

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 1st March, 1955.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G. Q.C., B.A., (*Premier*), 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., (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E., Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. T. O. BRYAN, Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. O. T. ALLDER, Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.

Prayers were read.

Messrs. CRAWFORD, E. D. MOTTLEY and J. C. MOTTLEY 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 ready for confirmation.

PAPERS LAID

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Scheme of Government for the Barbados Technical Institute.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Report of the Cane Fire Board 1954.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled "The Public Health (Yellow Fever) Regulations, 1955."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to sanction the Scheme of Government for the Barbados Technical Institute.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to consolidate the Laws of this Island relating to the Representation of the People.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. G. H. Adams, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, the Bill to consolidate the Laws of this Island relating to the Representation of the People, was read a first time.

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

PRIVILEGE

Re Minister of Communications

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, before the business of the House is begun, I wish to draw the attention of Your Honour and members of this House to the fact that on January 18 last, a vote of censure was passed on the Minister of Communications Works and Housing by the reduction of \$1 in a Resolution which came within the compass of the Minister's portfolio. I also wish to draw to the attention of the Head of the Administration, the grave disquiet of this House at the retention of office by this Minister, after a vote of censure was passed on him; an indirect violation of the constitutional conventions which must govern the tenure of his office. Having done my duty in drawing this matter to the attention of the House, I wish to draw it to the attention of the Administration and all persons responsible and I hope it will not be necessary to take this matter to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. [Hon. M. E. COX: He would not care two hoots!] I hope that His Excellency will continue to maintain those necessary characteristics that are associated with office—impartiality, strength, and an inability to be influenced by the party in power and so enable the constitutional practice of this island to continue. I am sure that His Excellency—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member reading from a document?
3.25 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: No, sir, I am just reading from notes; I am not reading from any document. I was saying sir: I am sure that His Excellency will proceed in the assurance that the public is gravely concerned by what appears to be a deliberate attempt to flout the wishes of this House; in the manner that the Minister of Communications retains his office though a vote of censure has been passed by this House on that Department.

At the opening of the Legislature on the occasion of the inauguration of Ministerial Government, the Head of the Administration clearly stated that we were proceeding on a new form of Government; and he felt that it was incumbent on himself and the Ministers to maintain the constitutional practices as adopted in Great Britain. It was stated that we did not have a written constitution; and because of that, we had asked that we continue our development in the manner that we have always done, and similar to the manner in Great Britain.

We are proud of that; but on that occasion His Excellency made it quite clear that the Ministers had to abide by the conventions that existed in England. In the passing of the census on the Minister on the 18th January, it was made very clear by the honourable senior member for St. Philip that the reduction of the vote by \$1 was because of the concern that this House felt with regards the department under the Minister's administration.

I will go one step further and say, that the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, Minister of Social Services, after hearing the debate at great length, stated to the House that he was prepared to investigate the matter relative to this department; and that it was a matter of great concern to the Government. It was after that statement from the Minister of Social Services that the hon. senior member for St. Philip was prepared to withdraw his motion and to give the Government the opportunity to investigate this department; but after the Minister's refusal to give an assurance to do so, the senior member for St. Philip proceeded and in the most categorical terms stated that it was a vote of censure of the department. For that reason he moved the reduction and it was carried.

That is by the way. I am to-day drawing this matter to the attention of the Head of the Administration; and we do hope that just as I have drawn it to his attention, he will take the necessary action since we are following the conventions that exist in England. I hope sir, that if any debate takes place after this, you will direct the attention of members to the fact that it is only as a result of that censure that this debate may take place.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing before the House. The honourable member has given notice of his intention to do something. There can be no debate at this stage.

Mr. GODDARD: I have not given notice of my intention to do anything. I am raising a point of privilege of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is raising a point of privilege. I think that can be made quite clear; but until I reacquaint myself with the convention referred to, I will not allow any debate on this point of privilege; because I would be at a disadvantage if I am not really very much informed on and reacquainted with the convention referred to by the honourable junior member for Christ Church.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I will refresh your memory.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said that I must reacquaint further. I am ruling that; that is my Ruling. I do not intend to delay the matter or to stall the matter; but the raising of a point of privilege in relation to the convention referred to is a very important matter. I must, I repeat, as Speaker, reacquaint myself with the convention; and I am not in a position to do so immediately.

Mr. CRAWFORD: May I ask Your Honour at what time during today's sitting we may expect to hear from you on the matter?

Mr. SPEAKER: Possibly at no time today; it will take some study. The honourable member cannot attempt to precipitate me in any matter. This is no light matter; this affair may take great proportions; therefore I must be well informed by this convention referred to by the honourable member. As I have said, I do not intend to cast a stone in the way of any member of any section of this House in debating this matter. I want that point to be made quite clear in the minds of all honourable members. I must reacquaint myself with the convention. I have already tried to get certain information from my office in that respect.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not attempt to question Your Honour's Ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no point of questioning my Ruling. Honourable members will have a full opportunity to debate the matter after I have reacquainted myself with the convention. It should not be expected that I would be in a position to deal with this matter immediately, a matter of such tremendous importance, and which has been put upon me without notice. [VOICES: *Shame! Shame!*] it has been put upon me without notice. Therefore in my position, honourable members will understand that I must be well acquainted with the convention before I can allow any further debate on this point. That is without prejudice to any honourable member.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: No one questions anything which Your Honour has said. For my information I am trying to find out if before the business of the House is proceeded with, and the House is in session, whether it is not a matter of an honourable member's privilege to draw to the attention of the Speaker and the Chamber any matter of public importance. I am only thinking of the Rules of the House. As I take it, under the Rules of the House any member has the privilege of drawing the attention of the House to so and so before the business of the House is proceeded with.

As to what Your Honour's Ruling will be on the question raised, is a different matter. That is why, with the greatest respect to what Your Honour's Ruling might be, one wonders whether what the last speaker said was not partly misunderstood. I do not think that anyone should do anything without acquainting Your Honour; but I am thinking of the Rules of the House which say that a question of privilege takes precedence over any other business with which this Chamber must proceed.

Therefore, sir, every member who is elected to this House has a right, before Government or any other business is done, to draw any matter of public importance to the attention of the House; and I have seen it done on many occasions with Your Honour presiding. What I am saying is nothing to do with the point about Your Honour having to study the convention; it merely relates to the right of an honourable member to draw to the attention of the House something of public importance.

That privilege must take precedence over anything else which the House proposes to do. Under those circumstances it strikes me as being a question

of ruling whether an honourable member has a privilege such as I have referred to.
3.35 p.m.

I repeat, with the greatest respect for Your Honour's position that what I said has nothing to do with the question of Your Honour's Ruling. Whether Your Honour is right or wrong I have faith in Your Honour's Ruling; I believe Your Honour would do nothing to stifle debate. I felt that as soon as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition got through and after listening to you, that a wrong impression seemed to have been conveyed. I do not think the question of convention arose. Sir, it says here that on a point of Order and on a point of privilege, you can allow any member the opportunity of discussing anything under the sun. Rising under any of those, any member can so to speak, (using Parliamentary language), so long as the hon. member is not offending another member (and that is under Rule 82) that hon. member can speak. I think Your Honour has actually observed that Rule on other occasions in this House before Government business got under way, I have seen with Your Honour in the Chair, a debate take up the greater part of the day because it was of public interest. If Your Honour rules that because one member raises a question of some constitutional error under the new system of government, will Your Honour then say that because that matter was on a point of privilege, that no other member can in the same Session raise the same question? I am not attempting to argue anything about any convention. As Your Honour has intimated, I agree that it would take sometime for Your Honour to acquaint yourself with the convention. But that is not my point; my point is, whether it be a convention or no convention, a member is entitled to raise something on the floor of the House on a question of privilege, and to draw to other hon. members' attention something which in his opinion is of public importance. I feel, unless Your Honour otherwise rules after hearing me (which is something different in substance to Your Honour's Ruling) that as one representing a separate and distinct constituency that I should be permitted to draw to Your Honour's attention something which in my opinion, seems to concern the general public and to cause the public some concern.

Mr. Speaker, this is no question of making any motion; no question of passing any motion at all; no question of adjournment; it is merely a question of whether Your Honour will say that if a member for one constituency raises a matter of public importance, and he sits, that no other member has the right under the Rules of this House to ask and be granted the same privilege as the hon. member who claimed the privilege to raise the same question.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member is going to raise another question of privilege, will the hon. member state it? There is nothing before the House.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Your Honour having made a ruling in respect of what the hon. junior member for Christ Church brought to the attention of this House—

Mr. SPEAKER: What has the hon. member in mind? Will the hon. senior member for the City give the House more reasons as to his new point?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of Order. Before the hon. member begins his point, you will forgive me when I say even some lawyers read and do not understand.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of Order. I happened to be standing when Your Honour ruled.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier began to speak on a point of Order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I never heard him to say so.

Mr. SPEAKER: He did say so.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I rose on a point of order, and I am going to repeat what I said. I am not attempting to suggest anything which is a matter for Your Honour's ruling. If the hon. member can be so inconsistent as to say that he is in order, I have to point out that the only Rule which deals with that matter is Rule 73 and it reads as follows:—

"An urgent motion, directly concerning the privileges of the House, will take precedence of other motions as well as orders of the day."

Let us see before we get to Rule 73 what the matter means. If you go back to Rule 60 it says:—

"The orders of the day are to be disposed of in the order in which they stand upon the paper. Bills not proceeded with when called on in their order, to be ordered to be placed at the bottom of the Order Paper without questions put, unless excuse can be offered to the satisfaction of the House."

And then Rule 61 says:—

"Notices of motions not proceeded with when called on in their order, to be put at the bottom of the list of notices and motions unless excuse be offered to the satisfaction of the House. The House proceeds each day with 1st petitions; 2nd, giving notices of motions; 3rd, motions for leave of absence; 4th, unopposed motions for returns; 5th orders of the day and notices of motions as set down on the Order Paper."

3.45 p.m.

The House proceeds each day with 1st petitions; 2nd, giving notices of motions; 3rd, motions for leave of absence; 4th, unopposed motions for returns, which is a technical thing, (and I say nothing more about it) 5th, Orders of the Day, and then notices of motions as set down on the Order Paper. Then the next Rule reads "Any member desiring to give notice of a motion, may at any time before the meeting of the House enter his name on the notice paper to be kept by the Clerk, and the next Rule says "At the time for giving notices of motions, the precedence of each member whose name is on the notice paper, shall be determined by ballot, and his name will be called by Mr. Speaker accordingly." That has taken place in my time, not often it is true, but I think it was in the time of the question of lowering the franchise; and there were two of us who had opposite notices of motions, and the Speaker either had to rule or we had to ballot.

The next Rule says "A member whose name is called from the notice paper, may not give more than one notice of motion."

The next Rule, which is Rule 65, says "After all the names have been called from the notice paper, members who have already given a notice as well as other members may give notice of motions."

Then Rule 66 says: "Every member in giving notice of a motion, is to deliver at the table a copy of such notice, fairly written, together with his name."

Your Honour, it has amazed me. Under a constitutional convention or rather under a convention of decency, with a motion of this sort, one would have expected the Hon. Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Is this a point of Order? The honourable member has no more right to do that than any other member. That is not a point of Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is speaking on a point of Order. That is the only way in which he could speak. The honourable member is getting on with his point of Order. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: When he speaks about decency, that is not a point of Order. If the honourable member goes on, everybody will continue like that].

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for the City will now cease from making such loud asides or be named.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I shall endeavour to be as calm as possible. I am merely drawing attention to Rule 66, which says that a member has not only to give notice of a motion, but he has to write it out; and I merely add that in a matter of this supreme importance, the first time that it has taken place since we have had Ministerial Status, imagine my doing something without notifying Your Honour. [A VOICE: I am prepared to defend any decision or any remark.] What the honourable junior member for Christ Church, or the hon. member for the City attempted to do is entirely out of order; because the notice of motion should have been written out and left with the Clerk of the House to take its course. If it is a point of privilege, that motion should have been made and left with the Clerk. The Rule says that you have to give notice of motion and the Orders of the Day are dealt with in this and that manner.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member has developed that point.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If the hon. member is referring to Rule 72, it must be a motion made in the proper way and left with the Clerk; it must be put on the Notice Paper clearly written and in the name of the honourable member. None of those things has been done.

Mr. LEWIS: I am speaking on that point of Order. I would just like to say that we are in a new phase of this constitutional business, and there is no rule governing this particular point. However, if the honourable member had got down as far as Rule 70 or 80, (I think it is) he would have seen that if a question of privilege arises, that can interrupt any business in the House. This is something which is entirely new and we have to take it as it is. I would like to say that I have been rather apprehensive about what I have heard; and in case of any illness to yourself I might be involved; therefore I think that this is the time to hear both the *pros* and *cons* of this matter, so that when you refer to what is written, to the reference which you intend to make, you will have the points made in one way and in the other, so that you might read it as a judge might read the law to which a case refers.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member is not disposed to think that I intend to stifle debate on the matter.

Mr. LEWIS: Nothing like that Sir, I merely say that what Your Honour referred to as a constitutional instrument, it would be well to know what is said for and against the points which have been raised, so that you may consider them as a case. If you merely read up this matter and then come back here and hear the *pros* and *cons* of the points raised, then you might be placed at a disadvantage. Your Honour will do well to hear the points which are raised first and then look up the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hold the other view.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: My raising a point of privilege—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member has satisfied the House that he is somewhat anxious over a breach of privilege of this House. The House is absolutely clear as to the particular point he is raising. I would like to know if the honourable member is simply reiterating what the honourable junior member for Christ Church has said, or if he is making a new point. If he is simply reiterating what the honourable member for Christ Church has said, then he is out of Order; because I have ruled against that. Honourable members will readily understand that

with the introduction of the Ministerial Status this point of privilege has now come about. It is a tremendous innovation; and therefore, I say, I must give myself the opportunity to be able to examine the convention and see if there is really a point of privilege. I am insisting upon that, and the honourable member of Christ Church has understood that. Unless the honourable senior member for the City is making a new point I am ruling him out of Order. That is the end of the matter so far as the honourable member is concerned.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am not raising any question of privileges relative to Ministerial Status—

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the honourable member raising?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It is a point of privilege for any member of this House to draw to Your Honour's attention what has happened.

3.55 pm.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a question directed to the Chair. It will be answered privately, and not in this whole House.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The point—

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a question that will be answered privately. I will examine the matter and keep the honourable member informed with every point; but it does not concern this House.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not quite follow Your Honour. As I said when I was speaking just now, Your Honour allowed the Hon. and learned Premier to make a point of Order, drawing your attention to certain Rules of the House. I thoroughly disagreed with the point that he raised. I was not raising my point under any of those Rules, and I must respectfully try to suggest to Your Honour under what Rules I would be raising my point. I want to assure you that I am not raising any point under Rule 172. What I am saying is, that honourable members have a certain right and that right applies to every member; I have seen that right exercised on many occasions with Your Honour presiding. What I am saying is nothing to do with any terms of the House, but with my interpretation of a Rule dealing with the privilege of a member.

I quite agree that Your Honour must look up the honourable member's point and study it as far as a convention is concerned; I also agree that it will take some time to do so. The point I am raising is whether an individual member does not have the right to raise a question of public importance in the manner I have described. Having said that, I would like to assure Your Honour that I do not intend to raise the same question that the honourable member for Christ Church raised; but I would like to deal with the same substance matter, if Your Honour allows me.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to do anything which might even appear to be trying to circumvent Your Honour's Ruling; that is why I am trying to satisfy Your Honour that I am on different grounds.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is certainly trying hard.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I know that it is difficult at times; but you surely will not blame me for trying, because it is my right as a member of the House and member of the Opposition, to be able to put my point on all occasions subject always to Your Honour's Ruling. If therefore Your Honour agrees that I can deal with the same substance matter but not deal with the same points, I would like to do so. In other words, feeling that the honourable member in drawing the point to Your Honour's attention has not made his points sufficiently clear for the members of the Chamber, if Your Honour permits me, I will proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER : I will permit no such thing to-day.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY : If that is what Your Honour rules —

Mr. SPEAKER : I have made my ruling.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY : It only remains for me to abide by Your Ruling; but it is one of those things

Mr. SPEAKER : The hon. member will go warily now.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY : It is one of those things that members must abide with; but it may be a matter of public attention.

Mr. CRAWFORD : Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to your attention the extreme difficulties under which hon. members labour in a matter like this. There are only three Rule Books in the Chamber; Your Honour has one, the Leader of the House has another, and the Leader of the Opposition has the third. The result is that other hon. members have no means of following intelligently the points at issue. I am therefore suggesting that Your Honour should take the necessary steps to make Rule Books available to each and every member of the House when the House is in session.

Mr. SPEAKER : I will consider what the hon. member has said. But as the hon. member knows, we have Draft Rules to put before this Chamber, and I am not at all sure that we should print new copies of the present Rules. What happens is that some books have disappeared and they are nowhere around at all.

Mr. GODDARD : I would like to ask Your Honour if you would make a Ruling as early as possible, because we intend to pursue this matter further. This is something I thought would have been done today. As a matter of fact, we thought that today we would have had a notice from the Chair or from the Premier that the Minister of Communications had resigned. (Laughter) I will therefore ask Your Honour to give a Ruling as early as possible. We intend to go further, and not to leave it as some members would want.

Mr. SPEAKER : I gave the assurance that I would not have the slightest intention or desire to restrict any hon. member in raising a point of privilege. As I have said, this is a very important point of privilege which involves the convention referred to. It is a tremendous point; I have not been given any prior notice of it, which I regret very much. The hon. member has made a certain amount of excuse for that; but I think I am entitled to a certain limit of time to study the convention in the light of the point raised by the hon. member. I will again give the assurance that I do not intend to delay the efforts of any member on this particular point.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS : Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 3 as the first Order of the day.

Mr. LEWIS : Mr. Speaker, if the assurance given at a previous meeting is worth anything we were told that these Resolutions would be got out of the way by the Premier and the Premier would then make the Budget Speech; and if the House wanted to adjourn after he had made the Budget Speech, it would be quite alright. What the Government is doing now is something about which notice should have been given before hand.

