what comes to the Hon. Ministers' minds when they are sitting around a table making decisions such as these. Someone has told me, sir, that this tree which will be planted at Six Cross Roads, is one which has never been seen on earth. In view of the fact that it takes some mechanical power to bring a tree from Mars, the Government has put down this amount as the amount which is necessary to get the tree here. The amount does not represent the cost of the tree, but the price which those who are bringing the tree here will charge. If hon. members remember, the Government has calculated the cost of planting a tree at 15 cents. That is the amount which they now pay planters for planting casuarina trees; now the Hon. Premier is saying that the planting of this tree will cost $250.00. It does not mean that car hire will be included, because travelling expenses are provided for under another item.

Of course I am not surprised that this is put here; because, the hon. junior member for St. George wants the taxpayers to be burdened with the cost of providing a monument to distinguished Barbadians. I hope that I am incorrect when I say, that I feel that that hon. member agreed with the proposal.

Now as far as policing is concerned, they are about 600 odd Policemen in the Force. A few people came into this honourable Chamber today to see for the first time what it looks like, and I am told that the Government, led by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, wired to the Police Department and asked for extra constables to be detached here because they fear—whom? (Shame! Shame!) Because they fear whom, Mr. Chairman,—their own followers? Let the hon. member use the same Police. Let him recommend that the extra Police at the out stations, and those who would be on vacation on that day or on those days, be detached to maintain law and order at the Landing, at the Garrison and elsewhere. I am not going to fall for the nonsense, that because 400 constables will be employed, we should agree to this. I am almost sure that there are not 400 Island Constables in Barbados. Over the recent period of years they have been sacking the Island Constables by the dozens.

I do not know if the hon. member expects a riot. While we do not like such things, I wish that the hon. member had cause to solicit more Police aid to keep back the crowds of unemployed and hungry who should be bearing placards in an orderly manner, with the hope that Her Royal Highness would see them, and would have impressed upon her mind the crying need that the numbers of our teeming masses in Barbados are faced with. That is what should happen.

7.15 p.m.

In an ordinary manner we are asking her to appeal to her sister, our Gracious Queen, to use her influence on the Prime Minister and the Government so that instead of allowing continentals to just cross the English Channel and fill the jobs which are there to be filled to give us consideration. We are only asking that she implore her Government to allow some provision whereby some Barbadians can get there and work. It is true to say that the Liverpool trade owes much to this colony and to our ancestors. The Lancaster Mills were also financed out of the sugar industry of this colony. Therefore it would not be a measure of disloyalty if thousands of our unemployed are allowed to line the Chamberlain Bridge with placards showing their needs, if the Royal Princess is landing alongside. Let the Royal Princess stay there and watch the placards; that would cause no harm. Let me say that we will die for the Royal Family, but they must also remember us. They are in a position to help us. We are sacrificing ourselves to show our loyalty. Let us say to her, "you have the means to help us, do help us." We do not blame the Royal Household, nor do we blame the British Government; because that Government is comprised of politicians who cannot get their seats on the Government by the votes of the people of Barbados or any other colony for that matter. Therefore, they have to depend on the feelings of the British electorate. But it is up to our colonial politicians and our so-called leaders, to bring our needs forcibly to the minds of the British Government's politicians and the officers of that Government who are responsible for the running of that country.

Of course, when it comes to Government House, we are accustomed to these two terms "Unforeseen expenses" and "Contingencies". They are only set down under different names in the Estimates. You will find in every year's Estimates the words "Incidentals" and "Miscellaneous" under the Head "Governor", but nobody knows what happens under those two heads. I do know that to question the spending of public money is distasteful to some honourable members and because of that, they close their mouths even though their feelings are doubtful over the manner in which it is to be spent. However, we as the protectors of the taxpayers should not give way to that feeling.

There is another point which I would like to put to this Committee. On the last occasion, when Princess Mary visited here, no special Resolution was brought to this Chamber for money to entertain her. I was told that she was entertained out of the £1,000 per annum Entertainment Allowance which was given to the Head of the Administration. I also understood that after Princess Mary left, a Resolution was then introduced into this Chamber to reimburse what the Head of the Administration had spent on entertaining her out of his allowance. I think the sum of the Resolution was $1,331.

While someone might think that the Royal Princess is senior to her aunt, there is no difference in royal blood which runs through the veins of both. Mr. Chairman, the entertainment for Princess Margaret is not going to be far different to what it was for Princess Alice or the Princess Royal. Of course, there will be an eagerness to see Princess Margaret when she first lands here, but after that, everybody will depart to his or her home, and will actually forget that the Royal Princess is in the island until somebody says that she is passing a street nearby; then everybody in the particular district would run out to see her again. Certainly, Sir, that would not cost the Government one cent.

The Hon. Premier who introduced this Resolution has not even told us anything about the Entertainment Allowance which is provided every year for the entertainment of such dignitaries at Government House. He should have told us that part of that amount would be spent, or none of it would be spent, because the Head of the Administration would want it for the entertainment of others who might be going up there up to the end of the financial year.

The Hon. Premier has come down with this Resolution in a manner as if we do not allocate £1,000 to be spent at Government House every year. Not one word did he say about that.

With respect to special transport for the Royal Party, I am told that the number is thirteen which would be the Royal Princess' entourage. I presume that we have a very luxurious car at Government House and there are a few others just as luxurious owned by honourable members. I heard in an aside, one honourable member say that he would lend his car so as to make a saving in the Government's purse. He went as far as to say that he would have it painted up in time for such use.

Mr. Chairman, I am not worrying about entertainment as regards those who are invited to Government House. I would really like to see the number of invitees there reduced considerably, because that is just a palliative to satisfy critical minds. Of course, you can invite anybody on the pasture of Government House to have a rum and ginger, but when there are special dinners, those are only provided for the exclusive set. Of course, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is not excluded from the invitees to dinners; he can find his way up there to those dinners, but his invitation is the source from which they get the means for these lavishing things.

I am sure that when you tell people to go up there, they will not have eaten that day. Of course this is forbidden ground; but if the freedom of the City is extended to the *hoi poloi* they will march in droves to see the lavish place where their money is spent every year. I am going to move, because I fee it would be within reason to do so, that this amount be reduced by $15,000. I believe that if you entertain anybody as modestly as your means allow you to do that would be as good or even better, than if you send more what you have spent in other circumstances. As I have said, when you have finished with all these preparations, Her Royal Highness will only be spending a few hours in the presence of the Barbados public, and we should not permit that to cost us so much money. Of course, some firms will benefit considerably from the use of these 1,760 yards of rope, the use of thousands of bottles of Coca-Cola and Ju-C and things of that sort, and the bus concessionaires will be reaping a harvest. It is not a question of the few undesirables who will benefit; in my opinion, it is a question of the thousands who have to forward the money from taxation, and who will have to forward that money even although their little children may be taken so far in order to receive so little.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am not replying to anything which the honourable member may have said in connection with this Resolution. I got up to give the direct lie to the statement that the Government has refused to lend money to people to go to England. This Government has pointed out that it is impossible for us to make our final plans until we know what the British Government is doing; I have repeated that over and over again in here, over the radio, and in a Press communique. I made it pretty clear what I meant by mentioning Tom, Dick and Harry. It is not a question of giving people money, and it is obvious that you cannot say "yes' to "A", and "No" to "B". I repeat: when I mentioned Tom, Dick and Harry, it was considered an unfortunate phrase, and I explained what I meant. I just want to give the direct lie to any statement that I have ever said, that this Government will not lend anybody any money to go to England.

Mr. ALLDER: The honourable member in trying to accuse me of misquoting him, has justified my statement. The Debates of this Chamber and the Press will show that the honourable member made a statement to the effect that the Government cannot lend money to Tom, Dick and Harry. That appeared in the Debates of this Chamber and in the "Advocate" and it was not refuted.

Mr. TUDOR: (*Cheers*): Mr. Chairman, it would have been more pleasant for the most junior member of the second most ancient Assembly in the West Indies to have broken his voice on a less controversial topic, but as you very well know, Sir, in all Legislatures there is always the steamy side of discussions, and it is just my bad luck that I happen to be breaking voice in this Assembly this afternoon on this matter. I wish to state before I go further, that I personally yield to none in my loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. (*Cheers*). I will even go further and say that I am probably the only member of this Assembly that would be prepared to justify the institution of monarchy on religious and philosophical grounds. It must not therefore be thought, that anything I say in connection with this Resolution now before this House, presents a doubtful attitude towards the Throne or the Royal family. What I want to point out is just this: there are occasions, when one has to consider how far one's ideas of loyalty go and whether one has the right kind of loyalty if one sees it as being on the wrong side. There are numerous examples in English History, of the connection between the influence of the Throne as a power for good and the conditions of the people. In 1818 the Duke of Wellington referred to the sons of King George III as being the damnest millstones that ever have been around the necks of any Government; in 1839 Queen Victoria herself was openly booed and hissed at in Hyde Park 7.25 p.m.

A century later, however, not only the Queen, but the whole Royal Family had become objects of affection and veneration; and some historians profess to see in that change of attitude of the people to the Royal Family, a great improvement in the standards of living among the English people; and they draw the conclusion that the Throne and the Monarchy became more popular as conditions, both social and economic, of the English people improved.

Our problems, Sir, although on a smaller scale, is a similar one. Over the last two weeks this Government, according to published reports, has been much concerned at the unwillingness on the part of people who attend cinemas and theatres to show proper respect to the Queen by their refusal to stand while the National Anthem is being played. I, like anyone else, would like to see more respect paid to the Queen when the Anthem is being played. I should also, from the analogy I put before you a moment ago, like to see the condition of the people very much more improved. And I hold, sir, that part, if not all the trouble that arises in this island when we have to honour members of the Royal Family, is due always to the fact that the visit of a member of the Royal Family highlights in the most glaring way, the sorrowful condition of the people.

I have no doubt that if the majority of our people were well housed and well fed, and had opportunities for lucrative employment, there would scarcely be, if at all, one word of dissent concerning any money which it was proposed to spend on entertaining a member of the Royal Family. I equally hold that as long as the people are hungry, as long as the Government presides over a community that as yet cannot see its way to prosperity, for just so long will you come up against a row when you have to entertain members of the Royal Family.

I say that, because what is the conscientious member of a Legislative Assembly to do? He is loyal; of course he is. So are all of us. And over

and above his loyalty to the Queen's Throne and Person, there is also the loyalty to his conscience which he must equate with his love for, and interest in, the people whom he serves. That is why, sir, I beg to second the motion just made by the honourable senior member for St. John for a reduction to $15,000 of the amount asked for in this Resolution.

Now, sir, the Government is asking the people of this island to spend $30,000 to entertain the Queen's sister. Let us admit, let us admit very freely that we want to welcome the young lady. On that there can be no dispute. But I think we should also remember that Princes Margaret considers this tour she is making here as a tour of duty, and I wonder whether the members of the Government really realise what has happened. They would be very badly mistaken if they looked upon this visit as merely a pleasure cruise for Princess Margaret.

I am not in a position to say what goes on in the Colonial Office with respect to the policy of the U.K. towards the West Indies; but I think that every West Indian knows that in recent months, the Colonial Office has been very disturbed about the West Indies. I myself think that this disturbance is largely due to a guilty conscience. Be that as it may, they are disturbed, and that is where members of the Royal Family come in. The Queen herself must do her tour of duty; and if you remember all the complicated arrangements going on in international affairs as between East and West, and the advance of Communism in the Far East, you will see the significance of Her Majesty's tour last Autumn. The break down of agreements in Western Europe and the possibility that the U.S.A. might cut up rough, might itself have occasioned the visit of the Queen Mother to the U.S.A.

The mounting and teeming unrest which is just below the surface in these West Indian Islands, might have recommended to the Colonial Office that a visit on the part of Her Royal Highness The Princess Margaret would be timely. That is why I think such a visit is taking place. Recognising why this lady is coming here, and much as you are glad to see her in the line of beauty, you should not find yourself required to burden your taxpayers with exorbitant expenditure. Luckily for us, we live in an island which, despite what the Government thinks, is very difficult to beautify because nature has already done her share; and except for the City areas and certain other areas of St. Michael, no expenditure need to be incurred to make this island more presentable than nature and her Maker have already made her.

If you say that you must incur expenditure, (and I am willing to admit that there is not one of us in this Chamber that will say that we must not spend anything) you must exercise the greatest care to see that you give no offence in the spending of it. I submit, sir, that the Government is giving offence because they have social problems which, according to their public policy, they seem unable to solve. They have ideas which, again according to their published statements they cannot put into practice now. While all that is going on, there are thousands of people whom the Government is leaving without any hope, and whom the Government will have to forgive if they became embittered and impatient with them (the Government).

It is therefore not statesmanlike at a time like this, when you find that you cannot offer to the people the things you pretend that you would like them to have, to carry out a raid on the Public Treasury for the purpose of welcoming a lady who is only coming to do her duty; this is all that it amounts to, and there is more to it than that. We all suspect that the members of this Government are not free agents; and by that I mean, that we never get the impression from anything they say or do, that policy always originates with them. That is why we are willing to give them any opportunity to tell us that it does. We feel whenever they are prepared to tell us that policy originates with them, they should equally be prepared to say with us that they are spending too much money, at least in this instance.

7.35 p.m.

They cannot agree that they are spending too much money on Royalty. That shows that they are not free agents, but that they are only working in the old way and under people who do not know better than they do; but those people, at any rate, know what they know a little clearer.

Mr. Chairman, there is another point which I wish to draw to the attention of honourable members, and one, which I have not heard any mention as yet since the debate on this Resolution has begun. I am speaking about it with some embarrassment, because it is scarcely more than seven hours since I have entered this Chamber. I cannot imagine a Government which has just emerged from a bye-election wherein it has seen its policy crushed to powder under the wheels of popular resentment, coming back to this House within such a short time after, to tax its constituents on precisely the same kind of issue which brought it to its doom. Sir, that is not learning from experience; and I can only counsel its members to take some cognisance of the feelings of the people of this island, whether they are put to the test of fighting an election or not, merely because it is a good thing for Governments in power to take stock of public opinion.

Sir, I cannot support this Resolution as it stands. I will not do so, because I cannot encourage the spending of public money in so reckless and cavalier a fashion; and, secondly, I am not convinced that our loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen is enhanced or shown up in much a clearer light, by the spending of $30,000 on causes which seem to me not so worthy. It just occurs to me that there are only a few who really feel that way about royalty. As the majority of us believe, it would be far better to commemorate the visit of Her Royal Highness by doing such a thing as giving old age pensioners an extra five shillings. There are about 10,000 old age pensioners, and the giving to them of an extra five shillings would only cost an extra $12,000. They may be even less than that number; in which case you will spend less, but you would have given to those old folk a good reason to say or sing with all the fibre which their recruited strength can muster "God Save the Queen," "God Bless Her Majesty." Sir, that is what you should aim at; and because you should aim at that and I do not see you aiming at it, I cannot consider giving you my support on this Resolution. (*Cheers*).

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman,—I must first congratulate the hon. member who has just sat down for his very able and lucid maiden speech. I rise because I am going to support the Resolution, and I am giving my reasons for so doing. In the first place, I would say that the arguments which obtain against the granting of this $30,000 are equally valid against the granting of only $15,000, or for that matter $1,500; because, the argument in principle is this: we are a poor country, therefore we have no right to be spending $30,000 on the Roya' visit. I would say that whoever is responsible for the proposed visit of Her Royal Highness should have taken cognizance of this expected expenditure beforehand, and should have thought whether this country would be able to

bear it. If it were left to me personally, my opinion would be that a Royal visit at this time was not at an necessary; but inasmuch as Her Majesty the Queen was at Jamaica about a year ago, and there was the popular clamour that the Queen should visit every island and that visit, apparently to the Royal personage was impracticable, I suppose the idea then presented itself that since the Queen could not personally visit these shores, her sister should do so. My view is this: since we have accepted the invitation (and we have done so) we cannot allow the Royal Princess to come here and go back with the slightest feeling of insult.

In the way how we think to-day, $30,000 is a lot of money; but at the same time, for the occasion, it is not a tremendous sum. I think it would have been far better for those in authority to have told the Colonial Office that Barbados could not afford to entertain Royalty so soon again. We acknowledge, and we are grateful for the recognition, which the Royal Princess has given us by her wishing to visit these shores, but we cannot afford to receive her at this time. We cannot afford to accept the invitation and carry out the social obligations which are necessary for a Royal Princess.

I share a lot of the views of the hon. members who have spoken already. The hon. senior member for St. Philip pointed out how we depend on Colonial Office grants and gifts which amount to many times $30,000. The British people have more than a moral obligation to spend those amounts on Barbados and the other West Indian colonies; and that they are sensitive to international criticism, and that is the reason why they are spending these sums. Let me say that the Royal Princess represents not only the Royal Family but the British people. The Royal Family is the symbol of the citizens of the British Empire. The Royal Family is undoubtedly the highest symbol of the people. We all see the adoration of the British people for the Royal Family, and the Royal Princess is not only coming here as a member of the Royal Family but as a representative of the British citizens; and as such, we must accept her. We cannot for our own civilised standards, afford to give the impression to the British people that we are so uncouth that we do not cherish their Royal symbol. We do not show our admiration to their Royal symbol. We cannot allow them to see when the Royal Princess comes here that we are so niggardly that we cannot entertain her in a fitting manner; we cannot allow her to go back with the feeling as if she were not wanted here. We must bear in mind, that we are not only insulting the Royal Family if we do not entertain the Royal Princess in a fitting manner; we are also insulting the British citizenry.

