

## THE

## House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

15th February, 1955.

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

## PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*).  
Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER; Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS,  
C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*);  
His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*);  
Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications  
Works and Housing*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chair-  
man of Committees*); Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.,  
Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr.  
J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. St.  
A. HOLDER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA,  
(*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*) and  
Mrs. E. E. BOURNE.

*Prayers were read.*

## MINUTES

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

## PAPERS LAID

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: (for the Hon. Premier). Quarterly Return of Transactions in Rum, 31st December, 1954.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: (for Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour) Report of the Comptroller of Customs on the Customs Revenue, Trade, Shipping and Excise of the Island for the year 1953.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: (for Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour) Report of the Labour Department for the year 1953.

Mr. Barrow entered the House and took his seat.

## PRIVATE NOTICES

Mrs. BOURNE: Resolved that in the opinion of this House the Government should immediately take

the necessary steps to ensure that electricity be made available for the residents in the parish of St. Andrew,

And that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the appropriate Minister.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Of my intention to move the adjournment of the House to discuss the Report on Social Security by Professor Richardson.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY for Mr. W. A. Crawford.

*The House of Assembly  
To  
His Excellency The Governor*

The House desire to draw to Your Excellency's attention its deep concern over the decision of the Government to conduct the Princess Margaret School at Six Roads, St. Philip, as a Modern Secondary School.

2. The House also desire to draw to Your Excellency's attention the fact that there are large numbers of children in this and adjacent parishes whose parents and/or guardians are determined to give them Secondary Education of the Grammar School type and can do so only at great financial and other convenience — children, in some cases, being compelled to travel as much as 36 miles daily

3. The House therefore suggest that the Princess Margaret School, under reference above, should be run as a bilateral school, combining modern secondary and Grammar School education, thereby combining educational facilities for placing the emphasis on a practical basis for the children while simultaneously making the Grammar School type of education available for those who desire and whose aptitude permits them to take advantage of it, children in the Academic wing to pay the normal secondary fees while those in the modern secondary wing will get their education free, as in other elementary schools.

## QUESTIONS

Mr. HAYNES: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister of the Government at the next Meeting of the House:—

1. Does the Government know that New American Cars are advertised for sale in the Trinidad papers and that the Trinidad Government has lifted the Import restrictions on these cars?

2. If the Answer is Yes: Will the Government state whether they are prepared to lift the

Import Controls on American cars under similar conditions as in Trinidad?

*Mr. Crawford entered the House and took his seat.*

Mrs. BOURNE: To enquire of the Minister of Social Services at the next meeting of the House:—

When does Government intend to start a Self Help Housing Scheme in the parish of St. Andrew.

*Mr. Speaker called Order No. 1.*

### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

*The question was put and agreed to without division.*

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

### Supplementary Estimate No. 40 Peasants' Loan Bank

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the first Resolution is one to place the sum of \$2,623 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. 40, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

In moving the passing of this Resolution, I would first like honourable members to refer to the provision made in the Estimates 1954-55 where an amount of \$1,700 was set aside for the advertisements of loans.

3.25 p.m.

The Manager of the Bank has now reported as the Addendum sets out, that this allocation has proved inadequate. The amount expended on this item to 27th November, 1954 as a result of the extension of the Bank's activities and the rising cost of advertisements, totals \$4,323.28.

As to the first point, (i.e. the extension of the Bank's activities) honourable members will remember that in order to implement the policy of greater productivity of the soil, loans were issued to renters and occupiers of land, and even in many cases to squatters, that is, people who are in possession of land unlawfully, and people who did not pay rent to anyone. Facilities were also extended to assist owners and quasi-owners, that is people who were in possession of land for a long time, and are securing proper title deeds to their properties.

With regard to the second point (i.e. the rising costs of advertisements) I have a table here which sets out for the benefit of honourable members the rising cost of advertisements during the last six years. It is as follows:—

|                          | No. of New<br>loans issued | No. of<br>Loans in<br>Operation | Cost to<br>Govt. |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|
| 1949—50 ..               | 515                        | 865                             | \$716            |
| 1950—51 ..               | 282                        | 885                             | 1,103            |
| 1951—52 ..               | 672                        | 1,100                           | 1,458            |
| 1952—53 ..               | 719                        | 1,130                           | 1,659            |
| Up to Dec.<br>1953—54 .. | 839                        | 1,550                           | 2,065            |
| 1954 ..                  | 1,534                      | 2,245                           | 4,322            |

Hon. members will realise from that table the increase in cost of advertisements. The necessity in law for loans to be advertised, rests in the provisions of Section A (1) of the Peasants Loan Bank Act,

1936—6. It reads as follows: "Before any money is lent by the Bank under the provisions of this Act to any Peasant owner the Bank shall cause an advertisement to be inserted in one issue of a daily newspaper and one issue of the weekly newspaper published in this Island giving notice to the persons holding liens against the peasant holding of the intention of such peasant owner to obtain such loan. Every such advertisement shall state what sum (if any) has been already borrowed under this Act, and the sum then proposed to be borrowed; and the said advertisement shall be in the form in Schedule A to this Act or as near thereto as circumstances will admit and the cost of every such advertisement shall be defrayed out of the funds of the Bank."

Hon. members will observe that the notices of these loans must be advertised by the Act and in the form as set out in the Schedule to the Act. There is a table which sets out the various Heads which must be adhered to in this advertisement. They are:—

| Peasant<br>owner | Amount of<br>loan | Description of<br>Peasant holding | Amounts<br>already<br>borrowed |
|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|

Those are the Heads according to the Act with which the advertisement must comply.

The possibility of reducing the cost of advertisements is at present being examined. The question is whether the advertisements should be reduced in space by using a finer type or by a better arrangement, or whether it should be done by a reduction in the number of notices. In the latter case it will be necessary to amend the Act. The Act says that these advertisements must be in two newspapers—a weekly and a daily. This matter has been referred to the Crown Law Officers for advice, it being a legal point. The Crown Law Officers have advised that at present the necessity in law for advertisement rests in the provision of Section 8 (i) of the Peasants' Loan Bank Act, 1936—6. Unless that provision is repealed or amended, prospective loans must be advertised. The answer to that lies in the provisions of Section 9 (c) of the Act which provides that every loan (with two exceptions) shall be a first lien and charge against the peasant holding "in priority to all other liens and charges." If, therefore, a loan under the Act is to rank before all other charges, it is only fair and equitable that persons holding existing charges or liens should be given notice, otherwise their rights contractually and consensually created would be unilaterally affected to their detriment.

For the benefit of hon. members, I will quote the amounts which have been spent on advertisements during the last period up to December, 1954.

|                          | No. of<br>Loans | Total Amt.        |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| On 22nd and 23rd May ..  | 706             | \$1,556.44        |
| On 24th and 25th July .. | 532             | 1,496.64          |
| On 18th and 19th Sept.   | 194             | 819.64            |
| On 20th and 21st Nov. .. | 102             | 451.20            |
|                          | <u>1,534</u>    | <u>\$4,322.88</u> |

Mr. Chairman, I think I have supplied all the relevant information. If there is any other point which may come to the minds of hon. members, I

shall be willing to give the necessary information. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass  
3.35 p.m.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, it is quite obvious that this has been a very bad method of estimating, which has caused us to have to vote this money today. I sincerely hope that no loans have been held up as the result of the shortage of money for advertising. I think that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture will have to see to it that those persons who have to contend with this type of business in his Ministry will have to be more careful in the future. This House does not pass money for the Bank's advertising; we have not got the opportunity of seeing what the allocations are until something such as this has happened; but it is quite obvious, sir, that if in 1952-53 you have a total of \$1,659 spent on advertising and the next year you have spent \$2,000, then you yourself know that the facilities of the Bank are being extended, therefore you are going to need more than \$1,700 for advertising in 1954-55. Do the people who have to make these Estimates look at figures, and do they look at figures different from how any other human being would look at them? The figures which the Hon. Minister has read out have thoroughly put this Department to shame. I know it is a very difficult department to have to work, because personal supervision for the lending of Government funds is essential and they have to be very particular; but to tell me that they have allocated \$1,700 for a particular purpose and that they did not come back to this House until they had spent \$4,322, is awful. Suppose every other Department did that? It is over three times the amount spent before we are asked to vote this Bank any more money. It is true that it is not an item passed by this House which has been overspent; but sir, this is what we have in the last Estimates: "The 1954-55 provision is made up of operating costs \$14,822 and new loan money \$60,000, as against 1953-54 figures of \$8,947 for operating costs and \$33,600 for new loan money." They have increased operating costs by \$6,000 and loan money by \$26,400, and still the advertising was cut down. That is not a nice thing to happen; it seems to be very wrong to me. You put up the loan money up \$26,000 and you expect to pay less for advertising than you paid two years before. That does not seem right to me. We vote a lump sum to this Bank, and the only thing we do is to have a Note as to what is operating the cost and what is loan money. I do not know if they have been taking on any new staff, but I would like the honourable member to look at the fact that they spent another \$6,000 more.

As regards the housing of this Bank, I would like to know if they are paying any rent. I understand that the place was bought with money from the Labour Welfare Fund, and if you have the Labour Welfare Organisation owning the building and the Government renting offices outside, the Bank should pay rent to the Labour Welfare Fund for the use of a part of the building. That is how I feel about it. They are two separate and distinct things as you know; one is operating out of the taxes of the colony and the other is a special levy on sugar run solely by the Executive Committee; and they feel that they can do as they like with the money; they can alter the terms to buying buildings and so on, and nobody thought that they were out of the province of the regulations governing the Labour Welfare Fund. I think that the Bank should pay some rent, (as it did before) for the use of the building bought with funds not

strictly belonging to the Treasury. They paid rent before: \$50 or \$60 a month. This money, would be between six and eight hundred dollars a year; and in addition to that the Bank is given an additional \$6,000 in the last estimates not to pay any back pay for salaries or anything like that, but for ordinary running expenses.

The next thing is that there is a sentence in the Addendum to the Resolution which makes one feel that there are two separate and distinct things. It says this: "The amount expended on this Item to November 27th, 1954, as a result of the extension of the Bank's activities." I do not remember the Bank's activities being extended during the past year; it might have been something done before, and they should have budgeted for it. The Addendum goes on "and the rising cost of advertisements totalled \$4,322.28" I would like to know whether the rising cost of the advertising has resulted from the Bank's activities only and therefore an increase in the number of borrowers, or whether it is as well because the cost of advertisements has gone up. Has the cost of the advertisements gone up and in addition to that, more names are put in your advertisements?

Before I leave this subject, I would tell the Minister that I would like to see the Bank get facilities for advertisements as cheaply as possible; but I would not like the Government to get too cheap in the operating of the Bank and refuse to give adequate notice of loans to be made, because that may cause people to go and embarrass themselves by overborrowing on the same property, and the whole purpose of the Bank would be destroyed. I hope that in contemplating any change in the form of the advertisements, useful information will not be left out nor will you refuse to advertise some loans; because, that might work to the detriment of the peasants. I would not like the saving of a few hundred or a few thousand dollars in running expenses to cause you to encourage some peasant to overborrow on his property.  
3.45 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: As regards the first question asked, whether the Peasants' Loan Bank is paying rent for the use of the premises, I will have to secure that information for the honourable member. As regards the second question asked as to whether the cost of the advertisement in itself has increased or whether there is an increase in the number of loans, the answer is that the number of loans has increased. I have no notice that the cost of the advertisements in themselves has increased.

*Hon. G. H. ADAMS came into the Committee and took his seat.*

Mr. LEWIS: I would like the honourable member to pay some attention to the way the Addendum for the Resolution is worded. What we see here is, that because of the extension in the Bank's activities and the rising cost for advertisements, the allocation for advertising proved inadequate. That would naturally mean, that if you have the same number of borrowers the necessity for an increased provision would be a result of the increase cost of advertisements. If it is not an increase in the cost of the advertisements do not say so. It should be put quite clear so that everyone would understand.

Another thing is that they have here the extension of the Bank's facilities mixed up with this \$4,322.28; but the honourable member gave out that this money was solely for advertising, and the increased cost of advertising as a result of the increased activities of the Bank. Let them put in words in an Addendum what will convey the meaning they want to convey. What they have, means that the

Bank's activities have increased and therefore, there is more travelling to be done and more searching up of deeds etc., but the honourable member said that is not so; he said that the increase is purely due to the advertisements.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that the Hon. Minister was not specific in the suggestions about reducing the cost of advertisements. It has been some time since it was suggested in this place to Government to cut down on its advertising cost; but the Hon. Minister did not mention in this Resolution what steps he or they propose to take in doing so.

It has been drawn to my attention, and also by strangers to the island, how large a space is taken up in the newspapers with Government advertisements of matters of not very important a nature; and I suggested some time ago that ways and means should be adopted to see that the cost is brought down. I am now going further to say that it is true that the advertisements of the Peasants' Loan Bank take up a very large space in some of the newspapers. We do know that advertising charges are based on the amount of inches used. Certainly some of these advertisements of the Peasants' Loan Bank take up be very much smaller.

I do not know if it is the desire of the newspaper magnates to make as much out of the Government as possible, but sometimes you find names and figures very far apart, giving the feeling that there is an attempt to use up a very large space. It is very important, sir. Not only am I referring to the advertising of the Peasants' Loan Bank, but there are various institutions that advertise for tenders for the supply of certain commodities. Personally, I feel that it does appear to be a waste because if the Mental Hospital and the General Hospital and probably the Maternity Hospital at a certain period of the year advertised for tenders for the supply of sweet potatoes or yams, Government need only set out one advertisement, and it need not be a very large one. The Government can say that all those who want to tender for the supply of such commodities for the X Y or Z institution can do so now and the matter is covered.

What is more, the people who tender for the supply of commodities to these institutions seldom change. They know when their contractual year is going to be up, and they know they will have to apply afresh. I am suggesting that instead of each department using a separate advertising column every year or several times a year, all these advertisements could be coupled together in the same column, thereby creating a saving if the Government wants to save in that respect.

I am told sir, that formerly several newspapers used to be given the contract for these advertisements, and recently the number has been cut down and only two very prominent newspapers are being used for advertising — the daily and a weekly. I heard the Hon. Minister to say that the law demands that such loans be advertised in a weekly newspaper and a daily. If that is so then something went wrong, because I have seen these notices advertised in all the weekly newspapers and in the daily. However, I would like to emphasise the necessity for the further cutting down of the cost of advertisement in the future.

3.55 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the hon. member that the question of the reduction of the cost of Government's advertisements is at present receiving the active attention and consideration of the Executive Committee.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to make a suggestion to the Hon. Minister. The expenditure on the Peasants' Loan Bank Department is really not very much, and the Hon. Minister can arrange (perhaps in the coming Estimates although they are already printed) that just as Grant-Aided schools, Highways and Transport Department and other Departments have an Appendix to their Estimates, that this Department include an Appendix so that hon. members might know how the money allotted to that department is being spent. Hon. members should have an idea of how the \$14,000 allocated to that Department for expenditure is being spent; because, members can keep a check on how the money is allocated, they may be able to be of assistance to the Hon. Minister. At present the amount to be expended is put under a block vote and we do not know how it is made up, but we really should know. All that you do see is running expenses so much, and loans so much. We know how the loans have to be done, but so far as the running expenses we should get something on that. On the last occasion we did give \$5,580 over the previous amount, and I do not know any reason why apart from the rise in the cost of advertisements, that the amount granted should have been gone already.

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

#### Supplementary Estimate 1954-55 No. 41 General Hospital

##### Accommodation For House Officers

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: The next Resolution Mr. Chairman, is for the sum of \$9,000. As is set out in the Addendum to the Resolution, there are at present 25 officers on the establishment of the General Hospital entitled to quarters but accommodation is available for 13 only.

The situation has become urgent with the arrival of the newly appointed Medical Superintendent, who is entitled to furnished quarters. There is, in fact, no accommodation available for him. Let me say that this question was considered with the extension of the General Hospital, but it has become more acute within the last few weeks owing to the arrival of the Medical Superintendent. There is no accommodation for him at the General Hospital. He is at present being accommodated at a hotel, and attempts are now being made to provide a house for him. Naturally, you will ask what has become of the House that the last Medical Superintendent occupied? The answer to that is that when the Mental Specialist came, he wanted a house and the only house that was available was the one occupied by the then Medical Superintendent. This Mental Specialist had a large family and the then Medical Superintendent, (Dr. Gideon) had only a small family, and he was satisfied to take a living out allowance so as to allow the Mental Specialist to occupy the House which was occupied by him. The Medical Superintendent, Dr. Gideon, left subsequently and another Medical Officer Dr. Rodgers, came. He also had four in family and a small flat was inconvenient for him and his family, so he was allowed to go into that which was formerly occupied by Dr. Gideon. The Medical Superintendent which has now come has a large family, (a wife, three children and himself) and there is no house within the compound of the Hospital suitable for him to occupy; therefore, we are forced to provide a house for him on the lands of "Enmore."

As can be seen from the Addendum, it is proposed to build two houses for the senior staff. One is to house the Medical Superintendent. We expect the Anaesthetist to arrive soon and he also will need a house. It is proposed as soon as possible to build these two houses; one as I aforesaid you is for the Medical Superintendent and the other one for the Anaesthetist that is expected to arrive shortly.

The Estimates as given for building and furnishing these two houses including garages, servants rooms, etc., amount to \$46,000; but the amount which we come down for is \$9,000 because that is the amount which is likely to be spent by the end of the current financial year. As can be seen from the Addendum, one house is estimated to cost \$24,200 and the other \$21,800. We have come down for \$9,000 inasmuch as the Director of Public Works feels, and rightly so, that we cannot use up the whole amount of \$24,200 for the erection of one house before the end of the financial year.

As I have said before, under the plan of extension at the General Hospital, there is the proposal to build Nurses Quarters and Maisonettes at Stockton. When those quarters are completed and occupied, we will be in a better position to know exactly what further accommodation we will need for the junior staff; that is, the nurses and the pre-registration doctors; so the whole question of accommodation will have to be revised when the Nursing Quarters have been completed at Stockton. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, whenever it comes to the Medical Department at the General Hospital, there is a general feeling that one should not say anything about it because it provides such an essential social service, that whatsoever is proposed should be passed without discussion. I do not subscribe to that view. I am an opponent to *ad hoc* measures; and I have been a long opponent to *ad hoc* methods in dealing with the hospitals. I do not subscribe to the view of this discrimination, which would provide proper accommodation for some people and not for others. For instance, the proposal here is to build two independent houses for doctors at the Hospital, when it is stated that you need accommodation for twelve more doctors. You may as well look at the matter in the light of things today. I have not got the Report of the Hospital Planning Committee before me, but as a matter of common-sense why should you build two houses when it is proposed that you have to build flats or provide quarters for the people at the Hospital. You have the idea of providing certain professional people with too many luxuries, and these same doctors will live in Great Britain or in the United States of America and have to be contented with more modest quarters. But the idea here is that you give a man seven-room quarters, dining room, four bedrooms, living room, kitchen, servants' room an antediluvian practice which is something I detest; you provide all these facilities and you are building two of these houses. Is it not a wiser thing to start building your flats? If you have to give your senior staff more commodious flats then by all means do that; but you do not have to make the distinction of giving them two independent houses. They should have been flats, and they could have better flats than those provided for the junior staff. It must cost the Government more money to build these two independent houses than it would cost them to have a plan for building flats for the medical staff. I know that if you are building houses for subordinates, you will find a type of quarters which would be regarded inadequate for human be-

ings to live in without adequate conveniences, but when you come to other people nothing less than the excellent is given to them. I do not subscribe to this view of building these quarters for people at all; you make a distinction with the Sisters, but in some other countries you have Sisters in quarters and you have flats for them. But you must realise that you must come here and accept modest conditions because it is not heaven. Any of us would like to live in an independent home, but these people are not going to live here for all time; they are going to take other jobs in which they cannot be provided with the living quarters we provide; and they will take other jobs for more money even although the quarters and conveniences are not as good as that we provide. We have a good climate, but you do not take the climate to a shop and spend it. I think the former Attorney General is now in Kenya which has one of the hottest climates in the world. I do not like the idea of providing independent houses for doctors, when it has been stated that you need accommodation for twelve doctors. Why start on an *ad hoc* arrangements for making accommodation for two doctors and then you have to make accommodation for ten? The urgency of dealing with this matter cannot be any greater than the urgency which you will have to face in the future. What we have before us savours too much of the idea that you are making something extraordinary in the case of a doctor, but that anything would do for other public servants. All public servants should be treated in a similar manner. I hope that no one would be so stupid as to think that I am suggesting that doctors should not have good quarters; but good quarters do not mean the provision of independent houses with conveniences as if we intended to build them in a private home. We have to build flats to house people in, and we have to begin to realise that they have to live in flats in these jobs. I would be inclined to the idea of building independent houses for people, if it could be proved that building flats would be more expensive. It must take more land to build independent houses than to build flats; all these independent houses are very nice if you have large acreages and a lot of money to spare; but if you are nursing every penny you are spending, you should avoid such luxurious things and build something more modest for public officers.

4.15 p.m.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the honourable member who has just sat down feels that there is some discrimination in putting up buildings of this sort. First of all, we ought to know that in any institution where there is a junior staff and senior staff it is a recognised fact that the senior staff are given preference.

As far as these buildings are concerned, the question of flats was examined and the Director of Public Works pointed out that it would cost very little less to build flats than to build houses; because, the higher you go the more it costs to build. The point was made by a member in Executive Committee and it was examined; and as I have said, it was the opinion of the Director of Public Works that you would save very little by building flats and that by building houses you would have a more satisfied staff.

It is alright to get up here and talk about saving every penny; we all realise that we should save every penny in Barbados; but we must also realise that as long as we are dependant upon a staff from abroad, you have got to cater to a certain

extent to their likes and dislikes in order to get them to remain with us. As far as this Officer is concerned, if we did not promise to build a house for him as soon as possible he would have taken the next boat and would have gone back. He has a large family and there was no adequate accommodation outside. He only remained on our giving him the assurance that we would try to build a house for him as soon as possible. His family was coming by the next boat, and were it not for that assurance, he would have stopped them from coming.

I said clearly in my opening remarks that we know that we have not got enough houses to house the staff. If we did, we would not have to pay a lot of living out allowances that we have to pay now. I said that as soon as the accommodation at Stockton is built and we see how it works out, we will go into the question of building flats in order to accommodate the additional staff which will be required when the Hospital is extended.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister is entitled to his view just as I am entitled to mine. I never suggested that senior staff should not have preference. I said so. But I said they should have preference within the same type of building that you have for everyone. If you build flats, obviously you will give the senior staff better accommodation within the flats than the junior staff. That happens all over the world.

I do not want to bandy words with the Director of Public Works, but it is the first time that I have ever heard the theory enunciated that there is very little saving as a result of building a flat rather than building an independent house. You must save money; and it is erroneous to say that the saving on flats would not be considerable. In Barbados we also have to think of the matter from the point of view of land space; we do not have the available amount of land. And in addition to that, because of the money we have to pay for land, we should make the greatest utilisation possible of the land that we have.

It should be borne in mind that this \$24,000 is not all that the building will cost; because you have to add the cost to the land, the money which has been provided for already. The Minister has substantiated what I said earlier that there was an *ad hoc* arrangement. I have always opposed the policy of *ad hoc* arrangements in dealing with the Hospital. The Hon. Minister brought in the question of this gentleman having four children; suppose he had ten children or invalids in his family, the Government would not be able to get a house to suit him. The Minister has used too much, the argument that we are actually on the threshold of losing someone and that in order to hold him, we have to do certain things for him. That is not good enough. No matter what you do you cannot keep this Medical Superintendent here longer than he would like to stay. If his family comes here and his wife does not like the climate or the people, he will go just the same. I do not subscribe to the view that because you are attracting someone to the service you must of necessity, do something that you need not have done in general circumstances.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I see in this Addendum mention made of fittings, inclusive of crockery, cutlery, linen, stove etc. I thought sir, that when the Government provided furnished quarters they only provided heavy furniture like tables, beds, etc. It seems to me they have extended their provision in this case. It does seem an extraordinary thing to do; and it will be difficult for the Government to keep in touch with all these things. I

believe that a lot of people prefer to bring their own. Why is it done like this in this case?

Another question is that we were told that all these extensions to the Hospital would be provided for out of C.D. & W. funds. I think the point raised by the honourable junior member for St. Peter was a good one, that is to say, that you should face up to the fact that if you have to provide for so many doctors you should put the scheme into operation quickly because later on, you may not get a refund from C.D. & W. I want to know if this money is coming out of C.D. & W. funds, and whether the Government does not think they are going too far with this question of furniture.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, lest it be thought that the honourable junior member for St. Peter is singing a lone tune, I would like to support his views and to say that this is a very slipshod manner of going about business. It is true to say that when we the members of the Committee who made enquiry into the whole Hospital were presented with the formula, these things did not appear; and we thought that the amounts suggested then would have covered all the things that were being asked for. I agree that if you have to look for accommodation for 25 officers at the Hospital and you only have accommodation for 13 now, it is bad business to have it done like this. If you find that you have to look for accommodation for 12 and you are now asking us to agree to make provision for the accommodation of two, you are still leaving ten to be accounted for.

4.25 p.m.

I presume in the next couple of weeks we will be asked to make provision for two more, and it will go on like that, and that is why I agree with the suggestion of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. It is a fact that in large countries the officers whom we employ cannot get the conditions which we provide for them; and I will warn this Government now, that when it gets twenty-five officers attached to the Barbados General Hospital and each officer has a family of the average of eight in number, that the General Hospital will have a population of officers and their families, which will nearly compare with the sick population which one would find in the wards. Government should therefore consider when internees are wanted, that those who apply and have large families are not given preference in selection, because while it is true that we want the services of these medical officers, yet we should not bind ourselves to make provision for their families which may be large in number. I well remember we had a Secretary at the General Hospital who had a family of fourteen in number, and he and his family used to live in the Hospital compound. You can well imagine if you have twenty-five medical officers each having a family of fourteen, what it would mean. Certainly you would have to build two Hospitals; one for the families of the medical officers and one for the sick population. Sir, it is important that you consider the question of selecting an officer with a large family.

I know there is another institution in this country which has to employ personnel from overseas and provide accommodation and quarters for them. They are very careful not to congest the limited area which they have at that institution, by not taking on officers with large families. They select a man who is single or one who only has a wife and child, or a wife only. I say again, it is very important that we consider whether we should build a four bedroom place with additional

out-offices to accommodate a Medical Superintendent however efficient he might be. I notice that the total set down here for the building of those quarters is \$24,200. That is too costly. Certainly sir, you should give a medical officer, if his qualifications merit it, sufficient accommodation to suit him and his family; but you need not give him a four bedroom place with sitting room, servants' rooms, and things of that sort. Imagine that you are building a garage for \$1,500. Certainly all these things can be combined into one so as to make one overall construction scheme. It would be very much cheaper than the proposal shown here. It strikes me that at one time you get an argument put up to the Government to justify an action such as this, and then you get a contrary argument being put up by the same official who puts the thing to the Government. Having to purchase the land at "Enmore" as costly as it was purchased, there should be a saving in the land area by building two-storey houses instead of flats. Certainly it will be better and of more lasting benefit than the slipshod way of putting up buildings as have been proposed here. The same engineer who is suggesting that it would be better to build separate houses on the area to this Government, if he were in a bigger country he would recommend and agree that up-in-the-air buildings must be cheaper even, if you have to pay a couple more cents for labour, because the land value is high. Sir, can you imagine that in New York an engineer would tell the authorities they should not build up-in-the-air buildings because they would cost more? Certainly they might cost a couple of hundred dollars more, but in the long run you will save on them.

If you do not plan well you are going to find that in the next couple of years when expansion of the General Hospital might be necessary, that you will have to buy the adjoining properties and you will go on to do that until the whole area would be nothing else but a Medical Centre. It is logical to carry up on your buildings instead of spreading them out in a small area such as what you have at "Enmore."

For all the cost of these buildings, you find that the medical officers are only asked to pay five per cent of their salary as rent, and that system has been going on for very many years now. For all these conveniences, a house for himself and his family, plus the providing of things which they must use in it, and which normally they will have to purchase if they were living outside of the Government, we are giving them all actually free of cost because they are only paying 5% of their salary for them. According to the regulation, if an officer is compelled on his job he has to pay 5% of his salary by way of rent, and if he is not obligated to live on his premises or the institution, he pays 10%. Mr. Chairman, when we provide these houses and all the things that go with them, we are providing them with them free or for little cost. Outside they will have to pay anything like \$200 or \$260 a month for a four bedroom house and all the appurtenances we are giving them.

4 35 p.m.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture will know what I am saying because he lives in that exclusive area where these large rentals are being asked for, and all these things you are giving this Officer free on the assumption that you must do these things. We have seen highly qualified officers coming to this colony even when we were arguing that we must give them leave passages for themselves and their wives. It is not only in that direction, but in the teaching profession that we have been getting people to make applications for appointments; so that we

need not bend our backs too much to attract people at all. We have one of the best specialists in surgery with us; he has revolutionised surgery in this island. He left us and went to another country and he found himself back in this colony. There are certain things which it appears as if Barbados can offer, and which these worthy men cannot find in other places although they can get better salaries than we can offer. It is something more than the salary which attracts these people here. If you accommodate one officer to this extent, naturally you have to make provision for twenty-five; and each officer is liable to want the conditions of employment which you have extended to another and so it goes right down the line. You will get dissatisfaction and agitation until you will find that you will have to give everybody the same thing. Of course the Government has a method of thinking that as long as they have come down with a prepared Resolution, they will only listen to criticisms here but they will not amend the Resolution. However, the proposal here is too lavish. You have crockery, cutlery and so on broken; you get careless children turning over several cups in a short time; you have articles stolen or misplaced or handled badly, and I should like to know if a Government would commit itself to the replacement of all these things. The Addendum makes mention of furniture, fittings, inclusive of crockery, cutlery, linen, stove etc; and that can include toilet paper, safety pins, clothes pins, and so on; must we commit ourselves to recurrent expenditure of such small things? If we give an officer such lavish quarters for himself and his family, can he not buy these small items? When the officer realises that all he has to do is to put in the estimate a sum for replacement, he will say "I cannot afford to use crack plates and articles which have been used by other people." As soon as you supply these things to one officer another officer will say "I do not like these; you have to put it in the Estimates that I want these better things." There was a vicar of Christ Church who gave the Vestry a lot of trouble and he eventually reached the law courts, simply because in the agreement they did not stipulate things correctly. I would like to appeal to the Hon. Minister of Social Services; I presume that he is a busy man and he is not expected to have his finger tips on everything, and he probably accepts things when they are put to him; but I am suggesting that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed so that the Government can go over this whole programme and do something which will be more acceptable to honourable members.

I have noticed that when accommodation for officers was limited, houses were rented to accommodate them until the institution was able to provide its own quarters; and therefore, I feel that even if the officer comes down here within a couple of weeks, it cannot inconvenience him very much if the Government had to give him one of the flats at the Garrison for temporary accommodation, or even if the Government had to put him at a hotel until these quarters had been completed. In case the Hon. Minister is thinking in terms of the delay which the Department might experience if they have to start all the flats at the same time, he need not have that fear; because, if you are building a set of flats you can convert some of the quarters to accommodate the increase in the number of staff which you have to bring in.

I feel sir, that this is brought in in this matter because of the attempted haste to get these quarters completed in time, as the Addendum says in three months time, to accommodate the officer or officers

I am going to suggest that we postpone further consideration of this Resolution for two weeks. I feel that if that is done, the Hon. Minister can go back to the Department and make new arrangements. I now formally move that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed for two weeks.

4.45 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: I am rising Mr. Chairman, to second the motion which has just been made by the honourable senior member for St. John. I do so, and at the same time I congratulate the Government for having found oil. It was only two weeks ago that the Premier (I am sorry he is not here at the moment) assured me and through me the members of this House, that it was not possible for him even to consider lending 11 people in my constituency \$100 each to purchase furniture for houses.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. member to stick to the Resolution. Do not stray.

Mr. TUDOR: I am not straying Mr. Chairman. As I was saying, he could not see his way to consider lending these people \$100 each to purchase furniture; and now I see, the first thing that caught my eye in the Addendum is that for one house (House No. 1) furniture including crockery, cutlery, linen, stove etc. will cost \$24,000. That means therefore that this Government is prepared to spend on one house, twice as much as it refused to spend on 11; and that therefore, while two weeks ago it was just a matter of touching goal if oil could be found and 11 people could get what they want, it must be a matter of great rejoicing to know that oil has been found and that one person can get what 11 could not get and get twice as much.

Secondly sir, I noticed a very curious thing. In the estimate given for House No. 1, which the main building will consist of four bedrooms, a living room, a dining room, kitchen, toilet etc., the estimated cost is set down at \$16,500. When we turn to House No. 2 we see that the main building which will consist of three bedrooms, living room, dining space, kitchen, toilets etc., I noticed that House No. 2 differs from No. 1 in that has one bedroom less, and dining space instead of dining room. A house which differs only by having one bedroom less is costing \$2,000 less. I noticed also that in the case of the three-bedroom house, the estimated cost of the furniture is \$1,800 while in the case of the four bedroom house the estimated cost of supplying furniture is \$2,200. One can be forgiven for concluding that the difference between them of one bedroom, which difference comes to a disparity of \$2,000 in the overall estimated cost, the extra bedroom for which the furniture is required in the first house will cost \$400.

I do not know of course whether the Minister of Social Services in introducing this Resolution, said whether he was satisfied with everything that had been presented to him. I do not even know if he vouchsafed to the House an explanation for the skimping and ludicrous information given in this Addendum. But we are asked quite seriously to provide money for two houses; one house carries a bedroom less than the other, and the estimated cost of the main building of House No. 1 is \$2,000 more than the other. Further down we see that the estimated cost of supplying furniture to the building having one bedroom more, requires \$400 more.

I am not satisfied, Mr. Chairman. I think there has been some carelessness in drawing up this Addendum and setting out the whole estimate. I cannot say more not having heard the introductory remarks of the Minister. There is another more important point. We are told that it is estimated that

only \$9,000 of this amount will be spent by the end of the current financial year. Approval is sought, we are told, for the provision of \$9,000 towards the cost of these two houses. The financial year will end on the 31st March. As I understand it, the Government is asking for permission to spend \$9,000 between now and the 31st March (a matter of six weeks) and then come for \$37,000 after that.

