

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954-55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 17th March, 1955.

Pursuant to the adjournment the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock noon, to-day.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*); 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. J. A. HAYNES, B.A. Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN and C. E. TALMA (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*).

MINUTES

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

GOVERNMENT NOTICE

A Government Notice was given as follows:—
Hon. R. G. MAPP:—Bill to provide for the establishment of a Development Board charged with the duty of securing the development of industry and agriculture in the Island and for matters incidental thereto or connected therewith.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:—

(1) Whether it is a fact that the Road Inspector for St. Joseph has not, since the roads of the Parish have been taken over by the Central Government, been re-employed by the Department of Highways and Transport, notwithstanding the assurance Publicly given, "That no person would be unemployed in consequence, as a result of such transfer of Power."

(2) If the answer to the above question is "Yes"; will the Honourable Minister state fully Why?

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to provide for the establishment of a Development Board charged with the duty of securing the development of industry and agriculture in the Island and for matters incidental thereto or connected therewith; was read a first time.

ESTIMATES RESUMED

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume Committee on the Estimates for 1955-56.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Estimates, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Head XLII—Controls, Subsidies, Etc.

Head XLII—Controls, Subsidies, etc. was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the sum of \$463,113 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. VAUGHAN: I am speaking under Item 3, "Control of Prices, Supplies and Currency". I want to bring to the notice of the Hon. Minister in charge of this Department that the granting of foreign currency for certain specific purposes is still too restrictive where the Control Board is concerned. Let us take the question of books; in every civilised community culture is seldom controlled exclusively by currency. I understand that the absence of many American books from the Public Library is because of the refusal of the Control Board to grant American currency. It is not too harsh to treat that as a disgrace and a lack of appreciation of the broad influence of the mind. How much currency would certain essential American books take to bring to the Public Library in Barbados? Internationally it is conceded that where literacy is concerned there must be a certain liberalism in the grant of currency, but we in this island have no understanding of certain rules; and I am asking the Hon. Minister in charge of this Department just to advise the Controller of Supplies or whoever the particular officer is, that where books are concerned, he must exercise greater liberality. Cars and cloth may be excused although the excuse may not be a proper one; but in things concerning the mind, it is hard to find an excuse.

Several thousand dollars should be granted where books are concerned. I cannot appreciate the undesirable control of the mind where things of culture are concerned; culture should not be exclusively restricted by currency; and I deprecate the fact that in Barbados such a thing is being done. I understand that what I have said is the only reason why the Public Library has not got certain American books in it. I want this practice to be changed. We are so backward that we cannot appreciate the effect of releasing certain currency for certain essential publications. There are international Libraries of the world who send all over the world for certain publications to please perhaps one or two people in the community; they value culture so much. Books must not be looked upon like cloth or cars; perhaps it is easier to get currency in respect of a motor car or truck than in respect of a book. I do not think it is too hard to dub it as cultural isolation and the people who are responsible for it will be looked upon as they should be looked upon.

12.25 p.m.

Mr. MILLER came into the Committee and took his seat while Mr. VAUGHAN was speaking.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I want to raise a matter under the same Item. I am going to make a serious charge; I am charging this Department with rank discrimination. There is a case on record and this Department knows about it. This Department has granted an individual the right to import an American vehicle; this present order which comes from the Ministry was made and a similar grant has been refused by that Department.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, an American hearse was brought into this island and the owner was allowed to take it out, when it is known that they are people who have worked in Curacao and Aruba and have taken their savings, invested it in a motor car and brought the car to this island and they were restricted in working it. They were told that they could not sell the car nor hire it, and they only could use it for personal purposes. We have on record a case where a hearse came to this island from America and the flimsy excuse given was that the hearse came to this island from America and the flimsy excuse given was that the hearse was received by the particular person as a gift from his son who is a University Student in North America. No one could accept that.

I am making a serious charge and saying that that privilege was granted this particular individual because of who he is; and that the individual has a family which is connected with members of the Government. I go further and I make this strong statement: the same person that was given permission to take out this hearse was in the U.S.A. three months before this hearse came to the island. I would like to know what were the extenuating circumstances which could cause the Minister or this department to release this hearse to that man when other people were refused similar concessions.

You Mr. Chairman, are connected with a business that imports hearses and you are forced to import them from the U.K.; you are not given permission to import a hearse from the U.S.A. I know as a fact that the cause given for granting that man this privilege was that it came as a gift from his son. That is a flimsy excuse, because at the Control Board many people have been refused such concessions in the past, although they made the claim that someone in the U.S.A. was sending something for them. That excuse was not taken because it would be impossible to check if the statement was true or not.

I want to know how this man could be receiving a gift from his son when the latter is apparently in such poor circumstances, that he has to work in the U.S.A. while he is studying at the University. Although he is in those poor circumstances we are asked to believe that he can send his father a surprise gift of a motor hearse. I want to say that that is rank discrimination; and it should not be done on the basis that you are doing it to someone because that someone has some connection with the Government. You cannot do those things under a Labour Government. It is a thing that I would protest against until my dying day. One of the things that I am proud about is that this country has not been taken up with the wide spread corruption that obtains in other parts; but there is a growing tendency to acquiesce in things that will give our country a bad name.

I do not have any family connected with the Government, and I do not want to be associated with any family which wants me to do something extraordinary for them. This matter came to the Control Board and the application was rejected. There was a move on foot for other people to agree to it, and to wait for me to give it my blessing. I refused to do so because I was not satisfied that it was a genuine gift. I want to repeat Mr. Chairman, that it is a serious charge which I am making. No facts were put to the Control Board to prove that there were any extenuating circumstances why this gentleman should be allowed to take out the hearse.

We know of a case where Mr. N. E. Wilson's motor car was confiscated because it came from the U.S.A., and he said that his grand-mother had sent it as a gift to him. In the end the Government put up the car for sale at auction. I cannot see how in the case to which I am referring anyone could say that it was a genuine gift. They know it is not a genuine gift because the circumstances of the son would not allow him to be able to give his father this gift.

I go to the U.S.A., on occasions. I could get some of my relatives or friends to send me down a refrigerator, but that would not be playing fair with this Government because I would be taking advantage of my position to get certain things in this country that other people cannot get. People have been prevented from ordering things from the U.S.A. which would have created employment, and some other individual is allowed to bring in a motor hearse because he made a flimsy excuse about a gift. A son might surprise his father by giving him a coffin; but a hearse? What are we coming to?

This Government came into power on the ground that we do not believe in favouritism. A man may be my best friend politically or otherwise, but if he wants me to do something for him which savours of favouritism I will refuse him. This hearse was released by the Government; it could not be released by the Control Board alone. I refused to release it when I was a member of the Control Board, and subsequently I heard that the release was made. The man may be unfortunate, but his son knows the Currency Regulations. The father was in the U.S.A., and he would have brought it with him if he had been ignorant of the Regulations. There is no question of any ignorance.

I say this is a matter of principle; I would like to know what are the real reasons why this release was made. A Press Release has been published recently saying that the Government intends to relax the position as far as some of these imports are concerned; but that has only been published this week.

12.35 p.m.

I want to say that if you are going to give this gentleman this hearse it will not be fair to those people who came back from Aruba and who were refused permission to bring in cars, some of whom had the greatest difficulty in getting them out because of the restrictions which were placed on them. I agree Mr. Chairman, that if you have a Currency Control Board that it should do its work for all without favour. I would be the last man to go to the U.S.A., and get currency and bring back such things as Refrigerators, when I know that other people of this island who want to do business in Barbados are not allowed to do it. If I do those things you should lock me up. If we are in public life we should not be prepared to help our friends or family in matters where public policy is involved. I protest against the release of this hearse to this individual for the reasons which I have given.

Mr. HAYNES: Under Item 3, Control of prices, supplies and currency, which refers to the schedule of non-established offices, a lot of matter comes under it. A matter of nearly \$48,000 is to be spent in controlling other things. One would have thought that these controls after ten years would have gradually disappeared. I know I would be told that if controls are not kept on the prices would go up, but I have had the experience that the minute you control anything, the very reason for that control causes the price to go up. If you say that a thing must be sold for not more than 6/- that becomes the maximum price. I read in yesterday's newspaper that the policy of the Government (and I presume that means the Minister of Commerce) will under certain conditions relax the control on American cars. That is very good news and I must commend the Hon. Minister of Commerce on that. I also read about three or four weeks ago, a day or two after there was a luncheon at the Marine Hotel, that the same Minister stated that the Government is going to promote the tourist trade. If we want to encourage our American friends to come here and spend their money, I think he would realise that we should admit American cars here; and that should have been taken place over five months ago. The island benefits from the *ad valorem* duty on those cars. You add almost double the amount of money to the revenue of the island by the importation of American cars; and you can imagine what benefit that would be to us for improving our highways and for the other amenities which are so sadly lacking in Barbados.

Another matter to which I wish to make reference is Item 7, Subsidisation of foodstuffs. According to the law that includes the subsidisation of \$9,500 barrels of pickled pork. I wondered when I read that, if the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is doubtful of his local pig production scheme. He told us that he is expecting \$5,000 litters of pigs this year and if a litter is between 6 and 8 piglets, then that means 30,000 to 40,000 pigs a year.

Sir, are we backing up the prices on these commodities we are subsidising? What is happening is that when the importers from whom we import our pork products learn about what we are paying out for subsidisation, they back up the price over there which our importers have to pay, and the prices of these things will never come down; they will always be on the ascendancy; whereas if there were no restrictions in trade, the various producers over there would take off the price of his products in order to get the trade. Sir, as long as this subsidy is paid out on this Item it means that the prices will be bolstered up and the people will always have to pay more.

To my mind it would solve itself eventually. I do not say that it would happen in a couple of weeks, but you would see prices tumbling all the time.

12.45 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I am going to repeat again the same thing which I have expressed in here on every occasion when the matter of Subsidies and Controls comes up for consideration. As you know, sir, a long list of items have been put up to the Ministry of Trade for relaxation of control. These items are keenly competed for by exporters; the price of these items is coming down and competition is taking charge of that. These items just remain on the list so that the Control Inspectors will have a few more items to look for. I do not think you could point to any of these items which are sold above the normal mark-up. It is the duty of the Inspectors to go through the items; as a matter of fact the great concern is not a matter of the mark-up but the mark-down. Competition is so keen that unless something is done among the merchants themselves they might be a few bankrupts. That would be the time when the Government would take off controls; they want to see bankruptcies first before they take off control. Well, I do not think the time is far off for that. When you come to the pork subsidy, that takes up the majority of the money which we vote here; that is the feet, ears, and neck bones. Those are the three items which the people are not particularly concerned about. We can say at election time that we are keeping down the cost of these items, but the items which people are in great need of are tails, snouts, and other productions on which no subsidy is put; and rightly so; and they are in short supply because they put a ceiling on them when a limited quantity of these products come in. I would like to take the opportunity of asking the Hon. Minister of Trade what he is doing about the Sugar Subsidy this year. It is time that something be done about it. As you know Sir, the Government has subsidised Brown Sugar last year; are they subsidising this sugar again this year? We want a statement from the Hon. Minister today. Is he going to pursue the practice this year in respect of subsidising this sugar? Because the factories have to know the time since they have to manufacture it.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I would be the last person not to supply information which is justified; but the hon. member knows that sugar is not subsidised from sums voted under the heading of Controls and Subsidies. A separate Bill has to be brought down in respect of that matter.

Mr. GODDARD: If I were the Hon. Minister I would be very pleased today to inform Members of this House and the public as to what the Government is doing today about this Brown Sugar. All I am saying is that the people should have Brown Sugar and they want some statement to be made as to whether this sugar will be subsidised again this year. All that is very relevant; it is time that something be said about the subsidisation of this sugar.

In connection with Item 5, "Miscellaneous" the Note says "Expenses in connection with continuance of emergency measures taken during the 1939-45 war." Are we still operating under war conditions? This is now 1955 and we are coming here and saying that we are operating under the emergency powers. The only thing which needs to be controlled is currency; they are subsidising pork stuffs and you will have to exercise a certain amount of control because that is limited. Rice is subsidised but anybody can buy rice. I say that only three items of pickled pork should be controlled; and that can be done by one

officer in the Currency Department. But we have a big Department and we are spending a lot of money on it; we are persisting in that because it makes a good platform basis at election time. This matter should have been taken out of politics by now. The money which we are now spending could be more usefully used even if it is put aside for Old Age Pensions.

12.55 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: To take the last speaker's remarks first. He states that the time has come when these controls should be discontinued. I think it was the hon. junior member for St. Andrew who agreed in general that these controls should be discontinued. I am not convinced by actual experience that we would be justified in removing price control. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: We did not say that] [Mr. HAYNES: I said import controls; which is a different matter]. At one time we hear the hon. member saying or rather advocating the removal of all controls.

As I have said, experience has shown us that this competition that the hon. member talks about exists merely in theory. In fact there is not that degree of competition in this island, especially between wholesalers and wholesale that would justify us in removing the controls. We have in the past taken controls off a number of items; that has been done since I have taken up this Ministry. We have put certain items on open general licence, and the hon. member should be aware of the fact that this caused absolutely no difference in the matter of price, except that some items increased rather than decreased in price. It is true that we got a better supply of, say, corned beef than before it was placed on general licence. We got a supply from sources previously barred to importers. We also got a better grade of corned beef; but the price jumped up.