The fixing of the Order Paper is something that should mean something to this House. I was told on the last occasion that these Resolutions, Nos. 1 and 2 on the Order Paper would be dealt with first; I am now told that this will not happen. If a debate takes

place on the Estimates, what am I to do? This is very wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER : Is the hon. member raising an objection?

Mr. LEWIS : There is no point raising an objection; because if the Government do not want to continue, they will not continue. This is not the proper method to conduct business of the House — to deliberately mislead members when you are fixing the Order Paper. I do not know what the Government intends to do. The Leader has not said, whether they intend to introduce the Estimates and then come back to the Resolutions. The whole idea is changed; the Premier or the Leader of the House should say what they intend to do. It is not fair to members of the House.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS : What we intend to do is to introduce the Estimates and let the Premier make his Budget speech. No Heads of the Estimates will be discussed today.
4.05 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT : Last week in an unequivocal manner, the Hon. Premier said quite clearly and calmly that it was his intention to proceed with the Supplementary Estimates before he dealt with the Annual Estimates; and he went on to say that he wanted to get all of those things out of the way first, and then he will make his budget speech; and if hon. members agreed to adjourn at that stage they could do so; that was what was said last week. How can you expect hon. members in the future to have any faith in your words? How can you expect this House to have any assurance in what the Hon. Leader of the House says, when he makes an assurance and does not keep it? Are we to suggest that the hon. member gave an assurance which he did not intend to carry out? This assurance was given on a matter of procedure and it should be carried out. You may say that the Government can deal with matters as it pleases; but when it proceeds to deal with things in a different manner from what an assurance was given, that is bad manners; and it is bad manners by those who should have better manners. One of the things in democracy is to have good manners; and that means not only to be polite when you meet Royalty, but also when the House of Assembly is meeting, you should adhere to what you stated; and if you cannot adhere to what you stated previously, you should say that you cannot do what you stated last week and for such and such a reason. I know that in other Chambers of Government other members are treated with better courtesy than we are treated in this Chamber.

Mr. CRAWFORD : What the hon. senior member for the City and what the hon. junior member for St. Peter spoke on, are entirely different matters from what was said by the Hon. Leader of the House last week. He said that we will start the Annual Estimates to-day, but we will not deal with the Heads of Expenditure. The Hon. Premier said that he would make his Budget Speech and adjourn there. What the Hon. Leader of the House said in his statement is, that after listening to the Budget Speech by the Premier, we will pass a motion to go into Committee of Supply; that would mean that there would be no other speeches at all on the Budget until we go into Committee of Supply and deal with the Heads. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, let us get it clear as to whether the hon. junior member for St. Peter was right or what the Hon. Leader of the House said was right. Which is the procedure to be adopted?

Mr. BARROW : The hon. junior member for St. Peter and the hon. junior member for the City have greatly surprised me, because they professed that we

were taken by surprise due to the undertakings given by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. Having been in this Chamber for a much longer time than I and having been associated more closely with the hon. senior member for St. Joseph than I, they should have done like me; that is, they should expect the exact opposite to what he has said.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is breaking a Rule of the House. He sees me standing, yet he is going on to speak. [Mr. BARROW sits]. I was about to tell the hon. member that he seems as if when he began his speech, he was really concerning himself more with the hon. senior member for St. Joseph than with the subject matter dealt with by the previous speakers. That will do us no good.

Mr. BARROW: All I was saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the honourable junior member for St. Peter completely misrepresented the intention of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. If the hon. senior member for St. Joseph said that he would have dealt with Orders Nos. 1 and 2 and then go on with Order No. 3, we know his intention is always to do the direct opposite.

The question that the hon. member be granted permission to postpone Orders Nos. 1 and 2 and to take Order No. 3 as the first Order of the day was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. F. L. WALCOTT—(9).

Noes: Mr. BARROW, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. TUDOR, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD—(11).

4.15 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Government is not prepared to go on with any Government business today. The Estimates are there to be gone through and they have to be got through before the 13th March; [Mr. LEWIS: Why?] Because everybody knows that the Hon. Premier has to go to Trinidad. [Mr. CRAWFORD: You are the Leader of the House.]

Mr. LEWIS: Is this a reflection on the vote of the House?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: If hon. members are prepared to come back here next Thursday, I will make a motion that this House do now adjourn until Thursday next the 3rd instant.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Speaking on the motion for adjournment, I should like to say that you do not want to reduce this Parliament to a stage where if your will does not prevail, you want to break up Parliament. You will remember that about two Tuesdays ago I gave notice of my intention to discuss the Report on Social Security. I consider that the practice—

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: A motion for the adjournment of the House was duly moved and seconded. [Mr. LEWIS: He is speaking on the motion for adjournment.]

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: That shows that we are heading fast to a stage which is alien to British democracy; where when people are arrogating so much authority to themselves, they are blinded with power. I say that, because you will remember Mr. Speaker, you have indicated that every hon. member if he intends to deal with any matter such as this, he can move the adjournment to deal with that matter; and that you would like to notify the Government about it so as to accommodate the Government. You will remember sir, that I gave the required

notice to this House and one of the members of the Government when I started to deal with the matter, suggested that in view of the fact that it was a late hour, I should proceed to deal with the matter on the following Tuesday. On the following Tuesday which was last Tuesday, I refrained from dealing with the matter; and I decided that I would not deal with it until the Government had got through some of its business. I would not proceed to deal with the matter because with the items on the Order Paper, I considered that my issue could have been left over until some of these matters under Government business have been finished.

It has struck me as strange, with Resolutions on the Order Paper, and since I refrained from introducing this matter a debate has been started, to find that the Hon. Leader of the House because a vote was taken against him, has decided to adjourn the whole proceedings of the House at twenty past four. If somebody had proceeded with the matter with which I am going to deal now, the Government would have asked the House to forego dealing with it. I do not feel it is fair for this House to let it go out to the public that because an hon. member lost a vote on the items on the Order Paper, (it was not a vote to forego Government Business) the Leader of the House proceeded to adjourn the whole House. Hon. members have refused to deal with Private Members' Business when the Government wanted to go on with their business; and now they do not want to do any Government Business because a vote went against them. We are now reaching the stage of the Gestapo. At this stage, I feel that I should proceed to deal with the Report on Social Security of which I gave notice sometime ago, and with which I shall deal on this motion for the adjournment. I am a busy man. I do not intend to come to this House and then the proceedings are disrupted for a whole day. I am therefore taking this opportunity to discuss the Report on Social Security.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, we all appreciate the anxiety of the hon. member to deal with this matter; however, he must realise that a motion has been made and seconded; and therefore, that motion has to be put to the vote before anything else can be done. When the time comes, we will vote with the hon. member; but he cannot proceed to deal with this matter until the motion before the House has been resolved in one way or the other.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is absolutely correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want to say that the public affairs of this colony are being brought to a very sorry pass. There are two Items on the Order Paper, with which the House has been asked not to deal, and which are Resolutions representing nearly \$90,000 which the Government owes for a number of important purposes. The Estimates refer to public expenditure from the 1st April this year to the end of March next year. These two Resolutions are for \$36,144 and \$54,503; and these are sums of money owed by the Government now for organizations of people, of which money the people stand badly in need. Let us get that clearly before us. The Resolution for \$54,503 is money owed for various items, under the Heads "Lighthouses" "Prisons", and the General Hospital, etc., and the Resolution for \$36,144 is owed for various items in respect of "Education". So that hon. members will see that a great portion of this money has already been incurred in connection with the running of the General Hospital; and the Hon. Leader of the House who is Minister of Social Services and who is directly concerned

with conditions at the General Hospital, is prepared in a fit of childish pique, because he could not get his way, to leave these people at the Hospital and the firms which supply the Hospital with goods, without their money until God knows when.

The next Resolution is even worse. It is a burning shame that in this country today, there are teachers who have not been paid for two months.
4.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable member not to go too far in that matter at this stage.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am saying that no reasonable person can agree with a motion for the adjournment, purely because the Leader of the House and the Premier are so overburdened with a sense of their own importance, that they seem to think that what they want must be done even if it is to the detriment of the entire community. We have teachers on the established staff, permanent teachers to whom money is owed; they are relief teachers who have not been paid for two months, and they are expecting that the House would deal today with the Resolution to pay them. Because this House, composed of responsible members of the public refuse to deal with the Estimates at this stage, which Estimates deal with money to be used from April this year to March next year, we are told that Government business will be stopped for the entire day.

Furthermore, if and when we come back on Thursday, we are coming to deal with Estimates and not with these Resolutions. All I am asking, is if it is fair to those poor men and women who have given their services to the public, and if it is fair to the business places to whom the Government owes money, not to get the appearance merely because either because of increasing old age—

Mr. SPEAKER: Again I must warn the hon. member not to go too far into the subject matter of the Resolution which I hope will be discussed soon by this honourable Chamber.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not referring to the Resolution: I am talking on the motion for adjournment. I am wondering Sir, whether the ravages of old age or a decreasing mental capacity are responsible for what is taking place here today. After all, sir, it is not a private association or a political club run by the two hon. members—the senior member for St. Joseph and the junior member for St. Thomas. We owe a duty to the public who put us here; these people cannot get a single cent unless we vote this money. Are we to understand that we are to go home now without voting it, and come back next Thursday to deal with the Estimates merely because the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has to go to Trinidad? Do you mean that the entire public service as well as individuals, must be subordinated to what he has to do? Is he the whole House? Are we to say the other 15 members of his party are of no account whatever? What are they here for if they cannot conduct business in his absence?

The hon. member should be ashamed to imply that those 15 members of his Party are so negligible a quantity; their numbers should count, even if their mentality does not. If they have a majority they have one; why cannot they proceed with Government business and with their numbers, ensure the passage of any business they want to conduct? It is not fair to the House, the community or to themselves to suggest that because one man from among them is going away, the entire affairs of the public must be subordinated and the other members of the House must submit themselves to all sorts of physical

and other inconveniences merely to be at the hon. member's convenience.

It is true that many of them do not have to work for a living; but many other members have to do so. We come here on Tuesday because we have earmarked that day for public business. To leave here at 4 o'clock today and go home, and come back on Thursday for the Estimates, is not playing the game.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I am going to suggest to the Government for the sake of the progress of the work which we expected we would have done when we came here today, to reconsider their decision. I for one sympathise with the Government's desire to start discussion on the Estimates, so as to relieve the Premier to go overseas. I had made up my mind to come here today and do a spot of work. The first thing we are accustomed to do in these circumstances, is to pass the supplementary votes before any other matter is dealt with which not would take more than one day's discussion.

With that view, I feel that consideration should be given to the Supply Teachers, who since the month of November have not been able to obtain their salaries. Many of them have been bombarding me, and I dare say, other members during the past week; and we have all heard cries about their not being able to pay their groceries' bills, rent etc. I am sure that if we have a Resolution before us which would relieve that situation, the Government should be sympathetic enough to withdraw the motion made by the Leader of the House and let us handle these Resolutions, after which, we would be quite willing to go on with the discussion on the Estimates. I hope that the Hon. Leader of the House will consider my suggestion and realise that it is a reasonable one.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I think we all appreciate that as far as the adjournment is concerned, it is really lamentable. If there is one thing that it goes to show, (and I believe that all of us will appreciate it) is that the Premier when he heard the remarks of the Leader of the House, must have felt his head swollen twice its size. I do not think we should adjourn in this manner.

As the honourable senior member for St. John said, we came here today to do some work. I do not want to deal with this question of the teachers although I suppose every member of this Chamber has been visited by some school teacher who has not received his salary for around three months. I am not concerned with that now; it is my intention to vote with the members of the House who feel that we should proceed with the Resolutions in order to relieve this situation. This is one occasion on which the Opposition and the backbenchers are saying, "Let us do some work," and the Government is saying, "We are not going to do any work." I never paint a lily. To say that I have a great respect for the Leader of the House would be painting a lily. I caution him however that he should not make certain remarks in a fit of temper.

Everyone knows that the Estimates must be passed by the 13th. Why? Because the Premier has to go away. If any one outside the madhouse read that, they would say that the whole bunch of you are nothing—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member must address the Chair.
4.35 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The whole bunch of them are nothing but nit-wits. We have said that on platforms already; but you say these things on platforms and when you get down you are friendly with people, if they have any decency. Why should

the Government come here and confirm what we have said? The moment that the Leader made his admission he has confirmed that they are nitwits. Today is the 1st March and we must get the Estimates passed by the 13th.

As a matter of fact, I want to say that there is an assurance of an easier passage through the House of any measure with the Hon. Minister of Social Services as Leader than with the Hon. Premier; because at times the tendency of the Hon. Premier is to fight, and that tendency often brings out a fight with other honourable members on this side of the House. Let me ask this question: suppose the Hon. Premier dies, what will happen? Suppose he is sick, what will happen? Let me tell you that this country will still go on. As far as the Estimates are concerned, we on this side of the table are in the Opposition, but do you think we will come in here and oppose any matter just for the sake of opposing it? I regret that there is this motion for the adjournment of this House. The Government wants to do something today which is contrary to what the Hon. Premier says; even the backbenchers of Government are saying that you should not break faith with members of this House.

Honourable members are saying that we are willing to go on and to do something which will relieve the Order Paper. You are saying "No" we will not do that; you either do this or nothing. That is childish, and small in the extreme; why say, because the Hon. Premier is going away by the 13th of this month that we must do this now. I acknowledge the ability of the Hon. Premier; but it is stupid to make any one man feel so conceited or to make him believe that he is indispensable. None of us is indispensable; remove the Hon. Premier, and Barbados will go on. Sir, to make a statement like that on the floor of the House is rather embarrassing to other members of this House. Of course, it is not embarrassing to members of the Government. Everyone now knows that the Estimates must be done by the 13th of this month, and why? Because the Premier has to go away at that time.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not care whether the honourable member says that I am conceited because honourable members are paying this compliment to me.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of Order. The Hon. Premier has seconded the motion before the House; he cannot speak. I saw him get up and second the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is in the records that the Hon. Minister of Social Services made the motion for the adjournment, and it was seconded by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I hope I will never have to say this, because of the delicacy of the negotiations which will be taking place in a short time. [A VOICE: That is not the point.] I hope the honourable member who made the sucking noise with his teeth will still listen to this: if we believe our grounds correctly, Barbados will have nothing to fear from the existence of Federation. [A VOICE: That is nonsense!] Let me say that this House started the suggestion for this particular conference which is about to take place in Trinidad. We started off by saying that we should have a conference on immigration, and that immigration is of more vital importance to us than Jamaica. Although an honourable member is saying that it is nonsense, it is obvious if Barbados should be represented in a particular way, surely we expect that for that superlative reason this House no matter what is its politics or

because of its politics, should make Barbados appear in a lesser light than it should appear. [A VOICE: What is he saying] All of my life I have listened to sneers from some honourable members. Can anyone picture any Prime Minister, any Leader of an Assembly, appealing to an Assembly to make it convenient to have a certain matter dealt with within a certain time, and they saying suppose he were dead? I hope to be dead before I see this House as a responsible body, because of Party politics, giving Barbados a good hard kick in the pants. I will only ask other honourable members to read other West Indian newspapers. If they do so, they will know at what I am driving. Sir, all I am suggesting is that Barbados should not through the irresponsibility of a few persons, do anything which might hinder Barbados from being represented properly at the Federation table. I say that for this reason: if in the future it is said that by reason of our conduct, they could not get on with the business of Barbados, or by reason of our conduct, the case of Barbados was not put before the Federal Conference in the way other participants at that conference would like it to be put, I want to go on record as saying, I made this warning.

Before I sit, I am moving an amendment to the motion by the Hon. Minister of Social Services. My motion is, that this House adjourn for half an hour for tea.

[Mr. BARROW rose].

4.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member seconding the motion?

Mr. BARROW: Yes Sir, The hon. member who moved the adjournment of the House for half an hour, has brought to my recollection something which I read not very long ago. [Interruptions]. I will continue when Your Honour is disposed to have Order in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member says that he will continue when I am disposed to have order in the House. Is the hon. member saying that I am condoning disorder in the House?

Mr. BARROW: I should just like to say that I did not intend any reflection on Your Honour at all; and I do not think that Your Honour should be so sensitive, if my phrasing is not as sensible as yours. I was saying, sir, that there were subterranean grumblings going on on my left, and I was asking Your Honour to have them subdued.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks made by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph remind me of something which I heard not so long ago. "A big brother has spoken, and master of the double think." I am seconding the motion for the adjournment of the House for half an hour. It is a fact that we were subjected to the unfortunate experience where we have members of the Government who are drawing salaries for doing work, and who will remain here for 24 hours a day and will still be drawing money, that they are moving the adjournment of the House when they are important matters affecting workers in the community remaining on the Order Paper. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas gave us an exhibition which one might expect from a temperamental ballerina, and not from one who is approaching the evening of his days.

As regards the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, he is now bringing back the Federal Capital to Barbados; and if we are made the Federal Capital, we would not be in need of his closing anything. A similar thing happened with the Deep Water Harbour but the rabbits did not come out of their huts then. I do not necessarily think that Barbados is

the best place in the West Indies for the Federal Capital, and where the Federal Government will be able to perform. I would like to say this: I consider it a classical example of double thinking on the part of the senior member for St. Joseph, in making the appeal (if it was an appeal) rather the diatribe he made.

Our very purpose in adjourning the House for half an hour is to enable him to expedite matters on the Order Paper of the House. His going to Trinidad or any other place lower than that, if lower places exist, (*Laughter*) surely is no argument against consideration of the matters of this House, or in order to dispose of matters which have been long standing on the Order Paper. I have witnessed arrogance and conceit in my time, and those are two vices to which I hope I will not succumb; but I fail to see any relevance between the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and the question of the Opposition as to the adjournment of the House; because they are those who feel that we are not remunerated for whole time participation in the debates of this Chamber, but still want to see those measures carried out for the benefit of the community. It would be rather churlish on my part if I did not say that when the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has time to reflect, he will probably realise the error of his ways. I therefore take great pleasure in seconding the motion for the adjournment of the House for half an hour.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I think some misunderstanding has been made as regards the hon. member going to Trinidad and as regards the matter of his being here for the end of the discussion of the Budget. It must be appreciated that in the hon. member's position he is Minister of Finance; and he should be present throughout the debate on the Budget; his position more or less corresponds with that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Imagine the Chancellor of the Exchequer being absent during the discussion of the Budget! At the same time, I must say that the hon. member is a delegate for Trinidad; and the fact that the Hon. Leader of the House is emphasising that, is not to me any mystery. I appreciate the adjournment of the House for half an hour and not for the balance of the day.