That is the point; that is where I find I am justified in seconding the motion for the postponement. Until the Government lays the Estimates on this table, (and they should do it soon) we have no idea of what we may be asked to provide under this Head for the next financial year. It is not a matter of wanting only \$9,000 now; that is just a smoke screen; they really want \$46,000. They have, as my colleague said, ten more officers to provide for, and unless they tell us whether those ten officers will be served on the same basis as this (a house per officer) or whether they will turn over to entirely a new policy, we do not know where we are, and that they have not said. Having failed to make their position clear in so far as these other officers are concerned, we are apt to conclude that these other officers might require precisely the same treatment as those two are now getting; in which case, we may find ourselves called upon to provide accommodation to the tune of perhaps \$24,000 each if the Government is building four-bedroom houses; or if they want to treat the other officer with a certain diminished grandeur \$21,800 each. Working on that average, we may see them put in the coming Estimates perhaps nearly a quarter million dollars for the entire housing of these ten officers.

4.55 p.m.

That is why I have to support the postponement. It might well be, that the technique which Government is using, is not as complicated as it seems to be. The position of that is this: Government knows to what it is committed; this House does not know; it is set down that these two houses are going to cost \$46,000 to be erected in three months time; and as we are nearing the end of a financial year, we need only \$9,000 of that amount. Government can only spend \$9,000 by the end of the financial year. How can we believe Government when we do not know what it proposes to do about the other ten houses, and we do not know what provision it has made under this Head in the next annual Estimates for the building of houses at the General Hospital. This House will be walking down a blind alley if we allow Government to pass this without consideration. I did not hear very well what the Hon. Minister had to say on it, but I cannot see why the difference between a four bedroom and a three bedroom house should be \$4,000 for furnishing. I think this is clearly a matter which calls not only for mature consideration, but deep and severe scrutiny. And for that reason I am going to vote for postponement of the Resolution.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, the first thing which I think members would want to know in a Resolution like this is, whether it is going to affect the loan that is going to be raised. It says here that it is to be met from available funds, but that means that you are going to use some money out of your revenue balances, and you are going to have a contribution from your current Revenue and all of that. If you come and ask for \$9,000 now to spend on the erection of one of these buildings between now and the end of the financial year, whereas you have said already that you have made your allocation towards Medical Services, this amount strikes me as one which is to come out of loan funds.

Nothing like that was said. However sir, that can go unnoticed.

What I would like to remind the Government is that when it bought "Enmore" or when it was bought for the Government, we were told by Government that they were not putting a single patient there, but that it was earmarked for the building of houses for the staff exclusively. I thought at that time that that was an uncharitable statement, but it seems to me that it was prophetic, and it is now coming to pass. Let us take the old Hospital as an instance; you will find that it is a series of single buildings for members of the staff, both Medical and nurses; and that was remedied at one time by the late Mr. Graham Yearwood when he lifted up a roof of one of those single house buildings to put a second story on it. There are still a series of single housed buildings there for the Medical and nursing staff; and it would appear at present that we are extending the Hospital in the same identical way. It may be a good idea to have a second building for the Medical Superintendent; but even if that may be so, the Medical Superintendent whom one would expect, will as a general rule be always a man somewhat advanced in years and would have a family that is grown up, and probably one that has left his home; so to have a four bedroom house, because you have at present a Medical Superintendent who has a large family, is only an argument which is only taking in the exigencies of the time being under consideration. According to the junior member for St. Peter, to make these *ad hoc* arrangements to suit a particular situation is something which is undoubtedly wrong. This is the first time I have heard that if you go up two stories in the erection of a building that the cost will be so much more.

5.05 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I did not say that.

Mr. LEWIS: The Hon. Minister said that. He did say that it will cost more. Many honourable members who have already spoken commented on that and said that he has said so. Who is telling the truth? I never thought I would be corrected on this point; particularly, after other members commented on it. The honourable junior member for St. Peter repeated it several times, and I never heard the Hon. Minister correct him on it. Sir, I sincerely hope that Government has taken expert advice in that matter.

If the entire Hospital for patients is going to remain on the Bay Street-Jemmotts Lane-River Road area, I think the place for the Medical Superintendent is inside the Hospital compound. He has to superintend and he should be very easily got at; he should superintend the Hospital and live as near to it as possible; but to tell me that you have set out to build four bedroom houses and three bedroom houses when you know that you must have some comprehensive scheme for housing the medical staff, and that you should do that as quickly as possible because I understand that you need medical staff at the Hospital, it seems to me to be the actual revelation of the suspicion at the time that you cannot keep that premises for exclusive staff-housing and not allow a single patient to sleep up there. Strange enough, you have a Medical Centre where the patients will live, and if you have the staff in that exclusive place at "Enmore" I say make them as happy as you can; but I am convinced that this is not the way you can save. I want to say that some of the people who occupy these houses are perhaps friends of the Director of Public Works. I like to give a man what he is worth; if I were he, I would get the space for all the buildings and then you could not do what is now being proposed. You do not get these people out here having regard to this matter; what would

you build for the Director of Medical Services? A Hotel? He would rent a cheap house if you got him to rent one. If you build a house for a medical man with so many children, then you will have to build a bigger house for another man with more children. If you are going to use all the space up there, I would say, let the Medical Superintendent have a separate house, but do not build a one storey house at "Enmore" for every other individual whom you employ at the Hospital. This does not sound right to me, and for that reason I am voting for the postponement of this Resolution in the hope that the Government will reconsider its decision. The very reason for building a separate house has just been contradicted; the moment the honourable member heard that stupid suggestion he must have realised that it was stupid; and he thought it necessary to say he did not say so. That is positive proof that the matter has not been given mature consideration, but that they have been tricked by somebody who went to lay the foundation for separate houses and it became *fait accompli*; he should have laid the foundation for all these houses and then he would have been caught. This is not the way to spend the people's money, and then say that you cannot do this or that because you find difficulty in balancing your budget. We were told that the budget would have been brought in earlier this year; it should have been here already, but on the eve of the budget you tell us that you are borrowing more money to pay out another set of interest which will prevent you from building houses for the people. You used this money to pay interest on the money which you have borrowed; now you are repeating the same mistake by housing somebody at the compound of the Hospital. You have housed this Sister and this Doctor, and are you going to do the same thing at "Enmore"? Because you are getting the money from C.D. & W. are you persisting in this mistake? And then you tell people that you must be careful as to how you use the land for housing scheme. The Hon. Premier is suggesting that in the housing area people will be cut down to the size of a tennis lawn for their spots, and that you should take the lawn which you have bought at a high price irrespective of whose money you bought it with, and build separate little houses for people; that does not make sense at all, especially in the context of things in this island. If you tell me that the Medical Superintendent should have a house by himself, I would say "Yes," but he is the only person. Do they expect that they will have both sexes on the staff and will have to accommodate their spouses? What is the new idea? I must say that this proposition is entirely out of tune with things as we have been hearing them recently; and I am somewhat surprised to find it in here to-day. I heartily support the honourable junior member for St. Peter in the remarks which he has made; you are being tricked by people who have excelled in a particular direction in building, and they are now putting a little bit before you; let us try them out with some single houses at "Enmore" and see what a wonderful job they will do. Are we going to build three and four room houses for Medical Officers?

Ask these Medical Officers to take a salary and rent a house for their families and see what they will do.

5.15 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I do not profess to be an authority on building but I must say, that I was surprised when I read in the Addendum that the most outstanding feature is an amount of \$1,500 proposed for building a garage. I must consider that, in relation to the \$1,300 which is the cost of each of the houses in the Self Help Scheme. I cannot imagine, I cannot conceive, what a garage for

\$1,500 would look like. How many cars is it expected to contain? What material will it be built of? What are its dimensions? I ask that because I noticed, that it is the same price that is estimated to provide for a servant's room, and toilet.

I am told that it is quite possible to erect a decent garage for between \$240 to \$300; and that that amount is ample. What will be done to justify an expenditure of \$1,500? I must wonder how many vehicles it is contemplated that these two officers will have.

There are two houses, one with four bedrooms and the other with three, and the difference in price is \$2,000, which would suggest that the cost of the bedrooms is \$2,000 each. In respect to House No. 2, I notice that reference is made merely to dining space, whereas with House No. 1 reference is made to a dining room. Again while with regards to House No. 1 reference is made to "toilet" in the singular, with regard to House No. 2 "toilet" in the plural appears. I must confess that I share the joy of other members who look forward to employment will be found for artisans in the erection of these two buildings; but I feel we could find other employment for them if we provided a more reasonably priced garage, so that the amount of money saved could be expended on other buildings on which we could employ the same people.

There is no point when our Treasury is not in a flourishing condition, to give the impression that we can afford an amount as extravagant as \$1,500 for a single garage. If the garage is that elaborate, the rest of the house will have to be just as elaborate; and that is where we find ourselves with a \$25,000 building in which \$1,500 is for the housing of a car.

I do not know if there is any reason to assume that Medical Officers may have more than one car. It may be even more difficult to find these officers if they have so many cars near the institution, than it is to find them today when a patient is carried hurriedly to the Casualty.

The next point is that if accommodation is available for thirteen out of the twenty-five medical officers, and by this scheme we are providing for two, that still leaves us with ten. We can imagine what that will be, unless we decide to erect one building for these ten. We can imagine what it will cost to have ten garages and ten servant's rooms at \$1,500 each. If this scheme is such as to give these people an impression that our Treasury is so prosperous, they will settle down in these elaborate houses with these elaborate garages, and no doubt they will soon appreciate having another car or two, and will ask for an increase in salary.

I do feel, sir, that in the absence of more detailed explanation as to how these grants are made up, the type of material that will be used in the construction of these houses and the dimensions of the houses etc., I would not be justified in supporting today the Resolution for this amount.

Another point which arises was mentioned by the honourable junior member for St. Andrew—crockery, cutlery, linen etc. Are those things nowadays normally supplied to everyone who is supplied with furnished quarters? Or are we creating a precedent in this case? If that is so, there must be a very careful check made of these items to ensure that all will be there for the next person who occupies such a house.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman. I only got up to point out to the Minister of Social Services that the honourable junior member for St. Andrew asked a very pertinent question; to which I would like to hear a reply. Having the over-all picture of

development at "Enmore" is most important, if we are to decide today on the building of these two houses.

I quite appreciate the point that we must give adequate accommodation to the Medical Staff at the Hospital, and we are prepared to give that adequate accommodation for the Senior Staff; but they are ten others to be housed, and I think that an over-all plan of what provision is going to be made at "Enmore" or elsewhere should be provided. We may go and site these houses in some spot that will spoil the entire area; we may be causing the other houses to have to be badly sited.

Now when it comes to the cost of building flats as against building individual houses, I do not think that the difference is so great. I have in mind the block of flats in Hastings known as "Greystone Flats," a very desirable lot and good enough for anyone to live in. To-day, with the cost of housekeeping being what it is, I think it is more suitable for people who are coming here for short terms (because that is what they are coming for) and who will have their problems of gardeners, housekeepers, etc., it would be less of a problem for them if they lived in flats. That might be the answer to the housing of these 13 people whom we are today discussing.

I would like the Minister to answer the question asked by the honourable junior member for St. Andrew as to whether this is coming out of C.D. & W. Funds. If we provide this money to-day, will it preclude us from getting a grant for the additional buildings we will have to put up whether they are houses or flats? When the Minister replies I will know how to vote.

Someone suggested that this Resolution be postponed for further consideration. We do not want to hasten anyone out of the colony. They have come to do a job and we feel that it is our duty to provide good quarters to house them; but we do want to know what is the over-all plan for the housing of the Medical Officers at the General Hospital.  
5.25 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, before the Hon. Minister replies, I would like to say that by getting the houses together in one block of flats, even the servants might, as a result of having quarters built for more than one, get better accommodation. The next point is that in a place like "Enmore" I hardly think that an individual garage with a door is necessary for everyone. You could have a common garage capable of holding a couple of cars or more. You could have a garage holding four or five cars on one side and the same number on the other side, making it easy and convenient for the owners to get at them.

Now the next point I am going to deal with is something that I am always complaining about. Imagine taking a place like "Enmore" and using it up without even providing a plan. By normal passage through the Legislature, the Government cannot get this money until March, unless as on other occasions you have started to spend money digging foundations etc. You cannot spend this \$9,000 in one month; not if you planned to spend it in two. Certainly there must be some plan in existence. What is it that you are going to build? I say that the Legislature is entitled to see the plans of these buildings. We never see a plan; and if we do see it, it is as a result of making a row; we see it after the money is voted.

It is not fair. We should be shown the plans to these things. [A VOICE: You had the plans to the Ministerial Building!]. The Honourable member said that we had plans for the Ministerial Buildings. That may be so, but not when the Resolution was brought in at first. However, Sir, I think it would be a good idea if we are shown the

plans for these things. We should have something to give us some idea of the buildings. If we are shown something, we might be able to be of some assistance to the Government. You are going to put up these two buildings somewhere at "Enmore". Where are you going to put the others? Can you start to spend this \$9,000 on the erection of one of these buildings without having a plan? It is not merely the plan of the building that we should be shown; we should be shown something to see where you are putting them and to see how they fit in the space you have at "Enmore". Let us see something. It is a fact that if Government supply this House with a plan of some buildings, it only supplies one in every six buildings they erect; and Government only does that after it has been asked to do so.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who has just sat started shouting in answer to something I said. He is not disturbing anybody but himself. I maintain that I said at the beginning that in the building of flats you will save very little and the Director of Public Works has said so. The honourable member did make a useful point when he suggested that there should be a common garage for all these buildings; and that suggestion will be considered. The honourable junior member for St. Andrew asked one or two questions and they shall be answered. I will reply first of all to the question of furniture. Let me say that I have been a member of the Hospital Board since 1941, and all the doctors' residences there are fully furnished. It has been so for years; therefore, the provision has been made in these estimates for these buildings for crockery, cutlery, linen, silver, and everything except a refrigerator. That item has been asked for, but inasmuch as other residences did not have one it has been refused in the last instance. These residences have been fully furnished in accordance with the accepted practice at the General Hospital. It was so from 1941 when I joined the Board; and it is not so in Barbados alone; it is so in the other colonies of the Caribbean.

As far as the question of C. D. & W. Funds coming into this matter, I do not know from where the honourable member got the idea. C. D. & W. Funds have nothing to do with this matter. C. D. & W. Funds bought "Enmore." These buildings, if you so decide, will be erected out of Government's funds. I am sorry that the honourable senior member for St. John is not in his place. He talked about a lot of things, but the only thing I think to be worth answering, is that part where he questioned the safety of furniture and crockery in these residences. I want to tell him that when anybody moves into one of these furnished houses, (just like the practice with all furnished houses,) an inventory is kept in the Secretary's office and when the person moves into it the Secretary along with the person, checks the various items with the inventory, and when that person moves out, the Secretary is there again to check with the person in accordance with the inventory, and should there be any loss the person has to replace such loss either in money or in kind. Let me repeat, when an officer is moving in and moving out the items are checked. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy who is the echo of the honourable senior member for St. John, questioned the difference in cost of the furniture for a three bedroom house and a four bedroom house. Certainly, the honourable member should know that a house with four bedrooms would cost more in material and labour; and it will also cost more to furnish than a house with three bedrooms. He ought to know such when he ques-

tioned the difference in price; I thought common-sense would have dictated that to him. As far as the other officers are concerned, at the moment they are living out and are paid living out allowances. 5.35 p.m.

When the nurses' house at "Stockton" is built, then it is proposed to review the whole question of the accommodation of staff. I said that about two or three times already; because, the accommodation at "Stockton" will provide 150 nurses plus ten maisonettes for Sisters and other people. When that is built the Government will be in a better position to say "we want so many houses for the staff." We know that we need additional staff; all of that has been envisaged; and I repeat that when the house at "Stockton" is built then we will be in a position to say how many more we want. Then we would come down for the required amount. As to where these two houses will be placed, it is intended to place them at the entrance to "Enmore" at the right. There would be an independent entrance, and it is proposed that it would not take more than a quarter acre of land to build the two of these houses. As far as plans are concerned I have no plans here, but these houses are just the ordinary type of bungalow house. Anybody who knows this type of house can envisage that this is no big elaborate house which would need a plan; it is the ordinary bungalow type of house which will accommodate these two gentlemen. The Government brought down this matter knowing the present needs of the Hospital. There are those who think that there are many doctors waiting to rush to the Hospital; I can assure you that that is not so. You took more than a year to secure this Medical Superintendent who has just come down. I should like to say this: within a short space of time and with salaries in the Caribbean advanced within recent months, honourable members will be well advised to try and make it possible to keep those who have come to us. I am very sorry that the honourable junior member for the City should descend to say that the Director of Public Works is doing this job for his friends, or words to that effect. I do not know the gentleman concerned, but at one time you praised this gentleman and now you say that he has descended to the level of making things comfortable for his friends.

Mr. LEWIS: On a point of explanation. I merely said that it is possible for the Director of Public Works to be friendly with the very people for whom you are building these houses. Everybody would like a separate house for himself. I would like the honourable member to correct that.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am not in a position to correct it; probably the honourable member can correct it, and he ought to know. The Government feels that we should try and accommodate the best of our ability, the staff who have come to us. This man is a man with past experience, and I am sure that he is in a position to make a good contribution to the running of the Hospital. If on the other hand honourable members feel that he should not be so accommodated, the Government will have done its duty.

*Mr. Miller and Mr. E. D. Mottley came into the Committee and took their seats.*

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister gave the impression that they were building a house for a person. I want to say this: it is common knowledge that the house which is at the corner of River Road was formerly used by a Medical Superintendent, Dr. Crawford, who was the senior officer at the General Hospital in those days. There was no question of that house not being suitable for Dr. Crawford. It must be admitted that Government has made certain *ad hoc* arrangements from time to time in order to

accommodate certain officers. I want to say, that the fact that one Medical Officer has more children than another cannot place the Government in the position where they have to build a four bedroom house for the Medical Superintendent. Dr. Crawford used that house and other Medical Superintendents must also have used it; and I do not like the idea that you are voting something to give this particular gentleman accommodation as such, that you are erecting two independent houses. If Dr. Leacock decides to live at the Hospital what is going to be the situation? However, Dr. Leacock is a Barbadian and he lives outside the Hospital. The honourable Introducer of this Resolution cannot escape the fact that they need accommodation for several people; and they are providing accommodation for two persons and the circumstances are, that they are providing this house for the Superintendent to live in because he is a person of this calibre. They are providing this accommodation for this particular person and as I have already said, that is something which I do not like.

5.45 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Social Services in making reference to some criticisms which I made, dismissed those criticisms as being merely an echo of the honourable senior member for St. John. It is a very sad day when in the debates of this House sarcasm, or what is meant to be sarcasm, takes the place of argument; and in any case I have no objection to being what the honourable member is pleased to call an echo of anyone, even he himself, (although it is a feat which I should dread) happens to be saying something that is right or true.

If the Minister wishes to defend himself against specific charges it is his duty, or it should be his duty, to take the charges one by one and show how absurd they are. To say that an honourable member is an echo of another honourable member is not even an insult, because it may well be a compliment if the honourable member whom he is supposed to be echoing is right. Is there any member who sits on that side of the House of whom any member of this House could afford to be an echo without misgivings? I certainly would not undertake it.

I would not claim that the hon. member has insulted me because I happened to be an echo in this case, because the hon. senior member for St. John is right and so are other members. I warn the Minister that this sort of thing cannot go on, if the five of them are prepared to distort genuine criticisms, made by the sarcastic nature of their replies, without actually paying themselves the compliment of giving serious replies to serious criticisms.

Of course I did say that I found it strange that there was such a discrepancy between the price of a four bedroom house and that of a three bedroom house. I was not surprised that the price of the three bedroom house was less. What I asked for an explanation on was this: I want to know (and I am repeating it now because the Minister is still to answer me) is if the three-bedroom house in addition to being a smaller house was built, or rather whether we propose to build it of different materials and possibly with cheaper labour; because at first glance you cannot hope to convince anyone that the mere difference of one bedroom between three and four should bring about this difference of \$2,000. Certainly one is also entitled to enquire of its costing you \$400 more to furnish one bedroom since the three-bedroom house will require \$1,800 worth of furniture while the four bedroom house will require \$2,200 worth. Those are the questions which I asked.

As a matter of fact, now I remember it, the Minister was still inaccurate in dubbing me an

echo, because so far as I recall, the hon. senior member for St. John or indeed no other member, mentioned that particular aspect of the matter. If by calling me an echo the Minister means that I criticised this Resolution on the same grounds as other hon. members, he is right; but if he means that everything I said followed every other hon. member, he is wrong.

I even went further, Mr. Chairman, and said that they are asking for \$9,000 out of the \$46,000 which they say they want, and that it should not be given to them now because they are soon to introduce the Estimates; and until they tell us what they propose to do for the housing of the other ten officers, what type of housing they will provide and how much money they are coming for, we should suspend judgment. That has been my point and it still is.

I noticed that the honourable junior member for Christ Church said (and rightly so) in his speech that he would not know how to vote until the Minister had answered certain questions or until quite possibly, he had satisfied the House on certain points. I agree with the attitude; but I differ from him in that I knew how to vote long before I heard the Minister reply. When the hon. junior member for St. Peter was speaking and after him the hon. junior member for the City, I thought that what they said was good enough to warrant a reply on the points raised by both of them if the Minister had anything to reply on.

I therefore say, sir, that this Addendum is not a satisfactory one, and we cannot support this Resolution until the Government tell us and satisfy us as to what they are doing and what they propose to do for the other ten officers; and therefore, what they will ask us to provide for the next financial year. Until the Government can satisfy us on all those points, they cannot expect anything other than an attempt to postpone the Resolution.

The Minister of Social Services has been asked by nearly every hon. member what he proposes to do for the housing of everyone else in addition to the two officers we are now being asked to provide for. Unless I have not heard him correctly, I have not heard any satisfactory reply; and even if he did say it, and it escaped me, he did not say how much the Government thought it would cost.

Mr. Chairman, this is the people's money. I should not have to say that, but it happens to be true; and hon. members who wish to know how it will be spent, and who wish to draw comparisons between the way in which it is spent on one set of people and how it is spent on the other set, must certainly not be insulted because they press for answers which the Government is not in a position to give, or do not wish to give because certain people asked for them. This is serious business. If the Minister wishes to convince this House that everything that is set down here in this Addendum must go through as it is put down, he has to do two simple things: first of all, declare in unequivocal terms what his policy is with regard to the housing of the staff of the General Hospital. That is to say, whether he is giving them ten flats or whether he will erect ten houses similar to any of these which we are now considering.

Secondly, he should say what he thinks it will cost us to put those houses or flats there. If he could only say that, we might be able to let him have what he wants. I cannot, of course, speak for other members; I can only speak for myself; I personally am not prepared to support this Resolution as it stands, because I still feel unsatisfied on the points on which the Hon. Minister is still to answer.

## ADJOURNMENT

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I hope we will have fifteen echoes of the motion that I will make now, that is, that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again. I formally make that motion.

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

*The question was put and agreed to without division.*

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of Order. You will remember that I made a motion for the postponement of the Resolution.  
5.55 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will remember that I have been here since 3 o'clock! We are reporting progress and asking for leave to sit again so that hon. members can get a break and then return to consideration of the Resolution.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, there is no question of not wishing to give a break for tea to you or anyone else. What the hon. senior member for St. John wanted to say was that another motion had been made and seconded.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

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

*The question that the House do now adjourn for half an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.*

6.00 p.m.

*On re-assembling:*

LETTER FROM THE O/C B'DOS REGIMENT  
RE MILITARY BAND

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the House resumes in Committee of Supply, I have the honour to present the following letter:—

Garrison Headquarters,  
St. Ann's Fort,  
Barbados.  
14th February, 1955.

His Honour,  
The Speaker,  
House of Assembly.

Sir,

I hereby tender my sincere apologies, on behalf of the Barbados Regiment, for any annoyance caused to the Members of Your Honourable House of Assembly by parading the Regimental Band on the occasion of the Rehearsal for H.R.H. Princess Margaret.

I sincerely regret the occurrence, and assure you Sir, and the Honourable Members that no disrespect was meant.

I have the honour to be,  
Sir,

Your Most Humble Obedient Servant,

O. F. C. WALCOTT, Lt.-Col.,

Officer Commanding, Barbados Regiment.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. SPEAKER. I thank Lt.-Col. Walcott, Officer Commanding the Barbados Regiment for the apology. I am glad to learn

that it was an oversight and that no disrespect was meant to this House.

## COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY RESUMED

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

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

Accommodation For House Officers At Hospital  
Continued

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that I was not in my place to hear what the Hon. Minister of Social Services had to say on this Resolution. When I received a copy of this Resolution I thought on it for quite sometime, and I jotted down a few notes which I should like to speak on. I am quite sure that I will not be accused of being the echo of anybody. Let me begin by saying, (and I hope the Hon. Minister of Social Services will listen attentively) that I believe people who occupy positions such as Medical Officers must be allowed to live in circumstances which are comfortable and conducive to the job which they are doing; and that applies to Medical Officers who were born here also. I do not want to make any suggestion of relegating Medical Officers who might be called upon to work here under conditions other than normal working hours, to a position where they should live in little houses. If I may use some of the views of the so called Socialists who say things which they do not always mean, I do not want to say that Medical Officers should live in little houses and in the same position as a man who is working for \$40 a month. I want to be very reasonable; I want Government to weigh carefully anything which I may say in this matter.

The Resolution in front of us is for the sum of \$9,000 which is part of the amount of \$46,000 to be spent on the erection of two residences for Medical Officers. The amount which is set out here, is what is proposed to be spent up to the end of March. I am going to be very mild when I say that the least this expenditure can be termed as, is reckless extravagance. I have a full sense of my responsibility when I say that; and I am going to prove it. All of us here pay great tribute to Captain Tomlin, Director of Public Works, for the services which he has given to the colony and the work which he has been doing. There are no two ways about it; he is doing a good job. If I say this is reckless extravagance, it does not necessarily mean it is a criticism of him, but it is a criticism on the Government for not realising what they are doing. If you put a case to an architect telling him what you want to do, he will in turn put figures to you to suit what you want. The Addendum to this Resolution reads as follows:—

"In order to provide suitable accommodation for the Medical Superintendent and to ease the housing situation generally for medical staff at the Hospital, the Director of Public Works, at the instance of the Minister of Social Services, has indicated that he can erect two suitable houses on the grounds of "Enmore" within three months time at a cost of \$43,000 including usual facilities."

6.35 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I did not hear what every hon. member said on this Resolution, but my counsel this afternoon is that the Government should postpone the consideration of this matter. This is not a question of embarrassment, this is a question of reckless extravagance and I will prove it. The remarks which

I caught from the Hon. Minister when I came in are, that they are having a Medical Superintendent—I hope the Hon. Minister of Social Services will see to it that what happened with the last Medical Superintendent will not happen with this one. It has been reported to me by medical practitioners that the great trouble at the Hospital was the fact that the Medical Superintendent there thought he could run the Hospital from a wheel Chair, and weeks and weeks passed by and he never visited one Ward in the Hospital at all. If that is a statement of fact (I got it from doctors attending at the Hospital) then they should let this other officer know that if he comes here with any such attitude on the behalf of the people of this colony, he should be asked to pack up and go. Everything which is reported is taken for granted; however, that is by the way.

As to the question of the erection of the four bedroom house I should like to say this: I have a certain amount of faith in the Hon. Minister's integrity, but he will be misled at times and he does things in good faith; but can you see this Superintendent coming from England, Scotland, Wales or any other place in the world, taking up a job and telling you that you must provide him with a four-bedroom house just because it is he? That is not right; and it is not showing any administrative ability. You build in keeping with the economic resources of the colony. In a house where a husband and wife sleep in the same bedroom, the boys occupying another room and the girls another one; show me the reason for building this type of house? A man may say that he has his family which might be his grandmother, his sisters and so on. If you were giving a rent allowance of \$60 a month, show me this man renting a four-bedroom house; he would go to the Garrison and rent a flat for \$40 a month. What would be the position of the Director of Medical Services whose office is actually above the office of Medical Superintendent? Would you say that you are building a house to suit his family? I am submitting to the Government that they would not do that; the provision of a four-bedroom house is absolutely unnecessary and it is reckless extravagance for this country to embark on this expenditure for a Medical Superintendent. I am going a little further; a three-bedroom house is the normal house which you should build for a Medical Officer or any other officer who is coming out here to take up a job. The Government has suggested recourse to family planning or birth control, and are they building a house to accommodate this officer with many children? I believe that with the growth of the Hospital and with the growth of the population of this colony and with the Health Services offered the world over, you must offer suitable accommodation for doctors; therefore, I say "Yes, build a three-bedroom house." It has been suggested that the establishment has 25 officers and these officers must be offered suitable accommodation; it would hardly pay us to have a doctor living at Gun Hill when we want him for a case of emergency; but you must not be so extravagant as to accept things which have been thrust upon you. I ask in all seriousness, be he Captain Tomlin or any other man, should he suggest that you spend \$1,500 on a garage for a Medical Superintendent? If the Government think so, mere decency prevents me from saying what should be done. The normal garage is 15 x 10 and 10 feet high. Let the hon. junior member for St. George advise you.

6.45 p.m.

If he can spend more than \$500.00 (I will even give him \$700.00 and then he will have to seal it and close board it) I do not know anything about building. Is it not justifiable for us in the Opposition

to say that this is reckless extravagance when you come down here for \$1,500 to build a garage for a Medical Officer, and say that you spend \$1,800 at the Housing Board for a house for a human being to live in? Are you crazy? You do not know what you are doing.

Unless you are speaking of the idle rich or the fabulous rich— [A MEMBER: One is coming in now!] The hon. junior member for St. Andrew would drop eternally dead before he built a garage for \$1,500 even to hold a Rolls Royce car. Who but the Government of Barbados, if the House was so stupid as to agree, would build a garage for \$1,500? I ask hon. members to be serious. Do not let us put anything like this to the vote.

The Hon. Minister of Social Services says that Mr. Tomlin suggested that it would not cost much less to build a flat. All that I say is that the Hon. Minister is a doctor and it is not expected that he would know about building. A garage for \$1,500? Of course you have no plan, and you can build a garage for \$5,000 if you want to. I am not saying that Mr. Tomlin is wrong when he says that a garage can cost \$1,500. What I am saying is, that it is reckless for the Government of Barbados to spend \$1,500 on a garage and to spend \$1,800 on a house for a human being to live in.

I suggest to the Government to postpone this Resolution, and let the Minister get down with Mr. Tomlin and tell him that the Government cannot afford this type of thing. Are you building this house to suit an individual, or to accommodate a medical officer to carry out his duties? Apparently the Government is building it to suit an individual which is a wrong thing.

Let us take the next item—servants' room and toilet. Let me ask the Hon. Minister what size servants' room and toilet will you build for \$1,500? It is just reckless extravagance. I take it that you must be using the same earthen pit. I cannot see the justification for this expenditure.

Now we come to fencing—\$500.00. We all know this place; it is already walled and fenced in all round. The Minister will tell us if that is right or wrong. This place used to be Sir Harold Austin's home; a place where it was sacriligious to enter the gate unless you had a passport. If you are building a house in there with all your civic pride, where are you going to put the Pride of India and the Barbados Beauty in a place already fenced around; will you still have to spend \$500 on fencing to fence in what already is fenced in at "Enmore"? If it were not the Minister of Social Services handling this, I would begin to get suspicious; but from the depth of my heart I believe in his integrity and honesty, and I believe that he is being fooled. He should withdraw this Resolution. Are they putting up iron rails? I agree in the principle of a three-bedroom house with modern accommodation for a medical officer to do his job; but do not come here with \$500 for fencing.

Now we come to path entrance. I know "Enmore". Quite recently I had a job to do, (a public job in my capacity as Chairman of a Board) and I wanted to satisfy myself about something. When you are in public life you must be above suspicion, especially when you know that there are foul minded people ready to say things about you. So I know "Enmore" well. I would like to carry the Hon. Minister there and let him show me personally what he is going to do these paths. Will he terraze them?

As far as lighting is concerned I do not question that, because I know that you will put in the latest fluorescent lights.

The hon. junior member for St. George is building a house now in Flint Hall that any doctor would be glad to live in; I challenge him to say that he is building it for more than £2,500. As far as contingencies are concerned, no one can quarrel about that; if you are building you must allow for that.

I tell the Government this: in another five years you will be getting doctors all a penny. Let them laugh! All this fool that is being played now, in another five years you will get them glad to come out here. The whole idea is one of kow-towing and bowing and scraping to professionals, instead of making them realise that they are men and so are you. They are raising a family and so are you.

6.55 p.m.

According to your estimate for the house with four bedrooms, furniture and fittings inclusive of crockery, cutlery, linen, stove etc., amount to \$2,200. Why should you furnish four bedrooms? Let me tell you that the modern way of building houses where officers come and go, is that you must have built-in cedar — lined closets. These are built at a quarter of the expense of a modern wardrobe. I am merely reasoning with you when I tell you of this; all these things go to show that with all the Social Services which we are in need of, you must be careful how you spend money; and the Hon. Premier says so time and time again. How have you got so extravagant? If you had a child to be married to-morrow morning, unless you are a Haynes or a Bryden, will you spend \$2,200 on furniture and crockery? [A VOICE: Order!] Why does not the Hon. Premier take the Chair?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The fact that I called for Order, was because I saw the hon. senior member for the City turn around and treat the Chair with the greatest disrespect, and addressed the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. Is he so rude and crude to tell me that it is not my business? What are we degenerating to? The fact that I called for Order was to make the hon. member realise that he should not have done it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Premier has talked about being rude and crude; who can be more rude and crude than the Hon. Premier? Let him tell me who has set the standard for behaviour in this country. He has set the standard for behaviour in this country; his behaviour is more disgraceful than any other hon member's. Who are those that cannot be rude to the Hon. Premier? Let him look around this Chamber and see. If those around you are rude to you, you can stop their money. Your very action is very crude. If you want to get in that Chair, get in it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the hon. member not to be personal.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Tell your members on the other side of this Table that they are rude and crude; don't tell me so! Why don't you shut your mouth and do your job. Who can't be rude to you? Go home and talk about that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member to keep to the Resolution.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am sure the hon. junior member for St. Andrew cannot take exceptions to what I said, because of the position of affluence which he holds in this community. I did not make reference to you Mr. Chairman, because I do not consider you to have any position of affluence in this country. I said that with the greatest respect to the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, because it is public knowledge of his position of affluence in this community. If the Hon. Premier takes umbrage because I did not make reference to him, it is up to him. I threw out to the Hon. Minister of Social Services that it would be infinitely

better with reference to the providing of furniture in these houses, to have built-in Cedar-lined closets. If as the Hon. Minister said, that these residences were fully furnished since 1941, then they must be fully furnished now. I find no fault of that. What I do say is that since everybody knows a Medical Officer comes for three years and then leaves, it would be much better to go into the matter of the furnishing of these residences more carefully.