I cannot sit solemnly and agree to the removal of controls generally, after this Government has promised the people that we would reduce the cost of living or keep it as stable as possible. Everyone knows that in the final analysis our cost of living depends in part on the world movement of prices; it depends on the rates charged by steamship lines, general freight rates, and price trends in the outside world. We have to do whatever we possibly can locally to keep down the cost of living. As I have said, experience has shown that the removal of controls does not result in any appreciable difference in price; in fact, the price of one or two items jumped. I agree that there are certain items now on which it is nonsense to keep on price control. I am investigating that matter now. If to my mind it is silly to keep items on price control I will recommend to the Government that they should be removed. Generally, however, I am not convinced that we would be doing the people a service, rather we would be doing them a disservice if we removed controls generally.

Now sir, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew spoke about currency control. I think he mentioned that we should bring in cars from the U.S.A. for the purpose of tourism. I think the House is aware that recently in Trinidad and Jamaica the restrictions on the importation of American cars have been relaxed. In case the hon. member does not know it, that was done on specific instructions from the Secretary of State for the Colonies. As he may have noticed in the Press Release, in those islands specific requirements have to be met before the importation of such cars is allowed. It has to be shown that these cars have to travel long distances and over

rough roads etc. That was in the Press Releases in Trinidad and Jamaica. The hon. member is saying, and I agree, that we have promised to support tourism. He goes on to say that we should therefore allow the importation of American cars for tourist purposes. The Government has not closed its mind to all those suggestions. Obviously, if Jamaica and Trinidad allow these cars in, even though the conditions I mentioned were imposed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, it is natural that we would be present to follow suit.

Generally speaking, our policy is that dollars should be released first and foremost for essential commodities; items that are essential to the broad masses of the people. The hon. member should and must appreciate the fact that it is very difficult to ensure when you allow a car to come in for tourist purposes, that this car will be used for those purposes and nothing else. It means in effect that your policy is "A", but it can be anything else in the alphabet. In other words people will be able to get around your official policy in many directions. It is not an easy matter to say that you will allow the importation of these cars for tourist purposes; it will require very great administrative control to see that directions are not got around. I can assure the hon. member that just as we are enthusiastic about freedom of movement we are enthusiastic about freedom of trade.

I think that one of the members of the Opposition referred to the pork subsidy. The House must be aware that we have actually reduced this subsidy, and we are voting that money to assist in the scheme for increasing local pig production. That is our policy. Wherever we can subsidise local products we will do so rather than subsidise imported products. However, we do not think it wise to remove the whole subsidy at this time; we think it better to adopt a gradual process of doing so. Over a period of time we will make reductions in the subsidy of imported pickled pork and assist local pig production. It is felt that when we have increased a supply of local pork and we can afford to move the subsidy on the imported product we will do so, making sure that the consumers will not suffer by a big jump in the price or by a lack of the supply of pork.

Now sir, the hon. junior member for St. Peter referred to what he called a serious matter; I wonder if he really regards it as a serious matter. The way in which he raised it would lead one to believe that he looked upon it as something light. He is always the first to protest if the Government springs something on the House. Here is a matter which he feels is serious and instead of trying to find out the facts from me by asking or tabling questions, he jumps up during a debate on subsidies and controls and indulges in charges against the Government generally and against my Ministry in particular, and expects me to give him a whole history of this matter in an atmosphere like that.

The hon. member should know better because he was a member of the Government. He should know that as a responsible member of the House if he wants to solicit facts, he should table questions and let the Ministry give him answers.

The hon. member got up in this Committee and accused me of discrimination. Can you want a more serious charge than that? He said that I was helping my friends and my family. Instead of tabling questions and getting facts, he is accuser and judge at the same time. If the hon. member wants to debate a serious subject he should table questions.

However Sir, I will tell him that he does not have his facts straight; he should learn his facts first. There was absolutely no discrimination in this case. There was no favour of friends and nothing of what the hon. member suggested. As regards the gentleman to whom he made reference, from the first time that the Board was asked to look into the matter again I said "No" and that was the decision of the Board. If the hon. member wants to know what is happening and under what circumstances that decision was changed, he should table questions and he would be told. If he tables questions as any decent member of Parliament would he would get correct answers. He should not accuse me of helping friends.

Sir, the hon. junior member for St. John referred to the Control Board and the obtaining of books from the dollar areas. I think the honourable member would agree that some of that stuff which importers here get from the United States is not the kind of stuff we should be peddling. I see more comics here than in other islands. We should not open our doors too wide. We should not import any and everything from the U.S.A. Of course I would be willing to agree to the importation of books of a cultural value from the U.S.A. but not any and everything. Throughout the West Indies the most horrible and most uncultural books, both for parents and children, have come from the U.S.A.; and I regard it as a misuse of dollar currency to import that sort of thing. I do not have the figures to hand to present to him; but we spend many dollars on books and magazines from America. I will promise to get the figures for him. I can assure him that there are no restrictions on allowing anything of a cultural interest or anything which would materially benefit the people of this colony from coming in.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I am very glad the Hon. Minister mentioned something about comics as I forgot to mention them when I was speaking on the issue. Exactly what he said is happening. I do see American comics here in numbers more than what should be allowed; there are far more numerous than the higher and more serious cultural stuff. There is evidence of a certain amount of liberalism for importing comic magazines and not for better literature. On my part, comics could be entirely restricted. I would not like to see one come here, especially American comics. They are so to speak, derogatory to the mental training of children. I must however emphasise that a greater liberalisation must be given to American literature coming here both to individuals and to the Library. You should not restrict the amount of currency for this purpose. I am sure that it would not take any thousands of dollars for the importation of good American literature.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, there is this unfortunate idea that when you come to this Chamber and you are debating a matter, the Minister has an idea of telling you "Ask questions; you should not debate the matter." I want to say that there is no question about anything when you are stating facts. The Hon. Minister said I have the facts wrong, yet he is still asking for time. He knows the facts, yet he is not prepared to tell the House. He said that the gentleman came to him and the Board decided the issue; I will say that is a lame duck's excuse. The Governor-in-Executive Committee must decide what is going to be; this Control Board is only an advisory board. This Board is without statutory and executive powers.

Why did that gentleman go to him? He said that the gentleman came to him and he refused to let him have the hearse. He emphasised that the Board said that they were not going to release the hearse

to the gentleman. I am going to be bold enough as to say that the Minister agreed to release the hearse to the gentleman. I make that charge against him. The Hon. Minister knows the facts of the case. He knows of the reason why he refused to release it at first. It has been said that the gentleman's son gave him this hearse as a surprise present. The Hon. Minister knows very well that that gentleman went to the United States three months before he came to him.

1.15 p.m.

This is a Head in the Estimates which has to be voted and I must ask this question. The day I have to charge any member of the Government with corruption, I am not afraid of doing it. [Hon. R. G. MAPP: Ask questions.] I am saying that he acquiesced in delivering a hearse to a man when other people have been refused permission. The person to whom this hearse was released is a relative of a member of the Government; do you think that that attitude could prevent me from performing the business of the country? That matter is going further than this; it is not a matter of asking questions, it is a matter of saying that you as a Minister have agreed to give somebody something when other people have been refused. That is discrimination; because a person is a relative of a member of the Government, he is given this hearse. The gentleman came to me too; he said that his son had given him a surprise gift; the only surprise gift he could give you is a motor hearse. [Mr. CHAIRMAN: My son?] Mr. Chairman, put yourself in that position; the only present he could give you is a hearse where you do not have to put air in the tyres. I know something more. I know that certain people come to this island and when they have to do certain business, they are preventing certain people from doing business with them. But the time for dealing with that will come. I can make this charge because I have chapter and verse for it. What are the extenuating circumstances that you have to give him this hearse? Because he had some dream? This same Government has refused people from trading in United States dollars; but they want to be a party to a system which allows certain people to bring in certain things and that is not right. Any man who can be associated with that conduct, sooner or later the people will find out; because Mr. So-and-so is related to Mr. So-and-So he was allowed to bring in something which a poor man cannot bring in because he has friends at court?

What are the facts of the case? A man had that hearse brought down here and a poor man was refused to bring in a similar hearse; I think this man's name is Blackman or something like that. I know Mr. Chairman, your firm was told that it could not bring in any hearse from the United States of America, that you had to get it from the United Kingdom; if you knew that what has been done could have been done, you have your friends in the United States of America and they could have dreamt too. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas, the Minister of Trade, says that I must ask a question; well I am saying that the Minister has perpetrated discrimination when he agreed that this hearse could be issued to a relative of a member of the Government. After the gentleman came to him he agreed to the release of this hearse.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of Order. The hon. member is deliberately quoting me wrongly. I said that the gentleman came to me a number of times.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The hon. member is so afraid that he is wrong.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I do not mind that. I said that the gentleman came to me a number of times and I refused him. Why didn't the hon. member enquire into the circumstances of the case in which the request was granted?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The gentleman came to me and after he went to him the hearse was released. It was not released by the Board; it was released by the Government of Barbados of which the Hon. Minister of Labour is a member. It was not done by the Board; the Board is advisory to the Government. There is no convention to say that it is not the Government. As I said, the Hon. Minister is not a member of the Control Board, but controls come under his Ministry. When he said that there was refusal on the ground that a member of the Government refused to agree to give the gentleman the release of this hearse, that is on record too. The Minutes of the Board can prove that the gentleman was refused; but he was refused on the ground that it did not seem to be a valid reason for the release. I want to say this: I am not going to be a party to any action like that at all. This is like a matter dealing with the hon. junior member for Christ Church: what he stands for in politics and what he looks like in race; but when somebody has a different hue—The Hon. Premier has said that if somebody in the United States of America want to give you an American car, let them give you the equivalent and get the car from Great Britain. That is the whole purpose of the control. When they allowed this hearse to come in, there could not be any possible excuse. Then you have the stupidity of asking me a question; the hon. member cannot tell the Committee what are the reasons why this hearse was released to this gentleman when other persons were refused to get cars from America. Sometime ago a poor man from America was not allowed to bring in a motor car; and now we are told that this man's son had a dream that he could get this hearse and therefore he sent this hearse. 1.25 p.m.

Do you mean to tell me that this man's son in America had a dream overnight and bought this hearse after his father had returned from the U.S.A.? It stinks to high heaven. We cannot have this sort of practice; you cannot bring Trinidad "Bu-ball" in this Government. You do not want to be like Jamaica where you get Ministers going to jail. We cannot have men being pleasant, affable and nice, and yet their public conduct is such that it cannot stand the light of day. If you want to stand out above these other colonies you have to stand out first in character and integrity.

I am not going to ask any questions; I make this bold statement with a full sense of responsibility: how are we going to test the truthfulness of any letter? If I were one of these dishonest people I could get around the law too. You Mr. Chairman if you wanted to be dishonest you could write to one of these voluntary organisations in America and get them to send you a hearse too. Even when the organization that I represent wants certain things those things have to come through the straight and narrow way. Some people want to be so complacent and self-righteous, and still they want to perpetrate the old system of favouritism. If it were something else you would have heard a lot about it. I cannot agree with the principle, and no one could ever be so nice as to make me agree with it.

I challenge the Minister to say that he did not agree to the release. It could not have been released by the Control Board unless the Minister agreed.

He would have had to agree with the actions of the Board.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, the hon member has indulged in charges of discrimination and of corruption.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I said discrimination. If he wants to include corruption he can do so. I am ready for that anytime.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member take his seat?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: No sir. I am on a point of explanation. I must have some right. He said that I used the word "corruption." I never used any such word; I never accused the Minister of corruption. I said it was rank discrimination.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman:—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas will speak.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Let us concede that the hon member only said discrimination; he said that people from Curacao and Aruba made applications which were turned down and that this hearse was released. I told the Committee that the hon. member had his facts wrong. He did not have the facts; and if he had asked questions he would have had them. Since he persisted, I will give one or two facts and make a brief statement on the matter.

Now this particular vehicle was released in October last year. The hon. member referred to cases of people from Aruba and other places. After I assumed office I received two applications from people in Aruba to allow them to bring in vehicles; we were sympathetic to those persons. One of those applications was on the 26th of July. This hearse, as I have said, was released in October. The application from the person in Aruba was in July, and I was sympathetic.

Previous to this, such persons were not allowed to bring in vehicles even if they had been working for years in Aruba. I was sympathetic and I decided to take the issue up with the Control Authorities. We went to the extent of even finding out the practice as regards this type of used car in other colonies.

The Government held a meeting with the Controller of Supplies and we decided on the 17th of August that persons who had been residing in dollar areas and in places like Curacao for not less than 18 months, and who had had such a vehicle in their possession for the 18 months would be allowed, on coming back to take up residence in this island, to bring the vehicle here. [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: When was that published?] I will inquire into the facts and find out whether it was published or not. If it was not published it should have been published. Since then persons have been allowed to bring in vehicles. That is our policy and anyone applying must be given permission by the Controller.

There is absolutely no question of discrimination. As regards the hearse, the hon. member stated that this gentleman approached me and that I agreed with the release. I told the hon. member that the gentleman approached me, I told him the decision of the Board and I agreed with it, and that I was not going to alter the decision. It was then obvious that this hearse could not be allowed in. It would have to be re-exported to the U.S.A. or to some other place outside of the island.

After I did not allow it, the gentleman wrote a number of times appealing to the Board and

again appealing to the Government, and this took up a course of months.

1.35 p.m.