Mr. LEWIS: Before you put the question, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say this: On a previous occasion there were two motions for the adjournment before the House; and the hon. senior member for St. Michael objected. I would like to know if he considers that this procedure is right.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is addressing his remarks to the hon. senior member for St. Michael.

Mr. LEWIS: You had to rule on that matter already. You said that since it was a motion for adjournment for a particular reason no amendment can be made to it. I am merely wondering whether this fits in with the previous ruling; because if I did not do this, the hon. senior member for St. Michael would do it. For fear that he makes his usual display with you, I think I had better do it. This House has been asked to act in a certain way by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. A sensitive Premier could come here and say, "I beg to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the Resolutions of which notice has just been given"; the time has arrived and now, because the House insists that he must do what he has said, he is prepared to disrupt good business and still appeal to hon. members saying that the Estimates must be through by the 13th March, and asking us to be responsible because if the Estimates are not through by the 13th, Barbados will lose the oppor-

tunity of being the Federal Capital. From what I have heard that matter would have been decided already; I have heard that from the delegates myself. However, I do say that if there is one thing which would dub the Barbados Government as insensible to responsibility to be moved by pique and caprice rather than by sensible and responsible dealings and intentions, it is the motion which was made here this afternoon.

4.55 p.m.

Of course I say Sir, that I hope the hon. member for St. Michael will agree that this is the proper amendment that can be made. If it is ever made against him, I would like to know if he would allow you to do it without a great amount of interruption and debate. I am warning him that he should not read the Rules and offer ideas for selfish reasons, but above all, to see the procedure of this House is what it should be.

As I said sir, if you accept the motion as an amendment, Your Honour will refer to the Rules and see which motion should be put first. There is a Rule of this House that when it is a question of a longer or shorter time a particular motion is put first. I am asking Your Honour to refer to the Rule so that you will not make a mistake. [Hon. M. E. COX: The last motion must be put first.] Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is wrong again. There is a Rule of the House which says that when it is a question of a longer or shorter time, a particular motion must be put first. I cannot remember the Rule off-hand, but I know there is a Rule to guide the procedure in putting this motion to the House. It is not a matter of an amendment. However sir, I have nothing more to say except that I am sorry for the sad display by the Government to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER: I refer to the Rule. I do not think it has any bearing on what I consider an ordinary amendment. I will have to satisfy the hon. Chamber by reading the Rule which says: "When there is a question between the greater and lesser sum and the longer or shorter time, the least sum and the longest time should first be put to the question." I do not think that that Rule will have any bearing on an ordinary amendment. There must surely be some reason for inserting a Rule like that; but in my opinion, I do not think that it has any bearing on a motion for adjournment which is an ordinary amendment. May's Parliamentary Procedure should give some background for the reason for inserting a Rule like that into our Rules. In my view this is an ordinary amendment, and you cannot just cite a rule which talks about a greater sum or a longer time. In my view the Rule does not apply to these circumstances.

ADJOURNMENT

The question is, that this House do now adjourn for half an hour. Hon. members in favour will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No", I think the "Ayes" have it. This House now stands adjourned.

5.00 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On Re-assembling.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1.

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.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I rise merely to say that it was never the intention of the Government not to deal with these Resolutions; it was merely felt that it was best for me to make my Budget Speech first, and then deal with these money Resolutions next. Perhaps after that hon. members could reply to the Budget Speech. It is only fair to say that the Hon. Leader of the House discussed this question with the Ministers and decided on that procedure.

The motion that the House do now go into Committee of Supply was put and resolved in the affirmative with division and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this House is in Committee of Supply on Order No. 1, which is a matter that has been sent back to this Chamber from the Other Place. I think it was the intention that this House should go into Committee of Supply on Order No. 2; I therefore beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: If Order No. 1 were mentioned, obviously it is a mistake; it should have been Order No. 2.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, all I was pointing out, (and for the benefit of the Hon. Leader of the House) that he did move the House into Committee of Supply on Order No. 1. He said that that is a mistake; if it is a mistake, we must regularise it. We have to report progress and go back in to the House and come back in Committee on the correct Order. We cannot say that we knew it was Order No. 2 with which we should proceed; that would be wrong. That is the reason why I made the motion that we report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Rather than waste time, Mr. Chairman, I accept that motion.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I cannot allow the hon. senior member for St. George to do something wrong this time. We cannot add to the motion "leave to sit again."

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the words "leave to sit again."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I got up and said that it was always the intention of the Government to deal with these Resolutions today. It was an accident that the Hon. Leader of the House said Order No. 1. The hon. senior member for St. George has to waste time.

Mr. BARROW: Accident or no accident, it does not matter. You did something wrong... I wonder if the Hon. Premier considers it right that we should do away with all the procedural customs of this House; every one knows that it was an accident, but it was an unfortunate mistake.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask you for permission to speak again. I am going to ask the hon. senior member for St. George to withdraw his motion. The House was moved into Committee of Supply, and it would be a reflection on Mr. Speaker for not knowing what was Order No. 1. I am appealing to the hon. member to withdraw that motion. Do not let it appear as though we were speaking on this thing.

Mr. BARROW: The hon. member on my left is asking me to withdraw my motion; he is trying to justify a wrong. This debate has served a useful purpose, and I do not have any intention of withdrawing my motion. We went into Committee on Order No. 1, and until we revoke that we still will be in Committee of Supply on Order No. 2. My motion is to correct that error. How can we correct it by just an agreement?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I really did not want to enter this Debate. I would just like

to ask on what did the House vote? The real motion before the House was, "I beg to move that the House go into Committee of Supply;" and that is what we voted on and agreed to. When we agreed to that motion, we did not agree to dealing with the amendments to the Bill from the Other Place. I think we are quite in order. The hon. senior member for St. George is confused over it.
5.40 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: I think that the Minister of Communications will fill that Bill very thoroughly indeed. This House went into Committee on Order No. 1.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that a motion was made for the House to go into Committee of Supply. The Hon. Minister said—Order No. 1, but the motion was made after that the House go into Committee of Supply; and therefore, I rule the honourable member out of Order.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, you have to take the motion; you are bound to take the motion that you report progress with leave for the Committee to sit again. What is the result of the motion is not the point, but once the motion has been seconded you have to put it to the Committee.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: One sometimes wonders why the honourable junior member for St. James does not enter debates more often. He should recollect how long this Government has been running. The honourable member has made his motion on the ground that we made a mistake; you Mr. Chairman, have ruled him out of Order and the honourable junior member for St. James is arguing on your ruling.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: How can you avoid a properly put motion that you report progress with leave for the Committee to sit again once that motion has been seconded? As regards the honourable member's reference, I will say that I have never seen what has happened today happen in my time. A Minister gets up and says he will take Order No. 1 and the Speaker calls that Order, and somebody moves the motion which could only be moved under Order No. 2. If we choose to remain in Committee, honourable members can say we can overlook it, or let us vote on it; but we cannot deprive a proper motion from going to the vote at all. The answer is that honourable members will vote whether a mistake is made or not; and whether they will remain in Committee is an entirely different thing, if you rule that a motion is out of Order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I ruled on the ground that the honourable senior member for St. George said that we went into Committee on Order No. 1, and that is not so. After Order No. 1 was called, the motion was made that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You asked the honourable member to withdraw the motion; why did you ask him to withdraw the motion if there was no motion at all? Your asking the honourable member to withdraw the motion proves that there was a motion.

Mr. LEWIS: So far as this House is concerned, we are not in Committee on Order No. 1: there is no doubt about that. The only way to correct the position is to ignore it; but if honourable members are arguing as to what the position is, I do not know what to do. So far as the House is concerned it has not dealt with Order No. 2 at all, which is regrettable. To go back to the House again is a reflection on the House, including the Speaker.

Mr. BARROW: It is rather regrettable that members of the Government do not take leaves out

of the books of members who intermittently commit acts of grace and favour, and restore debates to the level of sanity. If anybody says this House is in Committee on Order No. 2, I will ask that the motion be put; but out of deference to you and because a personal appeal has been made to me by the honourable junior member of the City, and because it is probably better on the ground of the matters to which I have referred I will withdraw my motion on the understanding that I will stick to what I have said and save the House from embarrassment. I do not like the pontification on the part of people who are not in a position even to carry on a debate.

Supplementary Estimate No. 42

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This Resolution is for \$54,503; the explanations are pretty full, and I do nothing more than move the Items and refer honourable members to the Notes; and if there is any fuller information with which I can help them, I will do so. We will follow the usual practice of moving these Heads one by one. I therefore beg to move that Head XI—Lighthouses—stand part of the Schedule.

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

Head XI—Lighthouses

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to draw to the attention of the Ministers concerned that there is a bad practice in existence. You have two lighthouse-keepers at Needhams Point, and it is against the conventions that you should have a man working for 365 nights. Are there not means of relieving these two lighthouse keepers? I suggest that the Government should go into this matter; I do not say that these men are not free in the day. There are three lighthouse-keepers employed at the other lighthouses; what I want to point out to the Minister of Communications is this: you have two lighthouse-keepers at Needham's who are required to work 12-hour shifts and I do not think it is a proper practice which the Government is carrying on. There should be the employment of even one more person. I suggest to the Government to look into this matter, because it is not a good employment practice. A survey is going on in respect of employment by the University College of the West Indies; and it is against the conventions to work people every night in the year. Both of them are required each night; and I ask the Minister of Communications to go into this matter so that he can put an end to this bad employment practice. We in the Trade Union would not stand that in private employment; and I do not think the Government should be the leader in bad employment practices. I hope the Hon. Minister will give this matter the consideration which it deserves.

5.50 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I hope that the remarks which I am going to make will be taken in the spirit in which they are made. The Note to the Item about the Lighthouse says that in April 1952, two engineers of Messrs Chance Brothers Ltd. Manufacturers of Lighthouse equipment in the United Kingdom, paid a visit to Barbados and made a survey of the condition of the marine lighting aids in Barbados. Well sir, if they had come to look at lighthouses on behalf of some international body, it might be alright; but these people are manufacturers' representatives travelling around, and it is expected that they would condemn all that they

could possibly condemn and get new orders for equipment. That is their job; they will get their draw back on it, and their trip out again. If it were some international lighthouse league that saw to it that mariners are protected against bad lighting or no lighting at all I would accept it.

The next thing I would like to know is, who invited these gentlemen? Were we told that they were coming here, or did they just happen to be here in the West Indies looking after lighthouses? Or is it that they did not have an order for a long time and they wanted to get a chance to order new equipment? They came soon after the winter and they might have been avoiding the winter in their native country. Naturally they would suggest getting this new equipment; it is a considerable amount of money, \$23,000.

Sometimes we get down experts and they tell us that machinery is ruined because it was not used to the full extent; is there anyone who can check up on the recommendations made by these gentlemen? They have a very unfortunate name—Chance Brothers. I would like to know the circumstances; in the Estimates year after year the House was never told as far as I remember, that the Government felt that something was happening to the lighting equipment at South Point or any other point. I feel that this matter should be brought to our attention; we should be told that these gentlemen were likely to be in the island and that the Government was taking an opportunity to utilise their services.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The Director of Public Works for many years has said that the lighting equipment at lighthouses was not up to standard. As far as I know, the Chance Brothers firm did not do the job originally; but they confirmed the Director's survey that the lighting was dangerous.

Mr. LEWIS: I really must thank the honourable member for that attitude. For once he has said that you were likely to be misled. The Director of Public Works should be mentioned here.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I feel that people in the Secretariat feel that we must give the Opposition something to talk about; and therefore, we leave out a few lines out of the Votes.

As regards the point raised by the honourable junior member for St. Peter, the Hon. Minister for Communications has promised to look into that. As soon as we get down to the actual Estimates, we will deal with that.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, there is a habit as regard Resolutions, of slipping in things which are not directly in issue and on a future occasion, the House is asked to vote some considerable amount of money for the upkeep or renovation of a particular institution such as the one which we are discussing now. We are often told that we were warned on such an occasion when we passed a Resolution, that the Government would want money for carrying out these repairs. The instances which I can cite, Mr. Chairman, are too numerous for me to enumerate at the present moment; but every member, apart from those members who do not want to remember, every member of this House on my left, and perhaps one or two on my right will recognize that as the truth.

I see absolutely no justification for mentioning the Chance Bros. or the prospective amount or tender or whatever it is, that Messrs Chance Brothers make, because it is not in this Resolution. I must join issue with the honourable junior member for the City in taking it up in a manner like that. This

vote is for the sum of \$903 to be spent locally for repairing the Lighthouse.

Unless there is double thinking, or some other motive (I do not want to say it is an improper motive) I see no reason why the officers whom we pay should not be given the encomiums necessary. Credit should be given to the Director of Public Works for finding out that this machinery is decrepit, and the credit should be given to the Central Foundry for carrying out a Survey for the Government. That is a matter which could be germane to the issue which we are discussing now. I do not think that the Director of the Public Works is so modest that he would specially ring up the Private Secretary of the Minister of Communications and say, "please leave me out of the Addendum. Do not say that I have done my job; but there is a firm in England called Chance Brothers. Will you mention that they happen to be passing through, went to South Point for a sea bath, went into the tower of the lighthouse and saw that we wanted machinery to the tune of \$23,000."

In this Resolution we are asked for only \$903 to carry out certain repairs; and the Minister has told us that it was as a result of investigations carried out by the Director of Public Works, and a subsequent appraisal made by the Central Foundry that this amount was arrived at, and the state of disrepair and decrepitude at the lighthouse was discovered. All I am asking is that if Chance Brothers have now got around to the Government for the supply of this equipment, and if any tender has been advertised for equipment, please leave Chance Brothers out of it altogether and give credit where credit is due.

The Minister of Finance has told us that for years before this firm came down to Barbados our officers were carrying out their job; they should be given that credit.

No mention is made of the Director of Public Works. To what conclusion must we come when we are asked to vote money to Messrs. Chance Brothers without any question?

6.00 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If the hon. member would give way—

Mr. BARROW: Why should I?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I just want to say we never came for the whole sum. We may get it free.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has no right to stand up now; if he wants to reply, he has the right to reply when the time comes. I am sure if the honourable member was speaking and I had got up, I would be termed as inconsiderate and ill-mannered. I hope Mr. Chairman, you will do your job in the manner in which you should do it. I say so without any reflection on the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, we have now heard the interesting disclosure that the sum of \$915 which is set down here to be voted, is part of the \$24,000 that is set out for the complete repairs to this light; and we have also heard that we may get the whole equipment free of charge. If we are to get the whole equipment free, why vote this amount? If we are to get the equipment free, why come for the money to repair it? Why mention the specific amount that Messrs. Chance Brothers has stipulated that it will cost to put this light in a state of good repair. The Minister has said that this is part of that vote, but there is no indication of that in the Note. Perhaps he will tell us later that our prognostications were not correct. Mr. Chairman, it is going to be a great day

for the people who hold tenets of socialism when Capitalists begin to give away equipment free to the Government.

The question that Head XI stand part was put and agreed to.

Head XVI—Prisons

Head XVI Prisons was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XVI stand part.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I have a little question to ask and perhaps the Hon. Minister of Trade could answer it, though he is not in his place at this time. It is with respect to Item 18: Provisions. The note to that says "increase in cost of salted meat. For the period March to August, 1954 it was necessary to use salted beef instead of salted pork, which was unobtainable. Salted beef is nearly twice as expensive as salted pork."

They do not tell you here, if from the period March to August salted pork is unobtainable by other people also. [A VOICE: It is unobtainable in that period to other people also.] I also want to know if this is something to do with trade restrictions; I am wondering if the hon. junior member for Christ Church can help this Committee on this matter. Probably, Government bought salted pork from the store next door to the hon. member's grocery and they did not want to come to him for the next shipment. What I want to know really, if this is something which can be remedied by the taking off of the trade restrictions.

Mr. GODDARD: If I may help this Committee, I can definitely say that this quantity of salted pork which merchants are allowed to import is inadequate for the consumption in this island. On the last occasion, when the price of salted pork was rising and the Controller of Supplies wanted to make either his second or third purchase, he realised that the subsidy was limited; and he had to limit the quantity of salted pork coming to suit. At one time, the only thing in salted pork that was obtainable was pigs' feet. The Controller of Supplies had to limit the buying to pigs' feet because the subsidy on that item was very small; but really the things which the people wanted in that item of salted pork were unobtainable. I have suggested for a long time the freeing of these things from control; if you allow these items of pickled pork which are now subsidised to come in freely, and you do not put a limit to the quantity coming in, it will be better for the people. You are now trying to subsidise something, but in doing so you are limiting the supply, and the people are suffering as a result.

Mr. Chairman, you know as well as I do that salted beef and salted pork were unobtainable since last week.

Mr. LEWIS: That is what was not made clear to us Mr. Chairman. There is another something which I am asking the hon. senior member for St. Joseph to look into; it is with regard to another Item under another Head. I hope that the present population at this institution is not bigger; under the other item you might get salted meat and salted pork, and there is the amount of \$1,800 and over to be voted to one Item under one of those items.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, it is pleasing to see that there is an increase for provisions at the prison and it is further complimentary to see that more milk is consumed at the same institution. Without doubt I can say that is progressive, but

I am going to refer to some other matter. I hope on other items there will be improvement. I would be happy to see the Government consider the removal of handcarts drawn by prisoners along the road. I am sure that the Hon. Premier is acquainted with the ugly sight which one sees while passing those areas where those prisoners have to traverse with this burden. I hope sir, that he would also realise that that method of punishment has been discarded in other progressive colonies. It must also be taken into account that owing to the increase in vehicular traffic on the roads of this colony, that old system of punishment is becoming extremely dangerous.

I hope too that the Hon. Premier has noticed a letter in the daily newspaper which condemns the continuation of such a primitive system of punishment; that is, forcing prisoners to do something which is unsightly and dangerous not only to themselves but to the travelling public. If an amount of about \$4,000 were to be contributed to this Head, it would remove that blot and it would prove more economical in the long run than the present system.

