

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 28th Sept. 1954.

Pursuant to the adjournment the House of Assembly met to-day at 12 noon.

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Hon. G. H. ADAMS B.A., C.M.G., Q.C., (*Premier*), Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), 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 Opposition*), Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES B.A., Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER, Hon. C. E. TALMA (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*).

Prayers were read:

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for circulation.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that, I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month ending 31st August, 1954;

Also, Statement of Revenue and Expenditure from the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of St. Joseph for the half year ending 31st August, 1954.

Also, Statement of Revenue and Expenditure from the Commissioner of the Parish of St. Joseph on Tenantry Roads for the half-year ending 31st August, 1954.

Also, Report and Accounts from the Barbados Sugar Industry Agricultural Banks for the year ending 30th June, 1954.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor to lay the following:—

MESSAGE NO. 24/1954.

His Excellency The Governor
To
The Honourable The House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to the Address dated the 22nd of June from the Honourable the House of Assembly regarding the remuneration of the Chaplain of the House of Assembly, and to inform the Honourable House in reply that after careful consideration the Governor-in-Executive Committee, while agreeing that there should be some increase in the rate of remuneration of the Chaplain, regrets that he is unable to accept the amount of the increase recommended by the Honourable House in their Address referred to above.

2. It is considered that the salary of the Chaplain should be increased from \$12.00 a month to \$20.00 a month. In arriving at this figure the Governor-in-Executive Committee has been guided by the rates of increases granted to Vicars in the past salary revisions and has concluded that the figure of \$20.00 a month approximates more closely to those increases than does the increase recommended by the Honourable House.

3. As the remuneration of the Chaplain of the Legislative Council has always been the same as that of the Chaplain of the House of Assembly, the Governor-in-Executive Committee proposes to make provision in the draft Bill for increasing the salary of the Chaplain of the Legislative Council to \$20.00 per month also.

4. The necessary legislation to give effect to the decisions referred to above will be submitted to the Legislature as soon as possible.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados.

27th September, 1954.

Annual Report of the Barbados Regiment for the year 1953—54.

Statement of the sums of money paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police during the quarter ended 31st March, 1954.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 12 Order, 1954, creating the post of Principal Peasant Agricultural Instructor.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 13 Order, 1954, creating an additional post of Road Overseer, Grade II. Department of Highways and Transport.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 12 Order, 1954."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 13 Order 1954."

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of 2,310 square feet of land at Jessamy Lane, Golden Square, for part of the site for the new Fire Station.

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

Resolution to place the sum of \$5,720 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1954—55, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1954—55 No. 19 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply, at its next meeting to consider the Money Resolutions of which I have just given notice.
12.25 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICES

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY (on behalf of Mr. Crawford) gave notice of the following Addresses:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly are profoundly concerned over the existing position with regard to,

1. (a) the unavailability of electric power in Barbados to large numbers of people who require it.
- (b) the difficulties which, for reasons of which the Government is not unaware, confront the Barbados Electric Supply Corp., in its attempt to obtain capital for the erection of additional plant and other essential development.

2. The House desire to draw to Your Excellency's attention the fact that the existing plant would permit of immediate expansion of the Corporation's service which would entail capital expenditure of £60,000; on an average estimated cost of £500 per district, this amount would enable 120 new areas at various points throughout the island to obtain electric current with a minimum of delay.

3. The House are of the opinion that, in view of the existing circumstances with regard to the raising of capital in London for which the B.E.S. Corp., is not solely responsible, the Government should take whatever steps may be necessary in order to make this £60,000 available to the Corporation at the earliest date possible, either by way of loan or preferably by purchase of stock, in order that the distress and inconvenience which result from the unavailability of electricity might be partially relieved until such time as the \$3 million required by the Corporation for planned capital expansion can be acquired either on loan with the assistance of the Government or by Government purchase of stock.

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House are profoundly concerned over developments which increasingly affect adversely the operation of the recently established Textile and Shirt Industries in Barbados.

2. The House desire to point out that in consequence of these factors hundreds of employees have been already laid off and the industries are faced with virtual extinction.

3. The House are convinced that steps should be taken immediately to ascertain, among other things, what protection and assistance, if any, should be given these industries in order to guarantee their continuance, and what should be done to make the colony more self-sufficient in this direction.

*The House Of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

The House are deeply concerned over the grave situation which, in consequence of the inadequate number of medical practitioners, confronts the general public who are unable to obtain medical assistance at night.

The House would point out that it is physically impossible for the small number of physicians in the colony who are harassed and overworked during the day to cope with the situation, but would also emphasise that cases are becoming more frequent in which sick people have died at night for want of medical attention.

The House respectfully suggest that as a temporary measure, in order to alleviate the position until there is an increase in the number of doctors, there should be on night service at the General Hospital, a small panel of doctors who shall be available to the general public on payment of the normal fees.

*The House Of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

The House desire to draw to the attention of Your Excellency the intense dissatisfaction which obtains throughout the colony on the part of small cane farmers in respect of the unreasonably low advance payment they have received from sugar factories for canes reaped during the current crop, and the unsatisfactory operation of the Domestic Sugar Agreement, in so far, among other things, as it guarantees an equitable price for such canes.

The House desire to emphasize that indications are that the total price which small cane farmers will receive for this crop shall be completely uneconomic and respectfully request that an investigation be conducted into the matter in order to ensure that all sections of the sugar industry shall obtain a fair share of the sugar price.

QUESTIONS

Mr. MILLER tabled the following questions:—

To enquire of the Minister of Social Services.

1. Is the Government aware that there is in our midst a local concert singer, Miss Nell Hall, who possesses great potentialities?

2. Will the Government actively consider the possibility of granting this talented local artiste a scholarship or some other means of assistance so that she may be able to further the development of her art?

To enquire of the Minister of Social Services.

1. Is the Government aware that there is a need for more communal baths and latrines in the parish of Saint George, notably in the districts of Ellerton, Drax Hall, St. Judes, Market Hill and South District?

2. Will the Government consider granting some financial assistance to the parochial authority of Saint George so as to enable them to proceed with the construction of these public conveniences at an early date?

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is Order No. 1 on the Order Paper.

REPLY TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—Before the Orders of the day are entered there are one or two matters I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention. The first is the reply to H.E. speech made at the re-opening of the Legislature. I do not know if it is to be treated as a speech made at the opening of the Legislature; but if so the Rules say that it should be brought up at the next meeting. In this connection, we found ourselves in difficulty last time. I wonder if some motion should not be made today, that consideration of the reply to His Excellency Speech should be deferred since the reply is not yet ready.

Mr. SPEAKER: I quite appreciate the honourable member's suggestion; and my interpretation of Rule 26 is, the Rule holds good anytime that the Governor makes a Speech to the Legislature, either at the opening of the Legislature, or after a prorogation.

VACANT POST OF MESSENGER AND LIBRARY ATTENDANT

Mr. LEWIS: There is another matter. I was told that on the last occasion the House met, nothing was done about filling the vacancy on the Staff of the House,—I mean the post of Messenger and Library Attendant. I am suggesting that the House should at an early date, say that it will advertise for applicants for the post.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suppose that the honourable Leader of the House has taken note of the honourable member's suggestion. That lies within the province of the Leader of the House.

12.35 p.m.

VACANCY IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LEWIS: There is yet another matter to which I would like to draw Your Honour's attention. It is the fact that one of our members has forfeited his seat. I think that we are in honour bound, to be concerned about filling that seat, irrespective of whether or not the machinery exists for filling it. I think that we should endeavour to apprise the Head of the Administration that a writ should be issued for the election of a new member. I understand that the Crown has notified the House that a member has accepted an Office of Profit under the Crown, and I think that the House should be anxious to show that it is willing and ready to have the entire population properly represented. In my opinion, I think we should pass an Address to the Head of the Administration asking that a writ should be issued. I deplore the fact, that you Sir, could not issue it yourself.

BILL TO MAKE SPECIAL PROVISION FOR THE USE OF EXISTING REGISTERS OF VOTERS AT AN ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Honourable Premier: To move the second reading of a Bill to make special provision for the use of existing registers of voters at an election of members to serve in the General Assembly.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I think honourable members will have gathered from the "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill, that at least in the present state of the Law, no provision exists for the use of a particular register in case of holding of a bye-election. Therefore, it is necessary to have legislation declaring that as in the case of a general election, a certain list is valid for the purpose of holding a bye-election to enable the rest of the Law to be complied with. Honourable members will remember, a revised list of voters is the list to be used at a General Election. There having been no proper provision in the 1951 Act for the use of the 1951 List for a bye-election, and it having been considered that there was time before another general election, for a new Act to be introduced, it would be more sensible to introduce a completely new Act. Inasmuch as the Universal Suffrage Act was a new Act in itself, it was thought that there was no hurry for the introduction of a new Act. Faced as we are with the necessity of having a bye-election, it is therefore incumbent on the Legislature to pass this Bill declaring what would normally be the legislation, when the new Act comes into operation. The present register of voters should be the register of voters in connection with the coming bye-election or any bye-election. That will enable the Revising Officer to comply with the law, and to bring this List up-to-date. It is thought that the Revising Officer can do that by the months of September and October without much difficulty. I think honourable members will see the point in my remarks, and the absolute necessity to pass this Bill in order that the bye-election will take place before we have a new Act. No bye-election can take place now if we read the Universal Suffrage Act together with the Act of 1901. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I think it is unfortunate that we should find ourselves in this position, especially when we are paying good salaries to our legal department; and especially in view of the fact, that soon after the last General Election, it was rumoured that we had no machinery for holding a bye-election. I have heard, and I have heard it in circles which one could easily suspect, that the Government knew about this matter. It was regrettable, provided the Legal Department is sufficiently staffed and good salaries are paid, that we should find ourselves in such a position that only when a bye-election is necessary, we can see what we are up against. I think that either some such Act like this should have been passed immediately after the General Election, or early opportunity should have been taken to bring the Representation of the Peoples Act up-to-date, because the representation of the people should be of paramount importance to Parliament. It is of paramount importance to the people.

Having said that, I would like to draw the attention of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to what appears to be something unusual. I think the honourable member has said that he does

not like the drafting of Bills to be criticised in this House, (Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have never said that,) because it is a reflection on himself and the Attorney General of this colony, inasmuch as they are lawyers on the Executive Committee who send down Bills to the Legislature. However, I am telling him that this is a genuine attempt on my part, in asking him to consider what I am saying, so that if there is anything in what I am saying, it can be remedied before you, Mr. Speaker, affix your signature to a Bill and have it criticised in the Other Place, and returned to us, because it is not in the form of a Bill at all.

12.45 p.m.

For that purpose Sir, and with your permission, I will refer to Clause 2 of this Bill, which says "For the removal of doubts it is hereby declared that—" "I do not remember seeing that expression in a Bill before. It looks to me like a form of declaration or proclamation. Other Bills have come to this House clearing up doubts of interpretation of Acts, and in no one instance, have I seen any Bill starting off like this one. I have seen such bills with a preamble "whereas doubts have occurred etc. etc." I have seen in some instances, words such as "notwithstanding anything to the contrary, this is what you want it to mean." For a Bill to come here starting off with "for the removal of doubts it is hereby declared that" looks peculiar to me. It may be a very foolish idea of mine, but I merely say it because this expression sounds strange to me. I would not like the Other Place to take this early opportunity of telling the Peoples' Representatives that they do not know what they are doing, or for some high authority to say so secretly. Of course this Act is not meant in to remain on the Statute Book for any length of time; but if it is not in its proper form, we should take early steps to put it right.

I do not know if the Hon. Premier would condescend to reply, or if he would say something about it when this House goes into Committee on it. As I have said before; it seems to me a very good thing to hang on a wall as a declaration or proclamation; but as a bill it reads peculiar to me. I have not had the time to get any assistance from people who know more about it than I do.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker,—There is a small matter that comes to my mind about this Bill. As far as what the Hon. Premier told us, this bye-election will be held on the 1951 list of voters. In other words, I do not know whether he means to tell us that new voters would be appended to the 1951 list. Since 1951, there should be a lot of voters who have attained the age of 21 years; they should be also some who have passed away; therefore, I am wondering how that list would work, and whether it would be proclaimed to the public for electioneering purpose. It has also occurred to me, that some of those voters may have changed their address. It is possible that a lot may have moved out of the parish since that time. I do know that we have Registering Officers, but as far as I know, they have not put on fresh voters to that list for the House of Assembly. I am a bit confused over this matter and I really would like it to be cleared up.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am afraid, the honourable junior member for St. Andrew did not hear me clearly. I specifically said, you could not have an election without a revised list. The 1951 list, not being revised, this Bill was making provision that that list should be the list for the election; and if necessary, that the list should be revised. I believe, I have not got it direct, that some attempt has al-

ready been made to get hold of the names of the persons who would have become of age since 1951; but if you pass this Bill, in the way it is drafted, any Act which may have been done before the passing of this Bill would become valid. Suppose, for instance, that the Revising Officer has already begun to strike out people whom he has been informed are dead, this Bill would validate that Act. It may be doubtful, if he had any authority to strike out names merely because they were reported to him as dead; but this Act now makes that act valid, and he would not have to go all over that again. (A VOICE: Suppose they are not dead?) Do you think any Revising Officer strikes out a name unless he has good grounds? Until the Representation of Peoples Act is revised, anything done after, as a result of this Act, makes valid all revision done; and for all purposes, the 1951 list as revised shall be the list for the future bye-election.

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: In reply to the honourable member's question as regards an honourable member accepting a job of profit under the Crown, I wish to tell this honourable House that in the case of the resignation of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy, under Section 6 of the Representation of the People's Act, the House will have to act at once. Section 5 states other reasons for which this House is not bound to act.

The question was then put and agreed to and the House went into Committee, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

12.55 p.m.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS moved seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS that Clause 2 stand part.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—Before Clause 2 is passed, the Hon. Premier should answer the question which my colleague asked. I am not criticising the drafting of this Clause; I am a layman. What I am saying, when a member of this House asks a question, it out of politeness that the Minister to whom it addressed should answer. If it is an ignorant question, say so.

I have underlined myself to the point raised by my colleague. I have never seen it put this way before. Learned as the Hon. Premier is, he could say that nothing is wrong and sit down. If he did that, my colleague would be stupid to offer any more criticism, because the Premier would be learned in the law and Legal Phraseology. I say it is bad manners. I do not care who gets offended.

The Clause says, "for the removal of doubt it is hereby declared." I have never seen it put that way before. I am a layman, and I have never had the opportunity to become learned in the Law. If my colleague asks if this is wrong, it is not right or fair to refuse to answer him. The same treatment that is meted out to him today, will be meted out to any of us tomorrow.

Today is for Tom, and tomorrow for Dick. I challenged any member of the House, including the Ministers, to say that they have seen a Bill in this form before. I have always seen it in the Preamble. The Hon. Premier should tell us whether this is the way it is done now. I tell members of this House

that the same way my colleague is treated today, they will be treated tomorrow. They should not stand for that. They have been elected here.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable member is an expert on bad manners. Getting up and shouting the way he has done, will not make it any better. I have said here already, there are certain questions which I will always ignore. I took pains to say last Tuesday, and I repeated it today, that they were some people who had doubts about this matter. I personally have no doubts. I made the mistake of thinking that you only had to say A. B. C., and every one will understand that you are referring to the alphabet. There is a doubt about what the Revising Officer has been doing. I have not asked anyone if the Revising Officer has struck out anyone's name. I have heard that you have already to do some sort of revision without legal authority, or at least with possible doubtful authority. You therefore say in the Bill, "for the removal of all doubt" so as to make it sure that what the Revising Officer is doing, is right.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am sure that the Hon. Premier would appreciate that the point he is making, has nothing to do with what we asked. All that my colleague is asking, is that he say, learned as he is in the law, whether he has ever seen in the past a Section of a Bill drafted in this way; and whether it is correct. Of course I understood what he said about the Bill itself. We are only asking him to say whether this Section, drafted as it is, is in order.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: All this noise and fuss could have been saved if the honourable senior member for the City had consulted the honourable and distinguish member for St. James. (Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Why?) Because he is part of the set up of the Electors Association. I do not know whom the honourable junior member for the City approached, but any law student could tell him that there are certain laws in which when a decision of the Court is made, fifty per cent of the lawyers think the decision is wrong, and fifty per cent think it is right. All that this Bill says is, for the removal of doubts, you declare so and so. What is the use of the honourable senior member for the City having a super legal expert in his ranks, if he does not make use of him?

Mr. LEWIS: I am quite accustomed to this type of thing. On many occasions I have seen Bills come in here, and I have criticised them—the Entertainment Tax Bill for example; and those Bills have come back to us from the Other Place with many amendments to which I had drawn attention, when the Bills were before this Chamber. It would appear to me, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is himself conscious that something is wrong; but he has been clever enough not to say yet that this is the right way or wrong way to put it. He has now said that someone has misunderstood him to say that there is no doubt. That is not so. We have always understood him to say that the whole Bill is the result of a doubt or doubts existing somewhere; and those doubts must exist in the Law Office of the Crown. It is a Bill that has come to the House to clear up a doubt. Speaking from memory, I am saying, this is the first Bill that I have seen with this form of declaration. I have seen it put, "notwithstanding anything expressed or implied" in such and such an Act, it means so and so. I have also seen it put, "notwithstanding anything to the contrary", you should interpret it in such and such a way. I have always seen the "whereas" form used in the preamble. I have never seen it this way. If the Hon. Premier is so sure that it is right, let him get up and say so. Do not get up and say that he told

us that there is a doubt, and that we do not seem to believe that there is a doubt.

The honourable member has been cleverly avoiding questioning this form, because it seems that he does not want to change it. If someone in the Other Place brings up the point, it may be changed and sent back to us; the honourable member will swallow it then because one of his 'buddies' would have sent it back to us. What I am saying is, the Speaker of this House who has got to sign this Bill, should be spared having to sign something that is not a Bill at all. I know that there is a doubt, whether it is a foolish doubt, or legal nonsense or whatever it is.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and agreed to.

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

On motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. H. G. CUMMINS in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.
1.05 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—I am taking this opportunity to ask for leave to give notice of the questions which I handed in to the Clerk since last week.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: As far as the leave asked for by the honourable senior member for St. John is concerned, I do not think that the House is in a mood to grant the honourable member that leave; but if the honourable member is in any doubt, I can put the matter to the House. The honourable member is asking leave to give notice of a question which he has handed to the Clerk. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the honourable member. (After a pause)

There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member to give notice of the questions.

Mr. ALLDER: To inquire of the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:—

(1) Is the Hon. Minister aware that there is dissatisfaction of the Sugar Workers of this Colony over the long delay in the payment of their production Bonus?

(2) If the answer to the above is in the affirmative will the Hon. Minister state the cause for such delay?

(3) Will the Hon. Minister state whether this practice of delay will be avoided in the future?

(4) Will the Hon. Minister cause to be set up a Committee to investigate the practice of employers and with the view of bringing about the immediate payment of such Bonus?

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES NO. 17

Head II: Secretariat

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—This is one of the usual Supplementary Resolutions which are brought before the House from time to time. I propose to deal with each Head of the Schedule

separately. Although I think that the notes are comparatively full, if there is anything which I can add to them, I will do so. As regards Head 2, Secretariat, the House has provided an additional Assistant Secretary and this amount of money set out here, is for the purpose of providing the furniture for his part of the room. Three Electric fans will be provided for the younger Ministers, including the Hon. Minister of Social Services. I beg to move that Head 2, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—It is good to see that the Ministers are putting themselves in such a position that they can give the maximum amount of work; but what I am wondering is, if there are any clerks there, who are similarly placed, and who have not been given this facility. If the Ministers need these facilities, then the clerks would need them as well. I wonder if the Ministers expect that they can keep themselves cool and the clerks can be kept hot. If what I am questioning is a fact, then it would seem to me that there has been an oversight. If they had provided these facilities for others, they would know that anybody who is going there would need electric fans. If the other persons have not got the facilities of electric fans, then I think the Ministers should see to it that they get them. The Ministers will be out of their offices for much longer periods than the clerks. The fans are for the Ministers and the water-cooler for the use of the staff and Ministers; I am wondering if the clerks have use of electric fans already.

1.15 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—The items to be bought, are not itemised here; therefore, one does not know the individual cost of these items. I am wondering, Sir, if the Hon. Premier who is handling this resolution, would give us an itemised statement so as to guide us as regards the prices to be paid for these items. My reasons for asking for this information, is because some time ago, the Government brought down a resolution for a very substantial sum to purchase a chair and a desk, and it caused a howl in business circles.