Later on, Mr. Chairman, he appealed for some time to raise the money to export the hearse in accordance with the decision of the Board, and the Board gave him the time. I may say that the Board did not decide anything about confiscation. In the meantime the Secretary of State for the Colonies issued another memorandum with regard to dollar imports relaxing the previous policy, and hon. members will note that it is in accordance with this decision by the Secretary of State for the Colonies that we arrived at the later decision. In accordance with that policy and in accordance with further advice, it was decided that this vehicle would be released; and I may say that it is now the general policy that if such a vehicle can be obtained cheaper from the U.S.A., than from the sterling countries it will be allowed in. I repeat that as a result of this change in the policy of Her Majesty's Government in the U.K. it was decided to release this vehicle. I say again that I will give a fuller statement in the future.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, what are the facts of this case? You will remember at the beginning the Hon. Minister said that I must ask questions; now that he has been pressed to answer something, he has given us a rambling story about the Secretary of State for the Colonies having issued a statement with regard to relaxation of hard currency. He said that the Secretary of State has told you to release something last week or this week when he knows that this hearse was released sometime in September last year. How can he say that the policy of the Secretary of State for the Colonies is the policy that caused them to release this hearse? The facts are, that a school boy does not drive a hearse. The Hon. Minister talked about not being willing to say what are the facts; but the facts are that the son of the gentleman to whom they released this hearse gave it to his father as a surprise birthday present. Would you believe that? To me that is a classical joke! He could have given him a coffin! Why didn't he give him a coffin? That would be a surprise present. Imagine that you are giving your father a hearse as a surprise present and your father is an undertaker. That is what they want to tell the public of Barbados was something which they did above board, and which was the policy of the Board. What policy of the Board is that? The Government does not have to carry out any policy of any Board. That is a policy of controls; this is not what the Board says. The Minister does not have to agree with the Board. The cat came out of the bag again when he said that an appeal was made to the Government after he refused to grant the man a hearse. He also said that he refused, but the five Ministers agreed to give him. He also said that this is now the policy of the Government; the Secretary of State for the Colonies has changed the policy on these things. Sir, he knows as well as the world that the Secretary of State for the Colonies does not say in what context you must allow something to come into the island. Do you mean to say that the Secretary of State for the Colonies can tell you how to allow material to come into the island from the U.S.A.? You must say under what circumstances you will allow that material to come into the island. You are making the Secretary of State for the Colonies the scape goat. Moreover, you have said that a release of this statement from the Secretary of State for the Colonies was sent to all Colonial Govern-

ment, but nobody knows what that statement is. The Hon. Minister could as well be truthful and let this House know the real facts of the case. You are dealing with the Government. Somebody else may say you said one thing in the House of Assembly and another thing on another occasion and might then write and say that you are not telling the truth.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member inferring that I was telling lies? The hon. member must withdraw the remark that I am not telling the truth.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I did not hear exactly what the hon. member said.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I said that when you are dealing with these matters you may as well be truthful, because sooner or later, somebody is going to read what you said and if it is not true, they will say that you are not speaking the truth. If the Hon. Minister is going to draw from that, that he is not speaking the truth, he knows better than I if he is speaking the truth.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Why don't you come straight? 2.45 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: You are the person to come straight. Sir, the point which I am making is that up to this moment, you have not said what is the extenuating circumstance that caused the Government to release this hearse to this gentleman. All that you have heard is that the Secretary of State for the Colonies cannot dismiss a Minister; he cannot tell you what to do with a hearse.

I repeat: it was discrimination when this gentleman was given this hearse. There was no such thing as the Minister talked about Curacao; he does not know what he is talking about. Mr. Wilson's motor car was confiscated and sold in this island on similar grounds, and his grand mother had a dream and gave him a car in America. I would like to know what big glorified joke is in this island; a man sends a hearse to his father as a surprise present! Well, well, well; I never knew that that could happen; it is really laughable! It is laughable to see that the Minister is now justifying a policy which was not connected with the hearse; they allowed the hearse to wait so long that they gave it to him under a changed policy. All you have to do is to bring in a hearse and allow it to wait long enough, so that when the Government change their policy you will have it released.

The hon. member said that this hearse was delivered in October, 1954, but that hearse was in Barbados around December, 1953. It was in this island nearly a year before any decision was taken on it. The matter was drawn to the attention of the Minister soon after he became a Minister; he would not tell us when was the first day that the man asked for release of the hearse. The gentleman came to me early before the hon. member became a Minister; why did they have to keep this hearse for nine months before the policy of the Secretary of State for the Colonies was implemented? The old Board cannot tell the Government what to do as a matter of Government policy; the fact is that this man was given the hearse for what he was, and I stick to that.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: My name has not been called in this matter, but I am not afraid to say that I am the member of the Government to whom the hon. junior member for St. Peter is referring. I am first cousin to the gentleman who brought in this hearse. I have never done anything not above board in my political life up to today. The hon. member knows and my colleague also knows the stand which I took in that particular case. I am not afraid to say that the gentleman in question asked me about this matter on several occasions and on a particular occasion he asked me if he could see the hon. junior

member for St. Peter at his house. I particularly said that as far as that matter is concerned he could invite him, but I could not help. I telephoned the hon. junior member for St. Peter and particularly told him I was doing it out of sheer courtesy. I understand the gentleman had a shock. The hon. member did not call my name, but he has referred to me and I am not afraid to say anything that I know. The gentleman does not even speak to me because he felt I could have helped to get this hearse released and I did not do so.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: In connection with Controls and Subsidies I should like to say that I have listened carefully to the Hon. Minister, and I should just like to ask what policy the Government is adopting in respect of the importation of American cars and non-essentials. All of us agreed that there is the necessity of releasing dollars and that dollars should be first released for essentials and anything else after. I noticed quite recently that the Minister of Trade has given a Press release to the public to the effect that American cars will be allowed to be imported, provided that you can prove to the satisfaction of the Government that you cannot get them other than from the United States of America. I do not agree with him that it was a direction of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, because all of us know that Governments have actually made a row and got the Secretary of State for the Colonies to do some sort of releasing. I think it would be a serious accusation if that could be proved.

Coming back nearer home, I want to draw something to the Hon. Minister's attention. He has said that he is exercising leniency with people from Aruba and so on; but I want to draw to his attention that apparently there has been a pick-up standing in the Baggage Warehouse which a youngster actually brought from Curacao; he landed it here in order to try and make a living out of it.

1.55 p.m.

That pick-up had to be taken back by Capt. Fergusson out of this island, and then had to come back in and go back out again until finally it was propped up in the Warehouse. I appeal to the Minister; the man has appealed several times to the Government. I am asking the Minister to say that this pick-up is not a luxury. The man wants to work for his living and petitions were sent in. They denied him the right to get it out. When it comes to these other youngsters with cars, many of them who come back with these cars are not bringing back high-powered Studebakers or Chevrolets for a luxury; they want to use these cars to work for a living. I think the Government should view the matter sympathetically.

I know we cannot say we are a law unto ourselves, and therefore it is no business of ours to contribute to the U.K. by dollar restrictions. We cannot get here and argue that we are entitled to the U.K.'s protection and then say we should be able to import from the U.S.A. *ad lib*; I do not agree with that. What I will say is, that due to our position in the West Indies we had been for years dependent to a certain extent to the U.S.A. and Canada for the things which we use, and it should be the duty of this Government to represent these facts to the Colonial Office. I do not mean with respect to the idea of relaxing controls and everything, but where it is made out to the Control Board that certain essential stuff for human consumption (I am not subscribing to the importation of cars in general) essential food stuffs and clothing should be imported from the dollar areas, so that even with the exchange rate you can get stuff here to sell cheaper to the consuming public. I say it is the duty of a socialist Government to make such a representation to the

Colonial Office, and demand — I say demand because I am sure that if such representation is made and such a demand is made, such stuff will be released.

There are many items that could be sold cheaper in this island if they were imported from the U.S.A. and Canada. The Hon. Minister before he was in the Government professed on several occasions to have a great interest in the people; now that he is holding this portfolio I am sure that if he is really interested, he will get the facts surrounding this case which I have mentioned and that he will work on the suggestions that I have made.

Where cars are concerned I am at a loss to understand what the policy is. Some people who come in with cars are told that if they are American citizens and are going back out, they must put the cars in garages and leave the keys with some authorities. Other people are allowed to bring in cars and leave them with people, and within the knowledge of the Government they are allowed to jolly ride in them and use them for all purposes.

As I have said, I do not understand the policy. It seems to be based partly on the opinion of the Government, partly on the opinion of the Police, partly on the opinion of the Customs Officers and partly on the opinion of the Control Authorities.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Chairman leaves the Chair, and Mr. Speaker takes the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER:—It now being after 2 o'clock this House now stands adjourned according to the Rules.

2.05 p.m.

ESTIMATES RESUMED

On reassembling,

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Head XLII—Controls and Subsidies—Cont'd

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Hon. Minister of Trade to answer two questions relative to the Control of Supplies. I would like to know under Item 3 Control of Prices, Supplies and Currencies whether the Minister would explain why the Government considers it necessary to employ persons in the Currency Department, persons who are already drawing pensions from this Government; and also, whether the Minister does not think that in view of the grave unemployment situation in Barbados it would not be better to give those jobs to persons who are not drawing emoluments or pensions from the Government. I would not in the first instance, suggest that any boy leaving school should be put in charge of the Currency Department; but surely if officers were seconded from other Government departments to the Currency Department and the Control Office, then youngsters would be able to fill the vacancies which would arise in the Government Service.

I would also like to ask the Hon. Minister whether he can make a statement as to the amount of dollars earned by Barbados both on the visible and invisible trade account. On the other hand, I would like the Hon. Minister to explain the system under which an allocation is made to Barbados for dollar spending. I would also like to know from the Hon. Minister of Trade how much do we spend on the average per annum out of that allocation. If he gives those figures it will then be a matter of whether we are a net dollar earning country or not.

Sometime ago Mr. Chairman, I asked the Hon. Minister of Trade whether he was willing to submit

a complete break down in the cost of production of local manufactured margarines and cooking oils. The Minister in his reply said that he would not give a breakdown in the cost of production, as the Government had made an undertaking with the manufacturers not to disclose that information. Now that is a very interesting state of affairs because, there it is, you have an industry which is virtually a monopoly. The directors of that particular concern are able to submit figures to the Controller of Supplies or to the Minister of Trade to justify an increase in the control price of these commodities, but the members of the public cannot adjudge the merits or demerits as to warrant the increase in the price to consumers. They cannot know anything in a matter which intimately affects the day to day existence of Her Majesty's subjects. He has said that they cannot enquire into the merits or demerits of the case, but they have to pay this increase without being given any explanation as to why the increase should take place; and they must do so without the right to examine whether those figures and facts are such as would assist the Minister or Department in arriving at the decision to control the price of those particular commodities. If the Government gave the manufacturers that undertaking, I am submitting that the Government did wrong.

Sir, no one is asking them to disclose any secret prices. No one is asking them to disclose what percentage of the particular ingredients goes into the manufacture of their margarines and cooking oils. But we would like to know (and the Hon. Minister would know that exactly what I am saying now is a matter of public interest) how the middle man's profits supervene between the cost of production and the final prices which people have to pay.

I submit that members of the public are entitled to know what is paid out by way of commissions for the purchase of commodities which they enjoy as a monopoly and the commission by way of distributing costs. I have been informed although the Minister could not provide these figures which I asked for, that the same edible oils and fats in the manufacture of this particular concern are exported to British Guiana and other West Indian Islands at a price lower than the price which the local consumer and retailer have to pay. I want the Hon. Minister to tell me if that is not true. May be the honourable junior member for Christ Church can assist us in this matter. I am saying that if we are being called on to subsidise the consumers in other West Indian Islands of these particular commodities, that would not be fair.

Sir, this is a serious state of affairs; and the reason why I asked for that breakdown in the cost of production is because I can prove to the Hon. Minister of Trade that the increase was not justified. If he gave us the honest facts about that commodity, I can prove conclusively that the increased price towards the latter part of last year was not justified at all. The Hon. Minister of Trade said that he had given the manufacturers an undertaking and that he would not disclose the cost of production figures to members of the public or to the House of Assembly.

2.55 p.m.

I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to the Minister's reply. Margarine has been increased by an average of 4 cents per pound, Glow spread and Mello-Kreem in one-pound and five-pound tins, has also been increased by 4 cents per pound; there was also an increase in the cost of Velyo-Kris by 4 cents per pound; there was no increase in the cost of laid (locally manufactured

cooking) or in the cost of soap. The Hon. Minister set out in his reply the increases in Tallow, Coconut Oil, Fatty Acids, Edible Oil and Hardening Fats between 1953-54. Those are two independent sets of fats; but when it came to the question which I asked as to the cost of production, the Minister said this in a reply laid on the 22nd day of February 1955—

"Information on costs of production is supplied confidentially to the Government, which is accordingly unable to give the figures requested. The Government is, however satisfied that the increases permitted were fully justified."

"The profit which the manufacturing Company," they are not showing the over-all profit, "is allowed to make, is governed by the Oils and Fats Agreement," as the reply sets out, "and is not to exceed 5% of the cost of Copra plus manufacturing costs and packaging. At the end of the financial year, any profit made in excess of that allowed is credited to a special account supervised by the Government. Likewise any shortfall on the allowed profits would be debited to this account."