I am going to make a statement: (and I hope the Hon. Minister of Social Services would appreciate when I say with the greatest respect to him, that \$16,500 to build a house is too extravagant) it is my vocation to know something about real estate. These things must be aired because the general public must know what we are doing. Bear in mind sir, we are dealing with \$16,500 for a house alone; not for the land, because we own the land. If you take houses in the Pine Hill, Blue Waters, Welches and Highgates, not one of those modern houses cost that much to build. I am not dealing with houses that are in Strathclyde—because for the most part they are antiquated. Now, sir, I have an idea of the type of foundations which you get at "Enmore". [A VOICE: How do you know] I was called in owing to my professional capacity, to give my opinion not for the Government, when the row was on over the price of this land between the Government and the owners. May I point this out to the Hon. Minister of Social Services: this house is being built for a price within the vicinity of £5,000. Do you know that you can get a big house with a quarter of an acre of land attached to it in any of the residential areas for £3,000; and that type of house is better than what any medical officer lives in when in England. The Hon. Minister can call upon a member of his own party to substantiate what I say.

I ask this question: is it not reckless and wilful extravagance when you are faced with these facts as to the cost of a new house and land? People have just built houses at Pine Hill and with these facts staring you in the face, are you saying that you have not been misled? The Hon Minister should go into these figures, and he is bound to reduce this amount by about \$3,000 or \$4,000. As it is set out here, there is an amount of \$16,500 for the main building; and that is nothing to do with the servants' room or the garage; and I can tell you that for \$16,800 you can go to the Pine Hill, Blue Waters, anywhere around and get a property. But what I am surprised at, is that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture who has some knowledge of this matter has not been able to guide the Hon. Minister of Social Services in this matter. I am convinced that the Hon. Minister of Social Services has been misled in this matter; no one can fool me that he would in his private capacity say "Let me have this luxurious type of house with this garage costing \$1,500." Would any member of this House have a garage costing \$1,500? The Government has brought down this Resolution and the Government with its numbers will win; but there is still the question of a certain amount of public morality. When this matter goes to the public it will be a matter of public immorality. I ask this: what will be the position of the Civil Servants under the Housing Loan Scheme? How much can a Civil Servant get to build a house? How much can a man like the Auditor General get to build a house? \$10,000? They can all get houses for \$10,000 and decent houses too. Of course the idea is that the Opposition wants the Government to spend this money; but I am not like those who would say "The houses of the size of those of our Housing Scheme are good enough for the doctors."

I repeat that doctors must be given houses in keeping with their professional standard; let them be comfortable in body and in mind so that they can cater to the needs of the sick and dying; but I cannot subscribe to the idea in this Resolution. Captain Tomlin might build a house which would cost \$10,000, \$20,000 or \$25,000; he might have a string of wall letters all around the sitting and dining rooms; I do not know. I am however arguing that this price for building this house is too much; I am arguing that in Barbados we should not build a house at this cost to house a doctor when in truth and in fact, people of the rich class are using houses costing £3,000 inclusive of the land.

Finally, I am saying that I will not vote for this Resolution as it is. The Government can vote for it with its numbers; I will not make any speech and then go against what I have said; I will not speak in one way and vote in another way. I am suggesting that the further consideration of this matter should be postponed, and I will back up anything that I said. If these two houses were side by side and if you build one party wall for the garages you might get away from two of them costing \$3,000. Can you not build a party wall between the two garages? In the United States of America the cars are left in the street. We talk about Socialism, but is what is proposed here Socialism? I am a humane man. With all I have said I do not contend that Captain Tomlin's figures are wrong; these figures might be in respect of a garage for \$1,500, but can we afford such a garage for an officer who is a doctor? My answer is "No".

Of course when you say these things you annoy some of the Ministers. Let me annoy them. What difference does it make to me? Then they forget themselves when they are talking to the people who elevated them to power, and some of the people to whom they like to say "I will stop your living tomorrow". They cannot stop mine. And then some of them have the audacity to tell you about where you came from—

7.15 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member speaking on the Resolution?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: You should knock the gavel when some of these foul minded members get up. I got up to deal with this matter logically and in a factual way. I said I did not agree with a four-bedroom house; I agreed with a house of not less than three bedrooms. We must not build houses for people who want to bring in their grandfathers, grandmothers, aunts and sisters. When a member talks according to his views, if he does not hear that he is a Communist, he hears all sorts of things. I do not worry about that because I know that a short memory is a politician's greatest gift.

What I am saying is from the depths of my soul. If you open the hearts of the Ministers you will see that were it not for the fear of being dominated and victimised, they would get up and say that what I am saying is right. They would agree that Barbados should not build a four-bedroom house with a \$1,500-garage for a Medical Superintendent, and build a house for a human being to live in for \$1,800.

I am going to vote for the postponement. I am not doing so to embarrass the Government. I agree that you should have these houses for the medical staff. But as it is here it is reckless extravagance. I hope that the Minister will see the wisdom of postponing it and seeing that Barbados has many social reforms to carry out, and we cannot afford to pour all our money down the drain in one direction.

I have always criticised the Hospital. The Minister has said that we should give the Hospital a chance and I have done that; and when I saw things that were wrong I have told the Minister about them. I am telling him today that as far as this Resolution is concerned he is doing wrong, because Barbados in the near future must embark on expenditure for many needed social reforms and we cannot afford to go in for reckless extravagance.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on the Resolution. Listening to the remarks of the hon. senior member for the City, I wondered why the Government thought in the first place of building a four-bedroom house. It is true that at "Enmore" there is a lot of space, but with the perpetual development that will be necessary at the Hospital, it is obvious that this space will be required from time to time.

What I can say is that the Hon. Minister of Social Services places implicit confidence in the Director of Public Works, who would make recommendations that the Minister would be willing to accept. I would also say, thinking of the Medical Superintendent, that when there are 13 officers to be housed including the Superintendent, there will always be a tendency to do something exceptional for him. However, I do not know if that can be justified according to socialist philosophy.

What I would also like to say is that for the past five years the estimates coming up to the House for building, have been unlike the estimates that are made by private people. I think we can appreciate why things like this happen. If you are given an enormous sum by the Legislature I think that \$25,000 or \$30,000 will lapse as a result of saving on the building. I think everyone will appreciate that nothing is likely to go wrong with the amount saved, although it is not right to vote more than is required for a particular purpose, because you isolate sums that could be used for other social purposes.

As far as the garage and the servants' toilet and bath are concerned, you will hardly separate those two; so there is no reason for putting down \$1,500 for a garage and \$1,500 for a servants' room.

There have been remarks about fencing costing \$500. It is correct to say that "Enmore" is to some extent completely enclosed with iron rails on the outside; but if on the grounds you put up separate and distinct buildings, you will want to separate them and that will require some fencing. The pathways and the drive to the garage will have to be taken care of.

I would not say that the sum of \$1,500 is extravagant for the garage. In the first place I do not know why they should want to build a four-bedroom house. I do not see why they could not build a two storeyed flat so that you could get everything in one spot, because it is obvious that in the near future you will need all the land for purposes of expansion. Hon. members should appreciate the fact that if you are building a four-bedroom house and treating the garage as an annex you will not want a garage to cheapen the appearance of the house.

7.25 p.m.

The hon. senior member for the City knows what I am talking about. I enjoy his feelings now; but he must bear in mind that the Government is not likely to put up a galvanize shed with Wallaba posts and call it a garage along side of a building on which it is willing to spend £5,000. With these things in mind, I am sure the hon. member will appreciate the position. It is true to say that some saving would have been effected if Government had planned to erect not more than a three bed-

room house, but if in the order of things and general development of the Hospital, a four bedroom house is required. I do not think we should postpone this Resolution. If we postpone this Resolution they may cheapen the estimate and then fail to build it for that estimate, and we will be asked to come back here and vote more money for it. I think we all appreciate the position of the Hon. Minister of Social Services in this matter; he must rely entirely on the Director of Public Works for instructions in these matters and that applies to almost any member of this House if he were in the position of the Hon. Minister. With all these things in mind, I do not see any hon. member after calm examination would hesitate to vote for this Resolution. Postponement of it would only delay this circumstance, of which the community is in dire need. If we have any confidence in the Director of Public Works (and I am sure we all have that) we have no reasons to fear that some of this money will not lapse. It is very obvious that some of the money which we voted for the building of the New Fire Brigade Station is going to lapse. The hon. senior member for the City criticised the estimate of \$1,500 for the building of a garage, but that is not at all extravagant. [A VOICE: You ought to be ashamed when you say so!] I say again that \$1,500 is not extravagant for the building of a garage. I know of what I am speaking, because it is something I am doing now and have been doing for the past twelve years. Certainly you can build a garage for \$1,200 or even for \$100; but would you build a \$100 garage against a four bedroom house on which you plan to spend £4,000? What sort of garage would you build for that house; I am sure you would not build one with a few galvanize sheets. I say again to postpone this Resolution would do nothing else but postpone the service.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to state my reasons over the whole matter, because I want to justify the reason why I shall vote as I will. There is such a thing as architectural proportions or architectural features. The Health Centre at "Enmore" is an elaborate structure, and it is on a great site. Now, the Hon. Minister of Social Services has to be advised by the architect, and if the advice of the architect appeals to the intelligence of the Hon. Minister we cannot blame him if he accepts such advice. It is possible to build a cheaper building than what is estimated in this Resolution; but it is also possible to build the same size building for more money than what is estimated here. The point we must bear in mind is that the architect must achieve developmental harmony. You cannot have an elaborate structure as a Health Centre and beside that structure build two pygmy houses or cheap structures which in the end might cost the Government more than what it is now prepared to spend.

Sir, you must not look at this matter from a political or cheap angle; you must take into account the advice of the architect; and I say that there is such a thing as structural symmetry. Sir, from that point of view I quite agree with the expenditure proposed. I suppose that very argument was put up by the architect to the Hon. Minister, and that argument will certainly appeal to him.

Let us take another instance. Suppose you proposed to build some adjacent building to this Public Buildings you would not think of putting up something out of proportion or comparison with this elaborate structure; you would put up something which would harmonise with the general site. From that angle Mr. Chairman, I can see the argument for this vote and I am quite willing to support it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I have not heard anything since I have been sitting here, that has not been said by any of us at the general meeting of the Executive Committee when this matter was being discussed; I include the argument of Birth Control. Let me say that everything the Opposition said to-day, (may be it was said in stronger language to-day) has been said at the meeting of the Executive; but after careful consideration we came to the conclusion that this Resolution should come down as it is. Surely it would not be wrong in any Government Housing Scheme to have one four-bedroom house even if every other house may be three-bedroom houses, or even two-bedroom houses, or even flats. Surely there is nothing wrong to build one house with four bedrooms. If there is anything I hate to do, it is to live in a hotel or to live in a flat besides someone whom you do not desire to see. Anyone who had anything to deal with staff, whether it is at a University, or College or Medical Centre knows that it is better to build separate buildings for each member of the staff. If you have assistant masters or superintendents who may be bachelors and who are willing to live in a general place, that is all well and good. 7.35 p.m.

If you appoint a master at Harrison College and you have quarters for him, if he happens to be married, surely it would not be unreasonable if he told you to give him a house allowance rather than for you tell him "You and your wife must live here although these masters are bachelors". I have not heard all the debate on this Resolution, but the suggestions which I heard the senior member for the City make, were discussed in Executive Committee and we feel that as long as this officer asks for a four-roomed house, it is perfectly reasonable to make provision for the possibility of what might happen in the future. Some husbands and wives do not sleep together, they have separate rooms and it is not extraordinary to make provision for a possibility which is likely to take place. The same question has arisen at the University College of the West Indies; you have some houses built in which two bachelors may live; there are some three-room houses, and there are some four-room houses. I quite agree with the senior member for the City that there should be a common garage for all the doctors; and the cost can be cheapened in that way. As the Hon. Minister has already said, that is a point which should be considered; the Government I believe would agree to a suggestion of that sort. It is a reasonable, sensible, constructive suggestion, but we have compared this building with other places outside this island. Hon. members seem to forget (although we sometimes say it) that we do credit the Opposition with some things, and we say that the Opposition will oppose not merely for the sake of opposition; we take into consideration the kind of arguments which are likely to be raised. I repeat that everything which has been alleged since I have been hearing the debate, has been taken into consideration and it has been thrashed out; and we still feel that we are perfectly right in spite of the figures which also astonished us. We are perfectly satisfied after careful examination, that we are doing the right thing in asking hon. members to accept these proposals.

Mr. ALLDER: When the hon. senior member for the City was speaking, he attempted to place the technical ability of the junior member for St. George very high. When the hon. member got up as a contractor, I expected to hear some argument from him which would have made me change my view; but the hon. member indulged in arguments which have only

strengthened my determination to vote against this Resolution as it stands at present. One also expected to hear something concrete from the Hon. Premier; he has made the position worse. I am not claiming to be an architect or an individual who knows high finance; therefore I would like to be practical. The Hon. Premier said that the same arguments which the Opposition brought up in this matter were also brought up at the Executive Committee; that further strengthens our argument because the same way we feel now, the members of the Executive Committee also felt.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of correction. I did not say that; but it is inevitable in discussing anything in Executive Committee to consider what is likely to be said against proposals. Arguments are used such as this: "They are bound to say so and so." I did say that the birth control argument was used by me; they may say "You talk about birth control and now you are building a four-bedroom house for this officer." I want to make it clear that we have considered that we would be told that it was wrong; not that we considered it was wrong. (Laughter) I do not know what is funny about that; even the hon. member who laughed would be told by his very close friend, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, that if any Barrister is worth his salt he would put the worse possible feature on a matter and see how he would face up to it. The Governor-in-Executive Committee considers what might be said here in respect of many a matter.

7.45 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has made it worst. It seems as though they get an idea before they come here of the opinions which will be expressed. On many occasions they come here with something wrong which forces us to express our unwillingness to support it. The fact that a Minister will bring down a Bill or Resolution although he is doubtful of its rightfulness, shows that he disregards the opinions of the members of this House.

What I am trying to point out to the Minister of Social Services is purely facts. This is how I look at it: as one who has no affairs in high finance, and who is not a professional contractor, even though I have had to build some bricks without straw, (Laughter) I notice that the Government has built a school to house 315 children and it cost \$36,000; but now that the Government has to build two houses to house just two individuals, it will cost them \$46,000. That is how I look at it; that is the only way in which I can look at it.

I want to know if in the face of high taxation and unemployment and the failure of the existing Government to allay the needs of the working classes, they should indulge in this expenditure for the extreme comfort of two individuals and probably their relatives. If the Hon. Premier and the Minister of Social Services or any of the other members of the Government (including my hon. colleague) could bring any argument to justify it, I would be willing to vote for the passing of the Resolution.

My colleague said that you can build a garage for a dollar, for a hundred dollars or for £1,000. No one can be vexed with a person who wants to build a £1,000 garage if he has the means, and especially when he is building it with his own money; but no one can be satisfied with the wanton expenditure which is indulged in by the Government and supported by the hon. junior member for St. John.

Mr. VAUGHAN: On a point of explanation, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member is wrong. I never mentioned any figures in connection with the garage. I said that these buildings could be put up for less than

they are being put up for, or for more. I never said anything about a £1,000 garage.

Mr. ALLDER: The hon. member was making reference to figures and I am doing the same. But the hon. member made reference to a lot of things like "architectural proportions", "developmental harmony", "symmetrical lines" and things of that sort. Therefore he means that those of us who feel that the scheme is too elaborate for the means of the colony are wrong, and that the Government, including himself, are right. It is misleading.

If you feel that these gentlemen should be given marble arches to walk under, and tiled bathrooms, and that the floors must be such as could only be found at Buckingham Palace, and that they must have hot and cold water running all day and night and that the children's bedroom must be like one which is found at Clarence House, say so. No one can prevent you from saying so; nor can a minority as we are who see right on this occasion, prevent you from getting this through; therefore you can put it forward, and I presume that you will succeed in getting hon. members to say that it is correct when in their consciences they know that it is not. But the question is whether because you can get a Resolution of this sort through the House you should disregard the moral aspect of it.

Those hon. members who defend the Government have not gone deeply enough into this matter, although I presume they have discussed it months before it came here. The Addendum says that 25 officers are to be housed; thirteen have had provision made for them already. This \$46,000 is to make provision for the two officers who are coming down now; but ten more officers still have to be provided for. This is what the Government has not given consideration to, (perhaps their arrogance prevents them from doing so) they have not given consideration to the nurses whose numbers would have to be increased due to the expansion of the institution, nor have they given consideration to the additional maids, cooks, matrons and sisters for whom provision is also to be made, plus the other ten officers for whom provision is not yet under consideration.

You will realise, Mr. Chairman, that just to provide for additional staff at the Hospital is liable to cost as much as the overall expansion of that institution which would have to hold hundreds of human beings. That is how you have to look at this overall plan. It is not true that in bigger countries whose resources are greater than ours, that any second rate doctor or even a first rate one can get provided for him the lavish quarters which we intend to provide here.

Everyone knows that for the average bungalow which you see at Blue Waters, Marine Gardens or any of the other exclusive areas, the contractor's cost (the hon. junior member for St. George can support this if he wants to be co-operative) does not exceed £3,000. I am speaking from personal knowledge, because I have had the fortune or misfortune of having one constructed; therefore I am not quite a fool in this respect. I am merely a small businessman who sometimes hears expressions on business matters by other businessmen who may be considered more successful than I am; even the hon. junior member for St. George. Nobody expected that hon. member when he got up would say that the Government was wrong, therefore he could have remained sitting in preparation to vote; he only made things worse.

I am saying that the overall cost will be too great, and I am voting against this Resolution because as a member of the Committee which considered the overall plan for reconstructing the General Hospital,

these things were not put to us; or at least not in this manner. I would not have sat as a member of a Committee and agreed to an expenditure of \$40,000 to house two officers, when I know that in other countries they have to share quarters between them. The Hon. Premier says that he does not like to live too near to his neighbours or to see them wherever he turns; if the honourable member were building his own house in which he expects to live perpetually, he could build whatever he likes; but when a doctor is working with a Government as poor as ours, and not forgetting that he may be here today and gone tomorrow, he should be satisfied with the amenities which are necessary for his healthy existence.

When he retires and he wants to build a marble palace in a desert he can do so, but that does not mean that an intelligent Government such as this should provide such things for him. How can it be that cultural persons, according to what the Hon. Premier said, cannot enjoy each other's presence living together, but people who have no culture must be huddled together at the Pine with only a celtotex partition parting them and with the overall area of their rooms not bigger than a motor car box? This same Government is justifying that such is good enough for those people. How can this Government elect to build a garage for \$1,500 to house a medical officer's car when, if the same officer had to build a garage for himself, he would not spend half of that amount on it? If you go down to Clinketts you will see ugly four-cornered boxes put up for people to live in. Of course, the people could not do better than to accept them. Can the Hon. Minister of Social Services say that he is justified with the structures down at Clinketts which cost \$1,100 each, as against this \$1,500 garage for a medical officer? Can the Hon. Minister justify his action in advising the building of a four-bedroom house for a medical officer against all that? You certainly will get one who will come as a bachelor. Are you going to let him occupy that four-bedroom house? You will have to do so. Naturally, they are Englishmen, Americans and Canadians in this colony. When you put that bachelor to occupy that large house, all he is going to do is to tell some of his friends here whom he knew in the country to which he belongs (probably some of them might be working at Messrs Cable and Wireless Ltd.) that he has a four-bedroom house free, and to come and live with him. He will get his friends to live with him at the expense of the taxpayers, because of this short-sighted policy of the Government. You are also providing crockery, cutlery, furniture and linen for them; does the Government consider what is the recurrent cost of crockery and cutlery? It is all well and good to give them, but how will you know when an officer who might be a brawler will bring in his friends and in their drinking of grog together, they throw away the crockery? Will that crockery be replaced? Let the Hon. Minister of Social Services get up and show that they are right to furnish these residences with all these things, and I will then be willing to vote for the Resolution. He has only given us a spacious argument which cannot hold water.

We also have to take into consideration that we have to provide these Medical Officers at the General Hospital with other things. Is it right that we should provide all these things? When you provide linen does that include toilet paper, and also napkins? If, as the Hon. Minister for Social Services has said, we have to provide them with everything then if we carry it to its logical conclusion, you will have to provide them with even a bundle of steel straw with which to scrub the

kitchen saucepans; and if the Medical Officer is indiscreet and wants his pound of flesh, you might also have to provide him with toothpicks. God help you if you have an officer with ten or twelve in family, and you have to replenish the cupboards with all of those non-essentials. There are non-essentials from the point of view that there are necessities which the officer should provide for his family. You must bear in mind that he gets all of those things for only 5% reduction of his salary.

The Hon. Premier made reference to people living in flats and hotels. Those same people who are coming here have lived for months and even years in hotels. I am sure if the medical officers that come to the General Hospital had to provide quarters for themselves, they would go up Hastings and rent a flat. Why should a Government like this try to make those people so comfortable? You need not do so much for them; you are giving them what they do not expect; and so long as you have started to do, so you will have to continue. You should not build those two residences for Medical Officers for as much as \$46,000, and when you come to deal with the others give them quarters far below that value; you should not go to extremes.

I was not in my place when the Hon. Minister of Social Services made some reply to a statement made by me. I was told that the Hon. Minister said that the giving of furnished quarters with everything, has been a precedent which was created for some time. You are the Government in power; if this precedent of sweated Negroes was there for all that time, you can remove it; to remove such precedents is the reason why men like you dominate this Chamber today. A precedent created becomes binding as regards to the individual for whom the precedent was created; but as soon as that individual goes out of office you can change it. You can tell the medical officers who are coming here now, that these are the conditions of your employment; you can take them or leave them. What the Hon. Minister said in reply to me is no argument at all; anybody who makes a law can break it. There is nothing obligatory on the present Government to provide quarters and all of these things for the Medical Officers who now come to take up residences at the General Hospital.

8.05 p.m.

This is definitely showering too much on the undesirable. We want officers who will be quite willing to see the services up there improved, and we want efficient men brought in to carry out these services; but I am saying that you can pay too much for gold; and it is also a fact that many students are leaving the Universities. It is also a fact that Dr. Leacock who has revolutionised surgery in Barbados, went abroad, (I must repeat this) and now he finds himself serving the people of this colony. It is not money which brings these people here; it is a question of supply and demand; and you have not taken into consideration the lucrative salaries which are provided for these people already together with leave passages for themselves and their wives. The position is getting to a stage when the taxpayers should rebel not against paying their due measure of taxation, but against the madness in throwing away such monies that have been collected through taxation.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly would not have risen again if it were not for the purpose of correcting the wrong impressions which the honourable member who has just sat down has given to members of this House. First of all, he thinks that these doctors are coming here on lucrative salaries, but he will soon see what the

position is. As I said earlier today, salaries in Trinidad, Jamaica and British Guiana within the last three months have advanced, and in a very short time Barbados will find that we may not be getting anybody at all. The honourable member has given the impression that we have nothing to do but squander money on people. Little does he know that we are in the competitive market and anyone who wants a job will take into consideration the conditions obtaining elsewhere. Every colony in the West Indies has to provide furnished quarters for its staff; you have to advertise too and nobody will come here for two years, and be expected to buy furniture and furnish a house. "Enmore" has been finished and is ready for occupation; we have advertised for a Medical Officer, and not a single person has applied for the post. Why? Because the conditions do not suit; and we want somebody to work there and give the service for which the place has been built. No one in the Caribbean or from anywhere else has applied for this post; so that when the honourable member is giving the impression that we have nothing to do but lavish money on these people when they come here, he is giving a wrong impression. Of course the honourable member has taken the opportunity to propagandise against this Resolution; he took the opportunity of contrasting the houses built at Clinketts with the houses which it is proposed to build here. If he has any sympathy for the people at Clinketts, if he thinks that that sort of house should be occupied by everybody, why does he not build one? He has just built a house and why did he not build one of these houses at Clinketts? I want to say this: we either want these officers at the Hospital or we do not want them. It does not suit me to state here the reason why we are asking for a four bedroom house for this officer, but I hope that honourable members will have enough confidence in the Government to know that there is some very good reason why we have asked for this house.

Again the honourable member was misleading this Committee in referring to a school being built for \$36,000 to accommodate 315 pupils; but he did not read that that amount includes provision for making alterations. Just above what the honourable member read out there is a sum of \$61,000 which has been voted for the construction of a school to accommodate the same number of children. Why did the honourable member leave that out? He left that out because he wanted to create suspicion. I repeat that I cannot divulge the reason why we are asking for this four bedroom house, but there is a reason for it. I am not an architect or anything of the sort; however, I made some enquiries on my own behalf and I was told that in building a wall house today, there is an estimate of roughly \$1,000 per bed room.

8.15 p.m.

Anyway sir, some practical suggestions were made, such as having a common garage, while on the other hand someone else suggested having the garage and the servants' room together. All these are practical suggestions and they will be entertained. As far as the fencing is concerned, I think the hon. junior member for St. George made a point that these houses which are to be built at "Enmore" should be fenced around. It has been said, and rightly so, that "Enmore" is already enclosed; but when this area is fully expanded it will be, so to speak, a public place and it is quite natural that you should put up a little wire fencing between the houses for privacy. That is no more than I or anyone else would do. I will go over the suggestions that have been made, and I will go into the figures

again with the Director of Public Works; and I am sure that we will try to effect some savings in accordance with the wishes of this Committee.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. John, with the best intentions, is as usual barking up the wrong tree. I do not entirely blame the hon. member because so deeply is he affected with the unemployment situation and the suffering of the masses of the island, (to which the members of the Government seem to be entirely oblivious) that I do not entirely blame the hon. member if in his fervour for the suffering masses, he does not see the real issue confronting this House and this island today. That issue is the complete lack of consistency and planning on the part of the Government which is presiding over the misfortunes of the people of this island. As long as you accept the principle that officers have to be provided with quarters, and that the quarters are justified, I do not think that one can quibble over \$500 or \$600 one way or the other. To accept the principle on one hand and to quibble over additional expense on the other hand is not seeing the matter in its true perspective.

What alarms me about this Resolution is the fact that the Hospital Planning Committee published a Report which was completely supported by the members of this Chamber not longer than six months ago; and nowhere in that Report to which I believe the present Director of Medical Services and the Superintendent of the General Hospital subscribed, was there any mention of the fact that the renovations and expansions of the Hospital then envisaged would entail the building of quarters for 13 medical officers.

Prior to that, we were cajoled and inveigled into supporting what some members of the public call the Five Year Plan, and other members of the public, less charitable, call the Five Year Plot. Time after time the Government has come back strictly from the point of view of public finance, and deviated substantially from the provisions of that plan creating not only new capital expenditure from the public purse, but also involving the taxpayers of this island in the maintenance of white elephants and monuments in perpetuity by way of recurrent expenditure.

In that respect, Mr. Chairman, my criticism of the Government today is as regards its inconsistency in the financial measures which it brings before this House. It is not only an indictment on the foresight of members of the Government but also the administrative officers whom we unfortunately employ. It is perfectly true to give the Devil his due; (and I do not mean that in any personal sense, because there is nothing diabolical in the Minister of Social Services in comparison with his colleagues) it is true that when the Minister of Social Services asked the House to support a Resolution for the Hospital Plan for approximately \$1 million (the majority of which, I might also say in deference to him come from C.D. & W. funds) he did say at that time that there was room at "Enmore" for the building of quarters for the medical officers. It was on that occasion that I told the Minister of Social Services that Sir Rupert Briercliffe's recommendations were far more worthy of adoption than the piece meal plan which they had at that time advocated for the Hospital. I said that the day would not be long off when the Government would come back to the House and ask for money over and above that proposed in the Resolution before the Chamber, for additional improvements to the Barbados General Hospital; and I said that that would go on from year to year.

It seems to be a feeling on the part of the Administrative Officer, in charge of finance, that it is best to take little and live long; that if you tell the whole truth at one time you stand a chance of your plan being rejected; so you give a half truth and come back later on when you think that the public's short memory has lived up to its reputation, and introduce further burdens on the taxpayers.

I am not concerned with the merits of a three of four-bedroom house, but with the overall picture of the finances of this island. I am also concerned with the lack of forthrightness (to use a charitable word, because I do not want to say lack of honesty) on the part of those officers whom we employ in this Government in bringing forward financial measures or making recommendations to this House. There are multitudes of examples since the inception of the Five Year Plan, in which I can show clearly that the Government has deviated substantially from the provisions of that plan, which from the time of its introduction I described as an agglomeration of five yearly budgets.

We were told that the reason for the Five Year Plan was that we wanted to know in advance where we stood; but how can we know that if week after week we come here with substantial money Resolutions which substantially deviate from provisions of the Plan; and Resolutions involving capital expenditure and which are going to mean added recurrent expenditure from the public purse of this island.

8.25 p.m.

Nowhere in the report of the Planning Committee is there any money estimates for quarters for medical officers; and that itself is an indictment on this Government. If there are twenty-five Medical Officers at the General Hospital, surely they were not twelve when the Report came before this House. There were always twenty-five posts with vacancies bringing it up to that number. There has been provision within the last few weeks for one or two graduates from the University College of the West Indies, but I doubt very much whether those graduates would get quarters within the precincts of the General Hospital.

We were told that "Enmore" was a suitable place for quarters; if that remark was a mere suggestion at the time, then it is a rather insidious method of giving warning of a Resolution of this kind. I do not want to prolong this debate any further, but I cannot agree with the hon. senior member for St. John that postponement of this Resolution would necessarily mean that Government would abandon the idea of building these quarters for the amount set out in the Resolution. It is clear that what will happen, is that in the earlier hours of the morning when all self-respecting citizens have taken to their homes, this Resolution would be stampeded through the House. I do not think we need delude ourselves on that particular scope at all. In view of the statement made by the Hon. Minister of Social Services that he is going to consult with the appropriate officers of Government the modifications which have been suggested on the floor of this House, I wonder if it would be in order for him to consult with them, and maybe carry out the modifications both what is suggested here and what they themselves would agree on, without bringing this matter before the House again. If as the Hon. Minister has said he intends to consider the modifications which have been suggested, I see no danger in the Hon. Minister of Social Services retiring gracefully and himself accepting a short postponement of the Resolution. As far as I am concerned, I do not think that the postponement of the Resolution will do any good. It may only cause more acrimony in

this Chamber; a feature which is always present in recent months.

I am therefore throwing the onus on the Hon. Minister of Social Services, and in the light of the observations which he himself has made, to show that there is at least one magnanimous gesture of the Government in this statement.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to clear up the accusation which the Hon. Minister of Social Services made against me. He charged me with the short-reading of certain items in the Estimates. If you look at the Item, Six Cross Roads School under Head IV — Education — in Capital Expenditure, you will see the explanatory Note says — that the sum of \$36,000 is for the construction of that School to accommodate 315 pupils, and it includes provision for alterations to existing buildings. Now the St. Joseph (Western) School is to cost \$61,000 and the explanatory Note reads: "Construction of a School to accommodate 315 pupils." I think I am correct in saying that the purchase price of that palatial residence, "Blackmans" is also included in this Item; therefore, I want the Hon. Minister to understand that that is what is set down in the Estimates. I want to remove any feelings of this Committee that I have been short-reading explanatory Notes to gain my argument.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, you will remember I said when I began, that I did not hear what the Hon. Minister of Social Services had to say on this Resolution. Since I have spoken, the Hon. Minister spoke and I was at pains to note what he said; and among the things he said, although he did not actually reply to the observations and criticisms which I made, I gather he said he had asked members to believe that they were certain reasons for the construction of this four-bedroom house, reasons of which he was not able to divulge all of the facts. I suppose that there are times when such things will happen; I believe there are times when some things which might take place and Government might not be discreet to express it on the floor of this House. The honourable member has agreed in principle that owing to the economy of the island, a four bedroom house for medical officers should not be the general practice; and I think that satisfies the views of many members of the Opposition.

8.35 p.m.

Just to review what I have said; the Hon. Minister having given his undertaking that if this Resolution is passed, suggestions as regards the garage, the servant's room etc., will be reviewed by the architect and planning officer with a view to seeing what saving can be effected. Having said that and the Hon. Minister having given his word, (up to now I have personally not found that when he has given his word in this House he has done anything contrary to what he has said), I am prepared to look at the matter from the point of view of the £3,000. I think that the criticism on this occasion will cause the Hon. Minister of Housing to make some thorough investigations as to the cost of houses of this nature. I know that no three people outside of Government who want to be honest, would agree with building any kind of garage for this money. The honourable member is absolutely correct when he made an investigation of work within the Christ Church — St. Michael area, and found that a house could be erected for £3,000 which would include the garage. That is the standard followed by every builder and every contractor in this island; and they have to make a profit. I repeat that never in this House have I got up and expressed a view and then voted contrary to the view which I have expressed; but you

must assume that a person is honest until you prove him to the contrary. Throughout all his dealing here the honourable member has shown to this House that he will do what he says. If the Hon. Minister had attempted to say that you cannot build a garage for less than \$1,500 and also attempted to justify the Resolution by mere abuse or the type of stupid argument which you get from some Ministers that because something has come from the Government it is alright and it must be passed) I would have adopted a different attitude. I will not again subscribe to the idea of four bedroom houses being agreed to; but they are bound to come down here for more houses and we will be here (*Laughter*). Let us not mind the argument used by the honourable junior member for St. John about building houses in keeping with the Georgian type. However the Hon. Minister has said that he will give this matter further consideration. It is because of the sweet reasoning attitude of the Hon. Minister of Social Services and it is because of the confidence which myself and other honourable members of the opposition have got in the Hon. Minister up to now, that I am prepared to vote for the passing of this Resolution; and to my way of thinking that is the attitude which any Government should adopt. It cannot be argued that from this side of the table we have made destructive criticism; we say that this is what we think should be done, and the amount which should be spent; and they should not allow any high-falutin schemes to be brought down.

In the circumstances sir, I am going to support the passing of the Resolution today on the understanding that the Minister will use his influence and will be able to tell us that at least \$3,000 to \$5,000 has been saved because of the criticisms and suggestions made on the floor of the House. With that assurance, because I take the Minister's word, I will vote for the Resolution.

8.45 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: I hope that the members of this Committee will not adopt the vacillating attitude of the honourable senior member for the City as representing the views of all of us who have spoken against this Resolution. If the honourable member is not careful, he will build up a reputation in this Chamber for barely wasting the time of the House, shouting loud and pretending to be against certain things which in their nature are truly wrong, and which he does not really and truly intend to oppose by actions in spite of the words which he uses. What ever the Minister of Social Services might have told the honourable member privately.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I never said that the Hon. Minister told me anything privately. I am not the kind who will say one thing and vote the other way. The Minister stood up here and said definitely that he would go carefully into the suggestions made relative to the various items and see whether there was a possibility of saving. He has given similar assurances on many occasions in the past and has done what he said he would do. The Hon. Minister, as I said, has given that assurance and he went further and said that Government does not subscribe to the policy of a four bedroom house, but proposes to build one on this occasion for reasons which the Hon. Minister cannot state in full. If the Hon. Minister had said that it was Government's policy to build four bedroom houses, I would vote against the Resolution come what may. In this case there are special circumstances which the Minister says he cannot explain. In all Parliaments such things happen; there are things on which you cannot very well say everything. The honourable senior

member for St. John should not say that the Minister told me something privately. I sat here and told the Leader of the Opposition that if the Minister had given that assurance, he would have to stick to it as long as he had any sense of decency.