We are now asking Britain to open its doors to us where there are vacancies for work. It is only to-day we see in the daily Press that the Midland Factories are sending their representatives to meet steamers at ports in order to recruit West Indian workers. Sir, we cannot in one breath expect aid from the British people, (and even insist that they employ West Indians) and in the same breath give any suggestions that we are not wishful of welcoming the Princess of the Royal Family to visit here.

7.45 p.m.

I look upon this matter from the British citizen's point of view. As I said, the British Government is sensitive to international criticism and to-day they are conscious of a moral obligation to West Indians; and we can say that they are trying to-day to pay the debt which they owe to us. Some of us may say that British Guiana who has shown such dreadful disloyalty, has been provided for a lot more than we who have been so loyal throughout all the years. British Guiana has received a bigger grant than Barbados has ever been allowed, but at the same time, we must remember that it is a question of one of the British Government's weaknesses. It appears to me that the British Government always has to be aroused by some untoward event in order to give any of the British Colonies what the social conditions deserve; but we in Barbados cannot at anytime be asking and expecting our right of employment and grants by Britain, and at the same time, allow the British people to say that we do not deserve these things because we do not acknowledge or respect them. If we do that, we will open ourselves to that criticism. As far as I am concerned, this invitation would not have been given; because, I feel it is entirely unnecessary for us to have any Royal visit. I do not share with the same philosophical depth or imagination, all the feelings expressed by the last hon. member who spoke of his veneration for Royalty. But I would rather live under a constitutional monarch than under a would-be ruler, be he small to-day and large to-morrow. Under a constitutional monarch we are still protected better than under any other type of Government in history. Under a constitutional monarch, justice at least, West Indians have known. There is no justice in Kenya and no man has criticised that more than I have done.

From my point of view, the British people should walk out of Kenya; Kenya is nothing as old as these colonies. From the point of view of civilised standards and from what we expect of the British system, and from the point of view that Her Royal Highness is of that system, we cannot afford to entertain her in any way in which she would feel that she was unwanted when she returns to the United Kingdom. After all, $30,000 is a lot of money to all of us; but when you think of the value of the dollar to-day for a Royal visit like this, $30,000 is not a tremendous sum. We can always draw a picture of poverty at any time. If this money were to be spent among the poor it would go a very little way. The greatest thing that could be done with this $30,000 would be to build some lasting institution. I cannot see for the life of me how the type of entertainment which we propose here, can cost much less than this amount.

It is all very well to talk about 400 Island Constables, but it takes a little imagination to realise that on a day like that on which Her Highness lands here, the crowds can be so tremendous that 400 Island Constables are nothing superfluous. We must realise what a great trouble a crowd can be. I do not imagine that anybody is thinking of doing any harm to the Princess, and I will say that this colony is more loyal than the people in some parts of Britain. As to the question of the seeming disrespect which is shown at the theatres, that is not anything deep; it is just looked upon as a traditional humbug, and I would say that you cannot avoid a traditional humbug by standing when the National Anthem is being sung. That is no disloyalty to the British Throne. When I was abroad in Grenada I never heard the National Anthem played at the theatre; I heard "Land of Hope and Glory" played. Jamaica is no less poor than Barbados; as a matter of fact the depth of poverty in certain parts of Jamaica has not been seen here. I do not know, the exact figure which Jamaica spent on the Royal visit, but we know the welcome which Her Majesty had in Jamaica. We cannot show any poverty of entertainment which would be insulting; as a matter of fact, a lot of people claim that they know the average Barbadian but they really do not know the average Barbadian. The average Barbadian will be highly

insulted if he realised that the Princess came down here and there was a poverty of entertainment. The average Barbadian likes to see things done on the grand scale when they are done. I do not think that the average Barbadian would welcome the Princess here, and in that welcome, feel that we have done nothing to measure up to the standard of the occasion.

7.55 p.m.

That sir, is my reason for voting for the Resolution. Since we have accepted her offer to visit Barbados. we cannot do anything but carry out to the letter the standard and type of entertainment due to the Royal person.

There are certain criticisms made by honourable members which sound good. It is very good for the honourable member who has just sat to suggest that old age pensions of five shillings should be paid on that day. I agree with him entirely. I am not criticising the individual suggestions made, but I am criticising the suggestions that $30,000 is too much. I agree that it could be spent differently, but I cannot see that it is too much to spend for such an occasion. The same logic that can be expended against $30,000 can be used against the spending of $15,000. When we say that we cannot spend $30,000 we can equally say that we cannot spend $15,000. Since you have accepted the visit of the Princess I do not think that it is too great an amount to spend.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, the entertainment of Royalty has always been an expensive procedure. As regards this Resolution, whether the sum was for $15,000, $30,000 or $45,000, you will always get criticism; because, in this community which is a poor community, there are so many things to be done, and we all say that such and such a thing should come first. Some people will say that it is more deserving to give an extra five shillings in Old Age Pensions. I may say that we should have some building or some Scholarship Fund for the occasion, while every member will suggest somethings else which should be given priority before the things mentioned in this Resolution. When is it that you last had Royalty so near to the Throne, visiting these shores? Putting aside the Princess Royal and Princess Alice, it was the Prince of Wales way back in 1924. It is not every year that we are visited by Royalty. The Princess has chosen this time to come, and we have accepted her invitation. What would this House have said to-night if she had been going to other West Indian colonies and leaving out Barbados? It would be more turmoil than we are having tonight. We are glad to have her, and in doing so, we must extend a welcome befitting Barbados.

Very little of this money will be spent on the Princess. Much of it will be circulated within the island. Children are being entertained, and I am sure the children will be entertained to their liking. It is not a wish of this side of the House that the recommendations of the Committee meet with full approval, because we do feel that the entertainment of children could be more properly done in their own areas. To feed and entertain 12,000 children at the Savannah is a herculean job. Some will get a lot and some will be left out. It is not an easy job. We have tried these things in Queen's Park on several occasions and we know that it is a most difficult job.

Although there have been criticisms against Unforeseen Expenses and Contingencies, which the Premier may say may not be spent, we know that you must have a sum set aside for that; but it does seem large to us. What can be unforeseen when a Committee has sat and examined carefully what is to be done? I would like to draw to the attention of this House, the exemplary behaviour of the people of Barbados during the Coronation period. Rumours were started that there would be hooliganism and people stood at home for fear of going into Bridgetown. We did not have one single incident. I do not think there was a cut hand or a single bicycle accident in Bridgetown. The loyalty of the people of Barbados is unquestionable.

I am one who will say that each and everyone of us in this Chamber, those who have criticised the vote and those who will vote for a reduction, are as loyal as I am or as the Premier or anyone else is. So whether the public outside may say that the honourable senior member for St. John is not loyal because he did not vote for the Resolution, I will give it the lie. The honourable member is as loyal as I am, or as the Ministers are. He feels, however, that this vote is too much for a poverty stricken colony like Barbados. We can draw an instance of that over and over again. If after this Resolution is passed and we come with something else, you will get the same arguments. The saving of this $30,000 will not help us a lot. It will do us a great deal of good if we can entertain the Princess in the way that Barbados wants to do.

We want to see things go as smoothly as the Coronation went on. I do hope, the suggestions and the criticisms that came from this House will be taken in that spirit. I repeat, we are not questioning the amount but we are saying that the manner in which it is to be spent should be revised. I am saying that to spend $5,000 on special Police and constables on an occasion like this is an insult to the loyalty of the people of Barbados. We will extend a welcome to the Princess, and the people will behave and stand back in an orderly manner. A few Police on horse-backs will keep the crowds back. I think we should also use the voluntary organizations. You have the St. John's Ambulance, the Cadet Corps, the Guides and Scouts, and they will be willing to come out in uniform to help keep order, because they will be in the front seats. The children of the island will enjoy themselves. As the Princess has expressed a wish that young people should be in the forefront of the entertainment, I heartily agree to giving school children a treat. Again, I wish to say that they could be better treated in their own areas near their schools. It would be unfortunate if in the programme that is drawn up, the Princess could not pass the major roads where most of the schools are situated; because, if the children came out in front of their schools and with flags or even a handkerchief to wave their welcome, it would be much better than collecting twelve thousand in one spot to wave their handkerchiefs. Let the Princess see the children of the island in their various areas and at the same time, see Barbados.

8.05 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I too have a word to say on the Resolution. I do know that in spite of this lengthy debate, it is very obvious that this Committee will vote this $30,000 and for that reason I wonder why is it necessary to have all this unnecessary talk. However, I would like to explain just one section of this vote, and it is the one which is the burden of the whole of this debate. It is with respect to the question of the children's rally. We were told, to some extent, by Clarence House that that would be something which the Princess would like to do. When we had decided in our proposals that the Royal Princess should be taken on one route in the hope of having half of the island's population getting one quick glance at her and on

the next evening taking her on the other route so that the other half might see her, we submitted our proposals to Clarence House. We were then told by the Colonial Secretariat that these trips should be only of an hour and thirty minutes duration. We were told that she would be spending after her visit to Trinidad one day at Grenada, the next day at St. Lucia, the next day at St. Vincent, and there was hardly any four hours on those trips and that the Princess should have the opportunity to rest. What more could we do? Hon. members have talked of lack of imagination, and of lack of vision to think out a suitable programme. Since it is only possible to avail ourselves with two 1½ hour trips round the island, and since on those journeys we would only be passing 2 per cent of the island's schools, we had to think of getting a great number of school children to a place where Her Royal Highness could view them. What was our next problem? Since we had to take the children to the Savannah from the various parishes, it became a question of feeding them. You know very well, that on that day the children will get up from early morning thinking only of getting to the Garrison Savannah, and in their excitement they would not want their own lunch. We had to bear in mind that we would be holding them at the Garrison for almost two hours, and that it would be about two hours in preparation to get them there. We also had to bear in mind that these children will be just over twelve years. What do you ordinarily expect? Even the idea of fitting taps up there to supply something as simple as water to satisfy those children, would cost $100; therefore the suggestion was to give them some drink.

Let us examine the criticisms made against this Resolution. You have one section saying that you should put all this sum of money to the treating of children. The hon. senior member for the City said he would not object to that. You have another section saying we cannot afford to spend this amount on entertainment and that you could make better use of this money. I can also say you can use all this money in tenantry roads and water supply for the people of St. George. We can overplay our poverty by saying it would be better if this money were spent in building institutions or in putting up more wards at the General Hospital.

An hon. member referred to our paying Island Constables five shillings a day to assist the Police. Long before the Princess arrives in this colony, I think security police would be here. The hon. senior member for the City said that the Workers' Union would not allow the Leader of the Opposition to employ a watchman at $1.20 a day, but that the Government was employing Island Constables at $1.20 a day, for the occasion. Let me say that the Royal Princess would not be on the road for the whole day. The trips on which she will be taken are only of 1½ hours duration. On her travel along those roads the speed will not be at the rate of 30 or 40 miles per hour, as the whole idea of these trips is to give the population the opportunity of seeing her. The rate of speed for the Royal procession would be about 5 miles an hour when passing through villages. You know our position as regards to the Police. Now, you are taking the Royal Princess on the route through St. Andrew. She will be passing by the Health Centre in Speightstown. Imagine what will happen, if you only had members of the Police Force to control the junctions where the people will gather in the several parishes on the route. As I have said, you can overplay poverty; you can prove that this $30,000 can be spent in a better way if it were spent on building projects or on the suffering people at the various almshouses. You can bring a calculation to prove that this money can give help to many by way of emigration to England. All these things can be proved; but is that all?

The hon. senior member for St. John made an attack on me during his speech. It is well known that the hon. member objects to anything being granted for Royalty. Whether or not he is uninfluenced or has a dislike for Royalty, I hope his argument would not persuade hon. members. I would say that British democracy has given us the opportunity to express our own feelings. Those of us in public life can even be criminals, or lunatics in our own institutions. British democracy leaves us free to even become communists. However, I see no reason to launch a similar attack on the hon. member or to even retaliate to his insinuations.

Let me say that every organisation in this colony, even those that go without uniform, would be given an opportunity to play their part in the visit of Princess Margaret. Again, I will say that it was not a question of giving a Ju-C or lemonade, or a bun, or a cake to the school children; nor was it a question of taking the children away from their schools or where they are located; but the Committee which dealt with this matter realised that these children in order to gather at the Garrison for the rally, would be spending almost 1½ hours on the road and then another 1½ hours on the Garrison, therefore, the very least you would have to do is to give them some simple form of refreshment. Sir, we were at pains to make it possible that everybody in this colony would be satisfied.

The hon. member made reference to a Ball in honour of the Princess. If we remove all the furniture at Government House you could only bring in 200 people for a Ball. It would be far wiser to entertain twelve to fifteen hundred people at a reception at Government House than to make provision for a Ball.

This is providing them with an opportunity. I believe I attended about twelve meetings of the Committee and I am quite aware of what we should have. There was nothing wrong; we made no mistakes. We were perfectly sure that this attitude would have been adopted by the House, but we were assured that no member of the House would vote against the entire amount. If we reduce this amount from $30,000 to 15/- we will still be entertaining the Princess. Whatever we do, even if we build a monument to commemorate the occasion we will still be voting this $30,000 under this Resolution. However, I am aware that the Premier has something to say on this matter and at this stage I will give way to him.

Mr. ALLDER: I have been forced to endure the "monkeyism" in this matter.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon ourable member referred to "monkeyism"; but I do not consider it to be unparliamentary. I am asking him, however, to make that simple examination of himself, and that is the application.

Mr. ALLDER: If I were the honourable mem ber I would wait until I am ready to put on a side show, and I would not try to take a leading part in making myself sound stupid and my statements not based on honesty.

Mr. MILLER: I must say at this stage, that I dislike the use of the word "honesty". The honour-

able member would be in a better position to explain that than I. However, I may have to rise again.

Mr. ALLDER: The honourable member tried to impeach my allegiance to the Crown. I did not get vex and disturb him; I allowed him to go on because the honourable member does not have any reason to say I dislike Royalty. I have never discussed the matter with him. What I should like to tell the honourable member is, that vanity will not cause me to lick the foot of Royalty or anybody else; but I will continue to show my loyalty as a man, not as any parasite. Vanity will cause some of us to sell our birth right; it will also cause us to adopt a dishonest attitude when some of us do not see with others in perpetuating these things. I want to say that my making of a statement against the amount provided in this Resolution, must not be taken as any disloyalty against the personality of her Royal Highness. But the honourable member, empty as he is always, trots out slogans and statements which all of us know are far from his heart. He only practises them temporarily so as to misguide and fool the public. What is more, the honourable member as a member of this House has introduced some nonsensical things which only harm the people; he would like to take the pennies from the poor and erect monuments with them. He introduces these things because he seems to like certain things. He will aspire to, and thinks that by serving the great, he will get these these things automatically. But these things are not produced by serving in this way. Up to last night the honourable junior member for St. John said he had no interest in these things.

Mr. VAUGHAN: On a point of Order. Last night the honourable member asked me: 'What about this Resolution?'' I said that I have not thought of it, but I am not against it. The honourable member appears to object to me personally when I am against him. I do not criticise him when he is opposed to me; I must imitate him like some blooming gramophone. I have not got to please the honourable member; I have to please the constituency of St. John.

Mr. ALLDER: The same people who voted for me have voted for the honourable member, and when I am uttering these words, I am uttering the words which I know the people will have me to utter. If the honourable member supports the squandering of this $30,000 he is pulling one way—that is against the people of St. John who voted for him and who also voted for me. (Mr. VAUGHAN: The people of St. John will rectify that.) Everybody knows that the honourable member can do fantastic things which are not expected of human beings; the honourable member knows that, and everybody knows it. I have heard the honourable member say that the conservatives cannot put their case and that he can put it for them better than they can put it.

8.25 p.m.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I will not have these fictitious allegations made against me. No one can prove what the hon. member has said. Why is he so incensed because I took a different view from his? That is no reason for his allegations against me. I will answer him when he is finished.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the hon. sen. member for St. John to stop this type of thing; and to speak on the Resolution before us.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I also expected the Chair to rule that the hon. jun. member for St. George was making onslaughts on me. However sir, they are some of us who do not have a newspaper article to prove our statements, so anyone who says that we made such and such a statement is telling a lie. I will remind the hon. member that he and I used to discuss politics over at the Y.M.C.A. Some of us have short memories; but there are statements which come from individuals which are so astounding in their implications that you cannot forget them, even though much water has passed under the Bridge. The hon. member boasted at one time to be able to champion the cause of the Conservatives.

Mr. VAUGHAN: That is a mis-statement. I do not want to use the word ''lie''. I could even take that statement and use it against him, sir.

Mr. ALLDER: The hon. member told me so at the ''Y.''

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the hon. member not to travel in that direction any more.

Mr. ALLDER: I will try to do so, sir. I do not appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the hon. jun. member for St. George suggesting that I dislike Royalty. I believe that if Royalty knew my feelings, they would consider me the most loyal citizen of the whole British Empire. (Cheers). What I do know is this: the hon. member suggested that if we spent $15,000 instead of $30,000 on the visit of the Princess, it would be an insult to Her Royal Highness. That is tripe! If a man entertains another on what his means afford him, to do that could not be taken as an insult unless the person whom he is entertaining has no conscience. But even if in this instance it is taken as an insult, it would be a less insult than if the man doing the entertaining went outside and stole a ham, a bottle of champagne and came back and said to his friend, ''Sit ye, eat, drink and be merry.''