I should like to ask the Hon. Minister to give the House the amount which was paid into the special account in 1953 and the amount which was paid in or paid out in 1954. What the Hon. Minister is saying is that the Company only makes a profit of 5%; I find it difficult to understand how a Company which is making a profit of only 5% would worry to carry on business at all, because you could sit down at home, lend out the money and get 6% interest for it. Why carry on a Company and ask the Government to give special concessions and only make a profit of 5%. How can they carry out extensive modifications to their plant and buy considerable quantities of land in such a short time from the commencement of their operation, if the Government is only allowing them 5%? That Company is making gross profits and in excess 5% and that is why I wanted the Hon. Minister to give a break down of the cost. There are 4%, 5% and 6% commissions being paid out by the Directors on the raw material that they get. You have Directors who go to the Control Board and they get a whole quota in another name, and those Directors sell the quota to the Company as a Company, and yet the Hon. Minister cannot give us the figures [AN ASIDE:] I know that, but I want to know if he can be honest enough to give the information. I challenge them to ask the Directors if that is not so. I consider that the Controller of Supplies whether they are overlooking the actual way in which the licences were issued or otherwise, is acting wrongly to give any quotas or licences to any individual when he knows that according to the Oils and Fats Agreement, it is the manufacturer to whom the actual quota and licence should be issued. I think it is highly improper; and I think the Controller should check up on it. To give an individual a quota which was designed for the manufacturers of the particular commodity, I think it is highly improper that the Minister should tell us that the figures are confidential. Why are they so confidential? Nobody would go to the Coca-Cola Company and ask them what kind of syrup they are using; I am not asking for trade secrets. I know that the price has been increased because I have to pay my bills; nobody pays my bills for me. I had to pay one price for locally manufactured margarine and Coconut Oil a week ago and it went up. If we have to pay an increase of 4 cents in the price of butter, we are entitled to know how the Hon. Minister arrived at the conclusion that the increase was justified. I know the Wednesday when

the Minister made this decision; I would like to know if the increase is justified. How it is that we can ship these commodities away cheaper than what the consumer here has to pay for them here? Perhaps the hon. junior member for Christ Church may be able to assist the House in this matter because the Hon. Minister does not want to get the figures. I have no rancour in my breast against any industrialists coming to this island, but in view of the fact that the Cost of Living of every Civil Servant in this island is affected by *ex parte* decisions like those made by the Hon. Minister of Trade, since we are all affected by those decisions, I feel that we have a right to know how they arrived at this decision; and we will not vote on it with any silly excuse that the figures as to cost of production is confidential.

3.05 p.m.

How can the cost of production figures be confidential? You only have something confidential when you have something to hide. The only thing you are entitled by law to conceal from the public for 28 years is a trade secret; and even then the law does not allow you to sit on these secrets indefinitely. How can they conceal cost of production figures? Why do I have to get up time and time again and press the Ministers for information which they are in duty bound to give to members of the public and members of this House?

I find it difficult myself (if the Minister is exercising that diligence which he should) to understand how a state of affairs existed like the one which I have just disclosed. I know that I have been trained to find out things; I only have to study certain figures which are available to every member of the public if they know where to look for them. I am saying that a profit is made by the company and the increase was not justified, although the price of certain raw materials had to go up.

There is something worse than that: the Minister allowed the price of what passes for butter (margarine) and cooking fats to rise long before the increase in the price of raw materials actually took place. That is very unsatisfactory. Anyone who wants to find out if what I am saying is true can examine the documents at the Customs Department. The price was put up long before the actual raw materials came in. Therefore, they drew on stocks which were available here in Barbados at the old cost of the raw material; and the Minister allowed them to increase their prices before their old stocks became exhausted. They were allowed to increase everything; what was in the warehouse and what was in the store. I would like to be in the position of the honourable junior member for Christ Church; I would have rollicked through. Everything on the shelf went up as well; tins that had been there for months, and which had been manufactured at the old cost of production.

With all that, you say the Minister of Trade is doing his job properly and with that diligence and integrity which we expect. I had to pay for it, so I know. Everyone in Barbados would have to use cooking oil so everyone in the island was effected. Every shopkeeper who had stocks on his shelf could make an extra profit because he had bought those stocks at the old price. I hope that the honourable junior member for Christ Church will tell you that I am wrong; he will know.

It goes further than that and it is a far more serious matter than it appears to be at first sight, because the manufactured product is distributed only through one of the Company's directors. One of their directors is on the Control Board, and one advises the Government on the Oils and Fats Agree-

ments. Sitting in on meetings this director gains advance information which no other competitor can hold on. He can take advantage of any decision to raise or to lower the price of the raw material, and then before any disclosure is made to the general public that there will be an increase in the price of raw materials, he could go to the Minister of Trade on the Wednesday morning and tell him to put up the prices.

He did not go to the Controller, he went to the Minister. He went to the Minister and told him to put up the price of margarine because the price of the raw materials was going up. Do not forget that they went down a bit last year; I think they went down by one cent a pound the year before or by a couple of cents a pound. The company was in the way to get an additional profit still. That is what the Government has been doing all the time. The consumers are not represented. They have an advisory Committee on which an employee of the Union has been put; but when the real decisions affecting the pocket of everyone are being made, only the directors of certain firms, (not in the slightest way connected with the policy of the Government, I mean the alleged political policy of the Government; and who are in no way sympathetic to the Government or to the consumers) are the people who make the decisions. They are judges and juries in their own cases.

That is a serious state of affairs. The Minister cannot tell me that what I am saying is not true. I always check my facts before I speak. I do not have to call names, but he will know. You have directors on the Control Board, directors who go and make decisions on the Regional Economic Committee and then inveigle the Minister into putting up the prices of a commodity like butter without any previous consultation with the consumers, to see whether they will agree with it or not. In other words, we have no say at all; no public statement is made (apart from reading in newspapers on Saturday mornings) that the maximum price is so and so. But the maximum price is always the minimum price.

In a highly developed country like the U.K. a matter like an increase in the price of butter would be a matter of public concern, and so would be increases in the price of bread and other essential commodities. Such increases are matters of national importance; and statements are made from the Ministerial benches in the U.K. when the Government makes a decision which will affect the cost to the consumer of any essential commodity such as bread, or butter, or bacon, or meat, or anything of that kind. Furthermore, before those statements are made, no manufacturer in the U.K. would have any information that an increase or decrease was going to be made; because it would open the door to a lot of speculation and unnecessary profiteering; but in Barbados the reverse is true.

Despite the fact that they say that political sovereignty resides in this Chamber and especially in the Ministerial benches, great economic decisions are made not by the House or by the Ministers in the first instance, but by people who stand to lose or to profit by these decisions; and they tell the Ministers what to do. Let them tell me that that is not correct. After they make decisions affecting the Cost of Living of every citizen of this country, they then tell the Ministers what to do. In England for instance, when there was going to be an increase in the tax on beer and Mr. Dalton just twenty minutes before he delivered his speech let it slip to one of his friends, he had to resign. In Barbados a Minister would never

resign; Ministers never resign or die; they simply fade away.

What I am pointing out is the whole paradox of the situation in Barbados. We say that we have the greatest constitution in the Colonial Empire; but when we examine the frame work of the constitutional position of this island and the economic situation, you will find that the very persons whom we say we have ousted from controlling the destiny of the people in this island have more control and more say in governmental decisions, than they ever had before in the history of this island.

I am not attacking the personalities of any one particular group of persons. If it were all capitalists and I found the Minister foolish enough to make any one set of people millionaires, of course I would take a different view of it. I do not blame them; I blame the people who get up on public platforms and talk.

3.15 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want to hear something of Subsidies and Grants. I do not want to hear anything of the consequences and all those kind of things which the hon. member is talking about.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the whole conception of appointing them to the Control Board is an attack on the constitution's principles.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am only asking you to keep to the Control Board.

Mr. BARROW: Some of the people whom they put on these Boards do not have any say at all; they are only put there for a sort of window dressing; they have no say in the control of prices at all and that is an absolute fact. Sir, I asked the Hon. Minister these questions with the hope that he would have been able to come and give us a full statement as to the reasons why the price of these essential commodities should have increased to the consuming public. I am not satisfied with the answer given by the Hon. Minister; and I hope he will make some effort to give us the truth and nothing else but the truth about this rise which took place in the price of these commodities during the latter months of last year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on the question of currency under the same Head, I would like to know from the Hon. Minister of Trade the basis on which allocation of hard currency is made to commission merchants in this country. I would also like to know what principles underly the allocation of funds to students who have to study in the U.S.A. and the Dominion of Canada. I know of a case where a young fellow going up to Canada to study was told by one of the officers of this department that he could not allow him to take along any Canadian currency at all because he was not going to a University to do a useful course but to do engineering at one of the technical schools in Canada, although he had documents to that effect from the technical college. I do not know that anybody in the Control Office is qualified to say what are the appropriate educational institutions or what are not the proper educational institutions established in Canada. I do not appreciate any officer sitting down in a chair on the Wharf telling any of our young men who are trying to improve their technical skill and experience that because they are not going up to Canada or America to do psychology or history or some other comparatively useless course, they cannot be given money, even their own money in change. I think that is absurd; and I would like the Hon. Minister of Trade to check up on the manner in which Currency Officers make their disbursements or allow exchange to be made in hard currency

I would also like to ask the Hon. Minister of Trade whether the Control Board as such has been abolished, or if it has not been abolished if he contemplates to do away with it anytime in the near future.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as my name was mentioned during the debate and I am a member of the Control Board, I feel I should at least say what operates under that system.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear to the hon. member that I did not refer to any person on the Control Board who have quotas and licences, nor was any reference made to him concerning that. As a matter of fact, I was unaware that the hon. member was still a member, because I know some time ago a re-organisation had taken place in the set up of that Board. Let me again repeat that none of the criticisms I made were made in connection with the hon. junior member for Christ Church and his firm, but were directed to the Roberts Manufacturing Company.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I am quite aware of that. But I think as a member of the Control Board, whether my name was called or not, I should say something with regard to the change of prices either up or down by the Control Board. In the majority of cases of Price Control Inspector is sent out on the morning on which a price check is to be effected to holders of stock of that commodity, and he checks the stock of that commodity held by that firm and appropriate forms are filled in. Returns are made to the Control Department and if the price of the commodity is increased, the holders of that stock are expected, as we do, to pay into the Control Board a sum which represents a difference in the price. On the other hand if there is a drop in the price of the commodity, we see that the Control Board sends out the Price Control Inspectors to make a similar check of the stocks we have in hand, and the holder of the stock has to give us a cheque for the difference.

That has operated all throughout the War, and in recent months there has been very little change; I believe that when the prices change it must be operated. The only exception which we had to that, (and it was because differences were carried over) is the price of sugar; but to-day it is on the downward trend. As to the operation of the Roberts Manufacturing Company or any other firm, it is a matter for the Government to answer. I only want to say that it is a question either of the collection of the difference in price or a revision of stocks held, in any change in the price of commodities.

3.25 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Before the hon. member replies, he should hear me on a few points and reply to all at the same time. I would like to comment on a few aspects of the question of importation of articles and about these articles being held up on account of their coming from a hard currency area. I want to say that where any man who goes away and works for wages and buys something with these wages and brings it to this island, it is very difficult to keep out things like that. In my opinion, if a man can prove that he bought anything out of his own wages, you should not stretch your control so far as to prevent him from doing as he likes with money which he has earned outside the colony. I have always regarded that as something which might be a peculiar interpretation of the Regulations. If a man goes to Curacao and works for wages and buys a suit, are you going to tell him that he must come back naked or that he would be allowed currency to pay for it? Along those lines, I think that if a man has bought a car and it is

part and parcel of his belongings, he should be allowed to bring it in. Should he go out and work for the hard currency and you compel him to bring it in?

There is another thing which looks like an anomaly to me; it is the notice applying to Bank Notes being sent out of this colony. I have known of somebody asking the Control Board whether it would be in order to put \$20 in an envelope and send it to Trinidad. We do not operate on Bank Notes today and I saw a notice with "Bank Notes" appearing in it; I think that in the charge against the persons for sending money out of this island, the words "Bank Notes" were in it. The money which is being circulated is as much belonging to Trinidad or British Guiana as it is to Barbados; it is issued by the Currency Board and it is no longer a question of Bank Notes. We have to be very careful that we do not carry the wrong person to the Court. If I am taking the risk of putting money in an envelope and sending it out of the island, if I take the risk of sending out \$20 in that way, let me take the risk of doing that. Nobody could come back and tell you to give them anything for money which has to be destroyed; and very likely there might be millions of dollars destroyed. I do not know if it is legal to send money through the Post. The position is the same as if you tell me not to send money from St. Michael to St. Philip or St. George.

The next point is whether the Hon. Minister knows that there is a policy of reserving hard currency for new business. People who are doing new business find that to be essential, and I do think that some reserve should be there for such people.

3.35 p.m.

What is the use of saying that the importation of motorcars can be made from the U.S.A., but that the particular person has not been allocated any dollars. It only means that he has to get the dollars somehow. From what I heard the matter is not being given the serious consideration that it deserves. These controls have a tendency to keep trade in the hands of big business. Having no great measure of industrialisation, we should aim at keeping our people employed; and it is no use having a system by which you are channelling all the business in the island through the big six, the big ten or any other number. I wonder if the big five in the Ministries will see to it that they do not entirely support the big six. I would like to know if that is the policy of the Government and if the Minister knows exactly how it is working.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to know something about the Rice Agreement that was distributed in the House sometime ago. Either it is signed or will be signed soon. I am taking the opportunity to refer to that because we are subsidising rice. Sometime soon after the Rice Agreement was made it came to this House for ratification; since then some of the most peculiar things have happened. I think we were represented on one occasion by Sir John Saint, I cannot remember if he was "Sir" then. However, there was a dispute. Trinidad said they were not going to pay the price which British Guiana were asking.