I feel, Sir, we have reached a stage, when we should try to economise, even in the furnishing of Government offices. I should like to suggest to Government, that it has become necessary for Government to have a purchasing agent. Members of the Government should give this matter consideration. The millions of dollars which Government spends every year to purchase equipment for the respective departments of Government, necessitate some permanent official, who would be in a position to acquaint himself with prices of various articles, and who would seek the cheapest when Government wants to buy articles. I am sure sir, no purchasing agent of the Government would think about acquiring a desk and chair for \$300 and odd. Why, some of the biggest offices in Bridgetown, are furnished throughout for that sum or less. I think that was a great mistake on the part of Government. The Government just depends on the people who make and sell these things to submit the prices to Government; and the Executive Committee does not have the opportunity to compare their prices with other prices. Government does not know whether cheaper equipment can be had. I hope sir, my suggestion for the employment of a purchasing agent to transact Government business of this sort, will be given some consideration. I am sure the savings which this official would cause the Government to get, would be more than the salary which this official would be paid, and more than the cost of running his office.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I do not know if it is necessary to correct the honourable member, but I would like to know which big office in Bridgetown, is furnished throughout for \$300 or less than that! I am sure that they certainly did not go up Roebuck Street to get the furniture to furnish it. Be that as it may, I want to assure this House that the Government has profited by the criticisms of the honourable senior member for St. John.

With regard to the break-down which the honourable member asked for, it is as follows:—

Desk and Chair			\$195.00
Shelf			38.00
3 fans (electric)			325.00
Water-cooler			600.00
			\$1158.00

I would also like to say, it is the offices of the Minister of Social Services and the Minister of Communication, which are hotter than the other two. It is for these offices that the electric fans are required.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—I would like to say that as far as the new offices are concerned, honourable members know that the offices of the Ministers to which reference has just been made, can be very hot. Honourable members know that to the east are the offices of the Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries and Permanent Secretaries. There is a partition separating the office of the Minister from that of his Secretary. That partition prevents the air from above, from coming in; therefore, the Secretaries are better off than the Ministers for air. Sir, as soon as 3 o'clock comes, candidly, I have to leave my office because of the heat.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, — Ministers should be very careful over how much they spend on their conveniences. They should also bear in mind that Civil Servants previously occupied the quarters which they are in now; therefore, those servants must have suffered the same inconveniences.

The Honourable Premier referred to the buying of equipment from up Roebuck Street. I can tell him, when it comes to the furnishing of Government offices, from the Head of the Department right down to the long-grade clerk, do not need to have an elaborate mahogany desk, such as I have seen in the Labour Department. Everybody knows that a properly made pitch pine desk would last just as long, and cost much less than an elaborate mahogany desk. Sir, unless we are prepared to scrape up money out of the gutter, that would be the only means I see available as to how we can continue spending as we are doing on equipment. Sir, my reason for my drawing this to the Government, is because I want Government to find ways and means of spending less on equipment for Government offices.

The question that Head 2, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD III.—ACCOUNTANT GENERAL

Head III Accountant General, was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The note to this Item is very full. I can only add that the office of the Accountant General is the most hopeless of all public offices. Everybody knows that the building of the Highway and Transport is like a shack; but nevertheless, there is a lot more space in the offices of that de-

partment than in the Treasury. If honourable members go into the Treasury, they will see that they will have to squeeze between tables and chairs to get from one person to another. I can say that this Department is really extremely bad for floor space. The fact that 14 clerks are working within 579 sq. ft. of floor space, will prove that. You will find in that office, 3 clerks sitting at one desk. No doubt, the conditions of that office through lack of floor space, are extremely bad. I need not tell honourable members that this Government is opposed to renting offices. I may say that such was the policy of former Governments, and also of the members of the present Government. We are opposed to the renting of offices for our employees, and would put off any application for such, but in this case, conditions are too bad to be allowed to continue any longer. If honourable members read the note, they will see that this office is more than congested. I will draw to honourable members' attention the last sentence of paragraph three. It reads as follows:—

"It has become necessary to partition off a portion of the Accountant General's office in order to provide accommodation for one of his senior officers, and to utilise a part of the space formally used by the public to accommodate two members of the staff. Floor space now available for accommodating 14 clerks is 579 sq. feet, which allows an area of about 41 sq. ft. per person. This is exclusive of the fixed space occupied by the Tellers' cages, but includes a passage way in which two clerks now have to work; this passage way leads to the vault, and senior officers moving in and out of the vault unavoidably cause frequent interruptions."

I wish to assure the House that the renting of these premises will be a temporary arrangement, pending the erection of new Government offices. We therefore ask the Legislature for \$1,200. For six months' rent, we need \$900, plus \$300 for the erection of temporary partitions, and for other incidental expenses. I have been over it with the Accountant General and the Financial Secretary; in addition, the Director of Public Works has approved of the building as being suitable. For this reason, we are asking the Legislature to agree to the voting of this money, so that we may be able to transfer in a day or two.

I move Sir, that this Head stand part of the schedule.
1.25 p.m.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman,—The person who wrote the explanatory note, went into very great detail. I see that it is proposed to spend \$300 for partitions. In an office like this, the Accountant General should have a private office. The rest of the staff should be in one general office with the principal clerk in the position to see what everyone is doing. The proposed arrangements make possible too many cubby-holes, and the hiding away of too many clerks. The Head of the Department, I repeat, will need a private office; but let everyone else get out in the general office with proper space between them. There should not be too many partitions, or else they would come back for more fans. We are in the tropics, and we need space.

At one time the Royal Bank of Canada rented out this office to the Income Tax Commissioner. This office is very well ventilated; and if the Government avoids putting too many partitions into it, the staff will be comfortable in there.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I think the honourable member is quite right in saying that this

building was rented at one time by the Government; but I am sure, the Government officer who occupied it, did not say that it was a cool office without the assistance of a fan or two. I would counsel the Government that if any partition is needed there, it must be part and parcel of the place already. Otherwise, I must say that I do not see any sense in partitions at all. I would advise Government to take the \$300 and install fans. The honourable junior member for Christ Church was wrong when he stated the place was properly ventilated. It has the Public Building right above it. I have had to endure it some years myself, and I know that it is unreasonable to ask clerks to go there without offering them some artificial cooling arrangements.

I must say that the rent for this space seems rather high to me. It is only a part of the first floor, and I think that \$150 a month rent is much too high. I suppose that Government was in the unfortunate position in having to get some place, and this was a good opportunity of getting a good building to rent near the Treasury. It is going to be a very hot place for clerks to work in, and the partitions will make it worse. It would be wrong for us to vote money for partitions to-day, when we know that there will be no need for partitions for the clerks, Government is taking over there.

I quite agree that there is need for room in the Treasury. But if you take into consideration the Report of Mr. Foster the Organisation and Methods expert, who was here recently, it certainly would not appear justifiable at this stage, for the Government to rent this place. There is to be a re-organisation of the Treasury and the Audit Office; and I think that perhaps when this re-organisation is completed, Government will find room enough in that part of the Public Buildings for both offices, if even some of the clerks from the Treasury have to occupy rooms in the Audit Office. Reference was made in that Report to having the Treasury staff divided. I really feel, before the House has had an opportunity of considering Mr. Foster's Report, it is wrong to go and rent this building or any building.

I know that for a number of years the Treasury has been cramped. I know that the people who work in it, must be very glad to get this place near by. But the rent is very high; and the Government should pay some attention to the renting of these places, because it is Government who should institute rent control. If Government is willing to pay exorbitant rents, such would push up rents all over the island. It will be taken as a criterion. The Government rented a house in Bay Street as an extension for hospital nurses, and they had to give it up, because too much rent was charged. Imagine the Government confessing that! I think that they will be paying too much for this place, which they now propose to rent. From the outside, you cannot see the space you will be getting; but if you go inside, you will see that they will be getting a very small space. I know that a place near this has been offered for rent for a good time. There is no large number of people anxious to get in there. It is a very hot place. If you ask the previous Government officers who occupied it, they are bound to tell you that it is very hot, unless they are very exceptional human beings. The partitions should be abandoned. The money should be spent on electric fans, otherwise you will have to come back and ask for a vote for both. It might appear that the place is properly regulated, but it is not.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman,—Although the Resolution itself seeks to provide premises for the Accounts Branch of the Department, I think that a lot of the congestion over there, is a result of there

being an inadequate number of tellers' cages. Most of the congestion is therefore caused, because people have to wait in a queue for hours on an end, before they can get to the tellers' cages. I am wondering if the new premises would provide additional accommodation for the general public, or if it would only take care of the Accounts Branch.

I think that the Government should be prepared to say whether or not, they will increase the number of tellers' cages, which would bring about greater convenience to the public who have to use them. There is nothing in this note to indicate that they are increasing the number of tellers' cages. The note merely says that it has become necessary to partition off a portion of the Accountant General's private office, in order to provide accommodation for one of his senior officers. I am wondering if the Government is aware that the trouble in this department is the congestion of the booths. We have long queues being held up for a number of hours, and something should be done to relieve the congestion there.
1.35 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Certainly, Mr. Foster's Report has been circulated to honourable members. I do not know if I have been picked out for the privilege of getting a copy of that Report, but I think that the Report has been circulated; and if the honourable member would read that part of the Report pertaining to the Treasury, he would see where the trouble is. There are many suggestions in that Report, and there is one suggestion with which I do not agree. However, if the honourable member will read that Report, I repeat, he will see where the trouble is.

Mr. MILLER: The Government is aware of Mr. Foster's Report; and it leaves no room for the Government to consider waiting on that Report. This is what is regarded as an emergency.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: There are occasions when we must say, in the explanatory notes, attempts are really made to give a clear picture of the situation; and that has been done here. I have listened quite clearly, to all that has been said about the difficult conditions under which people in the Accountant General's Department work. I agree with all of that; but I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Premier, in respect of the Assistant Court of Appeal, prison cells have been turned into offices. I am sure that the Hon. Premier has never taken the opportunity of asking the Hon. Minister of Social Services to visit those premises, because he would condemn them before he entered them. The conditions under which the clerks work there, is most shocking; if they occupied one of the slave huts in St. Lucy, the position could not be worse.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the honourable member to keep to Head III of the Schedule, with which we are dealing.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am dealing with that; but the Honourable Premier has always expressed the wish, that honourable members should draw to his attention, anything which they see wrong.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must tell that to the Honourable Premier in his office.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What I am saying is this; this Head of the Schedule, which deals with the bad conditions obtaining at the Accountant General's Department, is a part of the Civil Service; and what I am drawing to the attention of the Honourable Premier, is that similar conditions exist in another Department of the Service.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have given the honourable member the latitude to draw that matter to the attention of the Honourable Premier.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Anyway, I am sure that the Honourable Premier appreciates, while we agree that we are spending this money in an emergency, because we have a report before us, we still have to make conditions comfortable so that people can work properly. I only rose to say that in future, all the explanatory notes should be as clear as this one. While we can call for more information to-day, I believe the Honourable Premier will tell us the number of clerks who will be put in this place. The rent for the premises is alright, and you will know what the space is; but we want to know if it is necessary to rent such elaborate premises. I suppose the Honourable Premier would have at his finger tips, the amount of floor space, and he will answer the criticism which has been made. I suppose he will tell us what the floor space is, that the necessity for renting arose because of the number of clerks, and that they could not rent one-half of the space, but they had to rent all of it. I say finally, now that they are trying to make some Civil Servants more comfortable, I urge upon the Honourable Premier to take another look at the cells which have been converted for the use of the Assistant Court of Appeal; and I hope he will do something immediately, if it is only to raise the roof; because during the day, people have to come out under the trees. I am sure the Honourable Premier will not forget that he had to pass this way. I am sure he will tell us the number of clerks which they are carrying over to this building, and if they are carrying a sufficient number for that area.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I cannot tell the honourable member the exact number of clerks. I can say that there will be room for a lunch room, toilet, etc.. The whole area will be 2,640 sq. ft. It is quite possible for us to use a part of that room for another department. Where we are renting elsewhere, we will save that rent by putting somebody else there. As regards the rent, the Bank's Head Office in Canada has said, the premises will be rented at the same rate as obtains in Bridgetown. The Government has not been poked in the eye as regards this rent. We have been advised that this rent is cheap, as regards the rent in other places. These partitions will not be built to reach the roof; and I understand, because of that, there will be no necessity for electric fans.

1.45 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I would really like to know the reason why the Government has decided to rent this office for \$150. This same Government has quarters down at the Customs Department, which are occupied by the Schooner Pool Association, which is a private concern; and this Association does not pay any rent for these quarters. If the Government has not remembered that, I hope now that the Government is aware of it, Government will try to get rent from the Schooner Pool Association, or turn that Association out and utilise the quarters for the extension of Government offices. That should be done instead of going outside and spending \$1,800 per year for rental of offices. I am hoping that the Government bench would say something on this matter. For years, the Schooner Pool Association has occupied offices at the Customs Department, and I have been informed that it does not pay any rent. We cannot go on sheltering a company which makes profits, without getting payment in return. I would really like the Government bench to make a statement on this matter.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I have already told the honourable member about this matter. Even before we were Ministers, everyone of us

who are Ministers here, were certainly of one mind. In so far as it is humanly possible, we would not rent one square inch of office room to anybody in Bridgetown. We have always felt that rents are too terrific; we are emphatically opposed to it, and we are considering the suggestion which has been made, of two mother Government departments, being shifted to private renters. We are *Prima Facie* opposed to that; still we are investigating it. However, you cannot take the Accountant General's Department to the Customs; but you can walk across the road to the part of that new department. It is for that reason that we have accepted the suggestion.

I am replying to the hon. member; but I am also saying for the benefit of other members, this Government started out in opposition to the renting of offices for the various departments. We have to be driven into it; therefore, when we come with this, it is because it is necessary, and because this office is right across the road from the Treasury, and is a reasonable place for a temporary annex to the office of the Accountant General.

As honourable members are aware, Government has come down with proposals for Capital works. In those proposals, they will see that instead of Government buying the Temple Yard for a public Market, Government proposes to put the market in the old railway yard, and is taking the offices of the Department of Highways and Transport to the Pine. Hon. members will see from that proposal, it is the intention of the Government to use Government lands, wherever possible, to build offices. Government has proposed to build Ministerial buildings on land which it has at Bay Street. If honourable members remember all these things, they cannot really blame the Government of renting unnecessarily. It is not our policy to do that. I think that I should take this opportunity to pay public tribute to Captain Tomlin, for getting through with Government buildings ahead of time. Therefore, we have no doubt, no time will be wasted in putting Government departments in offices belonging to the Government.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, — I would just like to say something in answer to the honourable senior member for St. John. There was a war on not long ago, and we were very grateful to the Schooner Pool Association, because it was a means of bringing food to this island from the sister colonies, and taking food to them. The Schooner Pool Association is existing in Government Offices, and I agree that it should pay rent. Let us make the Association pay rent; but let us bear in mind, it is appropriate if we render whatever assistance we can, to it. Let us keep it in close proximity to the Customs. It is a great facility to have that Association in that building. It is a very much better place for them than a Government Department. As I have said, let us make that Association pay rent; but do not let us disturb it. We are now subsidising the fishing industry, and we are trying to help people who go to sea. The Schooner Pool Association is deserving of every assistance that the Government can give it.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, our rules are under revision; therefore, I do not think that the rule about 2 o'clock being the hour for adjournment, when this House meets at 12 o'clock noon, is no longer valid. However, as it has been suggested that this rule still holds good, I

am moving that you do now report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second the motion. This motion was agreed to and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Hon. Dr. H. G. 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 the motion. The motion was agreed to, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

2.05 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

On the re-assembling of honourable members:
2.45 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. Speaker, left the chair, and the House resumed Committee of Supply Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Head VI: Customs

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The next Head in these Supplementary Estimates, is Head 6 Customs. There are two sums under this Head dealing with Ex-gratia refunds of Customs Duty. As regards the first Item, a note makes it clear. This sum is in respect of Customs Duty paid on an out-board motor sold to Mr. Sebastian Remacha, who is using the boat for commercial fishing purposes. Mr. Remacha, who is a Spaniard, is unable to speak English. Consequently, he was unaware of the provisions of Section 87 of the Trade Act, 1910 (1910-4) which permits all articles required for the building, repair or refitting of ships to be passed out of bond, without payment of duty, on a certificate of the builder, owner, or master of the vessel.

Inasmuch as Mr. Remacha is a fisherman, and the Government's policy is to help people to acquire powered boats for commercial fishing, we have decided to ask the Legislature to make this Ex-gratia refund. I do not want any budding lawyer, or even any old lawyer, to get up and say that ignorance of the law is no excuse.

The other matter is a normal one. A Bedford Refuse Collector was imported for the Commissioners of Health of St. Michael in the regular way, and a refund of Customs Duty is being asked.

I beg to move sir, that Head 6 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,— While I agree that a good long explanation is one way to avoid debate, I do not think that to say that because this gentleman is a Spaniard and cannot speak English, is an explanation at all. He did not buy this motor from Spaniards. The people from whom he bought it, are well aware of the conditions under which he could have got it. Perhaps he did not tell them what he wanted it for; but if these facts were known to the person selling it to him, there would be no necessity for him to speak any special language for the persons from whom he bought it, to know how to get it properly.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman,— I agree with the last hon. member that the question of language does not arise. Whether Mr. Remacha was ignorant of the law or not, it would appear that there was

some neglect on the part of the persons who imported that out-board motor for him.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not know if I am particularly stupid to-day; but I specifically said that if he were not a fisherman, the Government would not have come down for this refund.

Mr. MILLER: I do not believe that the Hon. Premier understood what I said. It does appear lame on the part of DaCosta & Co., Ltd., to claim this refund on the grounds that the man was a Spaniard.

Mr. LEWS: The Hon. Premier can describe himself as he likes. This gentleman must have made signs telling the importers that he wanted the motor; and perhaps he did not tell them he wanted it for fishing. Who is to say that he will not sell it to someone else in the island for pleasure. To say the man is a Spaniard, is not sufficient explanation. If the man is a fisherman, say so; but do not just write and give a long explanation which is just nonsense. This man went to people who know more about shipping and about stuff going aboard ships out of bond etc., than any other firm in Bridgetown. They are agents for more ships than anyone else. They know all about it.

The question that Head VI stand part of the Schedule was put and agreed to.

HEAD XX. EDUCATION.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, — I do not think that hon. members will need any long explanation about Head XX, Education. It was made clear to hon. members during the last session, we were introducing a two-year course at Erdiston College, and that we were having sixteen teachers from the Windward and Leeward Islands. Because the operative costs of the College have increased, it is necessary to provide funds to meet this increase up to the 31st March, 1955. The Leeward and Windward Islands are paying on a *per capita* basis.

As regards the other Item, hon. members will remember that we amended the Government Scholarships and Exhibitions Act, affecting the University College of the West Indies. The amending Act was deemed to have come into operation on the 1st October, 1953. Hon. members will also remember how it is worked now. The money is paid into a fund, and a Scholar who wins an Exhibition may get more or less of the grant, according to his means, or the means of his family. Thus, if the son of a very rich man won an exhibition, he will get some of the grant, but not necessarily all. The money is put in a pool, and is used only for Scholars from Barbados. It is not a central pool out of which all West Indians get money, although the other colonies work on a similar basis.

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

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

HEAD XXI. SCIENCE AND AGRICULTURE

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXI, Science and Agriculture stand part of the Schedule. If any questions are asked, I will be grateful to the Minister of Agriculture for answering them. It is not that other Ministers are not aware of this vote, but the Minister of Agriculture has given special attention to this matter. Therefore, if hon. members wish to enquire in minute detail, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries will reply.

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

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second the motion. 2.55 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,— After a long period of agitation, the Government has started to do something by way of bringing about a greater production of meat for local consumption. I presume, the Government is going to raise flags, thinking what a wonderful gift this 100 lbs of concentrated pig feed will be; and in what a general supply of pork, it will result.

We cannot help remarking the Government is barely scratching the surface, when the pigs produce these piglets, and the pig breeders will benefit from this 100 lbs of feed which is given free, *gratis* and for nothing. As regards the very effect of producing meat for the people of this colony, substantially, you are not going to get one additional individual joining the list of pig-keepers in this Island, because of this 100 lbs free gift. I would show you what will happen. Those who are already pig-keepers, will appreciate the idea of the Government giving them 100 lbs of feed for every piglet which is born; but it will not cause those who have not started to keep pigs as yet, to start and keep them now. This is no incentive to increase the number of pig-keepers; but this is good propaganda. That is what I observe; and that is the tangible benefit, I notice, from a political point of view. This \$8,000 could be used as the nucleus of a fund to import, such as Holland has just done, several hundred good-breed pigs from the United Kingdom, so as to improve our stock and guarantee to the consumers a continuous supply of meat. You can go to England, or to America, or one of the South American republics, or Australia, and bring in a couple of hundred boars and sows, and put them at the Pine. All the feed which you are giving away free, you can dump it up there, so that these boars and sows can consume it. Within one year, you will begin to get your benefits. When these piglets are born you could send around your Peasant Instructor and let him select from among the house-holders, those who are most suited to be given one of these piglets, and allow him to start off as a new pig-breeder among the existing number of pig-breeders. All you are doing under this scheme, is to ease the situation of those who have already started to keep pigs. But we want to increase the number of pig-breeders in this island. If you have 2,000 people keeping pigs, and you do what I am suggesting now, you are getting whatever opportunity, your resources permit you to get. That is how you can solve the problem. Those who are already keeping pigs will try to continue to do so. What you want to do, is to go around and tell Mr. So-and-so that if he wants to become a pig-keeper, the Government will give him a free pig. In this way, you will get many people who are willing to become pig-breeders.