I again on behalf of those incarcerated at Glendairy make another appeal to Government for the removal of the handcart system of transportation, and for the provision of mechanical means of conveying block stones to and from Codrington.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, at the risk of being tedious, I again draw to the notice of the Government the extreme cruelty to the prisoners caused by the type of cell which is at Glendairy Prison. I have said already, and I do not apologise for saying it again, that imprisonment robs a man of his freedom, and adding darkness to that punishment throughout the hours of the day is really an undesirable punishment. All of us are entitled to the light of God's day; and I have been made to understand that it cannot penetrate beyond the thick doors of the prison cell. I have noticed pictures of barred prison doors and I want to see a Resolution brought down to this Chamber for provision of such doors at Glendairy so as to rid it of that old system. I have noticed that prisoners have barred doors, and I want to see that the entire system of changing prison bars becomes available at Glendairy. On the last occasion I spoke about it I was commended by several people. [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Who? The prisoners?] No, the potential ones! Even prisoners are entitled to an opinion; but I want to emphasise the cruelty which belongs to the Middle Ages and that it should be changed. Every time a prison vote comes here and I know that the same style obtains I will talk about it.
6.10 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a very peculiar position of having to speak on this matter of prison administration and speaking as it were between two colleagues neither of whom has had any first hand experience of a prison, [Laughter] when on the contrary I have had. I am a frequent visitor to this prison in Barbados, in all capacities except one; and I see quite a lot there that is wrong, and quite a lot that could be made better. One thing that worries me so is the health of sick prisoners and the steps which are being taken to restore that health, I have spoken to the prison doctor who (without in anyway disclosing any confidence or even indeed without even suggesting that he is complaining in any way) himself is as worried as he should be over the resources at his disposal for the care of sick persons. I noticed here that we are asked to provide money to meet

the cost of the increased consumption of milk for prisoners under medical care. I would like the Hon. Minister of Social Services to tell us, if not now at some time or other, whether first of all, there are any instances of tuberculosis in the prison within recent years, and what the Prison Authorities have been doing about it.

I would like to say too that there is a great grievance on behalf of the prison officers with respect to their uniforms. It is on record that complaints have been made by the Prison Warders, and I say in passing that the Premier himself should know about these complaints; because one of his closest friends, I need hardly say confederates, is now Steward of that Institution. Complaints have been made that the uniform in addition to being unsightly, is frankly unhealthy; it is black and causes continual and almost excessive sweating; and it is not the sort of uniform which enables duty to be done especially in an emergency. There is a case on record in which quite recently a prisoner was giving some trouble and he managed to get the better of one of the Warders who was trying to administer discipline, merely because the Warden could not unbutton his coat quick enough so as to deal with the disobedient prisoner. It is even more important than that; if you are asking people to work in an Institution like that which calls for so much of their energy, their general conditions of work ought to be such as to enable them to carry out their duties. That uniform is a disgrace; and the fact that it is still retained, is an indication that prison reform has not passed on from 1900. If you will you could keep that uniform for ceremonial purposes, if such can be associated with a prison perhaps it could be associated with a visit by the Minister of Social Services. This uniform increases our financial burdens; and you are asking these officers in addition to wearing this unsightly black, to wear boots; you would not even allow them a second pair of boots unless they first prove to you that they have not given away the pair which was formerly given to them. You insist on keeping them in these boots which are very uncomfortable for a long time.

Then there is the general question of the comfort of the staff. I have had the privilege Mr. Chairman, of being asked to lecture at night to groups of prisoners who were, I suppose, better behaved than most and who were given the privilege of staying out of their cells a little later than was required by the Rules. It struck me that there was something very peculiar about that arrangement, in that those Warders who would normally have been on cell duty or who might have been off duty had the prisoners been put up at the accustomed hour, had to remain on duty as long as the prisoners were outside.
6.20 p.m.

Some honourable members may feel that it is not necessary for persons undergoing sentences to have their minds enlightened, or to hear or to receive lectures; but if they are allowed to do so, it should not appear that the recreation period of the prisoner is at the same time a penalty by their attendance at these lectures.

These matters Mr. Chairman, may appear to be trivial; but they hardly get aired, except at times like these when we are discussing from time to time the administration of these departments. I hope therefore, that some members of the Government will be able to give us that assurance that first of all sick prisoners are receiving the best attention, and that prison Warders may have some hope held out to them; and that in the near future these warders will be allowed to wear a cooler and more efficient

type of uniform. If these assurances are given I think that the prisoners themselves will be encouraged and also the people who have to attend to them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am very sorry that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not in his place; because I feel on this question of the shortage of pickled pork, and the additional cost which it involves, that it is high time that the Government makes some change in its present policy. At the moment our pickled pork products are from Canada, a hard currency area; and therefore the question of the amount that we import is bound up with the question of the allocations of dollars which we have. I see no reason why we should utilise for pickled pork imports a portion of the allocation of dollars which we have, when we could obtain these supplies from a soft currency area at a rate at which we could sell them at the present cost, and without one cent of subsidisation.

The Government took upon itself about two years ago to ban the imports of pickled pork from Scandinavia and the Argentine, on the ground that Foot and Mouth disease was prevalent in those countries. I have pointed out time and time again that during the time that that ban was operating in Barbados, other West Indian colonies were getting pickled pork from those countries; and even the U.K. was importing it in large supplies from Denmark.

It is plain that the process which these products undergo in the actual act of being canned and prepared for export, nullifies the virulence of this Foot and Mouth Disease. Furthermore, I am informed authoritatively that there is no more existence of Foot and Mouth Disease in either Scandinavia or the Argentine; but for some reason best known to itself, the Government insists in maintaining the ban on pickled pork from those countries. Last year I drew it to the attention of the Minister of Trade and Industry; but through sheer perverseness he has refused to devote to this question the amount of attention which it deserves. There is no reason why we should spend hard earned revenue in subsidising pickled pork products; and there is no reason why we should allocate some of the few dollars we get on the importation of pickled pork from hard currency areas, when we can get all we want at a far cheaper rate and of no inferior quality from soft currency areas.

It is bad enough when the normal Estimates for the purpose are overspent; but when they are exhausted because we have to use a more expensive product to replace the salt pork, it is time that the Ministry should be brought to its senses and be forced to take some action in this matter. I have no doubt in my mind that the persistence in this policy on the part of the Minister is one of those mysterious things with which the whole Control Board is infested. It suits the people who have a big say on that Board to continue to bring in supplies of pickled pork from Canada instead of opening the market completely, and allowing a policy to operate which will be in the best interest of the country. The whole thing is being carried on behind the fantastic claim about the prevalence of Foot and Mouth Disease as if those people want to make it appear that they are more interested in the health and welfare of the people of this country, than the corresponding authorities in other West Indian colonies or even Great Britain itself.

I am glad to see that the Minister of Trade and Industry has returned to his seat; I thought he had gone back to England; but maybe he will tell us,

if he is aware of what has been going on during his absence, whether his Ministry is devoting any attention to this matter of re-opening Scandinavia and Argentina for supplies of pickled pork, and whether he is satisfied in his own mind that we are justified in voting more money than we estimated for last year for supplies of pickled pork to Government institutions, to say nothing of the financial hardship and the inconvenience which the public must undergo in having to buy such imported commodities of food at prices in excess of what other West Indian colonies are paying for them.

6.30 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I was trying if possible to stop hon. members from asking questions which the Minister might have to reply to later on. For example, the last question raised will be dealt with in the Budget Speech. I hope I did not give the slightest cause to anyone to think that I am attempting to say that Your Honour allowed the debate to go too far; but in Supplementary Estimates you stick to the particular item because in the Estimates all these questions have to be asked of the specific Minister. Furthermore, we are not dealing with these Supplementary Estimates in the month of June or July where members would have to wait for nine or ten months before they can ask for information during consideration of the Annual Estimates.

Really, sir, I thought I would have nothing more to do than to thank the two honourable members for St. John. I do assure the hon. senior member for St. John that I see those prisoners almost every morning; and they are a source of embarrassment to me; about three of them whom I presume to be ex-clients of certain hon. members in this Chamber, will call out to me by saying: "Howdy Mr. B."

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, it must have been embarrassing to the Hon. Premier when he is meeting former ex-clients of his, and he is not able to do anything for them, even if he has already done his worst or his best for them. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that mine was the lone voice years ago in this Chamber when emphasising that prisoners at Glendairy should be better treated, and emphasised that such treatment was due to the heart of the Barbadian capitalist.

Under Item 23, Incidentals, reference is made to cleaning, water and light; and I mention it now not because in the very near future we will not have an opportunity to deal with it, but because the Hon. Minister who is in charge of it would then be prepared to deal with it. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that we are the most backward colony in the Caribbean when it comes to prison reform. I am not in a position to say whether my colleague visits that institution more than I; it is remarkable that we never seem to meet there. However, I can say that in the cells of this prison are the most primitive accommodation and sanitary conveniences; and as you know, Sir, if that sanitary convenience has to be used after three or four o'clock in the afternoon, this very insanitary vessel has to remain until next morning when the cell is cleaned out. It is a far cry today from the days when we were able to persuade the Administration to include greens and Cod Liver Oil in the prisoners' diet. Since then, the hon. senior member for the City was moved to follow the same example to include Cod Liver Oil in the diet of those who obtain it from the St. Michael's Vestry. I feel it is essential that we should have a certain amount of electricity if only in the corridors of the prison so that some of the light might percolate into the cells. It is nothing more inhuman than to keep people in cells

in darkness from four o'clock in the evening until next morning. Sooner or later a prisoner will come out, and if you require him to become a useful citizen as a result of the lessons he has learnt from the punishment he underwent, you must ensure that during the period he is incarcerated, he will live in conditions which are suitable and reformatory. I do not think anyone would say that their position should be parallel to as if he were in a hotel. I remember on an occasion when I was clamouring in this Chamber for better treatment for them, that a question was asked if you wanted the prison to be like the Marine Hotel. However, since those days there is an entirely modern conception of prison accommodation although I may say it seems to be foreign to the people who minister to the local prison. I do hope when we are discussing this Head in the very near future, the Hon. Minister who is in charge of the prison would be able to say and should say a word or two on the present running of the prison, and the policy with regard to its future running.

If you take a place like Antigua for example, you will see that the prisoners who assisted in cleaning up the grounds at Government House for the occasion of the visit of Her Royal Highness the Princess Margaret, had an opportunity of seeing her. Prisoners like that are easily assimilated into the community when they have served their term of imprisonment; they go back into normal life as useful citizens. I am sorry to say that this House cannot drum into the heads of those certain people whose idea is that people who are condemned to serve a sentence of imprisonment, should go to a place like Devil's Island.

Mr. Chairman, I hope to return to this matter later, when I expect we will have a statement from the Hon. Minister who is dealing with this institution.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to point out to the Hon. Premier to persuade those heads of departments to desist from buying a sewing machine or equipment to provide for clothing and uniform. They have no right to buy a sewing machine out of funds provided for clothing and uniform. A sewing machine should be budgeted for as a special equipment; and I remember quite well, that the Government did make a stipulation between things like that and other things.

I agree with the Hon. Premier that you should only mention certain things in passing, just to pass on the information for future consideration when dealing with the particular Head in the Estimates.

I would therefore like to pass on the information that I have been told, that prisoners at Glendairy do not get anything to eat after half past two or three o'clock in the afternoon until next morning. It might be something which might cause prisoners to rebel or it might be good for their digestion; but that bit of information was told to me and I am asking the Hon. Minister in charge to look into the matter.

The question that Head XVI stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative.

Head XXIII (2) General Hospital

Head XXIII — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXIII—stand part.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.
6.40 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, from the Supplementary Estimates under Item 19, there is a substantial sum; and after all, it is something which can be fairly well estimated, because you know of the amount of work which is to be done. I would really like to

know if the present specialists are doing more work. From the reading of the explanation—Note 6—I cannot say whether their fees have been increased. I know they get 50% of the fees; I am therefore wondering if their fees have been increased recently. So far, I know this House was told that there was to be a revision. I would not like to think or to feel that these fees are increased merely because these specialists think they should get something more.

Perhaps this is a matter which will have to come before the House; I cannot remember. However the Executive Committee is responsible for the running of the Hospital. I sincerely hope that this is not an increase in the fees and that more work is being done. [Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: It is due to numbers.] Well then, that is a very good sign that more work is being done at the Hospital.

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

Head XXIII (4) Lazaretto

Head XXIII (4) Lazaretto was called and passed.

Head XXIV—Barbados Regiment

Head XXIV—Barbados Regiment was called and passed.

Head XXVI—Pensions

Head XXVI—Pensions was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXVI stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to know Mr. Chairman, if this disability pension is something which the War Office is paying and if it is a recommendation which the Government is in honour bound to pay, and if so why? The next question is this: what is the Government's position with regard to the War Service Credit which these ex-servicemen were allowed to have, when they joined the local service? They are still some people in the Government service who have not received their War Credits.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have not got the file before me, but I remember reading it. My recollection is that this matter is actually covered by an Act: at any rate we have undertaken to do it. This matter was negotiated by the War Office and they said that the scales which were given are reasonable, and we said that we would come down to the House with it. On the question of War Service Credit I will look up the matter when the Estimates are being considered; I have not got that particular file for use to-day.

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

Head XXVIII—Subsidies and Grants

Head XXVIII—Subsidies and Grants—was called and passed.

Head XXIX—Miscellaneous Services

XXIX—Miscellaneous Services—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to ask the Hon. Premier if he thinks that this is a good policy

with regard to Clerical Assistance; and in speaking of this Item, I am also referring to substitutes for Clerical Assistance in the Post Office. I do not like the idea of the Government paying a substantial amount of money for this item; I think it will be necessary to have a review of the situation and if you need such a substantial amount of money for Clerical Assistance, it seems to me as if the compliment of your service needs an increase. You have \$6,000 here and in connection with the Post Office you have over \$8,000. That represents a large number of individuals whom you are employing; and the Note reads that it is due to the absence of established staff on periods of vacation leave and things of that nature. If you need six people, it is better to have six people on the permanent staff than to have five and decide to have one for relief all the year round.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This is like the question of relief teachers, a point which has been raised recently. It seems to me that there are not enough teachers on the permanent staff. The point which the hon. member has raised has been taken up by the Chief Secretary and myself quite recently, and the question of increasing the number of permanent posts under establishment Orders will soon be coming before the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I see here that the sum of \$20,000 which we voted for the payment of passages has been insufficient, and we are now called upon to supplement the vote by this additional amount of \$2,000. I sincerely hope that the Government is determined to reconsider this matter; I am voting against it if I stand alone. To begin with, I personally do not believe that the country can afford even the \$5,000 for public officials to go joy-riding with their wives and children every four years. [Mr. LEWIS: This is not leave passage. It is for passages of public officers.] If it is for passages for officers coming to this island, that is a different thing entirely; it is a pity that these things are not put down more clearly. When one reads this Item, one is liable to think one thing or the other; the Item should have been set out more clearly. One is justified in thinking that these passages apply to the joy-riding which we have strongly condemned already, and which we will condemn again.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to remark merely in passing, something about this Item "Clerical Assistance." The moment the Government increases the perquisites of officers they must have superfluous staff all the time. They must be prepared in an office which can be run by ten or twelve people, to have one or two extra because they must be people away for long periods; and of course Government always has to make provision for sickness. But as regards this new Item "Visit of British Industrialists" it is worrying me a bit. The Note to this Item says this "Provision of \$2,000 is included in the Supplementary Estimates 1952-53 No. 27 under Head XXIX Miscellaneous Item 75—Visit of British Industrialists. This provision was based on an estimate of \$24,000 supplied by the Colonial Office and the Barbados share being one twelfth of the total cost. The actual expenditure exceeded this Estimate by \$768.40 of which Barbados' share is \$64.03." It seems to me that it has taken quite a long time to be finalised. This must be based on an allowance, not on what they care to spend, and they did not care to ask back for it. We should have been able to finalise this matter by now. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: We were waiting on information from them].

These estimates are based on daily allowances and at the end of the day you must know what the allowances are; and the hotels must have sent in their bills ever since.

6.50 p.m.

The question that Head XXIX stand part was put and agreed to without division.

Head 1.—Post Office

Annexed Estimates, Head I, Post Office was called.

Hon. G. H. Adams moved, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. Cummins that the Head stand part.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with Item 12, Auxiliary Postmen. I wonder if the Government is referring to the people they employ at Christmas and such busy periods. I think that the policy of employing them needs some examination. In the busy periods they employ these postmen and it is absolutely no use from the point of view of training them to become regular postmen; because the regular postmen have no time during those busy periods to teach them the routes, and they have to learn as best they can.

I want to suggest to the Government that the time has come when they should, by some enactment, make it compulsory for people to number their houses so as to make postal deliveries easier. We are providing this island with a postal service that is second to none in the West Indies and perhaps in the world, whereby people in the City can get three deliveries of mail per day. You should not encourage people in that laziness; people living within a radius of a half mile of the Post Office should not be given three deliveries per day.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Government does not take seriously the suggestion that the number of deliveries in the City should be reduced. The hon. member who made that suggestion seemed to have forgotten that the Government has increased postal rates, and we are now among the highest in the area. We have to pay four cents for a local letter; if we have to pay these high rates we are entitled to superman service. If the Government is going to reduce the service they should reduce the cost of posting letters.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. junior member for St. Peter should realise that they are many people who would be willing to get delivery 40 times a day without postmen, but cannot because they cannot get post office boxes. For years we paid a penny to carry open letters locally when other places paid a cent. To-day we are paying four cents for a sealed local letter, a sum that would carry an air letter from here to St. Kitts. If you have boxes to rent people they can come for their mail 40 times a day or once a week if they like.

We do not have any proper Post Office at all; we have a most inconvenient building for that purpose. It is just as if you were in British Guiana seeing them trying to make out after a fire. A series of cow stalls is how you can describe the Post Office here.

Another point is that these notes are very misleading; they talk about auxiliary postmen and the Government has continuously to employ them when necessary. Is it that you do not have enough postmen on the regular staff?