One island seemed to be able to force all the others in arbitration. Barbados had to join in the arbitration with the result that on the decision of the Arbitration Board, we had to pay a higher price than the Guianese were asking in the first instance. We were lucky to have Sir John Saint as our representative, and he was also our delegate on the Arbitration Board; but we still came out badly.

Since the day on which copies of the Agreement were distributed to the House, the matter

has never come back to this Chamber. I do not know if we have any order on our Order Paper to discuss it. It seems that the Agreement has been changed entirely because it is being made between the Rice Marketing Board of British Guiana and the Barbados Government. There must have been some alteration.

We were forced into arbitration because of one island. At least that is the explanation that was given; but I was told that that is not true. I asked people from the Leeward Islands about it and they told me that they did not go to arbitration and they got their rice at the reduced price. I believe it was a big joke played on the people of Barbados; I have never been able to get it explained. I wonder if we are going to debate this Rice Agreement and find out something about it. Fancy that the Arbitration Board was set up, not at the instance of the seller, and in the end you offered the seller more than he asked in the first instance. That is like the arbitration that went on some time ago with the Barbados Government and the Telephone Company. The latter put up their rents; the then Attorney General made a big row; the result of it all was that the Government had to pay more rent than the company had asked for in the first place. We are famous for that kind of thing.

What about this Rice Agreement? Will we have any say? What about the Oils and Fats Agreement? Barbados is noted as being the only island whose people get no representation when it comes to Oils and Fats. All the representation at those conferences is on the side of the people who are more or less the manufacturers and sellers of the commodities. That is one of the things that has probably caused us to pay more for those commodities than we otherwise would. It is not satisfactory. I know that you can always say, "I cannot tell you everything," but the result is that we pay more. If you do us a good favour let us know about it.

The next thing I want to talk about, sir, is locally consumed sugar. I do not know if any hon. member has brought that up already.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for Christ Church.

Mr. LEWIS: He is interested in buying and selling sugar; I am only interested in buying it. However, sir, I understand that since the Government apologised one year for bringing it in late, they have brought it in later every year since. They want to start the subsidisation in April or May so that the money they allocate will last until Christmas.

People are telling me that they cannot get any sugar at 7½ cents a pound. When they telephone the groceries the grocery people do not tell them that the sugar is now 10½ cents; they say, "We have got some nice sugar at 10½ cents. The 7½ cents a pound sugar is off." That is a serious thing to happen with a Labour Government in power. This is not a thing that the public should be tricked with. If the Government apologised for bringing it in late one year it should have come in earlier every year since then.

The next thing, as some hon. member remarked during the luncheon interval, is that the war has been over for ten years and we are still spending \$50,000 a year on the Control Organisation. Let us try and stop this nonsense and get on with spending this money on the taxpayers in a different way. As I have said already, the personnel of the Control Department could be put to do useful work for the Government in another direction; you would

not have to dispense with the services of everyone there.

Seeing that it was a temporary organisation, you put some old retired people to work there so that they could give the Government the benefit of their experience, and so that when you were ready to stop, it would not be such a jar to their economic outlook.

3.45 p.m.

That Department can be changed to become a useful department. Why don't you try and get out some expert to teach you to run your own insurance and let the people in that department be transferred to such a department. They are accustomed to statistics and figures, and that would be something which your insurance department would require. Let the two things be roped together — your statistical and your insurance departments; and that has been told to me ever since the days when the Workmen's Compensation Act was brought in. Nobody can see any reasons for your keeping of the Control Department. If that Department is still kept because of the imperial policy, let the Home Government send down the people to run it and the money to pay them. If it is your considered view that it should be closed down, close it down. So far as control of prices is concerned, all that you need is a few inspectors and they can be attached to the police department, and currency control can be done by one man. He can see what the financiers are doing and inspect their books every month so as to see what has been done. If you are relaxing some of the controls, you would not have to go to him; and no harm will be done because the financiers are not going to take risk. I would just like to impress upon hon. members when they see an advertisement about Bank Notes that we have no such thing as Bank Notes around here. I wonder if the policy is to add reserve hard currency to the business.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I have a few things to say on this Head and the first is with respect to the remitting of currency for the importation of technical books. I am wondering if you are aware that there are not very many technical books in book shops as hitherto. Almost every month I am in search of a technical book of some sort, and very often I am forced to get somebody to write to the Control Board to get some dollars to import this book directly from the publishers or through the S.P.C.K. Book Shop. We have had some talk about 'Horoscope' and 'Horror Stories' being too plentiful on the market, and that they are not the type of books which boys should read; but when I was a boy I read 'Dixon Bret' and a lot of that stuff and while you may be right, I do not know, I think we can over do that. You might lack a sense of humour and that may be the reason why you may not care to read such books; but I think horror and ghost stories and those simple magazines which children love to read do play an important part in creating a habit of reading in many cases. It is all right for some adult to say "You should not read comics" when he has read almost everything in his boyhood. Although I would not like to see comics removed, I would say you can examine them; I certainly believe that you should always throw all your books to the public. I would say again that the S.P.C.K. Book Shop and all the book shops should be allowed currency to import technical books from America and other countries like that; at least, I do not see why it is necessary to continue to control various book shops of the people of this area with regard to the importation of technical books

Industrialisation starts with an interest in technical books. I feel all books of that type should be on sale at all the various book shops and book sellers in this area. The age of industrialisation is here; we must industrialise or die. I think we all are satisfied about that.

There has been much expression of opinion recently about the Control Board, and I am wondering if the Hon. Minister of Trade would consider a change in the set up of that department. People all over the world use the pre-war period for reconstruction and development. I am not prepared to say anything about controls, but I do not feel too happy about the Control Department. There is a strange kind of feeling in this Chamber that if you criticise a department, somebody has it to say that there is some bad motive that caused you to do so. However I am wondering if the Hon. Minister would think of re-examining that department. Obviously there are some things which you would need to have under control, but there are many things for which you can do away with controls.

There is also some talk about giving a further release on the U.S.A. dollar for American automobiles. I think you will note that the people who handle the modern automobile are not producing a tractor which is very much in use abroad. However it has been hinted that the English people are willing to permit the West Indies to import American cars. What I do think is that you should make it possible for people who are interested in industry to import American equipment when it is available. I also hope you will release French Francs and German Marks so as to enable people to import equipment from those countries. I believe you are aware that more often than not, in spite of the high premium on the American dollar there are lots of American machinery much cheaper than that of British manufacture.

As I have said, I believe that the Hon. Minister should pay some attention to what is taking place in the area. I do not know if there is still need for this department, especially if the Head and the Secretary of that Department are only controlling the U.S.A. dollars. If that is the greater part of their job, then I think it can be done in another section of the Government and the people who work there can be put to some other use. I feel that this department can be made to serve another purpose. You must move on if progress is to be your ultimate goal; you must be prepared to move on even if you are going to rock the boat. I am more or less appealing to the Minister to do a little re-examination.

I am asking them to throw the gates wide open in so far as books are concerned. I think that a country which is without the desire to read is a rather poor country.

3.55 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I have listened carefully to the last appeal by the hon. member who has just sat down following that of the hon. junior member for St. John, and I can assure him that my attitude is the same as his in respect of books and the cultural needs in general. The honourable member also spoke about getting in essential things. I can tell him that this is actually taking place with an increased allocation this year. Those things which are essential to our economy and to our standard of living will be considered.

The honourable junior member for the City has questioned the policy of allocating new quotas to new business. I can inform this Committee that this is a point which I have taken up since I became a

Minister, because I felt that the position was unfair. As the honourable member knows, the old system is based on the quota year 1946-47; I think it is unfair for a new trader to have to apply for the same quota belonging to a person who was established since 1946 or 1947. This year a quota of 10% is being reserved for new traders, and the honourable member will find that we have applied to the Secretary of State for the Colonies for a bigger allocation in order that the quota can be extended. If we find that from the inter-play of competition prices will fall in process of time, more and more people who are on the Control Board will be taken off and we will relax controls gradually. However, even in respect of those items off which we took controls last year there was no fall in prices. When a general falling off in price takes place, when it will be to the advantage of the community to take off controls, that will be done and we will absorb the personnel of the Control Board or some of them in some other Departments.

As regards persons owning vehicles for a year, they can bring them in. The Comptroller of Supplies cannot refuse them; he must act under that policy. It was surprising to hear the honourable senior member for the City say that there is a vehicle in the Customs for 18 months now. If that is so, I think it is the fault of the individual to whom the vehicle belongs.

In so far as the Rice Agreement is concerned, I cannot now speak about the effect of the arbitration because that was some years ago; but I can tell the honourable member that Jamaica stood out of the last Agreement and they had to buy rice at a dearer price than those who came into the Agreement. The Korean War came along and conditions got no better. We sent delegates to the last Conference which took place and all things being considered, I think hon. members will find that we will profit from this Agreement; because by the quotations of world prices we are getting rice more cheaply from British Guiana than we would get it from other countries. I do not think we can debate the Agreement; the hon. member can make a motion to debate the Agreement, but it is not necessary for the Government to come down to the House before signing the Agreement. Trade Agreements take place between Governments all over the world: they sign the Agreements and then come down to the elected bodies, and if the Legislatures disagree then the Governments must take the consequences. We are advised of that constitutionally.

The hon. senior member for St. George has raised the question of the personnel employed at the Control Board; that they are people who are drawing pensions. Whatever might be my personal feelings and opinions about those persons who draw pensions being still employed by the Government, I think the hon. member should know that we have nothing to do with the appointment or dismissal of personnel. That is a matter for the Civil Service Commission.

4.05 p.m.

The hon. member also asked about the allocation of dollars. Each case is considered on its merits. In that scheme the basis of the years 1947 and 1948 is used. We spent under this amount last year for food and clothing alone 5.8 million dollars. I do not have the figures of our dollar earnings. I will let the honourable member have them when I can; this being a financial matter which comes under the portfolio of the Minister of Finance.

As far as the answers to his statements are concerned, it seems that the honourable member started off with a lot of vitriol and then changed to honeyed words, when he found out that members of the Oppo-

sition were on the Control Board. I do not know how much further he will carry personal feelings into public policy. The hon. junior member for Christ Church has referred to certain things which he said about the Control Board.

I will say that so far as this Government and these increases are concerned it is not true to say that these increases were allowed before the price of the raw material had gone up. Nor is it true to say that I, on my own, allowed these increases after consultation with some person whom he did not name. The hon. member gets up and makes personal reflections without one iota of justification; he does not mind what he says so long as he makes statements like those. It is tragic.

When this case came before me, the particular firm had to produce figures to the Financial Secretary and to everyone concerned. It is not a matter of making a request to me and my saying all right. They had to produce a breakdown to the Financial Secretary. What the hon. member said is not the truth.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member says that I did not speak the truth. He objected today to another honourable member saying that he was not speaking the truth, and asked that the hon. member be made to withdraw the statement. I am asking that he be made to withdraw the statement that I did not speak the truth.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member—

Mr. BARROW: I am asking you, Mr. Chairman, to treat this matter as a chairman. I have objected to the statement made by the honourable member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the statement?

Mr. BARROW: I am not joking.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not joking either.

Mr. BARROW: The honourable member said to let me go and speak the truth; I am objecting to his saying that. What is untrue about asking the questions that he attempted to answer? We have got the whole House reduced to a farce.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister said that what you said was not true.

Mr. BARROW: He himself today asked you to make the hon. junior member for St. Peter withdraw a statement like that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Did I make him withdraw?

Mr. BARROW: That is a matter of supreme indifference to me. I am asking you to make him withdraw his remark to me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: After the honourable member explained, I saw that he was right and I asked the honourable member to withdraw.

Mr. BARROW: I am asking you to call now on the Minister of Labour to withdraw his remark. These debates are going down to posterity. If you do not want to do your duty you should decline from being Chairman of Committees. I am asking you to call on him to withdraw his remarks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is objecting to the remark of the Hon. Minister.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I can only state facts. I said that what the hon. member said was not in accordance with the truth.

Mr. BARROW: I am objecting to that. I am calling on him to withdraw it. He has made it worse by trying to explain what he said.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member said he was around the Public Buildings and I met some Director personally and it was a Wednesday that the director whispered in my ear that the price of raw materials

had gone up and that I allowed this increase to be put on the public.

Mr. BARROW: I never said that anyone whispered that raw materials had gone up. Was not the Hon. Minister approached on a Wednesday in regard to this matter of the increase in the price of margarine? Let him check his files and see. Let the Minister of Communications answer for him then.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If the hon. member realises that he is wrong let him say so. Do not—

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I got up to ask you to make the Minister withdraw the remark I have objected to. I never said that the price of raw materials had gone up. I said that a director of the firm went to him on a Wednesday. He has said that that is not true. I want him to withdraw his statement to me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You accused him of the director meeting him.