Another point is this, I have seen pigs sold out at the Agricultural Stations; and it is not a question of the control of price or discretion, used by the person who is selling the pigs. If the pig is worth \$3 and I can pay \$20 for it, I will give that money for it. That is something false. I have seen poor people pay \$15 for a half grown pig-let which was sold out at auction. I have seen the wealthy people buying all these pigs, because some of them may be keeping a birthday party, and they keep these pigs for a few weeks and then roast them; but the poor peasant is turned away disgruntled. When you give away a 100 lbs of feed, your assistance has come in when your house-holder has already increased the num-

ber of pigs he has. You want to get more people to become pig-breeders, and the problem would be solved in that way.

Even that would not be the correct thing for a Government, as regard its policy towards food production. We have always questioned why Trinidad, which is the country where you get cheaper goods because of the presence of the Americans and the liberalisation of the policy of the Minister of Trade—The Trinidad Government is permitting cheaper things to come in from America, and they have allocated two and a half million dollars for the purpose of food production. That happened about two to three years ago; and during all that time, I have been drawing the matter to the attention of this Government, in the hope that something similar would be started in Barbados. I see an amount of \$5,000 tucked away in the Estimates in respect of food production; but how far will that go? As regards the intensification of a necessary scheme like this, that money cannot go anywhere. In the face of the rampant unemployment which we have, and the additional increase of population, the least you can do is to make sure that the people can get food to eat.

That is the Government's business. The Government cannot leave this matter to the plantation owners, or to the merchants. It is Government's business to see that the people are given the opportunity to get the means of their existence; and one essential part of that, is to see that a generous amount of food is always there, whether locally produced or cheaply imported. I prefer the locally produced food, because of the several benefits which are attached to it, and because there will be cheaper food and concentration of capital in the colony, and on unemployment and the effect which it has produced. I am not attacking the Government principally on this point; but I am trying to get them to give consideration to my suggestion. If you were to take an estimate of the existing number of pig-breeders, and if this scheme is put in to practice for a year or two years, you will have to agree with the statements which I am making now. This scheme which is now before us, will not increase the number of pig-breeders. You will not get the increase of pigs or meat, because of what you are doing today.

3.05 p.m.

If the Hon. Minister of Agriculture wants to prove that I am wrong, he can work on it and give us a report in a year's time. I am saying: import the animals; you have the Government farms; you have the Technical Officers; when the pigs are bred, call in the peasants and select those to whom one should be given. Do just as you have done when you distributed the land at Seawell. It would be remembered, you went around and selected families whom you thought would be able to utilise that land in the best way possible; and I am told, they are making a success of the scheme. The Government can do the same thing now. The Government can spend a couple thousand pounds on the purchase of this lot of pigs from wherever it can get them. Sir, if you have to get them from Brazil, America, or England, do so. If England can sell a country like the Netherlands, whose food production, comparatively speaking, is one of the highest in the world, that country can sell us too. England is selling to the Netherlands good breeding sows and boars. Tell her that we want some too. Let her send down some to us either by ships or by aeroplanes. Let us get them down here, then let Government keep them at the Pine for breeding purposes, and I am sure that in about one year's time, we would have sufficient pig-lets to distribute. I am sure

after that, you will see the tangible benefits, because the number of householders who would be keeping pigs and producing pork to the butchers, would be substantially increased. I do hope the Government would pay some attention to that. Sir, if the Government continues with this scheme, it will undoubtedly help somebody; it will not bring about what Government wants to bring about,—that is, an increase in pork for the local population. As I have said, it will somewhat ease the strain on some householders who have already started to keep pigs.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—I am supporting this resolution. I feel, Sir, that the Government in bringing this resolution before the House to-day, is conscious of the condition of the people of this island. Although this resolution, I am sure, cannot bring the desired effect and relief which Government wants, I still feel that it is a step in the right direction. Government should be commended on bringing it down. We cannot conscientiously condemn this scheme as inoperative; it is worthy of a trial, although I am afraid, many of those people whom we are hoping to benefit from this scheme, will never be able to receive one bag of feed, to enable them to feed the piglets which they are likely to rear. I am hoping that the Government will utilise every means of this proposal, to see that every section of this community benefits under this scheme.

There is another point which this scheme affects. We may find that after we have encouraged the populace to take to pig-breeding, we are leaving it to the whims and caprices of butchers, to exploit them. There is at present, a Regulation on the Statute Book stipulating the prices butchers should pay for butcher's meat; but I doubt whether any of them observe it. At present they come along and ask "how much do you want for that pig?" He openly tells you that the price he should pay is 26 cents a pound, but he can only give you 20 cents a pound for it. That means, you either sell him at that price, or keep your pig for a longer time, hoping that another butcher would come along with a better conscience. I feel that the Government can investigate the possibility of having a central purchasing agent for pigs, when they are fit for market, so that pig-breeders in the country and other places, can take them there, and be assured that they would get the correct price for their stock. I also think that the distribution of these piglets is going to be another burning question,—one which the Government should keep before its mind's eye. Government should see to it that pig-breeders, after having this subsidy from Government, do not charge an exorbitant price for piglets. At the present moment, the sale of piglets is a burning question in the country. Some pig-breeders are demanding between twelve and fifteen dollars for a piglet, as soon as it is weaned. Mr. Chairman, I commend Government on this step; but I want to tell members of the Government that it is not far reaching enough. Government should see to it, every section of this community benefits from this scheme.

Another thought comes to my mind. I feel some Peasant Instructors should be compiling a list of the present sows in existence in the various parishes, and the number of piglets, so that a better distribution could be effected.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the Government for bringing this measure down at this time. As I have said, it is an indication that the Government is aware that something must be done. If needs be, Government should increase this vote. If the suggestion of the hon. senior member for St. John that the Government should import sows and boars to augment the stock in the island, is thought to be a good

suggestion by the Government, then Government can go ahead and act on it. One wants to see pigs, and more pigs, in the island.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman,—There are many points made by hon. members, which more or less, represent the policy of the Government. I would like to tell hon. members, the policy of the Government in this matter is divided into two phases. First and foremost, it is the old policy of importing a good breed of pigs, so as to increase the pig population. Hon. members will remember that one of the positive steps taken since the introduction of the Ministerial Status by this Government, was to see that young pigs which were bred at these Agricultural Stations were not sold by auction; they were to be distributed to the people who wanted them. I am not referring to that now; that was done since February. As hon. members should know, there are at present at the Central Livestock Station, at the Pine, and other Agricultural Stations, a good breed of sows; and the piglets which were bred from them last year, were sold to pig-breeders. However, Government has come to understand, that owing to the low prices which these pig-breeders get for their piglets, the breeders are selling the sows as soon as they reach maturity for purposes of slaughtering. Owing to the high cost of animal feed, price control, and other measures, it is a fact that pig breeding has been discouraged, or pig breeders are finding it difficult to continue with the rearing of pigs. Since the introduction of Ministerial Status, the present policy of the Government is not only to continue with the up-breed of pigs, but also to bring about a mass production of pigs, whereby the situation island-wide, will be well taken care of.

3.15 p.m.

It is not good reasoning to say, because our ultimate aim, or as I have called it, or second objective, is to increase the pig population, we should not still try to encourage private enterprise as much as possible.

To expect the Agricultural Department to be the only source of pig-breeding, would be illogical and unreasonable. We boast of private enterprise. We do not live under a dictatorship, or anything of the sort. If we do what the honourable member for St. John has suggested, and rule out private enterprise, we will be accused by the same honourable member of Communism or something of the kind.

We are giving pig-breeders a free issue of 100 lbs. of concentrated feed for each litter of 6 piglets or less, and 200 lbs. of feed for larger litters. By so doing, you will encourage private pig-breeders with the hope that the sows purchased from Agricultural Stations and the Central Livestock Station, will be kept for breeding purposes, and not merely raised and sold for slaughter. The chief reason why the scheme has failed so far, is that sows were procured from the stations at a cheap price, raised as quickly as possible, and sold at a reasonable price for slaughter. The whole scheme has been defeated mainly through that practice.

I think I have covered the points raised by the honourable member; but just to avoid if possible a lengthy debate about a scheme which we have gone into very carefully, I will say, sir, as you will observe, the Resolution before us today is a means of doing something quickly. The idea is to encourage pig-breeders as much as possible.

For the benefit of honourable members who have spoken, and the other honourable members who are anxious to join in this debate, I will mention from the files that 10,000 pigs were slaughtered in the Public Market in 1953. The requirements of the

whole Island are estimated at twice that number. To produce a supply of 20,000 pigs per annum 1,200 breeding sows need to be maintained. One third must be replaced each year, thus about 575 young sows are needed annually. For breeding purposes, must produce about 300 young sows per annum; this should be sufficient if the animals are used for breeding as intended.

With regard to the question of price raised by the honourable senior member for St. John, I mean the price at which pigs are sold, as I mentioned before, pigs are no longer sold by auction. That practice was stopped. I will now read word by word, the basis at which pigs are now being sold. Young pigs will now be sold when they reach 40 lbs. live-weight, at which stage, the critical point in their development, is passed. They are then sold at \$15.75 each, instead of by auction, or as against the old rate of \$15 for every 16 lbs. That goes to prove the action taken as soon as the Ministerial Government started. Prior to that, pigs were being sold at auction; but as soon as the Ministerial system started, we immediately decided that the average peasant and working man, would not be able to compete with the people who are better off financially, when it came to the matter of purchase of pigs by auction. We knew that the most that they could pay, was \$15 for a pig; we said that a pig weighing approximately 60 lbs, and at three months old roughly, should be sold for \$15.

Following that, another system was devised; the system on which we are working. A pig weighing 40 lbs, is sold for \$15.75; and over and above that, we are giving this subsidy of a 100 lbs. of concentrated feed which is valued at \$8. That amount subtracted from \$15.75, leaves \$7.75; and if it is a litter of 7 pig-lets or over, the breeder gets a subsidy of 200 lbs. of feed, which is valued at \$16.

I believe that honourable members appreciate the attempt that is being made to subsidise the pig-rearing industry. In connection with the system of distribution, the system which has been introduced is one of control whereby applications are sent to the Department of Agriculture. In that way, there is no room for favouritism. There is no question of no one favouring his friends, or giving them priority, or preference, in anyway. The scheme is controlled by the Director of Agriculture himself. The applicants' names are put down in alphabetical order according to the time the application was made. So the question of preferential treatment cannot arise now.

3.25 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: I am glad to hear the honourable Minister's remarks on this section of the Resolution. After agitation for six years, this is a step in the right direction. But I am somewhat confused, over some of the remarks made by the honourable Minister. He refers to the good prices paid for sows, and he refers to pigs being bought cheap. When the honourable Minister refers to piglets being bought cheap and sold for attractive prices, the whole idea aback of the speech of the honourable Minister, is defeating the purpose of the Resolution. If the argument is, by attractive prices you will sell your pigs, that is the main reason why people will remain in the industry. I believe that the honourable Minister missed the point, or he was somewhat off colour in making his speech.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: What I said, was, under the old system young piglets were sold at a fairly reasonable price. In many cases young sows would be bought and reared for slaughter, and not for breeding purposes.

Mr. MILLER: The more you pay for your pig, the more inducement it would be, to sell it. However, that is not the point. We have a tremendous opportunity in this country, where this matter of pig-keeping is concerned. This is a pig-keeping country. What I am worrying about, is the breed of pigs. This new subsidy is going to be a difficult piece of machinery to operate. It will involve the loss of a day in going for this feed, and I do not think that you will be able to give all the pig-breeders the necessary inducement. I think that the approach to this matter is somewhat wrong. I have implicit faith in the Veterinary Surgeon at the Pine. I know that he will do quite a lot in the matter of exploiting opportunities for producing a good breed of pigs in Barbados; and he will put all his energy and effort into this matter for the benefit of the country. However, our big trouble is in improving the breed of pigs. By our persistent and continuous ingraining, rather than collateral breeding, deterioration is always at the heels of the efforts of the Government. You take a boar to the country, he breeds the mothers and the daughters and so on, and you have deterioration setting in. But you want to take care of the boars as they should be taken care of. You want the Inspectors to report where you have half-breed pigs which can produce a 30-pounder within six weeks, and you can take them in and pay the difference.

I should like to say, the transportation of pigs is a problem in itself, especially in that they cannot be exposed to the sun; and pig-breeders are up against the difficulty of getting the service of the nearest boar. What we want is, the Department should be able to import boars of several sizes, and see if they can change these boars, so as to improve the breed of pigs. When we come to the question of the subsidy, I am a bit unhappy about that; because I do not think, it will produce the results which the Government expects. I would prefer to see the subsidy paid on pigs' feed. I would like to see the Department arranged with people who supply this concentrated feed, to bring about a ration, which is suitable for pigs. Last year at the cassava factory, feed was sold at 2½ or three cents per pound; and you will buy it back to supplement the industry at probably 7 or 8 cents a pound. If you can get the ration which is necessary, you can make it bring any price. I sympathise with the efforts of the honourable Minister, and I appreciate his anxiety to bring about this development; but I do not think it is sufficient to encourage the small breeder. You will always have to look for the back-yard individual who will produce his litter of pigs. You will be up against the difficulty of people coming for this pigs' feed, and it will not be the big picture of people going back to the industry, as anticipated by the honourable Minister. I hope the honourable Minister will examine what I am saying, because I will come back and remind him about it, when this scheme does not produce the effect which the Department is seeking.

Mr. GODDARD: I see that the Government is being concerned about this matter, and it is time that they got concerned about it. The reason for the falling off in pig-keeping, is that it is not economical to keep pigs. Let the officers see how much it takes people to raise a pig up to the amount of 120 lbs. of pork, and they will find that people are keeping pigs at a loss. If you import pork from New Zealand, it will cost about 70 cents per pound; but if it is controlled you will get it at 48c. a pound. I should like to ask who are the pig-breeders in Barbados?—The small man. I have a brother who

keeps pigs for the fun of it, but he loses more money than what he gets from the pigs. Today you are subsidising the pig industry to the tune of \$8,000; but we are importing 23,000 barrels of pickle pork this year, and the subsidy will be in the vicinity of \$300,000. You are subsidising the Canadian pig industry to that tune; but you are only subsidising the industry in Barbados to the tune of \$8,000, and you think that you are doing something. If you want to give people pork at 48c. a pound, then subsidise it; and do what you are doing to the Canadians. You must reverse your policy of paying this subsidy.

3.35.

Everyone who buys pork, wants to get it as cheap as possible. It was 42c. per lb. but it is now 48c., per lb. You created a big hardship on the pig industry when you took off the subsidy on feed. By so doing, the people have to pay more per pound for pork.

I am glad Government is beginning with this scheme. I am sure that when this scheme gets working, Government will realise that it has started something, but that it is not enough. Therefore, Government will have to come back to this House in the course of time for something more. Be realistic! Come back and subsidise the pig industry properly! No one is going to continue to breed pigs, at the cost demanded now-a-days. A lot has been said about the importing of the good breed of pigs; but from my little experience, the sow that gives the greatest litter, is the inbred Barbadian sow. If we want to get a good breed of pigs, we must inbreed with our sows. Sir, we have to encourage our pig industry along proper lines. I am sure that the officer at the Pine Livestock Station is well aware of that, and I am not going into details. However, I only want to say, I am reliably informed that our sows produce a greater litter than the imported sows. Imported sows are for the most part, only good for slaughter; they do not pay as breeders.

As regards to this method of distributing feed, Government may have already worked out a system; but I think, it is going to create some sort of difficulty. Whether you are going to distribute feed from one central spot or not, you must keep some sort of check. You are going to be confronted with a problem of a bag of feed for six pigs, and two bags of feed for seven. You may have the instance, as some honourable member said, of pigs moving about. I do think it would be better, if money were paid out to the pig-breeders, so that they could buy their own feed. If Government prefers to set up a scheme, whereby it feels that the balance feed is better for the pigs at an early stage, that is a matter for the Government; but you are going to have difficulty in the distribution. Again, I say, be realistic about the matter.

I also want to bring to the notice of the Government that they are now subsidising the pig industry at \$8,000; and at the same time, subsidising pickled pork, which is being imported from Canada. Are you sure, that this \$8,000 with which you propose to subsidise the local industry, will have the desired effect. I am sure, that it will not. I am sure that you will have to come back to this House and say, it was not enough. You will have to revise your scheme. Perhaps, you may have to subsidise pork. Something like that will have to be done, if you want to establish a pig industry on a proper footing.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I had no intention of entering this debate, in view of the fact, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is quite capable of dealing with it. But the statement which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has just made, about this Government having created an additional hardship on the people by the removal of the subsidy of animal feed, has

brought me to my feet. I think I should say something on that.

For years, I have been a member of the Control Board. Time in and out, over and over again, members of the mercantile community have stressed for the removal of the control on animal feed, which would automatically remove the subsidy. It is a known fact, if you do not know how much feed you are bringing in, you cannot subsidise it, because you will not know how much money to put into the annual Estimates. Almost at every meeting, members of the mercantile community pressed that this thing should be removed from control. One of the reasons which they gave was, as soon as we removed any item from control, it would become cheaper; it would right itself on the market. They kept on saying, because we control these things, we have to pay higher prices. Well, Government eventually removed animal feed from control. Now the Hon. Leader of the Opposition says, Government has created an additional hardship on the people by removing that item from control; when in truth and in fact, merchants including himself, used to press day in and day out, for the removal of that item from control. Even now, they are pressing for the removal of all items from control.

Mr. GODDARD: Sir, the hon. Minister is a member of the Control Board. He was the virtual minister in the last Government, for Trade and Commerce. Do you mean to tell me, that the removal of subsidies in Barbados can affect world market prices of food stuffs? It cannot. I said, and he has admitted, the Government has its subsidy on animal feed stuff to the tune of 50c. per bag, which means about 1c on the pound. That meant, the people got it at 50c. less than world market price; therefore, my argument still holds out. Merchants have pressed for controls to be taken off, and we are right in doing so; because, by the taking off of controls, it will bring about competition in the business, not only in Barbados, but also in Canada. The taking off of control on animal feed, has brought about competition between the sellers and shippers, and world markets are the much healthier than when it was under control. But that does not alter the fact that the subsidy of 50c. per bag, which the Government used to pay on animal feed, is not paid out now; and if the Government does not pay it out now, it would come to a saving of more than the \$8,000 with which this Government is now proposing to subsidise the pig industry. You are not giving them now, what you gave them, when you subsidised animal feed. I think that is understandable.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman,—This proposal, in the terms of economics, not does not make sense to me. I expect to awake any morning and hear that this Government has decided to import sea-water because ours may be too fresh, or too salt, and because in their opinion, it would be better, and would be for the good of the island if we imported sea-water. (Laughter) If you want to improve the pig industry in Barbados, the laudible idea should be that of improving the economy of the country. At the moment we are importing 23,000 barrels of pickled pork at a cost of \$690,000 a year; and the Government itself, is subsidising the imports of this pickled pork to the tune of \$300,000 a year, so that you can see we have a lot of money to play with. If we really want to improve the economy of the country in this direction, we can make it possible, by digressing the amount which we send abroad to import pickled pork. But what does Government propose to do here? It proposes to spend \$8,000 per year, by giving people who rear piglets, imported feed.

In other words sir, this \$8,000 will go outside this country. In actual fact, you will find that this

scheme will do little to encourage pig-rearing; but it will increase the value of our imports of concentrated feed by \$8,000 a year to begin with. We will get a few more pigs; but we will be spending more money on imported feed.

3.45 p.m.

The scheme would have some value, if the Government were preparing to feed these young pigs with locally produced foods, like cassava, corn, potatoes, black-eyes, and things like that. If you want to do anything, subsidise the production of local food, so that the money you are preparing to spend now to improve your pig production, will remain within the country and strengthen the country's economy. Years ago in St. Philip, as my colleague will confirm, one of the plantations reared large numbers of pigs every year, feeding them exclusively on black-eye peas produced on the plantation itself. They did not use any imported concentrated feed.

We have a lot of land now, in which we cannot grow canes, because it is effected by the new cane disease. The Agricultural Department has claimed that certain types of food crops, should not be grown in that thrown out land. This year, they recommended planting of corn on an extensive scale, presumably because corn-bearing, as it does above the ground, is not as likely to take up some of the poisonous insecticide they are using to irradiate the cane disease as potatoes or yams which bear below the ground. There would therefore be no harm in utilising some of this land for growing more corn, which is a three months crop, or for growing black-eye peas, or potatoes, or cassava. We have a factory at Lancaster to process it; and if there is any excess of production costs over revenue in respect of these items, the Government could step in and subsidise the production.

They have a guaranteed market at a good price for any surplus of corn this year, because the people were asked to plant more than usual, in lands treated with insecticide for the eradication of the new cane disease. If the Government were to bring down a scheme to encourage food production of any sort, and to subsidise it in order to improve pig-rearing, or cattle rearing, or anything like that, it would get the universal support of the members of this House. But to talk of spending more money on importing feed, with the hope of producing more pigs, certainly appears to me as the most nonsensical manner in which to begin.

Schemes like these should be entirely self supporting from the local point of view. We embark upon them, and spend money with the hope, that the total economy of the country will benefit. The moment you will add to your imports and increase the amount of money you spend abroad, you are doing little or nothing to improve the economy of the country.