I am saying that the gracious young lady, Her Royal Highness Princess Margaret, would not expect us to do more than we can afford. The hon. member talked about Jamaica. How can we follow Jamaica in all its behaviour? Does the hon. member mean to suggest that we must follow Jamaica even in its immorality and the wrong doings of some of its population? Must we, because Jamaica squanders money on non-essential things, with our limited resources do the same thing? Must we follow Trinidad, British Guiana, or anywhere else whose wealth is greater than ours? If, realising the resources of the island and the hardships which our people are suffering, an hon. member speaks against the throwing away of $30,000 will that be wicked, insulting or wrong?

I must comment on my colleague's remarks because he represents the same constituency as I do, and was sent here by the same people. I must therefore be interested in everything that he says in this hon. Chamber. Let him know that from now. I am interested in what he says, whether it goes to improve the parish or whether his statements go to make the parish poorer by supporting Bills, Resolutions, and what-not that will bring harm to those people. Whether you are in St. Philip, St. John, St. Michael, Christ Church or in any other parish and money is spent like this, it is collected from everyone in this island, whether they can afford to pay it or not. That is why those people sent us here. They cannot come here themselves, and they had to send representatives. If you are the people's representatives you are expected to carry out a duty to the community and the masses who have voted for you. If the hon. member is tired of doing that, I will let him know that I will never be tired of saying what I think those people will appreciate.

Mr. VAUGHAN: The hon. member who has just sat has a sneaking, secret suspicion that somehow, if I differ from him, the people of St. John will agree with me. That is why he hates the idea of my getting up and saying something different from him. The day that I have to follow the lead of the

hon. member, I will resign from this Chamber again. I am not here to think as the hon. member thinks. I have my own thoughts and my own opinions on issues that come before this House.

This is not the first time that I have expressed my own views and have been abused by the hon. member. I want him to understand that I am answerable only to the electorate of St. John; and I am convinced, I have an uneradicable conviction that if any campaign against me is started in St. John by the hon. member, he cannot influence the people of that parish to put me out of the House. They can put me out; but not through his influence. Let him get that in his befuddled mind. I fought up there alone against him. He was my bitterest opponent, and I beat him. I have never criticised him for what he said, but he has the weekly habit whenever certain issues are up for discussion, to find out what I think of them. Last Tuesday speaking on a certain Bill, he and another hon. member of this House completely misinterpreted the meaning of this Bill. I pointed it out to them and both of them made big speeches on me afterwards. The hon. member has a secret and suspicious conviction that somehow when he and I have different views, I am right. He does not want me to express my views. He wants me to express his. How could he expect that?

I never said for half a moment, (as the hon. member has interpreted me) that we must follow Jamaica. The hon. member is not trained in logical sequences. I said the principle objection to this sum being granted was, first, one of poverty. I said that there are poorer countries than Barbados and the principle of poverty did not prevent them from spending on welcoming the Queen. I did not say that we should follow Jamaica. It was an analogy. The hon. member seems to be incensed because I do not agree with him. Let me tell him that the greatest form of tyranny is when a person thinks that other people must only say what that person says. Any person who thinks in that way, is a tyrant. That is a dangerous person. Let me say that I would rather live under the constitutional monarchy to which Her Royal Highness belongs, than to live under the monarchy of the honourable senior member for St. John.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, at this hour, I would suggest that consideration be given to the Chair. A great deal of discussion is still likely to take place on this Resolution and at this stage, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for this Committee to sit again. I well imagine how you are feeling after such a long period sitting in that Chair.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I beg to second the motion.

The question that the Chairman do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again was put and agreed to.

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

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for three-quarters of an hour.

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

The question that the House do now adjourn for three-quarters of an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.55 p.m.

On resumption,

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY RESUMED

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.

Resolution for the Entertainment of the Princess (*C'td*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the adjournment the honourable senior member for St. Lucy was speaking on this Resolution for $30,000.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution has occupied quite a few hours of our time; and I will say that when the honourable junior member for St. John said if any one had issued this invitation and that this invitation was not necessary, I cannot help but agreeing with him one hundred per cent. It is not that I do not appreciate that this lady should be visiting our shores, but it is because in our present impecunious state and because we have to concentrate on the construction of the Deep Water Harbour or other commitments, I do not feel that we can afford to spend this amount of money. There can be no getting away from the fact that we have already spent $7,000 for the refurbishing of Government House, and now we have been asked to vote this $30,000, and that is something which we cannot afford. We have been asked whether this island should be included in the itinerary of Her Royal Highness and we have replied "Yes;" and that is unfortunate, having regard to our financial position. But if we accept anyone as a guest, particularly a distinguished personage, one has to face, (even if we borrow the money) certain financial commitments which are inevitable. If one were to be informed that either one of the honourable members for St. John would be dropping in for dinner with us, I am sure that he would put himself to great expense although he could ill afford to make provision for the entertainment which would be called for. That is the position in which we find ourselves; but I think that this debate should serve a very useful purpose, (particularly for the members of the Cabinet) in having anything to do with the issuing of invitations being encouraged in the future; and that they would hesitate before committing this colony to a similar financial expenditure.

There is no gainsaying the fact, that $30,000 is exactly what it sounds like; that is to say, a large sum of money which this colony cannot afford to spend having regard to certain other items of expenditure to which it has already committed itself. We are looking forward to a future heavy emigration from this colony to the country from which this lady is coming, and it would be a bad gesture if we did not make ample and regal provision to entertain this lady from the United Kingdom, the country which we anticipate will be providing for hundreds, if not thousands of Barbadians in the near future. As a result of this lady's visit to this island, there is a firstclass advertisement value; the visit of Princess Margaret combined with the visit of the Australians, has caused every hotel or boarding house in this country to anticipate more people than they can accommodate. The visit of this lady to the island is certainly a means of free advertisement.

Now, Sir, as I consider this amount, I am moved to propose that the amount is ample up to the end of Item 8. Having regard to the full accommodation

provided in respect of these first 8 items, I cannot conceive any unforeseeable expenses. By the way, I would be interested to discover from the member of the Secretariat responsible for the Addendum to this Resolution, the difference between "unforeseeable expenses" and "contingencies." I was unable to get any distinction between these two things even with the aid of an Oxford and Cambridge Dictionary. But I sympathise with this person; possibly he could not think of other words such as "miscellaneous," "incidentals" and so on, because that would have given him more opportunity for making similar amounts. I am moving that the amount of this Resolution be reduced by $4,500. And if in the provision of the entertainment to which I cannot but feel that we are irrevocably committed, it is found that the amount has been exceeded, then there is no reason why the Government could not return to the Legislature and ask for an additional amount (Hon. G. H. ADAMS: And have another protracted debate?) to cover the programme to which we have in principle committed ourselves.

I can never congratulate the Committee (of which the honourable junior member for St. George was the live wire) on the programme which has been arranged. This programme is singularly lacking in imagination and void of intelligence; it has made no arrangement for any dancing. It cannot be said that I am interested in dancing with the imperial lady; it could not ever be suggested that I am interested in trying to "trip the light fantastic toe." But I remember as a schoolboy looking across from the Olympic when His Royal Highness was being entertained by the Government of this colony, and there was a state dance. I remember the spectacle of the present Duke of Windsor indulging in the art of terpsichore with no less a person than the late lamented Lady Gilbert Carter. In those days, with the outstanding exception of the late Mr. H. W. Reece, the elected branch of the Legislature bore an entirely different complexion to what it bears today. Apart from the blue to which the honourable senior member for the City referred today, and perhaps the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the Assembly in those days had an entirely different appearance from the Assembly in these days. One cannot help hearing from the Barbadian plantocracy, how would you have a dance in these days when you have people in the House of Assembly looking like the vast majority in this Chamber? Fancy a Princess being asked to dance with one of them in these days; Even the late Mr. Walter Reece would not be keen in resenting a dance with a young Princess, but in those days it was the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales.

9.55 p.m.

I do feel, sir, that as dances at Government House, official dances, are so carefully avoided, (one never hears of them unless they are secretly carried on) it is more than essential that on an occasion like this, this concession be made to popular sentiment. Even if you can only accommodate 200 people representatives of every colour, class and creed in this country, you will be doing a good thing to show that this is really a mixed and cosmopolitan community.

The programme which has been arranged is a stereotyped one, completely lacking in imagination, with the unfortunate result that the local Bourbons can claim that they have achieved a victory which was of their seeking, and which undoubtedly they have gained.

Now, considering certain of the individual Items, particularly Item 3, Children's Rally at the Savannah, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, the Premier suggested that the number of children will be limited by the available transport. He mentioned a certain number of buses which should be accommodating the school children. I should not like the number of children to be limited by available transport, if that means that only a certain number of buses which it will be thought convenient to take off their routes for that day, are to be used. You should be prepared to make provision for all the other school children that are available, along with their parents, to travel to the Savannah and take part in this rally. There should be no discrimination, nor should there be any rigid selection. If the children's parents are willing to let them go, the Government should have provision made for their transportation.

I must say that as far as the children are concerned, the soft drinks aspects of it will be essential and I would not quibble on any amount spent on such a rally. As to Item 5, Policing Requirements, in respect of which the figure of $5,000 is mentioned, the Honourable Premier referred to 400 island constables at five shillings each. You will remember that when the coronation celebrations were carried through, as part of their contribution to the celebration, the rank and file of the Police Force were asked to work almost twenty-four hours a day. That was perhaps inevitable. I would like to be assured on this occasion that if this is to happen, even with the assistance of the special constables, when the celebrations are over and the Royal visitor has left our shores ample provision should be made for those Policemen who were deprived of their normal off duty period; it being given by way of adequate compensation. That was not done on the occasion of the coronation celebrations. I do not know if the officers took their week-ends individually at the Crane after the celebrations were over, but the rank and file had no compensation for their onerous additional duties which they were called upon to perform, and which they so willingly performed.

As regards fire-works, I must confess that they have no attraction for me; and as far as I am concerned, this item is undoubtedly a 100% waste of money. The note to Item 3 which deals with the Children's Rally at the Savannah mentions that it includes provision among other things for fireworks, labour and material for decorating and marking out the grounds. To me the fire-works is the least necessary item of expenditure.

The children are going to the Savannah to see the sister of their Queen. They are going to spend an afternoon at the Savannah, and they are going to be refreshed. No justification exists for the provision of fire-works. The fifth of November would not have so long passed when we reach the first week in February. I do not remember the honourable Introducer of the Resolution mentioning how much was allocated for fire-works; but whatever that amount is, it could be provided for under unforeseen expenses, contingencies, or miscellaneous items. —those things which we have no need to make provision for in this Resolution.

Now, Sir, I recollect the honourable Introducer referring to tenders and saying that the Committee proposed to call for tenders. I will advise them to call for tenders not only in respect of the Item to which he referred ,but every Item sold at more than one business house in the City. I think the honourable member referred to half-dozen twelve volt batteries which I understood him to say would cost one-sixth of $420. Well sir, I should hate to think that I would have to pay in the near future one-

sixth of $420 to get a twelve volt battery for my car. I think the Government should call for tenders or ask persons who know at what price you can get a battery today. One-sixth of $420 is $70, which is the most extravagant price. Let us not only call for tenders in respect of one Item, but in respect of any other Item. Let the Chief Secretary or the Secretaries attached to the various Ministers go around and get competitive prices. You will not want these things to use for eternity. You will be surprised to see how fast they will disappear. You had illuminations and decorations during the coronation period and the number of decorations we have in store today is considerably below the number that was there, when the coronation celebrations were over. There is no use selecting the most expensive thing even it has an indefinite or permanent guarantee, because after the lady's visit the vast percentage of these things will disappear. Scotland Yard or no Scotland Yard, you will not be able to find them.

10.05 p.m.

Sir, as I have said, I feel that we are committed to this Resolution; but for those responsible, whether they be Ministers, the chief occupant of Government House, the Chief Secretary, or any other person, let him be forewarned from this debate that before he accepts a royal invitation in the foreseeable future or makes his acceptance of any invitation from such important and outstanding personnel, to bear in mind that we have our Deep Water Harbour Scheme to look after and a lot of other things of which we stand in need. Let this debate be a warning to those responsible that we cannot find the money to enjoy this luxury for a very long time to come. There are really too many things remaining to be done.

It has just come to my memory that the hon. junior member for St. George in his speech, on more than one occasion referred in the most respectful tone to Clarence House. Whenever he referred to Clarence House, he spoke with a special expression on his face. I merely refer to that in order to enquire from him, whether there was any suggestion of a dance in the suggestions offered for the entertainment of the Royal Princess; and if there was such a suggestion, whether it was not acceptable to the Royal lady.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I feel I should at this stage refer to a few remarks made by the last speaker. The hon. member criticised the provisional plan of activities, and he closed by expressing his sole grievance that in the round of activities, there was no provision made for a dance or ball. I think when I spoke not long ago, I gave him the reason for it. I pointed out that the Royal Princess would only be here for three nights; and on the first night after her arrival, she would be given the opportunity to rest and on the other two nights, a Dinner will be given at Government House and a reception. The question which the Committee that dealt with this matter ironed out, was whether or not they should decide on the reception where you could invite twelve to fifteen hundred people, or whether to decide on a Ball at which you could only invite 50 couples. The question of the Ball which is more or less some obsession of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, was decided against. It seems as if I cannot satisfy him on this question of a Ball. Let me again say, that the Royal Princess will be leaving on Saturday afternoon soon after she leaves the Children's Rally at five o'clock. Two of the three nights which she will be spending on the island have been set down for official functions; one, a Dinner at Government House, and the other was a question of how best could we use it. It was a question of whether you should have a dance where you could only invite fifty or sixty couples, or whether you should have a reception where you could invite the Police Band and some of the local artistes to provide a background for the twelve to fifteen hundred people which you could invite to that function. Whatever the hon. member might say, I would still decide in favour of the reception. His desire for a Ball beats me. I know he is not a dancer, and I am wondering why he is so perturbed about it. I am wondering whether he is thinking of an opportunity to dance with the Princess. I think honourable members of this Committee would be more in agreement with the reception.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am really and truly reluctant in rising to speak on this Resolution, as I think the discussion on it has gone on long enough. However, I only wish to say that I think there is no hon. member in this Committee who is more conscious of the needs of the poor of this island and who is more eager to relieve some of their needs, than I; but there are times when we have to look beyond the needs of the poor or else we might be charged for being interested more in the bag and its contents than for being interested in the poor. Why should there be all this discussion on this Resolution? I do not know. I think the time for this discussion which I have been hearing tonight was a month or two ago, when we passed an Address agreeing to a Message from His Excellency which came to this House to acquaint us of the proposed visit of Princess Margaret. I think that was the occasion when those hon. members should have raised objection, if they felt that the financial position of the island could not afford us the opportunity of entertaining her. As I remember, most of them were mute on that occasion; I was one of those who were mute. Well, I say, silence gives consent. We consented to her coming here, therefore we should go all out to see that her visit among us is of the best and is most comfortable and harmonious.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care what other people might say. I feel that what I am, where I am, and how I am able to express myself for my people, is due to the influence of the British people. I do not care who thinks differently. It is a fact that our forefathers were brought here against their wishes, but even if that were a wrong thing, I think it has done us a good turn; because, it has enabled us to accumulate certain knowledge which we are using now for the entire race. I am sure that if we use it intelligently and skillfully, we can bring better and quicker help to our suffering brothers in Africa. If we do not use these opportunities intelligently, we are liable to hamper the progress of our brothers in Africa, and the immediate improvements of our people in other parts of the world. Sir, I want to state emphatically that I am going to give this Resolution with all that it sets out to do, my wholehearted support.

10.15 p.m.

None of those honourable members who have spoken, have convinced me with any sound argument and presented a better scheme for the entertainment of the Princess, and I will therefore stick to this scheme until a better one comes. Mr. Chairman, there are times when we as individuals have to look away from personal ambition, personal animosity, and personal aggrandisement and look to the higher and greater aims to which we are aspiring for the

benefit of ourselves and the future generation. The electorate of the various parishes three years ago, selected us because they felt that we in our ignorance and imperfection, were able to meet with the problems which confront us, and the electorate still feel so in spite of all that is being said and done. They are looking to us not to let them down. This visit of Princess Margaret might be of benefit to us or it may not be; we cannot tell yet; but we hope that it will help us out of our economic distresses. We hope that the visit of the Princess will be a means of relieving some of the economic strain under which we are labouring today. If we, by some inadvertent reference or words, mar this case we will be charged by the electorate. I hope that this scheme meets with the full support of all and sundry. I know that the children will be glad to see the Princess. I know that all may not be able to see her, but as many as possible who can congregate at the Garrison will do so. I remember that when I was a boy I went to the Crane Hotel to see Prince Edward or Prince George when he visited this colony, but I did not see him when I got there. I know that the children will be glad to take a personal look at the Princess. We must not, because of selfish aims, try to stop these children from seeing the Princess. With those few remarks Mr. Chairman, I think I am doing right in supporting this Resolution.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, before the Hon. Premier replies, I should just like to say that just after tea he made certain observations on my remarks when I was not present. I am not going over the whole matter. I hear *sotto voce* something about taking the vote; I heard the honourable junior member for St. George say that he dared anybody to vote against the Resolution.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, why does the honourable member say that I said I defy anybody to vote against this Resolution? The honourable member is free to do what he likes. What I did say was, that we would all vote for the Resolution.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I still say that the honourable member said what I said. I must congratulate the honourable junior member for St. Lucy on the splendid speech which he has made, but I want to tell him that if I have to vote against him today, I am voting according to the dictates of my conscience. I am prepared to vote for this Resolution for $30,000 provided that the Premier does not think that it is not subject to change. If that is his attitude, if I voted alone, I would vote against the entire Resolution. After listening to the honourable junior member for St. George in his attempt to defend this Resolution, all you could hear during his entire speech was "we", "we", "we"; of course we know that the honourable member is about the only person who can organise anything on behalf of the Government. Whatever difference in political opinion we may have, I will say what I believe is for the good of the country. I could make a flamboyant speech on this matter; this is a lovely thing on which to make a speech. I could make a lovely speech on it on the soap box or anywhere, but I will criticise the Government and the Premier for not going all out in order to assist people in going to England.