As far as numbering the houses is concerned, it seems to me that that is something that should have been taken up long ago when we had Mr. Sharpe who liked to do things like that. There is a friend of mine who says, that the people in Trinidad are waiting until the time when Barbadians run out of names of houses to see what they will do. I am sure that they cannot run out of numbers.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am not suggesting that we should reduce the service; despite the fact that we pay a high rate, I am suggesting to the Government that it is a waste of manpower in a place the size of Bridgetown to give three deliveries a day. You do not get that in New York or London; it is a waste of manpower. I think that those postmen should be utilised in a better way in serving some of the other districts that are poorly served. Some people in those districts have to depend on a single service.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I think that a great deal of benefit would be derived in connection with the delivery of mail if the Government would consider the proposal I made some time ago, that in the outlying districts postmen should be supplied with motorcycles for transport. Another aspect of the matter is that the auxiliary postmen are insufficient, and the hours they have to work are inordinately long. Sometimes if you are in the Square around 7 or even 9 o'clock at night, you see postmen on duty during the busy season and perhaps only one clerk on duty. The working hours of the postmen should be carefully scrutinised; because it is the duty of the Government, especially in a Socialist State, to set an example and to see that there is no transgression by the Government in respect of working hours or any other conditions of service.

7.00 p.m.

It is said that it would not be convenient for postmen to have motorcycles in the country districts. Those people who say so, do not know the activities of postmen in the country districts; they are confined to delivery in Bridgetown. It is a fact that postmen who make deliveries in the country district have to travel a quarter of a mile from one place to another in their delivery; and I am sure that this is not too short a distance for the postmen to get motorcycles to travel around on. I consider it is a necessary thing for them and I hope the Hon. Minister in charge will say something on it when we are discussing the Budget.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, the honourable member misunderstood me a little. I would like him to see how inconvenient it would be for a postman to make a house-to-house delivery in Bridgetown with a motorcycle. I am sure everybody would agree that it would be inconvenient for a postman to do so; it would mean that he would have a heavy machine to push around all the time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question, is that Head I—Post Office (Annexed Estimates) stand part of the Resolution.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am going to take this opportunity to say that the Notes to these Heads in this Supplementary Estimates are printed in such a way that it is very difficult to know at what you are to look. The person responsible for the compilation of these Notes has used numbers instead of letters of the alphabet to Note 2. If you look at it, you will see the paragraphs under Note 2 are numbered 1, 2, 3 and 4; they should be numbered by the alphabet in order that you can observe some distinction between the Notes and paragraphs to a Note. You cannot read these Notes and follow them correctly without some great difficulty.

The question that a Resolution for \$54,503 was put and agreed to.

Supplementary Estimates 1954—55 No. 43 Education: Relief Teachers

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$36,444. I would like to

say early that I mentioned a few minutes ago that we are coming down in the Estimates with a new item to make provision for supernumerary teachers. We started out by having supernumerary teachers and we have now found out that there should be a Civil Establishment Order to make them permanent.

Doubtless, hon. members have heard of this story of supernumerary and relief teachers from one angle; but what has happened is, that it has now come to light that the method by which relief and supernumerary teachers, (they all being called relief teachers) have been paid has caused the money to run out. They were paid from under the Item for assistant teachers which is fixed by law. I would say it was through a misunderstanding on the part of the department; the Department taking a sort of ten-year-old directive about the proportion of teachers to children as a fixed rule by which we are bound to employ a supernumerary as soon as a school has another 40 children in it. This year because of the great increase in children attending schools, we have discovered that more money than what was put down was needed. If you look at the Draft Estimates for 1955—56 you will see money put down under a new item for supernumeraries as well as money for relief teachers. I repeat that we will have to put this new heading—Supernumerary Teachers—because there is a difference between a relief teacher and a supernumerary; a relief teacher may only work for three or four days. Suppose a teacher takes sick and remains sick for ten days or longer; it would be difficult to divide his work among the staff, therefore, you must bring in a relief teacher. Let me repeat that the principle is, whenever there is more than forty children to one teacher they bring in one supernumerary. In addition there are supernumeraries for those teachers who are attending training at Erdiston College. It is just because of the increased number of children which calls for more teachers, that this money has run short. If the 162 new supernumerary teachers for which we are providing in the coming Estimates had been taken on before, it would be seen clearly that the vote would be expended before the end of the financial year. We realise that it has caused some inconvenience, and I say it with some trepidation. [A VOICE: You said one teacher to forty children that is too bad!] Let me say that does not include the headmaster. Those hon. members who read about schools in England will know that they are just as overcrowded as in this country. I may say that this has been the case in almost every country in the world; however much hon. members may feel about it, all of us feel that it is unfortunate that this thing should have overtaken the department; and of course, the teachers themselves. As soon as it was brought to the notice of the Executive that this money was running short, we gave it consideration.

7.10 p.m.

Hon. members have the figures; the number of established posts of assistant teachers has been increased by only six in 1948—49 [Members: We read it.] I repeat that this is an honest mistake on the part of the Department, because a Headmaster ought to work for as much as anybody else. Even if you read the ratio of one authority you would not need so many supernumeraries. It is a very difficult position to employ supernumeraries fairly often and then to have retrenchment; that is the position which the House has got to face; if we have to give this extra sum to provide for 162 extra teachers we will have to take it into consideration in some other direction. The Notes being so full I will add no more than to ask hon. members to raise whatever points arise out of these Notes to which I can give full information.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT : I am not criticising this vote because we have to vote this money, but what I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Premier who is Minister of Education is this: I want him to look upon this matter very seriously; either he is too busy and he cannot devote enough time to this matter — I will say that no human being can devote four-fifths of his time to anything; I do not see anything in life to which you can devote four-fifths of your time. The Premier must examine his portfolio most carefully and see if really and truly he has the time and energy to devote to a department which is as vast as education; I say that quite seriously. I do not think that with the portfolios under the Premier's control it is possible for a man of his age or years to devote his time and attention to a set-up like this. He is Minister of Education and Finance, and there are more Heads in the Estimates that call for more attention than any other Head, and he as Premier has to deal with co-ordination. I am not throwing any reflection on him; but he cannot devote proper time to these matters. If there is need for a Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries then there is need for a Minister of Education alone. [MEMBERS: Quite true.] The fact remains that it would be all right in the old days when the Colonial Secretary used to deal with everything, but now that the work is subdivided among Ministers, the Premier cannot make the same remarks about departmental duties because it is his function to see that these departmental duties are carried out and this delay should not have taken place.

The Hon. Premier said just now that you need these supernumeraries, but let me examine the position. Gone are the days when you should say these wages which you are now paying these people are adequate; it is scandalous that you are paying these people some of them \$5.90 a week, less than what the Government has laid down for shop assistants in Bridgetown to get. The maximum is \$1.50 a day which makes \$7.50 a week. There is need for a review of this situation. There are lots of people who are looking for work, but because that is so you cannot pay wages which are regarded as scandalous. Where you employ people on a casual basis it is not unknown that you increase their rate of pay sometimes by ten or twenty-five per cent.; a man who is working casually must of necessity work for a higher rate than a man who is working permanently. These supernumeraries are not getting the conditions which are given to the members of the permanent establishment; they are devoid of that. Where you have supernumeraries working for a maximum of \$10 a week you can only attract to this service people who are usually devoid of qualifications; because if there is a shortage of people, you can only get the worst people at these rates. There are few people today with qualifications whom you could get to work for \$7.50 a week; I understand that they use the people who have retired and people who are supplementing their pensions; but that is not good enough. You should not perpetuate a system which you only use in cases where there is a shortage of employment. I am asking the Hon. Minister today to re-examine these rates of pay. It is no point in the Civil Service Association warning about the exodus of senior staff and speaking about an increase in the emoluments of senior staff, and then you have this sort of wages obtaining. I believe that these rates which the Government is now paying should be reviewed, because I am sure that if the employers in Bridgetown took serious regard of these rates which the Barbados Government is paying, we will have a very difficult task in the Trade Union movement to get an increase in wages.

I do not begin by arguing that a man should be paid \$2 a day; I will tell a man to find out what a pint rice is selling at and what house rent he has to pay.

I will say that people working for \$5.90 a week must steal; they must do something corrupt or dishonest to supplement their wages. In their places I would carry away some of the milk and biscuits from the school because if you give people \$5.90 a week who teach at these schools, some of the milk and biscuits are obliged to disappear. I am not making any fun; honesty must have something else to back it up.

In the name of goodness, how could a man or woman support himself or herself on \$1.68 a day? The next thing is that you start off both the men and the women at \$1.68 a day; then as far as List "A" is concerned, you carry the women to \$1.92 and you give the men eight cents more. What is scientific or logical about that? In List "B" you start both at \$1.18 a day and then you give the men six cents a day more than the women. Instead of wasting all that time, why not put both on the same wage scale inasmuch as the wages are so low? I hope sir, that the Government would see its way to review these rates which have been in existence for some years, so that the Government can face the island as being innocent of paying wages that can be regarded as scandalous.

7.20 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Normally speaking, a Minister seeing after his departmental duties would not know that teachers were not paid during the month, and that the money was running short or that the lamps at the lighthouse were out of order; you do not know these things unless they are brought to your attention. Even if there was one sole Minister responsible for Education he would be in no better position than the one that I am in.

These teachers were being employed for the last ten years. The money to pay them came out of the teachers' vote. There were more children this year and it was found that the money was running short. It might have gone on for another ten years if these circumstances did not arise. I do not mind what people say about how many portfolios I have; if I had to deal with Education alone it would not, necessarily make any difference as far as this particular matter is concerned. A man going around checking up on this and that would be likely to discover something like this; if the man at the top does not have a thing like this reported to him how would he know it?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that this Resolution has at long last come before us. The Hon. Premier at the end of his first speech on the Resolution said he hoped he would be able to answer any further questions that members might have to ask. In attempting to answer the questions that I asked, he has said something which really caused me to get to my feet again.

In replying to the hon. junior member for St. Peter he said that anyone going around checking would observe these things, and it is not practicable for a Minister to go around like that. Anyone studying Education in this country will realise that busy as the Premier is with his intercolonial and international duties, plus the tremendous duty which he has as Minister of Finance, while I do not advocate a sixth Minister I would suggest a re-shuffle. Either of his two portfolios can, I think, be a whole time job in itself.

When I make certain statements in this House the Premier takes me up. At one time he used to say that I would cause someone to lose his job because I said things which, apparently, no other member wanted to say. I hope that he will not take umbrage

at what I am going to say, but he seems to have forgotten something. It is a fact that the situation as regards these teachers was brought to the attention of the Ministry around the end of last year, that is, that the money would run out. That is a simple fact that was drawn to the attention of the Ministry. Either you will have to blame the Education Department and say that they knew this was going to happen and caused these teachers to wait for three months before they got their salaries, or it was actually bungled in the Ministry or the Minister was too busy to deal with it.

I do not say that by way of criticism of the Premier, because I appreciate that as Minister of Finance in this country, with the various activities and the work to be done, even if you have been trained in the study of Finance, it takes some time. You even have to work at night; and indeed that is sometimes the best time to work. But it has been drawn forcibly to my attention that since around Christmas time these teachers were complaining about not getting their salaries.

If it were the Education Department which was so negligent as not to know that the money was running out and to bring it to the Minister's attention, I would say that you need staff in that department or something is wrong. It is a fact that they actually sent all the recommendations and their recommendations stood in the office of the Premier for some time and he was unable to see them. That shows that there is a tremendous amount of work there; I hope that such a situation will not arise again, or at least not for a long time.

Now it seems to me that not only in Barbados, but everywhere you get people with a desire for education doing more for education than educated people; I can cite many instances. Take St. Michael's Girls' School. Some of the people who initiated it could hardly spell "Ada" backwards; nevertheless they had a desire for education and they did a tremendous lot for education.

7.30 p.m.

Naturally, one would expect the Premier, as an educated man, to do something; but it strikes me as if he is unable at present with his other duties, to contribute or to do anything or to give any of his time to education. When I say to give any of his time, I do not mean running to a school here and there and to the department; I mean to give study to the system of education; because there is grave concern with the prevailing system, and the best proof of this is to discuss it thoroughly with your teachers in the island.

Let us take this Resolution which we have before us; I think it was last Saturday when I came into the Public Buildings Yard that I found half of the teachers in the island in the yard. I think they wanted to see the Hon. Minister of Social Services to find out whether they could borrow money from someone to aid them out of their present difficulty. If the Hon. Premier had the opportunity to go into this matter, he would have realised that he should have earlier in the year done something to offset this situation.

I want to say also, that part of the Hon. Premier's job when he was President of the Barbados Workers' Union was to look into the wages of people. As a human being, would you say that \$5.50 is enough a week for a school teacher to work for? Sometime ago there was an advertisement in the Press for a cow-boy, and it was stated that applicants must have a school certificate. The Hon. Premier is offering school teachers \$5.50 and the cow-boy was offered \$9.50 a week. Would it surprise you to know that the Government in looking

around for these teachers; some of whom they are paying \$5.50 and some \$7.20 a week who have to leave Christ Church to teach in St. Andrew and some living in St. Andrew who have to teach in Christ Church, and they are just doing it because they want something to do. This Government is asking a girl who has just left school with a school certificate to leave St. Joseph to teach in St. Michael for \$5.50 a week; from where must she get the bus-fare? Must she go to the Minister for it? This is more than getting up and criticising the Government; this is a pathetic situation. It is something to see after you have advertised for a teacher; I am speaking with some experience, because I happen to be a manager of one of the schools in this island; if you advertise for a teacher, believe it sir, you have fifty, sixty and sometimes seventy with school certificates making applications, and you even get some with higher school certificates, who because of their economic position are willing to work for \$5.90 a week. This is a direct appeal to the Hon. Premier because he was once President of the Barbados Workers' Union. I am saying it is his solemn duty to the youth of this country to see that they are no longer represented in this way. Fancy that female teachers are given \$5.90 a week to teach in an elementary school five days a week, and on top of that, they have to carry home work and do it at night.

The honourable junior member for St. Peter referred to 40 children in a class; if it were only 40 I would have no objection. Would the honourable member believe that some school teachers have to teach 80 children in a class. Sometimes there are 80 children in a class, sometimes 70, sometimes 60; forty children in a class is a mild number; when you get forty in a class, you feel comfortable. I have seen a relief teacher getting \$5.90 a week teaching 80 children in a class; and the Hon. Premier knows that.

In the coming Estimates, we are going to deal with the entire question of teachers. If the Hon. Minister of Education were a member of the Opposition, I wonder what would be his position in the absence of Ministerial Government if the Department of Education sent down an order to pay a school teacher \$5.90 a week. If you work as a domestic servant and allowed food, you can work for a tremendous amount more than that. The fact is this: many a child has to burn midnight oil in order to get a school certificate; and when they get that, apparently, they are faced with the difficulty today in order to get by; they have to do a lot of back-scratching and a lot of other things to get a job. [A VOICE: Do you mean a Sunday school teacher?] Once before, you had to teach a Sunday school class with a minister to get a job as a school teacher. Of course, it is known that a lot of young ladies who want to teach today are being led into immorality; I would only say that those people should be appointed on their merits, and I sound it out as a warning. [A VOICE: What about young men?] I do not know how they get around that.

Mr. Chairman, I hope Government is reviewing the rates of pay for these school teachers during the consideration of the Estimates. I cannot see you start off a teacher at anything less than two dollars a day; and I hope you will bear that in mind. With the cost of living today and the standard which school teachers must appear in school, you cannot start them off at anything less than that. It would be unkind for any man who has reached the position which the Hon. Premier has reached, as Minister of Education, and by the people of this colony, to allow to pass before him any scheme which would pay a female school teacher \$1.18 per day. The honourable junior member for St. Peter has suggested that the biscuits and milk and the like at the schools which these teachers

have to supervise must be taken into account. Whether that is taken into account or not, I hope the Government is not taking as far as a teacher's emoluments are concerned the fact that they can get biscuits and milk at the school.

Mr. Chairman, under these circumstances we agree to the passing of this Resolution. We are very glad that this Resolution has come down, even though belated. I will throw it out to the Hon. Minister of Education that in the future either he or his private secretary should attempt to draw this earlier to his attention. If he is out of the island somebody should deputise for him on matters of this sort; they should not take so long to be dealt with. Nothing should be done to cause those people to suffer.

It is a fact that the majority of these teachers have been told that it is the fault of the Education Department, and the Education Department has had to keep its mouth quiet because nobody could tell what would happen. The tendency today is that if you express a view you might be victimised by a Department. I hope, sir, that what we are saying today will strengthen the hands of the Hon. Minister to increase the daily wages of these Assistant teachers; it is absolutely necessary to do that. You must do that; and I go as far as to say that you should not pay them at any time anything less per day, than what the average teacher is getting.

7:40 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: I quite agree that these salaries are rather low; and I hope that some attention will be paid to this matter. What has struck me is that the Department of Education can take on additional people without first providing for the payment of these people. They must know that the money will run out as long as they employ more people than what it is provided for in the Estimates. I remember that an ex-Lord Bishop of Barbados was in the Legislature (and at the same time a member of the Education Board) and he thoroughly castigated the Financial Department of the Government or the Government itself for not paying sufficient attention to a serious recommendation of the Board of Education for the provision of 29 teachers or something like that; the Government said that they could not afford that. If we are laying down a policy, these teachers should not have been flouted as they were; the Government has not got a leg to stand on in saying that something has arisen. This is something which has been brought to their attention by the Head of the Church. I must support the remarks of my colleague when he said that these supernumeraries are transferred from one parish to another; it is like where a dairy in Black Rock has to deliver milk somewhere in St. Lawrence and *vice versa*; people who could be given a job near where they live are sent far away, and then somebody has to travel to the school near where the other people live. Something should be done to prevent a great part of this \$5.90 per week from going in bus-fare. I do hope that these teachers will get their money; after all they have only been kept out of it for three months, but other people have had to wait for theirs since 1953.