Mr. LEWIS: I am interested in the figures which I heard the Hon. Minister of Agriculture read out. I would like to warn him not to accept statistics like that from any department. They mean absolutely nothing. To tell us that 10,000 pigs were slaughtered in 1953, and that you estimate that the island need 20,000 pigs a year, is no information at all; because you do not give the figures of other years for purposes of comparison. The information that honourable members want to hear, and which I am sure the Minister will like to get, is whether the 10,000 pigs slaughtered in 1953, is an increase or decrease over the figures of 1951, and 1952. We are trying to increase pig production. The information given by the Hon. Minister is valueless, when we cannot compare the figures he has quoted with those of any other year. Whoever compiled those figures, did not even tell the Hon. Minister how many pigs were slaughtered for

the first six months of 1954, so that we could make some comparison.

When those figures are taken somewhere else, they will be proper figures. The Government's servant who has to present them in the Other Place, will not carry in that type of information. How do you arrive at the estimate that the island need 20,000 pigs annually for slaughtering purposes? Just because 10,000 doubled is 20,000. You might discover that you need 30,000, because over the same period we might have been importing a lot of stuff that you hope to cease importing.

I would like before I vote, to get this clear. Did I hear the Hon. Minister right, when he mentioned the price at which pigs are now sold? If I heard him wrong, let me apologise in advance. As I understood him, he said that at one time a piglet weighing 60 lbs. was sold for \$15.00, and today one weighing 40 lbs. is sold for \$15.75. Are those figures to be reversed or did I hear him wrong? He said it more than once. Did that happen so long ago, that 40 lbs. today is worth 75c. more than 50 lbs., and is a bargain? It sounds like nonsense to me.

Some years ago, sir, we were told that the duty on these feed stuffs would be taken off, so that the feed would be cheaper. I understand, as far as a poor man keeping a pig is concerned, it is his penny bank. It is understood, when he is raising the pig, he would eventually be selling it for pork. He cannot keep sows for the purpose of producing a litter of six, eight, ten, or more piglets. What are we doing to help the man feed his pig after he has bought it? 3.55 p.m.

Another point is this, and perhaps the honourable junior member for Christ Church can help me on it: if there is a decrease in the slaughter of pigs in the Public Market, is it because this new idea of curing hams in Barbados is causing less pigs to be available for pork? (A MEMBER: That is the answer.) If that is so, you are getting the pork in another form of food; but let us be able to state categorically that the number of pigs are on the decrease; and we cannot have that information from the statistics which the Hon. Minister of Agriculture has brought into here today. I am interested in this matter of food for the people. I have never heard that the poor man in Barbados has been able to keep pigs for breeding purposes. The keeping of pigs is his penny bank, and he must sell his pigs after they have reached maturity, if he is to avoid any emergency with regard to ready cash. If you can guarantee him a good price for his pork; that is as much as we can do to help him, and to see that the food is cheap. If you start to buy this feed and hand it out to people, Government will continue to import it because it is in the form of subsidy.

With regard to the giving away of pigs to the people free, I suppose the Government will have to supply the entire island, because people are not going to keep pigs in the hope of breeding them. They are going to sell them. The Government will have to give a free pig to everybody. I do not know if the Government has heard this, but with regard to the question of inter-breeding, I have been told that the Government imported pigs, and if they have a litter of eight or ten, they are unable to feed them. I do not know the technical way of putting it; but that is how I understand it. We distribute a breed of pigs to the public, and if they have any young ones at all, they cannot be accommodated where nursing is concerned. You have to accommodate the young ones according to the number of teats, and if a sow has more than half a dozen young ones, the others have to be stunted. However, I do not know

sufficient about this matter to go around investigating it, and I am asking the Government to get their Officers to tell them whether they have made a mistake.

In a matter of this sort, you should be able to tell by figures, if you are forced to do what you are doing now. We should not merely go by figures as to the number of pigs which have been killed in the Public Market, because people are going in for making hams. There seems to be more to this matter than I can gather, and what the Government has taken notice of. I give them the benefit of that. However the Hon. Minister of Agriculture has the reputation of one who likes to satisfy honourable members, and I think it was a great let down for him, just to read out the figures which he has read out; because you must quote figures for the sake of comparison. To give one year's figures and then make your own estimates, is wrong. The hon. Minister should have the figures the year 1950 at least.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Lest it be thought that I am parochial because pigs are not kept in the City, I will make my contribution to this debate. It seems to have taken this Government very long to get down to these points of view. In some things they have taken 8 years, and in other things they take 3, 4 or 5 years; and the only conclusion to which I can come, is that now they have got one or two members among them who have been really hammering at these points, they are now beginning to bite. First of all, while this is not satisfying, it is refreshing to find that they have started. Every honourable member must be able to recall that an honourable member, who is now a Minister, was clamouring about the subsidisation of Canadian products. I hope that that honourable Minister is still saying that today. The Government is taking this matter in a piece meal fashion, and they have taken quite a long time to learn. People can get a colossal amount of information by way of books, but they cannot even build a fowl coup. I am supporting this expenditure of \$8,000, but I thought that they would have been able to work out a better scheme with which to start. They must have taken some evidence and gathered some facts, so as to arrive at this decision; but everybody knows that the people who really go in for pig-keeping, are the very poor people. To some of these people, this matter of pig-keeping is a sentimental means of saving money. It is their means of saving money in the bank, and getting a Christmas bonus. Whenever people come to you, they tell you, "I have no money but I have a pig which I can sell."

I believe that the Government should gather some figures, when it comes to the number of breeding sows in the island. That information should go beyond the people who keep these sows. It should go as far as the average man who buys a pig to sell for pork. The average man who buys a pig for \$10, starts off at a loss. If he were to take every cent which he spends on that pig into account, at the end of a year, or up to the time he sells it, he will find that he is actually out of pocket. I know of the amounts which people spend on rearing pigs. Sometimes, I smile over the amount which some people spend on rearing a pig. As I have said, this information should go beyond those who keep breeding sows. Government should be able to work some scheme out, along those lines. It should not merely say that it is going to give \$8,000 for the purchase of bags of feed, for those who rear piglets. That is not enough.

I have often told the Hon. Minister of Agriculture that when Government subsidise pickled

pork, it does not matter very much to the people, because that is not an item like flour or rice. As the Hon. Minister himself has said, when you subsidise pickled pork, you are subsidising the Canadian farmer. As I have said, what Government is doing now is not good enough. Why should it take you so long to know that you should do something for the people who keep pigs? Pork, above all other meats, is the common man's food; it is the meat which he buys. I think it is expressed now by eminent scientists, contrary to former belief, that there is more value in pork than beef.

Sir, we cannot turn this resolution down; we cannot cut this item out. I notice when I said so, there were smiles from members on the other side; but there is no justification for smiles. Members of the Government should be ashamed that it has taken them so long to learn. It has taken them long to learn from what the Opposition says. Are you bereft of ideas? What is wrong with this Government? Something must be really wrong with it. Mr. Chairman, can you tell me?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is nothing wrong?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Anyway, Sir, I hope that in the not too distant future the Hon. Minister of Agriculture would be able to do something more in this matter. As I have said, you should also do something for the people who keep barrow pigs. They are the people who are spending the money. Sir, I believe the majority of us are going to support this vote today; but we are certainly supporting it with the feeling, that you have only touched the fringe of the matter. I believe that it is because the Opposition has criticised Government so long, that they have brought down this today. That is not so good to say for the Government.

The Hon. Minister has a reputation for shifting all criticism and gathering something from it. He has gained that reputation, not only from members of this House, but from visitors in the gallery. He is one Minister who endeavours to satisfy the members of the House as regards the facts at his disposal, and one who carefully weighs all criticisms. Therefore, I hope he will carefully weigh all that we have said on this matter, and eventually will see that more should be done by Government in this matter. I hope he will see that Government should not only subsidise sow-keepers, but that it should bring in a scheme to subsidise all the people who keep pigs.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman,—I must at the outset commend honourable members of the Opposition on the manner in which they have debated this, what I would call, "piggish" matter. In issuing my compliments, I refer mainly to the last honourable member who has just spoken and the honourable senior member for St. Philip. I must further compliment the honourable senior member for St. Philip for the tactics which he has adopted in this particular matter. I am conscious that he is not only wishful of having something done for pig-breeders, but his criticisms are concerned on tactics, so far as the next General Election is concerned. That statement, probably applies to some other honourable members, although I believe that the majority are anxious that something should be done in the matter. I excuse the honourable senior member for the City over the fact that he has not long taken his seat; he was not in here when this matter was first discussed.

I thought I made myself crystal clear, (if I may be allowed to use an expression of the hon. Minister on my right) when I said that this pig-breeding scheme was divided into two phases, of which the first was what this resolution seeks to provide. Government felt that instead of holding

back the scheme, and not trying to encourage pig breeders and so as to prevent them from going out of business, it should come down with this scheme at once; but the second phase, for obvious reasons—and all the points have been made by most of the speakers, more especially by the honourable senior member for St. Philip and my colleague, the honourable junior member for Christ Church, — will necessarily come into existence later. These things which these honourable members made mention of, were always in the second phase of Government's programme. You can only have mass-production of pigs by increasing the pig population, and making more accommodation for them at all the various agricultural stations; but that will take some time. That is Government's policy. Government realises that pigs are needed, and we must bring that about so as to have a mass-production of pigs. Government also realises what the honourable senior member for the city has said, when he referred to pork as butchers' meat.

The honourable senior member for St. Philip, mentioned that \$300,000 was being spent by Government to subsidise pickled pork; but that amount is not quite correct. The amount spent in that direction is, \$138,000. We cannot remove that subsidisation right away. We cannot remove it until the second phase of this scheme comes into focus. When that time comes, that subsidy will be reduced gradually. It will be spent in subsidising local food crops, and in the pig industry to provide more accommodation at the Central Livestock Station, and for importing more pigs.

4.45 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, a point has been raised about the planting of food crops. That is also the policy of the Government. Lancaster Factory is still open, and the Order under which food-crops must be planted, is still in force. When the honourable member talked about the necessity of planting more corn; every one knows about that. Through the use of 'Agroicide 20', the soil cannot grow food crops like yams, potatoes and eddoes; and we have to plant corn. All that is linked up with the pig-breeding scheme. It is all a matter of Government's policy; so the honourable senior member for St. Philip is assisting in the setting out of the comprehensive scheme, whereby the mass production of pigs can be put into operation. The Government is now working on increasing the accommodation at the various Agricultural Stations, and the handling of an increase number of applications for pigs. We are working on all that the honourable member has suggested. To be candid, the sentiments of the honourable member represent my sentiments.

Why blame the Government now? This Government has only been in existence for eight months; and for the first time in probably 300 years, you get something being done to assist the pig industry something for the first time to assist pig-breeders. The majority of members in the Opposition belong to the conservative group. (Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Oh, no.) Mr. Chairman, the members of the Electors Association and the Independents are now trying to blame the Labour Government, who for the first time in the history of the Island are doing something to assist pig-breeders. We are anxious to see something done, and done quickly; and for that reason, we have brought down this Resolution as a preliminary measure to giving assistance, and to give it quickly.

As regards the big scheme, we plan to remove the subsidy of \$138,000 a year. We will use that same money for the second phase of our programme.

Relative to the point raised by the honourable junior member for the City, I will say that the position is not as confusing as he has outlined it. In the past, pigs were sold at \$15.00 when they were three months old and weighed 60 lbs. That was changed. Pigs were often sold at auction, and brought a price of \$30.00 to \$35.00 each. Those prices prevented the small man from buying a pig. On the introduction of the Ministerial Status, the first thing was done by my Ministry, was to summarily stop the sale of pig by auction. That was done in the first week that I took over; and I brought the position back to what it was—the sale of a pig weighing 60 lbs. for \$15.00. At that time however, no pigs were available, and none were sold at that rate. In the meantime, we revised the whole thing, and it was decided that we would give a subsidy of 100 lbs. of concentrated feed worth \$8.00 and sell a pig for \$15.75. That was better than continuing to sell by auction, because we would be selling within the range of the average peasant, and the small pig owner. The price at which pigs are now sold, is regarded as reasonable by the peasants.

I can assure hon. members, this Government has the interest of pig-breeders at heart. We shall do all that we can to see that the pig population is increased, and that as soon as possible, pigs are produced in greater quantities. We will concentrate also on the production of local feed for pigs; bearing in mind, the Lancaster factory is still open and can process such feed. I thank the hon. senior member for St. Philip for assisting me.

Mr. CRAWFORD: No one will question the personal desire of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture to do something to improve pig-breeding in the country, or to foster agricultural development generally. But what we are suggesting to-day, is that since the present Government has no proper economic policy of its own, the best thing it can do, is to listen intelligently to suggestions from this side of the House, and to act upon them with expediency.

The hon. senior member for St. John, for over three years now, has been counselling Government as to the advisability of increasing local food production. If one half of his suggestions had been carried out, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture would not have to agree to spend \$4,000 on imported feed for pigs. Over six years ago, Mr. Mc. Donald Simmonds, who was not a member of the Government's party, suggested to the present Government how to improve and expand the production of pigs in the Island. He introduced an Address specifically for that purpose. He suggested the production of local foods crops, and the planting of bread-fruit trees on the widest possible scale. If you had heard the laughter from the Government benches,—comprised almost as they are now,—you would have thought that you were in some forest at night listening to the laughing of hyenas.

Hon. M. E. COX: That was in 1947, Mr. Chairman. I was not a member of the Government at that time.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Six years ago, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph was the Leader of the Government; and to all intents and purposes, he is the leader to-day, and is the only one who counts in the present Government. No matter whom he may have with him, his policy or lack of policy, is still as much in evidence. As I was saying, in 1947—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member is going too far back. Let us deal with what is before the House. I will have to keep the honourable member to the Resolution, or he will go on until 11 o'clock tonight.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am only going six years back; while the Hon. Minister of Agriculture went 300 years back. This is a question of pig production; but there are numerous other questions that one could mention in connection with it. The position is, to-day 6 or 7 years after this scheme should have been started, the Government is now embarking on it; and they are throwing away money in the meantime.

In your recollection, sir, you have heard the hon. senior member for St. John saying grow more potatoes, cassava, and yams, and increase local food production. You have heard Government members laugh at this suggestion. You have heard the hon. senior member for St. Joseph ridiculing everything that was said. Now the Government thinks that they have a brand new idea in their heads about increasing pig production; and the only way they can do it, is by importing more feed. The few more pigs that we will get, will not compensate for the \$8,000 you will spend on concentrated feed. That is not economics, it is nonsense.

4.25 p.m.

If for all these years, bread-fruit trees had been planted all over the island, they would have grown wild, and you would have had bread-fruits, saving all that we are having to spend on imported feed. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture has deluded himself, that it is only six months since Ministerial Government has been put into effect; but we have had members of this House in control of Government's policy for over six years, and they had just as much power then to do what they wanted to do, as they have now. There is just one further point which I would like to make. This question of the importation of pickled pork is being largely in the public's eye to-day, because of the amount of money which we are spending on it. I would like the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, to tell the Committee, why he continues to maintain a ban on imported pickled pork from Denmark, and the Argentine, countries from which we can get that article cheaper, than the places from which we are getting it to-day.

Mr. LEWIS: I just asked the hon. Minister to clarify what I heard him read out just now; all he needed to say was, what I have said is right or wrong. I did not want to do him the injustice of saying something, which he did not say. However he has not answered my point about getting statistics for comparison, because he has only supplied figures as to the slaughter of pigs for one year. If this scheme has one good point about it, that point is in respect of compelling people to register the number of pigs which have been born in the island; and you can bribe them to come and get some feed.

The hon. Minister has said, because of the use of Agrocide, they cannot grow potatoes and yams, and they were planting corn instead and as the result of the mealy bug pest, the planters have asked the Government to rescind the law about the compulsory planting of food crops. I have seen that the Government has agreed to that. (Hon. M. E. COX: We have not agreed to anything like that). Well if you reduce the acreage to be planted in food-crops; you must have reduced the percentage which the Order required to be planted in good crops. They have modified the Order; therefore, they have reduced the acreage for the planting of food crops. The acreage must be reduced further, and I am wondering if the only food-crop which can be planted is corn.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman,—I have asked for certain information from the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry & Labour. I heard some hon.

members laugh when I ask the question; but you can laugh outside the Mental Hospital, and can also laugh in appreciation of what has been said. Let the hon. Minister illustrate that his laugh has sprung from the fact, that I am talking nonsense. Let him tell us why they are preventing people from importing pickled meat from the Argentine and Denmark, and they are still spending this money on subsidisation. If you get this pickled pork from these two countries, you could save this money which you are spending on subsidisation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head XXI stand part.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You cannot put the question yet, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That question does not come within the portfolio of the hon. Minister, and therefore I am not allowing it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Well I am not asking him that question. What I want to find out from the Government is this. We are embarking on this scheme to expand the pig production, and we are proposing to subsidise the production of pigs to the extent of \$8,000 to the remainder of the present financial year; so as to give 100 lbs. of feed to every owner of a pig which has a litter of six piglets. The object is, in time to come, the production will so expand, we will save what we are spending on the subsidisation of pickled pork. I am simply suggesting that if we are going on with this scheme so as to save this \$138,000 on subsidisation of pickled pork, the Government should tell the House and the community, why they are still maintaining a ban on the importation of pickled pork from the Argentine and Denmark, when we can get the same amount of pork without spending this subsidy. I want to say, other West Indian colonies are getting cheaper pickled pork from Denmark, Holland and the Argentine. Great Britain herself is importing pickled pork from these countries; so why should the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry & Labour be loathed to say why this Government permits this ban to remain in force? The point is quite a simple one. If they claim that they are carrying out this scheme, God knows if this 100 lbs. of feed will produce the piglets, so that we can stop importing pickled meat. It may be that my information is wrong, or that if you removed the ban, you could not get pickled pork any cheaper. But if I am wrong, tell me that I am wrong, or prove to me that I am wrong; but do not just sit there and grin when remarks are made.

I drew this particular matter to the attention of this House sometime in February this year. It is now September, and nothing has been done about it, except that there has now been brought forward, this little scheme to give people who keep pigs a hundred pounds of concentrated feed. Let us hear why in September, 1954, they are still maintaining this ban on the importation of pickled meat from the Argentine and Denmark.

Mr. ALLDER: When I made my comments in connection with this matter, I had it in mind, to be as constructive as possible. I expected the Government to be as magnanimous as possible. We discussed this problem among ourselves, so that the Government would be able to get ideas; and in order that they could put forward every suggestion which was made, suggestions which would result in a proper scheme being brought about, so as to produce the results which this scheme of distribution of feed stuff for pigs, seek to achieve. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture seems to be willing to disregard suggestions, which are made from this side of the table. That is not sur-

prising, because there are several schemes which the Government has modified in recent days, and when suggestions were presented from this side of the table, the members of the Government disliked to know that our suggestions were respected. However, after a few weeks, we read in the newspapers that our suggestions are being considered and are being implemented by the Government.

When I listened to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, I thought, I was listening to him last Sunday night at Pie Corner. If the Government wants to have a 'show-down' in this matter, this is nothing more than material for the propaganda machine which is being carried on now. Only the Government's members can see tangible results being achieved, from this scheme. It is a waste of time, to give a hundred pounds of feed to a pig-breeder whose pig has produced these piglets. That will only help people who are pig-breeders already; but it will not increase the number of pig-breeders, which is just what you want to do. I have already started to keep pigs; but after I have been keeping my pigs for sometime, you are now saying, you will give me 100 lbs. of feed; but my next door neighbour, who does not want to have the trouble which I am having, is not worrying himself about starting to keep pigs. I suggest the Government should purchase a good breed of pigs from England, inasmuch as the Dutch Government has been doing that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has already made all those points.

Mr. ALLDER: I want to arouse the Government bench into doing something.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member think he can arouse them? (Laughter).

Mr. ALLDER: I am very sorry about that matter. That is why I am speaking a second time; and because the Government members were not willing to consider suggestions, which I consider to be constructive. If pigs could be imported from England—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for Christ Church has given the answer to that question, and it is the correct one.