10.25 p.m.

You cannot reconcile the two things: asking for assistance to get people to England and then having some sham entertainment at Government House. If the honourable junior member for St. Lucy finds that I am voting against him, I will be voting according to my conscience. There are times when we will vote together.

This business of the rally is a stupid idea on the part of the members of the Committee; and when you remember that the honourable junior member for St. George was a member of the Committee, the idea is even more stupid. However, returning to the question of entertaining the Princess I will say that after all these flamboyant speeches are finished, the average man knows that Barbados is a link in the Comonwealth of Nations and he knows that we have to entertain the Princess.

I am not backing down on my suggestion that the money proposed to be spent under some of these items could be transferred to other items, such as the entertaining of the children. No one has criticised the Government on the question of Old Age Pensions as much as I have. But this Resolution deals with entertaining the Princess. It is her expressed wish that young people should play a prominent part on the occasion, and in my opinion the emphasis should be on young people. As far as what the honourable junior member for St. George seems to be telling us, I realise you must take instructions and get certain particulars from Clarence House; but the idea of the Government carrying 12,000 children to the Garrison is wrong. Twelve thousand children from various parts of the island means 4,000 mothers or fathers. If the honourable junior member for St. George put this idea to the Committee, it is absolute stupidity.

I believe myself that school children of the island should be entertained; all the school children; and Government will not need one cent more to do that. If you say one shilling per child, 30,000 children could be entertained. When you take these 12,000 children to the Garrison it means that at 5.15 p.m. when the rally is over, it will be dark, being in the month of February. It is all nonsense. The persons responsible tell you that the Princess has said that she wants to meet young children, but I am sure that the Princess did not say that she wanted a rally of 12,000 children. You have Scouts, Guides, etc., who are trained for these things; but can you imagine 12,000 children between the ages of six, seven, eight and nine on the Garrison Savannah at 5.15 p.m. trying to get back home after the Princess has left? Can you not see the danger in that? I ask the Premier not to be stubborn in a matter of this sort; and not to say that it cannot be changed. You have $12,000 to be spent on the entertainment of these children and out of it, you must pay to bring them from all over the island to the Garrison and to give them some sort of refreshment. It would be infinitely better to transfer the amount from the Policing requirements item, so that you will have $17,000 to spend on the children. There can be no criticism of spending more than half of the money on the youth of the country. If you spend this amount—$17,000—at one shilling per head, you can make your arrangements in each parish.

When members of this House go on these Committees comprised of distinguished persons, they should talk with experience and Barbadian commonsense. Did not the hon. jun. member for St. George realise that it would be impracticable to put all those children in one place at one time? Today he has been talking so much nonsense and rubbish, that I doubt whether the Premier could follow him. Not one of us, if we live in St. Philip, would put our children of seven or eight years of age on a bus to go to the Garrison. Let the children of St. Philip and of every other parish be assembled in one place and be instructed as to what the days means; that would be a more sensible thing.

The Government is talking of having 12,000 children at the Garrison; the Leader of the Opposition has the biggest bakery in the island, and he is connected to one of the biggest aerated factories; let him tell you if it would be easy to cater for these 12,000 children. I want the hon. jun. member for St. George to understand that I am not grudging him because he is on the Committee. I have sat on many such Committees, and I enjoy myself much better in the company of my family.

As the Leader of the Opposition has said, it was surprising to see the discipline with which the people carried out all the festivities during the Coronation celebrations. There are some things mentioned in this Resolution which I do not think the Premier himself has studied thoroughly. I believe the Premier is a busy man and sometimes only reads these Resolutions when he comes into the House; but it irritates hon. members to see the Government proposing to spend this amount on the purchase of rope. Everyone knows that any lumber yard will lend or rent you rope.

10.35 p.m.

If the honourable Premier can assure me that the programme put before us in the Addendum to this Resolution is something which they are not obliged to stick to and can be varied, I will vote for the Resolution. If the Honourable Premier cannot give me that assurance, if he cannot tell me that they will go carefully into what was suggested in this debate, (and for instance that they will not carry out the stupid idea of collecting 12,000 children at the Garrison Savannah for the Children's Rally) if they cannot put forward a better suggestion than moving children from the eleven parishes to the Garrison Savannah, then I cannot agree with this Resolution. I am sure that there will be some people who are not going to let their children come to this Rally in buses, unless they come too. I am counselling the Honourable Premier to tell those responsible for this programme to work out something different to this suggestion. If you are going to give those children who attend the Rally something, give all the children of school age. I say again that this treating of the children can be more easily done at the various schools, than on the Garrison Savannah. Of course, if the request is to have a Children's Rally, you must have it, but it does not necessarily mean that you should have it with 12,000 school children. You can have it with your already established youth organisations. If you think that all your youth organisations are not sufficient in number, then I counsel honourable members of the Government to draw in only those school children from St. Michael. One might argue that the Princess will be denied the right of seeing school children. My answer to that argument is, that I presume you are taking her along the Speightstown route. On that route, you can have the school children from the neighbouring parishes of St. James, St. Thomas, St. Peter and St. Lucy gathered under their headmasters or headmistresses. It would be infinitely better to arrange for the Princess to see all the school children in that way, than by taking some of them to the Garrison Savannah. I think the trouble in arranging this matter properly was because the Honourable Premier and his advisers did not ask one schoolmaster or schoolmistress to sit on the Committee. Certainly it would be infinitely better to have the school children of the various parishes lining the routes on which the Royal Princess will be taken. Let schoolmasters and schoolmistresses take their children to the nearest spot and let them line the street with their children. You can lay them out in sections and in a way that the children will be able to see well. Then let the schoolmasters and mistresses take the children back to their respective schools and treat them while they sing patriotic songs. Sir, that would be infinitely better than to pick them up in buses and other contrivances to take them to the Garrison Savannah.

When you are talking of a fireworks display, that is abject nonsense. If the honourable junior member of St. George acquiesces in this plan, it is not the honourable member whom I credit for his organising ability. Let me say here now, that whatever you do, all the children will not see the Princess; but it would be infinitely better to have them lining the streets on which she will be taken, than to pick them up in buses and carry them to the Savannah. When you have 12,000 children on the Garrison Savannah lined up for the occasion, you must bear in mind that you are not dealing with soldiers, who when a command is given they all obey.

I make this final appeal to the Honourable Premier. The responsibility rests upon you in getting the most revolutionary member, the most conservative, (I will say ultra-conservative) to make it appear that you are prepared to accept some of the suggestions offered. I am saying that from whatever party these suggestions come, do not let any pigheaded person tell you that you must only work according to what is contained in the Addenum to this Resolution. If you are prepared to work only along that line, I am going to vote against it. I will sit and await what the Honourable Premier has to say.

If I may be allowed to summarise my points, I would say, when you again go into the question of the vote for Police protection, I am sure you can affect a saving by a reduction in the number of Island Constables. I will say again, that it is far easier to handle 150,000 adults than to handle 15,000 children, especially those between the ages of 12 and 14 years. I will agree to the sum of $30,000 being voted, provided the Honourable Premier can give us the undertaking, as he has said at the beginning, that this is only a provisional programme. Those were not his actual words, but he meant that. I counsel him to say that he will go into this matter again, to see how best the plans can be rearranged I do not know if the Director of Education sat on this Committee, but it is my firm opinion that whenever you are having something to do with the organisation of children, you should have some schoolmaster or schoolmistress on the Committee, whether that person is retired or not. That has been my experience in dealing with children. Some people think that the mentality of a schoolmaster or a schoolmistress is that of a child, but I do not think that it is exactly like that. Schoolmasters and schoolmistresses by their association with children, know exactly what they will do. I will go a little further by saying that I notice that the Committee which was appointed to go into this matter did not have on it any of the actual persons who are associated with relatively big organizations, not even a school teacher. I suggest to the Honourable Premier that he should co-opt some of those people.

If that can be done with the school children, it would be better to let them line the streets than taking them to the Garrison.

10.45 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: I am only one member of the Committee. The hon. member started off his speech by saying that this is the type of job you can handle yourself, but he wanted to know something about the tree planting.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I did not want to know anything from the hon. member; he is the "fly in the ointment" in this matter. I have only asked the Hon. Premier for an undertaking, but the hon. member will only aggravate the situation.

Mr. MILLER rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for the City says, that he does not want to hear any reply from you. (*Laughter*)

Mr. MILLER: I am addressing the Committee and I know that the hon. member will not understand. The mistake which the Committee has made is that he is not a member of it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: As far as I am concerned I have too much work to do now. I am only offering the Government honest, straightforward criticism.

Mr. MILLER: I should like to say that no member of this community has paid me more compliments for organising anything in this community than the hon. senior member for the City. It is not a question of taking 12,000 children to the Garrison.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I object to that statement.

Mr. MILLER: I will not give way to the hon. member on this occasion.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Premier said that 12,000 children would be there.

Mr. MILLER: The Hon. Premier said that it was a question of transport; but I have been at pains to explain, that we are hoping to take children from St. Philip, St. George and Christ Church and we will require a lot of buses. It was a question of making provision for these 12,000 children; but we are accustomed to the hon. mem ber.. Earlier to-day it was explained that children from the St. Michael area and those around the Garrison would probably walk to the Garrison; the Hon. Premier explained that we will have to use private buses, but now the hon. senior member for the City is making it appear as if we are carrying 12,000 children to the Garrison.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Premier did say that.

Mr. MILLER: The Hon. Premier said that 11,000 or 12,000 children would be taken care of with refreshments. The hon. member would not even pause to ask anything. Before the ship leaves the Harbour you will have a demonstration in the Harbour. I happen to be one of a Committee of seven people; nobody has paid me more tribute in this House for organising things than the hon. senior member for the City, but it suits him today to speak in the manner in which he has spoken. I am more familiar with this matter than the Hon. Premier. The day on which the Princess is planting the tree, three or four thousand children would be taken from that area. I said that to most hon. members privately; I said that the children would be taken from St. Philip, from the top parts of Christ Church, and children from St. John will be sent to Six Roads.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. If the hon. member makes it clear that certain things have been operating in the minds of the Sub-Committee and have not been confirmed, that is a different matter.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I hope the Government will not approve of that scheme, because it is a scheme to kill people's children. I hope that the Government will not agree to this matter. Of course I have paid the hon. junior member for St. George tribute for his ability to organise things; that is why I feel that he should not have been so stupid to bring forward this arrangement to kill people's children. Let the hon. member tell this Committee that he will carry his children to the Garrison and be able to find them afterwards.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This explanation about taking 4,000 children from St. Philip to the school up there, is merely an afterthought on the part of the hon. junior member for St. George; because, it was stated that all these children would be going to the Garrison. Earlier this afternoon I said that if you carry 12,000 children up there, you will kill some of them.

10.55 p.m.

The position is this: the hon. jun. member for St. George is a firm believer in dramatic productions. This visit of the Princess will be his biggest production since "The Man Born to be King." I am going to warn him, that if he carries 12,000 children to the Garrison he will put the Government to a lot of expense. Some will get killed before they get back home and their parents will look to the Government for compensation at least. The Govornent had better insure these children.

I am glad to hear that the committee is entertaining the idea of amending these proposals, and that perhaps they will drop this idea of carrying these children to the Garrison. If this debate has done nothing better than that, it has still accomplished something.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I hope hon. members have finished. So far as these proposals are concerned, I have already drawn attention to the use of the word "provisional". I take it so often for granted, that a single phase is sufficient to put hon. members on the right track, that I often forgot that hon. members will hear what you say and still make the same speech that they left home to make. It is set out in this Resolution that it is essential to place orders at an early date for material, and also to employ persons and to start the works that must be put in hand so as to be completed in good time ocfore Her Royal Highness' arrival. The Government is saying that the provisional breakdown is so and so. Obviously when you tell an Assembly that a breakdown is provisional, you intimate to then that there down is provisional, you intimate to them that there If you come with a Resolution in which everything is cut and dried and you say you will spend $20,000 in paint, and $20,000 on lumber, you could not spend all on paint without the Legislature saying that you obtained money by false pretences.

The hon. sen. member for the City was absent when I said, that I would go further than merely taking back to the Committee what honourable members have said. When I said that, it should have been an obvious indication that the labours of the Committee are not yet over.

There has been criticism of our Unforeseen Expenses and contingencies. It is true that they could have been easily combined; but we specifically put them in that way. In every etstimate you allow 10% for contingencies. In an estimate it may become necessary to transport some portion of one Item. Originally the Item Unforeseeable Expenses was higher than it is here and the vote for the children was lower. The full committee recommended to the Executive Committee that we should transfer a portion from Unforeseeable Expenses to the Entertainment of Children. The hon. sen. member for the City has made a suggestion relative to the entertainment of the children, and I have given the assurance that I will take it back as a recommendation to the Committee.

We had to wait and see what the Princess will say as regards any extra provision which we

put in. At Clarence House they are doing it with a map of Barbados. I repeat that holding a rally is the sort of thing that Princess Margaret has done on more than one occasion. She gets into a Land Rover and drives slowly on the Barracks Square up and down the ranks on parade. She will do it in Jamaica, and the only thing you can say is that their grounds will be slightly bigger than the Garrison. I am sorry I have to criticise that portion of the hon. member's speech. I believe he is sincere; but he must not fall into the habit of some honourable members who think that all the intelligence of the House is on that side of the House, and that there are a bunch of nit-wits over here.

Surely, the hon. member must know that where this rally at the Garrison is concerned, Government went carefully into the question of safety, the question of how to get them there, and how to get them back home. As far as the remark made about children running around about on the Savannah trying to get home is concerned, surely it must be known that the Government will not send children up there in the circumstances in which they will have to run about looking for a bus to get home. I hope that no parent will be silly enough to say, that he or she must go with a child in the same bus. The most sensible thing to do is to let the children who are going to the Savannah assemble at their respective schools, so that the teachers can go with them and keep everything in order. Every teacher will know where his bus is. The children will know where they stand. Obviously they will be in ranks. You cannot please everyone; but it seems to me far more orderly when you are dealing with children to feed them where they are, than to tell them to go to booths and expect them to find their way back.

11.05 p.m.

All these things have already been gone into by the Administration, but I will promise the honourable member that we will go into them again. I don't mind even saying this, even though I should not say it: in the course of discussing all these things, honourable members will be surprised to know that every hundred yards of the route on here has been timed already. It has been found out how much time it would take passing from here to there. As the honourable member for St. George has said, when the procession passes between cane fields the procession may travel at 30 miles per hour, but when passing districts where the people are gathered, it will travel as slowly as 5 miles per hour. Let me say again, that it is already known at what time the Princess will pass every district from the time she leaves Government House until she gets to St. Philip; similarly so on the route to St. Andrew, passing by the Speightstown Health Centre and so on.

That brings me to the question of Island Constables. I must point out to the Committee that it is not a question of Police protection. I was surprised to see on the occasion of the Queen's visit to Jamaica last year, how orderly were the crowds in various places with the use of special constables. Let me say that our present Commissioner of Police saw to the law and order of the processions on the occasion of the Queen's visit to Jamaica, so he speaks from experience when he made suggestions. I can say that it was a fine job done in Jamaica on the Queen's visit; and other West Indians along with myself noted with surprise, how eager the crowds were to obey the Special Police at different parts along the route. All of this planning for the Princess' visit has been carefully worked out. I may also remind honourable members, (it was my fault in not saying it in my opening remarks) that this visit of Princess Margaret will be taking place during the crop season, and lorries laden with canes have to be kept off the route at the time of the procession. It is utterly impossible to have a lorry laden with canes passing a half dozen or so motor-cars which will be in the procession. The Island Constables will be there to see that at the particular time the procession is passing, the route is kept clear.

I hope no parent is going to insist in getting in a bus with his child when the schoolmasters and schoolmistresses will be there to shelter them. They will be there to see that they get to the Garrison and back to their schools safely. The Executive Committee might conceive itself to be guilty of manslaughter if it is so reckless as to do things which will prove a hazard for the children. It can be sued. (A VOICE: That is not so.) The Executive Committee can be sued; the Crown cannot.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to assure the honourable member that not only his suggestions will be taken back to the Committee, but I will go further and give him the assurance that we will accept his suggestion that every school child will be given the chance of remembering the Princess' visit. However, you must have this Children's Rally which I say is essential in any visit of this nature, either by the Queen or by other members of the Royal Family.

I do not think the honourable member was present when I pointed out that the $250 for the tree planting and naming of the School at Six Cross Roads also includes an amount for providing an enclosure for the Reception Committee, and so on, and space for a car park. Obviously it will also provide something for decorations for the school which will not be completed by that time. I should have made this explanation earlier.

Wherever we can borrow anything, we will do so. I am suggesting that it may be useful at one of the ceremonies to have raised stairs and seats, and it may be possible for the Barbados Cricket Association to lend us or we may be able to borrow the lumber from a lumber yard; so I assure the honourable member these matters will be given further consideration. If we can get rope without buying it, certainly we will borrow it, but you must make provision here in case you have to buy it. I am perfectly prepared to agree with the honourable member in that suggestion. I may tell the honourable member that if we can save $100 on something and spend in another way we will do that. I take it that we will have agreed to giving the Committee *carte blanche* as to the way it should spend this money. I think I have covered all the points. I do assure honourable members again that the suggestions which were put to this Committee will be given every consideration. I may say here now, that it was only yesterday that the Executive Committee agreed on certain things and decided to send a cable to ask the Princess' approval to a change in the proposals for her visit. That shows that the Committee has not yet concluded its work; and therefore, any reasonable suggestions made here will be put before the Committee. When we brought down this Resolution with these provisions, we did so with the main idea that we must come in early with something in order that such things which may need ordering, we can put through the orders in time to get them early.