Mr. ALLDER: What the Opposition is asking for is not any saving of \$3,000. They feel that \$46,000 is too much to spend in this case and therefore suggested a postponement of the Resolution for two weeks, so as to give the Minister an opportunity of revising the whole programme and bringing something more practical and worthwhile. We are not asking for charity; it is right that the Government should accept such a suggestion. If the Government saves \$3,000 or \$5,000 we still feel that they will be spending too much. It is too big a programme for so little benefit; that is what we are saying.

It is not enough for the Minister to say that he will go into the suggestions; we have heard that on many occasions. A reasonable proportion of the members here feel that the scheme as presented by the Government is too great for the purpose; therefore we have made a motion for postponement so as to give the Government two weeks' grace in order that the Minister in charge of the Resolution can go back to the Department and bring down something more moderate, and which will be more acceptable to all honourable members. That is nothing unreasonable.

We are not against the construction of these quarters to accommodate officers of the Hospital, but we feel that the scheme is too expensive; and therefore, when the honourable senior member for the City decided not to vote according to his previous statements, he is trying to influence other members over whom he thinks he has control to follow suit and do harm to proper legislation in this colony. I tell the honourable member so openly; I dislike being forced to tolerate such questionable lobbyings. When the honourable member talks about the sweet reasoning attitudes of the Minister, all that is sentimental talk. If the Minister merited such words he would have agreed to the reasonable suggestions made; but he only thinks in terms of playing ball with certain members whom he thinks control all other members, and he feels that as long as he speaks to one individual that that shepherd will get all the sheep going into the wrong fold.

Let the Hon. Minister handle his business like a Minister; and do not let him depend always on having everything in his favour. Let him give some consideration to the opinions of other members who have been sent here by the taxpayers; that is what he must do before he qualifies for those sweet reasoning terms. If our arguments are right, there can be no harm in postponing this Resolution so that things can be done in a proper way. Public matters should be done openly. The Government should accept the motion for postponement, call in the Colonial Engineer and say that if the Ministers of the Government at Executive Committee felt the same way, that members of the Opposition in the House feel something must be wrong. If we did not know their feelings and they did not know ours, and our feelings turned out to be the same, naturally something is wrong. Let the Government come back with a revised plan which will cost less; and when they bring it back there will be no discussion because it will be exactly what we ask for. Do not tell me that we should accept this Resolution as it is, because the Minister of Social Services can appeal to the whims and fancies of the honourable senior member for the City who after a tirade of over an hour in which he gave the impression that the Resolution was wrong, then turn around and talked about the sweet reasoning of the Minis-

ter. In the past we have had similar assurances which were not backed up by the actions of Ministers.

The honourable member mentioned something about not being able to disclose the reasons for building this four bedroom house. Mr. Chairman, in legislative business there are no secrets; unless it is a question of a military secret. If the Minister feels that a four bedroom house should be built for a particular doctor let him say why; and if the case is reasonable I am sure that honourable members will agree. To tell us that you cannot give us the reason for building a four bedroom house is trying to make us look like fools. No submarine would be sunk if you disclosed the reason; nobody would die if you tell us the reason. That is not sufficient argument for refusing to vote for the postponement of this Resolution after the honourable member has made such a long speech in favour of it. As I have said, I feel that the whole scheme should be considerably reduced, because you should not spend that amount of money just for the purpose of housing two officers; and I do hope that I will not have to repeat that argument. 8.55 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am confirmed in my view of the honourable senior member for St. John, that he has a single-tracked mind; and it is for the reason that if you attempt to disagree with him, he thinks that there is something peculiar about it. The honourable member should know me well enough by now; he seems not to listen to any argument after his argument has been put. The honourable member made reference that I in a tirade for over an hour, expressed certain views and that I am going to vote contrary to those views. The honourable member knows that it is not true when he spoke of other members of the Opposition; I have not heard one word from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. When the honourable member said that members of the Opposition spoke contrary to the views I expressed, he is absolutely wrong. I never said anything of getting any benefit. You cannot measure any benefits from the Hospital from expending money on a house for doctors. I would not attempt to reduce a medical practitioner who must come here to take charge of the Hospital to the position of living in houses like those at Clinketts. That is not an honest expression; that is the usual socialist expression.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if some honourable members think that by the remarks I made, that doctors at the Hospital should be housed similarly to those people who are housed in the Clinketts Housing Scheme; what I wanted to say is, that the people at Clinketts could have been better housed than the car of an officer of the Government. That is the comparison which I was making at that time.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What the honourable member has said, is that the members of the Opposition did not agree with the overall expenditure on the two houses. I have not disagreed with that; what I said was, that the policy for providing houses for doctors was one which I agreed with. Certainly it would not do to have doctors who are supposed to be in residence at the Hospital to be living in St. Joseph or in St. Andrew. I went on to say that the actual Resolution in front of us was asking for \$9,000 to be spent on the erection of these houses up to the end of March, and what influenced me to agree with the Resolution, is because the Hon. Leader of the House said in his reply that he will review the whole Resolution. What I would like the honourable member to understand is, that the Hon. Minister will still have to come back to this House over this matter. The view has been expressed that you cannot get any benefit from spending this \$46,000 in the way it is proposed. If you spend \$256,000 in the

right direction you can get benefit from it. Bear in mind you are spending that money on the health of the people of the island, and health cannot be measured in terms of money. I did not agree with the building of four bedroom houses, but the Hon. Minister has answered that; and there are some things which you must take as reasonable. In my speech I said that \$1,500 for a garage is too much. Do you think after the arguments which have been put up in this Committee that they would spend \$1,500 on that garage? I do not feel that the Hon. Minister of Social Services will come back in here and tell us that. He said he was prepared to have the matter reviewed with a view to effecting a saving. Because of that statement I am going to support this Resolution. 9.05 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer to a few points which the honourable senior member for the City has made. It is not true as he was trying to put forward, that the spending of this money would be providing medical accommodation for the public.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: On a point of Order. I have never said any such thing; where did the honourable member hear that? But of course he is accustomed to replying to nonsense which is spoken from the other side and therefore he cannot help for that sort of thing.

*The question that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed was put and resolved in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows:—*

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

*Noes:* Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. HOLDER, MILLER, F. L. WALCOTT, BRANCKER, VAUGHAN, E. D. MOTTLEY and GODDARD—12.

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

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

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

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

## ADJOURNMENT

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

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

## DEPUTY CLERK GRANTED LEAVE

*On resumption*

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Deputy Clerk has been relieved of his duties for the rest of the day's sitting.

*On the motion of Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Mr. D. A. BANFIELD was appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for the remainder of the day's sitting.*

# RESOLUTION TO APPROVE SALARIES OF HOUSE OFFICERS AT THE GENERAL HOSPITAL

*Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS asked for and was granted leave to take Order No. 6 as the next Order of the Day.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution to approve the salaries payable to house officers at the General Hospital. As far as the history of the Resolution is concerned, I think it was in 1953 that an amendment to the Medical Registration Act was passed making provision for the Registration of duly qualified doctors who are compelled to spend a year in recognised hospital before they are allowed to register. That Bill was passed about September, 1953, and then about November, 1953 a Resolution was passed by this House which fixed certain salaries for these duly qualified practitioners. The figure then was \$1,680 per year and was in accordance with the figure paid to such gentlemen in the United Kingdom. These figures were adopted throughout the Caribbean area. Subsequently they were revised upwards and the salary now paid is \$2,040 per annum for the first six months and for the second six months \$2,280. Those are the figures paid in the U.K. and they are adopted by territories in the Caribbean, Jamaica and Trinidad especially.

We are asked to pay the same salaries; and we are asking that the revised figures be retrospective from the 1st April, 1954. Making them retrospective from that date will not cost us anymore, because it is only within the last month or so that the first of these qualified doctors reached Barbados in the person of Dr. Ward who took up his post about the 28th or 29th of last month. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, there is one part of this Resolution that I do not like. The Addendum gives the impression that these interneers are really doing Barbados a favour by coming here. It reads that the "British Medical Association has accordingly drawn attention to the futility of advertising pre-registration posts at a lower salary and has suggested that the local remuneration be brought into line with the rates mentioned above—which have been more or less generally accepted by the other colonies."

There is no objection to paying these interneers what other colonies are prepared to pay them, but we do not want the impression to be given that the Barbados General Hospital is being granted some sort of favour by this. It is the other way round; these young interneers are glad that the Barbados General Hospital is a place where they can come and spend their internship in the colony in which they intend to practise. Even at some Medical Colleges and Universities all interneers are not allowed to spend their internship at the place where they are. Some of them are as glad to get to Barbados as anyone else. You will probably find that when the University College of the West Indies has a lot of them, they will not be able to take in all and it would be good if West Indian Hospitals are up to a standard to accept them.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I do not think that the honourable member who has just sat down is quite right when he says that there will be a lot of them coming from the University College of the West Indies as graduates; because after graduating from that College, everyone of them goes back into the Hospital. The College has so to speak taken advantage of the opportunity and brought them back into the service, and they are being paid this salary. As

a matter of fact I think that a lot more will have to be graduated from the University College of the West Indies for us to benefit from that source.

As I mentioned sir, Dr. Ward came here just a few weeks ago. He came here because he could not get a place in the U.K. He wanted to remain in the U.K. and then further his studies. Having failed to get a place in the U.K. he came to Barbados. 10.10 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I remember well when the actual Bill was passed in 1953 I did hope to make certain comments on it at the time, but unfortunately for me I was ill. Without reflecting on any act of the House, members will appreciate what would have been my attitude then.

In supporting this Resolution, there are some things which you must say and the Hon. Minister of Social Services ought to appreciate what I am going to say. Just about the time this idea took root in England, I read an article in the Press and I consulted an eminent physician, and he told me that we should be very careful how we deal with the matter. I too was very suspicious about it. I want to say at once that Dr. Ward is the first of these interneers to come here. Within recent years we have been hearing a lot about constitutional and other reforms for the West Indies and I am wondering if this is one of these reforms. I am wondering, because when you see these things happening, especially when they are decided on the floor of this House, some people try to twist them. It is a matter of indifference to me whether the people responsible for this thing think that we in the West Indies are the biggest fools to listen to; but I do say that it is rather suspicious that with all these amendments, regulations, agreements and what-not that no medical man of colour can finish his profession in England unless there is a tremendous lot of string pulling. It is a fact that medical graduates of colour are finding it rather difficult to put in their period of internship at an English hospital.

I read an article about these interneers in British newspapers; I speak subject to correction; I understand there is great advantage for an interneer, if he is able to put in his compulsory year of internship in a large hospital where he can see many cases. He must be able to get a tremendous lot more experience than if he had put in his internship at a small hospital; and I think I am speaking correctly when I say that. Why at this stage of our development you do not find graduates from the United Kingdom coming to us in Barbados and saying "I am a graduate from Bristol, but I find it impossible in the whole of United Kingdom to put in my period of internship at any hospital in that country."

Mr. Speaker, those of us who are parents and who are not the fortunate few, must view this idea with suspicion; we must view it as a wrong that is being done to West Indian people. I know you will never get this Government to express a similar view, but we in this colony feel that if a youngster has graduated in England as a medical practitioner, there is a lot of advantage to be gained by it. When a medical graduate is putting in his period of internship he is just beginning to learn. I am therefore wondering whether this new idea of a youngster putting in his period of internship at hospitals in the West Indies is not pushing us further back than we were twenty-five years ago. I am rather surprised that the professional or more enlightened people of this colony have not expressed this view already. It is my firm belief that the whole idea of this suggestion is a racial question; I am going to call a spade a spade. I was really surprised and shocked to learn that the coloured doctors have not got up against the

idea. The first internee to come is Dr. Ward; let us watch and see whether we are going to have any more youngsters like him. If I may put it another way, let us see whether we are going to get a Dr. Farmer. I have many friends among both sections of this community, and I am going to risk to bet that all the graduates sent down to the General Hospital to serve their period of internship will be coloured graduates. I have spoken to young doctors who came here, and they told me that they are worst off by this. They have said anything like what is at the end a tar brush; you are not going to get any chance of putting in your internship in a British hospital unless you have someone at the top to pull strings for you. What is the use of their telling that they are giving us constitutional development and what-not, and then they are saying that when your son goes to England and completes his pre-medical course in a British University, if he wants to go into a Maternity Hospital he must come back home and look at women of his own race in a hospital bed. I say enlightened public opinion should stand up against a thing like that. If this is not hitting at the very root of racial discriminations what else is?

The Addendum states: "The British Medical Association has accordingly drawn attention to the futility of advertising pre-registration posts at a lower salary, and has suggested that the local remuneration be brought into line with the rates mentioned above—which have been more or less generally accepted by the other colonies." We have never said that we wanted any pre-registration medicos at our hospital or any person that was not qualified.

10.20 p.m.

This is what the Addendum to this Resolution says: "In accordance with an arrangement made by the General Medical Council for medical graduates to serve a compulsory period of one year in an approved Hospital, the Medical Registration (Amendment) Act, 1953, was passed to provide for the provisional registration of Medical graduates who wish to do their intern service in Barbados." I really plead ignorance to a lot of the things here. I have read how badly undergraduates have been paid; in some cases they work for twenty hours a day because of the tremendous experience they gain in all cases of diseases. However, all is not well; all that glitters is not gold. A lot of people in this country will not raise this question; but that things are so you cannot deny. It has been told to me by young practitioners coming out here from England that they would prefer to put in their internship in one of the big hospitals where the experience gained there would stand them in good stead if they had to practise here; but everything is being done, and West Indian Governments had been asked to pass this legislation, and they speedily did it. Recently we have been reading of graduates; sons of people of this country who are not of African descent and who have been put in internment in big hospitals in England. You cannot blow hot and cold at the same time; the whole idea is that you will be able to say "You are a graduate of England but you are not in the street with the youngster who has qualified in England." The Hon. Minister of Social Services knows whereof I am speaking; I want to ask if any provision could be made for students other than those who graduated in the United Kingdom, putting in their internment here. The position is that they do not want any coloured doctor of any standing to go into these hospitals. You talk about Ministerial Status, Federation and so on and then you say "You people are rising too much and what we did for you 25 years ago we have to put up a barrier against now." I am quite sure that the Hon. Minister of Social Ser-

vices will be able to allay these fears if what we hear is true. What I have said is the view which has been expressed by a young medical practitioner; I do not know whether he came down to put in his internship here, but he said he was unable to go to a big hospital in England. Before this youngster could register he must put in his internship; and I say that if that is going to be the attitude towards students of colour, then I suggest that we must have some reform. I have no objection to what is paid these youngsters, but it is great deal more than what internees get in big hospitals in the United States of America; as a matter of fact, recently when I was in the United States of America I was speaking to a graduate of the New York University, and he pointed out that to all young graduates it was a privilege to get into a big hospital. I want to say that in the United States today you put in 16 or 18 hours a day, and it is your privilege to go into big hospitals and get experience in such a hospital. I might be singing a solo, but I say that the position here is misleading and it is designed for one object alone. I know the Education Department said that you cannot get in, even Universities in Canada.

10.30 p.m.

He said he had just got a communication from the Registrar of McGill University. They only wanted to know what was the colour of the boy. I am prepared to talk about these things whenever the time comes. The salary attached to these posts is \$2,280 per year; the hon. member said that in his time it was \$40 a month. Whatever the salary is, it is a privilege to the internees; it is no privilege to us. When I give my views on this question of graduating in Edinburgh or London and then coming to Barbados to put in your internship, the hon. member knows that what I am saying is correct. If the hon. member's son graduated in England I am sure he would be willing to let him put in his internship in a big hospital in England.

What I cannot understand is how in one breath he says you have not got doctors, and still in England they say that it is better to come to Barbados for your internship. As I have said, a medical practitioner has told me that what this means is that these young practitioners would not get a chance to put in their internship in a big hospital. I am sure that Dr. Ward would have preferred to put in his internship in a hospital in London; not because it is England, but because of the opportunity. In a country where they are 50 million people and where there is opportunity to see a lot of cases, a man doing his internship in a hospital in England even as an ambulance attendant, would see more practical cases long time here.

Because something may not affect one of us personally it is no reason why we should not speak on it; we are representatives of all classes and sections. Whenever we see something pointing to racial discrimination, no matter how concealed or wrapped up it may be, it is our duty to express our view against it. It is wrong to fool ourselves. While I am going to vote for the Resolution because it is at present a case of Hobson's choice, I feel that the Minister should certainly take this matter up. It is no desire of any young doctor to come here and do his internship; but in London where you have hundreds of hospitals he is told that he cannot get a chance; he must come to Barbados where there is only one hospital. Is there any difference between the body of a black man and the body of a white man from a medical point of view? Let me tell you something: here we pride ourselves on the fact of being British; does the Hon. Minister know that in the U.S.A. to-day unlike 25 or 30 years ago when it was difficult for

a coloured man to put in his internship anywhere but in a coloured hospital, that it is illegal today to prevent a coloured man from putting in his internship in any state hospital? It is illegal under the Civil Bill of Rights. It is a matter for you if you are sick in a hospital bed and do not want a coloured doctor to attend to you. There are 26 hundred beds in the State Hospital of New York and you must have black, mulatto and all sorts of interneers.

The British are folding it up and concealing it and making you believe that you are doing someone a kindness. They are telling you that it is better for a doctor to put in his internship here if he is going to practise here. In a big hospital you see more and get more experience. Here it is true you have a first class surgeon specialist, but what of the physician specialist? In any case when a young man comes down here, what opportunities will he have in the surgical theatre as against the opportunities he would have in a big hospital in England where they are experienced surgeons and where he can see more cases in one week than he will see here in a whole year. The Minister knows that I am right; and much as this case might appear to affect only one individual, it hits at the root of the health and population of this country. I have talked with the wise on this subject and therefore I can speak on it. This case concerns Dr. Ward. Everyone remembers Ward who did extremely well in science in the higher certificate and who did well at school and at the University; but he must not be allowed to do his internship in a Hospital where there are white women and white men!

I do not care who says that I am raising a question that I should not raise; I am very strong on this matter. The British cannot tell me they are going to give us Federation and independence and all that, and then try to fool us by concealing racial discrimination. We have a West Indian University today; You have a Hospital there, so put in your internship there. Where is that human feeling on the part of the British and that relationship as trustees of the colonies, when they say that after a black man has studied in their University he cannot put in his internship in their hospitals? I say that our members of Parliament and members of the Government should not sit down and allow things like these to go on without speaking against them. Let them open their mouths, although I know that some of them will never do it.

10.40 p.m.

You should open your mouths. I do not want to be personal. Which of you would like to send your son to England to be a medical graduate under these conditions? Would you like him to put in his period of internship in a place where segregation is rampant? In all the big hospitals in America, if you are as black as the Ace of Spades so long as you graduate at that hospital, you are allowed to put in your period of internship there. I feel that you should take up this matter with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, because you yourself know that it is not right.

Experience makes a man a doctor; a graduate may get through with all his examinations, but more is meant to him by what he sees along with those experiences of his in that year of internship, than all the degrees he may have. He cannot get that experience unless he serves that year of internship, at a big hospital. Dr. Ward has said it would be infinitely better if he were able to serve his year of internship at a big hospital. He said: "I have tried and tried, but without success."

Paragraph 3 of the Addendum reads as follows:—

The salary of a newly qualified intern in the United Kingdom however has, from 1st April, 1954, been revised to \$2,040 per annum for the first post (i.e. the first six months), and \$2,280 per annum for the second post (less \$600 per annum for board and lodging if provided). The British Medical Association has accordingly drawn attention to the futility of advertising pre-registration posts at a lower salary and has suggested that the local remuneration be brought into line with the rates mentioned above — which have been more or less generally accepted by the other Colonies.

Of course, I have no objection to your letting me know where I stand; but I do not like you to think that you are fooling me. You are not fooling me! You are fooling those students who go up to England to become medical graduates. I am going to vote for the Resolution but I am voting quite grudgingly. I regret very much I was not here when the Pre-registration Bill was passed; I would have raised the question then. The Hon. Premier has said time and time again that the views expressed by members in this Chamber are taken to Government House; I hope the Hon. Minister of Social Services would take the view I have expressed on this matter there also. As I look around the Table I can see by the silence of honourable members that they have acquiesced in the views which I have expressed. This matter has been worrying me for a very long time, and I am glad for this opportunity to express myself.

Before I sit, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Social Services if either Englishman, Irishman, or Scotsman has been sent here, or applied to put in his period of internship here. I would really like to be enlightened on that matter. Do not try to wish-wash this case and help the English official; be like Caesar's wife; that is, be above suspicion when you are dealing with this matter. I do not think the honourable member should say what he did, and I hope he will reply to my statement.

10.50 p.m.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows that when it comes to questions dealing with racial matters that I would take objection to any signs of prejudice just as he would. I may not use the same method as other persons, but when the occasion arises, I will express myself strongly. However, on this question I think the honourable member is mistaken. As I have said: Barbadians of all hues and from all sections of the community have been studying medicine in the United Kingdom for a very long time now; this refers to interneers, (that is, medical graduates from the fourth year onwards.) The course is now six years instead of five, and in the fourth, fifth and sixth years a medical student has to do clinical work, and the patients he has to deal with in the majority of cases are white people. At least 99% of the patients which these medical graduates will see in a hospital in the United Kingdom are white. They must do clinical work before they are allowed to sit their final examination there.

If they do that when they are students what objection would they have to do it when they are qualified? I know that Dr. Brown applied sometime last year, and I suppose that it was this same position which prevented him from accepting the offer. He is still in a Hospital in the United Kingdom [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: After much difficulty.] I think that Dr. Graham is also in the United Kingdom; and I have a son who graduated in the United Kingdom and after graduation, he spent three years in doing midwifery and he never had any difficulties;

he qualified in obstetrics and he is now in Trinidad. Where the honourable member made his mistake is in respect of those graduates who have returned this year; there is a quota for every Hospital and it is not a position where 100 or 150 students can go in. I have not spoken to Dr. Ward in connection with this matter, but from a conversation which I had with his father before he came, I gathered that the quotas were filled. I want to assure the honourable member that as far as I know there is no question of coloured doctors in the United Kingdom not being allowed to attend to white patients; that position never existed as far as I know, because I have had conversations with people over some years and there was no question of difficulty. I will repeat that in my opinion the honourable member is wrong and there is no question of discrimination; as far as I know why Dr. Ward has come here is that the quotas at the several Hospitals are filled, and there was no opportunity other than coming down to the West Indies.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Before the honourable member sits down —

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot speak again.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I propose that we adjourn at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable junior member for St. Peter may proceed with his motion.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if at this late hour I should proceed with this matter; however, I wanted to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes, (if that is the regular motion) in order to discuss the Report of the enquiry

into Social Security in Barbados by Professor Richardson. My reason for doing so is this; this Report was sent in by the writer in September, 1954, it was laid in this Chamber on the 16th November, 1954 and three months have elapsed and the Government has not indicated if they would appoint a Select Committee to go into the matter; in fact nothing has been done in connection with this very important matter. The Message which accompanied this Report was Message No. 27/54 and this Message was presented to this Chamber, but no Committee has been set up communicating to us that the recommendations contained in that Report are under consideration by the Government. As I said, this is a very important matter and it is a document which should be studied by people who are interested in this matter.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member; but in view of the fact that it is a bit late, I would appeal to him to postpone this matter until next Tuesday. The position is that we might be left without a quorum, and this is a big subject to be dealt with.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member accede to the request?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I have no objection, sir; it is only a question as to how the matter will be dealt with on a subsequent occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member will have permission to continue with this matter on a special motion.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that this House do now adjourn until this day week at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

*The question that this House do now adjourn until this day week at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.*  
11.05 p.m.

$\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{4}$

# THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

22nd February, 1955.

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

### PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*), Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E., Mr. F. C. GODDARD; (*Leader of Opposition*), Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, and Hon. C. E. TALMA (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*).

*Prayers were read.*

*Hon. G. H. Adams, Mrs. E. E. Bourne, Mr. Alder and Mr. Smith entered the House and took their seats.*

### MINUTES

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

### DOCUMENTS LAID

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 January, 1955.

### PAPERS LAID

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

Message No. 3/1955 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly presenting for the consideration of the Honourable House the draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the Financial year 1955—56.

MESSAGE NO. 3/1955.

*His Excellency the Governor  
To  
The Honourable the House of Assembly*

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to present for the consideration of the Honourable House of Assembly the draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the financial year 1955-56.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,  
Governor.

Government House,  
Barbados.

21st February, 1955.

(M.P.—1356 Vol. XV)

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for the ten months ended 31st January, 1955.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of His Excellency the Governor I am commanded to lay the following:—

Statement of Post Office advances for payment of Money Orders to 30th November, 1954.

### REPLY TO QUESTION

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Reply to question No. 8 regarding prices of local Manufactured Fats.

### GOVERNMENT NOTICES

*Government Notices were given as follows:—*

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$54,503 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55 Part I, Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1954-55 No. 42 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$36,444 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55 Part I, Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1954-55 No. 43 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921.

### BILL READ A FIRST TIME

*On motion of Hon. G. H. Adams seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS the Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921, was read a first time.*

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the Resolutions of which notice has just been given. I should also like to say to the House, (as can be gathered from the Press statements recently) that the United Kingdom and the West Indian Governments have agreed to hold a pre-Federation Conference in Trinidad mainly with respect to Freedom of Movement beginning on the 13th March and ending 18th March next month. I am therefore giving the House the warning that the two supplementary Resolutions ought to be done before the consideration of the Estimates; and that I shall ask the members of the House in view of the obvious importance of Barbados at least giving the appearance to be as anxious as anybody else to get Federation, that we should consider the Annual Estimates in such a way and over such a period, that those members of the House who may be appointed to go to the Federation Conference might be able to get away to go to Trinidad by the 13th March.

It is my intention to make the Budget Speech after the completion of the Supplementary Resolutions at the next meeting of the House; and if anyone wants to continue the debate on the Budget Speech, he may do so. It is of supreme importance that the Federation Conference should not take place with us being absent. Quite a lot of correspondence and cables are taking place arranging and disarranging the dates.

I therefore hope hon. members will assist this House in getting through the Estimates, in order that the members of this House who might be chosen to go to the Federation Conference might be able to get to Trinidad before the 13th March.

3.25 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,— I ask leave to postpone Orders Nos. 1 and 2 and to take Order No. 3 as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, while I am not raising any objection to this leave being granted, I will say that the Hon. Leader of the House should pay some attention to the fixing of the Order Paper. Here is a Bill which is before a Select Committee of this House and it is put down as Order No. 1, when the Hon. Leader of the House knows that it will not be ready to be dealt with today. This Bill should be put down at the bottom of the Order Paper until the report of the Select Committee has been presented. It would save a lot of struggle if more attention were paid to the fixing of the Order Paper.

*There being no objection, leave was granted to take Order No. 3 as the first Order of the Day.*

### RESOLUTION TO LEASE LAND AT HASTINGS ROCKS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:— to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the lease of land at the Hastings Rocks to Mr. A. M. Taylor.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is one to approve of the proposed lease of 1200 square feet of land at Hastings Rocks to Mr. A. M. Taylor, lessee of the Hotel Royal. This portion of land is situated at the southern end of Hastings Rocks and it is proposed to lease it to Mr.

Taylor provided that the terms of this Resolution are agreed to. Mr. Taylor is desirous of extending the kitchen facilities of this Hotel. He made an application to the Hastings Rocks Committee for the lease of this land, and the Committee after careful consideration submitted the following terms and conditions to Mr. Taylor as set out in the Schedule. The Schedule sets out these terms and conditions as follows:—

- (i) The land is to be used for the purpose of extending the kitchen of the Hotel Royal and that permission be granted the lessee to build thereon for this purpose.
- (ii) That the sum of \$20.00 per month be paid for the tenancy of the land.
- (iii) Any building erected thereon be removed on giving one year's notice to the tenant.
- (iv) That the building thereon be erected in accordance with the specifications to be approved by the Hastings Rocks Committee.
- (v) That the building erected thereon should be enclosed in order to prevent any means of entrance and exit to and from the building by way of the remaining lands of the Hastings Rocks.
- (vi) That the tenant will be required to meet the bill of costs in connection with the lease.

Those are the terms and conditions which the Hastings Rocks Committee submitted to Mr. Taylor, and to which he eventually agreed. This land which is known as the Hastings Rocks was acquired by the Governor-in-Executive from the War Department. Mr. Taylor as I have already said, has accepted the terms and conditions of this proposed lease and the Hastings Rocks Committee on the 4th November, 1954, submitted an application for the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the Legislature. The Government has gone into this question of leasing this land very carefully, in that one time, it was proposed to erect a sub-Post Office at Hastings Rocks. As a matter of fact, an Address was passed in this Chamber in 1947 to that effect; and as the Government still intends to carry out its programme in connection with the erection of this sub-Post Office, the southern end of the Hastings Rocks' site has been inspected in order to see whether there is ample room not only for the Post Office, but also to agree to accept Mr. Taylor's offer. That matter has been gone into very carefully and the Government is satisfied that there is ample room for both proposals. The extension will be in such a way that there will be no means of access from the Hotel proper to Hastings Rocks.

Sir, the Addendum sets out every thing very carefully and it explains the position fully. This is what it says:— "The Executive Committee (Amendment) Act, 1951 gives effect to the lease or sale of Government lands but the approval of the Legislature is essential; and for that reason we have to come here for the terms and conditions of this proposed lease to be approved of before the matter can be dealt with. The Hastings Rocks Committee considers that the rental of \$20 a month is reasonable; and the facilities of the Hastings Rocks will not be interfered with, and the Committee is willing to accede to Mr. Taylor's request. I hardly think that there is anything more that I can add to this matter, apart from the fact that Mr. Taylor being really the lessee of the Hastings Rocks, in the case of his giving up his lease to some new hotel keeper taking over the power to assign his lease to the new hotel keeper, will cover our position, provided of

course that the consent of the owner is not unreasonably withheld. That is the only legal point in this matter. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: This small piece of land at the southern part of Hastings Rocks apart from the fact that it is very little used, is being given by way of rental to a form of business which we are encouraging in this island; at least I hope that that is so. Anyone who is familiar with the Hotel Royal will readily realise that it is very cramped for room. The Hotel is situated at the water's edge and it is bound on one side by the Hastings Rocks and by a house on the other side. This is a very small area of land and I congratulate the Government on getting a very high rental for this small area of land.

It will not inconvenience anyone who uses the Hastings Rocks but it will be a great convenience to the owners of Hotel Royal; and should therefore result in an improvement in the service they now give; and for that reason, I am in hearty agreement with this Resolution. I agree with it because it gives, or tends to give, assistance to an industry which we are hoping to encourage, and which we in Christ Church know the value of, because of the rates we collect in Christ Church from those Hotels. This Resolution has my blessing.

3.35 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add one little word much in the same tone as that of the honourable member who has just spoken. I think the Minister should explain why the decision was reached as to the charge of \$20 a month rent for this little nook. I believe that the House is in agreement with the fact that the majority of the people in this island are poor and are renters. I am wondering if the Government is not creating a condition which the Legislature of this colony will have to fight at some subsequent date.

I am anxious to see this bit of land leased to the individual, Mr. A. M. Taylor. As the Leader of the Opposition said, I do not know if the Government will ever want to use this land, although I was pleased to hear the Minister say that they were thinking of putting a Post Office on the same plot. I am wondering whether he will be willing to explain whether the price was fixed by the Hastings Rocks Committee, who I believe should not have had any word in fixing it, since the Governor-in-Executive Committee will have to decide whether they want to lease the land or not. I do not know if this is creating a precedent which you should not create.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, the Government in introducing this Resolution, introduced it just like an old woman, an old widow, who has had a house left to her from which she expects to get a livelihood; so she is going to rent out the house to get a couple of shillings a week, and that's that. The Government is unlike an old widow; and the Hon. Minister for Lands and Fisheries has only told us that the Government is going to lease this land at a rental of \$20 a month; but we as members of the Legislature should demand more than that. There should be some definite reason given as to why the Government is committing itself to leasing its lands, and whether the benefits accruing from such rentals would help the finances of the colony, or whether the services to be rendered would add to the benefits of the colony. Nothing so has he said. It seems as if the Government is of the opinion that its lands and properties must be utilised and dispensed with

in the interest of private enterprise; and that no particular justification must be given other than to say, that they are going to lease a bit of land or a building or something else.

I am apprehensive about the possibility of our laying too much strain on the encouragement of the tourist industry. That it should be assisted and facilitated I do agree; but that the Government should bend over backwards and make sacrifices to assist private investors to lay down substantial hotels etc., I want the Government to be very careful in that matter. We have been accustomed to seeing Hastings Rocks and going there to hear music on occasions. That area will be disfigured and reduced in size as the result of this lease; it is wrong that we should disfigure that place which was there for so many years. The Hotel Royal Company has sufficient means at their disposal to embark upon any extensions they might want, and they need not look to the northern part of their hotel for such extensions. It is only because they have a Government which they feel will be amenable to their suggestions that they want this lease. The same way they could go to the southern side of the Hotel and build tennis Courts and still have room there, why could they not have extended their kitchen accommodation there? Or why could they not have gone and purchased adjoining property or properties? It is because the Government has got a bit of land which they acquired from the Admiralty many years ago for the purpose of providing recreation, that they are asking for this lease.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to lease Hotel Royal a part of this land, and if we are going to build a Post Office there, we must reduce the size of the area and at the same time reduce the quality of the recreation which it now provides. I say that because these buildings, finding their way down to the Band Stand, must limit the space that you have there now; and if the space is limited, you must fail to get the amount of air which many residents of the area have been going there to enjoy for the past number of years. It is alright to say that you will facilitate the tourist trade, but you should not facilitate it in this manner. The hon. junior member for St. George said the rental of \$20 a month is a high rental; it is not a high rental, if you take into consideration what hotel owners charge tourists for the same amount of square feet used in housing them. This piece of land should not be leased. The Government some time ago felt that a small restaurant should be at Graves End beach; several small people look forward to leasing a spot of land from the Government there, so as to be able to sell sandwiches and soft drinks to the public who go to that beach, and also to find a means of employment. Because Mr. A. E. Taylor had the means of influencing the Government he got the lease; he put up a structure there, which has been closed for over two years now, and the Government say nothing. If the Government felt that such a service was necessary at that Beach, it should have stipulated that the person who succeeded in getting the lease should give continuous service. Mr. Taylor, however, realising that he need not worry with such a small thing, closed it up; and it is there as a white elephant, no use to the public; and the accommodation that the Government wanted there is not yet there.