4.35 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: I am saying that Government has not even promised us any suggestion; it cannot say that this suggestion is a constructive one. This cannot solve the problem. I can give the Hon. Minister of Agriculture some more knowledge in this matter. When these animals are imported, (and you cannot get an increase in population unless they are imported, because if you wait until the local population of pigs make increases, it will take too long) you should keep them at the Central Livestock Station and breed them. When you get young piglets from them, your Peasant Agricultural Instructors should be ready with a list of suitable people to whom you should distribute them. These piglets should not be given to people who own a pig, or who have already started to keep pigs. They should be given to those peasants who have not already started to keep pigs. By so doing, you will be increasing the number of pig-breeders. You should also distribute them among the peasants, with the stipulation, that they should not be sold until they have produced several litters. If you do this, over a period, the problem would be somewhat ameliorated. If you do not do that, you will find, year after year, you will be spending \$8,000,—in fact, \$16,000, because \$8,000 is what you are providing to spend until the end of this financial year—and your pork supply will not be increased as a result of what you spend.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, it is to the contrary of what you have said, and that the members of the

Government are capable of sound reasoning; and that they are not as dead as your statement implies.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman,—Before you put the question, I want to know what is the cause of the delay, or the refusal, or the inability of the Government, to reply to the question which I asked about pickled pork.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Allow me to explain this matter to the hon. member. Do not blame the Government, or a particular Minister, for not replying to your question. I am not allowing it. The hon. member has the opportunity of asking that question through the proper channel if he is desirous of the information.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What opportunity have I?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is not question time of the House. The hon. member will have the opportunity of asking that question through the proper channel, and I am sure you will be given the answer. I feel that if the hon. member takes up the question with the particular Minister privately, you will get the answer. I certainly am not going to allow him to answer you during this debate, even if I have to sit in this Chair until next morning. Anything under the Head, Department of Science and Agriculture, the hon. member can speak on until tomorrow morning; but do not ask the hon. Minister any question outside of that Head.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the \$138,000 which the hon. Minister said Government is spending on subsidising pickled pork came out of my pocket only, I would turn to him and say: "My boy, try and get it back for Crawford." Since it is public funds which this Government is squandering, I am demanding an answer in the most public way possible. Mr. Chairman, I am not asking any question in the manner which you mean, such as, "Is the Government aware, etc." Mine is not a question which the hon. Minister has not the answer, or cannot supply the information, or one which the Government has to refer to its files, or the Minister has to be given time to check up on the answer. This is a question arising out of the debate; and if the hon. Minister does not know why he is doing so and so, then Ministerial Government is a farce. The hon. Minister knows why we must wait until this pig production scheme enters the second phase, before this subsidy on pickled pork can be taken off. The hon. Minister knows that this policy is maintained in the interest of certain importers.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Again, the hon. member is straying from the point. We are dealing with Head XXI—Department of Science and Agriculture. It has nothing to do with the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Even if the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour wants to answer you, I am not allowing him.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour is part of the Government. The Minister of Finance produced this resolution to supply the money to help pig-breeders. If the Government is not being run either by the Government Officers, or by big business men in Bridgetown, or by both, and if Ministerial Government means that the five Ministers are running the country, certainly they should know something of what is going on in this matter. Do you mean to tell me, the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, does not know why Government is spending \$138,000 on the subsidisation of pickled pork? The Hon. Minister of Agriculture has told us that this is phase No. 1; and that when we come to phase No. 2, Government will stop importing pickled pork and stop spending a subsidy on it. Let us say, the Hon. Min-

ister for Agriculture is completely ignorant of what the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour is doing. Let us say, there is no co-operation on any level; therefore, the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour is completely left to his own will to lay out his own schemes. Do you mean to tell me, the five Ministers do not know why we are still subsidising pickled pork? If you refer to the Estimates, you will find that at the time you produced the Estimates, it was estimated that the subsidy on pickled pork would have been merely \$300,000. That was what Government was proposing to do, on the 23,000 barrels of pickled pork which is imported annually. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture has told us to-day,—or has at least told me,—that my figures are wrong. My figures were based on the figures of the issue. He is now saying that the revised figure is \$138,000. The Government is not as completely ignorant, as it is trying to make out. All I am saying is this; if Government has been checking up on the question in order to get those figures accurately, does it imply that the expenditure of \$300,000 was not under consideration at sometime or the other? 4.45 p.m.

If they had been following it in order to get the correct estimate, it follows that they should be in a position to tell the House if they will maintain the policy, or for how long, and why, they are maintaining it. We know how it benefits certain people to have this subsidy maintained. It is common knowledge, the higher the cost of pork is, the more money you invest in pickled pork. It all boils itself down to the fact that in six months—even before the introduction of the Ministerial System—the Government had the power to stop this nonsense. In February this year, other West Indian islands had stopped it. The Barbados Government is still going along with it.

Now to-day, sir, they are sheltering behind your delayed ruling, which, if carried to its logical conclusion, would mean that debate in this Chamber is useless. On any occasion that a member poses a question which demands an answer, he will be told that he must bring in a formal question and table it. One might as well stop coming here. I do not see where that will lead. It is entirely a matter for them, if they feel like answering or not. It does not mean anything to me personally, whether they go on spending this money or not. It is, I repeat, entirely a matter for them, if with what should be their sense of responsibility, they feel that a question like this should remain unanswered.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of order, sir. The hon. member is speaking absolutely contrary to your ruling; to which he has referred in the most offensive terms. Let us show an example to the public that we can respect the Chair. How can the hon. member ask a Minister such a question, without having given previous notice of it? Is he prepared to abolish the rules governing the asking of questions? If that is so, he can come any day and ask the Minister of Agriculture if he is prepared to increase pig production in the city; or he can come and ask me as Minister of Education, if I am prepared to improve pig-breeding among elementary school children. If that is so, he can ask any such question without having given notice of it, and demand an immediate reply, in spite of the ruling of the Chair. The hon. member is entirely out of order to pursue the line of debate, he is pursuing.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Listening to the last speaker, one can only come to the conclusion that what I said, was entirely outside the ambit of the debate today. But it is not. All that I have been doing is,

quoting the Minister of Agriculture. That Minister told us point blank, we are spending \$138,000 to-day on subsidising imported pickled pork. He also said, the second phase of his programme is calculated to remove the amount of money we are spending on imported pickled pork. Does it not follow, as a natural conclusion, and quite within the confines of your ruling, that any member of the House is entitled to ask: why wait until the programme reaches a point where the subsidy is no longer necessary, when you can remove the subsidy immediately, and save money by that process? Is that unparliamentary, or contrary to your ruling? I am not bringing in anything separate and distinct from this debate. What I have asked, is a natural corollary from what the Minister said. There is nothing foreign in it. It is a related question.

In spite of the fact, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture himself referred in the specific terms to this subsidisation of imported pickled pork, the Government knows nothing of the policy as regards imported pickled pork. If that is so, the whole Ministerial system is a farce. You have a jack-ass in a cart, the two front legs are going forward, while the two hind legs are going backwards. What it means is, the Minister of Agriculture feels deeply hurt and personally annoyed, that we are spending all this money on imported pickled pork. It is the height of his ambition to get to the point, where we would not have to do it. Subsidisation of imported pickled pork does not come within his portfolio. Are we to understand then, his sentiments against spending this money on imported pickled pork, do not find an echo within the breasts of the Hon. Minister of Finance and the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour? Are we to understand, it is a matter of complete indifference to those two Ministers, that we continue to spend this money which the Minister of Agriculture deplores? The Minister for Finance says: "I want \$138,000 to subsidise pickled pork—"

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have not seen anything about \$138,000 in this Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I got it from the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the Minister of Agriculture took up a gun and shot people in the gallery, would you follow him? I do not want to hear anything more about \$138,000, keep to the pig-breeding scheme.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Since the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is apparently at loggerheads with his colleagues, he might shoot one of them, and not anyone in the gallery.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will, however, stick to the point.

Mr. CRAWFORD: With all due respect to your ruling, Sir, it will be possible to stick to the pork proposals, merely by sticking to what the hon. Minister said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not see anything about pickled pork in this Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Those proposals have naturally come about, because the Government wants to increase pig production; in order to decrease the importation of pickled pork.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not stated here.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In other words sir, the Minister of Agriculture should not have said one word in bringing the resolution down. He should just have referred to the explanatory note: but he could not do that here, because no one would have stood for it. That is not the way that matters are introduced in the Other Place. In all Parliamentary Chambers, debates arise out of statements made by the Govern-

ment's members to the House itself. All that I have done, is to reply to the statements made by the Minister of Agriculture, and asked the same Government to which the Minister belongs, to explain how these inter-related matters are so diametrically opposed to each other. Any refusal on the part of the Government to reply to what I have asked, is not merely a matter of being obtuse; it is far more than that. It is either conniving at a policy injurious to the island as a whole, or ignorance of what is going on in Government's business, or both.

4.55 p.m.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman;—Order and responsibility are the very essence of an important debate in this House. I do not know if members of the Government remember it, but the honourable senior member for St. Philip has tabled a question in connection with this matter of pickled pork. From my knowledge of the Rules of the House, he is out of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member on my left, (Mr. Vaughan) cannot take up any Order Paper, and show that I have tabled any question in connection with this issue. I have never tabled any question about it. (A MEMBER: During the last session.) Neither during this session, nor during the session which has just been ended. I defy the honourable junior member for St. John to prove that at any time during the last session, I asked any questions about this matter. (Cheers).

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

HEAD XXV—PUBLIC WORKS DPT.

Hon G. H. ADAMS: The next Head is Head XXV; the items speak for themselves. The notes are sufficiently clear. I beg to move that Head XXV stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: In connection with Item 14 Unestablished Staff, the amount required is \$2,900; and in connection with Item 19, Leave Pay to Casual Employees, the amount to be voted is \$3,000. I think it would be as well for me, to take this opportunity to remind the Government, it is high time that they promulgate a policy, with regard to the Unestablished Staff and the Casual Employees. You will recollect, Mr. Chairman, that in the previous session, I raised the matter by way of a question, as regards the Government's policy in respect of granting time off to the Unestablished Staff and the casual employees. I proposed that just as individuals in private employment are given time off, without any deduction from their pay, so that they can attend the Races, Intercolonial cricket matches and so on, I see no reason why the Unestablished Staff and the casual employees of Government cannot also be given time off, so as to attend these occasions. As a matter of fact, it is for the Government to set an example in this matter. If the local private employers who are about the severest in the world do not find that they lose anything by giving their employees time off to attend Intercolonial cricket matches, Races, and so on, there is no reason why the Government employees should not have similar privileges. When they attend these occasions, they return to their work refreshed, and very enthusiastic about working. I think the time has come, when we should look forward to the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, formulating and promulgating a policy with regard to leave pay for casual employees and the Unestablished Staff; and also to the question of their being paid for a full week, when one day of the week is a bank holiday.

I would have liked to see in this Resolution, some reference made to the matter I have just mentioned. It is essential in any state; especially in the Socialist and welfare state, which we are endeavouring to set up in this country I would like the Hon. Minister to give consideration to this matter; but of course, I am not forcing him to answer me now. These casual employees, and the Unestablished Staff, are almost the only ones who do not get the opportunity of attending Race meetings, or important Cricket matches, without losing a day's pay.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I am not satisfied over the many complaints and grievances made by the Unestablished Staff in some parts of the island. I would like the Government to issue a booklet governing the conditions of work of these employees, having regard to sickness, overtime pay, time and a half, and overtime; because every now and then some grievance is brought to me which I cannot answer, since I do not know the conditions of work which govern this staff. I think that these people are important enough in the Establishment, and that the Government could issue a booklet governing the conditions of their employment, for the enlightenment at least of members of this House. When these employees bring a grievance to me, I am quite powerless to advise them. What I have suggested is something which members of this House should know. At the Water Works Department in Bridgetown, there are some people, who get overtime pay; and at the Water Works Department in St. John, similar workers are not paid for working overtime. There is one man who is employed at Golden Ridge, and he is there entirely alone for a whole night. Formerly, a watchman and another man were employed. The watchman has just retired, and I understand there is no intention of replacing him. However, I would like the Government to set out in a booklet, the information for which I am asking.

Mr. LEWIS: When I read this Note 8, which says: "This amount is required to meet increases in the wages of the Unestablished Staff during the financial year," does that refer only to people in the Key Scale, or does it mean that these people are to be paid for holidays, and half days, for which they were not paid before? I find it strange that this applies to the Public Works Department alone. Is this increase due to the fact that you are taking on more staff? Note No. 9, in connection with Printing and Stationery, says this: "The need for the additional amount of \$400 is due to the large capital works programme which has involved a great increase in the consumption of vouchers, order books, ledgers, etc. It has also been found necessary to prepare a price list in book form for merchants' quotations." I would like the Hon. Premier to assist me in this matter: I understand some Head of the Department is now being paid \$100 a month, or a year, for the actual signing of the vouchers in his department. I am assured, that is the Gospel truth. The Hon. Premier may not be able to tell me at this stage, but that is a matter which should be under his charge. I really want to know if there is any Head of a Department who is getting \$100 a month for signing vouchers. I understand that that is the case. I am taking this opportunity of enquiring into this matter; otherwise, I shall have to put in a question, and I would not know to whom I should put it. Is this something new or what? Is this an increase in salary or what?

5.05 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman.—One thing I would like to find out, before the question is put: I would like to know something about Leave Pay to casual employees. Note 10 to that Item reads

as follows: "The full amount required to pay casual employees who qualify for vacation and sick leave under the Leave Regulations is \$14,000, but as all of the employees do not claim this privilege, especially if they are continuously employed, the sum of \$6,000 only was included in the Estimates. As more men are now applying for leave, it has become necessary to supplement that amount, and it is estimated that a sum of \$3,000 will meet such demands to the end of the financial year."

This is the part I want to bring to your attention, "but as all of the employees do not claim this privilege, especially if they are continuously employed, the sum of \$6,000 only was included in the Estimates." Is that an error? Or would the Hon. Minister explain it more fully? Is that a privilege or a legal right? (A VOICE: It is a privilege.) I hear *sotto voce*, it is a privilege. If it is a privilege, then it should also be a privilege for the man in the street. If you work a part of the year, it is common knowledge that you are entitled to vacation leave. I therefore cannot see, how this can be a privilege for those working under the Government; and on the other hand, a law for the man in the street. How can it be a privilege for those casual workers, when you are saying, according to the note, they qualified for vacation leave, but all the employees do not claim it? I do not want to embarrass the Government; but I see no reason why these employees should be robbed out of their leave. It is my belief, as soon as you pass that law, it was theirs by right and not a privilege. I notice that the Hon. Premier is looking up a Law Book.

Mr. LEWIS: The law does not speak of people in the employ of Government.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I was looking up something else; but I can tell the honourable member that there is no law binding Government to pay its employees. No Civil Servant can sue the Government for his salary, if the Government does not care to pay. I thought that was elementary. Therefore, if Government treats one of its employees in the same way as a private employer, it is a privilege. Honourable members should know that no Government employee, not even the Colonial Secretary, can ask for his vacation at any particular time in a year. That is why it is a privilege. Sometimes, you cannot give a man leave, although he qualifies for it. If you do not give your domestic servant annual holiday, she can sue; but no Government employee can sue the Government.

What is really happening in this case, (it may be an indication that a few more people are taking sick leave) is that more and more people are availing themselves of what you might call, this privilege grant. Bear in mind, it is not a legal right. More and more persons are taking advantage of it; therefore, you will have to find more money for more relief. The Government will be wrong if it did not grant it. However, the Government cannot tie itself down legally to do so, since the exigency of the service may not permit persons to go on leave at times.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, I can quite understand, owing to the relationship between the Crown and the people, they cannot sue the Crown. However, I must talk about this. This note says: "The full amount required to pay casual employees who qualify for vacation and sick leave under the Leave Regulations is \$14,000." Further on you say: "but as all the employees do not claim this privilege, especially if they are continuously employed, the sum of \$6,000 only was included in the Estimates." After all, Sir, this is not the Government of 1925; this is the Government that brought in the law to

make provision for holidays with pay. I say this: If these casual employees qualify for a vacation with pay, you should not be a party to say, although they qualify for it, they should not claim it. If Mr. "X" who runs a private business, according to the law, must give holidays with pay to his employees, why should Government take advantage of that statute? I do not believe the Government has done it intentionally; but what you are saying in this note, is to that effect. I do not know what is the relationship between the Union and the Public Works Department, which employs the greater number of these casual employees. In other words, if those employees were employed by Mr. Clarke, or Mr. Denny, or some other contractor, for nine months in any year, and they were not given holidays with full pay, they would be able to go to the Labour Officer and put their case; and the contractor would be bound to give them that leave. You are saying in this note, some of these employees do not claim the privilege. Have they been told that they are entitled to it? You are calling it a privilege; but I am not calling it a privilege.

5.15 p.m.

You may not be able to call it a privilege, Sir, but it is a moral obligation on the part of the Government. If a man works nine months, he is entitled to a week and a half vacation with pay; if he works six months, he is entitled to a week's vacation with pay. Because a man cannot claim it legally from the Government, it does not mean that the Government should not see that he gets what is his moral due. This is not a criticism. I am merely drawing the matter to the attention of the Government. Since the Government has passed the Holidays with Pay Act, I do not see how they can come here and say, these people have not claimed their leave with pay.

The department should have kept certain statistics, to show how many men worked over a certain period, and how many qualified for leave with pay. Any honest member of the House can see the point that I am making. The Government should not come here and say that some employees have not claimed it. They are morally entitled to it. Does this mean that because some of these people may not like your political views, or your looks, you are not going to give them what is morally theirs? Of course they cannot bring a case against the Crown. But what example would the Government be setting to private enterprise, if they refused to give these men what is theirs by moral right?

I do not think that it will be doing any harm, if we ask the hon. Minister to go back to the Department, look through the books, and see what is the position. The Government is demanding that private enterprise do it. Do not come and tell us, that some people have not claimed this privilege. I suggest to the Hon. Minister, if he likes, to postpone this. The note says, "employees do not claim this privilege, especially if they are continuously employed." Any member of this House, in his private affairs, would give his servants this privilege, unless he has the heart of a beast.

Is it that these workmen did not claim this privilege, because they did not know they could claim it, or because they were prevented from claiming it?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: When the hon. member starts to shout, often he has no case, and he makes it worse. If a man is not sick, how can you give him anything for sickness? If he is on leave he still gets paid. The hon. member talks, as if these men have earned something over and above their pay, and we are keeping it from them. There are people in the

Civil Service, who boast that they have never taken vacation. Some people just do not take vacation.

Mr. E. D. MORTLEY: The hon. member must be fair. Do not try to confuse the House, by bringing in the question of Civil Servants. When a workman does not take the two weeks to which he is entitled, he should draw the equivalent in money.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. member has interrupted me quite unnecessarily. Whether a man takes leave or not, he gets his money. By working for so many days, he qualifies for leave. If a man chooses to say: "I am too tired. I have nothing to go home for; I am quite fit," he draws his money. On the other hand, he can go to the Head of the Department and say he is entitled to leave, and get his leave. Perhaps the note is unfortunately worded. It must mean, you are aware that you have to look for money to pay the substitutes of the men who go on leave. More and more people are taking vacation leave, and you have to look for money. It is nothing like cane-cutters earning bonus, or anything like that. It is not a question of a legal or moral obligation. The only obligation comes from the fact, the Government say "regular casual", to mean a man who works for 250 days in a year. When a painter working with the Government gets sick and goes home, he does not get pay.

While I am on my feet, I will answer the other questions that were put. If the information of the hon. junior member for the City is correct, the Auditor General, the Minister of Finance, and two, three or four other people should be fired. How could anyone draw \$100.00 a month, or any other amount, merely for signing vouchers. If the Auditor General passed a voucher for such a person, he should be fired. I suppose the rumour originated from someone with a sense of humour. Someone, comparing his work with the work of someone else drawing perhaps more than he, may have said: "that fellow just comes to the office, drinks iced water, smokes a cigarette and signs a couple of vouchers and draws more money than I do." Or he may have said: "I do a lot of work and draw \$60.00 a month, while the other fellow just signs vouchers and draws \$1,000 a year." But seriously speaking, I cannot see anyone drawing \$100.00 a month, merely for signing vouchers. That is a difficult one to swallow.

5.25 p.m.

As regards the question asked by the hon. junior member for St. John, I should like to say, sometime ago, (I am not sure whether it was done in other Departments) the Water Works Department used to do it. Employees knew where they were, as regards their conditions of service. Only yesterday, we had some preliminary talks with Mr. Matthews of the I.L.O. as regards conditions and terms of service. We are actually in the contemplation of some labour code; and as to whether you can put government employees in that code, or not. It is the desire of the Government to let employees know what the position is; and this Booklet is actually being prepared by the Government, with the aid which we are getting from the I.L.O. expert. I entirely agree with the hon. junior member for St. John, an employee should know exactly what his relation is with the Government. If your cook does not choose to come out to work on any day, you still have to pay her for that day, unless you notify her that you are not going to pay her. If your cook is genuinely ill, you have to pay her for the days when she was absent from work.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am very glad to hear the remarks which have been made, because we have passed the Masters and Servants Act; and any Soc-

alist who would hang on to that Act, as a means of strengthening his argument, to speak about these things, is as dead as the dodo. It is admitted, this phrase in the note to this item, is unfortunate. It must be admitted, we have agreed in this island, that one of the conditions of employment with regard to the casual labourer, is that if he works for 250 days he is entitled to vacation leave and to sick leave. The Holidays with Pay Act does not actually apply here; a holiday connotes rest, which is to act as remuneration for working for so many days. In the Government service, it is intended to give a man a vacation; and that is why the number of 250 days has been used. That period represents a high proportion of a year; and you say, if a man works for 250 days, it shows that he has actually completed a normal full term. In these circumstances, you say that a person is entitled to 14 days vacation leave. It has never been in the intention of the Government to regard, in the strict sense, your vacation leave should be regarded as a privilege, which the Government will be willing to withhold from you. There have been cases in Great Britain, in which the Whitley Council and the Government, have differed, and Parliament had to make the final decision. I say that this is an unfortunate phrase, with respect to what the labour code would say; but any Government would have to be guided by high principles. It is not what your future legislation would provide; but what you intend, should be done. The Government intends to provide this necessity, but the phrase which is used in the Addendum about privilege, is unfortunate. It looks as if we are doing something, for which you have not made provision. If you employ a Civil Servant, and you give him \$100 a month, you say he cannot sue. But there is some condition of employment attached to the service; similarly, it is a condition of employment that you give a man vacation leave and sick leave. Therefore, I would not like the phrase which has been used in this note to go out as it is, because some future Government might say that we will act within our power, and we will not give these men any vacation leave.