11.15 p.m.

What more can we say? In one respect I pay a compliment to the Committee by assuming that a single word is better than a half an hour speech, and then they make a mistake by looking at the word and passing it over. I assure honourable members

that it is our normal practice to report every week, every Thursday, the course of every debate which takes place in this Chamber; and on a matter of this sort on which we are spending a substantial sum of money, not only will the criticism or suggestions of members be put before the full Committee and the Executive Committee afterwards, but these items which the majority of honourable members feel strong about with regard to the nature of the expenditure, will be strongly urged for the Committee's consideration in the hope that they will agree to suggestions and put them up to the Executive Committee for Governmental approval.

I apologise to honourable members for having spoken long and perhaps unnecessarily. The honourable junior member for St. George was speaking from a more detailed knowledge of the Committee, and I was speaking on what the Government has accepted of the Committee's recommendations and has passed on to Clarence House. I will say those things which have been approved of will take place. For one reason alone it is necessary to get a general expression of opinion from honourable members; and we give the assurance that their views will not only be reported on, but they will have the attention which they deserve.

The question that the amount of this Resolution be reduced by $15,000 *was put and resolved in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows:—*

Ayes: Messrs. CRAWFORD, TUDOR and ALLDER—3.

Noes: Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Messrs. HOLDER, BRYAN, MILLER, BRANCKER, J. C. MOTTLEY, VAUGHAN and E. D. MOTTLEY—12.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the CHAIRMAN declaring: "I think the 'Ayes' have it."

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee was read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE PENSION ORDER

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to take Order No. 5 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1954."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—This is a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1954." It is a Resolution to give effect to this Order made by the Governor under the provisions of Section 2 (1) (a) of the Pensions Act, 1947 which has been made on the Tables of both Houses of the Legislature. This Order is really consequential; we have changed the title "Colonial Secretary" and therefore it becomes necessary to alter the Order and put appropriate names. Under this Order the Private Secretary to the Governor now becomes pensionable and under the Head "Colonial Secretary's Office" all the titles have been changed and appropriate titles have been given. The Secretary of the Public Service Commission comes under this Head.

11.25 p.m.

Under Education Department, you delete "Principal of the Evening Institute" and put in its place "Principal, Evening Institute and Technical Institute" and also "Deputy Principal and Chief Instructor" because we have made Dr. Hamilton, Principal not only of the Evening Institute but also of the new Technical Institute. Under Science and Agriculture you delete "Cultivation Officer", "Assistant Veterinary Officer" "Farm Manager, Central Livestock Station" etc. These are consequential on having altered some of these titles.

I beg to move that this Resolution be now agreed to.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second the motion.

The question was put and agreed to without division.

BILL TO AMEND SEAWELL AIRPORT ACT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing: the Second reading of a Bill to amend the Seawell Airport Act, 1950.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, from the Objects and Reasons hon. members will see the purpose of this Bill. Section 4 of the Seawell Airport Act, 1950 is an omnibus Penalty Clause which is regarded as objectionable on two grounds:—

(i) It provides a general penalty for any person who contravenes or fails to comply with any of the Regulations made under the Act, rather than for any person who commits an offence under the Regulations; whereas the failure to comply with a Regulation may or may not be serious enough to be regarded as an offence.

(ii) It imposes a general penalty for offences the gravity of which cannot be known when the Act is passed i.e. until Regulations have in fact been made.

Soon after this Bill was passed, it was drawn to the Government's attention by the Secretary of State for the Colonies that Section 4 was objectionable. It was then suggested by him that it should be amended. Consequently it was decided to have the Bill amended, and opportunity has now availed itself for the amendment to be made. It is pretty simple and plain, and I do not think it needs any further explanation; but if hon. members desire to have further explanation I shall do my best to supply it.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second the motion.

The question was put and agreed to without division.

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

The three clauses of the Bill were called and agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS in each case the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE MOTOR VEHICLES & ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing: to move the passing of the Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled "The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1954.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this is a small Resolution to approve the Regulations mentioned. These Regulations, in the first place, are under seven different heads. The first is an amendment to Regulation 12. Hon. members would remember that sometime in 1953 Regulations were amended. Prior to that time persons whose driver's licences were revoked by the Commissioner of Police could appeal to the Police Magistrate in case they were aggrieved, and the Regulation stated that the Magistrate's decision would be final. In 1953 we amended that Regulation and made it possible for aggrieved drivers to appeal to the Court of Appeal.

There was a test case which went before the Court of Error and the judge ruled at the time, that the Court of Appeal Judges had no jurisdiction to try the case, in view of the fact that the Regulation under the 1937 Act made it clear that the Police Magistrate's decision was final. We amended the Regulation at the time, but it was found that it was *ultra vires* because Regulations which are subordinate legislation, cannot supercede an Act. It therefore became necessary to have that Regulation amended.
11.35 p.m.

I should like to tell this House, Sir, that it was suggested that the original Act of 1937 should be amended in order to give the individual the right to appeal to the Police Magistrate; and as a result, we did consult other colonies to see what change they had made in this matter. We got some replies. In the United Kingdom, any person who is aggrieved by the refusal of the Licensing Authority to grant a licence, or by revocation of a licence, may appeal to a Court of summary jurisdiction and any order made by that Court is binding on the licencing authority. In Trinidad, any applicant aggrieved by any Act, Order or refusal of the Licensing Authority or of a Licensing Officer may appeal to the Trinidad Transport Board whose decision shall be final. In Jamaica, the application for a Driver's Licence may be refused or the licence may be revoked by the Licencing Authority on the grounds of physical disability but an appeal can be laid to the Road Traffic Appeal Tribunal whose decision is final and binding on the authority. In British Guiana, anyone who is refused a driver's license by the Licensing Officer or whose licence has been revoked may appeal to the Police Magistrate whose decision is final. That is the situation as exists in these colonies or countries. We therefore decided in view of the fact that that would not be an appeal on law, but that it was rather an appeal on a matter of fact, that the decision of a Police Magistrate should be final, and for that reason, this particular amendment is before us.

The second amendment seeks to increase the overall width of motor vehicles. Regulation 24 lays it down that the overall width of motor vehicles should not exceed 7 feet 3 ins. Recently, applications have been made by persons interested in the bus business to import corridor buses for use in the island, but as the overall width of these buses is 7 ft. 6 ins., and because the Director of Highways and Transport feels that it is a good thing to encourage that type of buses and agrees to the increase in width (provided it is a corridor bus) this Regulation seeks to amend the old regulations so as to give effect to this proposal.

The third is an amendment to Regulation 45. This amendment also seeks in the first place to make provision for the width of the letters carried on hired vehicles such as taxis. The length of these letters is stipulated in the Regulations but not the width; and so, in the first place, the width is now mentioned in these particular Regulations. The width is now put at one quarter inch. The second part of this amendment is to allow cars which are generally described as self-driven cars, to carry instead of the letters "Taxi" on the windscreen, the letter "H". Quite a few people have complained about the letters "TAXI"; more particularly strangers. They say that it is a sort of nuisance, because sometimes when they are driving along the roads, some people call at the car because they feel it is a taxi. Because of that, it has been decided that on self-driven cars there should be placed the letter "H" to distinguish them from taxis and private cars.

No. 4 is an amendment to Regulation 55 which seeks to extend the area of the Silent Zone. We have had quite a number of complaints from the Headmistress of Queen's College because of the tooting of horns along that area, and so we have decided to extend the Silent Zone from Bridgetown to the bridge in Constitution.

No. 5 seeks to amend the Regulations (the heading to part II of the Principal Regulation) to include Light Signals. I think all honourable members must have seen the Light Signals which are now being tried out by the Police at the corner of Roebuck Street and Magazine Lane; and as there is no law now for the use of Light Signals, we are seeking to have a Regulation which would give permission to carry out these experiments with the authority of the law, and may be, if they prove successful, they will be permanent.

No. 6 deals with studs. At present we have studs in the road and also stop signals. These Regulations seek that where Light Signals are installed, attention must be paid to them, or, that the Light Signals would be observed with the other stops which are there.

We now come to the seventh amendment. In the third schedule, the Director of Highways and Transport has to see that wages, hours and conditions of employment of those persons who work in the bus business are carried out according to the Regulations. Section 5 (c) of the Motor Vehicle and Road Traffic Regulations states that Bus companies should adhere to time tables, rates of fares, scales of wages and hours of employment submitted to and approved by the Director of Highways and Transport subject to such revisions as may from time to time be required of him. The time-tables and rates of fares, as approved by the Director, are to be printed by the Concessionaire, and exhibited in a conspicuous place in the Motor Omnibus.

"Scales of wages and hours of employment" appearing in that paragraph is cut out, and after paragraph 5(i) the following new paragraph to be numbered 5(k) will come.

"To pay rates of wages and observe hours of employment and conditions of work submitted to and approved by the Labour Commissioner, subject to such revisions as may from time to time be required of him." There was some discussion some time ago between the Director of Highways and Transport and the Labour Commissioner. The Director of Highways and Transport quite rightly feels that the duty of looking after wages and conditions of service is a matter for the Labour Commissioner and

not for his department. As a result of that, there was this discussion between these two heads of departments; and the Labour Commissioner decided to undertake these duties. The Union was also called in and it agreed that these duties should be transferred to the Labour Commissioner. The Labour Commissioner agreed, and now this Regulation seeks to transfer these duties from the Director of Highways and Transport to the Labour Commissioner. These are the Regulations which this Resolution seeks to approve. I do not think there is anything more that I can say, except any honourable member wants to ask any question. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. ALLDER: Before the motion is put, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question in connection with the fine proposed under Regulation 69 D. This Regulation reads:—

"Any person who by any act of omission contravenes or fails to comply with the provisions of Regulation 69B of these Regulations shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable on conviction by a Court of Summary Jurisdiction to a fine of one hundred dollars or to imprisonment for three months."

I want to ask if this fine of $100 or imprisonment for three months does not appear to be excessive. It is easy for the travelling public to make a mistake at times, and in case somebody makes a mistake, certainly the punishment should not be so heavy. It does not even say that the fine of $100 is the maximum; it just states that there is a fine of $100 or three months in jail. Sometimes in the case of a penalty you see that the fine is a sum not exceeding so much; but in this case it says that the fine is $100 or three months imprisonment. As the position is now, the Magistrate is not allowed any discretion in the matter.

Hon. M. E. COX: Under the Interpretation Act of 1949 a Magistrate or Judge as the case may be, can fine anyone from a penny upwards, or he can convict, reprimand and discharge him. The fine here is the maximum fine.

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

BILL TO AMEND THE MARRIED WOMEN'S ACT 1950

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Married Women's (Separation and Maintenance) Act, 1950.

Hon Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, when the Married Woman's (Separation and Maintenance) Bill was before the House in 1950, Clause 6 of the Bill which is now Section 7 was deferred for consideration with a view to making provision whereby a husband who has made default in paying, shall not be imprisoned unless the default was due to his wilful refusal or culpable neglect.

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of Order. I am appealing to the Hon. Leader of the House that inasmuch as this Bill is not a very controversial Bill———

Mr. SPEAKER: Surely the hon. member has not risen on a point of Order.

Mr. ALLDER: I wanted to get an opportunity to appeal to the Government Bench.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will have an opportunity to do that; but now he is out of order.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: As I was saying Mr. Speaker, the present amendment was intended to take place of the original Clause, but owing to some oversight, the original Clause passed into legislation. Opportunity is now being taken to make the necessary amendment.

The Chief Probation Officer has called attention to the wording of section 11 of the Act as a result of a decision of the Assistant Court of Appeal in which it was held that a new order could not be made under paragraph (b) if the children were not in the legal custody of the mother under an existing order of the court and, whilst this decision is not conclusive, it is considered advisable to insert the words proposed in order to remove any ambiguity and avoid unnecessary litigation for those who can ill afford it.

The Chief Probation Officer has also pointed out that while section 12 of the Act empowers a Magistrate to make an interim order for maintenance against a defendant in cases where the final determination has to be postponed for longer than a week, yet the purpose of the section is frequently defeated by the fact that, under the present law, defendants appeal against the interim order thereby suspending its execution. No such right of appeal exists in England and Clause 4 of the bill seeks therefore to remove the right of appeal.

Section 13 of the Act, which empowered a court to vary an order made under the Married Woman's Act, 1896, provided for payment of maintenance until the child reached 12 years of age, whereas, under other provisions the age is 16. As no good reason can be advanced for this difference, it is proposed to make uniform the age up to which maintenance should be paid.

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

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

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

11.55 p.m.

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

The five Clauses of the Bill were called and agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon Dr. H. G. CNMMINS moved seconded by Hon. M. E. COX that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday at 3 o'clock p.m., and the question having been put and agreed to without division, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

12.00 a.m.

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 14th December, 1954.

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

PRESENT:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Hon. [illegible], C.M.G., Q.C., B.A. (*Premier*); Mr. [illegible], Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*); Hon. [illegible] (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. [illegible] SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. R. G. MAHON, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., and Hon. [illegible], (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*).

Prayers were read.

THE SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not ready for confirmation.

MESSAGE LAID

By command of His Excellency the Governor Papers were laid as follows:

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Message No. 31/1954 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly regarding an application for a free grant from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds in furtherance of the recommendations of the Hospital Planning Committee.

The Message was read as follows:—

Message No. 31/1954

The Honourable the House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to the proposals in the Report of the Hospital Planning Committee which have been approved by the Legislature and to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that so far the Secretary of State for the Colonies has approved grants totalling $771,000 to implement the scheme, which was estimated to cost $1,155,000.

2. The Medical Adviser to the Comptroller for Development and Welfare has offered certain valuable suggestions for improving the plan, and it is estimated that an additional capital sum of $80,000 will be needed to provide the following additional facilities which he recommends:—

(i) Increased accommodation in new Fever Block for the Ward Kitchen and staff Changing Rooms	$ 7,000
(ii) Additional pay wards and provision of additional verandah space for day room accommodation to each ward in the Main Building	20,000
(iii) Provision of Work Room, Surgeons Room etc. to operating Block	20,000
(iv) Provision of additional Small Wing to Tuberculosis Block with accommodation for a two-bed ward and three single wards to each floor	30,000
(v) Extra ward toilet accommodation to the Surgery Block ..	3,000
Total	$80,000

3. As it is considered most desirable that these facilities be provided, it is proposed to submit an application to the Secretary of State for the Colonies for a free grant of $80,000 from this Island's allocation of Colonial Development and Welfare Funds to meet the cost of implementing the recommendations of the Comptroller's Medical Adviser.

4. As the amenities detailed in paragraph 2 of this Message do not involve an increase in the number of beds envisaged in the Report of the Hospital Planning Committee, they will not involve any increase in recurrent expenditure while the "pay" beds to be provided will be revenue earning.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados.
11th December, 1954.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Quarterly Return of Transactions in Rum to 30th September, 1954.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Statement on Emigration.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is not addressing the Chair.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I said, Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay a Statement on Emigration.

Mr. SPEAKER: I never heard it.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay a Statement on Emigration.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hear it now

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Resolution to approve the exchange of land at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip.

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to approve the Book of Reference and Plan of the proposed extension of the Waterworks in the parish of St. Michael.

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to place the sum of $5,280 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55, Part I, Current as shown in Supplementary Estimates 1954-55 No. 30 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, in connection with this Resolution, I should like to inform Your Honour that at a later stage I shall ask for leave to move for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89, in order to deal with this Resolution for $5,280 of which I have just given notice.

Hon. H. G. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of $1,830 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55, Part I, Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimates, 1954-55 No. 31 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Fire Brigade Act, 1908.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Registration of (Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials) Act, 1891.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Registration of Deaths Act, 1924.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to implement certain terms of the Agreement for Technical Cooperation Assistance entered into between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States of America.

Messrs. Tudor, Miller and J. C. Mottley entered the House and took their seats.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to consider the Resolution for $1,830 of which I have just given notice.

3.25 p.m.

QUESTIONS

The following notices of questions were given:—

Mr. BRANCKER.

To enquire of the Minister of Labour at the next meeting of this House:—

(a) Whether attention of his Ministry has been drawn to advertisements in the United Kingdom's Press concerning vacancies in the Metropolitan Police Force?

(2) If answer to the above is "Yes" will the Ministry take steps to find out?

(a) Whether Barbadians are eligible for such vacancies and, in such an event (b) what steps the Ministry may take to facilitate the enrolment of local men in that Force?

(b) Whether the said Ministry is prepared to make representations to the appropriate Authorities in the United Kingdom in respect of recruitment for the Royal Navy of Seamen from Barbados?

Mr. BRANCKER.

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister at the next meeting of this House:—

Is the Government aware of the financial difficulties which beset the lower paid Public Employees (Casual and otherwise) due to their inability to cope with the extra expenditure which is so unavoidable in the Christmas Season?

2. If the answer to the above is "Yes" will Government take steps to alleviate the hardship, which such employees undergo, by the institution of an Annual Christmas Bonus?

Mr. BRANCKER.