2.45 p.m.

That is the kind of business which you get carried on and which does not meet the requirements expected. I am saying Mr. Speaker, if small people like the people who keep shops around Tudor Street, Milk Market and Nelson Streets were enabled

to get the lease, they might have found the means to set up a building according to the requirements of the Executive Committee, and if any such person were given the lease and with the low overhead expenses as Mr. Taylor has, he would be able to keep on giving the public a service.

What I do want to emphasise is that not only would the Government be actually reducing the size of Hastings Rocks, but it will find itself committed to further expense; because, the area which is proposed to be leased to Mr. Taylor now, has two buildings on it, and I am told it has also a latrine which is used by the staff of Hastings Rocks. That would mean that the Government would have to remove those buildings and find somewhere else on the Rocks to put them up; or it would have to construct another building for such new purposes in some other area of the Rocks. I do not think that the Government should be forced to spend money in doing those things after giving Mr. Taylor the lease.

I also noticed that on evenings a lot of tourists, clerks, nurses with small children and such people who live in that area assemble on the Rocks. If the hon. members of the Government want to promote the tourist trade, certainly they should not consider allowing a kitchen to be erected on the south of Hastings Rocks; because, the people who go there might not like the smell, and the smoke from the kitchen as well as the noise of the pots and pans and the various accumulations which one gets from a kitchen of that magnitude. How do we know that the smoke from that kitchen would not go down to the Band Stand and cause the people who go there to either go lower down or not to go there anymore? While you are trying to do one thing, you are creating a problem as a result. As I have said, everybody knows that the company which runs Hotel Royal is able to afford its own facilities and it need not rely on the Government for such assistance. Everyone who passes that way can see that the Hotel has some land above it. Why don't the owners use it up? Again, this same Government has been embarrassed by the same type of landowners over land which it wanted to use for public services. Not only do such landowners refuse to lease the Government land for such purposes, but they refuse to sell the land. There is a case now in St. Thomas—the parish which the Hon. Minister of Social Services represents. It is about three years now that there has been a conflict between the Playing Fields Committee of that parish, the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the landowners; and up to now, although the funds are there available for the construction of a Community Centre and the laying out of a Playing Field, the people in that parish have not been able to get those amenities yet. The same problem arises in St. John. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands & Fisheries, I presume, is aware that although sites have been selected by the housing authority, the landowners in that parish would not budge, and further more, lands which have been lying fallow for years (more than many of us were born) within a couple of days after the visit of the housing authority to that area, have been dug up stones taken out, the grass cut and a couple of half dead cane holes opened just to prevent the Government from carrying out its social programme. It is this same Government which is treated in that way, who is ready to accommodate people who do not co-operate with it for something in the public's interest. It is a fact that this Government has to come to the House so as to use the Compulsory Acquisition Act against those people to get any land it wants: and when Government does that Government has to pay them twice the value for their property. If I were a member of the Exe-

cutive Committee it would be on account of such reasons that I would not sacrifice Hastings Rocks for the purpose of allowing a kitchen to be erected on it. If the owners of the Hotel Royal had thought of putting a swimming pool, or lily pond, or something to beautify that area I might think twice of allowing them to do it, but not to put a kitchen there. I do know that the owners of Hotel Royal have the technique and the skill as well as the means, if they do not want to acquire additional property on the south of the Hotel, to add another storey to their building.

3.55 p.m.

The Hon. Minister for Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries also said that the Government would be getting \$20 a month for it; I do not think I have noticed the length of time that this land would be leased to them; and there seems to be an anomaly in this Resolution, because the rent must be paid on a monthly basis and yet a year's notice is to be given. I do not presume to be a lawyer, but a year's notice has to be given for the removal of any such building. I have often heard that if one rents a bit of land or a house weekly he is given a week's notice or two weeks notice of removal as the case may be, and if he rents it by the month or quarter he is given notice of removal to suit. I might be wrong; but I hope the Hon. Minister will explain the matter if and when he gets up again. However in the circumstances, and for the reasons which I have given, I must in duty bound vote against this Resolution. Of course it is said that so long as the Governor-in-Executive Committee has reached an agreement on anything, it must go through regardless of the consequences; but it is a good government which if errors are brought to its notice, will delay action in the public interest.

As I have said, after you have finished the kitchen you would have to build a Post Office and probably you will have a Library attached to it; and all those things will cause that area to cease to be what we all knew it to be. If you must reduce the area, the only thing you should reduce it by, would be to put a Post Office there. The erection of a Post Office in the area would handsomely facilitate the tourist industry, because visitors to the same hotel and others in the area, would make use of the Post Office; but the area should not be mixed up with a kitchen and a Post Office. There is no use hoping that the Government will refrain from doing what they proposed to do; but I would like the Minister who has something to do with the leasing of Government property, to call upon Mr. A. E. Taylor to provide the service at Graves End for which he was given a lease, or to ask him to terminate that lease; because, there are dozens of small shopkeepers and enterprising young men and women who would be proud of getting the opportunity of having what can be considered as a monopoly at Graves End beach in catering to the people who visit there.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I shall reply to the questions which have been raised by the honourable senior member for St. John. I would like at the outset, to set the honourable member's mind at rest insofar as thinking that facilities which are now afforded not only to visitors but also to the local public at Hastings Rocks will be affected in any way whatever. In saying so, I should like to draw to his attention the fact that none of us in this Chamber, or at least very few of us in this Chamber, would have the interest of the Hastings Rocks more at heart than the members of the Hastings Rocks Committee

who have been there for a long time and who regard it as a hobby of theirs. They regard it as something sacrosanct for the amenities not only of the tourists but also for the young children in the neighbourhood, and also the elderly folk who go there for the purpose of diversion; so that when the honourable member makes the point that the Hastings Rocks Committee of all people would be doing something wrong to disfigure the Hastings Rocks, or to cease the facilities at the Rocks as we know them, he need have no fear about that at all. The Hastings Rocks Committee have gone into this question on more than one occasion, and their advisers have measured the area and gone into the matter very carefully. This matter has been under consideration for quite a long time; and the question of disfiguring the Rocks does not arise. There will be no nuisance caused by the kitchen. The honourable member must realise that with the modern means of cooking, there is no question of any smoke being emitted from the kitchen. I should like to ask this question; what is more logical than to ask for permission to lease this bit of land along a little stretch? The building will not cause the removal of any tree or even the latrine which is there; there is no expense to the Government; and as far as the expense of the legal work is concerned, the proposed lessee has agreed to defray all the expenses.

4.05 p.m.

The lease will be for one year. It is a yearly tenancy; and owing to the nature of the lease and the type of business that is carried on, although the normal period for giving notice in such a lease is only six months, we felt that in order to be fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this particular lease, the period of giving notice should be one year. It would mean that when the lease is signed, Mr. Taylor would have a term of two years certain at the outside; but after the expiration of the first two years, could be given notice to quit at the end of any one year of the tenancy.

The question was raised by the honourable junior member for St. George as to who settled this rental value. It was settled by the Hastings Rocks Committee comprised of experienced business men, one solicitor and people of good standing who know values; and this rental was reasonable in their view. This money will be paid into the Treasury and will form part of Government rental.

As to the question raised about Graves End, I can only give the assurance that I will look into the matter. I would like to inform the honourable senior member for St. John that that concerned Mr. Taylor senior, who is not the proposed lessee in this case. If the honourable member were to see me or write a letter dealing with the point raised, I would by all means look into this question and see that the facilities granted at Graves End beach are taken full advantage of. It will be appreciated of course that the economics of the matter will have to be gone into. None of us is in a position to know the economics of that particular matter, or to know whether the running of such a restaurant is possible.

It will also be appreciated that none of us can suggest to a man how he should run his business. I will however, bear in mind what the honourable member said and see what can be done in that respect. I will see whether Mr. Taylor can be encouraged to carry on the business or assign it to someone else.

Mr. ALLDER: I would like to correct what seems to be a mis-apprehension as to what I said. I know that no Government or Minister can suggest to a person how he should run his business, but in this particular case there was a relationship existing

between the lessee and the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The latter leased that land for certain purposes which they expected to see carried out. But all of the members of the Government have seen, or ought to have seen that this place was closed for over two years, and that therefore the lessee has failed to carry out the proposals which the Government expected. It is a case where the Government should suggest to him that he is expected to give the service which the Government felt was needed there.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I will look into the matter and see how the terms of that lease are worded, and whether it is possible for the Government to take any steps in that connection.

I can assure the members of this House that the Hastings Rocks Committee of all the committees in this island, would do nothing to interfere with the facilities of the Hastings Rocks. No member need have any fear in that connection.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I have to speak after the Hon. Minister; but I thought that he would have said something to the effect that something will be done if, after the hotel people have put that kitchen there and the Government has put up the Post Office, and it is found that the kitchen creates a nuisance, something will be done to remedy it. If you are going to put up a Post Office there it will be practically impossible to tell at this stage what the effects of having the kitchen there will be. I hope that if it is found necessary, the Post Office will be put on the other side of the road.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the Post Office being put on the other side of the road; even if you have to buy a property for it.

I would like to say in passing, that I do not like the idea of asking a member of the House to write a Minister about anything. If a question is raised in here, the Minister should take notice of it and deem it as being sufficient, or more than sufficient in itself to warrant him making enquiries about it. It is easy for the Minister to discover what is causing the inactivity in the place at Graves End where the Government intended that there should be activity.

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

#### DEVELOPMENT LOAN BILL

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to take Order No. 9 as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to take Order No. 9 as the next Order of the Day. If there is no objection leave will be granted the honourable member.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the Government seems to be hopping all over the Order Paper, just as they did last Tuesday when I gave notice that I would like to discuss a particular matter. I do not intend today to tolerate that behaviour.

As far as Order No. 9 is concerned, I do not think that members should be called upon to deal with that to-day for two reasons. In the first place it refers to items which have not yet been printed, such as the Housing Bill; and then honourable members should have a chance to examine the Estimates (which have only been laid today) before we can deal intelligently with Order No. 9. I am objecting to leave being granted on that ground, and on the other ground that I raised a question last week and the Government hopped all about the Order Paper just as they are doing today.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that leave be granted the honourable member to take Order No. 9 as the next Order of the Day. Hon. Members in favour will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No". I think the "Noes" have it.

4.15 p.m.

*On a division being called for the question was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:—*

*Ayes:* Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA and Mrs. BOURNE. (6)

*Noes:* Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. TUDOR, Mr. ALLDER and Mr. GODDARD (5).

Mr. SPEAKER: I declare the ayes have it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order of the day now stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: second reading of a Bill to authorise the raising of a loan to meet the cost of development and for other matters incidental thereto or connected therewith.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I have not been able to put this Bill before the House earlier. Sometimes one does get tired of opposing for the sake of opposing. Everything by way of Government's proposals in the Five Year Plan of which this is the fourth year for which this Government proposed to get a loan to carry out, is in this Bill. I need not say here that the Government's plans for raising money by way of loans have been before the House for years; this is no new idea. All this Bill seeks to do, is to put on the Statute Book something to enable the Government to raise the necessary sums of money which it said four years ago it intended to raise in order to carry out the Five Year Plan of Development. All this happens to be, is something to give authority for the raising of loans which are likely to be raised in order to continue with the plans of the Government. If honourable members have read the Objects and Reasons they would see that there is nothing in here which is new. I will read the Objects and Reasons:—

This Bill, which is in the usual form taken by Local Loan Acts, seeks to enable the Government to raise by the issue of debentures a sum not exceeding \$6,720,000 and fixed the maximum rate of interest to be paid on that loan. Subject to the power of the Legislature to vary the Schedule, the purposes for which the sum loaned would be used are those contained in the Schedule.

Towards the cost of the Deep Water Harbour it is proposed to make available a sum of about \$1,920,000. The figure of \$2,338,000 for housing will be required to meet the sums of \$200,000 for Civil Servants Housing and \$120,000 for the Self Help Housing Scheme appearing in the capital estimates for 1954–55 under the Head "Local Funds," and the further sums of \$300,000 are required for the plan for Civil Servants Housing and \$1,718,000 for the Government's expanded programme of housing development over the next five years. It is proposed to make available to the Development Board \$1,000,000 during the five-year period. Of this amount one quarter appears in the 1954–55 capital estimates. Plans for the further improvement of water supplies mainly by the provision of additional mains and standposts require approximately \$831,000, and the further development of Seawall Airport a sum of about \$523,000. The balance of \$108,000 will, it is expected, be required for various other schemes.

Let me say that this part of the housing programme depended on the new housing authority to be set up; when I say depended on the new housing

authority, I mean that that is the instrument. I can well understand those honourable members who have only now come into the House asking certain questions on that, but the old members know of the laborious debates which we have had on town and country planning which is the modern authority for the giving of the loans to housing; it is the authority which have met the favour of the Legislatures in Great Britain and even Trinidad and the other colonies. We have established the Housing Board to give the authority to use loan funds, for erecting houses in the island as a whole. I do not think I can explain any more on that.

I repeat that this is an ordinary local Loan Act to give authority to the Government to raise from time to time, on occasions which are more suitable in the money markets, such sums of money which are necessary to further our plans of development during the finishing of the first five year period and during the next five year period. The only thing on which honourable members might need a bit more information is Miscellaneous. That item includes such things as Mental Hospital Farm and loans for Higher Education and so on. I do not think I can say more; if honourable members ask for specific matters and it is possible for me to answer the questions, I will do so. I cannot say that we are determined to build a house 24 x 14, should such a question as the type of houses we want to build be asked. I will not be able to answer details to questions like that, but anything I can answer in respect of those matters I will do so.

As honourable members will see, it is proposed to raise as much money as possible locally before going to the London money-lenders; because, it is essential that the people of Barbados show that they are in favour of the Deep Water Harbour by putting their dollars into it, and that the Government is also willing to put current revenue in it, before Government will go to the London market.

As can be seen by this Bill, this Government believes that we can raise \$6,500,000 over the next five years; and it is for that reason we have fixed that figure; the breakdown is according to that figure.

Obviously, it is undesirable to wait for the fifth or sixth year to raise this loan. Obviously, it is better that we be given the authority now; therefore, the Government has come down now and has asked for the passing of the Act to authorise the raising of this loan from time to time during the next five or six years as the Development Plan proceeds, and at the opportunity that suits Barbados best to raise the loan according to the market conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can make the position clearer. These are no overwhelming powers put into the hands of the Government. It is necessary to proceed on the strength of this Act to raise the loan from time to time. I therefore, beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

4.25 p.m.

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

*Mr. Crawford entered the House and took his seat.*

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, when one is not willing to skim over the work of the Legislature in order to accommodate a nonsensical argument, you will hear such as what the honourable member has said; and you will hear things which they cannot justify. There is nothing in the Five Year Plan to show anything as to any amount in respect of the Deep Water Harbour. The honourable member must remember that he is not talking to a crowd of people under a Sandbox tree, but to a

parliament; where has he ever debated the advances that this Government is undertaking for the building of the Deep Water Harbour? In what Five Year Plan—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I must interrupt the honourable member. I made it pretty clear that there are many things in the Five Year Plan which have not been finished, and there are other things coming under the second Five Year Plan.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: We hear that now. You have a measure here asking for permission to raise money by way of loan. What we are asking is about the money relating to the subjects with which you are now dealing, so that you can discuss them. Now you hear that there is a second Five Year Plan that we have to proceed with; and we know that this Five Year Plan is a C. D. & W. Plan; and the idea is that the parliament has to accommodate you with anything which you think is something we might be willing to accept. This is something which is reverting to Mussolini sitting in the Fascist Grand Council; that state of affairs will come back again. We have fought for something and we have cherished things in the British way of life. Parliament and democracy should mean what they mean. I challenge the Hon. Premier as to whether he has ever debated the question of the construction of the Deep Water Harbour in respect of this loan which he wants people in Britain to see that we are willing to have, or that it is easier to get this harbour by floating this loan here. I want to say that you have not got to float a loan here to let the people in Great Britain see that you are proceeding with the erection of a Deep Water Harbour. This is an indication to make us believe that you will not get a loan for the construction of this Deep Water Harbour in London unless you float a loan in Barbados. When you hear today for the first time on the floor of this House the Leader of the Government telling you that there is a second Five Year Plan which the Government is contemplating bringing down, and before you know what is in the second Five Year Plan on which the taxation you have imposed, then you have not reached the end of the journey if you are now telling us that you are having a second Five Year Plan based on Colonial Development and Welfare. What are you talking about? Every unit in the Colonial territory has a second Five Year Plan because the Five Year Plan passed in England was not passed for Barbados alone, but for the whole Colonial Empire. There are those who make the British people recognise that we are not just Colonials. Here you used the put or the Estimates the word Colonial because Colonial means a lot to some people. Now you put the Barbadian Estimates; there are certain people who do not like to make things inconvenient for the British people. We feel that you should have approval for all these matters. I am not saying that we are not agreeing to this loan; but what I want you to know is this; before I agree to something, I must see the right of what I am agreeing to. You do not want to reach anything because the past is there for you to reach: I say that there are other matters which have not yet been discussed in respect of this proposal, and I have selected the Deep Water Harbour.

The Government has set up an *ad hoc* Committee to deal with certain details in connection with the Deep Water Harbour, in connection with Bulk Importation, and things of that nature. The Hon. Minister of Housing before we left here for the summer vacation, put forward one of his handouts in the nature of the policy for housing, and the Hon. Minister in defence of that policy for housing, made

certain basic changes; and this branch of Legislature passed an Address about the change in housing, and we see that there is going to be an extended Housing Programme. We do not know to what extent this extended Housing Programme will go, and to what extent this Bill will deal with housing; but the Minister was quite satisfied in saying that the Legislature passed an Address to the Government asking the Government to allocate funds to deal with houses. The Labour Welfare Fund was established for the use of people in the Sugar Industry; they cannot say that the people in the island are satisfied with taking money from the Labour Welfare Fund and not using it for the benefit of people in the Sugar Industry; but they will wake up to the matter some day.

4.35 p.m.

Does the Government expect that hon. members must accept whatever comes before them without being given an opportunity of seeing what this new Bill says? Do you know how many Addresses have been passed in this House of Assembly? No Government is bound to accept an Address that is passed here. When I first came to this Chamber an Address was passed asking the Government to buy Maynard's land in St. Peter; that land has not yet been bought. The hon. member on the right of the Premier is always accommodating the Government. Why does he not remind them about this Address asking for telephones at Bathsheba? Every Address passed here is not bound to become the policy of the Government; if that were so, any Government would find itself in a pretty mess. The Government cannot commit itself to every Address passed by the House, because the Government is responsible for the expenditure of public funds and should know whether or not it can do what it is asked to do, and at the time it is asked to do it.

If you look at the wording of the Objects and Reasons of this Bill, you will see that it says that further sums of \$300,000 are required for the Plan for Civil Servants' housing and \$1,718,000 for the Government's expanded programme of Housing Development over the next five years. I would like to know what is meant by "over the next 5 years." The Five Year Plan that we are talking about was based on the taxation. The policy spoken about when the Five Year Plan came down, was to make a plan of development and taxation for five years. If you are going to plan for another five years, by all means say to what extent your original plan has been amended or modified; and therefore in the light of those circumstances, this is what you propose.

This is the second Loan Bill that has come here within the five year period. The hon. member said that there was no need to question this because it is something that we already know about; but he was quick to correct himself and say that he had said something about a second five years. If you go on you will soon talk about a third five years.

The Government wants to deal with this measure now, but the Government must realise that Parliament must be treated as Parliament; and that it is a privilege of every member to be accommodated with the fullest information at the Government's disposal, and with all the knowledge of related matters. I feel that we should have some information of that kind before we discuss this Bill.

Moreover, it is on the eve of the Estimates; but unless we are prepared to accommodate the wishes of certain individuals we are committing sacrilege. If a member of the Government Mr. Speaker, wants to go somewhere tomorrow everything must be done

so that he can go tomorrow. If a member wants to go to Trinidad to attend a Conference it is not a matter of telling the Colonial Office that it is not suitable to the Barbados Government to hold Federation on the 13th March; but if it suits Lord Lloyd to come out now because he wants to return to the House of Commons at a certain time, we must accommodate the Colonial Office. I see that Mr. Manley did not go to a Conference; and Mr. Bustamante did not go to London because he was fighting an election in Jamaica.

However, Mr. Speaker, what I protest against is the idea that we must do our business to accommodate people. There is a Bill before us dealing with Housing; the hon. member is going to tell us about the Town and Country Planning Bill. That was introduced here since 1945, ten years ago. It went to the Other Place and it never saw the light of day. Sir John Maude came here and said that that Bill needed amending. We want to see what it is that the two Ministers now propose to deal with, because this has some relation to it.

We are not the type of people who messed up the Government; it was the British that mashed them up in connection with the Gulf Oil Company and the British Union Oil Company. We have never done that. We want to see local people who have money contribute to local things; but that does not give anyone the privilege of saying that we should not discuss intelligently anything that we have to deal with. In dealing with this Bill, why cannot we be accommodated without insults from anyone? That is what we have been subjected to before. There is no member of this Chamber (apart from members of the Government) who have not been insulted, especially by the Premier everytime that he opens his mouth; the Premier glories in that. He feels that he is the one to insult other people at will.

What I ask about, is the Bill which the Minister of Communications put before this House about four weeks ago; we have not seen it yet.

This Bill deals with the sum of \$1,718,000 for the next five years, which means that it goes further than the original Five Year Plan; because if this is dealing with something in 1955 and it deals with the next five years, it deals with an expanded plan which will be up to 1960. Those of us who spend some time dealing with our legislative business, remember what the Five Year Plan said; and there is no reason why we should not insist on knowing what is our expanded programme. Even with regard to the Estimates how can we intelligently discuss this Bill in the light of the Estimates without having had a chance to examine them properly? 4.45 p.m.

There are going to be new things which will be asked for under this loan. There can be this irritation where, when you are in Parliament and you are discussing important things which are the result of matters like this, that you are prevented from discussing them. As it seems to me we are gradually reaching the stage when the idea of parliament has no meaning to us; it seems to me that we can do away with the House of Assembly and let the Executive Committee run the colony. What I insist on is, that anything which affects the Government everyone is entitled to debate it. You have come to this stage of the year with this Bill; I feel this Bill could have been discussed better with the Annual Estimates which you have now put before us today and with the information which you have now put at our disposal. I may say that we do not even get the opportunity of discussing the Annual Estimates properly; I am looking forward to the day when the Annual Estimates will be introduced and you are

asked to discuss them on that day. You are going to hear that you must discuss them on that day because somebody is going to leave the island. Honourable members should know the idea for this rush; it is because we want to accommodate the people who are going to the Federation Conference; but if we can well understand the need for this rush, we want those people to accommodate us with decency and courtesy and with the information that should be given us.

*Mr. BARROW and Mr. BRYAN entered the House and took their seats while Mr. F. L. WALCOTT was speaking.*

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I have heard from the previous speaker that we will have a further opportunity to discuss the items for which this loan is asked, but I think a fuller explanation of the various heads for which this loan is required should have been given by the Introducer. It has been stated that we will have opportunity at another time to discuss these Heads.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: How can the honourable member think that one half cent can be spent under any of these Heads until this House so decides?

Mr. GODDARD: That is what I said. I said we will have another opportunity; but that is not sufficient reason why we should not have been given more time and more explanation on the various Heads for which this loan is asked.

It has been stated that there is not a single head of the Bill which we do not know; I will state one; it is the Head—Seawell Airport for which a sum of \$523,000 has been set out. I do not know for what this sum is required. Two meetings ago someone referred to the extension of the building there; I think it was the Hon. Premier who did make some reference to it; he said that they had plans for it; but we of this House have not seen those plans. I do not know whether this money is required for a building or for the runway, and I am sure that other honourable members of this House outside the Government know very little about it.

Set down is \$1,000,000 to be made available to the Development Board. Well, that amount is in the Five Year Plan; in the present Estimates 1954-55 is a sum of \$250,000 earmarked for that purpose. Further to that point, the Development Board has not yet been appointed. I do think that the Hon. Premier should have enlightened us on what is holding up the appointment of members to that Board. He should tell us whether they cannot find suitable personnel to appoint to that Board, because that is very important. If we talk about industrialisation we do need somebody to give us some idea and also those people from outside who are willing to invest their money here, as to what is required. We are now being asked to provide this Government with the authority to raise \$1,000,000 by way of a loan to be put at the disposal of a Development Board, and yet the \$250,000 which we voted for that purpose in the present Estimates has not been spent.

With respect to the construction of the Deep Water Harbour we know that it will cost \$20,000,000 and more. The Report on it suggested a means of financing that; but that is only an indication of how it might be done. I am quite sure that the Government has more information on these matters than what it has given. The Hon. Premier has said that we should let the people in England know that we are in favour of it by our subscribing to the loan; I will say that members of this House and the Upper House have already said that this Harbour is necessary and the people want it; so therefore there is no need for us to show the people in England that we

need it by our subscribing first to the loan. The amount of \$831,000 is set down for Water Supplies. Of course that amount is required for extensions during the next Five Year Plan. We have just finished the third year and we have two more years to go; yet we are told this afternoon we are to give authority to raise a loan for funds, some of which seems to be required for the second Five Year Plan; that is how I take what the Hon. Premier said, and I am sure other honourable members understand it that way. We are giving the Government authority to raise these things when it thinks fit to raise them. We have been asked to give the Government plenty of time in advance to do this thing.

According to the Bill \$108,000 is required for various other schemes. These other schemes I have heard nothing of; I have not heard even an inkling of what they might be. I am sure Government has some cut-and-dried plan, because they have set out here \$1,718,000 for the Government expanded programme of housing development over the next five years. That must be a big scheme; and as I take it, it will extend into the second Five Year Plan. I am sure all of that must have been worked out already; I am sure the number of houses which are proposed to be built, the type of house, and all of that must have been worked out already; therefore, we should have been given the opportunity of knowing something more of the Government's plan before we give them the authority to raise these funds. Like as the honourable member who has just sat said, in this House we have not been given the slightest idea of what is to take place; I really do feel that more information should have been given at this stage. I regret that more information was not given us at this stage. What we will object to is, that in time to come when we happen to debate any of these matters they are going to say that we gave them the authority to raise this money for these things, and yet they are now debating it the second time.

4.55 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised that the persons who advised the Government on matters of this kind should have the temerity to so flagrantly depart from the provisions of the Five Year Plan within a lapse of so short a period of time; it leaves me almost speechless. However that will not prevent me from making my observations on what I consider to be inconsistencies in the Five Year Plan, into which we were inveigled, and cajoled, and induced by promises which at the time of making them, the makers had no intention of keeping. From time to time since the Five Year Plan was introduced into this Chamber, I have pointed out to the members of the Government that one of the basic principles which was introduced at the time the Plan was put forward by them was that, for the first time, we would be able to make a concrete plan in advance so that the Government and the people of Barbados and the taxpayers would know exactly where they stood. That has never been in dispute; again I must remind hon. members that from time to time I have reiterated that that might very well have been so, but I always considered the Five Year Plan a conglomeration of Five Year's Estimates. One would normally expect some trivial departures as to the question of amounts; we would not normally expect major departures from principle and the complete contradictions in terms and in substance of the proposals which were then put forward with so much beating of the drum and waving of the flag as at the time when the Five Year Plan itself was introduced. All of this would only lead one irresistibly to the conclusion that on the eve of the departure

of one of the lamented members of the Civil Service of this colony, the Plan was (as so many suspected) really a matter of window dressing rather than a serious attempt to solve the economic problems of this island. What I have just said I have said many times before. I would be completely lacking in my sense of duty if I did not ask for an explanation at this stage of one or two items on the Bill which is before this House. Within the last four weeks (without casting any reflection on anybody) I had cause to point out that the sum of \$200,000 was voted two years successively for Civil Service Housing Loans and up to now nothing has been done in the matter. I would like to point out to members of this House that it specifically stated in the Memorandum on the Five Year Plan that Civil Service Loans were outside the scope of the Plan; because loans for Civil Servants, and loans for agricultural workers had already been provided for. I am not in the habit of making statements without the authority of backing them up; and so I would like with your permission to quote from page 2, of the Barbados Five Year Plan of Development, and Taxation, "A brief summary of the Proposals." This summary appears in paragraph 11 of the Plan, and is sub-headed "A," "B," "C," "D," "E," "F," "G," "H," "I" and "J." Without boring members of the House with the details of the previous summaries which are there for everyone to read, I would go to No. 8 in the summary of the proposals. It says: "Housing loans to be made available for workers other than Civil Servants and sugar workers who are presently covered." In other words, Sugar Workers and Civil Servants were already outside the scope of the Five Year Plan for the simple reason that the House was given an undertaking that they were already covered. That is borne out by the Estimates for 1953-54 and 1954-55, where the allocation of \$200,000 was made for this purpose.

The argument which may be used now is either that there has been a misprint and that that was never intended, or that Civil Servants do not work and they are not workers, and some other abstruse reason to which this House is frequently treated much to its dismay. To me the language is both clear and unequivocal that part of this loan of \$6,720,000 is to be used, and \$200,000 is for the purpose of Civil Servants' loans. In the preamble to this Bill, it says that the figure of \$2,338,000 for Housing will be required to meet the sums of \$200,000 for Civil Servants Housing, and \$120,000 for the Self Help Housing Scheme appearing in the Capital Estimates for 1954 — 55, under the Head "Local Funds." In other words, these amounts were voted not under prospective Loan Funds, but under a different Head altogether. In actual fact the vote for two years was unexpended. This is really inflation. I challenge any member of the Government to get up and say that one penny of this money has ever been spent for the purpose of Civil Servants Housing. If the money were not spent for Civil Servants Housing, I would like to say this: it must either be in the Treasury or it must have been spent for some other purpose.

5.05 p.m.

If the first assumption is correct, there is no need to puff out or to inflate this loan (when our interest charges are already so heavy) to put in something which we already have in our possession. If the answer is that the \$200,000 was spent for some other purpose, one can only come to the conclusion that like so many other charges, this has also been mis-spent and spent illegally.

(Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, Mr. Deputy Speaker took the Chair.)

There are only two alternatives which would confront the logic of any member of this House. What is the purpose of having all these things? What is the point of the House voting money from year to year? Why should it be put under local funds if now, for the first time, the House is going to be informed that an additional \$200,000 will have to be raised for Civil Servants' Housing under the loans anticipated at the time of the Five Year Plan?

At the time of the Five Year Plan we were asked to support the idea of raising a loan of \$6,000,000. The Deep Water Harbour was no part of the considerations which were urged upon the House at the time that we were asked to accept the principle of raising that loan. On page 2 of the same Memorandum, Paragraph 12, it was said that the Government approves in principle the establishment of a Deep Water Harbour, but considers it essential that it should be self-supporting; it is intended to set up a Committee to report on its implementation, due regard being given to savings in the present costs, and the levying of a basic port charge not exceeding 2% on all imports and exports.

Paragraph 13 under the same Heading says, and I continue to quote, "The Domestic Sugar Agreement provided that if the Government decides on the implementation of the scheme, a cess of \$2.00 per ton would be payable from and in the year in which such decision was taken (and during the subsequent term of the Agreement), provided that the Government shall give adequate notice of the implementation of a Harbour Fund Scheme."

My views on that part of it are well known. But what is remarkable is, that a sum which by now would have doubled the sum of one and a half million dollars, has been left in the hand of the Government to accrue to the producers, and the taxpayers are being asked to show their faith now in the Deep Water Harbour Scheme, by paying an interest on this loan of two hundred and three quarter dollars, while the Sugar Producers Association who guarantee to give the Government \$300,000 a year on the average, are not being asked to make any sacrifice.

Not one cent has been collected from the Sugar Producers on that score. These are questions of fact which cannot be refuted. All the Government had to do was this: we have decided to build a Deep Water Harbour; that should have been done from the time of the Agreement some four years ago; if subsequently they changed their minds, obviously as a matter of morality the money should have been given back to the Sugar Producers' Association. But there was no harm, since the Sugar Producers' Association had volunteered to give the money, to say, "Alright we are going to build it;" since there was a provision that in case they decided to abandon the idea, the Sugar Producers' Association would get back the money.

This is the eleventh time I have said that; and everytime that I have said it, it has been left out of the newspapers and left out of the Debates of this Chamber. I am speaking slowly now, so that the reporter can get down what I say.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member is making a rather serious charge. I would like to inform him that it is for him to see that he has redress in the form of having an error corrected in the report of the Debates.

Mr. BARROW: I entirely agree with you Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am only drawing to the atten-

tion of the House what I have said before and what members are well aware exists already. I have never been able to follow the logic in the behaviour of the Government on this particular score. I have said so on many occasions. I have not waited until now to say it; I have said it three years ago; and I have said it several times since the Five Year Plan. Why did not the Government make the decision.

It seems to me, that the Government did not at the time have the confidence in the Deep Water Harbour project that they are now inviting the taxpayers to have; that is a charitable explanation. If they did have the confidence, why did they not make the decision and collect the money from the Sugar Producers Association? Did the Sugar Producers Association think better of their offer after it was made? There is no indication that this is so. If you have an agreement you presume that that Agreement can only arise out of a free and voluntary offer. There is no evidence available to the public that the Sugar Producers Association had a gun held to their heads and that they were forced into accepting the provision of making a cess of \$2 a ton to the Deep Water Harbour. If that is so, it is high time that people in Barbados know what the attitude of the Sugar Producers Association was towards the Deep Water Harbour at the time they made the Agreement. We have never been given any indication that they were recalcitrant on this score; if they were, it makes it worse, because, having made an agreement, they are not the people who doubled back on it, but the Government having no ambition to do anything about it, absolved the Sugar Producers Association from having to make this contribution. I wish that some of the taxpayers of this island could be absolved from the liability of paying Income Tax in this way, by the Government deciding not to collect it.

5.15 p.m.

It is the same thing morally; and mark you Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is what you get after a careful investigation by the gentleman who happened to be in Barbados at that time, and who came to the conclusion that the Sugar Producers could afford to pay this money. When I said that the Sugar Producers voluntarily agreed to pay this money, I did not mean that they rang up the Government and said, "How do you like \$2 a ton from us, and on all the sugar that we produce." I mean to say that it was a voluntary act with the rider added, "When the Government decided to build the Deep Water Harbour."

Let us go back to the Bill before the House. Towards the cost of the Deep Water Harbour, it is proposed to make available the sum of \$1,920,000, a sum which we would have already collected if the Government had the courage of its convictions and if it had only made the decision to build the harbour even if it were rescinded by the Government. So, Mr. Speaker, you can see that right at the start, there are the two items which involve substantial departures from the expressed dicto of the Government in the Memorandum itself.