As regards Item 32 "Examination Expenses" that is a very serious matter; because the Education Department and the policy makers of this colony have been exonerated from blame which I understand should be attached to them; it is that in these Government Aided Secondary Schools the Headmasters were told that they should decide whether or not a pupil should sit an examination, and that they should cut down expenditure for it, and when it is brought to light the Headmasters are blamed for picking out certain pupils. Pupils have paid for the examinations themselves and they have come out

better than those which the Headmasters selected. That was a directive to the Headmasters and when it came out in public, they are exonerated from blame and the very people who made the policy condemned it. It was their own policy. The Minister of Education is now so called, but he was on the Education Board for a long number of years and he knows what this directive means. I hope that the Hon. Premier will make a statement to say whether what I have said is true or not. When you say that something must be stopped, it started with the Director of Education himself; he should not start without the Minister saying that they must decide whether the pupils must sit examinations. If you make a mistake you should say it is your mistake and that you are going to correct it, but do not imply that it was somebody else's mistake. I sincerely hope that these matters will receive proper attention; but I must say that one teacher to forty pupils seems to be a great deal; but the expenditure on Education is quite high and if it is regarded as money well spent, I am afraid that we will have to do it and probably spend more on it. It is rather hard that you are paying persons such a small wage and that you deliberately take them from one school and send them miles away so that they have to catch two buses to get to the school, whereas people who live out of the vicinity of the school have to go to that school. That is a matter which has to be gone into.

7:50 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: It is interesting to find that the Department of Education has to come to this House tonight and admit that there have been inadequate estimates. The last honourable member and myself have no difficulty in recalling a recent instance where there was an inadequate estimate made through no fault at all of the Governing Body of the School, and when the Department of Education was simply flabbergasted when anybody made an under estimate. We find that they have underestimated what they would require to pay these Relief Teachers.

What obviously adds insult to injury, is the fact that a circular was sent around by the Head of the Department (the Director of Education himself) who incidentally is in receipt of a salary of \$580.00 a month, suggesting that these Relief Teachers are expected to uncomplainingly tolerate this state of affairs when they are short paid or not paid at all.

Now, sir, it is not good enough for any imported official to come to this country [A VOICE: No official at all!] no official at all, and especially an imported official (I make no apologies for saying that) who is drawing a salary of \$580.00 to say that people who are drawing five and six dollars a week are expected to uncomplainingly tolerate such a state of affairs until it is impossible to give them relief.

An attempt to relieve it came on the 22nd of February this year which was last Tuesday, when this Resolution was introduced into this Chamber. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown has given his version, or rather his alternative version, of the cause of this attempt being so long delayed. Frankly, it is not good enough to tell people they must wait uncomplainingly. One of these teachers has a monthly judgement summons of six dollars a month which he has to pay the Courts. Can a man go to the Courts and expect them to believe that he is working with the Government and that the Government has not paid him? After to-night, if this debate is allowed to see the light of day in the capitalist Press, perhaps certain Courts will see this particular state of affairs and will be sympathetic.

One is told that the Government's money is always good, certain and sure. How long does one have

to wait when it comes to these people. There is no question about it. These teachers are very uncomplaining because they are afraid. There are so many of these people who have left school with the General Certificate of Education and with perhaps five or six credits and without opportunity, that there is nothing which they can do about this state of affairs publicly. But privately they have to ask people who can ill afford it, people like you and me, sir, to help them meet their debts, and ask us to pass this Resolution as soon as we can when it was only introduced last Tuesday. These mistakes should not happen.

If the Director would devote less attention to his activities are not needed (the efficiently run Government-aided secondary schools) and attend to matters like this, perhaps the Education Department would be more efficiently run.

In passing I will refer to a point that I have been referring to for a number of years, and one that has been mentioned by a previous speaker today, that is, the discrepancy between the rates of pay to male and female teachers. The Government has made the concession that they are starting both at the same rate. I am sorry that the hon. senior member for St. Michael is not in his place. Before he was in an exalted position he used to join my chorus of equal pay for men and women; perhaps he still thinks that way, but maybe he is in the minority, because his colleagues do not agree although both men and women have to vote and each are asked with equal fervour for their favours at the ballot box.

After all, Mr. Chairman, lady legislators receive, and rightly so, the same remuneration as male legislators; and there is no reason at all for any distinction or discrimination between the salaries of the two.

I do not think I need emphasise the inadequacy of the salaries paid to these relief teachers; the hon. junior member for St. Peter has done it with his usual vehemence and vociferousness, and has pointed out how ill these salaries compare with the wages of gardeners, yard boys, messengers, shop assistants, and domestic servants. A person with the General Certificate of Education is to-day paid less in Barbados than many domestic servants in this country.

We will deal with these things more fully in the debate on the Budget. All these remarks are merely a forewarning to the Hon. and learned Minister of Education.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, the strictures which were made against the Government for the exploiting of its employees, would have I thought brought out a promise from the Premier who is Minister of Education that the Government would consider the low wages that are paid to the relief teachers and would also consider increasing them. I did not think about the wages that are paid to them until I received my copy of this Resolution. Certainly the Government cannot excuse itself in this respect when most of the members of the Government have something to do with the Trade Union in this colony.

Legislation has been introduced into this Chamber on several occasions for the purpose of improving working conditions, and seeing that private employers do not rob their employees. In this respect the present Government is showing itself to be the worst employer in this country. In this respect, while claiming to be a Socialist Government, it believes in the inequality of individuals when it increases the salaries of some individuals, some officials, in what can be termed a discriminatory manner.

8.00 p.m.

It also makes provision for large pensions to such individuals who retire. For example, an official earning four, five or six hundred dollars a month sometimes more, is permitted to retire voluntarily at the

age of fifty-five, and in some cases compulsorily at the age of sixty; when he retires on such grounds he is granted a pension of two-thirds of his salary. You can well understand how long a supply teacher will have to work to get two-thirds of six hundred dollars; it would take him a couple months before he can earn so much. That has nothing to do with the prerequisites which are provided for these officials by this Socialist Government which is put in power by those supply teachers and their relatives. Those officials are given leave passages etc. When you look at this Mr. Chairman, you will see that this Labour Government is reducing the status of one of their servants from whom you expect cultural refinement to a status less than an agricultural labourer whose job is considered to be the gutter-hole type of work in this country, or in any other country. In my opinion to be employed as an agricultural worker should be considered the greatest thing in any country because they are the producers of a country, while many of the other jobs can only be considered as parasites; and to my mind of employment they are the lowest type of jobs.

Sir, imagine a Government which carries a false Socialist name creating a greater disparity not only in earnings but in the state of employment; something which the greatest reactionary Government might not consider to do. What is more, Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Premier who has been President of the B.W.U. for many years and who set up himself as the only emancipator of the working class people, continues to perpetuate the system which he should have reformed. Fancy the very thing which he spoke against when he was aiming at achieving power, he is ignorant of since he has achieved that power. To-day with the high cost of living you get a supply teacher who has to do commensurate work with that done by another teacher of higher qualifications, and a higher salary being under-paid. Of course, they have to accept the employment because there is no alternative employment for them. You may know sir, that many of these teachers are the daughters or sons of labourers, and they feel that accepting such a job as teaching would carry up the fair name of their families; that is the reason why they do so. They do not accept teaching because of the economic benefit, but because some of them are proud to know that they are offered a better job of employment than their parents. Because that is so Government should not exploit the situation. Does the Hon. Minister of Education know that \$1.18 a day is less than what some of his officials smoke out? Does he know that some of his officials walk down to Messrs. Goddard's Restaurant on days and finish up with two or three rum and gingers, which means that they spend more money on stimulants than what these teachers get per day? Some of these young ladies who want to go in for school teaching have to give up their chastity in order to buy shoe polish, lipstick, powder, soap and hair dressing, things which they must use in order to set an example of culture and refinement to the children which they have to teach. Will the Hon. Minister of Education sit back and study all these things? Does he realise that such an injustice as under-paying supply teachers will fall heavily on our educational system? Does he know that a dissatisfied teacher who cannot buy a bottle of Phensic tablets cannot give of his or her best? Does he know that if he forces such a condition on these supply teachers that many of them will go to the class room feeling ill, and that the unfortunate pupils will have to pay for it? Does he know that this will really defeat the cause of education and will cause the cost of education to be higher in the long run? The Hon. Premier who every now and then is asked to visit

schools and cut ribbons to declare them open, and who makes flowery speeches on such occasions even although they are sometimes sarcastic and very reflective, would do well if he considers these things and apply himself to them. When he makes these speeches at these functions, they will be justified if the policy he is pursuing as Minister of Education is in keeping with those speeches.

8.10 p.m.

There is no earthly excuse for this Resolution; it is just a while ago that we assented to a supplementary vote (to an already voted amount of \$20,000) to pay the passages of Government officials who are brought down here. That is nothing to do with leave passages, because the leave passages for this year would be about \$90,000 to \$100,000. I want to make an analogy; the hon. member in the face of suggestions, continues to encourage provisions which allow imported officials to travel at the most expensive rate. He has been beseeched on many occasions to reduce this rate of travelling because you will get some officials whose posts are not of such importance, that they must travel in the luxury class; because many of them——

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No officials are in this Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: If some of them had to pay their own passage they would come and go at the second class rate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Officials are not in this Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: Not only is the passage to be paid for the officer but also for his wife; and when the hon. member sits in Executive Committee I presume he only thinks of the particular matter before him, and he does not realise that what takes place here has its reaction in another quarter. We do not want to do an injustice to people who are least able to bear it; would you imagine that a Government like this which boasts of over \$2 million of surplus revenue having the intention of putting by over a million dollars. Wickedness is indulged in by exploiting unfortunate young men and women because of the over population question in this island and the absence of sufficient jobs for people. While some Governments, (this Government is not excluded) pat themselves on the back for having had the opportunity of getting surpluses, it is the most wicked thing for Government to do and much worst for an acclaimed Labour Government to find itself doing. It is only an achievement when all your employees are reasonably paid, and when you do not force young ladies whom you employ to look for alternative means of supplementing their earnings. The Government is worst than some of the Jews whom we knew some time ago took advantage of the situation; but even the Jews have given consideration for those females employed, even although they might not have done it except for legislation enacted in this Chamber and suggested by the same Government in power. What I am trying to point out is this: if the Government feels that I as an individual employer should not be permitted to exploit an employee, then this Government should set an example; and they should not make it possible for hon. members to criticise the treatment which they mete out to such persons as they employ as supply teachers. It is true as the hon. senior member for the City has said, that some of these teachers have to travel 18 miles a day sometimes; and some of them involve themselves in debt purchasing bicycles and they even "hag a lift" from some sympathetic driver. The hon. member knows

that the bus fare is considerably high in certain country districts, and if you have a young woman travelling 9 miles a day she has to pay 40 cents of her money coming and going out. What is left for this young lady to keep herself tidy and set her mind at ease, so as to gather the necessary ideas which she is expected to pass to those whom she teaches.

8.20 p.m.

Those are things that the hon. gentlemen of the Executive Committee should consider when they meet; but it does seem that all their minds operate in the same manner, and that they leave without consideration the things to which they should pay attention. I am hoping, sir, that inasmuch as this sweated type of labour is brought to the attention of hon. members the Government, in the near future (because I notice no provision for an increase in the Estimates of the coming financial year) will bring down Supplementary Estimates to make sure that these supply teachers are given a rightful increase.

I do not want the Government to shelter behind the excuse that this section of employees cannot be given consideration until an overall revision of salaries takes place; certainly not. It has been clearly proved, sir, that these teachers deserve the sympathy not only of the Government, but of all hon. members. What makes it worse is the statement made by an hon. member that the Director of Education whose salary is over \$500.00 a month, should ask these unfortunate employees to bear it out with tolerance and wait until the money due to them for the past three months reaches their pockets. It is an insult to justice and fair play to make such a suggestion; it also shows a lack of sympathy manifested by the Head of the Department towards his subordinates.

If that officer wanted efficiency in the department for which he is responsible, he would have seen that an injustice was being done; and in view of the fact that the opinions of Heads of Departments are accepted by the Government he should have brought his influence to bear. In the next place he should have seen early that the increase in the number of the supply teachers would have necessitated a Supplementary Resolution earlier in the financial year, so that it would not have been put before us at this late hour.

I am hoping, sir, that the Hon. Premier who is Minister of Education and who pledged himself sometime in the past to devote four fifths of his time to the bringing up of this department to its rightful standard, will tell us whether he is impressed by the arguments put forward on behalf of these employees and whether he would really come to their assistance and do it very soon.

Mr. GODDARD: Before you put the question, sir, I would say that I think enough has been said about the non-payment of these teachers. I am going to introduce something new which I wish the Minister would take up. I am told that these teachers although they work for long periods, are precluded from taking the examination for Certificate "B" while they are in temporary employment. As you know, sir, the best time for study is as soon as possible after you come out of school, and if you are to achieve any success in teaching you should never cease in your training. It is a fact, I am told, that no teacher, no matter how well qualified he may be, is allowed to sit for Certificate "B" until he is a permanent teacher.

The reason is best known to the department; I believe it is that they fear a crowding of the profes-

sion. I think, however, that that situation should be corrected. Even if these teachers cannot be taken into the profession they should be given an opportunity to achieve that Certificate, so that if and when they are required in the profession they will already have had the certificate. To delay teachers' training is not at all in the best interest of the profession, and I would like this matter taken up. The underpayment of these teachers has been drawn forcibly to the attention of the Minister and I now ask him to take up this other point as well.

Mr. ALLDER: I would only like to point out that criticisms relative to these teachers have been made and certain suggestions have also been made to both of which the Hon. Premier, who is handling the Resolution has shown himself to be impervious. Of course I cannot make him reply; but I just want to draw it to the attention of the Committee.

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

On motion of Hon. G. H. Adams seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox Mr. Chairman reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee. Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. G. H. Adams, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and then agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

8.40 p.m.

ESTIMATES 1955-56

On re-assembling.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the Estimates for the Financial Year 1955-56.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in moving the consideration of the Estimates for the Financial Year 1955-56, I wish to say quite briefly that in spite of what people seem to think of what should comprise a Budget Speech, a Budget Speech is just a Speech on the Budget; a Budget Speech is a production of figures of Revenue and Expenditure. It is not an exposition of political science or political manoeuvre of a Government at a particular time of a particular country; it is just putting before the Legislature the financial policy of the Government as shown by a system of Revenue and Expenditure like ours. It is just a system of responsible Government and a declaration of the policy in which people are asked subsequently to vote Estimates. A Budget Speech is simply the expression of the financial policy of the Government, of how public money was expended during the previous year, how it proposes to expend public money for the coming year, and of what revenue it proposes to allocate towards meeting that expenditure. Honourable members would not therefore hear an exposition of Socialist principles or otherwise; they will hear as nearly as possible an approximation of the Budget Speech as made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as is consistent with our conditions, customs and practices, and with our system of Govern-

ment, even though it is today elevated to a Ministerial form of Government. If, therefore, honourable members hear from me tonight just a record of figures, some of which sometimes can be boring, I hope they would put up with it; because I have no intention of departing from the conventions of Great Britain or to be following other countries besides Great Britain, either with respect to the presentation of the Estimates or in respect of any other matter which falls within the conduct of such governments. In short, it is not my fault if some persons do not care to see that now, whether they are in or out of the House. They are blindly ignorant of what responsible government is. Therefore, they are inclined to think that this Government is not doing right when it does not do something which they want it to do.

This Budget Speech is largely a recount of what we have done and what we propose to do, and what revenue we propose to spend. I propose again, (following the custom of the Chancellor of the Exchequer) to say what the taxation proposals for this year are going to be, in order that the feeling of insecurity which used to exist, mainly, (I should imagine) among commercial rather than among people with personal incomes, may cease to exist when they know at this time of the year what the taxation proposals are going to be and how far they can budget for their business. I will say this: I shall endeavour to be as calm and as unprovocative as possible in my opening remarks, and am prepared, if reasonable questions are put to me, to answer them. We want as Ministers to give an account of our stewardship, and to give an opportunity to question that stewardship during the year. We would be entirely wrong if we did not prepare ourselves for the attacks which undoubtedly will be made on us. We have been preparing intensely for the past week or so, and I am glad to see that members of the Opposition are not putting their hands into the empty air to gather stray shots to throw at the Government.

Hon. members will have read the Memorandum on the Estimates. I shall repeat what I said last Tuesday. The estimates of revenue and expenditure are prepared under that democratic system which eventually has reached responsible Government. Heads of Departments put up their Estimates and these Estimates have to be considered by the Minister of Finance, or the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and then presented to the whole Executive Committee or Cabinet and then brought down to the Legislature. Before I go any further, I wish to pay a tribute to the Civil Servants, because the unfortunate members of that service have no means of replying to attacks. It so often happens that these Civil Servants do extremely good work and they do not always get the credit for it. I have had the benefit this year of seeing Financial Statements both by the Financial Secretary of Jamaica and the Budget Speech of the late Minister of Finance in Trinidad; I have seen Financial Statements in Nigeria and Gambia and none of them showed such constructive work as our Financial Secretary has shown in the preparation of these Estimates. I have them all here before me; and if any member chooses to look at them he will see that I am not exaggerating one bit in what I have said. I say this because last year there was an attempt, (I will not say it was a stupid attempt) to suggest that this Government was not thinking for itself, and it was merely saying or repeating what two members of the Executive Committee (but not members of a particular Party) had said. I wish to say again that we have

endeavoured to the best of our ability to run the Ministerial system on the best possible lines as near as is consistent with local conditions. I find that when I read last year's debate, so much was expected by way of a flowery, flamboyant, political harangue rather than a cold, objective speech to the extent that the figures were being put before the Legislature, that they expected me to do something more than that. I can only say that it is my duty to call the attention of members to the Memorandum, to go through it, not repeating all we have said there, but using it as a basis for drawing attention to our present, past and future policy. Again let me say this: this Government after much serious thought, considered, in common with a great deal of the rest of the world, that five years should be the life of the House; and that five years as a period for which to budget for revenue and expenditure was a reasonable time, and we are discontinuing having annual Parliaments. An annual Parliament is not good enough in a competitive world and for that reason we enunciated the Five Year Plan. I said last year that we are carrying out that Five Year Plan; and although one can easily point to departure of a certain sort, what we intended in the Five Year Plan was that such a Plan could not be but a broad outline of the Government's policy; with the reminder, that no human being could foretell what would happen in the fourth year in an agricultural community which is dependent on the vagaries of the weather and the question of diseases and pests; and so the Five Year Plan would be expected to be modified from time to time. Certain aspects of the Plan will be speeded up, and certain other aspects would have to be laid aside; and we ourselves said in the Memorandum on the Plan that it was a broad outline of policy. We indicated last year that there would be modifications of this policy and we contemplated more changes this year, which is the fourth year of the Plan.