To enquire of the Minister for Labour at the next meeting of this House:—

Whether he appreciates that dissatisfaction exists amongst casual employees of various Departments who are not given time off without deduction from their day's pay, upon occasions when even private employees of this Island are given time off, such as International and Intercolonial Cricket Matches, or Race Meetings, or the Annual Exhibition, are being held in this Colony?

If the reply to the above query is "Yes" will Government issue the necessary instructions to Heads of Government Departments whereby such employees may be afforded at least as much time off, without deduction from their pay, as private employees?

To enquire of the Minister for Education at the next meeting of this House:—

Whether Government has anything to add to its Replies, laid on the Table of this Chamber on 23.7.54. to question 58 and 59, that:—

(a) It is being the declared policy of the Government to provide children at Public Elementary Schools with a hot mid-day meal free to all who are unable to pay for it, the Government is considering this in conjunction with other schemes of expenditure on Educational matters to be undertaken in the near future."

(b) It is the policy and the intention of the Government to meet as much of the cost of Secondary Education as financial resources of the Island permits."

2. Is Government aware that widespread anxiety exists amongst the poorer classes in this community in connection with the delay in the implementation of the above?

Mr. Vaughan entered the House and took his seat.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motions of Hon. G. H. Adams seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. Cummins in each case, the following Bills were read a first time.

Bill to amend the Fire Brigade Act, 1908.

Bill to amend the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials) Act, 1891.

Bill to amend the Registration of Deaths Act, 1924.

Bill to implement certain terms of Agreement for Technical Co-operation Assistance entered into between the Government of the United Kingdom

and the Government of the United States of America.

RULES SUSPENDED

Hon. Dr. H. G. Cummins moved seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox that Rules 88 *and* 89 *be now suspended.*

The question was put and agreed to without division.

STATEMENT ON WELCH VILLAGE ROAD

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, as I hinted not long ago to Your Honour, I now crave Your Honour's permission to make a statement. You will remember, sir, that when the Resolution for $20,000 to carry out further construction of Tenantry Roads was before the House, the honourable senior member for St. John made a statement to the effect that the Government had prepared a Tenantry Road belong to Drax Hall Plantation, and he stressed the point that a similar thing should be done to the estate road at Welch Village, St. John.

I have caused an investigation to be made, Mr. Speaker, and I have also visited the road. I would like to say that there is absolutely no foundation or fact in what the honourable member said. The fact is that the road belongs to the estate, and the estate owners have prepared it themselves with their own equipment; and no Government funds whatsoever were used on the construction of that road.

CROWN PROCEEDINGS BILL

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to take Order No. 3 as the first Order of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Hon. E. K. Walcott entered the House and took his seat.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to amend the law relating to the Civil Liabilities and Rights of the Crown in right of its Government of this island and to civil proceeding by and against the Crown in right of its Government of this island to amend the law relating to the civil liabilities of persons other than the Crown in right of its Government of this Island in certain cases involving the affairs of property of the Crown in such right and for purposes connected with the matters aforesaid.

This is what you might call a tremendous departure from the normal English practice and from perpetual Barbadian practice, that the Crown cannot be sued. Although the Bill is of tremendous importance, it is in itself comparatively simple. Even conservative England has not anticipated the rest of the Commonwealth in making the Crown liable to tort. I do not remember the year, but I do remember that an Australian province was the first to do it before Australia herself (as a dominion) enacted this Legislation for the whole dominion. Everyone knows that the Crown is not normally liable as the Crown, for any tortuous act committed by its servants.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that honourable members have copies of this Bill. I am wondering if they have received their copies through the post.

Bill Postponed

I regret, Mr. Speaker, according to what I am told, neither Order No. 3 nor Order No. 4 has been circulated to honourable members, therefore there is no point in proceeding with them. I beg to move that consideration of this item be postponed.

3.35 p.m.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The question that the Bill be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Dr. H G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am reverting to Order No. 1.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the Committee to deal with the Resolution of which notice has just been given by the Hon. Minister of Communications.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

The House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1954-55 NO. 29

Head VI.—Customs

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of this Resolution, I would like to say that it is the usual Supplementary Estimates. I presume honourable members would like to deal with the Items Head by Head. With regard to Head VI—Customs, Rent of Warehouses, the note sets out the items clearly. It is as follows:—

During the current financial year, two additional spirit bonds had to be rented for the purpose of the storage of rum.

The total cost of rent of spirit bonds is as follows:—

Total rent of 5 old bonds ..	$11,582.40
Rent of new bonds at Hincks St. from July 1954—March 1955	3,158.71
Rent of new bond at Waterford, from October 1954—March 1955	480.00
Total	$15,221.11
Amount voted under Head VI, Item 23	13,800.00
Total	$ 1,421.11

Supplementary provision for $1,422, is now sought to cover the cost of rent of the two additional bonds.

I beg to move that Head VI stand part.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The question that Head VI stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XII.—Registration Office

Head XII—Registration Office was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In moving the passing of this Head, I think I should say that the note is full.

The sum of $300 is provided under the Head Incidentals, part of which is for lighting.

Since the removal of the Registration Office to the Town Hall, it has been found that the lighting conditions there leave much to be desired and it is essential to use electric light for the lighting of the vault and main branch during working hours in order that, not only the Government clerks working

there, but also solicitors and their clerks should not suffer any undue difficulty in making their day to day researches in the Registration Office.

I would just like to say that all day long that light burns, and therefore, it turned out that the provision of $40 for it was not enough.

I may tell honourable members that work is progressing steadily in transferring the Town Hall and the Registration Office into proper buildings, and it is hardly likely that this opportunity will arise again.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to without division.

Head XVII—Government Industrial Schools

Head XVII — Government Industrial Schools was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This is a new Item. It is for a personal allowance to the Superintendent. The Note reads as follows:—

> "While as a general rule it is not the policy of Government to grant personal non-pensionable allowances, it is necessary to award an allowance to the Superintendent of the Government Industrial Schools at the rate of $480 per annum in order that the Superintendent should not receive lesser emoluments than those paid to his junior officer, the Schoolmaster and Chief Overseer. In accordance with the recommendations of the Turner Committee the salary of the post of Superintendent was increased from $2,880 per annum to $3,120 per annum with effect from 1st April, 1952. Following upon the adoption of the Report of the Dos Santos Commission, the Schoolmaster and Chief Overseer was placed on the scale $2,280 x 120 — 2,760 plus a non-pensionable allowance of twenty-five per cent. of basic salary in lieu of all other allowances (approved in 1950 to all members of the teaching staff at the Government Industrial Schools) and as from 1st April, 1954, was in receipt of gross emoluments (exclusive of cost of living allowance) amounting to $3,150 per annum. The maximum emoluments, exclusive of cost of living allowance, which the Schoolmaster and Chief Overseer can receive are $3,450 per annum."

As honourable members will see from that Note, the Governent is at pains not to grant anybody personal allowance; but for the reasons given here, if we do not make this personal allowance, the Officer concerned would actually receive lesser emoluments than those paid to his junior officer—the School Master and the Chief Overseer. This is no question of creating a precedent, or because we want to keep the particular Officer.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to without division.

Head XXII.—Public Library

Head XXII—Public Library was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: As honourable members will see from the note, the amount of $480 provided in the 1954-55 Estimates for travelling expenses will be inadequate for the year's requirements. Since the Estimates were approved two new Branch Libraries, at Oistins and Six Cross Roads, have been opened.

An average of 200 miles per month is the minimum amount of travelling on which the work of the Library can be efficiently performed. Expenditure for the period April to October, 1954, has been $374. If this average is to be maintained supplementary provision of $120 will be required to meet expenditure for the remainder of the financial year.

I beg to move that Head XXII—stand part.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS I beg to second that.

3.45 p.m.

Mr. VAUGHAN: If I am in order, Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to the notice of the Government that I have been informed and I agree with it, that a building right at the corner of the Cross Roads opposite to a recently established Post Office is now for sale. The matter has been discussed with me, and I think that it would be a very suitable place to establish a Branch Library. In our important parish like St. John (VOICES: Hear! Hear!) with its traditional educational facilities obtainable at Codrington College etc., there is no library; whereas, in the parishes of St. Philip and Christ Church where there are no such educational facilities (A MEMBER: No, no!) have branch libraries. It has been put to me that a branch library and reading room could very well be made out of this building which has been set up for sale. I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Social Services that in the coming Budget, he should seriously consider a sum for the purchase and conversion of this Building into a branch library and reading room for the parish of St. John. I can only bring the matter to the notice of the Hon. Minister that this building is already in existence with its foundations, and there will not be any necessity for building that.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The Hon. Minister of Social Services has heard what the honourable member has said. For my part, I am at present being engaged with the consideration of the Estimates. However, in view of the excellence of the suggestion which the honourable member has made, I would say that if honourable members would make serious suggestions like that in these matters, the Government would be more than sympathetic with them. I am quite sure that the Hon. Minister of Social Services and I will visit the spot and report to the Government as to the suitability or otherwise of the building. As Minister of Finance and of Education, I would have to say whether we can afford to purchase this building or not; but I do thank the honourable member for his suggestion.

The question that Head XXII—stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXIII—General Hospital

Head XXIII (2) — General Hospital — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Under this Head, Mr. Chairman, there is a new item "purchase of Station Wagon and engines." The Director of Highways and Transport has reported that the engines of the Ambulance and Station Wagon at present used by the General Hospital are approaching the end of their economic life, and has made certain recommendations. The additional Station Wagon is estimated to cost approximately $3,000; that is one of the recommendations, as honourable members would see from the note. The honourable member on my left, the Hon. Minister of Social Services, knows more about the working of the Hospital than I do; but, from what I have been able to gather, there is a tremendous amount of work being done in the way of transport, more than one wagon can manage. This matter has the support of the Director of Medical Services.

I should like to say now what I ought to have said under Head XVII, that is: I understand in various places comments are being made about this House adding new items to old ones in the Estimates. As long as I have anything to do with the matter, I can assure all persons that if the Government thinks it expedient to add new items to old ones and get them through both Houses of the Legislature, it will do so. I now beg to move that Head XXII (2) stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The motion was put and agreed to.

Head XXV.—Public Works

Head XXV — Public Works Department — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXV stand part of the Schedule. Honourable members would see from the note that these items were not received by the department until May, 1953; and consequently, no funds were available to pay for them as the amount of $1,075 which had been provided by Resolution No. 1 1954 had lapsed at the 31st March, 1954, and therefore, this is just a simple revote.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The motion was put and agreed to.

Head XXIX — Miscellanecus Services

Head XXIX—Miscellaneous Services was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In moving that this Head stand part of the Schedule, I should like to say that this is a new Item, as honourable members will see, and it was not necessary to bring it under a separate Resolution. Our share in connection with the Lord Mayor's Show which is the Item being dealt with under this Head, comes to $310, and all the colonies except St. Kitts which participated in the show which was held in London last month, have paid up their contributions. I am also told by people who saw it, that Barbados did make a show.

I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The motion was put and agreed to.

Mrs. Bourne came into the Committee and took her seat.

Head XXXII — Department of Highways & Transport

Head XXXII — Department of Highways and Transport — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In connection with this Item, "Travelling Expenses" the note is fairly full I would just like to point out in addition to what has been stated in the last paragraph, that it is necessary to have additional travelling now that the parish roads are being dealt with.

I beg to move that Head XXXII stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The motion was put and agreed to.

Head XXXIII — Airport

Head XXXIII — Airport — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In connection with this last Head, there is a new Item "Purchase of Land Rover". The Note says:—

"The Austin Pick-up owned by the Airport was involved in an accident on the 18th October, 1954, and was extensively damaged. In view of this damage it has been decided to accept the estimated cost of $400 for repairing the vehicle from the Insurance Company in settlement of the insurance claim and to dispose of the vehicle in its present condition. This course is considered advisable since the vehicle was purchased in 1950 and certain parts are now due for replacement."

It is now proposed to replace this vehicle by a Land Rover, which will stand up to rough usage; this Land Rover will also cover all the requirements of the Airport including the towing of aircraft around the Airport. I do not know whether the honourable member who is immediately facing me (Mr. E. K. Walcott) is a member of the Barbados Light Aeroplane Club, but the Government has been asked to hurry up with this matter. I beg to move that Head XXXIII stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I am not happy about the purchase of this Land Rover at all. In the first-place I would like to know what would be the over-all cost of this new Land Rover. (Hon. G. H. ADAMS. Roughly $3,000.) It is stated in the note that it has been decided to accept this amount of $400 from the Insurance Company in settlement of the Insurance claim in respect of the Austin Pick-up, but it has not been stated what they will get for the G.M.C. Truck. 3.55 p.m.

If the cost of the Land Rover is attached to the $400 from the insurance, what will the Land Rover cost over and above $3,000. It is not clearly stated in the Resolution what is the price of the Land Rover.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the figures that I have got show that the Land Rover will cost $3,700. We are getting $400 from the Insurance company, and we are selling the remnants of the damaged Pick-up; so we estimate that we will cover $3,700 that way.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I do not know that the Government or any one else including the Government's Auctioneer, can anticipate the price which the Government will get from this Austin Pick-up as well as from the old G.M.C. truck. I imagine that all these various funds will have to be paid into the Treasury and that the Government should come with a Resolution for money to purchase this Rover. I do not know if it is regarded as a common practice to estimate for the sale of equipment, and then to use that money for the purchase of new equipment.

It is true that the Pick-up was bought in 1950, so the $400 that the Insurance Company is giving is less than what was paid in insurance over the period of four years. That is not the point however. I am wondering if the Government has some idea of what it will receive from the sale of the G. M. C. truck which is outdated and obsolete.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I will try to shed a little more light on this question. In the first place, when the vehicle was damaged the Insurance Company refused to give a new one, and decided to give the amount which was charged by a Garage for repairs — $400. The Government then decided that instead of repairing this vehicle, they would buy a new one and put the damaged vehicle up for auction. At this stage we only want $3,200, because the $400 which the Insurance Company have already paid in will offset the purchase of the new vehicle. As soon as we get the money from the sale of the damaged Pick-up and the G. M. C. truck, we will pay that money into the Treasury. We have not got the money yet; but even if we had it, we think it would be best to come with a Resolution and get the amount for the Pick-up.

Mr. MILLER: The Hon. Minister has thrown a slightly different light on this Insurance matter. I take it that the Government was paying premiums on the entire value of the Pick-up based on four years of service. An Insurance Company will only honour a claim of this sort if it is a *bona fide* accident. If the company regarded this accident as a *bona fide* one, I do not see how they could only pay $400 which is the estimated cost of repairs. I feel that the Government should get the total value if the claim has been accepted at all. I am wondering why the Government accepted that. In the beginning when the vehicle was insured, it would have been insured for the total value. Why should a company only agree to pay $400 which is the estimated cost of repairs, nothing to do with deterioration following the accident. It is not usual for a Government or private individual to accept such a decision of an Insurance Company.

Probably the Government has decided that after four years of service, it would be more economical to replace the vehicle than to repair it. Since it is true that a Land Rover would be more useful at the Airport than a Pick-up, I wonder if those things were operating in the Government's mind.

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

4.05 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr. MILLER: Before you put the question I think the least the Hon. Minister should do, is to satisfy me as to my query.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member would read the fine print at the back of the Insurance policy, he will see that the insurance company is not paying the depreciation.

Mr. MILLER: I know that; but I still think that the Hon. Premier should make no comment. I am sure that the honourable member is satisfied within himself that there is some point for him to answer.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I did not remember the point until the honourable member smiled. The point is this: if it were a comparatively new Pick-up and the damage for what ever reason was $400, and we were told to go ahead and repair it, we would have done that; but inasmuch as this Pick-up is four years old and some of the parts have to be replaced, and we are not getting any depreciation for that by the Insurance Company, (that is the Insurance Company is only paying the cost of repairs) it is better to get something new in order to stand up to all the work it will be called upon to do. For that reason we are asking for this sum.

Mr. TUDOR: I am not questioning the figures which the Government has laid down before us, Mr. Chairman, or indeed the wisdom of exchanging the particular vehicle and getting a new one. My difficulty is different. I think a question of principle is involved in this matter. This House has the sole authority for voting money which is to be spent, therefore I think it would have been better if the whole sum which is recovered from the Insurance Company plus the sale of the G.M.C. truck, is paid into the Treasury and then the Government come to this House and ask for whatever money it wants. I think this House ought to be in the position to vote $3,700. Perhaps the Hon. Premier would tell us if the law is changed, and therefore he can do it as he now suggests.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to comment on the fact that the honourable member has come into this House recently, but I think the honourable member knows that if money is paid into the Treasury it cannot be taken back out, except by Resolution. What difference does it make in this case, if these moneys are paid into the Treasury and we come afterwards with the $3,260?