Now, when it comes to the \$1,000,000 for the Development Board, I think it is perfectly clear that the Government said that it was going to establish that Board, and to the best of my recollection, the capital was approximately \$1,000,000. But there again, one would have to ask oneself whether the Government is serious with the matter of development when after a lapse of time the Board has not yet been set up. The functions of the Board have been clearly delineated. In the Five Year Plan it is stated that development should come first; yet we are getting expenditure on various projects which were not put in the Five Year Plan, nor

which were specifically outlined, nor which were on the borderline between the legitimate and the illegitimate plans prior to the carrying out of which this House has not been consulted. One can only come to the conclusion that the Government or its advisers, does not know how to begin on that Plan. We are nearing the end of the five year period and this Board has not yet been set up. It is like putting the cart before the horse; because, a Development Board and a Deep Water Harbour which is on the distant horizon, are two projects which should be the springboards of development for this country. I have said so before; I have said nothing now which is unknown to this House.

I also observed at the consideration of the Five Year Plan that it was the intention of the Government to build one house per month for five years; that was the observation of this Government in a place with overcrowded conditions like the City of Bridgetown and the island of Barbados. Now that the day of reckoning is close at hand, we find additional charges, not only of additional expenditure, being imposed on the public in order to carry out the hurried and ill-considered schemes in time to meet the elections for next year. What is the use of making estimates for a Five-Year Plan, if towards the end of the period you are going to ask us for money to plan a housing scheme which was not principally part of your plan? Is it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the need for housing has only arisen within the past eighteen months or close to the inception of Ministerial Status? Or, is it that the suffering masses of this island have become so inured to their conditions of squalour and overcrowding, that it is only now that their cries have been heard by the five ministers of the Government. Has there been some sudden visitation from Providence, which has designated the number of housing units which should be available to the population especially in the metropolitan areas, or has it been the result of the sudden discovery that the birthrate of our population has increased phenomenally over the past few years? Those are questions which one must put to oneself to answer.

5.25 p.m.

I have already stated that the principle which should underlie every financial proposal put forward by the Government should be the principle of alternatives; not only alternatives in the sense of the term, but social alternatives apart from the economic alternatives. That particular well-known observation of mine was confirmed by the remarks of the present Minister of Agriculture in his remarks on the Five Year Plan, that certain monies spent in a certain direction could very well have been spent in ameliorating the rather shocking conditions under which some of the unfortunate people of this island have to live; so that at least one member of the Government was aware of the problem at that time. The Hon. Minister of Communications as in most other matters, seems to be completely oblivious as to the state of affairs which he now seeks to remedy.

Now Mr. Deputy Speaker, we come to what I call our hardy perennial, Seawell Airport. I remember that one of the very first speeches I made in this House was on the subject of the frequency with which the House was asked to vote substantial sums of money not merely towards the maintenance but towards the extension, improvement and renovation of an Airport which certainly is not as old as any member of this House. I well remember that it was on that rather inauspicious occasion when I was new to this House, having had some eight years' association with Airports and matters belonging thereto, I made certain observations about

Trans Canada Airlines, and about the bearing of particular parts of the runway, and about the weight of Aircraft, and warned the House that we were going to be asked at some time within the next few years for a substantial amount of money. My worthy colleague on that occasion, (I would like him to go home and read the Debates) said that the weight of the aircraft landing on the first stage of the runway had nothing to do with it. Now the Chairman of B.O.A.C. made a speech last week, (a speech which I would like honourable members to read) which carried the proceedings to a level which they had not attained prior to his rising to his feet; and he invited the Government to improve the runway for use by Turbo-Jets and I know that T. C. A. will use them. The B.W.I.A. have got them within the three year period which I stipulated; and the Chairman of B.O.A.C. said that the bearing of the runway and the Aircraft landing thereon was an important factor.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: It is not true to say that he said that. [MEMBERS: He did say that.]

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. members who have not yet spoken on this matter will have an opportunity to speak on it.  
5.35 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: It is peculiar that the Hon. Minister of Communications and my colleague should give the Chairman of B.O.A.C. and myself the lie on that score. I am only reminding the House that when honourable members try to score something on a member, they should not fly up into space on matters which they know nothing about. We had a splendid opportunity of enlisting the aid of financial advice on various matters, because we have not reached the stage where we have people who are technically qualified on everything, without the embarrassment of having to rely on the advice of importees. The Government has not chosen to make itself acquainted with that position or with the aid which is available to it.

Therefore, Sir, Government must take their criticisms when those criticisms are valid; and when members try to assist the Government by warning them of the particular contingencies of a situation which are likely to arise, it would be more beneficial to this small community (which after all whether you call yourself a Pope or a High Priest it is only 21 by 14) if the best efforts were made to co-ordinate the experiences of all for the benefit of the taxpayers of this colony.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

*The question was put and agreed to without division, and Mr. Deputy Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.*

5.40 p.m.

*On resumption*

#### SEPARATION & MAINTENANCE BILL RETURNED FROM OTHER PLACE

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

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to give notice of certain questions:

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of Order. I think that in receiving a Message like that, the House should decide whether they will deal with those Amendments now or at the next meeting.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the point raised by the hon. member comes under Rule 262. I think the hon. member should be satisfied, having made reference to that Rule.

### QUESTIONS

Mr. BARROW: Before the hon. junior member for the City rose on a point of Order, I was seeking the indulgence of the House to ask leave to give notice of Questions.

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

Mr. BARROW: I beg to give notice of the following Questions:—

### NOTICE OF ADDRESS

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to give notice of an Address.

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

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: The Address reads as follows:—

*House of Assembly  
to  
His Excellency The Governor*

The House of Assembly regret to inform Your Excellency of the death of Mr. Alfred Gittens, their Messenger and Library Attendant, on the 20th August 1954, and respectfully request Your Excellency to send down a Resolution to provide for the payment of the sum of \$1,200 being one year's salary to be applied in paying the unpaid balance of the Funeral Expenses of the deceased and one third part of the balance thereof to be paid to Mr. Gittens' mother, and the remainder to be paid to the mother of Mr. Gittens' two children by equal monthly instalments to be applied by her for the maintenance and education of the said two children.

### DEVELOPMENT LOAN BILL C'TD

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the hon. senior member for St. George was addressing the House.

Mr. BARROW: Before this House adjourned, I was reminding members of this honourable Chamber that a warning note as to the expenditure at the Seawell Airport had been sounded by me, as well as (I may now add) by other members of this House at the very beginning of the very life of this House; that is some two years ago. I would really like to know if my fears in relation to the weight of the volume of traffic which the Airport has to accommodate are completely unfounded. I would really like to know exactly what the amount of \$523,000 is wanted to do now at that Airport. I am sure that not only are other hon. members anxious to know the details and to get the breakdown of this amount, but they are entitled to know it; especially in the light of the tremendous relatively large sums which we have been called upon to vote for that Airport within the last three or four years.

We are already the proud possessors of an adequate terminal building, only recently has it been completed. We have already spent over a million dollars initially on the construction of the new runway and since the completion of it, within the last four years we have been called upon to vote additional amounts of money to make well things which ought to have been done in the first instance. I believe there is now a canteen for the employees at the

Airport, and the restaurant which is available for use by members of the public has been functioning satisfactorily. We have also imported expensive equipment which is certainly adequate enough for a Grade A airport. A lot of that equipment which we have acquired is not yet in full use. We have also sent Generators which were acquired from the Admiralty at Six Cross Roads to Seawell for use as standby Generators. We have voted sums of money for the laying of underground cables and for the institution of an adequate system of lighting on the plane park and the runway. All those things have been done; it is true we have done some of them reluctantly, but they have been done. The runway cost over a million dollars initially.

I find it difficult to understand for what purpose this half-million dollars set down in this Bill to be spent on the Airport will be allocated and appropriated, in the light of the large and vast expenditures which have already been spent on the Seawell Airport. We have even built a fence around the outer perimeter of the Airport to guard against inroads of cattle and domestic animals from the surrounding districts. What new item of luxury will be involved in this amount of half million dollars? On what basis will the Government justify this expenditure? Those are questions about which I feel we ought to know something.

Mr. Speaker, as regards the \$108,000 earmarked for Miscellaneous, I feel we are entitled to know what this Miscellaneous expenditure is going to entail. If money resolutions or bills which involve the expenditure of public monies are allowed to escape under the Head of Miscellaneous without any further explanation, the day will dawn in Barbados when the sum total of the Annual Estimates from year to year will be passed under the Head of Miscellaneous. It is, perhaps, reducing the argument to its absurdity, but the present way and direction in which we are heading seems to point to that conclusion.

6.25 p.m.

The sum of \$108,000 even in relation to \$6¾ million is still a lot of money; we will have to pay interest on it for a long time to come. Various pronouncements have been made from time to time, especially when more useful schemes are being mooted, including that the Government is already strained to meet its commitments as regards interest payments on loans. A note of warning is sounded frequently as to the advisability of restricting our recurrent expenditure, because we never know, (so the pundits say), when we will get a bad crop and therefore a drop in the island's revenue. Therefore an amount of \$108,000 for Miscellaneous purposes which are unidentified at the moment will only further illustrate, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, the inconsistency of the Government's policy in respect of financial matters.

Mr. Speaker, I have only one further observation to make, and that is directed towards the Honourable Minister of Communications, Works and Housing. Why was it impossible to give members of this House an indication as to the extent of the housing programme at the time when the Five Year Plan was brought before the House? At that time the Programme was one house a month, and many of us made our observations that this is an island in which the population is increasing between three and four thousand persons per annum. I am not against building one thousand houses a month; but what is the use of having a Plan if at the time of having the Plan you cannot set out your programme and the stages by which the various aspects of your programme will be implemented? Why the expansion; and the expansion in this direction? All I am saying now is this: the

Hon. Minister cannot expect us to have any confidence either in him or his administrative officers, although he was not a Minister at that time it is true; but he was still a party to the Executive. It now seems as if they are going to deviate from something which the House has already agreed upon; in other words the Hon. Minister is now reversing the question of policy and taking it upon himself to formulate a new policy, which no amount of human ingenuity could have foreseen three years ago. In other words, to the Hon. Minister it is given to have wisdom which is not vouchsafed to other hon. members of this House. I would like to congratulate him on the new dispensation which Providence has reposed in him to give him wisdom which far surpasseth human understanding; and we can only construe it as an attempt on his part to deviate in such a manner as he so desires at any time, plans notwithstanding. It is quite true Mr. Speaker, that \$6 million were to be raised by way of external loans; but I am saying and reminding hon. members of this House that that loan did not include certain items which are included in this Bill, and it was certainly not of the amount and magnitude which is now before us. I must warn the members of the Government again that people lose all respect for you, if you say one thing and do another. You say that you are planning and you cannot plan at all; but you have to chop and change and modify and amplify your plans to such an extent, that they cannot be any longer recognised even in principle as the Plans which you earlier formulated. As far as I am concerned, I am not against voting for any Bill which will increase employment in this country, especially in the line of permanent employment; but I would certainly like to have a breakdown of the figures which have been set out in this Bill, so that we can be satisfied that the money will be gainfully used and that the masses of the people will be satisfied in having some avenues of employment. But to ask us to support a Bill which in no part of its preamble or explanatory notes, gives us any detailed information either as to the necessity for particular items or as to the manner in which the allocation to these items will be spent, I am submitting that that is not treating this House with the courtesy not only which we deserve, but to which we are entitled.

6.35 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR : Mr. Speaker, like all those hon. members who have spoken before me, I too feel somewhat dissatisfied at the little which the Hon. Premier has told us in introductory remarks on this Bill.

I should like to say first of all that there is no honourable member in this House who objects to money being borrowed to do the things which the Government have done. In any case, when it is remembered that this House has already committed itself, and the Government to quite a number of projects which require the spending of large sums of public money, it would be a contradiction to say the least, if any cavil were to be made at borrowing sums of money for the financing of those projects.

What I do feel however, Mr. Speaker, is this, (and it would take a lot to convince me that what I feel is unfounded) that when you propose to borrow this \$6,000,000 or any sum in that range you are doing a very important thing; and when you come before the Legislature with a proposal to borrow such a large sum of money on the same day on which you have just laid your Annual Estimates, you cannot help forgiving members of the Legislature if a spirit of caution enters into their decisions, and into their speeches.

What I mean, Mr. Speaker, is this: very soon from now, the Premier as Minister of Finance, will

be calling upon this House to consider for the next financial year the sums of money which this colony will receive as revenue, and which it will pay out as expenditure; and the things which are set down in this Schedule as being the projects to be covered by this loan are all of them, matters for which sums of money have to be voted, and some of them are matters from which Revenue will come in, in the course of a year. That being the case, it is not difficult to see that there is some justification for our insisting that we should be told much more about these important matters before we let the Government through persuasion commit us to such things.

The second point is this: when the Premier introduced this Bill, he said that it was a routine matter; that there was nothing in it which a child of three could not understand. While I am on this point I will say that I think it is time that the Premier stopped talking about important matters in this manner; because this House, whatever may happen to it in the future, is not at the moment so composed that children of three with their limited intelligence form the criterion of what is expected in thought in a Legislative Chamber and the Premier should not be allowed to get away with this obvious failure to do his duty by attempting to tell members how much they should understand, and how much they should not. He is Minister of Finance, and it is his plain duty to lay out his policy and the policy of his Government as plainly as possible, and to invite discussion on it; that plainly is his duty.

I cannot imagine that in the Other Place if members of that Body had asked whoever was introducing Government business, questions such as members of this House have asked, that the person responsible in that place for introducing Government business would have used such remarks. I think it is time that the Premier stopped saying that; because it is not a healthy contribution to the debates of this House.

Well, sir, here it is the Government is asking for permission to raise a loan of over \$7,000,000. Let me say at the beginning (and I want to emphasize this, because there may be an attempt to distort the criticisms of the Opposition on this score) nobody objects to the raising of this or any other sum of money; that should be made clear. What any reasonable person would object to is an attempt to raise sums of money for purposes which either have already been covered or which belong to some scheme which already have been on foot, without saying to the House how much of what you have already undertaken has been done and how much remains to be done, and what further extensions are still to be carried out.

Now, sir, the honourable senior member for St. George made what I thought was a very good point, when he referred to the inconsistency, (at any rate in the Government's policy) as between what the Premier said and what is laid out in the Objects and Reasons of this Bill on the one hand, and the provisions of the Five Year Plan on the other. But there are more inconsistencies than those to which he drew to the attention of the House. Here, (and you will forgive me for quoting) I notice that paragraph 8, of part I says:—

"The Expenditure proposals of the Plan envisage a capital programme of the order of \$16,500,000 during the next five years to be obtained from (a) Loan Funds, (b) Available Funds. Against Loan Funds there is an estimated amount of \$6,000,000 and Available Funds followed beneath like the Labour Welfare Fund and other funds. Therefore, it is

true to say that Loan Funds to the extent of \$6,000,000 are allocated in the Five Year Plan.

The Government is now asking the House to give them permission to borrow \$6,720,000; but sir, it is within the memory of the House, (unless my memory fails me) that the Government has already raised two loans so far; one of a half million dollars and another of a million and a half dollars. Therefore, I can be forgiven if I say that of the sums which the Government set out to raise under the Five Year Plan they have already raised \$2,000,000.

Well then, sir, if the Government have already done that, it is surely within the province and duty of the Government to say something like this: "Our programme with respect to the Harbour and Housing and other things has called for an Expenditure of so much spread over such a period of time, and in order to carry it through we need so much more to be spent as follows." The Government should then give the proper divisions, and the breakdown of each project should be added; that is not what they do. As a matter of fact it is the opposite of what has been done. They give us figures for Housing, and figures for the Development Board which has not yet been set up, and for Water Supplies and the Airport; but without having studied the Estimates which they have just laid before us, and which we shall be asked to consider in a short time, how can they expect a Legislative Assembly to commit itself to borrowing money before it has had a chance first of all to examine the record of the individual departments in respect of projects for which the expenditure is needed, and secondly, before the Legislature has had a chance to say whether it approves of the continuation of this or that policy of a particular department.

6.45 p.m.

It may well be that members of this House feel strongly on what improvements, if any, can be made at the Airport. There will always be discussions on the housing policy. It is therefore inadequate, to say the least, for the Hon. Minister of Finance to tell us that we are only doing routine things when he realises that we are opened to enormous things as the time goes on.

I do not know if hon. members feel as alarmed as I feel at the hint which the Hon. Premier put out; that there is a possible, or actually there is another Five Year Plan. If that is so, you cannot leave it at that; the Hon. Premier must inform the House if this second Five Year Plan is to follow on the heels of the first; and secondly, he should tell the House whether it is to run consecutively or concurrently with the present one. Let him tell us what extra provision has been made for it. Every single item for which money is required has already been the subject of legislation and argument in this House; and in no single case, whether it is for Deep Water Harbour or Housing or Water Supplies, has this House made up its mind that it is satisfied with the Government's policy, as it knows it. As a matter of fact, the Housing Policy has come in for severe criticism, because members on this side of the House have always been saying that we are not convinced that all the money is well spent or is spent as we would wish. Naturally, when it comes to the Water Supplies it is an easier method because of our criticisms of the Minister for Water supplies; and in that respect, we get a little more information about that than we do get normally of the other things.

Sir, you cannot ask us until we have discussed this matter more thoroughly, what we should do further for the Seawall Airport; we do not know what the expenditure proposed for it is based on; nothing can be accepted just like that. I for one feel that a great mistake has been made by the Hon. Premier

in assuming that this matter is very urgent and so unimportant, that we can consider it now while we are on the threshold of discussing the overall financial position of the island. If all the facts were laid before the House as to the overall financial position of the island, it may not be necessary; but at any rate, this House is owed the duty of having explained to it what is the financial position before we are asked to give you this authority to raise a loan of such proportions.

Now, sir, there is another important aspect to this matter which so far has not been mentioned. When the Honourable Premier was speaking, we all listened very carefully to see whether he would tell us anything about the previous loans which had been raised by the Government; and what is the Government policy on these loans as to whether this thing is to continue indefinitely; or whether, for instance, in the new Five Year Plan to which he hinted, we are going to be asked to give permission for the raising of loans piecemeal like this. I had expected to hear something on that; and I think it was reasonable so to expect. If you have to do several things and you decide on what you are going to do first, you should be able to make a full frank statement to this House. You should be able to tell this House what you are doing, how long any such things will take, and the stages at which you are doing them. Are you going to come every year and ask for this permission to raise a loan, no matter how great the sum is, without giving the House any idea of the general financial position of the island. When you do that no member of the House can even ask you a question which he would like to ask, because he would not know what you are doing. There is no continuity in your policy. In theory, every year in addition to the sums of money which you provide under the various Heads of Expenditure, you have asked for permission to raise loans and that permission was not withheld from you; and yet the amusing thing about the matter is that after the new sums have been raised by loans to be invested and expanded as laid out in the Schedule, sooner or later in the course of the current financial year, Supplementary Estimates are introduced to ostensibly or to extend the particular service for which the money was granted. I am warning the Government very seriously that that sort of thing cannot go on; you must have some sort of financial policy. Half of the trouble, perhaps, is due to the fact that if only the Minister of the Government took a little more time in explaining measures to the House as is his duty, (fully and frankly what is the position with respect to the matter under discussion, how it has developed and what shape it is envisaged that the matter would take) we all would be the better off by his so doing. I cannot tell the Minister that we would always agree with him, but we all would be better off. I cannot be happy at all with this piecemeal system of borrowing. It may well be if you knew more about it; you might be able to advise the Government a bit more carefully if you had heard certain things to help you from them. All five of the Ministers on the other side, (from the Hon. Premier down), are guilty of this fault. They will not give full information; they will not answer questions; if you ask them questions, you are branded as the most wicked person on earth.

My points are these, Mr. Speaker: having got a general financial policy, are you in such a hurry that you cannot tell us, so that we would be in a better position to make up our minds whether we can give you the permission to raise this money? Is there a second Five Year Plan, or is the Hon. Premier just using up space in his arguments? If there

is going to be a second Five Year Plan, is it going to run concurrently with the one that is now operating or is it a follow on?

6.55 p.m.

Is it different in scope in Plan or in execution from the one we know? Will it lay additional burdens on the taxpayers of this colony? And lastly, will it help them to a degree which the present Plan has not helped them? Those are the things which I would like to know. I should like to know whether the sum allocated in the Schedule for housing, the sum of \$2,338,000, is the sum which will be required to carry out a general housing policy in this island as envisaged in the Bill which the Hon. Minister of Housing introduced, but the text of which no hon. member has as yet seen. And then, is the amount allocated here in the Schedule for the Airport based on an exhaustive and full examination of what it will cost to bring the Airport up-to-date, or is it just a figure put in here for the sake of convenience? While I am speaking, I will say here that in this country we will be in for a lot of trouble. I noticed in the draft Estimates the Government will ask us to provide the sum of \$12,000 as a subsidy for British West Indian Airways. Thinking of all that is involved in this Bill, you cannot and should not ask this House to rush through and consider now a matter—the consideration of which might well be based on a thorough, a very thorough and diligent study of the financial position for the next year. The last thing that comes before me is this: if the Five Year Plan envisages borrowing as it does, and tells you that what it does must be raised from loan funds, then it is the paramount duty of the Government to tell this House first of all if any departure has been made from that policy with respect to the amount to be raised this year. If the Plan says that you must raise \$8 million and you think that \$10 million is necessary, let the House know it; and for God's sake bring down a comprehensive loan Plan and let us know where we stand and what we should be asked to provide.

The second part of this point is this: let the House know as clearly as possible the length of time which these projects which call for this expenditure here will take, whether they are going to run you to the end of the present period as envisaged in the present Plan, or whether some of these sums are to be spent over a longer period and therefore run you into the second Five Year Plan as the Hon. Premier said. I can well see that it is possible to raise \$6,720,000 and not spend more than one half of it between now and the end of 1957 which is where the present Five Year Plan comes to an end. You see sir, they must tell us quite clearly what the facts are; if you are going to provide this sum of money on which you are asking the taxpayers of this island through their taxes to provide interest to pay this loan, it is not fair to them to have to provide large sums of money every year to meet loans and repay interest on these loans, unless they can be satisfied beyond the shadow of a doubt that the monies which have been borrowed in their name will be well expended, and therefore they will not expect the Government to come back to them on a future date with regrets and explanations which tend to make the taxpayers think that the effort they have put up has availed nothing and that the sacrifices which they made could have been avoided.

The Hon. Premier is Minister of Finance; it is a responsible position; and he would do his duty much better if instead of making sneering remarks to serious criticisms, he would make a genuine attempt to meet such criticisms. We are sick and

tired of being told that we have intelligence below that of children of three; we are sick and tired of being told that such and such a thing is a routine matter; we are sick of being told that the Government does not mind how much the Opposition talks. Sometimes that can go too far; we are here on the peoples' business, and one side of the House is engaged in that part of the peoples' business known as the Queen's Ministers. They must so act that not only will they gain the confidence or keep the confidence of the majority of this House, but at any rate inform the House of what they are doing and why they are doing it. That is their plain duty, and if they do not see it to be their duty, I for one, am very sorry for them.

[A PAUSE]

Mr. SPEAKER: Is any other honourable member desirous of speaking on this Bill? Otherwise I will put the question; and when I am putting the question there will not be any interruption.

7.05 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: (*Laughter*) Mr. Speaker, there is a lot to be amused about; and the first thing is that it would appear as if the arguments on this Bill so far have so stunned the honourable Introducer, that he is unable to reply. He claims that this proposal was in the Five Year Plan ever since 1952; and still he is unable even to give the information which he promised to give when he introduced the Bill; that is to say, he promised to answer questions rather than to give arguments for the introduction of the Bill. That action is the coward attitude of somebody who does not know what he is doing, and waits until other people have spoken to bring in arguments which cannot then be answered. Mr. Speaker, we are too prone in this Branch of the Legislature to deal with financial matters and serious financial matters in a most off-hand manner.

A Bill of this nature is introduced one Tuesday, it is not printed until another ten days, so that you get it just before the third Tuesday when you are expected to debate it. If it had been printed and circulated in time, I suppose it would have been discussed long before the Estimates were laid. Honourable members who will be speaking a little later on will probably be able to read the Memorandum on the Estimates.

But, sir, so lax have we become in dealing with these important matters of finance, that we demand very little and get a lot less. There was a time when ordinary Supplementary Estimates were before the House the Government would issue some sort of financial statement, so that you would get to know about the financial position of the colony as best as it could be given up to a point. There have been many supplementary estimates with such statements printed as part of the information in the Addendum.

But when it comes to big matters like these, we are given little information; we are told that this is something that was in the Five Year Plan and therefore you should know all about it. But sir, the way that this six million dollars is mentioned in the Five Year Plan one would get the impression that the Government was hoping not to raise it at all, and that if they raised it, it was going to be an external loan. It was as if the first loan of two million dollars was to be raised to recoup the Treasury and it was particularly said that that would be a local loan. When it comes to the six million dollars, I know that it is ambiguously worded. It is put in such a way that one would get the impression that it might be raised or might not be raised; and in any case, sir, that it would be a loan raised principally outside the colony.

The Five Year Plan as some members have observed, speaks only negatively about the Deep

Water Harbour. The present Loan Bill before us sets out that the second largest amount is in connection with the Deep Water Harbour and the Government did not have that in the Five Year Plan at all and the original amount of six million dollars is increased by three quarter million dollars.

The Five Year Plan is based on an average crop of 150,000 tons; and for the three years that this Plan has been going you have been getting crops above the average. At one time we got the second largest crop that the island has ever produced; and at that time we poor legislators were being told that the Mealy Bug Pest would have cut the crop nearly in half, and in the end we got more than 28,000 tons more than the average on which the Five Year Plan is based. Therefore, sir, it would seem to me that a great deal more information should be given to this House before we embark on any loan or give authority for another loan.

If you tax the people to produce revenue to spend on the colony and you spend it wisely, some of the very people whom you tax will get back some of it in the process of the spending; but when you set out to raise a loan you have to be more than careful. While it may be true that you will get back some of the interest that you are paying out, you are very likely to run into trouble if you treat your finances in such a manner that you mortgage your future unnecessarily; and, as we are always hearing from the Government a doubtful future, based on this island's one crop economy.

The other industry, Tourism, that we are hearing so much about is subject to a great deal more hazards than any one crop economy could possibly be. You have to give it a great many concessions and it can be cut off in the twinkling of an eye. Do all that you think is necessary to encourage it and get as much out of it as you possibly can; but to depend upon it and mortgage your future on it, is to my way of thinking a very dangerous principle in financing this colony or any other.

7.15 p.m.

If you get one case of yellow fever, the whole of your tourist industry would go, and all the people who are engaged in it will be put out of work and become a problem to you; one case, perhaps of some disease that the very tourists might bring here, can cause all that. As I have said, you have been getting a crop above the average since you have planned your economy; you have not fallen below the average on which you have based your Five Year Plan. Even the current crop is estimated above the average and at least, you will reap it before the next hurricane season, and perhaps, a great deal of it would be shipped out of the island; so you will have had your '52, '53, '54, and '55 crops above the average. To justify this loan of \$6,000,000 and over, you have put in this Loan Act the scheme for the Deep Water Harbour, something which you did not have in your Five Year Plan. As the honourable senior member for St. George has said, you have entirely bungled and bungled miserably.

Here it is, the people in the sugar industry said that they would have given you \$2 on every ton of sugar produced if you decided to construct the Deep Water Harbour; all that you had to do was to say that you will build the Deep Water Harbour at a future date. You could even decide afterwards that you do not want it, and all that you would have to do is to give them back the money. You could have collected your taxes on it then. Instead of taking that money out of the hands of the capitalists as they were willing to give you, you are now going to borrow it from them and pay them 4% or 4½% interest on it. That is a serious thing to contemplate. The

interest and the sinking fund for the loan that we will have around the necks of the people of this colony if we pass this Bill, will in due course amount to nearly a half million dollars per annum. It is true that out of that amount you will be paying back some of the money that you had borrowed, but it is a fact that when you get money this way you spend it this way.

I think it is far wiser to reconsider the Revenue Equalization Fund Act; you should reconsider it to see whether it is still wise to leave the amount at 50%. I think the Government should reflect on this and glancing through the Memorandum which they have handed in with the Barbados Estimates to-day, it appears that they have already decided that out of the surplus—50% will go to this fund. According to the revised Estimates for 1954-55, there will be a surplus of 2¼ million dollars, so you can expect \$1,000,000 and over to go to that fund while you are borrowing \$6,000,000. From the amount of criticism which the Government has got through this fund Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Government should put as much as 50% to that fund. I do not know what will be the total amount to that fund when this amount is added. I do not know if it is put in the Estimates, but that is the sort of information one should be able to see when one looks at the Memorandum on the Estimates, especially a memorandum which starts off by saying: that legislation to raise a loan of nearly \$7,000,000 has already been introduced into the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the estimated surplus of the approved Estimates was just ¾ million dollars. The Estimates for 1954-55 is estimating for a surplus of \$759,759, and the surplus according to the Revised Estimates is expected to be \$2,245,465. With all that, this colony is running to a high-priced market to borrow money. Is that wise? The Hon. Premier has said that we should pass the Bill and Government will decide when the time is propitious to get the loan.

Mr. Speaker, the Barbados Government does not control even its own currency; it has nothing to do with the setting of the Bank rate. When we raised our last loan it was the worst possible time to raise it.

Mr. Speaker, if I may I would like to show you how the financial barometer with our Minister of Finance varies from minute to minute. After the period when the Legislature was last prorogued and this House was to reply to the Speech from the Throne in which for the first time was mentioned "My Government", the very first paragraph of the draft reply said, "We thank Your Excellency for the Speech and note the satisfactory financial condition of the island." Honourable members tried to point out at that time that it would be better to put that in another way. We were asked to say that we note the satisfactory condition of the island without any evidence whatsoever, and without any financial figures in the very speech to which we were to reply. Since that was done, how often have we heard in this House the Hon. Minister of Finance say how the Government is spending sleepless nights in thinking of what it is going to do about the balancing of the budget, and unless we found oil and collect revenue from that source, you cannot help people to get into the Clinketts Housing Scheme with any money; and when the Estimates for the coming financial year are laid, we see that you have a revised estimated gross surplus of over \$2 million; we have that surplus on a year's working and that is revenue from the people of this colony. That revenue was raised by taxation based on an assumption that you are only going to have a surplus of about \$½ million.

Are you going to build a Deep Water Harbour of the size which you have been investigating, and after having had several experts and Committees, you leave here to go and arrange for the loan for the Deep Water Harbour and then the people who are to arrange the loan for you, can confront you with the argument that you have decided to build a harbour which is too big for you. The experts told you what you wanted; bulk shipment is in the air, and before you leave here you decide to take along with you the Head of the Administration to impress upon them that in respect of anything that has taken place in England, people have shown their faith by putting money in it. One honourable member has said that you would have had \$1 million collected by way of the faith of the sugar producers in a Deep Water Harbour, if you had taken the money that was offered. You now say that we must show faith in it ourselves by borrowing money and sending money out of the island at the same time and having a surplus on a year's working of more than three times the amount you have budgeted for. Are we borrowing money like this? In any case the Deep Water Harbour should form a separate and distinct loan, and should not be mixed up with this particular loan, a loan which, when it was first mooted, had nothing to do with the Deep Water Harbour. We have had several local Committees going into this matter with experts from the Port of London Authority; you have even found that a Deep Water Harbour of the size you wanted could be self-supporting and now that somebody has suggested to you that you should construct a smaller harbour, is it that it cannot be self-supporting? Are you going to burden the taxpayers with this loan? Sir, if you read the Memorandum on the Estimates, (to which I take it you will permit some reference) paragraph 8 is a very significant one. That paragraph says this "during 1954, one and a half million dollars were subscribed locally for Government debentures, there is a comma there, and it goes on: "and deposits in the Government Savings Bank increased by over a million dollars." If you did not have your own Bank, you would not know whether the deposits had increased or not. Did the deposits in the commercial banks increase? It does not say here that during that period, the Government had one of the smallest notices which ever appeared in the newspapers about the Government Savings Department; the advertisement which was published in the newspaper could hardly be read. There was nothing about any interest being raised; has there been any transfer of money from the Commercial Banks to the Government Savings Bank?

7.35 p.m.

The whole question is whether those who have to run the Government Savings Bank have taken out money from the Bank and lent themselves. The Government of this country give a guarantee to depositors on the banking of their money; therefore they hold it in trust. In the raising of this million and a half dollars, it was said that we were going to use some of the Savings Bank money; but how much of it did they take? This is a case of their lending to themselves money which they hold in trust for others. Did they have any difficulty in raising this million and a half dollars, and did they take a lot out of the Savings Bank or what? Why cannot we be told that? Do they intend to take out more? Do they think it is a wise policy? Why not invest the Savings Bank's money abroad and use the Revenue Equalisation Fund money? It is their money and it is the taxes of the people; they do not have to guarantee paying that back.

In my view any socialist Government should look to the raising of taxes and the redistribution of wealth, and not look at raising loans; this idea of raising loans is a capitalistic idea. The Government expects that people will have a lot of money lying down idle and that if they (the Government) give them four and a half per cent interest on it which is more than anyone else will give, it will be a sound investment. But is it right to burden the taxpayers of this colony with carrying this interest?

We have heard that the Five Year Plan has had to be revised; but as far as the financial position of the colony is concerned, we have seen nothing stated about it. There should be statement on that account; but a proper statement of that kind has not been put before the House. The Memorandum on the Estimates merely says what the Government expects to raise; and it is so much guess work as usual.

Mr. Speaker, we have got as a little bait, a remark thrown in by the Premier to the effect that these heads of expenditure will all come back to the Legislature; we know what to think of those words, because after the Five Year Plan was passed and some of the items came back to the Legislature, the moment that any criticism was made you were told that you have already agreed to it and you are reflecting on a vote of the House. All hon. members know that they got that type of argument in the place of something more solid. We were told we had agreed to it in principle and therefore there was no need to talk; but when we are being asked to agree in principle, we are not given information on the grounds that the items will have to come back to us. Perhaps such tricks in doing the business of the House may assist the Government in getting a Bill through; but will such tricks get us out of the trouble that the legislation we are passing will put us in?

As a result of the 1953 Loan Act we had to put in the Estimates the sum of \$90,000 to pay interest for the first year on money that people have lying down, when some other countries tax such people and take such money away from them without paying any interest on it. As a result of the Bill we are considering now, we will be called upon to pay \$60,000 in interest; that is, \$150,000 in interest alone; and it is for money that I claim it was necessary to raise as a loan.