As far as the Government Service is concerned, if a man does not take his leave, he does not get pay for not taking his leave; and in these circumstances, you allow a man's leave to accumulate. To these casual employees who have not been given their leave in one year, Government gives them four weeks' leave in the next year, because Government will not want to do any injustice to them. I would not like to withhold any leave from a man, because he did not know it was due to him.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Hon. members have admitted that the use of the word 'privilege,' is unfortunate. Until the Premier contradicts what has been said, that it is not a vacation, but a sort of vacation—

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I should like to point out that it is not the same thing as in the Act, where provision is made for working so many days. If a man did not take his leave last year, and it accumulated to four weeks, the Government should be prepared to give him his four weeks' leave.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What I really want to understand is this: these are casual workers, and the point which I stressed at the beginning is, I should not like to think that because these people are ignorant of the matter, an injustice is being done to them. Having seen the word "privilege", it seems to me that the casual worker does not know that he is entitled to any leave. This Resolution is for money to grant leave to these workers; and if you put in the words, "but as all of the employees do not claim this privilege," it does seem to me, if a man is working for fifty-two weeks a year, and he knew that he

was entitled to two weeks during which he can go home and get his pay, he would be suspicious that there was something wrong in the office. The hon. junior member for St. Peter, has said that it is not a question of bonus. I want to say, if people do not know about this matter, they should be notified that they are entitled to this leave. Although a man has no right against the Crown, if he qualifies for his two weeks holiday with pay, show me the man who will not draw that two weeks' pay.

The point I am making is, if I accept what the hon. junior member for St. Peter said, this is merely a vacation privilege so far as Government is concerned; and the particular employee of Government does not know he is entitled to it. If that is so, then I say, you should draw it to his attention. (A VOICE: You are talking foolishness). 5.35 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. senior member for the City not to loose his temper.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If I am talking foolishness, my foolishness is what is keeping me in here. I am not going to allow the Hon. Premier, or anybody else, to put anything over me. I object to the word "privilege" being used in this note. The hon. junior member for St. Peter has said, this wording to the note is unfortunate. I shall address my remarks now to the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works & Housing. I believe, I understand human nature as well as anybody else. Point me to the man, who would not go home on leave, if he knew he is entitled to vacation leave with pay. The hon. junior member for St. Peter has said, you cannot view this matter in the same light as the Holidays with Pay Act; but that this is a bonus for working. According to this resolution, the note says; "the full amount required to pay casual employees who qualify for vacation and sick leave under the Leave Regulations is \$14,000, but as all of the employees do not claim this privilege, especially if they are continuously employed, the sum of \$6,000 only was included in the estimates". That can only mean that those who qualified, are ignorant of the fact; therefore, they do not claim it. I say, if a man qualifies and he does not know that he can get this vacation leave with pay, draw it to his attention. I would like to know the man who would not take advantage of it. No man, is going to refuse money or refuse leave.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—I beg to move that you do now report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN APPOINTED

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I am making the motion that the hon. senior member for St. James, be appointed to act temporarily, as Chairman of Committees during the Chairman's absence.

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

The motion was agreed to, and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. HOLDER in the Chair.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman,—There seems to be some misunderstanding, as regards the position of these casual employees. Quite a number of honourable members made speeches, which are not appropriate to the question under discussion. I think it is as far back as five years ago, when we laid it down as a policy, that casual employees of Government who completed 250 days of work, were entitled to the same treatment as permanent employees, who got

sick leave and also vacation leave. That principle was passed on to all Heads of Departments. I want to say, it is not correct to say, these casual workers do not know that this provision is there. I am sure each and every individual, as soon as he begins to work with Government, knows it; because he comes into contact with those who were employed for some time. In that manner, they know as well as the others who were there before, this provision is available; therefore, the question that these people are ignorant of the provision, and that the Executive is keeping them in ignorance of it in order to deprive them out of it, is untrue and unfounded. Sometime ago, I had a talk with the casual employees of the Water Works Department. They told me that they knew this provision was there for them, but they just did not feel like taking a vacation; so they did not take advantage of it. They said, it would mean the same thing, if they got two weeks' vacation with pay, as if they were employed. I want to make it crystal clear, all casual employees of the Highways and Transport Department, the Water Works Department, and the Public Works Department, know that this provision exists for them. As the Hon. Premier has said, they are some people who do not like to take holiday for one reason or another. For what reason, I do not know; that is best known to them. It should never go down in this House, that these people are in ignorance of the provision; and furthermore, that the Executive are keeping them in ignorance. As I have said, every Head of a Department makes it clear to the employees that if they complete 250 days, in any one year, (and that is what has happened five years ago; it was laid down by the Labour Department) they should get vacation leave and sick leave.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution is really to supplement the Item, because there is a larger number of people employed in the Public Works Department, owing to the programme of capital works. Because of that, larger numbers of casual employees are qualifying for this leave.
5.45 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: If my colleague will just allow me to say a few words, I would point out that even the Hon. Minister does not see the reason. This is one occasion when one unfortunate word has crept into this note; and because of that, the Government has got to give another directive to the Heads of Departments.

Reading this note now, I can see exactly what happens. The reason is not because these employees have been kept in ignorance of what they are entitled to. The reason is set down here. Look at what it says: it says, that the annual amount required is so and so, as all employees do not claim this privilege especially when they are continuously employed. The whole thing hinges on those words. The situation is this: If a casual employee is employed at the Public Works Department, and he goes on leave, you have to take on someone to do his work. When the man's leave is over and you do not take him back, he is out of work. The remedy is to tell the Head of the Department that if a man goes on leave, and you take on a substitute, tell the substitute that he will only be employed until the man who has gone on leave returns to work. If there were no risk of losing one's job by taking leave, these people would be fools not to claim their leave with pay. But no one is going to take two weeks' leave with pay, and run the risk of being put out of work for six or eight weeks. Let these people understand that they will lose nothing by taking their two weeks' leave, and you will see the difference.

The question that Head XXV stand part of the Schedule was put and agreed to.

HEAD XXVIII—SUBSIDIES AND GRANTS

Head XXVIII, Subsidies and Grants, was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman;—This Head relates to comparatively small amounts, and the notes speak for themselves. I beg to move that Head XXVIII stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

HEAD XXIX—MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Head XXIX, Miscellaneous Services, was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman;—As regards this Head, I see the honourable senior member for St. Lucy is warming up. I can assure him he is not half as warm about Government printing, as the members of the Government are. It is frightfully expensive to put down a Government Printery, speaking especially of the initial outlay. We have agreed, for some years now, on the principle of having a government printery. Year after year, we have put into the Estimates, a sum, for making the necessary inquiries as to what a printery will cost us. We have had quotations through the Crown Agents. We have had the advice of the Government Printer of Trinidad, and the Government Printer of St. Lucia; and we are now investigating the suggestions which have come to our notice, by reason of the fact, that the Caribbean Commission is employing a cheaper way of printing documents. Also, as a result of some information we have got from Mr. J. W. Foster, as to measures which, for government purposes, will be cheaper than establishing a big printing office.

This Government agrees that we should have a Government Printery; but it does not look at a Government Printery as having priority over a school or a hospital. We regret as much as anyone sitting around this table, this huge expenditure on Government printing. But it is a fact, when you are the only big bug in a territory, you can have a monopoly. No matter how much you may try to whittle down, I do not think that any of us on the Printing Committee can say, this, that or the other, is an overcharge.

Honourable members will agree that if we have to choose between a school or hospital, and a Government Printery, we should choose the school or hospital. I would also like to say to the House, it is time that we consider our procedure. We duplicate or even triplicate reports today. You publish a thing like Professor Beasley's Report, or Mr. Foster's Report, in the Official Gazette, and then you publish it as a document to be laid on the table of the House. You therefore print it at least twice. The cost of printing must go up.

I do not want to say anything that might seem like a reflection on anyone. But I would like to draw attention to the Rule, which deals with Documents of the House. I suggest to members of the House not to ask that every document laid in the House, be printed as a document and in the Official Gazette. Perhaps things like questions are different, in that that they relate to the procedure of the House. But to print a document to be laid on the table of the House, and then to reproduce it in the Official Gazette, is in some cases, spending money unnecessarily.

I suggest to honourable members, however, whatever their views about a Government Printery might be, and whether they think that a Government Printery should have priority over a school, this supplementary vote is something which they cannot repudiate. You cannot make a contract with a man, employ his services, use up his paper, and then say I am not going to pass the Resolution to pay him. That would be more worthy of condemnation, than it was suggested the Government deserved, in the last debate. This is more than a moral obligation to pay the Advocate Co.

6.00 p.m.

This is a question of a contractual obligation. I am not now giving a legal opinion, but some of the members of the Printing Committee can be sued, if not the Government. I am quite sure that the members of the Printing Committee will vote for this amount of money, because the *Advocate* can sue them. I am quite sure, the honourable senior member for St. Lucy will agree with that. We are under a contractual obligation with the Advocate to pay this money. So whatever criticism might be made, we shall be glad to hear it; and it will confirm the Government in the view, it is no longer necessary to spend this money, and that the Government in printing its own Documents, will not have to pay out all this money. I suggest to honourable members that they make the usual comments; and if they consider making the erection of a Government printery a priority where Government works are concerned, the Government will know what the feeling of this Committee is.

As regards the question of Conferences, many Conferences have taken place. I have the actual details of recent Conferences; and if honourable members care to ask for them, I shall give them those details in due course. I would like to say what I hinted to honourable members last Tuesday; that is, after this Estimate was made up, I received an invitation to join the two delegates who have been chosen by the Regional Economic Committee to attend the preliminary Commonwealth talks. In order to get there in time, I am going to leave this colony on Thursday, accompanied by the Financial Secretary, because the preliminary Conference begins on Monday. That item has to be added to the Estimate. The Colonial Office is not ready to see us in connection with the matter of the Deep Water Harbour. The actual expenditure in connection with these Conferences, is in the vicinity of \$5,684. On the question of Acting Allowances, the sum of \$40,000 has been expended up to April on an average of \$4,400 a month. I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Judging from the tenor of the remarks made by the Hon. Premier, the Government does not require any further convincing, as to the necessity for having a Government Printery, and it is not a question of whether we will have to fortify them in their view that a Government Printery should obtain priority, I submit, it should be one of the first priorities. As a matter of fact, I cannot conceive of any expenditure on Capital Works which is more necessary than the erection of a Government Printery.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If the honourable member will forgive me, I should just like to say that if the Government feel that we should change the order of priority, where Capital Works are concerned, then I should say that we should know what should be the order of priority. We have taken into account, all the criticisms which have been made in this House, with regard to the Five Year Plan; and we have a list as to priorities.

Mr. BRANCKER: If the Government feel that the Establishment of a Government Printery should be accorded priority, then the House will support the Government in this view; with the exception of course, of one or two honourable members who are either directly or indirectly concerned with the fortunes of the private company, which does the Government printing. I do not think that the members of the Printing Committee would be unduly worried, if they were called upon to pay the Advocate; because that company would be concerned with the honourable junior member for Christ Church. I do not think that company would be concerned about the honourable junior member for St. John, or myself. I do not think there is any need to fear that this amount will not be passed, because, we have committed ourselves to it, and it is legal responsibility. I should like to let the Government appreciate this: we will certainly support treating the establishment of a Government Printery as a priority. We will support it as a priority, and I should like to remind the Government that the contract for Government printing has just been renewed for three years. This is the year in which we should put our house in order, so that by 1957, we will have our Government Printery functioning. It is not without interest, that there was more than one application for the award of the contract for Government printing this year. One application was supported by a very strong surety, which implies, that this surety was of the opinion, that this other company would also be able to comply with the terms of the contract. I understand, the equipment of this other applicant for the contract, was inspected sometime ago, by the official who came out here; but according to rumour which was not unfounded, that official seems to have yielded to some kind of gentle persuasion and he has found, that the printing works in question, although it publishes a newspaper and does a tremendous amount of job printing, would not be able to fulfil the Government contract. I would be very surprised if that printing works were not able to do the work which the Government requires to be done under their contract. If these works are capable, and were sometime ago available for sale, another opinion should be taken other than the opinion of the gentleman who came out here, and said that this printing plant would not be suitable for a Government Printery. We have now three years to run. That is, in my opinion, the strongest possible reason why we should start now, and feel assured, the matter has the backing of this House. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that it was five, six or more years, when an Address was passed by this Chamber requesting the Government to take the necessary steps to establish a Government Printery in this island. If now in 1954, the Government treats with priority, something which the House requested some eight years ago, we will feel satisfied that it will get the support of this entire Chamber. The absence of a Government Printery is one of those things in respect of which, we are looked down upon by people in other colonies. They are amazed, when they understand that Barbados, which has so far advanced in the vanguard of political progress in the Caribbean, cannot boast of having a Government Printery. That is a state of affairs which should not be allowed to continue indefinitely. We are spending approximately half million dollars of the taxpayers money in a few orders to this private company.

6.10 p.m.

Sir, \$90,000 has already been voted, and to-day we are asked to vote an additional \$38,000. This means, \$128,000 of the taxpayers money is passing through the hands of one private company. At this rate, within the space of four years, more than half

a million dollars will be spent on Government printing and binding, and will be passing through the hands of one private company. Suppose, to the five honourable members of this House on the other side, that does not sound like a colossal sum. You should also consider the individuals who do this work for Government at this private company. I can assure you, there is not one of them, who would not like to be in the employ of this Government, instead of their present employer; although I am not saying, they have anything specially against that private employer. There is not one of them, who does not aspire to be in the employ of Her Majesty the Queen, instead of continuing in the employment which they now enjoy or have to undergo. Sir, it would give satisfaction to every one of those persons who does this work for the Government, if it were done by the Government, instead of by a private employer. If Government were to establish its own printery, it would enable us to hold our heads high, and maintain that Barbados leads the way in every respect. But we cannot say so in this respect; in this respect, we are behind the smallest West Indian colony.

Sir, from a business standpoint, I feel, and I repeat, this matter should be accorded priority this year. This is the right time to set about it, because you will have three years to make preparations. You can decide what you are going to do in two years, and in the third year, you can put your decisions into effect; so that in 1957, there would be no need to award a private contract. And, bear in mind, apart from that aspect, you are seeking to create a welfare state. Therefore, everything that can be put into the hands of the Government to run, it is your inescapable duty to do so. Sir, after the eight years this House has been inviting the Government to establish its own printery, a printery is entitled to be accorded priority at this time, and to be embarked upon immediately.

(A VOICE: Would you give it priority before schools and hospitals?)

Now, Sir, a member connected in some respects, with what is called free enterprise and big business, questions whether it should be given priority before hospitals and schools. Well, Sir, schools have received a reasonable amount of priority up to now. I take it, you do not mean to say that every school must be built or renovated, before you turn to something else. There is one other matter which might claim equal status, and that is, if you will agree with me, the Headmaster's residence for the Coleridge-Parry School. Apart from that, there is nothing which is more entitled to immediate attention and to consideration at the highest Government level, than the establishment of a Government Printery in this island.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman,—Honourable members will remember that during the first Session of this House, I brought in an Address requesting Government to establish a Government Printery. I gave every reason for so doing; one being, it would be a means of training a wide section of our youths just as they leave school, in a skilled trade. It is all very well for the Hon. Premier to tell us that the Government is not against the establishment of its own printery, and that it is the policy which the Government agrees to; but we want something more substantial than that assurance. When we see a resolution brought down to put up a building to house a Government Printery, then we can feel happy, and say at least, that this very necessary Government institution is coming to pass.

Now, Sir, in every West Indian colony, without any exception, there is a Government Printery. It is a matter of principle. It is the type of thing

which should be under the control of the Government. I have said already, when I moved that former Address, if Government established its own printery, it would be a means for the production of informative literature, and for the wider spread of adult education. I cannot imagine any cheaper way of spreading adult education by a Government, than by the ownership of its own printery. It would be the means for the production of the necessary books. The average Barbadian loves to read; but after leaving school, his inability to procure books easily, makes his literacy grow on the reverse. I would just digress to say, that the term literacy is very narrowly used. Very often, children go through school until they reach the seventh standard; but after they leave school they do not look at a book, thus they come within the true sense of the word illiterate. Elementary education is only for the acquisition of the three "R's"; but further knowledge must come from further reading.

Sir, a Government Printery must be looked upon, as the principal instrument for the spread of further education after school. It is deplorable that we should be spending \$120,000 annually, more or less, subsidising a private plant, when this amount could be of such invaluable use to the community, if it were used otherwise. Hundreds are leaving school annually; and if Government had its own printery, that would be a means of giving a substantial number of them a skilled training in machinery. Sir, it is much easier for a printer who goes abroad to the big countries, to get employment quicker than any other skilled tradesman. Another thing is, printing is on the increase. It is one of the callings which is not diminishing; it is forever growing in this modern world. This world must become a more literate world, if we must all survive. There is every argument for the immediate implementation and the establishment of a Government Printery. As a matter of fact, any Socialist Government without its own printery, I think, is a contradiction of its terms. I draw it to the attention of the Hon. Premier that we will not be satisfied continually, with his telling us that it is the policy of the Government to have its own printery. We will not be satisfied until he brings down a resolution for putting up a building to house its own printery.

6.20 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—Some of the honourable members who feel that this is a very large amount for printing and binding, will be glad to hear that in Mr. Foster's Report, he has made suggestions for cutting out a lot of the printing that now goes to the Government Printer. I do not know whether the Government has a printery pending or not, but Mr. Foster's method is the cheaper one.

As regards Item 31, Conferences, I heard the Premier say, to the end of August, the sum of \$5,684 has been spent on Conferences. I take it that the estimate printed here, \$12,000, would be quite in order. But, it appears as if in the next six or seven months, the Government anticipates that the number of Conferences which Barbadians will have to send representatives to, will increase. I am wondering whether the Government is keeping its eyes out, on cutting down expenditure under this Head.

The honourable member mentioned a Rice Conference. I cannot for the life of me see, why, if we contribute a large amount of money to the Regional Economic Committee, and they have conferences in intercolonial matters of economic interest to the areas, we should still have to contribute extra money for Rice Conferences. Cannot Rice Conferences be fitted

in with these other conferences which the R.E.C. has? Is there any reason why Rice Conferences should be something outside of these other conferences? I have been asking this question long enough to get an answer to it. If there are some special powers needed for the Rice Conference, tell me so. It does not make sense to have Rice Conferences and Oils and Fats Conferences, when all the time, we are contributing money to the R.E.C., where the same people talk about the same thing.

It is not true to say that we are spending \$12,000 on Conferences; because you are contributing extra to a source which is holding conferences all the time. It might be a good thing, if the Barbados Government passed on my suggestion to the other West Indian Governments. If there is a special reason for holding special Oils and Fats Conferences and Rice Conferences, I am entitled to know it. I am appealing to the honourable member who represents us at these Conferences to say whether the very nature of Oils and Fats and Rice conferences precludes them from being included on the R.E.C.'s agenda.

I am glad to hear that the Government has refused some invitations to conferences. It is difficult to believe that they have done so. The average expenditure does not seem to justify the decrease, except the Government anticipates that some of these other conferences, will be extremely expensive. We have spent \$5,600 out of the \$12,000, and a balance must be there.

As regards Acting Allowances and payment for substitutes, this \$52,000, as we have heard, is in a great measure mixed up with the granting of leave passages; so that in addition to the \$100,000 we are paying for leave passages, we have to consider this additional \$52,000, and perhaps more. It is true that the amount is to pay for other perquisites like casual leave, sick leave, and vacation leave; but a great deal of the expenditure is a result of the fact, that you are paying leave passages. It is time we keep an eye on this situation.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—There is some information which I would like to ask for, under the Item, Conferences. I read over the weekend, the Premier is to go to the Conference on G.A.T.T. In view of the fact that this Government contributes funds to the R.E.C., and they sent a delegation to Australia some months ago, I would like to know, if this Government is required to pay the expenses of sending a representative to this conference, inasmuch as we have been invited to do so by R.E.C.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: As regards the last question, I have been invited to the Conference. The Barbados Government is bearing the expenses. The idea was, only two people from the area should be chosen. Jamaica wanted to be in it and they chose the Minister of Communications and works of Jamaica. When it was intimated that I should be chosen, it then became the duty of the Barbados Government, to bear the expenses for the extra time we would be in England discussing proposals affecting the Deep Water Harbour. According to what has appeared in the press, it seems as if everything that happens in Trinidad, may not be worthy of the highest praise. Barbados should not be treated as being inferior in status; and we had to depart from the rule under which delegates were being chosen. The Barbados Government, as I have said, will have to bear this expense.