Mr. TUDOR: I do not know, Mr. Chairman, if the Hon. Premier has misunderstood me; but if you say the truck costs $3,700, you should come for that amount, even if after that, you sold the G. M. C. Truck and you have also received the $400 from the Insurance Company which amounts would be paid into the Treasury. I do not think it helps us to ask for this money for this purpose in this fashion; because, as it is, we have no notion of the amount which would be covered from the sale of the truck.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, when you read the note concerning this item, it can be read two ways. The first time I read it, I read it in a different light to how I read it now. I think I read it in the right way now. Now the cost of the Land Rover is stated as $3,260. It is stated in the Note: "Part of the cost of the Land Rover, which is estimated at $3,260, will be off-set by the amounts received from the Insurance claim." If you go on to read the Note, it would justify the sale of the damaged Pick-up and the G. M. C. truck. It goes on to say: "No Funds are available to meet the cost of purchasing the Land Rover, and it is therefore necessary to seek approval for the provision of the amount required, namely $3,260 by way of Supplementary provision." That is the complete explanation of the matter, because money which is received from any source must be paid into the Treasury and then the expenditure for whatever purpose it might be paid in for, is met later on by a Resolution, as in this case for $3,260. In this case, the Land Rover is for $3,260 and not for $3,700. We do not know what they will receive for the Pick-up when it is sold. We know that the insurance company will be paying $400 for which they are liable. Probably, when this Pick-up is sold, they will get another $100 and perhaps another $100 for the G. M. C. truck. That means those three sums of money will be paid into the Treasury. You really have come for the total cost of the Land Rover, but your expenditure on it of $3,260 is offset by the amount you received (a) from the Insurance Company, (b) from the sale of the Pick-up and (c) from the sale of the G. M. C. truck. "A" is known, and the two others are unknown. If on the other hand, as you have told us you are taking the $400 from the insurance company and putting it as part payment of $3,700 which you have estimated to be the cost of the Land Rover, in that case either this is wrong or the other two are wrong. It is always the rule and the law, that all monies received must be paid into the Treasury and all monies required to be paid out, must be paid by means of a Resolution. I take it that the true effect of this vote is that the Land Rover would cost only $3,260.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, may I enquire of the Hon. Minister how he proposes to effect the dispensation of those two vehicles. I would like to know whether it is proposed to dispense with them by tenders or by public auction.

Hon. M. E. COX: By public auction.

The question that Head XXXIII—Airport — stand part was put and agreed to without division.

4.15 p.m.

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I now beg to move Mr. Chairman that this Resolution for the sum of $13,768 do now pass.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The motion was put and agreed to.

RESOLUTION FOR $5,280 FOR INTRA-REGIONAL SHIPPING SERVICE

Hon. M. E. COX: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for $5,280 to meet Barbados' quarterly contribution to the Intra-Regional Shipping Service. As hon. members are aware, the Intra-Regional Shipping Agreement was approved by both Houses of the Legislature on the 30th October, 1954. The Addendum to this Resolution reads as follows:—

"Under the terms of the Agreement between the Governments of Barbados, British Guiana, Jamaica, Antigua, Montserrat, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, Trinidad and Tobago, Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia and St. Vincent and the West Indies Navigation Company Limited for the operation of an intra-regional shipping service, it is provided that the Governments shall make to the Company a payment at the rate of $240,000 (£50,000) per annum in equal quarterly instalments in advance on the first days of January, April, July and October. The share of this Government is $21,120 per annum. As it is expected that the "West Indian" will be arriving at Port-of-Spain on the 29th December, 1954, and will be sailing shortly afterwards to commence the service, it is necessary to provide funds for the payment of this Government's share amounting to $5,280 in respect of the first quarter, January—March, 1955."

Paragraph six of the Agreement says that the contributing Governments will advance their share in quarterly instalments as has been set out in the Agreement. I hardly think that it is necessary for me to say anything further, because the matter is still fresh in the minds of hon. members. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

The motion was put and agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. Adams, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the Chairman reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. Cummins, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case the Resolutions passed in Committee of Supply were read a first and second time and agreed to.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT ORDER NO. 16

Staff Officer and Instructor for Barbados Regiment

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I ask leave Mr. Speaker, to take Order No. 5 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of the following Resolution:— Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 16 Order, 1954."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 16, 1954, relating to the Staff Officer and Adjutant of the Local Forces of the Barbados Regiment and the Instructor of the Regiment. As long as we have the Act on our Statute Book, we must fill the posts of Staff Officer of Local Forces and Adjutant, Barbados Regiment, and of Instructor, Barbados Regiment, by members of Her Majesty's Regular Forces. It is necessary and it has been the practice for the emoluments of these Officers to be made to conform with those applicable to persons of equivalent rank in the Regular Army.

The basic pay of officers and non-commissioned officers in the Regular Army has been increased with effect from the 1st April, 1954. As honourable members will see from the Addendum to the Resolution, the present emoluments of the Staff Officer and Adjutant are $5,040 plus uniform allowance and Cost of Living Allowance which make a total of $5,340, while the equivalent emoluments in the Regular Army are $5,913 and no uniform or Cost of Living Allowance. Similarly with the Instructor; his present salary is $3,600 plus cost of Living Allowance making a total of $3,756 while the equivalent in the Regular Army is $3,990 and no Cost of Living Allowance. The purpose of this Resolution is to pay the new Staff Officer and Adjutant who will be coming to take the place of the one who has recently retired according to the salary and conditions of service in Her Majesty Forces. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I really am not in a position to question this matter; but what I would like to make a few remarks in connection with, is this: about two or three years ago, there has been some talk about the establishment of the West Indian Regiment in the West Indies. I think it is time that we should get some light on this matter, because that would be a means of finding employment for a good many of these ambitious young men in this island. I am throwing out a hint to the Government that if they in co-operation with Her Majesty's Government, intend to put this matter into operation, it is time that we do something about it now. I have read in the Press time and time again that this question has been discussed in Trinidad and in Jamaica, and I am sure that it is over three years that the question has been mooted. I therefore think that this Government should exercise itself and find out if Her Majesty's Government is serious about establishing this Regiment, and see if we can go about it as early as possible; because, a lot of young men are thinking about the matter and they are discussing it too. I hope that this hint will cause the Government to find out what is being done about having this West Indian Regiment.

4.25 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, when a young man cannot get constructive work to do the only alternative he has, is to apply to do what is destructive. I do not believe in seeing the West Indies become militaristic; and I should like to see that something more useful is established whereby youngsters can get productive employment.

What I really rose to suggest is this: the Government has got to be very careful as to how it increases the vote for the Barbados Regiment. I see that this department is costing us around $75,000 a year. It is a nonproductive department, and therefore we should not give them the impression that we are going to be very generous whenever they want an increase, whether it is for salary or equipment. I should like to see at some future date an attempt made, as I often suggested in this place, whereby the local Government should indicate to the British War Office that the finances of this Colony are not good enough to continue maintaining the Regiment, equipped and costly as it is. Even some of the equipment which the Regiment uses could easily be sent here from some of the surplus stock which the British Army has knocking about in England, the continent and elsewhere.

I feel that inasmuch as normally speaking we do not have any use as such for a Barbados Regiment, all that we are doing, is keeping these men in readiness in case the mother country should want assistance in time of hostilities. In view of that fact, I do not see why you should not get the British Government to bear some of the annual cost of keeping the Regiment. I am hoping that the Government will do something along those lines so as to ease the local taxpayers.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Strange as it may seem, the point raised by the honourable senior member for St. John has already been made by this Government to the British War Office. We have said to them that Trinidad and Jamaica may be able to pay one percent. of their revenue for this purpose, but we are being asked for too much. I cannot go any further at this stage, because our negotiations with the British War Office are not yet finalised.

I must apologise to the honourable junior member for St. Philip. When I was introducing the Resolution, I should have said what he asked about. The members of this party have considered it on more than one occasion; (so I have been told, because I was not present.) Members of this party have discussed it upon the very basis on which the honourable member raised it. I think it will be found that the Regiment provides physical training and some money for people who might otherwise be forced to meet at street corners and play cards.

Whatever one may say about destruction, (and strange as it may seem I am a pacifist and do not believe in war) I also do not believe in being a fool. When war is coming on your doorstep you should be prepared. To-day with modern warfare being what it is, no one would suggest that Barbados is not as much a possible fighting zone as Trinidad or Venezuela; and unless we are prepared to surrender to an external foe without fighting, there is justification for keeping some armed force.

The point was made by the Labour Party that the West Indian Regiment would be a means of physical training for some people, and providing that it did not cost too much, we would support it. As a result of that, honourable members will probably find that we will have to pay less than we would ordinarily have had to pay. As I said when introducing this Resolution, if, as is more than likely, in a short time the idea of the Caribbean Regiment goes through, naturally the position of the Barbados Regiment would have to be reviewed.

I do not think I am divulging any secret when I say that what we in Barbados have done, (I have not seen that it has been done by any other Caribbean territory) is to insist that the various battalions of the Caribbean Regiment should be composed of people from all the islands. You would not join as a Barbadian or a Trinidadian or anything like that; but as a West Indian. So anyone from any colony who joins the Regiment may find himself next to someone from another colony. We have requested that the West Indian Regiment should be so constituted.

I do assure both hon. members that their fears and hopes have been taken into consideration by this Government, and have been indicated to the British Government. The British Government has seen our point of view. I cannot say anything more than that. I am inclined to think that when the proposition for the re-establishment of a West Indian Regiment comes before the Caribbean territories all people in the Caribbean area, whether pacifist or otherwise, will feel that it is something that deserves their support.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to without division.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE MOTOR TRAFFIC REGULATIONS

Hon. Dr. Cummins asked for, and was granted leave to take Order No. 6 as the next Order of the Day.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled "The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) No. 2 Regulations, 1954.

I think, Sir, that all hon. members have copies of these Regulations. Regulation 2 is to amend Regulation 67 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Regulations, 1952, in order that vehicles which now park without charge on the Central Foundry site should be now charged a fee of six cents an hour or one shilling a day.

Regulation 3 seeks to amend Regulation 69 (D) of the Regulation which was passed some time last week. In that Regulation a penalty clause was inadvertently inserted, and in view of the fact that the Interpretation Act of 1949 provides a penalty for that offence, the insertion of the penalty clause in the Regulation was superfluous.

4.35 p.m.

It has been felt for a long time that in view of the fact that it is undecided as to whether or not a building should be constructed on the Central Foundry site, that those persons who now park their cars on the site should pay a fee. The House will remember that when consideration was given to the last Annual Estimates, provision was made for the purchase of slot machines to register the fees so collected. Hence the principle of collecting fees from persons who park their cars on that site has already been accepted by this House. I now beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: We are enacting legislation in these matters from time to time. Perhaps the Honourable Minister who has just spoken is aware, that honourable members do not have in their possession copies of Proclamations and Regulations now, due to the inability of the Government Printery to furnish us with a copy of the Proclamations and Regulations for 1952. So far as I know, no copy of such Regulations or Proclamations has been published or made available to the public since 1951. As these Regulations are so frequently referred to, and every now and again, you are making amendments, I would urge the Honourable Minister who is in charge of this Department to see that they are made available as early as possible. As it is, we have to get copies of the *Official Gazette* to see how this amendment would read with the principal regulations. As it appears to me, it is uncontroversial. I may take this opportunity to say that the controversial one was passed last Tuesday night after I had gone home.

Hon. M. E. COX: Which is that?

Mr. BRANCKER: The one in which we have dispensed with the appeal from the Police Magistrate. That Regulation is highly controversial. Again, I would ask the honourable member to see to it that the 1952 Regulations and Proclamations are made available as early as possible. We are at the end of 1954 and we will soon be entering 1955, yet we have not received copies of the 1952 Regulations and Proclamations. There are only two sources for issuing these Regulations, the Attorney General Chambers, and the Government Printery. It is hardly likely that these Regulations and Pro-

clamations are held up in the Attorney General's Chambers, because they are five lawyers in that Chamber, unless they are so close that they cannot work smoothly. I fail to see how five professional men cannot get out these Regulations and Proclamations quickly.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to back up the honourable senior member for St. Lucy in what he has just said. I realise that there are difficulties in this respect, and it is true to say that in the legal profession they take these things from the *Official Gazette*. However, I fail to see how this House can follow these amendments clearly when it has not got the principal regulations before it. Honourable members cannot debate them one way or the other, unless they see what they amend. This is just reducing it to a farce. We have not yet received the Regulations for 1952. This year is practically at an end and this House is not in possession of the Regulations that were completed in the year 1952. That is terrible! That is not all; you will always find that the people with the beam in their eyes are looking to those people who only have the mote in their eyes.

It is difficult to see what the Hon. Minister can do in this case. All he can do is to insist that this part of the work is completed and made available to the public, the House, and all persons who may want a copy to see things for themselves as soon as possible.

Hon. M. E. COX : I appreciate the remarks made by the two honourable members, and I promise honourable members as soon as possible to get consolidated copies of these Regulations and pass them on. The Hon. Premier has told me that the honourable Attorney General is a bit worried over the manner in which these Regulations are being dealt with. However, I should remind the House that in 1952 I brought in a consolidated form a copy of these Regulations. Since then, we have had two small amended forms.

With respect to the point made by the honourable senior member for St. Lucy relative to the amended Regulation which removed the right of appeal from the Police Magistrate to a higher court, I just would like to say that—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Lucy did make some reference to that point, but if the Hon. Minister persists he will find himself out of order.

Hon. M. E. COX : I always like to obey the Chair. I will make no mention on that point now.

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

4.45 p.m.

AMENDMENT TO PROVOST MARSHAL'S BILL ACCEPTED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to amend the Provost Marshal Act.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: This Order deals with an amendment of the Other Place to the Bill to amend the Provost Marshal Act. This Bill was passed by this House on the 16th November, 1954; the amendment of the Other Place is in respect of a verbal omission, (it is not an amendment affecting the principle of the Bill) in Section (2) Sub-section (7). In that Sub-section the word "were" was omitted. The sub-section reads as follows:—

"All expenses properly incurred by the Provost Marshal in the discharge of his duties shall be borne and paid out of the matter or suit in respect of which such expenses incurred." Obviously there is the omission of the word "were" between the words 'expenses' and 'incurred' in that sub-section. I beg to move this amendment be now read a first time.

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

The motion was put and agreed to.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. Cummins, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case, the amendment was read a first and second time and agreed to.

BILL TO AMEND THE LIQUOR LICENSE ACT

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave now to revert to Order No. 2 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade Industry and Labour: to move the second reading of a Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to the sale of intoxicating liquor and the supply thereof in clubs.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a Bill to amend the Liquor Licences Act 1909. It is a Bill which is certainly long overdue. Since 1949 the House passed an Address commenting on certain deficiencies in the present Act, and it is as a result of those deficiencies, that this Bill is before us today. The House will be surprised to hear that for the last 30 years there have been very few amendments, and no substantial amendment at all, to this Act. It will be seen therefore, that Barbados in so far as the control of the sale of liquor is concerned, has kept a very lawful course and we have not had to resort to any substantial change in the law; but there is no doubt about it that the Act falls far short of its main purpose, and this is an age when the drinking of intoxicating liquors has increased. Therefore, there is need for better control and there is need for a system as has been provided for in this consolidating Bill which I am now introducing.

The "Objects and Reasons" set out very fully the aims of this Bill. As the position is, while the present Act purports to exercise control of the sale of intoxicating liquors, it does not fulfil its chief function, which is the effective regulations and control not only of the sellers of intoxicating liquors, but also of the premises in which those liquors are sold. One of the outstanding gaps in the present legislation is the absence of the control of clubs. I think that we are the only colony, or rather one of the few places in the world, which do not control proprietary clubs; and they can sell intoxicating liquor until any hour of the night, and they do not have to be subject to the same terms and conditions of control as other places which sell these intoxicating liquors. This Bill seeks to remedy that situation and bring these clubs under control.

There is also another aspect of the present law to which this House has called attention. I think it was the honourable junior member for St. Michael who has questioned it in the past, and that is, the discrimination so far as licensed premises are concerned and the fact that under the present law the same licence is given to a wholesaler and a retailer, and the same fees are charged for these various forms of licences. The House considered it to be unfair for a hotel which can be opened all night, and which obviously enjoys a patronage which is not afforded the ordinary retail shop, should pay the same fee as the ordinary retail shop in Baxters Road or Tudor Street. The same thing applies to the wholesaler and the retailer; the wholesaler pays the

same licence fee of $48 as the retailer, and the House considered that to be unfair since 1949 and this Bill seeks to remedy that defect.

The "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill further state that most Liquor Licences Acts give the licensing authority power to impose conditions and amenities, having regard to the class of business which is being carried on; and so one of the principal objects of this legislation is to bring us in line with modern legislation obtaining in other parts of the world.

If honourable members will look at Part I of the Bill, they will see that provision is being made for eight kinds of licences with their respective characteristics. Instead of having all businesses paying only $48.00 a year for a licence, provision is being made that in future there will be eight kinds of licences. There will be a wholesale licence, a retail licence, an hotel licence, a restaurant licence, an occasional licence, a members' club licence, a proprietary club licence, and a druggist licence.

The scale of fees is graduated according to the type of licence. A wholesale licencee will pay $200.00 per annum, while a retail licencee will pay $50.00 per annum which is only $2.00 more than the present charge. Hotel licences differ. In respect of an hotel containing up to ten bedrooms, the cost of a licence is $50.00 per annum; eleven to fifty, $100.00 per annum; and over fifty bedrooms, $150.00 per annum.

In respect of a restaurant licence the charge is $50.00 per annum; an occasional licence, $5.00 per day; a Members Club licence, $5.00 per annum; a Proprietary Club licence, $100.00 per annum; a Druggist licence $10.00 per annum.

Now, sir the procedure relative to the granting of licences under this Bill is much the same as obtains today. Under the present Act, the applicant makes application to the Police Magistrate of the District in which he or she intends to carry on business. He applies to the Magistrate of the District in which he or she intends to carry on business. He applies to the Magistrate for a certificate, the applicant pays five shillings to the clerk, and then the application is heard by the Magistrate associated with two Justices of the Peace residing in the district. In the absence of the J.P.'s the Magistrate can constitute the Court by himself.

On receipt of the application, the Magistrate causes a notice to be published and then fixes the particulars of the application on the premises within three days. Within 14 days he considers the application in open court. If the application is approved, the applicant is granted a certificate which he takes to the Accountant General and he then gets a licence on payment of the fee of $48.00.