Mr. BARROW: I am not accusing him of that. They met every day practically. He knows, and the director knows that they met on the Wednesday. It is the privilege of any member of the public to see a Minister. That is not the point. The point is that these increases are not justified. I am calling on the hon. member to withdraw his statement whether they met on a Wednesday or not; and Mr. Hunte knows that he met him. I am asking him to withdraw his statement that I did not speak the truth. It is not the point whether Mr. Hunte met him on a Wednesday or not. If Mr. Hunte can fix the price of the raw materials on the Control Board what is wrong with him—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is a lawyer.

Mr. BARROW: Do not bandy words with me about my being a lawyer.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will rule the hon. member out of order for not allowing me to speak. The hon. member has accused the Minister of meeting the director on a Wednesday. The Hon. Minister said that that is not so. How can I make him withdraw? He said that it is not so.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of Order, Mr. Chairman. You are not here to judge whether the director met the Minister or not. I am making a statement of fact. You do not seem to quite grasp what I am saying. For a member to get up and say that another member is not speaking the truth is unparliamentary. He should be made to withdraw. I can call Mr. Hunte outside any day and ask Mr. Hunte in front of him. I am objecting to his saying that I am not speaking the truth when he called on you to make another hon. member withdraw a similar remark to-day. I am not asking you to judge whether my saying that he met Mr. Hunte is or is not an accusation, or whether that particular statement is true or not.

I am not asking you to judge that case because you are not in a position to judge it. I am asking you to ask the Hon. Minister of Trade to withdraw what he said; that is all I am asking.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the hon. member is objecting on a question of meeting some body. The implication is that as a result of the Minister meeting a director—

4.15 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, what is he doing in this now? Is he building up a false case? This is something which concerns one of the Ministers and myself. I am not against any director going to him; I am only asking you as Chairman of Committees whether you are prepared to call on him to withdraw the unparliamentary remarks. I am not asking you to judge anybody; the public themselves would judge that.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. member accused the Hon. Minister of—

Mr. BARROW: I never accused the hon. member of anything.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. George await his chance to speak.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. member is objecting to the implication that as a result of the Minister meeting a director—Surely if one says that you did meet him and you did not meet him, that is not true.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is what I was trying to explain.

Mr. BARROW: You seem to take rulings from the Government's Bench. Regardless of the merits or demerits of the case, if one member gets up and says that you are not speaking the truth and you do nothing about it posterity will say some member called on the Minister to withdraw a remark, but you did nothing about it. The Hon. Premier is saying that what I said was not true. That is not exactly the same thing. If you allow members of the House or of the Government to advise you on how to conduct the business of this House, I think—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think you are going a little too far now.

Mr. BARROW: How long must we wait on you; must we wait until the end of time?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do you want as soon as you get up and say something for somebody to fly at it. I clearly understand that the hon. member is not speaking the truth. If the hon. member is not speaking the truth, must not another member say it? [Laughter.]

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman,—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member take his seat. I rule you are out of order. I am appealing to the Hon. Minister who made use of the unparliamentary remarks to withdraw them.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I will call your attention to the Rules.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. I am appealing to you to withdraw the unparliamentary remarks and let us get along.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the remarks. I however say that what the hon. senior member for St. George accused me of doing is not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the Hon. Minister not to take the hon. senior member for St. George too seriously.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Trade whether he can at this stage make a statement as to the subsidy on sugar.

A VOICE: The Hon. Minister said he will bring down a Bill to deal with it on Tuesday.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I was speaking on one topic just now but I want to ask the Hon. Minister of Trade a few more questions. Mr. Chairman, I hear hisses coming from behind me. If the reporters who represent the Press of this island are so partisan that they cannot conduct themselves in a proper manner, I am going to draw their presence to the Chair. I am constrained to move around a bit in order that Your Honour would be able to see them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do you want me to see the Press? I am looking at you and not at the representatives of the Press.

Mr. BARROW: The hon. junior member for St. Peter made a statement relative to the importation of a certain motor vehicle and the releasing of that motor vehicle. The Hon. Minister of Trade in

one of his replies attempted to read a message or directive which came from the Secretary of State for the Colonies which I am submitting, should have been made available to the public of Barbados much earlier. I am going to ask Your Honour's permission for him to read it. I want him to read it so that members of this House should be acquainted with matters of that importance a long time before a journalist who may be a partisan to you sees it. I consider it a grave discourtesy and insult to members of this House for the Hon. Minister of Trade to begin to read a statement and not to complete reading it. It is not in the nature of a secret document. I looked over on that side of the table at that time and saw when the Hon. Minister of Communications made him desist from reading the particular document, and to push it at the bottom of a file. [A VOICE: Shame!] I draw the attention of the hon. member on my left (Mr. Lewis) to what was going on at the particular time and the Hon. Minister of Trade quickly sat down. Let him get up and say that is not true.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to hear what the Secretary of State for the Colonies said about releasing hearses, dollars, or anything. I want to know from the Hon. Minister of Trade whether as a result of this directive from the Secretary of State for the Colonies that he was induced to make out a special dispensation or a general dispensation in respect of the importation of motor vehicles of that kind. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, you will be very interested to know that. If that is a new policy, you can go ahead and get in a motor vehicle with impunity or without anybody attacking you and saying that you only got it because you are a member of this House of Assembly.

4.25 p.m.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that you would be the last person who would try to get out a motor until the public knew long before that everything was above board and in order.

The Minister for Trade said that it had been decided sometime in August to allow people who were living in hard currency areas like Aruba, the United States of America and Canada and who had been resident abroad in these areas for a period of 18 months, to bring into this country any motor vehicles which they had purchased abroad. I would like to ask the Hon. Minister this: this is an independent statement he made; it is nothing to do, as far as I can see, with the decision of the Secretary of State for the Colonies; I would like to ask the Hon. Minister the date when that decision was made. As a practising journalist he should be in a position to tell us. If that statement had been released to the Press, on what date was it released? If it was not released to the Press, we would like to know why. We have been informed that people who went to Aruba and wanted to carry on a "Drive Yourself" service in Barbados, would not be allowed to bring the fruits of their labour to make a living in Barbados. I would like to ask the Minister if only two Barbadians resident abroad made application either to the Control Office or to him for the whole time since he has been in office to bring motor cars from Aruba here; I would like to hear a clear and unequivocal statement on that. The hon. member may mean that he is only aware of two such people, but I want him to say that only two applications came before him.

I do not want to make any comment on the question of this particular motor vehicle at all, but I would like to say this: I am satisfied that the Hon.

Minister of Social Services would not have anything to do with this case because it is not under his control. I am glad he made the statement he made, because it will clear the air and everybody knows that he would have nothing to do with this matter: but it does seem that some of the members of the Government are always putting their colleagues in an embarrassing position, doing things which they think would make them more loyal. Apparently it is not confined to the Ministerial Benches; they do things for other people sometimes on their invitation and sometimes not, when they think it would make them more loyal, when in fact, they are causing people to be held up to ridicule. I would go so far as to say I accept what the Hon. Minister of Social Services says, and I am sure that every member of the House does; but the Hon. Minister of Trade will have to take all responsibility. He says that if you lose an appeal from one Minister there is an appeal to the full Court, and the full Court will overrule him. The Hon. Minister of Social Services has already told the gentleman that he would not get the hearse; then the position is that there is a 3—2 decision.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of Order: When did I say you could appeal from a Minister to the full Court?

Mr. BARROW: The Minister said he told the gentleman that he could go to the Government.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I gave my decision and the matter went on that.

Mr. BARROW: The gentleman seemed to have got the idea that he had the right of appeal to the Government. They castigated me for suggesting that one of the principal advisers of those five over there—They castigated me for saying that Mr. Hunte went to the Minister for Labour; now the Minister of Labour says that the gentleman went to him. What is wrong with my saying that Hon. K. R. Hunte represented them at the R.E.C. meeting which we cannot hear anything about? Whether the gentleman went to the Government on his own back or whether he went to a Minister, there was the impression gained that there is a right of appeal to the Government. But there is no right of appeal under our Constitution as to whether you are dissatisfied with the decision of a Minister on any particular point or not. Expressed provision is made for arbitration or for an appeal to the High Court from a local board to a Minister; but I have never heard it suggested that a private citizen wanting something purely for his personal use and not for the use of the general public, could appeal from the decision of a Minister.

4.35 p.m.

I am asking the Minister to listen carefully to what I am saying because I regard it as an infringement of his to make a decision, when a member of the public can go from him and appeal to other Ministers to do something which the Minister after his considered opinion stated that he would not accept. I want to know if that is a new constitutional position in this island. It makes nonsense of the whole idea of the responsibility of a Minister for the departments under his control.

We know that two of the Ministers at least were against this release according to their own statements; so it would seem as if three Ministers, on matters which intimately affected not general policy, but the working of a particular department, can overrule a Minister on the working of his own department. That is a serious state of affairs; although we know that in truth and in fact one can overrule four and sometimes sixteen.

I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister of Trade that they have deprived him of his man

hood. If he allows a situation like that to continue, out of a sense of shame he should dissociate himself from that. They could not put it on me; and they should not be able to put it on him if he has an ounce of manhood in him. The honourable junior member for St. Peter can tell you that he said go to the Government. We know the Minister of Social Services was against it; so three Ministers acted like a Court of Appeal.

I do not want to spend any more time on that, because that is what came from the honourable member in the course of this debate. I have been reminding members of the House of the dangerous trends that are taking place in Barbados today.

Now, the Minister might be in a little difficulty here, but I want to go on record as mentioning what I am going to mention now. I will not go into details because it is a bit involved. I want to go on record as asking for the first time in the House of Assembly (although the honourable senior member for St. Philip has made some reference in another way to what I am asking now) whether the Government will not consider exercising some control over the monetary policy of the island by inflating currency by having a fiduciary issue based on consols or other trustee securities, and inflating currency out of proportion to the exact amount of security that stand against the currency department.

It is a difficult thing to explain, and I will be willing to give the Ministers the complete plan for doing it. What they do at present is this: for every dollar you get out of the currency they have to have a dollar in securities. The West Indies will never be able to advance if they continue that policy. It is a policy of stagnation; we are not on the gold standard. With the gold standard you have to have for every pound an ounce in the Bank of England. They found that this practice was creating unemployment and they went off the gold standard; then they went back on it again on the instigation of Mr. Churchill, and Mr. Keynes wrote an article on the Economic consequences of Winston Churchill. Then they went off again.

They have three or four million pounds in gold in the Bank of England; but fiduciary issue is not four hundred million pounds. The value of notes in circulation in the U.K. is thirteen hundred million pounds or in other words nearly four times the security which they have to back these notes. What I want to see in Barbados is this: let us say that we issue five million dollars in securities. Instead of issuing five million dollars in notes we should issue twenty million dollars in notes. If we issue notes to the exact value of securities we have, we will be going around in a vicious circle all the time. We will not be able to expand our economy.

Those are the broad highlights of the new monetary policy which I want the Government of Barbados in particular to adopt. It will help in solving the unemployment problem here. I will be able to expand on the matter on a more suitable occasion, or if any of the Ministers want to learn something, I can put up a few facts and figures to them explaining the workings of this new monetary system which I feel they should adopt. Maybe it can be raised at the next meeting of the R.E.C.; I am sure that it will get the support of the Jamaicans and the Trinidadians.

The fiduciary issue that I talked about in connection with the Bank of England merely means an issue that is made in faith. There is nothing solid to exchange it for. The figure of thirteen hundred million pounds which I mentioned would be subjected to seasonal fluctuations in the vicinity of twenty

hundred million pounds and twenty-five hundred million pounds at Christmas time; but they will be called back in by the 15th January, and the fiduciary issue will remain at thirteen hundred million pounds.

There is one other point which I would like to make, and I would like the Minister to reply to it. A lot of young people in Barbados who do not have jobs read an advertisement that there was an Employment Agency in Boston that was prepared to provide them with information regarding jobs. This Government issued a statement to the Press saying that the Agency had a good reputation; that the Agency was not providing jobs, but only the information as regards jobs. That was quite correct. The Government actually had investigations made, I believe, about this Agency.

A lot of young people in good faith took up their own money or money lent to them by friends and sent sums ranging from 7/6 to 12/- to get information from the Agency. There was no racket in it. I was surprised to go into the Police Courts one day and see these young people in batches of 25 like the Bourbons waiting to go to the guillotine. They were hauled into court in batches and told to plead guilty of sending currency abroad.

The honourable junior member for the City on my left said that they sent Bank Notes; they sent postal orders. That is what the Government of Barbados has to offer the youth of this country today. You attempt to get a job and into court you must go, and off your head must go in the gutter. They hauled them into court in batches of twenty-five. I went up to one of the officers (I do not want to call his name) and I asked him what is going on in Barbados. He said they had been told that a directive had been issued to the effect that they must make an example of these people (about 250); and they were just trying to get information for a job. Did the Premier tell them to make an example of those people, or the Attorney General, or the Chief Secretary or the Minister of Labour? I only want to know. Or was that officer, a responsible officer, telling an untruth on a superior person in the Government?