Mr. LEWIS: I was speaking about the R.E.C. I have asked the Government why certain conferences cannot be linked up with the R.E.C. meetings. What I feel about this G.A.T.T. business is, we are contributing to the R.E.C., they have chosen two peo-

ple, and they would like the Barbados representative to come along and assist them, but they want us to pay our own way. The Hon. Premier says, British Guiana said they wanted to be on the delegation. This note is put in, to look as if the same thing happened in the case of Barbados. But the true fact is, the R.E.C. wants us to come along, and they should pay. We contribute to the R.E.C. on a *pro rata* basis. We have no right to pay exclusively for a delegation, when the R.E.C. has asked us to join the conference. This is a wrong procedure. The R.E.C. has asked us to come along, and we should not have to pay our own way.
6.40 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: There is an observation which I would like to make. It does strike me as being strange, now we have a Ministerial set-up where the Head of the Administration is regarding himself as a constitutional monarch, and we have a delegation going to London in connection with the financing of the Deep Water Harbour, the Head of the Administration should be a member of the delegation. For political purposes, the presence of the Hon. Premier is needed at these Conferences; but the presence of the Head of the Administration along with that of the Premier, is redundant. I want to say, unless you had a loss of faith in the Colonial Office or the British Government, where you would need the presence of the Head of the Administration as prestige value, the presence of the Head of the Administration is unnecessary. In connection with the question of emigration, the Head of the Administration went to the United States of America; but in those days, we did not have any Ministerial Government. I have read a letter in an American newspaper about Barbados having the most advanced constitution in the British Empire; I am therefore surprised, that the Head of the Administration is going as a member of this delegation. I should like to say, if you need the one, you do not need the other. I feel that the Governor's presence on this delegation, is redundant. It will only take away the prestige value of the Hon. Premier. It does not mean that the Head of the Administration could advance a line of argument which the Hon. Premier could not advance. The presence of the Hon. Premier is very admirable; he has face value and front line action. I have already made my statement as regards the Financial Secretary going as a member of this delegation. I must say, I am surprised at the composition of this delegation, with the Head of the Administration being a member of it. It does seem strange to me, at this stage of our development, the Hon. Premier thought it necessary to have the Governor on this delegation. The Governor has taken the position of a Constitutional monarch. Normally, Her Majesty the Queen would not go with Sir Winston Churchill to any international talks. If the Governor is regarded as a Constitutional monarch, then his place should be along that line.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I hinted to honourable members, when I first mentioned the question of this Deep Water Harbour delegation, there were other things to be discussed at the Colonial Office besides the question of the financing of the Deep Water Harbour. I should like to say that linked with the question of the Deep Water Harbour, is the question of future help for Barbados. It is also a question of seeing whether Barbados will be able to get grants in the future. It was felt at the time, there was the possibility that with personal talks on the highest level both at Washington and at Ottawa, we may be able to improve our prospects in respect of emigration. It was felt, in as much as the delegation would

be out of the country, we might as well pass back through Canada and the United States. That is the reason why I suggested that the Governor should go on this delegation. Now that this point has been made, honourable members will be able to see that far more can be gained by the Governor and myself going to Washington on the emigration problem, than my going alone. Let us face realities. The American Government is the American Government; and I need not say anything more. The representative of the Crown, talking on the highest level at Washington plus myself putting the point of view of the people, is far more likely to be effective than by either of us going by himself.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It might be very tactful, but certainly not realistic, to draw a red herring across the trail like that, following the remark of the honourable junior member for St. Peter on the question of the constitutional desirability of having His Excellency the Governor on this delegation to the Colonial Office, in connection with getting a loan for financing the Deep Water Harbour. In reply to the honourable member, the Hon. Premier has seen fit to draw across the trail this question of emigration. These are two separate and distinct things. As to the question of emigration, let us send the Governor to the United States, or to Canada, on a specific mission to see about emigration, instead of taking anyone else with him. In other words, the time to send the Governor on a delegation, was when that delegation went to California or to Washington on a tour of the American States. To bring in the Governor now at this time, would only becloud the issue which has been raised by the honourable junior member for St. Peter. I repeat, the question of emigration has nothing to do with the sending of a delegation to the United Kingdom, in connection with getting a loan to finance the Deep Water Harbour. If the Governor is going to see about emigration possibilities, let him go to Washington and return here. You cannot discuss emigration with Washington by going to the Colonial Office. The matter slipped me, but it was brought back to my attention by the honourable member on my right; and it is a matter which needs some clarification. How comes Barbados, with its advanced constitution, seeking a loan from the Colonial Office, to need the presence of the Governor on this delegation? Neither Trinidad nor Jamaica has the constitution which we have in Barbados, and both Mr. Gomes and Mr. Bustamante have been to the Colonial Office without the Governors of those colonies; and have secured substantial loans for their respective colonies. But, in Barbados, with our advanced constitution, both the Premier and the Governor have to go on this delegation. In what light is either the credit of Barbados or the responsibility of its Governor viewed by the Colonial Office? That is the question which arises. We do not want this question to be confused tonight, with the question of emigration to Ottawa and Washington. I think that the Hon. Premier should let the House know why he has found it necessary to include the Governor on this delegation to London, to secure the financing of this loan in respect of the Deep Water Harbour. That is the question which amazes me; and not long ago, the name of Barbados was mud at the Colonial Office in respect of the matter with the B.U.O.C. It is alright to get on the soap box and say that the high prestige of Barbados is necessary in order to secure emigration; but because the Hon. Premier thought that nobody is thinking of what he is saying, he chooses to mix these two matters. I really think that in his position as Premier it is his duty to tell the Governor exactly what the situation is, because the public should be in a position

to be able to judge. If the opinion is that we should not embark on the Deep Water Harbour scheme the matter should be considered from every angle. We should say whether we are fighting against advice that we can float a loan, and that we are impressing upon people that we can do it, if we carry the Governor on this delegation.

6.50 p.m.

I repeat, Sir, if we want the high prestige of the Governor's name and position to lend authority to our request for emigration quotas, let him go to Washington and to Ottawa. Let him take a plane and go to those places, and come back home. Anybody who is not a fool, would know, if the Governor is on his way to London with this Deep Water Harbour delegation, he would not be able to spend sufficient time in Ottawa as to contribute, or to make any valuable assistance to emigration prospects for the people of this island. Do not let us be the laughing stock of the surrounding islands with a less advanced constitution than ours. Do not let them say, when we want a loan, we have to get the Governor to go and get it for us. If we want to hold up our heads and demand our place in the West Indian scheme of things of which our constitution entitles us, we must be very careful in matters of this sort. When it comes to real material matters, you should not act just like a little boy in the yard; or in the same way as if you were a Crown colony, where you must have the Governor on the spot to speak for you. If you are in that position, you are nowhere at all. It is not good enough. I think the House is entitled to some proper explanation.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I do not want to prolong this debate unduly; but this touches a matter which is very dear to my heart. I disagree with the Hon. Premier on many things; but there is no disagreement when it comes to our constitutional advancement. I would like to say here, quite clearly, this of the Hon. Premier: maybe there is something in his nature in a circumstance such as this, he finds it difficult unless he is vex or provoked, to let it be known bluntly what is the true position. I want to make it clear, any socialist people, any socialist democracy which is evolving on its way in this colonial context to earn independence, I think, must gradually begin to talk boldly and plainly. Therefore, we must tell the Colonial Office and the British Government that when it comes to our own internal issues, we feel we are as capable as anybody else from the Colonial Office to present them. We must begin to make the Colonial Office respect us as a people. I have no doubt the Hon. Premier is given that measure of respect. I feel, the shackles of Colonialism must be removed, and must be removed constitutionally. From the point of view of tactics, I understand what the Hon. Premier meant when he spoke about emigration to the U.S.A. In taking a workers' delegation to the U.S.A., it is good to let the Governor go; and there is nothing wrong in letting people looking like the Governor, head the delegation. But the American people themselves are seeing what is happening in British Guiana and British Honduras; and they are changing their views. To give you an indication; I have been invited to attend a meeting of the I.L.O. Congress which is to take place in Los Angeles later this year. Ten years ago, they would not have asked me to attend. I believe I am one of the few men whom they would have asked to attend a meeting of that kind; but the position as I see it, is that the whole question of Latin America seem to be in the melting pot.

As I have said, it is purely a matter for the Hon. Premier and the Governor to decide; but I do feel, speaking as a Barbadian and a West Indian

who wants to see, if it is only the day before I die, that we are masters in our own place, and that a Governor takes his constitutional position. I would go as far as to say, I would like to see the day when we have the right to say who should be our Governor. I want to be quite frank. The Head of the Administration is a very nice man; but, I cannot see, despite his great qualities, he is better than the Hon. Premier to deal with a case of this nature. We are growing too much accustomed to the idea, if people are polite to us, we should not stand on our own right.

As I have said, it is purely a matter for the Governor and the Hon. Premier; but I would feel better if it were a delegation that was represented by the people of Barbados, which was going to the Colonial Office and putting our case. The Head of the Administration is fastly becoming a constitutional monarch for the Colonial Office. If the Colonial Office wants him, of course let him go. I am not in a position to know if it is because of a request from the Colonial Office, that the Head of the Administration is going on this delegation. It does seem to me pretty strange that he is going on this delegation; and it is for that reason, I have expressed these views.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman.— I have done all sorts of things in my life, and have been accused of some of them; but I do not believe, anybody has ever accused me of being unconscious of whatever particular talents Almighty God has given me. I do not believe that I am a bit inferior to any world statesman. When I went to the United Nations as an Alternate Delegate, and heard some of those world's statesmen speak, I thought I was attending a meeting of the Christ Church or the St. Michael's Vestry, when some of those world statesmen got up to speak. To my mind, some of them were very poor. I felt that I might well be listening to the honourable senior member for the City when I heard President so-and-so, who was counted one of the world's statesmen, speaking. It did make me feel I could hold my own with any of them. It may sound like vanity; but nobody can accuse me of being afraid of any powers, or can prevent me from arguing.

In my sober judgment as to who should comprise the delegation for these talks on the Deep Water Harbour, plus the opportunity possible of discussing the prospects of emigration with the authorities in Canada, particularly as these discussions are going ahead at the moment and it would be a good thing to be on the spot at the appropriate moment to discuss this matter, I was convinced that the delegation to London could be strengthened by suggesting that the Governor should come along. His selection has nothing to do with Colonial Office, nor is he going because of any feeling on my part of any sense of inferiority; but of a sober calculation as to the benefits to be derived by having him on the delegation. I even considered the possibility of having Sir Stephen Luke; but it would have been impossible, because we are begging C.D. & W. for a substantial loan. With that in view, obviously I could not use him. I had to suggest somebody else. I had to bear in mind the three things that we were going for: the future development of the colony, the Deep Water Harbour Scheme, and the invitation both from Canada and Washington that it might be a useful thing to come along now and discuss emigration problems.

I reflected that we could link-up these three things. I chose a date, the 10th October, link them together so that it would mean one flying out and one flying back, which would be a good thing. That

is why I suggested to the Governor to come along. 7.00 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: I must say, if we are going to embark on this expenditure, we should do everything to get as much assistance as possible. I do not like this new idea that is going abroad, that in everything that we are doing, we must get someone to assist us. We are becoming first class beggars now. If you are going to get something out of it, it might be a good thing; but we should not get in the habit of begging.

What strikes me as being very peculiar is, a public announcement should be made as to the reason why the Head of the Administration is leaving this colony. There seems to be other reasons why he is leaving, which have not been made public in the notice.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If the honourable member will give way a moment, I will explain that what was not made public, was not made public, because there was no certainty about it at the time. As a matter of fact, negotiations are still going on. If we get word, Washington's reply is that it is worthwhile to go to Ottawa, we should be on the spot; and instead of flying back out and up again, we can arrange it in such a way, that these three things can take place within the three weeks: consultation with C.D. & W. about the next five-year plan, with the Deep Water Harbour discussions, and emigration.

Mr. LEWIS: I am of the opinion that if a statement can be made tonight, it certainly could have been made before tonight. As emigration is a thing that is agitating the minds of the public continuously, I think the first opportunity should have been taken to let the public know the additional reason why His Excellency is accompanying this delegation. Everything might not have been settled; but you could have said, it is hoped. It is still problematical tonight, and it still has been made public property. What, therefore, is all this talk about not being certain yet? It will appear in the newspaper tomorrow. Why could it not have been put in the newspaper with the notice? An early opportunity should be taken to enlarge upon it.

Without attempting to discuss the Estimates, I remember that when we were dealing with the last Financial Estimates, we had to hurry them through. It was stated by some people that the reason for the hurry, was the Premier was going away. I remember the Premier saying definitely he was not going; and the rumour that he was going was denied by the Government bench, and then admitted. The Premier then said, he was going to London about loans which would include the loan for the Deep Water Harbour. At that time the Premier was going alone.

I do not know if an incident which happened in this Chamber, when we occupied a position nearer the door, is anything to do with the decision to include the Head of the Administration on the delegation to London. I do not know whether it is felt, His Excellency is a greater friend to the present Secretary of State for the Colonies than is the Premier, or whether the Secretary of State took offence at the way he was treated in this House; and therefore, it is necessary to send someone else along with the Premier. I heard the Premier state here on one occasion, he was not going to adjourn the House for any rum spree for Mr. Lennox-Boyd. Perhaps, it is felt that the Head of the Administration, who was not in the island at the time, and who was not mixed up with that incident, should be sent on this delegation. Perhaps, if this delegation were going to see Mr. Creech Jones, or Mr. James Griffith, the Premier would feel more confident. If that is the reason for

taking the Head of the Administration along, I feel that it is a good idea.

I must say, speaking of the West Indies and remembering our much vaunted advancement, I do feel that the persons who are in charge of our Government business, are the persons who have to advise us on economic matters, and are the persons who should be on a delegation of this sort. Before the Governor leaves England, he might get another job. He might not come back to Barbados for any other reason than to collect his baggage and leave for another job. I do not see any reason why he should be foisted on this delegation, except perhaps, the reason which I suggested, about the possibility of being a better friend to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, than the Premier.

Someone has it, that emigration is mixed up with this matter; and it is not hinted in the public statement on emigration. That is an aspect of the matter which I think is very wrong. What the people are anxious about, is all phases of emigration,—temporary work, and permanent residence. The people should be told what is happening. A delegation on the same subject has just returned from the U.S.A. Do you mean to tell me, one delegation returned two weeks ago, and another one is going now? The Premier said, he had chosen the date; but just a few minutes before that, he said, the Colonial Office could see the delegation on the 12th. I believe, someone is confused about the whole matter. It is not a matter on which you should be confused. It is too big an issue. Both the Deep Water Harbour and emigration are too big to play politics with, and to be confused about.

7.10 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: For all the fifty years of my life, I have never come across anybody suffering from a greater inferiority complex, than the hon. junior member for the City. The hon. member for the City must be labouring under a sense of frustration, in order to say the things which he is now saying. Everybody is sorry for the hon. member. On one Tuesday, a Message came down to this House and and to the Other Place; we were not sitting on that particular day, and the members of the Other Place saw that Message before we saw it, and the hon. junior member for the City got up in here and thundered, and said that we must not allow that to happen again. I specifically said in the Executive Committee, we always have to remember when serious announcements are being made, the hon. junior member for the City is sure to say that the House should know of these matters first; and therefore nothing should be published in the newspaper which has not been mentioned in the House. I want to say it is an awful thing! The hon. member's mind must be in a terrible condition. The hon. member's remarks show what sort of mind he has got. We are all sorry for him.

Mr. LEWIS: I am now publicly accusing the hon. member, of not telling the truth.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: What is it I have said, that is not true? The hon. member must withdraw that remark.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. LEWIS: Is what I have said, something to be withdrawn? I am going to prove it now. I am saying, when the hon. member introduced this Resolution, he said absolutely nothing about what he has said not long ago. The hon. member is not telling the truth about this particular instance. I will withdraw those remarks that the hon. member is not telling the truth; and I will say, his remarks do not

square with the facts. The hon. member introduced this Resolution and talked about a Conference in connection with the Deep Water Harbour, and about the Governor going to the Conference. He never said one word about the other matters, until somebody objected to the Governor going on this delegation. It was then, he gave the other reasons. I can be just as sorry for the hon. member, as he says he is for me. If the hon. member wanted to make an important statement like the one he has made, then it should not have been dragged out of him. If he had not been taken up on this particular matter, we would not have heard what he just said. I am saying, his remarks do not square up with the facts. An honest statement about the whole matter, would have cleared up the whole situation. If this Resolution had gone through before, would what the hon. member has said, be put in the newspaper?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The Financial Secretary and myself are going to the G.A.T.T. Conference. When the honourable member says, what I have said does not square with the facts, how does he know what declaration I will make about emigration before this debate is over? This vote is nothing to do with the Governor. This vote is a vote in respect of Conferences. I mentioned, that added to the list of votes, there would be this amount in respect of the G.A.T.T. Conference. After the honourable junior member for St. Peter raised the question about the Governor going, that was the proper stage for me to say what I said. Sometimes I come in here with prepared statements; but I do not make them, because the necessity does not arise. Sometimes you do not call a witness in the Court, because what you want, comes out otherwise. But does that mean you did not want to call that witness? If a person whom you have no reason to suspect of telling an untruth, gets up and makes a statement, common decency, makes you feel that that statement must be true; or the person would never have made it. That never appeals to the honourable junior member for the City. We thought that the Deep Water Harbour Delegation would have gone up in August. One of the reasons for putting the prorogation in August was, we expected that the Colonial Office could have taken us on then. The Colonial Office said that they could take us in August or probably September; I was asked about the particular date, and I said we could arrange to do three things in one. In connection with the visit on the Deep Water Harbour, we will be making an approach to the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation, with regard to future help for Barbados. When the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour was about to go to the United States of America, we were specially told from the American side that when you are going to the Colonial Office, you can go along in the same plane and have high level talk at Washington. The date of the conference has had to be extended. It was a question of getting Government and employers together, and that was an added reason for trying to get the dates together as closely as possible. When I chose the tenth of the month, the Colonial Office said that they could take us on the twelfth; and it was in view of that, the prorogation was fixed. We wanted to be away during the prorogation. Then came this invitation, and I said that we could go along earlier. I think that this invitation is something which the Barbados Government should accept.

7.20 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am the first to agree that if you are dealing with emigration at all, the Governor of this colony should go out. It is said, when you are in Rome, do as the Romans do. If you

want something done in America for Barbados, you should send out the Governor. If we know anything about American habits and customs, I say it is much better to send a person on the level of the Governor; and also send advisers to the United States of America to deal with this question of emigration. I quite agree on this delegation, we should have the Hon. Premier; but not both the Premier and the Governor. I want to say, I do not think these matters should be known to the Press before they come before this Chamber. However there is no complaint about that, on this occasion.

I did see, Mr. Chairman, in the Press, the names of those who are selected for the Deep Water Harbour delegation; although, we were not told on the occasion when we discussed the question of the delegation on the Deep Water Harbour, who would be going. The Hon. Premier distinctly said on that occasion, there was no selection. Suggestions were even made by some honourable members that the Financial Secretary should not go. I want to say here now,—though the Press might not publish it, but the Colonial Office must know,—we do not think that the Governor should go to London as a member of the Deep Water Harbour delegation. But as regards his going to Washington, we would all agree. To take the Governor as a representative on the Deep Water Harbour delegation, is a downright mean and nasty trick to the people of this colony. On the floor of this House, I said, I considered that the Hon. Premier is among the most respected people in the Colonial Empire, whether they are Labourites or Conservatives. I well remember, when we were dealing with the Sugar delegation to go to London, I said, he should be a member of that delegation. The Hon. Premier cannot justify his selection of the Governor as a member of this delegation. I am in agreement with him when he suggests, the Governor should go to Washington. I do not think that anybody would disagree with that suggestion.

I want to let this House know, when the Deep Water Harbour delegation goes to London for these discussions, it is not going to discuss the academic side of this question. It is going to London, to deal with the financial position, and the background of Barbados, so as to show the island's stability and our ability to pay. I agree with the Hon. Premier, when he pointed out, that Sir Stephen Luke would not be the likely choice under such circumstances. I repeat, when it comes to the Hon. Premier, he can put the case better than anybody else. He may not have the courage to put it as Mr. Bustamante would. He would not do it the way Mr. Bustamante would do it.

You are also going to deal with other aspects. One is, you cannot get this loan in the West Indies. You are not borrowing money to build a few buildings; you are borrowing money to construct a Deep Water Harbour, and the money to do so ranges into millions of pounds. It is not only the financial aspect, but the background of the country that you will have to deal with, when you go up to England. You must also bear in mind, you are going there to deal with the greatest financial wizards of the world. It must also be borne in mind, that before those people are allowed to invest money outside of England, despite the fact that it is private money, the British Government must be satisfied beyond any shadow of doubt, that the loans which they make, are properly secured. It is not so easy, as one may think. I remember, an attempt was made by some British interest to buy the Queen's Park Hotel in Trinidad, and the British Government refused to allow one cent to come out of England, until it had

fully investigated and found out that the investment would be secured. The British Government must be satisfied beyond any shadow of doubt, that the loans which these people make are secured.
7.30 p.m.