We are getting sufficient revenue in this colony from the taxation that we have now and the business that we are doing, to keep our workmen employed. We can reasonably supervise all the buildings we can do through Government channels, so as to keep our workmen occupied and get what we want done by paying as we go. That is something that the present Government can go into; they should not allow people to encourage them to borrow money to make a big splash. Watch the spending of your money and do not be fooled by people whom you think know how to spend money; people come out here and in a short time get such a reputation for the grand way in which they can spend money, that you forget to supervise them continually and see if their reputation is based on fact.

The Government should see that they are getting a proper return on the heavy works that they are carrying out now. Do not let them delude themselves with the things that people talk about and they just hear; let them try and see if the figures will square out with the supposed facts. If the Government spend the people's taxes wisely they would not have to raise these loans; the time has not come in Barbados for us to raise these loans yet.

While people all over the Colonial Empire are agitating for proper treatment from the Mother Country we are doing nothing ourselves, but we are

benefiting from such agitation; we are too afraid to embarrass the Metropolitan country and Metropolitan Government; but we are benefiting from the agitation of others. When we put in order what we are going to do with our hospital, the Government will come along and get C.D. & W. funds to buy a property for the extension of it.

7.45 p.m.

With what you can get from that source and the taxation which the people of this colony are paying at present, you are getting sufficient money to spend in the course of twelve months. I am saying, sir, that the revenue over the period of years which this revenue is supposed to cover, when the time comes, you will see that because you did not adopt a courageous and hopeful attitude based on that vision, it has prevented you from having the additional \$150,000 to be paid out on interest on these two loans. I say again you should raise your Deep Water Harbour money when it is necessary. It is necessary for you to decide first on the size of the Harbour which you are going to build, before you apply for this loan. Do you mean to tell me that you are going to spend within the next twelve months this amount of money which you have set down here for the Harbour? Carry out the investigations which you were told at the Colonial Office to carry out first; the Colonial Office and the people who deal with sugar are sending out people to help you to come to a right decision; do all that. Do not come here without those facts, without knowing one iota of the size of the Harbour you are going to build and encourage the Legislature to raise this loan. If somebody thinks that the time is right you should not go along with that. You might be listening to people who may be encouraging you to embarrass yourself constitutionally, probably by taking it away from you. It is all very well for members of the Government to say that that is not going to happen; but they had better be careful. Members of this Government are too prone to listen to people who encourage them to do things like this. Sir, you are taxing the people sufficiently now; especially the poor people. It will be better for you to spend that money which you now have invested at  $1\frac{1}{2}\%$  and  $2\%$  than to burden the taxpayers with an added  $2\frac{1}{2}\%$  on a similar amount which you intend to borrow for that purpose. Here it is you have money which you have loaned out at  $2\%$  and you are going to borrow money at  $4\frac{1}{2}\%$  to replace that money; it is not fair. Cut down the amount which you put aside to the Revenue Equalization Fund to  $10\%$  or something like that; but do not continue to put aside that whole amount. I think that that maximum is  $50\%$ . I thought that the whole idea of raising this loan according to the way which it was presented in the Five Year Plan, was that these would have to decide whether it is necessary to raise this \$6,000,000 by loans. I know sir, that the Hon. Premier has a method of saying that it does not matter out of which pocket you take out money; he is glib enough with his tongue to talk himself into believing those things, but will the glibness of his tongue take you out of the difficult position he may place you in? And bear in mind, when you find yourself in straitened financial conditions, the same people who advised you to adopt such a method have a way of dealing with you.

I know sir, when a Bill like this refers to Housing and Water Supplies, and you vote against it, people will take it that you have prevented them from getting their houses and water. Sir, I feel that this Bill is out of tune with the position of our finance; we are not doing right and if I vote alone, I feel it my duty to vote against this Bill.

Sir, if this Bill passes this House and goes to the Other Place the hon. Introducer up there will not say that it is based on what is the Five Year Plan, and to what you have already agreed, he is going to give members of that Chamber full details; he is not going to give you those details in his reply. Of course, there are no rules of procedure up there, so members of that Chamber are in the fortunate position of being perpetually in Committee. I am sure the hon. Introducer in that Chamber has to give members satisfaction on every measure. Political manoeuvres and all other kinds of manoeuvres can get something like this through in this Chamber on the flimsiest of evidence.

Let me ask this question: What are you doing at Seawell Airport? C.D. & W. gave you money for that purpose, and you pinned your faith on somebody whom they sent down here to build it. It seems as if no notice is taken of what is happening up there. I have been made to understand that we now have to build a concrete airport; the runway is now going to be a concrete slab runway. You have had already over a million dollars from one source to spend on that runway in addition to a great deal of money which we have since been spending to repair the damage, and the worthless materials were put back into it. We were told that the runway had the correct length and everything it wanted, and those who criticised it were told that they did not know anything of what they were talking.

7.55 p.m.

I feel that it was a lot of money for us; and more particularly because it was not our own taxes, I tried to get some information about it. The Head of the Administration of this colony entered into some conspiracy to becloud the issue where people were told that they did know what they were talking and in respect of up-to-date Aircraft, which we were told could land on the runway, we now have to spend \$1 $\frac{1}{2}$  million from loan funds and you must have spent a quarter million of our own money on the Airport already. And who knows whether we are really now getting full value for our money. With all of this happening, sir, nobody has ever been brought to book about it. When things like this go wrong we are told that we cannot lose the money which we have spent already, and we have to try and recover it by spending some more money. I sincerely hope that the Deep Water Harbour does not suffer the same fate. As soon as we start to get some revenue from the Airport, I understand they are going to subsidise B.W.I.A. landing up there, and it might be in the form of giving back the very revenue which we are told we are getting from Seawell every month. Those are things for which we are borrowing money; we subsidised the Steamship service in competition with the Airways Service, and now we have to subsidise both of them. That is the way how we run our finance. At one time we did not subsidise any of them, and now that we are subsidising one we are also subsidising the other. Now we are paying interest on the loans which we are paying out of the taxes of the people, while they are sending money out of the colony, and the full amount under the Head "Charges of Debt" will be a substantial one in the Estimates of this colony. I predict that by the time you raise this \$6 million you will have that Head of the Estimates up to \$400,000 and probably more.

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

## ADJOURNMENT

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: At this stage Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

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

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

8.05 p.m.

*On resumption.*

## DEVELOPMENT LOAN BILL C'TD

*On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.*

*Clause 1 was called.*

Hon. G. H. ADAMS moved seconded by Hon. M. E. COX that Clause 1 stand part.

*The question was put and agreed to without division.*

*Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—*

2. (1) It shall be lawful for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to raise by the issue of debentures under the provisions of the General Local Loan Act, 1933, a sum not exceeding six million seven hundred and twenty thousand dollars at such times and in such sums as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may decide for the purpose of meeting the cost of the various works and for the purposes described in the Schedule to this Act, provided however that the Legislature may from time to time vary the said Schedule or any item therein, or may delete any one or more items and substitute therefor another or other or may introduce into the Schedule any new item or items.

(2) The said debentures shall bear interest at a rate not exceeding four and one half per centum per annum.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering whether the Premier is willing to say whether there is any hope of raising this loan, or part of it, at 3½ per cent. The amount shown in the Bill is 4½ per cent. I am wondering if the Premier has any idea of at how much less they could get it, and whether this money will be raised locally, or if there will be facilities for external borrowing.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I need not call names, but the hon. member will know what I mean. All the people who know where the money is and whether it will be forthcoming for loans and at what interest, from all those people Government gets advice. We were lucky in respect of the last loan at a time when the Telephone Company was giving 5 per cent, to get ours subscribed at 4½ per cent; but 3½ per cent would be the hope of a super-optimist. That is the advice that we have got; and what we can gather as laymen from local trends, is that without going out of Barbados (let us put it that way) we do not think there is any hope of getting the money at 3½ per cent interest.

As regards to people outside, I think that honourable members know that we had a substantial sum taken up in our last loan by a Canadian firm. There is no reason why we should not have loans from outside. It is commonsense to say that if you are going to the London market to borrow money, even-

tually you have got to show those people that you yourself believe in what you are doing. Luckily, although there were many who thought that it might be a risk to lend money to a Socialist Government, many were forthcoming in lending us.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons why the Government has no chance at all of getting six million dollars at 3½ per cent. is, as I have mentioned before, that they chose the wrong opportunity. They were ill advised in that respect, and so are taking the wrong occasion on which to make their demands on the money market. Now, in case the Financial Secretary of Barbados does not know, since the last million and a half dollars that was floated the interest rate, what we call the interest rate (of course there are several rates of interest) at which the Bank of England is prepared to lend money as well as the discount houses, has gone up by a half per cent.; and the rate for industrials, the rate for consuls, and the rate for Government securities, all those rates vary around the bank rate and in proportion to any change there may be in that rate.

When the bank rate was 3 per cent., Government had to raise its loan at 4½ per cent. Now this is not to give an indication, Mr. Chairman, of the state of the money market in London, because that rate at 4½ per cent. was floated locally; but if the Government hopes by analogy to raise a considerable proportion of this six million dollars on the local money market, I will say that in this question not only patriotism comes into play, but the question of avenues of investment in other countries.

Therefore, sir, it stands to reason that if when they raised a million and a half dollars at 4½ per cent the bank rate was 3 per cent., and if the bank rate has gone up by a half per cent the rate for smaller colonials must have gone up also at least by a half per cent. From the local point of view, patriotism may extend to a million and a half dollars, but it will not extend to six million dollars. All that being so, you have to watch your chances of raising a loan very carefully.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, the answer given by the Premier was not satisfactory. He probably felt that the members of the House would not be able to understand the convolutions (I would not like to call them machinations) of discount houses, and the Bank of England, and the reasons which the Chancellor of the Exchequer might have to change the bank rate.

I would say that I entirely disagree with the honourable junior member for the City, (and this is one of those relationships in which we can disagree without abusing each other) on the question of not having to raise loans at all.

9.00 p.m.

What is not clear is what is the Government's policy in the raising of this 6¾ million dollar loan; that has not been disclosed today. We have not been told what proportion of it is to be raised locally and what is to be raised overseas. They cannot put in any Act of Barbados whether this loan will be at the rate of 4½% or whether they can get it at less than 5%. The whole thing is entirely speculative, because the Government is not in a position to say whether they are going to get this money at a rate of 4½%. [A VOICE: That is so.] I told them last year that they chose the wrong time to ask for money on the money market. I entirely agree with the honourable junior member for the City when he said that raising loans from local tax-

payers would be undesirable; because it would be a question of taking away investments from a private sector and vesting it in the Government to dispose of that money. When you take away investments from a private sector and invest it in the Government, you may be creating some employment with the Government; but you may also be preventing those people from creating some employment. It is a wrong policy to raise this money in Barbados even although the local capitalists, the people who have the money to invest, might be prevented from showing their patriotism.

If on the other hand there is  $6\frac{3}{4}$  million dollars or a substantial proportion of that amount which is not normally invested in Barbados but which is a saving from Barbados, and that money is normally invested overseas, as some of our money is, (such as is invested in the United Fruit Company and Sheffield Municipality Shares) I will say that it would be better if that money were invested in Barbados. If the money is not being invested overseas but you hope to take away  $6\frac{3}{4}$  million dollars from local investors, it will be better for you to leave those people alone and get it from outside. It would mean fresh capital coming into the country, and it would generate fresh trade. Those are some of the things which should have been gone into carefully by this Government before it came to the House of Assembly for this loan. The final analysis which members of the public of Barbados must resent, is that proper consideration is not given to matters which affect their pockets; those are the final considerations which the Financial Secretary should have set out on the examination of the facts with the private investors, the Insurance Companies, the Banks and private capitalists. If even the Government came to the conclusion that every year a considerable proportion of the net savings of this colony is sent out to places which would create employment for people overseas and not for the people in Barbados, Government has no right to raise any of this amount in Barbados. Government should not take that money from one sector and invest it in another sector where it will lie dormant. As a matter of duty the honourable senior member for St. Joseph should have had all the information. On my part, if I had to answer all the points raised, as the honourable senior member for St. Joseph should have answered, I would have got all those facts.

Mr. TUDOR: In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, there is something else which bothers me. If you say that the said debentures should bear interest at a rate not exceeding  $4\frac{1}{2}\%$ , it appears to me that you already know from whom you are getting this money. No hon. member of this House would question you if you already unofficially, so to speak, canvassed for this loan. If you have already received the assurance that you can raise this loan here, tell us just what you hope to raise and what is the negotiated rate of interest; because that is what this would mean. You are saying here that the rate of interest of  $4\frac{1}{2}\%$  should be paid, neither more nor less; there is not even a saving clause which allows Government to make that suggestion. If they discover that they will have to pay 5% instead of  $4\frac{1}{2}\%$  they will have to come back to this House with something to amend this Clause.

The second thing is this: (I am sorry I have to refer to it, but it seems to be part of the burden of all the criticisms levelled at the Government in this matter) I personally would like to know from the Hon. Premier when the Government intends to borrow this  $6\frac{3}{4}$  million dollars, as well as whether they intend to borrow it from people here or overseas. I

would like to know whether the Government has decided without examination, whether this much money is lying down in this colony not properly invested or not invested at all, in which case they are, so to speak, bringing it from under the bed and throwing it into the common pool; or whether it is money which is probably used somewhere else but they feel it would be much better if it were invested in the particular projects they have set out here. It makes a lot of difference which way it is.

9.10 p.m.

I would definitely like to know from the Hon. Premier therefore, if this decision to borrow the full amount required, and the rate which seems to be laid down here is based on an examination of what money there is in circulation; whether it is invested as the Government thinks it ought to be invested, or whether with a view to facts which are known to them, this new money they are calling into circulation and they are opening up new avenues of employment for people. That is a very important thing and it must be answered; and I am questioning the Minister of Finance to tell us what part of his financial policy both present and future, this particular matter covers. He has got to tell us this because his advisers might lay down a plan of action the implications of which they may not fully weigh. If he can tell us definitely that the money he is asking for is new money which he wants to bring in and set the wheels of activity running, we may be at liberty to say "you have already arranged and you know what you will get and four and a half per cent. is what we are going to pay." Failing that information, we do not know how much speculation has entered into this matter, and we certainly do not know what is the Government's intention in it. This is a simple matter, Mr. Chairman, to give us the information we need; because there are people in this island who are genuinely puzzled about the financial policy of this Government, and many members of this House are probably among that vast number of people.

The hon. junior member for the City in the course of his second reading speech, did draw attention to what seems to be an anomaly to most people. The surpluses have been piled up every year and invested abroad and the returns seem to be so little; yet the interest rates to be paid on loans seems to be far in excess of the returns we get on our money which is a dead loss to us. Therefore the taxpayers naturally have to be burdened to make up the deficit between the returns which we get and what we get on borrowed money. I do not think the Minister of Finance should look upon these matters and say that we are being lucky when we get something; there is no question of luck in it; the money market is there and it has its various adjustments and fluctuations. It is a matter of knowing what to do and the time to do it, and you only know it by providing yourself with an exhaustive examination of what is going on in the world of borrowing and lending. It is a mistake to assume that when you get a low rate of interest it is a matter of mere luck: because if you look at the position carefully and you realise that there is a time for borrowing and a time for lending, you must provide yourself with that information. I would definitely be glad to know what information the Hon. Minister of Finance has at his disposal which would enlighten us and at the same time give that queer decision by himself and to his policy, for what he proposes to do. I do say that I am not at all happy as to the demagogic way in which this Clause is worded; I wish to know the state of the debentures, or if the interest of  $4\frac{1}{2}\%$  per

cent. is based on the knowledge of the Minister of Finance or his advisers, or if they will have to go on the knowledge of fair promises which had been made to them that the loan will in fact be raised here. Have you got any full basis for putting down  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., or have you given yourself room for adjustments or whether you know or not, if you will get all you want in this island or not?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Hon. members must have read an article in the *Guardian* which appeared in the West Indian papers recently of Mr. Churchill getting progressively younger while Sir Anthony Eden was growing a long beard. Everytime the hon. junior member for St. Lucy speaks, I begin to think that he is addressing a young audience, then an adolescent audience and then an audience of cretins. Any member who is contracting to say when he is ready to float a loan with anything like exactitude, "I will get so much from Great Britain or so much from France or so much from somewhere else," would be either a super-prophet or a prevaricator. When the hon. member came into this House I expected him to be among that class of speakers who, having prepared a speech, come into the Assembly, and gets it off their chest no matter what they have heard. What else anybody in my position having a sense of responsibility could say? The Government gets advice from those people who best know; I will not call any name, but the hon. member who is in front of me (Mr. E. D. Mottley) will know who I mean. Some people will come for four per cent. others will say that they want six per cent. and some may want ten per cent. Any Government will ask what are the chances of getting a loan at a particular time. If hon. members will ask questions and point out the defects in the Government's policy and make suggestions to show that their ideas are better than the Government's, then that is all well and good. I am not helping hon. members to make any second reading speeches which they did not make at the proper time; but I am suggesting that the Government could reasonably say that over a settled period "We have a certain amount of money to spend and with a one-crop economy our revenue cannot be more than so and so, and our expenditure will be so and so and we will therefore have to look for loans." In these five years we are spending \$40 million.

9.20 p.m.

We are spending 40 million dollars in the next five years. Let us say, if you like, that we have a ten, eleven, twelve or fourteen million dollar revenue; let us calculate what we are likely to get out of sugar from the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement; barring the finding of oil, we have to calculate on something based on what is reasonable, on what our quota is reasonably going to be in these days when the production of sugar is increasing in places which do not have a substantial sugar production. Let us calculate on that basis, and on the basis of how much we will get from taxation.

When you have to borrow is it not sanity whether you are a private individual or a Government, to say that you will watch the market trend both local and external, and at the appropriate moment, the moment which to Government on the strength of the advice it gets seems most appropriate, to borrow what it needs to borrow? Has this Government at any time in the last five or six years acted differently?

I say, Mr. Chairman, as freely and frankly as possible, that all that a Government can do, a Government with any sense of responsibility and acting on the best possible advice it can get (remembering that even the Old Testament prophets prophesied falsely at times) is to choose the most appropriate time and

borrow money as and when it wants it. That is the least we can do, and we are certainly willing to do more.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to reply to any Aunt Sally statements; I want to deal with this section. We are not suggesting that the Government is going to borrow six million dollars at one time; we know that the Government will not do that. When it had two million dollars to borrow it did not borrow it at one time; but what is really clear and patent, and what a blind man on a trotting horse can see, is that in this island we have reached a stage where we really need some Economic Adviser to save us from the mess that we are in. The idea that we have a Financial Secretary keeping glorified accounts of the finances of the colony, but cannot advise on economic policy the Minister of Finance which Minister has no aptitude or inclination for financial matters, is not good enough. You must have some aptitude for these things; and you do not get that when it comes to the evening of your days.

We are being asked to give the Government permission to borrow six million dollars, and of that six million dollars, nearly two million is for the Deep Water Harbour. The Minister of Finance has not yet said one word of what conversations they had in London relating to the Deep Water Harbour, what are the prospects of raising the loan on the London Market and what is the nature of the loan.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, have you heard a more preposterously untrue statement? There was nothing that we had to conceal, as I have said over and over again on the floor of the House and in public. I have said that if we have to borrow money for four, two or three berths we have permission to do so. There was nothing that we were told by the Colonial Office that we had to conceal. Some feel that four berths are too many and others feel that they are not too many; I have said that over and over again. If we have to borrow four and a half million or five million dollars we can do so.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: When the hon. member talks about speaking an untruth, I can challenge him every day of the week on that. When did he say that the money he proposed to borrow was three million or four million dollars? Is anyone going to speak untruths in a matter like this? Who is going to advise the Premier? The Minister of Communications? The Minister for the Deep Water Harbour is goading the Premier telling him to get up and answer; that Minister will need some goading himself later on when we deal with another matter. He will get the rudest shock of his life. [Hon. M. E. COX: Anytime]. You can crow when your cards are above the table; not when they are below.

When this Bill came down to-day the Premier said nothing. He tried by innuendo to show that I was a member of the Executive and agreed to something, and that therefore there was no point my asking about it. He is putting something in this loan that was not in the Five Year Plan; the Deep Water Harbour was not in that Plan. A Committee was set up with terms of reference on the basis of financing the Deep Water Harbour and making it self supporting.

9.30 p.m.

The Hon. Minister of Finance cannot excuse himself because it is shown in the Estimates. Last year when I discussed this matter I pointed out that even if you were budgeting for a deficit there still will be no deficit. Your own figures in the coming Estimates show that you should have a surplus of over two million dollars. If you go on with your loan policy and budgeting policy in this way, you will be taking out so much money out of circulation that

you will have over ten million dollars accumulated in surplus between the Revenue Equalisation Fund and your general surplus within the next five years. The Hon. Minister has not said at what stage he is going to use the Equalisation Fund as a cushion. Each year since you have started your budget plan in this way, the surplus has been on the uphill. You are budgeting on the basis of an average crop of 150,000 tons of sugar annually, but the crop has not fallen below that figure since you based your average on that.

The Hon. Premier has made mention of a Development Fund. Now, what is the policy of the Government as regards development; in what position does the Government stand in that matter? The Government has not yet appointed the personnel to the Development Board. In Pakistan, a Development Board is set up of members of the Legislature with the Prime Minister as the Chairman; in this island you will not see this happen.

I will say "yes" to your borrowing money and I am not really worried over the rate of interest; because that will depend on the conditions in the prevailing money market. What I am against is when you have these important matters to be dealt with you give us no information, and as soon as a member asks for some information on some particular thing, somebody thinks he is impertinent for asking for that information. I am sure members of the Government would never have agreed to this raising of a loan unless they were given full information on the financial position of the colony. From the Estimates which have been laid to-day on the financial position of the colony for the coming year, I see several things that are new; and that is why I feel we should deal with this matter at the same time as we are going to deal with the Estimates. Why cannot we deal with it then? You will see all the matters above the table; not under the table. Do not let me ever catch you out doing anything underhand; if you do not play fair and square and above board you will hear from me. On the other hand, do not spare me if my life in public is shady.

This clause gives effect to the loan of \$6,720,000, and the Schedule behind points out that the sum of \$1,920,000 is to be raised for the Deep Water Harbour. I do feel that the Deep Water Harbour loan should not be put in the Bill; it is not the best thing for that to be put in the Schedule at this time; because all the facts connected with it have not yet been completed. The Government is still pursuing certain things in this matter, and we do not know to what extent those things will upset the calculation. What is the hurry? I am bold enough to say that with the \$1,920,000 which the Government is borrowing for that purpose, Government cannot undertake to spend any of it until all the relevant facts are known; therefore, to put that amount in this Schedule is not necessary. The Government should come to the House of Assembly with all the facts on that matter before it attempts to borrow anything on it. Any reasonable man will see that there is no urgency for this part of the loan; it is something subsequent. I think it would be better financing policy, if you pay out of your current budget for some of the things which you do not necessarily need but which you have in your loan policy. You have \$2,000,000 as surplus this year; that is a surplus from a budget of \$1,300,000; you cannot get away from that fact that that surplus is something substantial; it is something like 20%, when you compare \$2,000,000 with \$759,759; that is not something to sneeze at.

I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that we have a lot of things to perform; and that when it comes to tax-

tion and public finances, you should budget on the basis of your expenditure; you should not budget to get \$2,000,000 surplus. It is better to use the money than to say you want \$13,000,000 and then collect to get \$15,000,000. There is no point of your telling us that you want \$50 but you are only going to spend \$20. Many of us who have to pay Income Tax when the time comes around, have to get a loan so as to pay it. I do not like the idea of your budgeting for a surplus of \$759,759, and it turns out to be \$2,000,000. That amount of money is what we can put in for the Deep Water Harbour. The way the Hon. Minister of Finance has put it, suggested that all has been done and all has been known already in this matter; that is not true. The money for the Deep Water Harbour was not in the Five Year Plan. You never even had it down as one of the things you intended to do in this Five Year Period; you put it down now in this Schedule, and you have not even gone into the entire financing of the scheme. You have not even decided if you want two instead of three berths, or one instead of three.

If the idea is that you must borrow money here to let the people in London see that you are going on with your scheme, we can do that; but if you are borrowing a certain amount of money and you cannot raise all of it here, you will still have to go to the money market in London. I feel that this amount of money could have been spared at this time. The hon. member who introduced this Bill cannot tell us anything today, because he said that in order to do so he would have to be a prophet; but he would have to be a prophet because you have to prognosticate the position of a Government. It is within your province to say something because we want to know what has led you to bring forward this proposal.

9.40 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I believe the views on this entire matter, (at least the views of the official Opposition) have already been expressed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in this Assembly. I hope the Hon. Minister will pay attention to what I am saying; I believe I can apply a little commonsense here. I quite agree that we must borrow money; I differ substantially from many hon. members who have already spoken in the views which they have expressed. I want to ask one or two questions, and I sincerely hope I will be enlightened. I quite agree with the policy of borrowing this money, but the Hon. Premier has said that in order to borrow money on the English market or any other market we should first show that we at home have confidence in any scheme on which we are going to embark. I have heard from time to time views expressed relative to the savings of people and the investment of money locally. I suppose the Hon. Minister will be able to tell us if any attempt has been made to get the necessary permission, because I understand that permission must be granted before money can be borrowed for investments on schemes. I would like to know whether or not any attempt has been made to borrow this money and catch the rate. I heartily agree with the Hon. Premier that the matter is at a speculative stage, and therefore he cannot say what you can get either here in Barbados or in England. Do you know why that is so? What the hon. junior member for St. Peter has said is true; this country has been dealt a hard blow in England. We said we wanted to have a Financial Secretary in Barbados and I think it is bad for the Hon. Premier to get up in here and say what he has said; if you have somebody to advise you, surely you would know what amount you have to raise here; he could say that we expect to raise 15 per cent of the money in Bar-

bad. The Hon. Premier cannot tell us about that because he has not got any advice on it. I believe myself that in matters of this sort all sections of the community should be given the opportunity of contributing to them. If you take what happened in the United States during the War when they were issuing War Bonds, that is the position. You are going to raise a loan of \$20 million for the construction of a Deep Water Harbour, and you must raise money for a Housing Scheme; but it strikes me that this Government in power should not come in here and say "It is impossible for the Financial Secretary to advise us on any matters of this sort; now we want to get somebody to advise us." Anybody knows what happened during the War; we had a few financial wizards around here who could advise you what to do to feed the people. We have not yet got to the question of our savings here; we have Friendly Societies and so on. I am not laying down any policy; it is for the honourable gentlemen to formulate the policy. As a Socialist you should formulate a policy by which every man in the country should be part and parcel of a housing scheme; we can be advised as to what scheme can be embarked upon to which people can contribute from a dollar. You can raise \$200,000 and the money can be distributed among the people; you can work out an economic policy by which people can contribute individually. The Hon. Premier has always been a classical scholar; he knows nothing about finance, and that is not being offensive to Mr. Manley who is one of the greatest scholars in the West Indies.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the honourable member to keep to Clause 2 of this Bill and not to make any second reading speech.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Do not take any offense.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking you to keep to Clause 2.

9.50 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I expected that that would come! I said that everyone would speak and as soon as I got up, I would be asked to withdraw something. I am trying to make a reasonable speech; I am not generating any heat.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The time for that reasonable speech is past. We are all dealing with Clause 2.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It was not Clause 2 when the rest were speaking; that is why this House does not get any respect; people must watch this kind of thing. I am suggesting with the greatest respect, that the Hon. Premier knows nothing about finance. When I say that, I will also say that I know nothing about the humanities; that is his line; he was trained in that. He knows more than anyone else, that is why I say it is not intended as an insult.

I heartily agree with the Government and disagree with those members who say that you should not borrow. If you are going to develop this country for the benefit of posterity, let them assist in paying for it. I strongly suggest to him that if he has schemes totalling 20 million dollars, he should not come in this *ad hoc* way. If the Government gets an Economic Adviser they would be able to tell the House that there is the possibility of raising so much in Barbados over a period of so many years, judging from the national revenue and expenditure. If you carry out such a policy that the man with five dollars to buy his bonds cannot do so, the Government will stand indicted for not allowing every possible person to assist in the development of the

country. If you gave every man who has five dollars to his credit in the Savings Bank an opportunity to purchase it in bonds, you will have a better opportunity of saying to the outside world that you have faith in the schemes that you are embarking upon.

While I am on my feet, I will say that I have been watching carefully the things that are happening and I am pleased to hear that a Canadian concern had sufficient confidence in this country to make investments with the Government of Barbados; but I suggest to the Government to get an Economic Adviser. What always struck me was that during the War, every single soul trading in this country had their profits controlled; but the only people whom you did not control in that way were Barclays and the other Banks. People's profits were reduced; and although the cost of goods went up by hundreds per cent, the Bank rate remained the same as well as the interest upon savings.

I am supporting the passing of the section, but we must ask certain questions. I am not a financial expert; I am in the same position as the hon. members of the Government. I agree with them that we cannot very well raise a loan if we are going to demand three per cent. or three and a half per cent. interest, or four per cent. I consider it very dangerous to say that you are speculating without the advice of people scientifically trained in such matters. I would be among the first people on the Opposition who would agree with you if you decided to bring down an economic expert before embarking on these schemes totalling 20 million dollars. You bring down experts when you are dealing with sums far less than that, and with matters of far less importance.

The old saying that the shoemaker should stick to his lathe is correct. There are people who have studied economics to such an extent, that after four weeks in Barbados, they would be able to advise you as to along what lines you should go. I am sure that the Premier will tell me that before you could impress the English Market you had to have confidence in your own undertaking. Can the Premier tell this House that it is the policy of the Government to seek the advice of an Economic Expert to put up suggestions as to how best to give every man in this country who would put savings in the Bank to get 3 per cent on them, an opportunity to invest five dollars in the Government and get 5 per cent? The only value of money is to be able to use it when you want it. Some people do not have a cent, but they have the name and they can use the money in the bank when they want to use it. If a man has money to put in the Savings Bank and he can invest it in the Government and get five per cent on it, that is what he wants. Do not sit and say that you have an incompetent person; (I do not mean incompetent from the point of view of keeping books, but from the point of view of being able to advise the Government properly) it would be better to come and say that you want someone to advise the Government economically than to have someone there drawing a big salary and leaving the Premier in a position like this.

10.00 p.m.

Do not expect him as Minister of Education, Finance and all those things to be able to tell you everything on this matter; he should have his Financial Secretary to give him chapter and verse on this matter. You must improve Barbados, and in order to do so it would take you a tremendous sum of money; therefore, you must let the coming generation assist in paying for it. I am suggesting that

the Hon. Minister of Finance has nobody to advise him in that matter. There are people who are experts in this line; there are experts in the economic science of running a Government, getting the money and seeing the best way to spend it.

I think on the whole that this loan of 6¼ million dollars is really speculative at the moment. You cannot say what is the interest you will have to pay on it, but I feel that just as this Government goes to the country campaigning for election, it can go to the country on this matter; every man, woman, and child can contribute to this loan. It is shocking to think that your Financial Secretary cannot tell you what are the savings of people in the various brackets; there are people in this country who can tell you anything on that right away. I am shocked that the Premier has not got that advice. I say again, (this is not a criticism) but I ask you again if any attempt is being made to do what I suggested relevant to savings here, and if any attempt is being made to give opportunity to the average working man to subscribe to this loan so that he can get interest of 4½% on his money instead of the 3% which he now gets from the Banks.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Lest anybody today believes what the hon. member says, I am going to say it is far from shocking that the Financial Secretary is not able to give that advice. To say that it is shocking for a Government official not to know the state of peoples' incomes, would be to say that he delves into peoples' incomes.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Excuse me sir, I have not said that. I said that he should know the savings of people in the various brackets. That is different from saying peoples' incomes. You know what are the savings of people from your Revenue; it is worked out and you know it in the various grades.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: It is too strong a thing to say of a Government official, in the sense that he is not a Bank Manager; he can only ask what is the money like. Every now and then I do hear Solicitors talking of how difficult it is to raise a loan, and then at another time they say they have a few thousand dollars but cannot get anybody to take it from them. The hon. senior member for the City said that the Financial Secretary could easily discover that by asking the Bank Managers and the people who know. I am also inclined to say that if you ask a couple of real estate agents they would know as well as Solicitors, because they have money to lend out too. Let me say that every single Government on earth must go to the Financiers and ask: "Is this a good time to borrow money?" People who write Financial Papers may know something of it because they move in those circles. They are sometimes as good as Bank Managers, because they are the people who can tell you when money is tied up or when it is free.

As regards the other point, I want to say that it is the policy of this Government that if the man in the street wants to subscribe his five dollars to the loan, he can do so. That is not just being political. You ought to know that in spite of the bricks and broken bottles which were thrown at us by people who when we first started said that we were going to run this country into bankruptcy, they have had sufficient faith in the future of Barbados to put every cent they have in with this Government. Using that knowledge which we have gained from the contribution to the last two Loan Funds, we think that this is a reasonable sum which we can raise.

As regards this policy we have not discussed that yet, though we may feel that if you can get money otherwise you should get it. However, that is

not a policy on which I can give you firm information. It is not enough to say bring in an expert Economist; if you bring the greatest Economist in the world into Barbados, he will have to do what the hon. member would have to do, that is, ask a Solicitor.

As regards the attitude of the Government, I hope I am not saying this too early, but two months ago I had certain discussions out of which, there is every good prospect of our getting a United Nations Economist here to give us advice with regard to the National Income. [VOICES: Hear! Hear!]

I have spoken to the Head of the United Nations Organization who deals with such matters, and I think I am not saying too much when I say we are likely to get a tip-top internationally famous Economist; but I will still say again, how can he tell what is your income without going to the Income Tax Commissioner and to the Bank Managers? It does not mean because he is an internationally famous Economist, that he can tell you how much money you are likely to raise if you want to raise a loan next month. I say again: it is not fair in saying those things; too often we are too near to our own people to appreciate their worth. I saw a lot of Mr. Petrie's work when he was our Financial Secretary, and there is no doubt that he had a good reputation.

I could not help laughing up my sleeve last March when an hon. member, (I think the hon. senior member for the City, but certainly the hon. junior member for St. James who always ridicules the Government for not being able to prepare a Memorandum on the Estimates) said that the one which was prepared on that year's Estimates was different from the others; he thought it was prepared in an Accountant's Office. It was all written by Mr. Burrowes, the very derided Financial Secretary. Hon. members are so often fond of throwing bricks. Let me say that he wrote every line of that Memorandum.

That was written by Mr. Burrowes the Financial Secretary who honourable members are so fond of throwing bricks at; but because Hon. Mr. Cuke is on the Executive Committee honourable members say that it was written by him.