They were told to make an example, and the peoples' money was confiscated. They were not even under the Currency Control Regulations.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The implication against this Government is that this Government has joined in something which is in the nature of discrimination in respect of a particular person, and this having been repeated over and over again, I make this statement as far as that person is concerned. It is a matter for the Hon. Minister of Trade in conjunction with the proper department, the Control Board, to go into all these matters. It appears to me that a number of accusations have been made. The Government as a Government with all the Ministers collectively, or where a Minister is concerned with a particular department and acting individually has to get information; and if that is so, the Hon. Minister has made it clear. I say this in passing, not with any intention of causing offence or of accusing him, but to my mind, it is extremely easy to say what is a fact and what the Hon. Minister at sometime or the other in his speech made clear. Every territory of necessity has to have direct information with regards to the allocation of dollars and as to how those dollars should be allocated with respect to the different categories of expenditure. Of course, all Ministers know or can know what those directions are. In respect of some things which have been said I am not taking any notice but it has been said that every page in respect of a particular matter should be

read and I wish to say that a confidential despatch to all the territories was sent with respect to the allocation of dollars. In respect of representation having been made by certain West Indian colonies, including ourselves, a confidential telegram was sent to us on the 22nd September last year giving directions as to how there should be relaxation in certain cases as regards private and commercial vehicles from the dollar sources. I do not propose to read any confidential letter, but on the 27th September of last year an additional confidential telegram was sent in respect of the method by which colonies should be guided in a general way as to the release of dollars for the purchase of vehicles both private and commercial from the dollar sources. In consequence of that direction, the Hon. Minister of Trade acted as he did in this matter and other Ministers were informed. Not that it was necessary to say this, but I said it in the hope that this useless debate would be ended. In consequence of the directions which we were given as to the principles on which the different territories should act for the releasing of dollars for the purpose of motor vehicles the Minister has acted. 4.55 p.m.

I have spoken only because of the accusation which has been made; it was a suggestion at first and then there was a direct accusation that the Minister concerned and the others of us for personal reasons permitted the release of this hearsay. My object in speaking is to say that that is not true: my only reason for speaking at all is that the Government has been brought into the matter.

As I am on my feet, I will just say this: could any hon. member take seriously for five minutes any of the speech of the senior member for St. George? If the Attorney General or the Chief Justice or anybody else who was not concerned with the policy of this Government were to interfere, I would have to tell him "I am nothing to do with you." To suggest that a Minister is remotely connected with any prosecution is just to waste time; I use the mildest term I can use. Have hon. members already forgotten the distribution of the functions of members of the Government? Everybody knows that the question of prosecution is nothing to do with the political side of the Government; how can anybody seriously suggest that the political side of the Government could remotely have anything to do with prosecutions or with what a Magistrate does? God forbid that we should come to the stage when we say that a Magistrate was too severe in his punishment or to direct an officer with whom we are not concerned as to how he should exercise his discretion. The Act says that the Comptroller of Customs has the authority to do things in his own right; and if the Act says that you have no right to send money to a foreign country ignorance of the law is no excuse; and I am not questioning either in one way or the other whether the persons responsible acted rightly or not. That is all I desire to say. Mr. Chairman I have spoken only because the whole lot of us as Ministers have been dragged into this matter.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am very glad to hear those remarks. I do not want any Minister to refer to the law—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. member was not in the House or he would have known that this did not come from me but from the hon. senior member for St. George.

Mr. BARROW rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. Peter gave way to the Premier and the hon. senior member for St. George must take his seat.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I will give way to him.

Mr. BARROW: I reported what was told to me by a responsible officer of the Government: that they had to make an example. The law says what fine should be placed on them; and they happened to have had a decent Magistrate. I repeat: an officer of the Government told me that they were told to make an example and hon. members of the Government must have known that a prosecution would have taken place, and they would be able to justify the accepted policy of the Government to prosecute.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you making a personal explanation?

Mr. BARROW: We are in Committee, Mr. Chairman, and I am entitled to speak. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph in certain instances challenged the hon. senior member for the City that if it were the expressed opinion of the majority of the members of this House that you should not prosecute people, whether any officer in his right senses would prosecute anybody. I quote the example of people riding on bicycle bars, and there are other instances which I am prepared to check and put in front of him. I am not saying that he tried to fetter the discretion of the Magistrate because that Magistrate would not tolerate it from him or from anybody else, but I would like to ask the Minister if he was unaware of the fact that prosecutions were going to be made and whether the Postmaster General did not have to be summoned as a witness in the cases, and whether he is not in control of the officers. Do you want to tell me that the Postmaster General could not say "This is a trivial case" or ask whether those documents should be sent to the proper authorities to prosecute or not? Of course you cannot interfere with his discretion not to prosecute or to prosecute, and you cannot interfere with the discretion of the Magistrate. However, it does seem surprising to me in the face of the statement made to me in the Court by a responsible officer of the Government, that they did not know anything about it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Hon. Premier has said something which is quite different from what the Minister has said. I never believed in this surprise present which a son could give his father. The Minister of Communications made a statement which I am not going into. What the Minister cannot say is this—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Which Minister?
5.05 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Minister of Social Services. When he came to me I said that I did not agree with it; I would never agree with it and I do not agree with it today.

When the Minister now starts to shift the blame on the Government—

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I object to that. What is the honourable member inferring? I said that this gentleman was appealing from place to place; he said he did not come to me because he knew I would not agree with him.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member has objected. He said he refused to give this gentleman permission and the gentleman went to the Government. What does the Minister mean when he says that he as Minister refused? What kind of Government are you running? Do you mean that the Minister refuses to grant a man permission as regards something which comes under his portfolio and the Government is going to go over the Minister's head?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: That is what the honourable member is inferring. [MEMBERS: You said so.] I

said that the man appealed from place to place, and the honourable member is inferring that because I said so, I said he appealed to the Government.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I have never met a man who could change so in a couple of hours. The Minister said he objected to permission being granted and the matter was referred to the Government. Now he is saying that he did not say that. We know how this constitution works! [*Loud Asides.*]

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will draw to the attention of honourable members to Rule 135. I am going to work on it. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am accustomed to hecklers; I can stand it, although I know that it is not good for you and the Chamber. I was at pains to point out that the Minister was not consistent. He says things and does not realise what he is saying. I said at the beginning that this was a responsibility of the Minister. I said the release was his release because he even indicated that it was a matter for the Board. I pointed out that the Board was advisory to the Minister, and the Minister could override the decision of the Board. When the Minister saw where I was leading, he gave the Committee the impression that he too objected to the gentleman getting the hearse; and that the gentleman made these various appeals, and he appealed to the Government and the release became a decision of the Government.

I challenge him to bring the debates to prove that what I say is not true. If he proves that what I said is not true I will resign from this House. I cannot say I will stake my reputation, because staking your reputation in the House nowadays is like staking out a sheep in the morning and going back for it in the evening. It will go down in the *Hansard* that the decisions made with regard to the release of this hearse was referred to the Government. The Minister is one of those people who smiles at his own ignorance.

No matter can reach the Executive Committee dealing with controls, (something that comes under his portfolio) unless he presents it to the Executive Committee. The Minister does not put up a matter to the Executive Committee as a clerk would; he has to put it up with his comments. When a decision has been made he has to say to the Executive Committee, "I present it." If they agree, the decision is carried out. The only person who can override a Minister's decision is the Premier. The Premier is the only Minister who is allowed to take a matter on his own decision. If the Minister of Labour says that it was a decision of the Government, either he was not in agreement with what the Government was doing or someone overruled his decision. That is why I asked if the Government on this occasion was a court of appeal.

What is the use of having a Ministerial system, when, if a Minister says he does not agree with so and so, heads of departments have a right of going behind him to the Government. This hearse was in Barbados since the 22nd September, 1953. This hearse was in the island with the certain knowledge that it came without the permission of the Government. It was imported against the laws of this island, and it was landed here. You need not have considered anything about it at all. Moreover, it was imported under circumstances under which the Government and the control authorities have already prosecuted people. I will go further and say that even with what the Premier said about the directive from the Secretary of State for the Colonies does not bind the Government to allow anyone to get in New York and send down such gifts. Take the honourable junior member for St. Andrew; he has a son living in the

U.S.A.; his son might as well send down some trucks for him because he had a dream overnight. 5.15 p.m.

That was a counter move. I have a public duty to perform; I have no belief that the man's son gave him that hearse as a surprise present. Not a son in this world was going to surprise his father with a present of a hearse. It is a popular belief going around with some people today that if you agreed to release that hearse to that gentleman, you should have opened the door to others. I am not a party to that kind of politics; and that is why the charge which I have made, I have done so very seriously. In Barbados we have a reputation to keep up; it is not like Trinidad or Jamaica where you have "Bu-ball". I do not like the semblance of any "Bu-ball" and when you have cases like this it is no use your trying to tell me to shut my mouth, because I am not going to shut it. I will go further and say that the Hon. Premier himself has rejected claims such as this and stood firmly on his word. One of the things which this Labour Party has been accused of is that we have not been very lenient in our attitude to allowing people to bring in things into the Colony; if this Government relaxes its scrupulous care over these things, God help our population. I was a member of the Control Board and it has been said that because I was a political member of that Board I would not agree to certain things. I would say that the other members of that Board had no political reputation at stake. Their attitude was like all persons in that category; that is, if I give this away to you I would get shirts next week. They said when this matter was discussed that they would agree if I agreed. I said "No-can-do". As I have said, I do not believe the story of the gentleman's son giving him this hearse as a surprise present; that is one of the things you read for children when you are trying to get them to sleep at night. I rise to let the Hon. Premier know that he has a big responsibility. Some Ministers do a lot of foolishness and as Premier the Premier will have to represent them; especially the Hon. Minister of Trade. I would go as far as to say that you do not see red when you look at the Hon. Minister of Trade, but you see gold; he is not sufficiently virile for you to see red. If he agreed to the releasing of this hearse to this gentleman let him say he agreed to it. It is a lame duck's excuse to say that this gentleman's son gave him this hearse as a surprise present.

I am not going to challenge the integrity of the Reporters of this House, but I object to any Minister going to a Reporter to make his speech. The Official Debates should contain nothing more than what was said on the floor of this House.

Sir, I never agreed to this idea; I am satisfied that the Hon. Minister of Trade became the laughing stock of the whole Committee when he got up and said he did not say what I said.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, I feel that sufficient has been said on this particular matter by the honourable members and I would only like to warn this Government that this is a very serious charge about the action of one of the Ministers. It is something that could be taken very seriously in any responsible government. The charge has been made that there is some type of favouritism; and the documentary evidence does not support the case for the release of this hearse. From what I was made to understand, it appears that at some time a directive had been made retroactive in the case of certain people; and if that is so, it would be better if you carry it right back and give back to all those people their motor cars or the money which was taken from them by the Comptroller of Customs. I say again that this is a very serious

charge and it is going to make very bad reading. I do hope that at some future date we will hear more of this matter. There are certain things which appear to me very necessary to make public. If there is an alteration in your import policy, it should be made public.

I would like to correct the honourable senior member for St. George in one thing which he said that I said. I said arising out of the case of the prosecution of the people who were seeking employment in the U.S.A., a notice was put in the Press. I never said that these particular people sent Bank Notes out of the colony. I will give an instance. A person who wants to send 20 shillings to somebody in St. Lucia would be told if he enquired about it at the Post Office, that he cannot put a currency note in a letter; he would have to pay the bank exchange, so you can see that it is illegal to send Barbados' Bank Notes to St. Lucia. You must bear in mind that a Barbados Bank Note is not a St. Lucia Bank Note; it is a currency note and the notice in the Press stated about a currency note. However, it does seem very peculiar that you have a Post Office and the people whom you have working there allow these people to buy a postal order or when they put money in their letters you saw it and you then locked them up for it. If that is so, you allowed somebody to do something for a purpose and then you held on to it. Perhaps it was a postal order and not a money order, where you do not have to say where you are sending it. However, around that time there must have been an exceptional amount of buying of postal orders, and I fail to know why the people in the Post Office did not know the purpose for which they were bought. These people should have been warned at the time of their buying the postal orders. I feel that those people should have been warned. I myself heard of the rush at the Post Office for that kind of business. The Government was making money out of the selling of those postal orders and that was the time to warn those people. Those people did not buy the postal orders from a firm in Bridgetown; they bought them from the same Government.

Sir, I feel that a serious charge has been made. We have heard of the action of the Minister and I hope I will hear more of it later. There must be an explanation apart from what we have heard today. If somebody did something wrong on the 23rd September last, it should not be regularised in 1955. That is a dangerous policy.

The question that the sum of \$463,113 be voted under Head XLII was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

The motion was put and agreed to.

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

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

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

The motion was put and agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
5.35 p.m.

ESTIMATES RESUMED

On re-assembling.

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee on the Estimates Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When we were in Committee on the adjournment Head XLII of the Estimates was being considered.

The question that the sum of \$463,113 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XLIII—Contributions From Revenue was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$250,000 be voted under this Head.

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

The question that the sum of \$250,000 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Annexed Estimates—Post Office

Head Annexed Estimates — Post Office was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$268,735 be voted under this Head.

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

The question that the sum of \$268,735 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Capital Expenditure

Loan Funds

Head A — Loan Funds was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am moving that the Capital Expenditure stand part.

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

Mr. LEWIS: When you make that motion, do you put all these Heads together?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have moved the whole thing, but honourable members can ask questions.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Under this Head Capital Expenditure honourable members will remember that I circulated a Memorandum in connection with handicrafts and I want to insert under the Head "Miscellaneous" on page 135 of the Estimates a new Item — Item 11 "Minor Handicrafts, \$15,350". The reason for that, Mr. Chairman, is to be found in the Memorandum which I had circulated a few days ago. At one time it was felt that this matter should await the coming into being of a Development Board, but recently the Government has decided to take the matter out of that category and put it under the aegis of the Social Welfare. These minor handicrafts will be run by a Standing Advisory Committee which will be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The reason for putting this matter under the heading of Social Welfare can be very well seen; it is quite obvious that the Social Welfare Department is in touch with these associations and groups which would naturally deal with articles of this sort. [A PAUSE]. Mr. Chairman, as these Heads will be taken separately I will reserve my further remarks until the appropriate time.