From the point of view of prestige, who is the best person from this country to be on this delegation? The Premier! He is the best man to go there, so as to make it sure, we have no Communist government here. But when it comes to the financial aspect of these proposals, the Premier cannot put the case. One cannot be everything in this world. The British Treasury and the financial wizards of London will be sure about the Hon. Premier's background. They will know that this is no British Guiana, or Honduras, or Guatemala. But tell me, what are you carrying the Governor for? He is a Civil Servant sent down here. He will send one of his private reports to the Secretary of State behind the back of the delegation; that is part of his job. He has to do it. He will have to say as a Civil Servant that what the Premier is putting to the English people, is correct. If he goes on the delegation he will still have to make his private report.

I am going to move the reduction of this vote by a dollar, so as to show my disapproval of sending the Governor on this delegation. Let him go to America. Give him money to entertain there, and get work for the people of Barbados.

It strikes me, the Minister of Finance will not be the person to put the financial aspect of the Deep Water Harbour discussions. It would be an embarrassing position for the Minister of Finance to find himself in, putting the financial aspect of the matter to the financial wizards in London, without having the assistance of the Financial Secretary; even though, the latter is a square peg in a round hole. The Financial Secretary must carry the little red box, so to speak. If the position were reversed, it would be the Premier who would be carrying the box; so let the Financial Secretary carry it.

Why carry the Governor? His duty is to report on the people who will represent us on the delegation. Confidential papers must pass between the Governor and the Secretary of State, which will never be seen by the Premier. Why carry him? Deep in his heart, the Premier knows that when it comes to having someone, who has the financial position of the island at his finger tips, it is the Hon. H. A. Cuke. Whether you like it or not, it is so. It will not be a question of Mr. Cuke wanting a plane trip. Like the Hon. Premier, he must be tired of plane trips. The Hon. Premier knows, if there is one man in Barbados who can go to England on this delegation, and sit around a table with expert knowledge of the financial background of this island, extending over the last 50 years, it is the Hon. Mr. Cuke. Mr. Cuke can hold that position, regardless of all the financial wizards in London. And when you start to talk about financial wizards, you will find them in London.

When you want a loan in London, and the security is Barbados, it does not mean the Premier's head or my head. It means Barbados. The financial people in England will want to know the national revenue of Barbados; and not only as regards to-day, but extending over a period of years. They will want to know all about the cycles, of the up and down, and swings of revenue. We are talking about a loan. We want the Premier to go on this delegation, and we hope that he comes back safely. The Governor must report confidentially on whether what the Premier says is correct or not.

I repeat, sir, we should send the Governor to America. The Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour has been to America, and made his investigations. I have seen reports in the Press, of what he said when he returned. I have said privately and publicly, whenever there is an attempt to secure emigration to America, you should send your highest possible official; because whatever you think about Americans, and however callous and care-free you may think they are, they still have a secret liking for the English way of life and of doing things.

The Committee is being asked to vote \$6,500. According to the information given by the Premier, they will be going to America, and the Governor will go up to England. I do not think it is right and fair to the people of this country. It is merely taking the Governor for a joy ride. On the last occasion, when the Deep Water Harbour Delegation was debated here, there was much ado about it in this Chamber. There was subsequently a release in the Press, saying that the Governor was going. It came over in the news from Rediffusion. If the Premier and his Ministers keep their ears to the ground, they will know that the people who strongly support them, and who are the people, if the Hon. Mr. Cuke had to ask for a vote, would never dream of giving him one, will tell the Government that Mr. Cuke is the man they should carry on this delegation. The Premier can represent Barbados from the point of view of prestige. You should also carry the Financial Secretary. But when you begin to meet the big financial brains in London, you will look around and say: "I wish I had heard what the members of the Opposition told me, and brought along the Hon. Mr. Cuke." Although we have the reputation for saying anything here, I am not one, who believes, you should air private affairs publicly. But I will tell the Premier privately what is being said.

We do not feel that the Governor should go on this delegation. Who outside of Government circles, would feel that he should go? The honourable junior member for St. Peter is not now a member of the Government. When I have to criticise anyone, I will criticise him. The report of the Deep Water Harbour Committee is there. The honourable junior member for St. Peter by virtue of, his then position on the Executive, was Chairman of that Committee. The report is there. It is a very useful and wonderful document. I attended that committee. It is public property, that of two people, one of them being the Financial Secretary, who also attended the Committee, one could not help feeling that, in them, there was an underlying attempt to wreck this Deep Water Harbour business; and that the Financial Secretary, was part of that attempt. You cannot help feeling, of the two people of whom the Financial Secretary is one, there was an underlying attempt to wreck the scheme. These things go a long way. 7.50 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am appealing to the honourable member. He little realises what he is saying, or implying. You are not making the position of Barbados any better. The honourable member says something about the Financial Secretary wrecking the scheme.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I have never said that. As a matter of fact, the Hon. Premier should know, this is not the first time that such a thing was said in this House.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: When the honourable member said that little things go a long way, that is what brought me to my feet. The honourable junior member for St. Peter has already said, the Financial Secretary was not in favour of the scheme;

the honourable senior member for the City has said, one of two persons tried to wreck this scheme. All I am asking the honourable member to do is, to remember that the very fact that we have to go to London in connection with this scheme, is not an easy matter. We have to wipe out all the things which have been said, as to whether they can trust our word. I say most solemnly, knowing all the things I know, there is no human being who can help us more on this delegation, than the Governor.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: All I have to say is this: if the Governor can help us more than anybody else on the delegation, well God help our position at the Colonial Office. There were the utterances in the House of Lords, and there were utterances made by members of our Party to officials from the Colonial Office, when we were pressing in connection with the Electric Co. When we were pressing for a Deep Water Harbour, we were told: "I am afraid, that your treatment of an English Company will prevent Barbados from getting money." I have been stupid, apparently, but there is confidence in the Premier as the man who can put things over; but he should not lack confidence in his own position. The Hon. Premier feels as competent in putting the case for Barbados as anybody else in the world; now, he says with regard to getting help in England, the Governor is the man who is needed. It is the right of the Crown, to give its opinion on matters of this magnitude; but I contend no useful purpose could be served in taking the Governor on this delegation. I further say, as a member of the Deep Water Harbour Committee, in this matter, we must consider the natural resources of this colony, because we cannot go to borrow money and say that we might find oil. We are hoping that we would get this money. As regards the talk about the B.U.O.C. and the debate in the House of Lords on Barbados, I will tell the Hon. Premier, that we were so eager to clear the fair name of Barbados, and of those who run the Government of this country, I took it upon myself to draw to the notice of a Colonial Office official when he said that we treated an English Company badly—I made it clear in defence of the Government, what has been said in the House of Lords might not be taken against the Government. I said, we had an English Attorney General, and do not let us accuse our local men only. We have the interest of this colony at heart, more so in many cases, than these other people. If the Governor can be of more assistance to the Hon. Premier than anybody else, I wonder why they did not take Sir Stephen Luke. I want to say, if the Governor could do so much, then Sir Stephen Luke should be able to do more.

8.00 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I do not disagree with the view that the Governor should go to Washington. So long as it is a question of emigration, he can go; and I would vote for the money, because that really matters to the inhabitants of this colony. Even if he makes a trip, and he is not successful, nobody would be annoyed.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the Hon. Premier to listen to what I am going to say. Now that you have Ministerial responsibility, when a Minister leaves this colony at the expense of the people, it is not good enough for the Minister on his return, to meet a newspaper reporter some place for an interview. He has not left on his own; he left on behalf of the people of this island. If he cannot write his own report on his return, let him get somebody to write it for him. It is not good enough for him to meet the *Recorder*, or the *Beacon*, or the *Advocate*

and say so and so; and then, the next two weeks, for him to come in here and say that the Reporters reported him incorrectly. If a Minister cannot give a written statement on his return from these trips, this going on trips is nothing else but a racket! We are entitled to a proper report, so long as a Minister goes abroad to represent the people of this country.

Finally, sir, I would say, I know these things are fairly embarrassing to the Head of the Administration; but it is also embarrassing to us. In matters of this sort, I think it would be well if the Hon. Premier say before hand: "I think such and such a person would be suitable to take along on such a thing." Do not, because you have the majority, do things in this manner. The feeling of this Chamber is, the Governor should not go on this delegation. If the Hon. Premier had discussed this matter privately with the Leader of the Opposition, he would have known, the feeling of the Opposition was that the Governor should not go. This is rather embarrassing. The Hon. Premier might have said: "I am Premier, and you are the Governor, I am carrying you." He might even have told the Colonial Office: "Don't mind those few who get up on their hind legs and talk." I am going to move the reduction of this vote, if I stand alone; and if I only ask for the reduction by one dollar. Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the reduction of this vote—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—That is not before the Committee. The House voted specifically for a Deep Water Harbour delegation, to go to London. The honourable member is completely out of order.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—Can't I move the reduction of anything? I can move the reduction of every one of these items, if I am not pleased about any of them; and you are bound to allow me. Suppose I do not like the idea of increasing the money for stamps; of course, I can move the reduction of that amount.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I ask you to rule that he is out of order. This is not coming out of a Conference vote.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—I want to know your ruling before I proceed any further.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not ruling on anything at this stage.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If you want to rule, and probably rule wrong, I would put it to the test. However, by the expression on your face it does appear as if you do not want me to move it; and because I do not want you to be called upon to rule, I am not going to move it. I know that you realise, you cannot stop me from making that motion; but I do not want to put you in an embarrassing position. I will sit by saying, we are going to vote this money for the Deep Water Harbour delegation; but we are making the solemn appeal to the Hon. Premier in the interest of the Deep Water Harbour on which a Committee was appointed, of which I was a member, and of which I can say that the Committee really worked hard, because we wanted to see a Deep Water Harbour a reality in Barbados, that you should carry a man like Mr. Cuke, who can give you all the assistance you need. We will concede you the expediency of having to carry the Financial Secretary; but carry Mr. Cuke instead of taking the Governor.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have the interest of this colony as much at heart, as any other Barbadian. Nobody has greater respect for Mr. Cuke's financial ability, than I. With a full knowledge of everything before me on the one side, and also on the other, and for more reasons, I solemnly declare that the best

persons to go on this occasion, are the Financial Secretary, the Head of the Administration, and myself. We are not going to persuade only C.D. & W. to give us a loan, but we have to persuade the Colonial Office to persuade the British investors to put up the money we need.

8.15 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I really do not understand the honourable member. The investor in England, who has money to lend, must be satisfied about certain things. Do not let the honourable member fool himself. When it comes to dollars and cents there is no sentiment. It is a matter of security. Dollars and cents, is blood. It is not a case of the Conservative Party, the Labour Party, or anything like that. It is, will the lender's money be good. When you are on a delegation like this, you have to put yourself in the position where you can talk with the financial wizards. They will ask searching questions, searching questions about Barbados, extending over a period of the last 100 years.

Let the Hon. Premier smile. Does he think, this is a question of borrowing £250 against three acres of land? This money will be a security against the island of Barbados. It is against the industry of Barbados. You will have to satisfy the Capital Issue Committee about all sorts of things. You will have to satisfy them about the island's cost of living, taxation, ability to pay, how the people bear taxation, and all that sort of thing, before they release one cent.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman,—There is only one point, I would like to make. I hope that the Government realises, if and when the Governor goes to England he will be going in a dual capacity,—as Governor of Barbados and representative of the Colonial Office in Barbados, and as a member of the delegation. He cannot serve two masters. He has to report to the Colonial Office exactly what he knows from what he has seen and heard, since he has been here. I am not accusing him of duplicity or double dealing; but apart from the fact that he will be going as a member of the delegation to borrow this money, he has to make a confidential report as to conditions here.

The Head of the Administration cannot cut any ice with the British investors, just because he is Governor of Barbados. What the British investors are interested in, are sound economic facts. They are interested in knowing if we can repay this money, and what return will they get. I am asking this committee, in all solemnity, whether they think that on the full delegation as proposed, there is a single person who can really represent Barbados in this matter. Neither the Governor, the Premier, nor the Financial Secretary, is in a position to present out actual background, in order to justify the granting of this loan. As far as I can gather from the speech of the Minister of Finance, he is thinking purely in terms of sentiment. Sir Robert Arundell is Governor, and his word will carry a lot of weight. That apparently is what the Minister of Finance thinks. The Governor's word may carry a lot of weight, in getting you a constitution; but not in borrowing money. The investors want to hear economic facts, not nonsense. It is not only waste of the taxpayers' money to carry the Governor; it is a sheer waste of time.

What we want from the Governor, is the assurance that he will support the delegation in its endeavours, as far as his own private reports are concerned. What this country wants, is a delegation composed of at least one person, who has the requisite knowledge to be able to make out a proper case, in order to justify this attempt by Barbados to borrow this money. There should be no hesitation in letting the Governor know the way we feel, that from

the point of view of constitutional prestige, and for other reasons, he should not be on the delegation.

We should not delude ourselves with the idea, that because the Governor will be on the delegation, we will get the money. In fact, if we get it with him on the delegation, we would also have got it if he were not there. He cannot, by being there, deny the allegations which the Electric Company or anyone else will make. Nor will his mere presence be sufficient to remove all the suspicions and other things, which other events have produced. Let us bear in mind, the British investors and the Colonial Office, will want to hear solid facts; and there is no one on the delegation as yet, who will be capable of presenting the case for Barbados.

From what we have heard here today, it would appear that the Government feels, no one in the Opposition has any commonsense at all; while the Government members themselves, are the beginning and end of all the wisdom and intelligence in the island. Let them do as they like. It does seem, that so far, they have brought the country to the verge of disaster. This is not the first time that we have been led to the position in which we have got to resort to methods which are not necessary to other West Indian Governments, in order to get even a loan.

Do you mean to tell me, Mr. Chairman, in order to get money in the next five years, the Governor himself must go to England? In the next five years, the Governor will not be anywhere near here. All the West Indian Governments in the past, have been getting loans without that arrangement. It is a mark of intelligence, to be able to profit by past mistakes; and to listen to advice which has some foundation of fact in it, when it is given. It is all well and good to take up the taxpayers money, whether it is a question of this vote or any other vote, and waste it. I want to say, it seems to be an absolute waste of money to send a delegation to the United States of America six weeks ago, when you knew that the Governor is expected to go there six weeks after. This vote, which we passed in the Estimates for \$12,000, will now be \$18,500 for one year. We may get a list of the Conferences involved in this expenditure, but it will be interesting to know what value the colony will get from this expenditure. To turn around now and send the Governor on this delegation without admitting the necessity of having men of a certain type on the delegation, is nothing more or less than irresponsibility in the spending of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. MILLER: I have been listening with interest to this debate to-night. I am wondering if it has not been an absolute waste of valuable time. The arrival of the Premier in London, is much unlike the arrival of the Governor; and if the Premier feels the need for the assistance of the Governor on this delegation, I see no reason why we should waste any more time with this matter. No question has been mentioned about the colony's finances over the past 60 years. We have not had any loan from the Home Government to frighten us; and if consent is given at the Colonial Office, the money is available. That has always been the case. You get a guarantee from the Colonial Office, and that is all you require. The same thing applies to a loan from the World Bank; you get a guarantee, and the money is available.

What is also irritating, is the lack of charity expressed by the honourable senior member for the City, as regards the Financial Secretary. It is unfortunate that he should be unduly harassed. I do not know if any honourable member is in a position to examine and compare the position. I do not see, that with the necessity of having a Deep Water Harbour, we should have all this debate. This scheme

will not be like the scheme in Dominica, which became a failure; this scheme is not expected to be like that. It is not a question of any financier going into the money market, to persuade anybody. I repeat, all you want, is a guarantee from the Colonial Office, and the money will be forthcoming. I have great respect for the Hon. Mr. Cuke; but at the same time, what I have mentioned, is all that is required in order to get this loan. All you need do, is to satisfy the Colonial Office that you can stand such a loan. I quite appreciate, you will have to satisfy the Colonial Office that the money is needed. If we had a Government which is somewhat Communist, and there was a threat in the street, we would not even want a guarantee; the money would be sent to us. If the Hon. Premier feels that the Governor is the best man to be by his side, what more should we ask?

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

8.55 p.m.

Head XXXI—Labour Department

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The next Head, Mr. Chairman, is Head XXXI, Labour Department. The notes to the two items under this head are pretty clear. I beg to move that this Head stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.
The motion was agreed to.

Head XXXII—Department of Highways And Transport

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The next Head, Mr. Chairman, is Head XXXII, Department of Highways and Transport. The notes to the two items under this Head are even clearer, than the notes to the items under the Head which we have just passed, I beg to move that Head XXXII stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.
The motion was agreed to.

Annexed Estimates—Head I—Post Office

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The last Head, Mr. Chairman, is Head I, Post Office, of the Annexed Estimates. The item deals with the payment for postage stamps during the financial year. I beg to move that this Head stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.
The motion was agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox the Resolution for the sum of \$138,629 was passed.

Supplementary Estimates No. 18 Education and Miscellaneous Services

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is for the sum of \$106,866. It is in connection with matters under the Heads Education and Miscellaneous. The Six Cross Roads building is under repair. This Supplementary Resolution is a very short one. Under the Head, Miscellaneous, there is the Post Office and Library at Oistins, and there is the West Indian Student Centre. I am suggesting to honourable members, they should spend ten minutes and finish this Resolution. As regards the Six Cross Roads School, I should like to say that we need secondary schools, and we have started to work on them. It is proposed that in-

stead of building a separate Community Centre, to build an Assembly Hall to any new school, which can be used as a Community Centre and it will be erected from money out of the Labour Welfare Funds. I beg to move that this Head IV stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, we have been told that it has been purely decided, this school in St. Philip will be a modern secondary school, which would accommodate 525 pupils. I want to say that it is high time—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If the honourable member would give way to me for a few minutes, I should just like to say, is it not proposed that this Secondary School will be only a glorified Elementary School. Just as you may have a particular school with a particular bias, we are not ignoring the possibility of a school having a classical, mathematical or science bias. Unfortunately, I am afraid, that was not the case when we started off with the Richmond School.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I sincerely appreciate the statement which has just been made by the honourable member; because I feel, it is high time that some responsible authority, should make some proper statements with regard to the manner in which these so-called modern Secondary Schools would be worked. The school at Richmond has reverted to an Elementary School; and now that we are putting down two more Schools, I do not want people to delude themselves that they are getting Secondary Education, if it is the intention of the Government to make these Schools merely glorified Elementary Schools. It therefore comes to me as a source of satisfaction, to be able to hear to-night, that the Government does not intend to continue this disservice to the community; which has been begun at Richmond, where people concluded that Secondary Education would have been provided. I am quite sure, the entire community will look forward to see the policy under which this new school will be conducted.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: When Ministerial Status was instituted, I said that I thought the Premier should be responsible to the community for determining the policy in respect of Education. I, too, am glad to hear the Hon. Premier make this statement, because the idea surrounding this educational policy is rather confusing; not only to parents and teachers, but also to the members of this House. I am sure that the Hon. Premier would agree with me, that much controversy has been going on over these modern Secondary Schools; and while that statement has been made off hand, I should like to warn the Hon. Premier that that is not good enough. I am sure that the Hon. Premier will agree with White Paper on the system of education; because at the present time, it is rather confusing. You hear teachers and inspectors say things, and the position is so confusing, that at the close of the school year, quite a number of people came to me and said, "We did not attempt to get our children into the recognised Secondary Schools, because we had hoped that the Richmond School would have been a Secondary School." Children are being thrown out of school at 14 years of age, and people are disgruntled over the idea.

I throw this out as another warning. The people are dissatisfied over the method you have adopted, of throwing out some of these children from this School. As a matter of fact, some of them, since

they were thrown out, have been called back. I am therefore asking the Hon. Premier to avail himself of the facts, and if necessary, publish a White Paper on it. The people were dissatisfied, and because some of them made an open row about it, some of those children were asked to come back. I sincerely appreciate this statement the Hon. Premier has made; but it is not sufficiently strong. He should make a statement on the whole educational system, because the people are very dissatisfied about it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If you are putting a real Secondary School in St. Philip, I suggest that you find some money to build a residence for the Headmaster, on the spot. The Headmaster of that School, should be within easy reach of the pupils and their parents at all times; and for that purpose, I suggest, however small it might be, the Government should try to put some building there, so as to house the Headmaster.

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

On motion of Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, the two Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to. 9.15 p.m.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: In fixing the Orders of the Day for the next meeting, Committee of Supply should come first, and No. 8 of to-day's Orders should be No. 2. The rest of the Orders of to-day's Order Paper will follow respectively and then the Notices given to-day.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO REVISE RULES OF HOUSE APPOINTED

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that the Select Committee which was appointed to revise the Rules of this House at the last session, be re-appointed for the same purpose.

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—Before you put the question, with your approval, I would like to take a copy of those Rules which have been so far revised, with me to England and get some advice on them from whichever of the Clerks of the House of Commons would be available to give me.

The question was put and agreed to.

RE ADVERTISING FOR MESSENGER OF HOUSE

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that authority be given to Your Honour, to make the necessary arrangements to call for applicants for the vacant post of Messenger and Library Attendant.

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

The question was put and agreed.

The question that the House do not adjourn, was put and agreed to, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly. 9.20 p.m.