I would like to draw your attention, sir, to what I said at the beginning of the Memorandum. We are introducing in this Budget provision for starting the Deep Water Harbour; that is only mentioned in the Plan for which no financial provision was made. At this stage, sir, although perhaps it might come back later, I wish to correct statements that were made recently in this House about the policy of the Government in respect of the Five Year Plan.

Not only did the Government say in the Five Year Plan that we were committed to the policy of having the Deep Water Harbour, but we came to the House and said so, and said we would set up a committee to go further into the implications of the Deep Water Harbour; and that this committee would examine the report of the construction engineers and make recommendations.

As the House and whole island would know, that committee made a report which the Government considered was a very good one. This House passed a Resolution accepting the recommendations of that committee, and asking the Government to speedily implement those recommendations. I say that because only as recently as last week, some members seemed to have forgotten that that happened and that part of the recommendations was for raising loans. It is very necessary at this early stage to say that in this fourth year of the Five Year Plan we have departed to the extent of putting in the Deep Water Harbour, whereas in 1952, while we were committed to the principle of having it, not having examined it in detail, we did not know for certain what our

financial hopes would be if we went to London to borrow money.

I would like to remind hon. members of something that was not mentioned this session; but it was mentioned previously on the floor of the House: that as long as there was that smear which was thrown upon us in the House of Lords by people connected with the British Union Oil Company, there was no reasonable hope of going to England then and getting any money for the Barbados Government. The Barbados Government was at that time accused of being dishonest, of having gone back on its word and of making promises which it immediately broke, when there was not the slightest justification for saying that any promise was made to the B.U.O.C. to give them a monopoly to explore for oil.

As has been pointed out, much of the money necessary for the Plan will have to come from the external loan; and not only has it been pointed out as far back as the time of the introduction of the Five Year Plan but subsequently, that not only is it necessary to give local people a chance of subscribing part of the loan, but we must show to outside investors that the people of Barbados themselves believe in the necessity of having a Deep Water Harbour.

We have therefore in this Budget, Mr. Speaker, made provision for the estimated cost of the first full year's work (\$725,760) to be met from surplus funds. Part of this direct contribution, an amount of \$120,000, (the initial expenditure on the scheme) has been included in the draft Estimates under capital expenditure.

I shall, as I go on with points in this Memorandum, show honourable members what we propose with regards to expenditure on other items of capital works. But I must point out, (and I wish I was doing it for the first time, but I had unfortunately to do some of it last Tuesday night,) that what is before us entails expenditure of a sum of 40 million dollars and the question of priority must be carefully considered. There are certain things which we have to do first, and certain things which must await their turn as was the case in the Five Year Plan.

Housing is one of those things I will deal with later. I am mindful of the fact that much criticism was levelled last year and it had to be met time after time; criticism of what appeared to be a paltry attempt to deal with the question of Housing. We already have the concurrence of this House in a Bill to raise as much money as we feel we can raise by local loan for the next five years.

Although I said it last Tuesday night, I have to remind the House of what the Government has done in that respect by floating a loan locally. Bearing in mind the advice we have got, and bearing in mind the experience of last year, we feel that over a period of five years we can borrow \$6,720,000 to aid us in carrying out all the plans of capital development and welfare schemes.

I do not want to rub it in, but I would just like to remind the House that a local loan means a loan locally floated. The money can come from anywhere, and it will still be a local loan. I draw hon. members' attention to the points we made in Para 5: that some of these schemes would take longer to carry out than was anticipated, while some would be implemented very much faster.

As regards the financial position for the year 1955-56, what I am saying generally is that it is difficult to say with anything approaching approximate accuracy what the sugar crop is going to be;

but it will apparently be above the average which the Government, (not following Professor Beasley) estimated as the average crop; that is to say that it will be above 150,000 tons. We anticipate that it will be in the vicinity of 160,000 tons.

We have shown on Page 2 of the Memorandum what our imports and exports have been; and have shown that although our exports amounted to a smaller sum than our imports and we had therefore an unfavourable trade balance of over 8 million dollars, nevertheless we estimate that the invisible exports in the form of remittances and tourist money will be likely to cover that deficit.

The estimated revenue for 1955-56 is \$14,272,208. The estimated expenditure in Part I of the Estimates is \$13,705,616, so that the estimated surplus for the current accounts is \$566,592.
9.55 p.m.

The estimated Capital Expenditure is \$4,578,135, and inasmuch as \$2,812,525 comes from General Revenue Balances, there will be a net reduction of the surplus balance to \$2,245,465. Our Revenue has continued to expand and we consider that the Government is justified in proposing the expenditure according to the expansion which is before the House. It is a record expenditure; but we feel justified even although ours is a one-crop economy, in putting this expenditure before the Legislature. We feel it is all necessary. None of it is wasted, and although it is far beyond the notional figures set out in the Five Year Plan, it must be patently clear to every member of this House, if not to members of the public, that the Five Year Plan could only have been a broad outline of the financial policy of the Government, a policy which the Government intends to pursue but one which it was always necessary to change from time to time. You may forgive me if I say, that the opposite would have been the case if we had had two years of drought. Obviously, we would have had to go slow on Capital Works and even works of a welfare nature. I would remind honourable members in spite of rash statements made on the floor of this House, that when the Five Year Plan was put before the House, the Legislature was merely asked to approve in principle the suggestions of the proposals. We made it abundantly clear that the various Items had to be voted for separately by the Legislature, and that we would have to come down for them from time to time. It is untrue to say that you cannot discuss so and so in this House because you have already accepted it in the Five Year Plan; you accepted the principle and in broad outline what the Government proposed. When we said, (and I mention this deliberately) that we wanted Ministerial Offices and Parliament Buildings and we considered that we should make provision for those two items, it was obvious to us that the erection of Parliament Buildings could wait until the end of the Five Years; and even then, we were of the opinion that it might not be possible to build them then. I do not want to appear as though I am replying to something said on the last occasion with reference to the Loan Act; but before you take anything that has been put in the Schedule to the Act, you will have to come to the Legislature, and the Legislature is specifically given the power to delete any Item which appears in the Schedule. Therefore, the argument that you are bound by a previous decision is absurd.

A Government being human, has to make modifications. It cannot control nature. It is not a matter of taking stock; and as time goes on, we may have to modify this and that. I must draw this, however, to the attention of the Legislature. If I take criticisms of the past seriously, I presume

the Government will get credit for making these modifications in the last year or so. We intend to use available funds rather than Loan Funds for those items of Capital Expenditure which in the Five Year Plan are to be found appearing under Loan Funds. For instance, in the 1955-56 Estimates, provision is made for an abattoir and a Fish Cold Storage and these items will now come from Available Funds. We do so because the capital cost of that is expected to be in the vicinity of six or seven thousand dollars.

I do not propose in this Budget Speech to do more than outline the general policy of the Government. I am leaving it to the Ministers when we go into Committee to deal with the specific Heads of Revenue and Expenditure within their specific departments.

I am endeavouring not to start a row first; but sometimes it is amazing to members on this side of the Table to hear certain statements from members on the other side. They have made a statement as to Ministers remaining silent and not joining the Premier in the Budget Speech. Who does that in a representative Government? The Ministers will see after their specific departments when dealing with the specific Heads. While I am on the subject of the loans, I think it should be of interest to honourable members to be told, or to be reminded in case some honourable members know it, that a Financial Secretaries Conference will be held in Jamaica early in April on the subject of local borrowing; and it may be that we may be able to borrow even more reasonably than has been the case in the past.

Again, for the last time, I stress that we intend to borrow as and when it appears most likely. We believe we can raise all the money that we have asked and obtained permission from this Branch of the Legislature to raise. I should repeat that we are not going to borrow money, put it down, and pay interest on it. What has happened last week in Mr. Butler raising the Bank rate twice in a month should be an indication, (as a member of the Opposition said,) that you cannot control the outside market; therefore, you must get expert advice as to when it is right to borrow.

Now, I would like to go back only for a brief moment again to the Deep Water Harbour, in view of the fact that a very wild statement has been made recently on the floor of the House. Let me say for the very last time that the Deep Water Delegation to London succeeded as much as it could possibly succeed. If you go to the Colonial Office, the Treasury and the representatives of those positively interested and with whom we discussed the matter, you will learn that they have agreed that the Deep Water Harbour here is an A 1 priority in any development scheme.

10.35 p.m.

We are still in the course of trying to arrange dates. We expect, possibly in April, experts in connection with the Harbour to come; and we expect that when they come we will know in a comparatively short time exactly how much money we will have to vote. We have reason to believe that the Colonial Development and Welfare organisation will make us a grant towards the Harbour; it is possible that even the Colonial Development Corporation funds would be available; but I say no more than that is just possible. We do not know yet what our allocations under the Act will be, as the matter is before the English Parliament; but we know that we will get an allocation and in the next Five Year Plan, and a substantial part of that allocation will be in respect of the Deep Water Harbour.

I have drawn the attention of hon. members to the figures which are set out on page two of the

Memorandum which I do not propose to read. The revised Estimates are contained in paragraph 9 and then we go to the approved and revised Estimates under the particular Heads of Revenue. In connection with paragraph 8, last year more or less, we tried to show how much we could raise and we know that deposits in the Government Savings Bank have risen by more than \$1 million. Deposits in Commercial Banks are over \$43 million, and it appears as if business in Bridgetown is bright; and that is a very good sign for everybody concerned. Business men, like planters, do not often grouse and when they have no occasion we do not expect them to grouse.

I propose to draw attention to paragraph 9 as some would say to the buoyant revenue which we have, and to anticipate criticisms that we have collections of revenue which exceed our Estimates and that the Government has deliberately (some say carelessly and some say ignorantly) budgeted greatly underestimating their revenue. It has always got to be remembered that we lay our Estimates by the middle of February; it is obviously impossible to estimate with any great accuracy what exactly the Estimates of revenue will be. Last year I pointed out that merchants have a habit of using their own judgment as to whether the outlook in the world is gloomy, and whether they should take in big stocks. When the actual revenue is somewhat above estimated revenue, it does not necessarily mean that you are incompetent. Nobody would accuse Mr. Butler of being an incompetent Chancellor; and some honourable members must have read that he was estimating for a surplus in 1954-55 of £10 million and he got a surplus of £300 million. Suppose that happened in Barbados! We have got to guess as to how much money people feel like spending in Broad Street and elsewhere, and we are only too happy to know that when we estimate for income tax we are getting it; because on one of these days the luck of Barbados may not last and we may have a drought. I must remind hon. members that budgeting as we do for a financial year at the end of March, we must have something with which to start the year until income tax comes in. Again, I do not propose to do anything more than draw the attention of honourable members to the approved Estimates which appear on page three of the Memorandum. The figures of the draft budget before us for the coming year appear on page four of the Memorandum, and I do nothing more than ask honourable members to study those figures.

10.45 p.m.

Revenue appears also on Page 4, and we have taken the trouble to show hon. members what the state of the revenue has been since 1940-41. It was three million dollars then; eight million in 1946-47 when the Bushe Experiment started or just after that; nine million in 1947-48; \$9,587,036 in 1949-50; \$13,757,830 in 1952-53; \$14,916,811 in 1953-54 and in last year's revised Estimates it was \$15,402,391.

We are either the luckiest Government on earth, or we have been careful in our administration. One side says one thing and the other side knows the other thing. Draft estimates as hon. members will see are \$14,272,208 which is derived from departmental estimates of \$6,329,000 for Customs and Excise, \$5,965,000 for Income tax and other taxes, and other revenue of \$1,978,208.

The estimate for Customs and Excise is based on the fact that we expect a small crop while the estimate for Income Tax is \$250,000 more than that for 1954-55. If hon. members turn to Pages 1 to 3 of the Draft Estimates they will see the details.

I come now to the current expenditure as proposed; I do not propose to read all this through. Hon. members again will see what recurrent expenditure has been since 1940-41. In that year it was \$2,940,780; in 1946-47 it was \$5,668,683; it went to the 11 million dollar mark in 1953-54 when it was \$11,161,928. In last year's revised Estimates it was \$11,860,613, while in the draft estimates for this year it is \$12,464,994 or \$796,514 more than last year's. The main increase is in Education, \$215,556, and the others are set out in Para. 14.

I will point out to hon. members or refresh their memories by saying that the increase in Education is mainly due to the inclusion of 162 supernumerary teachers who have been added as semi-permanent staff to the Education Department. In the Notes to the Estimates when we deal with individual heads, members will see the cost of the increases throughout. Medical, Charges of Debt, Miscellaneous and all the others.

I should refer also to non-recurrent expenditure. Subsidised foodstuffs come to \$403,000; and here I may state that the Pig Breeding Scheme will continue to be expanded. I will say no more than that, because the Minister of Agriculture will deal with that specific item. We propose to continue the subsidisation of imported pork and the pickled stuff until we feel that we have built up a sufficient pig population to supply our requirements. We propose to continue with the subsidisation of items of food consumed by poor people; we will subsidise rice so as to keep it at 10 cents a pint.

Also on page 5, there is a summary of the non-recurrent expenditure which this year is to the tune of \$1,240,622. That figure is pretty near the same as it was in the present financial year. Under the Head, Science & Agriculture, it includes \$60,000 for the subsidisation of pig breeders. Over the page hon. members will find a comparison between the 1954-55 approved estimates of expenditure, and the notional expenditure shown in the Five Year Plan for 1955-56 and the draft estimates for 1955-56.

Perhaps at this stage, I should draw attention to one or two items on which I am sure to be asked questions by hon. members. Perhaps the outstanding question is that of unemployment. I am sure that members of the Opposition are as glad as I am to see the Minister of Trade & Labour in his place, although for obviously different reasons. [A MEMBER: Where is he?] His place is anywhere in Barbados where he may be useful. We have as hon. members know in our midst, Mr. Cumper of the University College of the West Indies, carrying out an unemployment survey; and at least hon. members will know that that unemployment survey should serve a useful purpose in letting us know not only the state of unemployment on a particular day or month, but its fluctuation, the possibilities of alternative employment, the capacity of unemployed or semi-employed people to turn to alternative jobs etc., and will provide the necessary statistics to assist the Government which not only has on its hands perpetually an under-employment problem, but also has to look, in the carrying out of our vast capital works, for expenditure for the continued employment of those persons.

We are glad that the Deep Water Harbour will take four or five years to construct. Even a Socialist Government, in these circumstances, must make plans for absorbing as far as possible (I have to say as far as possible, because obviously Barbados being Barbados will have to make provision for such people as may have to be displaced as a result of the

constructed of the Deep Water Harbour) those people.

Honourable members know pretty nearly as much as I do about the emigration question, because a lot of what we know, (apart from the letters which come to us, and apart from what the Government may now know from the Hon. Minister of Labour) appears in the Press of the West Indies and the English Press which some of us get, in addition to the tracts which appear in the local Newspapers. We shall do what any reasonable and sensible Government will do, on the assumption that emigration is an A1 priority. We shall endeavour to do all we can, even with those obdurate Governments which tell us frankly that they do not want non-Europeans. We shall do all that we can to get persons settled in those countries; and the Minister who has returned from the U.K. will shortly make a statement on the prospects of emigration to the U.K., and will offer suggestions as to what this island can do for those persons who still joyfully go to a land no longer flowing with milk and honey, or joyfully to a land where even if you can find a little money, you cannot always find a roof over your head.

We are keeping, as we foretold in the Five Year Plan, \$100,000 as an emigration vote; and whatever is found possible to do financially to help emigration to the U.K. or the U.S.A., we shall do. We have increased the annual grant to the Publicity Committee to \$47,206, and we have increased the contribution to the Caribbean Tourist Association to \$2,340. The Government has never changed its policy about tourism. The Government knows that tourists will always bring in dollars; but it also knows that Barbados is Barbados with all the racial stupidities that exist in this island.

To mention a simple thing Mr. Speaker, (a matter to which the Government will give attention) On two occasions in comparatively recent times, distinguished persons of colour have been personally refused a haircut by certain barbers in Bridgetown. That is not the sort of thing that any Government should tolerate. If it is necessary to have by legislation to bring about a licencing system to shut down such barber shops in Barbados, we will do it.
10.55 p.m.

I say that, because it is so easy for people to say that this Government is at last awakening to the fact that we need tourists, when all this Government is saying is that we need dollars. But we are not getting dollars at the expense of racial non-discrimination. We are still sticking to that policy.

As regards regional matters, this House is giving a subsidy of \$21,120 to the Intra-Regional Shipping Service and although one or two members may not want it, we are asking this Legislature to vote \$10,000 for the British West Indian Airways. [A VOICE: That is a Sunday School joke!] I love a joke as well as anybody else, but a joke which is anti-regional and anti-federation is one which goes just too far. When we hear that the Government will not do this or that for American airlines to come here, and we ask what is the truth, the answer is that they have not applied to the British Government or the Barbados Government for any rights. I hope any hon. member who has anything to say about this Government or the British Government with respect to the airways, would quote chapter and verse. If we are the only territory in the British West Indies who wishes to help B.W.I.A., I will only say: God help us. We believe we are not less warm than anybody else in the necessity for federation, in order that we may speak with a unified voice in the West Indies. We are saying give B.W.I.A.

a subsidy, but not what B.W.I.A. expects us to give. We are giving something which is largely notional. If we are going to be told, (for whatever reason God knows), that Barbados alone is going to stand out of having a link with the other islands in an air service, then let us drop all interest in federation at once.

Mr. Speaker, I go on with the Memorandum to draw attention to some of the items which we have put in under the Head, Subsidies and Grants. (See page 98 and 99 of the Estimates.) We have put in something to make provision for advice on Local Government. There are also one or two other items of a trivial nature which are new.