That procedure is continued with in this Bill except for a slight change as regards the licensing authorities. Under this Bill it is not necessary that the persons constituting the Court along with the Magistrate must be J.P.'s. Another amendment is that the Magistrate can hold quarterly sessions instead of a special Court in December.

As is pointed out in the Objects and Reasons Part III of the Bill deals with licensing procedure and provides in general for public notice of applications for new licences or transfers of existing licences and for any person to be able to object to these applications upon giving notice stating his grounds. At the hearing, in addition to the applicant, any person who has objected and any member of the police force may appear as parties. Personal attendance of the applicant is required except in certain circumstances. An application for transfer or renewal may be granted by the Police Magistrate without reference to the licensing authority where no notice of objection has been filed and the Police certify that there is no objection. There is provision in the case of death etc., of the licensee for authority to be granted by the Police Magistrate to carry on the business until the next licensing sessions.

The Bill gives the right to appeal to the Assistant Court of Appeal from the decision of a Police Magistrate or the Licensing Authority. As far as Occasional Licences are concerned, the procedure is that which obtains today with what are called Temporary Licences. We are changing the name from Temporary Licences to Occasional Licences, and the fee is also increased.

One of the most important parts of the Bill is that which relates to control of clubs. Under this Bill, clubs are divided into two kinds. The House will see from the Definition Clause the difference between the two kinds of clubs. The two kinds are, Proprietary Clubs and Members Clubs. As the Definition Clause shows, a Members Club means "a club, all the property, funds and assets of which belong jointly to the members thereof, whether such are vested in trustees for the members or otherwise." On the other hand a Proprietary Club means "any club other than a Members Club."

Part IV of the Bill which is new, follows generally the existing law in Trinidad and the Bahamas. As the Objects and Reasons point out, the effect of this new provision may be summarised as follows:—

No club with less than fifteen members can sell or supply liquor on its premises. All clubs of fifteen or more members which wish to sell or supply intoxicating liquor on their premises, are obliged to register either as members' club or proprietary clubs and to obtain licences. Registration may be made only upon the order of a Police Magistrate.

I do not think that honourable members will want me to reiterate what is set out in the Objects and Reasons, and in the Bill. The issue of club licence is automatic. In the case of a Members Club there is a nominal licence duty of $5.00 only. Licences are to be reviewed annually. Employees Clubs, (a number of which have recently grown up in the island) may be registered as Members Club although functioning in Proprietary Club form. They will pay $5.00 which is the fee for Members Clubs.

5.05 p.m.

All the other parts of the world provide for the use of safe-guards and method of control and the usual finishing details which are necessary in Bills of this sort.

I say again, the objects of this Bill are primary to tighten up the control of the sale of liquor, to tighten up on the premises on which liquor is being sold, and in other words, to stop the defects which exist in the present legislation. The principal object is to remove certain discriminatory legislation; and by increasing fees in certain respects, it is hoped to cut out any unfairness which this one type of licence gives. This Bill has been under consideration for a long time. I do not think it would meet with any serious objection from any side of the House, because its Objects and Reasons have been the subject of much discussion by members from time to time in this House. I may say, that the Leader of the Opposition spoke to me on this Bill and explained that he would not be here today. I put it to him that this Bill should be sent to a Select Committee if the House is so willing, in spite of the length of time that it has been, so to speak, on the tapis. Should it be sent to Select Committee, I hope that the Committee will carry out its deliberations promptly, bearing in mind that this Bill seeks to correct some very bad features which exist in the present legislation; and by so correcting these defects, would bring us in line with more modern legislation which obtains elsewhere.

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

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, it is since 1938, that I have been agitating in this Chamber for an improvement of the existing legislation in connection with the sale of alcohol in this country; so perhaps, it is not inappropriate if I might contribute a few remarks on the second reading of this Bill. I certainly agree with the suggestion by the Hon. Minister that this Bill should be referred to the Select Committee; and had that suggestion not been made, I would have made such a motion. In fact I cannot conceive of any other means of honourable members getting together to iron out certain controversial parts of this Bill. I know the usual argument, that if you refer a Bill to a Select Committee that it is doomed to die what we call a natural death, but that is not always the case, and I see no reason why that should be so with this Bill. I think every honourable member of this House is in favour of amending the present law.

Mr. Speaker, you will recollect that up to 1922 the fee for a liquor licence was £5 when a 100% increase was made to bring it to £10. That was an emergency measure which was proposed by the then senior member for St. Lucy the late Sir Charles Pitcher Clarke, and that emergency measure still remains on the Statute Book. As honourable members will recollect, I have from time to time in this Chamber drawn attention to the great discrepancy which exists between the volume of business which is being done in the sale of liquor, say, between Messrs Goddard & Sons or the Colonnade, or Messrs Stansfeld Scott on the one hand, and the small shop-keeper who lives in Pie Corner or Josey Hill or Alexander on the other hand, and who pays the same fee of £10 for a liquor licence. Sir, the wholesaler pays the same thing as the retailer. I find myself bound to repeat what I have been doing over the past sixteen years, and that is, that there must be some proper differentiation between the amounts of fees paid by sellers of alcoholic liquors.

The Schedule to this Bill is probably the most controversial part of it. Although it may be said that the proposed increase on the retailer is only $2 a year, it is still an increase to the small country shop-keeper; and it can hardly be borne by them. It is stated in the Schedule that the duty to be paid in respect of a wholesale licence is $200 per annum and a retail licence $50. Need I repeat that on the one hand, there is a small rural shop-keeper who has only one or two doors with not more than five bottles of beer and five gallons of rum stocked, and on the other hand, there is the large wholesaler like Messrs Goddard & Sons who carries a tremendous stock, yet the difference in their licence is only a difference of four to one. I may be mistaken but I think as long ago as 1938 a liquor licence in Port-of-Spain was for $1,080, while $560 for one in San Fernando. What I have been agitating previously is, I do not see the reason why it should be beyond the resources of the present brains of this Government or the resources of this whole Committee, to evolve a sliding scale which would be equitable and would bear some relation to the amount of business done by those concerns which do this business, and at the same time it should be a scale which would be beneficial to the Government and to the people. I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition has not come out today, because, I feel he would be able to render some lip-service by the giving of some verbal support, on the part of those who operate big businesses.

5.15 p.m.

For a firm such as the Ice House to pay $200 per annum as a licence fee is childish, having regard to the volume of business done by places within a stone's throw of them, places like the Paramount Hotel. If there is something better than a sliding scale, well then let us have it. Now we are all conceding that this Bill is a step in the right direction, but it is a step which needs a lot of other steps which should not be beyond the ingenuity of a Select Committee of this House to devise. As a matter of fact, I feel that the Committee might function very quickly, especially when the subject is one which is not very far from one's month. The Members' Clubs Licence is proposed to be $5 per annum, but in the interest of the Public Treasury we want something more than $200; (I feel that $200 is inadequate for certain businesses) and we can make a difference of four to one between the small people and the tremendous sellers of liquor in Lower Broad Street.

I may assure the hon. Introducer of my support to this Bill, and I will also say that I cannot conceive we will be doing other than justice to it, if we did not support its reference to a Select Committee of this House.

Mr. Barrow entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. BRYAN: As the honourable Introducer has said, this Bill is the outcome of an Address which was passed on the floor of this House in September 1949. I, Mr. Speaker, had the privilege of piloting that Address through this House, (Cheers) and in spite of the time which has elapsed since the passing of that Address and the effort which is now being made to implement it, I extend a very hearty welcome to this Bill.

In giving this Bill my support I have a few general remarks to make. However, there are some points which I should have to reserve until we reach the Committee stage. A material part of this Bill is the licence fee, and I see it set out here that a wholesaler's licence is of the value of $200 per annum. Mr. Speaker, public opinion is somewhat divided on the point as to whether that amount is enough; but I look at the matter in some form of compromise, because the Government must guard against the evil of setting up any protection around the wholesale dealers of this island. If rumour is correct, I understand that the wholesale dealers went as far as to offer to pay the sum £100 for their licence. You can see at a glance what it would mean to them; it would create in itself a monopoly for the Alleyne Arthur & Companies, the J. N. Goddards and companies, and the J. & R's, and it would be prohibitive or rather it would kill the initiative of any young man who had the idea of entering into the wholesale field. Today there are several young dealers who are either knocking at the door of the wholesale trade or they have already crossed the threshold; and if this licence were placed at $480, that would be a very steep figure for them to start off their licence. I agree with the honourable senior member for St. Lucy when he said, that we should consider some sort of sliding scale on which to base the ultimate figures.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to throw out a warning to the Government as to a practice which obtains today, so that they may guard against it when this Bill becomes law; the practice is that a merchant who pays $48 for his licence today, sells his liquor wholesale at his business premises and not being satisfied with that, he fills his truck or van and sends it out canvassing for trade and effecting sales on the spot. I am wondering if in that case he is still within the ambit of the law to make sales direct from the lorry or van, and his business premises as well.

Now we come to the retail licence. Honourable members will recall that during the passing of that Address, I advocated not only the grading up of licences but also the grading down of these licences so as to ease some of the shopkeepers of whom I spoke — shopkeepers who sell Whisky, Brandy and Gin and who can only sell this liquor in small quantities at a time. Today they are worried to find that instead of being given some sort of relief, the Government has also graded them up to the tune of $50. I can anticipate the reply of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour about working out these figures down to the decimal point; but the difference of $2 is infinitesimal when you think in terms of it. However, when you think of the difficulties experienced by the small man, you must realise what that $2 means to him. I consider that the grading so as to bring some relief to that man also is still possible. The small dealer does not carry expensive liquors like Whisky, Brandy and so on.

There is the absence in this set-up of commission agents who are importers or agents for exporters. As I see it they should also be included in the category of the Wholesale dealers, and regulations should be made to prevent these commission agents from opening their cases and distributing them in small lots of one and two bottles to their friends at wholesale rates. In my opinion, that is unfair competition to the retailer who is now called upon to pay $50 a year for his licence fee.

5.25 p.m.

Now a licence for a hotel containing up to ten bedrooms is rated at $50.00 a year. I wonder if it were an omission on the part of the Government that they do not include "hotel" in the Definition Clause. As it stands here, a man can have a place with two or three bedrooms and call it an hotel and pay $50.00 a year for a licence. Then he can open his premises from morning until next morning. It is significant to note that the hotel with ten bedrooms has the advantage of selling liquor all day and all night, and on Sundays. The proprietor of such an hotel is called upon to pay the same $50.00 as the little shopkeeper in Baxter's Road; and the hours during which the shopkeeper can sell are limited by the Shops Closing Act.

That to my mind is unfair; because, the hotel owner can open his place all day and night, and he should be called upon to pay something extra for that advantage.

Another point is that guest houses have sprung up all over the island as we all know, and I do not see them included in this Bill. I am wondering if they come in the same category as hotels. If that is the idea, I think it would be well to make mention of it in the Bill.

I will now deal with the occasional Licence which to-day costs 10/-. Under this Bill the cost is to be raised to $5.00. The system to-day is that when a person applies for a Temporary Licence, he is sold one licence. I for myself cannot see why the cost of such a licence should be increased. I know for myself that there are several dances and such entertainments held at a loss to the holders. Why raise the licence charge? It does not increase your revenue by any substantial amount.

Members Clubs are to be rated at $5.00 per annum. I am not going to be as mild as the honourable member for St. Lucy. In the Objects and Reasons with reference to clubs we see: "Clubs are free from the provisions of this Legislation in so far as supply of liquor to members is concerned, and this has provided a loophole which there is reason to believe is being used for the supply of liquor contrary to the intention of the law."

Now in the Bill I see that the Government is giving these clubs the right to sell liquour on and off the premises, for the fee of $5.00 a year. That is creating another type of competition against the retailer, because members will not only be able to buy liquor on the club's premises and use them there, but they can buy them on the premises and drink them off the premises. That system obtains in clubs both member and proprietary, and in hotels like the Marine, the Royal and the Hastings Hotel. On any Sunday the people who patronise those places can buy any amount of drinks and take them away. I feel that clubs should not be given that distinct advantage.

In those places like the Marine Hotel there is nothing to prevent them from having a floor show, or dance or something of the kind even on Sundays, and selling refreshments to people who have the time and the means to enjoy that type of entertainment. But I remember that some time ago there used to be a function to which the average person used to look forward—Services of Songs on Sundays. Those functions were greatly curtailed because of the fact that the law said that you could not sell on Sundays. As a result those functions have practically died out.

If certain places can hold entertainments on Sundays for those who have the means to patronise them, and if they can sell refreshments on those occasions, some means should be devised whereby the working class man can have his form of entertainment if he so desires.

There is one other point to which I would like to refer, and that is, that according this Bill, children under the age of 18 years will not be employed in the sale or supply of intoxicating liquor. Now, Mr. Speaker, when we remember the island's school leaving age, we should not pass legislation which will prevent children of that age from obtaining employment. When you do that you are leaving them unemployed at a dangerous stage of their lives when the devil finds mischief for idle hands to do. We must bear in mind that any money which they can earn during this period will be useful to their parents.

At the same time, I welcome any legislation passed which will prevent people of questionable character from congregating in places where intoxicating liquour is sold. I would rather see that more rigidly enforced. But I do not think it is advisable to pass legislation at this time with so much unemployment in the island, to prevent youths from getting the seven dollars a week that is laid down in the law, and which will be of much assistance to their parents.

Those, sir, are just a few general remarks which I had to make on this Bill. There are other points which I will deal with when we go into committee on the Bill. With those few remarks, sir, I give my support to the motion that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I imagine that further debate on this Bill will only be a waste of time; that time could be used to some better advantage. The Bill in itself is a majestic document, although I believe much is left to be done. I do not know, sir, that the Hon. Minister of Trade really occupied himself with what seems to be the most important point—the wholesalers' licence.

5.35 p.m.

The amount of $200 is for a wholesaler's licence. There are several types of wholesalers. I am also wondering if you can have all these several types of licences for $50. You have a retail licence for $50, a Hotel licence in respect of a hotel containing up to ten bedrooms for $50 and a Restaurant licence for

$50. I do not see why the proprietor of a restaurant should be called upon to pay $50 when he is expected to sell to people who only consume food on the premises. I think much should be done as regards a change in the schedule. It is rather controversial. It will take some reshaping. I will not say anything more on this matter because I am assured that this Bill will be sent to the Select Committee. My only regret as to its being considered by a Select Committee, is that it would rest in a pigeon hole for a long time before it comes back to this House.

What I am also wondering, is if the Hon. Minister has worried about what appears to be fair and equitable, and what would bring satisfaction to the people who would pay these licences, or if this Bill has only been brought down with the purpose of keeping up the taxation plan of the Government. We know that every year at this time when the Draft Estimates for the coming year are being considered by the Estimates Committee there is a lot of hush-hush. This Bill may be the result of a question of the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Minister has intimated, I am hoping that this Bill will be sent to Select Committee; and that the Committee would deal with it and bring something back to the House which would suit this country generally.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, the reasons for this Bill going to Select Committee, are to accommodate the views put by honourable members as regards details. Most of the arguments are centered around the various fees to be paid by licences. The honourable junior member for St. Michael in his remarks said that public opinion varied on that point: I do not know if he referred to the drinking public or to the non-drinking public. Speaking as a member of the drinking public, I feel it is right that your heart should bleed for the poor shop-keeper; but does the honourable member feel convinced that an increase of $2 more would mean an appreciable difference to the poor shop-keeper? It is all right to say to soak the wholesaler, but I say there are certain big wholesalers who would even welcome paying as much as $500, because they know that such a fee would enable them to get a monopoly. I do not think I should labour on these points now, as it seems to be the desire of this House to refer this Bill to a Select Committee; and I am not objecting to that.

So far as the point raised about the school leaving age of eighteen years, I would like to tell hon. members that I consider that clause as a very necessary safe-guard in this Bill. I myself was a schoolteacher, and I have seen boys of fourteen years and under going into rum-shops and partaking of alcoholic beverages. I have seen some who have come to school literally drunk. It is a fact that some shop-keepers are so unscrupulous that they think nothing of demoralising youth. I think this is a very necessary safeguard, especially in a day like this when youth are so undisciplined. When it comes to a youth being employed in a retail shop selling alcoholic beverages, I do not think it is an atmosphere which he should be placed in. The honourable junior member for St. Michael is a proprietor and his business may be well run, but there are other businesses which really need this safe-guard.

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

Bill Referred to Select Committee

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, in view of what I said earlier, I feel it is essential that this Bill should be sent to a Select Committee. I therefore beg to move that this Bill be sent to a Select Committee.

Mr. BRYAN: I beg to second that.

The question that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative, without division.

5.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Subject to the approval of the House I have the honour to appoint the following members to serve on that Select Committee:— The honourable senior member for St. Lucy (Mr. BRANCKER), the honourable junior member for St. John (Mr. VAUGHAN), the honourable junior member for St. Michael (Mr. BRYAN), the honourable senior member for the City (Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY), the honourable junior member for Christ Church (Mr. GODDARD), the honourable junior member for St. George (Mr. MILLER), the honourable junior member for St. Joseph (Mr. SMITH), the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour (Hon. R. G. MAPP), and the honourable junior member for St. Philip (Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY).

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that there be added to that Select Committee the name of my colleague, the honourable junior member for St. Lucy?

Mr. SPEAKER: Subject to the approval of the House, I also have the honour to appoint the honourable junior member for St. Lucy (Mr. TUDOR) to serve on that Select Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today and for the year. I beg to move the adjournment of this House until Tuesday, 4th January, 1955. I am sure the House will take this opportunity of wishing Your Honour the compliments of the Season.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 4th January, 1955 at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

5.55 p.m.