10.10 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The only time I said that was when the late Governor Sir Alfred Savage wrote it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Sir Stafford Cripps never wrote his own budget. What is the point of having these people and paying them good salaries if they do not do the spade work. I must say that the honourable senior member for the City has used his remarks in such a way as to raise the level of the debate. I am not trying to drive any wedge between the ranks of the Opposition; there are so many wedges already driven there that I do not want to drive another one; but those are the arguments which have to be taken into consideration. The sum of \$40 million is to be raised in five years and we are merely saying that we should put an Act on the Statute Book, and when proper people tell us that it is the appropriate time to borrow money, then we will borrow it. We get the necessary advice as the Chancellor of the Exchequer gets his advice from the Financial Secretary.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not say that the Financial Secretary can tell you how much money you should actually borrow here, but he could tell you from what source you could draw and the amount you could draw. If the actual revenue of the colony is so much and it is known that you are spending so much for the necessities of life, these

things are done by the best brains of the colony. Those are things which I say anybody like a Financial Secretary will be able to give. You can say we are drawing from the actual savings in Barbados; do not fool yourself that you cannot say what you can borrow within 20% of what is coming from Barbados. You can say that on the savings in Barbados you can have so much money here; with the greatest respect to anybody who advises the Government I would ask these questions.

Mr. TUDOR: The Hon. Premier has been more helpful to us now than he has been before; but I should just like to know whether this money is to be raised locally or overseas.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have answered that question about three or four times already; we will get it from wherever we can. It is now a matter of less than academic interest to talk about shifting money from here and money from there. What has happened is that a woman would ask her solicitor whether he should take her money from one source and put it to another —

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, —

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am not giving way to the honourable member; he has asked me a question and I have answered it. I say that you must have some people who must know how much money there is knocking about the country, and you must use your judgement when they tell you about it. We will get the money from wherever we can.

Mr. TUDOR: I am still repeating the question; is this money to be raised locally or from overseas?

Hon. M. E. COX: Both.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Three minds but with a single thought.

Mr. LEWIS: One mind is blank! [Laughter.] 10.20 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: I wonder if anybody can say that the question which has been asked by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy has been answered? I say that for this reason: the Hon. Premier spoke about people going to Solicitors and so on, and the Hon. Minister of Communications has said that the money would be raised both locally and overseas, but I do not hold him responsible for that; he cannot be serious.

The senior member for St. Joseph is worried because three members who have the interest of the public at heart have gone into this matter carefully, and gave him an opportunity to show that he is acquainted with the portfolio which he holds. He talked nonsense about undergraduates this and that, and about from this sector to that sector. What the honourable senior member for the City wants to tell the House is that Mr. Money at Barclays Bank and the other Bank Managers and those other people whom in Barbados they may choose to consult, can tell whether under the provisions of this Act this money can be raised and at what rate of interest. I invite members to read the Bill that is before the House.

Clause 1 says that the Bill may be cited as the Local Loan Act, 1955. That clause has already been passed. Clause 2 says, "It shall be lawful for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to raise by the issue of debentures under the provisions of the General Local Loan Act, 1933 a sum not exceeding etc." Now there are two General Loan Acts. The Premier is Minister of Finance and when the honourable junior member for St. Lucy got up and asked what he did, the Premier should have been able to ask him. "Can't you read," as he is so fond of saying. But the Premier did not know himself.

Since he did not answer, I gave the honourable junior member for St. Lucy the privilege of getting up and asking the question. He asked the question twice; the Hon. Premier is now looking up the Act.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: That is not true. The honourable member saw me reading mine and he got a copy.

Mr. BARROW: Why then is he at Page 400 and not at Page 107 where he should be? I challenge him to open the book and say that he is not at Page 400. Now Section 2 of the General Local Loan Act, 1933, sets out that that Act shall be applicable only to loans raised locally in the island. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy asked the Premier twice whether the loan was to be raised overseas or locally and he could not answer.

When he comes to section 38 of the General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act found on Page 195 of Volume 5 of the Laws of Barbados which I presume the Premier has already read, he will find that this Act shall be applicable only to the raising of loans in England. In England, not just overseas. Therefore, if under the Bill before the House the Government have come for this money under the General Local Loan Act, they cannot raise any of that money in England at all.

The Minister of Communications said that it could be raised in other places; but he is accustomed to doing things illegally so he might attempt to do it. I got up and pointed out that it would be important to disclose this information about how much of the money they expected to raise from private investments which were already here, and from private investments which had been exported overseas, and which you would now call back into the colony; the Premier could not answer.

Further, the Premier says that Mr. Money at Barclays Bank (I cannot think of any higher authority in matters of this kind) and the Financial Secretary cannot tell us whether we have six and three quarter million dollars in Barbados. That is a serious indictment on the Financial Secretary and on the experts whom he gratuitously consults and insults at the same time by making remarks like that. That is the only import of the question raised by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy and the observations that I made before.

Here you have a Minister of Finance who is so fond of attacking people and the honourable junior member for St. Lucy leaving himself wide open to attack, opened to being asked "Can't you read!" The honourable member asked whether the loan is to be raised locally or overseas and all that the Premier had to ask him was, "Can't you read?" Can you not see that it is a Local Loan Act? But the Premier instead of asking that, talked about undergraduates and academic arguments.

It is very important to know if this money is to be raised locally; it is very important that members of the House should know. Granted that the Financial Secretary is so incompetent that he has to consult someone better qualified than himself? even if that is so, does it mean that the Minister of Finance of this colony is not even briefed by the Financial Secretary to the effect that this is a local loan? It means that after all the searching up and investigation, the Financial Secretary cannot tell the Minister of Finance that they told him so and so.

We asked how much it is estimated that there is hidden in old stockings and how much in the Bank, and how much is money that has been already invested year after year in this island: those are the things we wanted to know, and in that respect

one must not view the observations of the honourable junior member for the City to be as pointless as they might have appeared to be before the honourable junior member for St. Lucy gave the Premier an opportunity to expose himself as not having been carefully and thoroughly briefed in this particular matter, and having to search for the Act from the Index before him.

I say and still say, that he had this Act before him and could not reply to the honourable junior member for St. Lucy; and the Minister of Communications said that it was to be both a local and overseas loan when the Act says that it is a Local Loan Act, although Section 2 of the General Loan Act, 1933 forbids the Government to raise a loan overseas when they come for it under this Act. If you look at the General Local Loan Act, 1933, you see that it does not mention overseas at all.

That is the position now. Let him get up and abuse for the whole night; it will wash over my head like the waves around the breakwater at the Pier Head.

10.30 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I have a few matters to clear up. The Hon. Premier has included me in the distinguished company of Bachelors of Science; I have been accused of conniving with such members of this Chamber. However what I am going to say is, that Socialist Governments do not go to ask questions of Bank Managers or go to money markets; they control those things. The Hon. Premier will remember that when the Socialist Government of Great Britain was in power, and it wanted to nationalise certain things, the first thing it nationalised was the Bank of England. The only thing which this Government knows about banking is what you see in the Memorandum on the Five Year Plan; and that is, it is to bank \$1,000,000. It has increased the amount that has been deposited and is giving a higher rate of interest. I still maintain sir, (in spite of what I have heard from my colleagues, if I may call them so) that this is a capitalistic way of financing anything: for a Socialist Government to say that it raised \$2,000,000 last year, and it can raise \$6,000,000 this year by way of a loan from the people whom they are supposed to be taxing. There must be another method of getting this money. I am not saying you should not raise the loan at all; something is wrong; you should either get it in taxes or the people should be using it to develop the place in their own interest.

Mr. Chairman, it might serve a useful purpose if I read from Paragraphs 63, 64, and 65 of the Memorandum of the Five Year Plan of Development and taxation. This is headed Government Loans. It says:—"As stated earlier, there is presently an account designated "Advances pending the raising of loans" amounting to roughly \$2,000,000. It is proposed to endeavour to raise this amount locally in the immediate future."

"64. It is almost certain that the whole of the \$6,000,000 for the new loan programme will have to be raised overseas, although local investors should be given the opportunity to participate. The approval of Her Majesty's Government to the loan issue will have to be obtained."

"If the local loan (paragraph 63) is successful, it may not be necessary to raise an overseas loan for two or three years and then it may be possible to limit the issue to \$3,000,000 and give later consideration to the requirements of the situation."

"65. There are fairly substantial balances in various Government funds which seek investment overseas from time to time. It is prudent policy to spread such investment, but the Government con-

siders it would be legitimate and appropriate for a small part, say a quarter, of these funds to be invested in the proposed local and overseas loan. The matter is being investigated."

"In addition it is hoped that the banks operating in Barbados will give some support to the loans and also that the Caribbean Currency Board will consider a similar investment."

You have changed your tune entirely by what you are doing now. You are making this a local loan, and you have come for even more than \$6,000,000. Do not fool yourself about Insurance Companies in Canada which took up some of your last loans; do not forget that they are getting \$1.78 for your dollar; so it will pay them. If they say the economic recovery of the sterling area might improve to such an extent, it will pay them to send some out now. Not only that these Insurance Companies will have to pay 78c. to send out a dollar, and if they can get you to borrow it, of course they will lend you; that is what they have sucked out of the local people; it is not their own money; it is money which they get from the premiums which the people here are paying.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that so far as the Harbour Scheme is concerned, you should have a special Loan Act for that purpose. As the Hon. Premier himself has said, the people in England are willing to lend you money for that purpose. Why are you trying to inject into yourself some sort of confidence in the scheme by saying you are raising the sum of \$4,000,000 to invest in it; I do not see the sense in that at all. From the different scraps of information which you gave about it, you have said that they are willing to extend to you the facilities of the external bodies. That means that you will have to get permission from them to do so. You have also said that they have suggested to build a smaller harbour; but you have not said that if you decided to build a larger one, that they will not lend you the money. I do not see any sense of having something for this Harbour scheme in this Bill at all; it is only going to encourage you to borrow more money than you should. I would like to have an explanation of how this money for the Harbour scheme managed to be put into this Schedule. There is a sub-paragraph to paragraph 64, which says: "If the local loan (paragraph 63) is successful, it may not be necessary to raise an overseas loan for two or three years, and then it may be possible to limit the issue to \$3,000,000 and give later consideration to the requirements of the situation." That is what you have said.

The Hon. Premier is always willing to thank my colleague the honourable senior member for the City, for any suggestions he makes. He talks about poor people, and the way they will benefit if they are allowed to take up part of this loan. I do not know how they will benefit, because they will have to provide the interest which they pay themselves. If you wish the poor man to participate when the issue is advertised, you will have to regulate the denomination of the debenture; that is, you can make some £1,000, and some 10/-; the poor man will be able to participate by buying a 10/- debenture. I see greatness being thrust on this Government by the Government of Jamaica coming into the Eastern Currency division; I know that it is a plan of Mr. Manley to have a controlling Bank for the area: so we can look forward to that.

10.40 p.m.

Sir, the Hon. Premier has not told us whether he has made available to himself all the information he can get; and I quite agree with him that in the circumstances you will have to go outside for this

money, because there are outside influences controlling the finance. The Government does not control it because it is not socialistic enough to know how to do that. The Hon. Premier has not said what the information which he has got is, if he has gone around; he has not said whether he will get this \$6 million locally. Certainly when he got up just now he could have said that the information is so and so, but he has not said it. It is a mistake to say that you are acting as other people act; Mr. Butler is in a position to manipulate the Bank Rate, to make people spend their money, and so on. At any time he wants money he can see to it that it is left where he wants it; he can encourage spending and he can encourage saving; but the Barbados Government cannot do anything like that, so that they have to get their information in another way. I ask: are they getting this money locally or are they getting it from some Canadian Insurance Company who is lending so much and getting so much more for it?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Whether the honourable senior member for St. George speaks out or not, I have contributed to it by remaining silent when he profounded some of the most preposterous principles of law you could have heard; if I were to show the utter uselessness of the propositions which he makes in this House, a lot of his clients would leave him. The Local Loan Bill which we are passing tonight is in the usual form as other Loan Acts. Except for the sums of money and the items in the Schedule, it is in same form as the 1953 Act and it is the same as any other Act for this purpose. The hon. member has purported to say that I was lying and that I did not have a book open before me, but he meant to laugh at the Hon. Minister of Communications when the Hon. Minister said "both". Because the hon. member has been called to the Bar he is not a lawyer; he reads the law and does not understand it.

Mr. BARROW: I invited the hon. member to open the book and show me. I was merely pointing out that this is a Local Loan Bill, and I pointed out that the hon. member did not answer the hon. junior member for St. Lucy in the way I would expect him to answer. However I am asking the Hon. Premier to withdraw that.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I withdraw it.

Mr. BARROW: Well, do not do that at all man! The next time he does that Mr. Chairman, I will not appeal to you.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not fight—

Mr. BARROW: Is the hon. member inviting me to fight now?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not mean a physical fight. I might be quoted again and again; but if I were to correct the hon. member's bad law over and over again, what sort of practice would he have? He tried to suggest that we do not know what we are doing, but I started out by saying that this is the usual Local Loan Bill. The hon. member is being instructed by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy who once had been to the Middle Temple! It is not because Ministers are attacked that they are wrong; they may be wrong in not answering back. The word "local" fools the layman who thinks that you are only collecting money locally; so he gets up and asks whether we intend to raise this money locally or otherwise. He gets up again and I replied that we hope to get money both locally and overseas. Not content with that hon. members discovered that the word "locally" was used and therefore the Premier does not know what it means. On the next occasion the hon. member opens a law book and sees something he should ask the hon. senior member for St. Lucy what it means before he gives a legal opinion. From the last \$2 million loan we can reason-

ably hope in the next five years (God knows what will happen in the next five years) to raise \$6,720,000. Some of the provision is in the next three years, some in the fifth year and so on; but as things have been going, the time in which we collected \$2 million it looks as if we can borrow \$6,720,000. How can we tell how many old stockings there are with some old sovereigns tied up in them? We can only say that by the way in which we collected these two portions of our money, we feel that we are not overdoing it if we say that we can raise this \$6,720,000.

I went on to say that people outside who had some sort of faith in Barbados, will take up some of the loan as they did before. The hon. member proceeded to make out what a wonderful lawyer he is; I will say no more about that. All of us were once young, and possibly sometimes some of us might have been over enthusiastic and over optimistic. I suppose that it is a question of a person's disposition; but some of us although young, or when we were young, still insert a saving clause in what we say. It is not for me to teach the hon. member how to grow up.

I suppose that I do owe the hon. junior member for the City some answer. But I have talked so much that I might have forgotten what his point was. If he has not been answered and he asks the question again, I will be glad to give him some answer.

10.50 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Premier said that as far as this Bill was concerned, anyone from overseas could send here to X, Y or Z. That means that this money can be raised in that way. But can we actually go to the London Market for this money?

Mr. BARROW: I just want to say this: before I sat down I said that I knew the Premier would try to wriggle out of it, and try to abuse people. It is strange that if he was so fully seized with the facts of the matter he did not get up and answer the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

In an impoverished island like Barbados, we are asked to believe that we have six and three quarter million dollars lying down hidden in old stockings, while when we wanted six million dollars it was an overseas loan. The Premier now admits that this is a local loan which I feel was not intended, but is due to the ineptitude of someone in the Administration and an oversight on the part of the Executive; because the hon. senior member for St. Michael said it was to be raised both locally and overseas; and the Premier, even attacked the hon. junior member for St. Lucy for sneering at the Minister of Communications.

I pointed out that if this loan was raised both locally and overseas it would be illegal, because it definitely says that it only applies to Barbados. I can well see in advance how the Government is going to get out of this; they will come back to the House under the General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act and say they were over optimistic over the amount they could raise locally; they can only raise two million dollars locally and therefore they have to go overseas. Within six months they will come back and say that.

It seems to me that all the strictures made by the hon. junior member for the City are now justified; the Government has been caught in the net of its own contradictions. At the time of the Five Year Plan they said they anticipated they could raise two million dollars locally, and that there would be a further loan of six million dollars which would be raised overseas—in other words raised in London. Do not mind the diatribe which we hear; that is

only for the gallery; we are talking about serious finance, not undergraduate finance.

What was significant was the way in which the Minister of Finance was manoeuvred into making the admissions that he has now made. We merely asked questions and pointed out that this was a local loan, there being the possibility that the Government might have been inspired by the response of the general public in 1953, and had now become convinced that there was a large surplus of uninvested savings hidden away in old stockings, tin tots and in sundry other corners throughout the length and breadth of the island; and that therefore the prognostications made in 1951 were incorrect as to the extent to which it would be necessary to raise this money overseas. But the Five Year Plan said it was to be an overseas loan.

Surely one would have expected that either in the introductory remarks of the Premier himself and in any case as a result of the questioning of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, that the Premier, having been fully seized of all the facts and the law, being such a superior being in matters financial and legal, would have said to members of the House that the Government have made a substantial change in the policy laid down in the Five Year Plan, because they had information (and that is where the points made by the hon. senior member for the City were relevant) they had certain information on the strength of which they changed from an overseas loan to a local loan.

The Premier has become so enmeshed in the illogicality of his own arguments which were for the purpose of stifling the debate rather than enlightening the House and the general public, how can we stand for that behaviour if we have any sense of political morality? I only hope for a full copy of these Debates, so that the people in London, in New York and in Washington and people in high Government circles in this island can fully study the Debates which take place on this floor of this House, and see whether a Minister or anyone is justified in getting up and making remarks which he does not intend to substantiate and which he immediately withdraws, and which do not deal with the important financial business of the Government in a fit and proper manner.

The Minister said that the money can come from overseas. Has he ever heard of the Capital Issues Committee? I will refer him back to Paragraph 63 and onwards of the Five Year Plan; let him read that and then deny that what I say is wrong. Did not the Minister say when he presented that Plan that they would have to go and ask the British Government for permission to raise the \$6,000,000 loan? That is all I want to know.

Look at paragraph 63; go down the page and see whether that was not stated. I am speaking from memory; I cannot profess like the Hon. Premier that I have it in front of me. Is not it important that having stated that you were going to borrow \$6,000,000 from overseas and now you are saying you are going to raise it locally? Does it mean so little to you when you change the whole policy of raising this money from an overseas loan to a local loan which would have a direct bearing on the economy and level of employment in this island? You are making an important change like that, and apart from the vulgar abuse which you have given vent to, you do not think it necessary to answer that question. Whatever I say, I can stand up like a man and give chapter and verse to justify it. Is he telling me that because I drew attention to the provision of the Local Loan Act of 1953 that my interpretation of that law of Barbados is wrong? Is he saying that

this is an overseas loan or that this in the final analysis must come out of the investments of this island? Is it as problematical as he is saying it; as if a fairy would come and wave a wand and drop a pot of gold? Does he realise that the Capital Issues Committee has been the one stumbling block in the way of colonial territories for a very long time? Does he know that not even a company in England can set up a branch in Barbados without the sanction of the Capital Issues Committee, far less to export money to Barbados. He is the Minister of Finance so he should know all of those things. He can only show off his vocabulary of abuse; he cannot show off his vocabulary of financial issues. He knows neither the nature nor the quality of what he is doing; he does not know right or wrong. He says he wants a fight; I will enjoy it. He attacks my reputation and my ability in my profession, but he has no profession to stand up to, and he has to withdraw it. He is saying, and he has said it so often that I should be in the Almshouse already. He said he does not want to do so and so; but there are times he does not want to do so and so. Despite the fact he got in Queen's Park and said, "you were starving—"

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is time the honourable member stop that and speak on Clause 2.

Mr. BARROW: When you look at Clause 2, Mr. Chairman, the facts are that this is still a general local loan Bill whether you like it or not. A lot of people will probably feel, and with some justification, that their money is in the Banks, but that is not true. In England only 8% of the people's money is actually kept in the Banks, the balance is invested from time to time. At one time just before the War they did not even have 8% in the Banks and they had to pass a special Act regulating that the ratio of cash which should be in the Banks should not fall below 8% of the amount which was put in. The whole secret of this is, that Banks make money by lending out your money, not their money. Of course this is not any object lesson in the theory of banking, but I would say that 6½ million dollars can hardly be in the Banks of this colony, at least not for long term loans. The Hon. Minister has not told us that the Solicitors who advise him on matters of finance, have in their possession something to show that a loan of 6¾ million dollars could be raised locally. I doubt whether \$670,000 can be raised locally from the aggregate funds available to Solicitors. Is this Government suggesting that the money is in mattresses and old tots. I wonder if its Solicitors have come to that conclusion. If the Hon. Minister of Finance does not want to speculate, he should not change from an overseas loan to a local loan. The whole difficulty about this thing is that the Government has got down into a morass of ineptitude. We have a lot of highly qualified West Indians not necessarily in Barbados, who would do this job much better than it is now being done by those who are advising the Government. They will come here and do the job if you pay them money; but this Government does not want them, and for the simple reason that they do not think people like you and I should have a privileged position such as that. It is a fact that you can get highly qualified West Indians to do this job. There are people within the area like certain Civil Servants in Jamaica; I do not care to call their names; the Ministers know well to whom I have referred. Some of them have displayed their ability at conferences. The Trinidad Civil Service is overcrowded with financial wizards who would be glad to get a job like this one in Barbados. Even in Grenada you get the odd genius

turning up in this sphere. We want somebody like the Adjutant of the Volunteer Force to do it; we will give him the job and then say how loyal we are, but that is not getting us anywhere at all. That is why you are getting so much incompetence in this administration, as can be seen in Bills which are being placed before members in this Chamber from time to time. I want the Hon. Minister of Finance to read it over again; I am inviting him to read it three times for a better understanding and then let him answer me. When the Hon. Minister finishes abusing me for the fourth time, perhaps we can get the answer to this question.  
11.10 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. member has spoken at great length and he has accused the Government of having a distinct policy in the Five Year Plan for getting this Loan overseas, and it would mean our passing a law saying on what terms we would get this money and going to London and being told on what terms to get it. I did not answer the hon. junior member for St. Lucy first, but the whole tenor of my address this afternoon, is that you are passing this Local Loan Bill but we hope to get some money from abroad. Now he accused the Government of talking about \$2 million being overseas; whereas the position is just the reverse, because we have not said that we are taking \$2 million locally and \$6 million overseas in the sense that you have to go to London and ask to be allowed to borrow money. I will go through the Five Year Plan paragraph by paragraph. We started out by saying this in the Five Year Plan:

"The solution cannot be complete, but the Government considers that a bold plan of development is essential at this stage. It recognises that the Plan will to a great extent depend on the ability of the Government to raise Loan Funds both in the Island and overseas. It is essential therefore that the Plan should give confidence to investors, otherwise underwriters would not sponsor a loan issue—except perhaps at rates uneconomic to the Government." That is clear. If you go to London or Canada to borrow money—if you go from outside the sterling area you must, unless you can create confidence, pay 5 or 6%. Then paragraph 7 of the Memorandum begins "The plan of development must be linked with taxation proposals" and so on, then over the page at paragraph 9 of the memorandum we say this:

"Taking into consideration the present known commitments of the Government and the recurrent costs of the plan, the Government proposes to obtain by additional revenue (\$1,500,000) and by decreased expenditure (\$615,125), a total amount of the order of \$2,100,000 a year. The position will have to be reviewed in January, 1955."

We pass by oil in the next paragraph and we come to the Deep Water Harbour which is paragraph 12. Now on page 4 of the Memorandum this is what we say at paragraph 25:—

"The supplementary expenditure proposals for 1952—53 will be submitted at an early date.

Then paragraph 26:—

"It is hoped to raise a loan of \$2,000,000 locally to cover the loan expenditure presently charged to an Advances Account. It will not be necessary or expedient to raise at once the additional proposed loan expenditure approximating \$6,000,000. At this stage, it appears that the new loan proposals could be financed during the next two years from Government funds and by short-term borrowing, but it will be necessary to keep the cash position continually under review."

Show me the declaration that \$2,000,000 will be raised from local funds which, I repeat might be

coming from Trinidad, Canada or anywhere else? Up to that page of the Memorandum is there any suggestion that we are laying down a definite policy that we are going abroad?

Mr. BARROW: I did not ask the hon. Premier to read the Memorandum on the Five Year Plan; I told him to go straight to paragraph 63. I did not tell him to go through the Memorandum page by page; I told him to open the book and stop me if I am wrong. I told him to go to paragraph 63 and read it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Some lawyers like to tell people how to run their case, that is why they always remain at the bottom round of the ladder. I promised the Committee to show that no where in the Five year Plan have we specifically said that \$2,000,000 would be raised locally and that we would go abroad for \$6,000,000. For the benefit of honourable members of the Committee who are not interrupting me—You can see how the mind of the hon. senior member for St. George works. Long before the hon. member got to paragraph 62 I had paragraph 63 before me. You hear a sentence coming out of the hon. member's mouth and you can bet what the next sentence is. On page 4 of the Memorandum we pointed out that it is hoped to raise this money locally and so on, and that it will be necessary to keep the cash position continually under review. That was the attitude of the Government. [Mr. BARROW: Go to paragraphs 63 and 64]. In spite of the interruption, I will say there is nothing I will read which will not be relative to the matter.

Mr. LEWIS: Read paragraph 27.

11.20 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I will read paragraphs 27, 63 and 64.

Paragraph 27 says, that special arrangements will have to be made regarding the financing of the Harbour Scheme; what is wrong with that? The hon. senior member for St. George said that we were going abroad for \$6,000,000. Paragraph 63, of the Five Year Plan states: "As stated earlier, there is presently an account designated "Advances pending the raising of loans" amounting to roughly \$2,000,000. It is proposed to endeavour to raise this amount locally in the immediate future."

Section 64, says that "It is almost certain that the whole of the \$6,000,000 for the new loan programme will have to be raised overseas although local investors should be given the opportunity to participate." Tell me how does that mean that there is a decided policy that we will go overseas and not locally. The section goes on to say that, "the approval of Her Majesty's Government to the loan issue will have to be obtained."

What is the use of suggesting that perhaps I never heard of the Capital Issues Committee? None of us should be a member of the House if we did not know of that. [Mr. BARROW: Ask Cox if he knows!] (Laughter). I am going carefully. Paragraph 64 continues, "If the local loan (paragraph 63) is successful, it may not be necessary to raise an overseas loan for two or three years and then it may be possible to limit the issue to \$3,000,000 and give later consideration to the requirements of the situation."

Then we come to Paragraph 65, which says, Government funds which seek investment overseas from time to time. It is prudent policy to spread such investment, but the Government considers it would be legitimate and appropriate for a small part, say a quarter of these funds to be invested in the proposed local and overseas loan. The matter is being investigated."

When we wrote that we were being careful. How could we tell what would happen two or three years, let alone five years hence? In 1952, we were saying that advances pending the raising of loans amounted to roughly \$2,000,000, and it was proposed to endeavour to raise the amount locally in the near future. I repeat, that in 1952, we were only talking about \$10,000,000 a year; we said that we could not obviously raise it all locally, but we must give local people an opportunity of participating. Then the hon. member gets up and says that we are departing from the principle laid down that we borrow \$2,000,000 locally and go overseas as distinct from issuing a local loan of \$6,000,000; where did we make a pronouncement to that effect?

The original confusion came from the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and the hon. senior member for St. Lucy and the hon. senior member for St. George reading the words "local loan" and thinking that you could not take money from people abroad who wanted to invest it in Barbados. Because the hon. members read the words "local loan" they rejoiced; but they are two vastly different things. We publish in the newspapers, print debenture forms, and ask people to take them up. So far we have not changed the Act, but I can well see if it is possible to lower it from the £10 that appears in the Act and change it to \$5. It may be feasible to change it because there may be some people who can only raise \$5 and who do not choose to go into a combination with nine others to raise \$50 between them. There is a vast difference between printing debentures, calling for people to take them up, setting out the terms under which you expect to get the money, and going to London and having to listen to the terms under which other people are willing to lend.

I got up, Mr. Chairman, purely to point out to members of the Committee that far from our having a specific policy from which we are now departing, it would not have mattered two pence if in 1952 we felt that we would not have to go abroad and if we felt differently now. But we did not say such a thing. In 1955, accordingly to the information we have got, we think that in five year's time we can borrow \$6,700,000, and we will do so whenever possible and according to how the necessity for borrowing arises.

Who would be happier than members of the Government to drop everything we had written here, if we had a wind-fall and did not have to rely on borrowing or on taxes? But we were careful to point out that we could not guess so far ahead and therefore, we will keep the situation under review.

Mr. Chairman, even if I am tempted to speak again, wild horses will not make me speak again.

Mr. LEWIS: While the Premier was speaking, I was thinking what a pleasure it would be to hear him on the other side reading those same words and putting the emphasis where it belongs.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I do not care if the hon. member answers me or not. I spoke about this Deep Water Harbour. I repeat that all the Five Year Plan says about the Deep Water Harbour is that special arrangements will have to be made regarding the financing of the Harbour Scheme; that is what I want to tell members of the Government. There is no place in the Five Year Plan, even in the relation to the \$6,000,000 that we are dealing with, that the Deep Water Harbour is mentioned. In the plan we see mention made of the Barbados Development Board, \$1,000,000; the Peasants Loan Bank, \$150,000; Motor Tractors, \$120,000; Pig Breeding, \$6,000; the Mental Hospital Farm, \$33,000; etc. Then there are schemes under investigation such as a Central Milk Depot, an Abattoir and Cold Storage etc.

Now, it goes on to say what you propose to do under these heads; which meant that the \$6,000,000 was going to be used to finance those schemes that the Government put in the Five Year Plan in such detail. On the other hand there was no mention in the Five Year Plan that you were going to borrow money under that plan for the Harbour Scheme. If the Government is amending the Five Year Plan let them say so. Do not tell us on one occasion that you cannot do anything apart from what is in the Five Year Plan unless you find oil, and then tell us something else on another occasion. Find oil where? There is oil lots of places.

11.30 p.m.

You have not struck any oil yet, but you have in this Schedule to this Bill \$1,920,000 for the Deep Water Harbour Scheme. Why have you put that in this Five Year Development Programme? You said in your Five Year Development Plan that you were going to raise a loan of \$6,000,000, to do certain things. What are the things in that plan that you do not propose to do, now that you are going to implement the Deep Water Harbour Scheme? You must have left out some things to do that. The Hon. Minister said, that there are other schemes which were not in the Five Year Plan; you cannot have a Five Year Programme which you put as a guide to the Legislature and the public, and then within the period you change it and do not say the reasons why you amended your schemes. It is our intention now to amend the loan scheme for 6¾ million dollars. You said in the Five Year Plan that you intended to have a Capital programme of \$16,500,000, and you intended to make it up in this way:—

|                          |       |              |
|--------------------------|-------|--------------|
| (a) Loan Funds           | .. .. | \$6,000,000  |
| (b) Available Funds      |       |              |
| (i) General              | .. .. | 6,500,000    |
| (ii) Labour Welfare Fund |       | 3,500,000    |
| (iii) Special Funds      | .. .. | 500,000      |
|                          |       | <hr/>        |
|                          |       | \$16,500,000 |

You have raised a loan of \$2,000,000 already. You now say you are going to raise another loan of \$6¾ million, and you are raising it in a different way from what you said in your previous plan; yet you are saying that it needs no explanation. It means that anything which you have written in the Memorandum on the Five Year Plan of Development and Taxation does not worth the paper on which it was written. You have not said to-day, what are the things you propose to leave out of your original plan. How can you put in something for the Deep Water Harbour Scheme and still carry out the other things which you intend to do in the Five Year Plan? It is clear that you do not intend to carry out all that you have said before.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, for all that the Hon. Premier has said (I mean all with the exception of the vile abuse of certain hon. members) this House need not have any fear about the financing of the Deep Water Harbour. Clearly, from the extract, the emphasis is for an overseas loan to finance that project. I therefore, beg to move the following amendment that in Clause 2, Section 1, lines 4 and 5 the following words be deleted "six million, seven hundred and twenty thousand dollars", and the following be substituted "five million dollars."

Mr. BARROW: I have already talked a lot, Mr. Chairman, but I will have to say something more. This is going to materially affect the future debates in this House, because the Five Year Plan

was for an expenditure in the vicinity of \$16,000,000. Now, we are told we are going to have to make provision for the Deep Water Harbour Scheme and other Developments and Welfare Schemes totalling \$40,000,000. I was one of the first persons who said, that we should have a Deep Water Harbour, and the proposals by your Development co-operation were clearly set out. The implication is that the taxpayers are going to be involved in a recurrent expenditure of some \$1,800,000 if we are going to raise \$40,000,000 at 4½%. [A VOICE: Who said that?] Where are we going to get it from then? However, I do not want them to think that the mere fact that they brought down a Bill here tonight, the first item of which is for an amount of \$1,920,000 or £400,000 for the Deep Water Harbour Scheme, that it would mean if they come down with any bogus or fantastic scheme for it they will get support on the ground that we have voted this token amount for it. The Government itself said (whether they said it advisably or after mature consideration) that the Deep Water Harbour should be self-supporting and they would set up a Committee for that purpose. I have already made observation on the method of financing it. The Deep Water Harbour Scheme was not placed in the Five Year Plan. I am one who want to establish my position up to the hilt, and clearly. This is a most insidious way of bringing forward something and I do not want anyone to think that they can do it in this manner and get away with it. Full details have not been fully considered as regards the manner in which they proposed to implement this scheme; they have not been put forward in this House.

11.40 p.m.

It would be under the \$6 million overseas loan and I underlined the word overseas. The Development Board was there and that should have come even before the Five Year Plan itself. We are not quibbling about this loan, but this is not the proper way to start talking about the Deep Water Harbour. The first intimation that we got that the Government was building the East Coast road was in a debate on the Spa road, when they said that it was something to do with the East Coast Road; no indication has been given in this House by the Government that they intended to build the East Coast Road until the matter of the Spa Road came up, and now they mention the Deep Water Harbour when they are floating a \$6 million overseas loan. Why come

with this loan when you have always regarded the Deep Water Harbour as a separate and distinct project, and one which must be financed independently because you went so far as to say "I do not see the feasibility of it that it will be a self-supporting proposition." My only purpose in rising again is to protect the right of members of this House whenever this matter comes up to agree or disagree with the specific recommendations which are put before this House.

*The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Clause 3 was called and passed.*

*The Schedule was called and agreed to.*

*The Preamble was called and passed.*

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

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

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

### ADJOURNMENT

*The Order Paper having been fixed,*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, we propose to start the Estimates at the next meeting of this House; and in view of the fact that the Hon. Premier has to go to Trinidad on the 13th instant to attend the Federation Conference, we propose to sit as often as we can in order to get through the Estimates before the 13th instant. There is a thin House now, but I wanted to say that in order to get through the Estimates, we would sit at 12 o'clock noon next Tuesday. However, I think we should leave the hour at 3 o'clock p.m. for next Tuesday, and after Tuesday the House will decide whether we will sit at 12 o'clock noon on other days. I now beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week at 3 o'clock p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

*The question that this House do now adjourn until this day week at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.*

11.52 p.m.