The comparative Capital Expenditure appears in paragraph 16 of the Memorandum and hon. members can peruse it. At paragraph 17 honourable members will see a statement showing the progress of capital expenditure from available funds, in comparison with the 1952-57 Five Year Plan. I bring these things to the notice of hon. members because I am anxious to point out to them that we have departed from the Five Year Plan by way of doing more spending, and we have done it because we have seen our way to do so. In carrying out our Capital Works Programme both directly and indirectly, Government has borne in mind the necessity for more employment.

I hope honourable members have done what the Ministers or some of the Ministers have done in order to be fully aware of the plan of Capital Development, and the stages which they have reached. Some hon. members will be surprised to know (as I was surprised to discover this morning) with respect to the Highways and Transport Department leaving to go to the Pine, that we have reached the stage where workmen are putting on the roof to the new building. There are 298 men employed up there; so that is only an indication of the extensive works programme and the employment which we are giving people. The Hon. Minister for Communications, Works and Housing will give hon. members the full details.

We have also extended our water supplies and, as hon. members already know, they will see in this same paragraph that we have spent more money proportionately per year than what has been spent in the way we set out to spend it according to the Five Year Plan.

11.05 p.m.

We have this advantage as regards Capital Expenditure on water supplies. It is not only of great benefit to people by distributing through standposts the extra volume of water which we are now getting, but it brings in additional revenue through the extension of this service. We have increased the provision for Housing; and when some honourable members ask "what is the erection of 60 houses or even 600 houses," I will ask them to remember that there is the use of Labour Welfare Funds. Not only was I surprised at the speed with which these buildings are being erected under the Capital Works Programme, but every honourable member has seen the speed at which the Fire Station has gone up. One Fire Engine is already there. Erdiston as a hostel for additional students is being dealt with; progress is being made with the Hospital which is approaching completion, and work on the Law Courts is proceeding apace. As regards the Ministerial Buildings which will be facing Carlisle Bay, honourable members when they come to visit the Ministers, will be able to regale themselves in the balmy breezes which come across the Esplanade. [Laughter]. The only thing I am afraid of in migrating to the Es-

planade is that the Ministers will be in such pleasant surroundings, that they may forget that there is the necessity for further emoluments. I think that we should be all happy to have the present Director of Public Works in this island to carry out these works with the direct, constant, daily supervision by himself. He does that not only in Bridgetown but also in the country; and he is an expert who loves his work and who is giving valuable and efficient service to this country.

I would hate to interfere with anyone's salary in this island, and I am glad to hear the expressions of opinion from honourable members which may cause them to keep holding steadfastly to that which is right. I have also to remind the House that we did not put in the Estimates the Town Planning Architect, and if we make use of his services it might cost us about £2,000 or £3,000 a year. I do not propose to go into any details in this connection as long as the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing is there. We will have a Fire Station, additions to the Town Hall, and there will be a workshop at the Transport Department; at least the Legislature has agreed to the principle of having a Work Shop where work on Government vehicles can be carried out.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture will deal with matters under his portfolio. We have not forgotten the possible cost of the Federal Government or the Social Security Schemes which we are investigating following the proposals of Professor Richardson.

I again say that if honourable members expect to hear a flowery speech from me, they will not hear it in a Budget Speech as long as we have the present system; but I shall cover, to the best of my ability, those points which I should cover in putting before the House a broad general picture of Government's expenditure in the past, the present and the future, and the revenue which we have to bear in mind when budgeting. We consider that with a Federal Government and Social Security Schemes, the amounts which we have here are the maximum sums which we can spend this year together with what Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation will give us and the accumulated surpluses which we have. If I have omitted to make specific reference to one or two things, honourable members will see these things have not been forgotten and that they are in the Estimates under re-votes; and if honourable members think that we have forgotten, the honourable senior member for St. Lucy will be glad to hear that we are considering the acquisition of a Government Printing Press. If we have not made any specific recommendation for it in these Estimates, it is not that we have abandoned the policy which we enunciated last year; but under the system of priority, we put first things first. The idea of the erection of Parliament Buildings has to be pushed far into the background when there are so many other things to be done.

11.15 p.m.

Now, sir, I am drawing to the attention of members of the Legislature that the Government has endeavoured in the past and is endeavouring now (because there are so many of us and so few jobs) to find employment for the unemployed; and one of the best ways to do so is by embarking on Capital Expenditure in the absence of any reasonable prospect of a great deal of employment by secondary industries. We have not abandoned, however, our policy that if we improve this or that and people are displaced, to try to give them work. I need not recount what all members must know; that coopers have had special attention paid to them because we owe it to them.

I repeat, that although we are a Socialist Government, (or rather because we are a Socialist Government) our general policy is to promote the development of industries in this island in order to find some employment. I have promised to be as unprovocative as possible, and I shall therefore make no reference to some of the real stupidities that I have heard in speeches from time to time in the past, as regards Government's policy on this or that. I cannot, however, refrain from anticipating what may be said, and drawing to the attention of the House that only in this morning's *Advocate* that paper asked on one page, what is the Government's policy on imports; and some six inches away on the opposite page, set out what was the Government's policy on imports. Luckily for us it appeared in the same paper. It might have appeared on different dates, and those who read the first paper may have forgotten. Then you get people blandly saying that the Government is doing nothing for employment, minor industries, etc.

I will be careful on this occasion to choose my words carefully, in order that the Government may not be misunderstood in what it is saying. I repeat. Government's policy is to encourage the promotion of industries in the island, and the development and expansion of the existing industries; but we are not departing from the absolute necessity for a Government like ours to safeguard the people against any rise in the cost of living. We will not encourage any industry that may turn out to be badly run or to be uneconomic. [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I will take him up on that.] There are some fish that will rise to a bait that is not even there. We are guarding against the rise in the Cost of Living that may occur if we give undue protection to industry. We will see that proper wages are paid. The Pioneer Industries Encouragement Act, 1951, is for encouraging new industries but sometimes when you say that this Government does nothing in comparison with other places, I will draw attention to the tax concessions which we give for eight years as compared with Trinidad's five years.

I do not say that in every respect our legislation is as good compared with Trinidad or Jamaica. We will start off by extending by a year the time for working under Pioneer Status, while we will go into the whole question of what protection we will give. We are going to amend the Pioneer Industries Act, so as to encourage industries to come to Barbados as rapidly as they go to Trinidad or Jamaica. We are not starting off a race such as was started off between Trinidad and Jamaica, but we are doing our bit in view of our employment problem; and we will make it as easy as possible for pioneer industries to compete with their rivals as has been done in Trinidad and Jamaica.

Arising out of this, we propose that drawbacks on duty should be given to board cartons, tin-cans etc., which are used as containers for local produce and articles that are exported. We have also proposed to grant similar drawbacks to glass bottles used in the rum industry, and on the clear understanding (as I pointed out privately to the hon. member for Christ Church) that the rum industry will use all the money they save that way on advertising especially in the U.K.

It is horrible to see, smell, and if you are rash enough, to taste the Jamaica rum sold in Great Britain; and sold in excessive quantities because it is advertised. The Government proposes to aid industries by giving them these concessions and to aid the rum industry by giving them this relief, on the

understanding that they will use the money saved for advertising abroad. It is hoped that the Pioneer Industries Bill will put Barbados on the map, and that it will give revenue to the rum industry and income tax to the Government. The sum which so far is likely to be saved to these industries to which these drawback concessions will be granted, is \$43,000. I assume that hon. members know of the drawbacks already granted in respect of the materials used in the manufacturing of certain goods.

We have found some difficulty in getting from some industries all the information we would like to get; because each industry has got to be considered separately to a certain extent, in its application for duty relief and customs relief. We have considered some industries recently, and in pursuance of this policy, we have considered the needs of particular industries. The Government proposes to introduce legislation to exempt from duty cotton and rayon yarn, knitted cloth, thread, and buttons imported by manufacturers for the manufacture of goods locally. We do this not under pressure, but because we are persuaded by figures put before us that such locally manufactured goods should be able to compete with articles that are coming from abroad. If the particular industries put their case calmly and boldly and with facts, they will find that this Government no less than any other Government for the sake of helping with employment, and with the proper safe-guards, will give protection to what may otherwise appear to be unfair competition.

The Government would like to help especially shirt factories. In my way of thinking, shirts unlike shoes, can be made by anybody. We cannot compete with Bata in shoes: it will be nonsense to say that we can do so if we take off all duties on imported leather. When it comes to shirts, there is no reason why every shirt should not be made in Bridgetown.

We propose to exempt from duty certain raw materials. [A VOICE: That is a wise thing]. [ANOTHER VOICE: I agree.] If we can help a shirt factory in any way we will do so, but we are going to take the necessary safeguards.

Year after year, you hear that you would not do anything to help local industries; you stick to socialist ideologies; here is something which you can do to help unemployment, why not do it. I repeat, we are doing nothing to push the cost of living up. Quite recently we had to refuse an application of a clergyman who had made application for his name to be added to the list of those who receive garments free of duty for distribution. We know very well that charity begins at home and because of that, we said "no" to his application. I may further say that we are going to watch very closely those people who get duty free articles. If it appears, as some hon. members realise, that some of these exemptions are not for the purpose intended, we may revoke them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am directly at the end of my remarks. I now come to deal with oil, fuel and power. As hon. members know, oil is a slippery subject, even more so than a slippery substance. I believe I have seen signs of more optimism at present than existed a year or two ago; but that does not mean that oil in commercial quantities has been found.

As regards electricity and gas, I would like to say that the Government has been very active in consideration of its policy with regard to those two items. I am very pleased to announce that the electricity problem has been completely settled.

There have been negotiations between the Bar-

bados Electric Supply Corporation Limited, the Government of Barbados and the Colonial Development Corporation concerning the extension of the electric supply in Barbados. As a result of these negotiations, an agreement has been reached that the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation should obtain a loan. The Colonial Development Corporation has made a loan to the Electric Company of \$720,000 (£150,000). The Electric Company will now form a local company registered in Barbados to take over the works and rights of the Electric Company; and, when that has been done, the Colonial Development Corporation will lend another \$480,000 (£100,000) to this local company who will also assume responsibility for the original loan of \$720,000 (£150,000). The local company will in due course, issue \$480,000 (£100,000) of preference shares to the public in Barbados thus providing in all \$1,680,000 (£350,000) for the development of the present works of the electric supply. [A VOICE: Will the Government take shares?] I do not think it will be necessary for the Government to take shares, because many of the local capitalists are willing to take up those shares.

I may further add that the negotiations were conducted under the sponsorship and with the active co-operation of the Government. If (which I do not expect) the local issue of £100,000 of preference shares is not fully subscribed, the Government will put proposals to the Legislature for the balance to be taken up by the Government so as to ensure local participation of at least £100,000.

With this new capital, it is intended to build a new Steam Power Station adjacent to the existing Diesel Station, and to strengthen and expand the present distribution system. The generating capacity of the new steam station will be equivalent to another 5,000 new domestic consumers or a total of 2,000 H.P. of electric motors. The new extension will be of British manufacture and it is hoped it will be commissioned by the end of 1957. [A VOICE: Are you going to take over the Gas Company?] I wish I could answer what the honourable junior member for St. George has asked. I can only say that negotiations are going on between the Gas Company and this Government. [A VOICE: To do what? Bury it!] It must be remembered that new supplies of natural gas have been discovered in this island; it is therefore reasonable to expect that these new supplies are extensive, and we are negotiating to make these new supplies available to the Government. All honourable members know (I do not think I am disclosing any secret of the Gas Company) that within its own property more gas leaks out than what passes through its mains.

11.35 p.m.

With that unsatisfactory state of distribution we have to be very careful about any negotiation which we may make as regards the Gas Company. [Mr. MILLER: Are you going to bottle the gas?] I can only say that the negotiations which are going on are very different from the negotiations in respect of the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation. The distribution is bad; and if we can improve the distribution, this Government will see that it is done. Some honourable members have criticised the Government over the delay in the establishment of the Barbados Development Board. We are introducing legislation on the lines of the Jamaica Act in this connection. Lord Reith, in the opinion of some people, is the greatest expert in the whole world in this matter of Development Boards. [Mr. LEWIS: You would say so even if that were not true.] I was

careful to say that in the opinion of some people, he is the greatest expert in the world on the matter of Development Boards; and the Government is mindful of his assurance that if the Development Board is established on a proper footing, it will receive substantial support from the Colonial Development Corporation. We have to consider that Lord Reith is Chairman of the C.D.C. The Hon. Minister of Labour and the Financial Secretary had interesting talks with him in Trinidad. We have had interesting talks with him here and he does believe in efficient work for the benefit of the community, and therefore he believes in having Public Corporations. The Bill dealing with the establishment of a Development Board will be introduced shortly, and honourable members will have the opportunity of discussing the matter.

Now I come to the last remaining part of my speech: the question of taxation. The Government is giving tax relief to industrialists. It is just last year that we examined the question of concessions in respect of children and gave them, so that we are improving in every direction. In addition to giving relief to trade and industry, we consider that income tax is very fair; and we intend to give only such relief as we can afford. I was very glad to be able to refresh my memory on the criticisms which have been made from time to time. The honourable junior member for St. John has drawn the attention of the Government to the question of the remission of taxation for medical expenses. I want to say that the Government will give relief with respect to medical and nursing expenses as from 1955. [VOICES: Hear! Hear!] We have examined legislation in other parts of the world and we have proposed to have an upper and lower rank in the amount allowed, and I would suggest to people that they keep their receipts in respect of medical expenses. However, I should like to point out that buying "love drops" will not score in this regard! [Laughter]. Doctors' prescriptions which can be verified, I suggest, should be collected so that an accurate record can be kept as to medical and nursing expenses. I regret to say that we cannot go any further in the matter of tax concessions. The Income Tax Bill will shortly be placed before the House, and the rates will be the same as those for last year. I remind honourable members that even at a low Estimate the suggestion has been made of \$400 a year which we have not budgeted for.

11.45 p.m.

Some members may be saying that I have said nothing about Education so far. I will reserve most of my remarks on that; and I will give a full account when we come to deal with the Education vote in the Estimates. I wish merely to say now, we have started the Six Cross Roads School as an elementary school, which is not what was intended to be done originally; but I was not satisfied about the creation of senior schools which are still elementary; and I wanted to be satisfied about the siting of new modern schools.

In the Estimates provision is made for St. Giles to be made into a modern secondary school. We have cheapened the cost of school building as in the case of Housing. Provision is made in the Estimates for an open school; and at present we have plans from Jamaica for such schools. Hon. members must have seen such schools in Jamaica and other parts of the tropics. It is a sort of shedlike building, and it is obviously much cheaper than a wall building. We have asked the department to examine possible sites for such schools.

The hon. senior member for St. John will be pleased to hear that as far as I can see at present, a school is likely to be placed in St. John. The hon. junior member for Christ Church may not be pleased to hear that the first site suggested was not in his parish; but they are getting the Foundation School. Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation will give us a substantial grant towards that; and at the rate at which Captain Tomlin is building schools, this school will soon go up. It will be co-educational. Blackman's school is finished. The Six Cross Roads School, now the Princess Margaret School, is also finished; and it is intended to run both of these schools as secondary modern schools with an agricultural bias.

Without endeavouring to bestow gifts all round, we are increasing the size of the Alleyne School and will give Lodge School a Library. [A MEMBER: What about St. George?] St. George, I am told, is so well represented already, that it needs no more scholastic representation.

We have tried to look into the needs of every parish and into the relative needs of every parish. It is good for me that I sit next to the hon. member on my left and do not face him; I find it difficult to get the St. Thomas's recommendations. They seem to always get forgotten.

I must thank the House,—I suppose after a storm there is a calm—I must thank the House for the jovial way in which they have accepted my Budget Speech. [Mr. LEWIS: It was a joke!] It was intended to be that so as to appeal to the mentality of the hon. junior member for the City. [Mr. LEWIS: I have a sense of humour.] I am asking honourable members to believe that this Government will not do anything on purely ideological grounds, and that we have not changed in any policy that we entertained; but we have to put first in an island like ours, the overwhelming necessity of trying to find more jobs for more people; and the concessions that we have made, we have made because we feel that it is not only our immediate duty to do so, but also an ultimate necessity. More work and more jobs for more people will mean more income tax; more income tax in the aggregate although not necessarily higher rates. If people will spend more money as a result it would be silly of us not to expand industries.

I am sure that when hon. members come to consider the Heads of the Estimates they will help us with constructive criticism, and will see that we do take our work seriously. Although it is comparatively late, it is not too late for a Budget night, and I do hope that some members will find it possible to make a speech before we go home.

Mr. Speaker, I now move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply on the Estimates for the year 1955-56.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, at this stage I am not prepared to continue the debate. I am going to move the adjournment of the House until whatever date suits the Government; because the Premier said on the last occasion that he will make the Budget Speech after which we could adjourn if we wanted to. I think that this is the wish of the House, and in moving the adjournment of the House until Thursday at 3 o'clock, I reserve my right to speak then.

I now beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday next at 3 o'clock p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to second that.

Privilege Re Minister of Communications

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the question for the adjournment of the House, I have the honour to make reference to the matter raised by the hon. junior member for Christ Church in connection with privilege. When the hon. member was addressing the House in that respect, I was under the impression that he was making reference to a breach of privilege; I now understand that he raised a question of privilege. I allowed the hon. member to make reference to certain conventions, but I find that as far as those conventions are concerned there is no reference to a breach of privilege nor is there any mention of privilege.

I must inform the House that I intend to allow the hon. member to resume this debate, and will give direction to the Clerk to put it on the Order Paper. In the meantime I will read from May's Parliamentary Procedure, page 369, the following passage:—

"In view of the requirement that a matter of

privilege should be raised at the earliest opportunity it is generally brought on without notice. But the claim to priority of such a matter is not prejudiced merely on the ground that it has been possible to place a motion dealing with it upon the Notice Paper. Such a motion is either placed at the Head of the Paper immediately after any "notices of motions at the commencement of public business" or, if placed lower in the list, may be taken as if it stood first."

As being more pertinent to the matter, I will read from page 365 as follows:—

"A matter which is postponed to suit the convenience of the House or to secure the attendance of a Member implicated, or to give the Speaker an opportunity to consider it fully does not forfeit priority when eventually raised."

The question that this House do now adjourn until Thursday of this week at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and carried. Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

11.30 p.m.