Head B—Available Funds, 1—Water Supplies

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I suggest that the Head "A—Loan Funds" be taken as a separate Resolution. Consequently, I am moving that Head B—Available Funds, 1—Water Supplies be now considered. I beg to move that the sum of \$290,000 be voted under this Head.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I am told sir, that the new turnover from steam to electricity at

Bowmanston and other pumping stations has resulted in a considerable saving to the Government, and the men we employ there are very disturbed over the fact that they take too many years before they reach their maximum salaries. Their case is a very old one. They have been running that department very efficiently with bad equipment until Mr. Garrod came here and money was allocated for the improvement of the water services. The men also feel that the uniform question which was brought up on their behalf about three or four years ago should not be forgotten by the Government; they still feel that they are entitled to it inasmuch as the staff in some other departments get similar treatment.

The primary question is, however, that they are forced to wait for many years before they reach their maximum. Their increments are not compatible with the sacrifices which they have to make and the service which they put in at the pumping stations. I would like to remind the Minister for Communications about that matter.

Another point I would like to stress is that now the water service is being extended to new areas so rapidly, the Regulations as regards the erecting of standposts should be revised, and not to allow the Sanitary Commissioners of the respective parishes to decide when, how and where standposts must be put. Due to the fact that the Sanitary Commissioners have to erect standposts and dig wells when wells are to be dug, they always try to keep down the cost in a particular year by not pushing the erection of new standposts. I have observed that; I have discussed it with some of the sanitary authorities and some of them say that the parish does not have sufficient revenue. There is no one to assist them in carrying the service to the areas which have been left out in the past, and also to those areas which have been opened up due to the development of land.

The Government should not continue to believe that the distribution of a particular number of standposts in the respective parishes every year is satisfactory. If the Government finds that there are several villages which need water service and the Government has the means of erecting standposts, there is no reason why that should not be done regardless of how many are put up in a week, a month or a year. Some of the districts have to wait too long before they get water.

Take a place like Newcastle where much land has been sold out: people have built up new villages in that area, and that may have to wait two, three and possibly five years before the water service reaches them. I must remind this Committee that the means are at present at the disposal of the Waterworks Department, and the Department should therefore do as much as it is possible to do and in as short a time as possible.

6.10 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a word from the Minister on this: the original idea was to change the pumping equipment, with the intention of bringing the supplies from the old method to the modern bore hole type of pump involving the use of electricity. What I am thinking about is the use of natural gas, because that would be cheaper than any other fuel which may be purchased in the area.

I particularly would like to see the Government spending more money on the expansion and efficiency of the water supply rather than holding on to the old steam equipment for pumping. I have been told that you were having trouble with the emergency pumps, and I do know that the cost of operating

the electrical motors is more than the cost of steam equipment; but it is a question of efficiency when you use the electrical equipment. I think it is only fair and reasonable to use electricity and I am of the opinion that honourable members would be willing to vote the money for that purpose. I have been told that you had to revert to the old steam engine for pumping, and as far as I have been made to understand it is still in operation. I wonder if the Hon. Minister has any information on the cause of the trouble with the electrical equipment and if the manufacturers have made concessions by way of supplying new parts. How long would the steam engine be in maintenance?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Communications a little question with regard to the water mains in St. Michael; he need not be afraid of my remarks because I am still in residence in St. Michael. Is the Hon. Minister aware that there is no main in Westbury New Road? I was amazed when I heard that; I could not believe that a main does not run along Westbury New Road. I understand that on account of that people who live along that road cannot get the service of water. There is a water main running along Westbury Road as well as one running along Fontabelle, but not in Westbury New Road. I would have thought that his constituents would have informed him of that necessity already; and I think that as a matter of public service they should have it; and that is my reason of putting the matter to him. Residents of that district should be able to get the domestic service as well as a standpipe should be erected somewhere along that road.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Chairman, speaking on Item 2, Additional Mains and Standpipes, I would just like to say that I have been approached by the residents in Thomas Gap, Westbury Road, with the complaint that they have to travel either to Barbarees Hill or to Westbury Road for water; and I want to draw the matter to the Hon. Minister of Communications and to ask him when he is planning the laying of additional mains this year consideration be given to Thomas Gap. There is a similar circumstance occurring in Passage Gardens. Recently, there was a fire in that district and a house was completely destroyed. Fortunately, the residents in that area rendered assistance with their buckets and were able to prevent the spread of the fire to the surrounding houses. I would therefore like the Hon. Minister to bear Passage Gardens in mind especially in view of the fact that there are no hydrants near the area.

My attention has also been drawn to the fact that a main was laid halfway up the Ivy Road by certain residents, and it has been there for a considerable time without further addition. I would like the Hon. Minister to make a note of that with a view to extending the main to the full length of the road.

Complaints have also been made to me with respect to the siting of two standpipes. One is on Barbarees Road just opposite to Richmond Gap, where there is a curve just along that spot and much traffic passes that way. It has been suggested that consideration should be given to the removal of that standpipe so as to save life and limb. A similar circumstance surrounds the standpipe on Fontabelle Road near Westbury New Road. I would like the Hon. Minister to give some attention to the removal of both of those standpipes at his earliest convenience.

Mr. TUDOR: I would like to support the statement by the hon. junior member for St. Peter

as regards the fact that there is no main nor standpipe on Westbury New Road; and no doubt, the situation there is very bad. There is a standpipe at the top of Westbury New Road near the Cemetery wall and there is another at Lands End at the other end of Westbury New Road, and these two pipes serve the whole of Lower Westbury Road plus the residents of Parris Gap and Lands End. I do hope that something will be done as speedily as possible as it would ease the situation quite a lot. Recently there was a dislocation of the main at Cheapside or Upper Fontabelle and as a result, the people of Lands End and the lower end of Westbury New Road for water, travel to the top of Westbury New Road for water. It is a pressing problem.

Hon. M. E. COX: In reply to the hon. members who have just sat down, I would like to say that I have already arranged to have water installed in the three areas mentioned during this financial year. I know that quite a number of people in that area would be glad to have a private service.

The question about the laying of a main in the Ivy Road has been mentioned by the hon. junior member for St. Michael and I would like to assure him that this area will also receive attention during this financial year. In answer to the point raised by the hon. junior member for St. John, I would like to tell him that no hardship has been created on any employee because we have changed over from steam to electricity.

6.20 p.m.

It is only a few weeks ago that the hon. junior member for St. John, came in to see me on this very question of employees at pumping stations, and I pointed out to him then that there was no hardship created on those employees who had complained. I pointed out to him that Sir Errol Dos Santos, when considering the question of the revision of salaries and wages in 1953, grouped these individuals into the category known as Grade B 5, whose hourly pay ranges from 28 cents to 30 cents. You have similar workers in the same category who will not reach their maximum before the firemen who complained; therefore there is no hardship created on these individuals. If you interfere with one scale you would have to interfere with the others as well; you cannot deal with one and leave the others as they are.

It was also suggested that something be done in the case of the sanitary authorities for the various parishes, making recommendations relative to the erection of standposts in the various areas, and that the Government should take over the responsibility. While it is true that the sanitary authorities make the recommendations, it does not necessarily follow that those recommendations are all accepted. There is nothing to prevent the Waterworks Department from laying mains in any area which has not been recommended by the sanitary authorities.

The hon. junior member for St. George asked about the submersive pumps. We did have a little trouble and the pumps were sent back to the manufacturers; they were being repaired and sent back. We did have some trouble on one or two occasions with the electric mains and we had to revert to the steam engines. Hon. members will see that that item has been increased to \$200,000, which means that more services will be laid throughout the island in this financial year.

Mr. BRYAN: There is one point which I would like to stress. I have made reference to the removal of the standpipes at Barbarees opposite Richmond Gap and Fontabelle opposite Westbury New Road. With reference to the standpipe at Fontabelle, all the surrounding houses have water services installed

in them, and it would serve a better purpose if this standpipe were removed and taken down to Lands End where there are two avenues leading into Parris Gap. I am not pressing for an immediate reply: I merely draw the matter to the Hon. Minister's attention.

Hon. M. E. COX: The question of resiting standpipes has been engaging my attention recently. I do know that some of these standpipes need to be re-sited; and I can assure hon. members that during this year that matter will be dealt with.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am glad that the hon. member is beginning to see the light of day.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Now that these relatively large sums of money are available for the re-organisation of the water services, one wonders whether in the attempt to make the water supply more general in the island, the Hon. Minister is considering the stepping up of the installation of new standpipes in the various parishes, especially in some parishes in which in any given year, none was installed at all. Normally, the schedule is two standpipes per parish per year, and I have drawn to the Minister's attention that in 1952 or 1953 no standpipes were installed in two parishes in this island. Now that we are embarking on this programme, I do not see why the unfulfilled schedule for the particular year should not be included in the present year's schedule. The money is now available and normally it would have been already spent if the schedule had been maintained. There is no reason why we should not bring the installation level for the particular parishes up to the point at which it would have been if the normal schedule had been carried through.

6.30 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member had been here on Tuesday night he would have known that the tempo has been stepped up, and he would have heard the figures that I read out. It does not so much depend on the number of standposts put down. What is important is the number of miles of pipe that you have to lay down so as to reach the people. A standpost costs something like \$50.00. The important thing is the pipe. To take water into some of these villages you have to lay a considerable amount of pipe.

I was in St. Philip last week. I think the honourable member knows that a pipe is being put down Eastbourne way. We have to run pipe over a long distance where there are no houses in order to extend the service. We do our best within our resources.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, now that the honourable member is on that, I will mention that there are some roads that have been in existence for a long time and they do not have through mains. It has been brought to my attention that there are one or two roads in Nelson Street without through mains. The people who live out there would really like to get one. I have drawn it to the attention of the Waterworks Department already. There are many houses the occupants of which would be glad to get their own water supply and they cannot get it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I was not here when the Hon. Minister was outlining the possibility of the additional mains. I wonder if he can say if he has included a main for Marshall Gap, Baxters Road. A main in that area would serve well to relieve the congestion which you get on Baxters Road when people are drawing water. Can the Hon. Minister tell me if it is proposed to put a main in that area — Marshall Gap or Wharton Gap?

Mrs. BOURNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister that there is

need for a standpost in the Triopath district. No main passes through that district. In this case it is a question of people having to go to the water instead of taking the water to them. I can assure the Minister that there are people in that area who would be glad to install water in their premises, but they just cannot do it because no main runs through the area.

I think it is ~~to~~ to say that the sanitary authorities have suggested sites. I would like to warn the Minister to be very careful about those sites, because it has been drawn to my attention that there may be another Baxters instance where one of the sites will be used for the purpose of getting land sold.

It has been drawn to my attention by members of the permanent staff of the Waterworks Department in the area, that when they are making installations they are paid on a weekly basis. They say that sometimes they work until midnight and are not paid overtime. It is creating ill feeling because these men feel that the plumbers and other people are being paid overtime, and that they are not being considered. They have to do the spade work, while the plumbers just wait until they are finished. The Waterworks Department has three men on the permanent staff in St. Andrew, and only night before last around 9.30 o'clock they were still on the job; they had started at 7 o'clock in the morning. They complain that they are given no consideration whatsoever. I would like the Minister to go carefully into that, and see that if possible these men are given consideration for overtime work.

Hon. M. E. COX: I promise the honourable member that I will look into that matter. I feel that the position is that these people do not qualify, as we had sometime ago to reply to a similar request of people who were not engaged on that basis. They were taken on with the understanding that the job was a whole time job like the caretaker at a reservoir. The caretaker of a reservoir lives on the premises and he gets certain facilities; but he does not get overtime pay. I am sure that everyone who qualifies for overtime pay will get it if he works overtime. However, I will look into the question.

I would like to inform the honourable senior member for the City that we have not yet made up our programme for 1955-56. I would like to assure him that in making up that programme we will take into consideration the installing of a pipe in the area that he has mentioned.

The question that the sum of \$290,000 be voted under the Head was put and agreed to.

Head II—Housing

Head II. Housing was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$180,100 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I see in Item 9 that the sum of \$6,000 is asked for to acquire a new window. Why is this window so expensive?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the plan as I remember it is to acquire a site very near to the Inniss' where the Sanitary Authorities are in possession of some land. The old dilapidated building is to be knocked down, and a decent window similar to the one near the Hospital, is to be put there.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What do you want \$6,000 to do? I think I know a little about it. If I am right, the land that the Minister spoke about was

originally owned by the Highway Commissioners of St. Michael which Board is now defunct. It is vested in the Commissioners of Health and they have agreed that the Government should use it as a window. Surely \$6,000 is a lot of money. There is no necessity for a breakwater. I do not see why you should need \$6,000. The Hon. Minister had better look into it carefully.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Communications exactly how many square feet of land will be involved in this transaction. I think that if a member has anything to disclose in connection with a vote of the House he should disclose it. One of my clients owns the house next door. I know there was an estimate for a breakwater extending from the Pondsides outlet right up to and including the two properties for about \$1,700.

My client at that time was willing to exchange a piece of land next to hers if they would build the breakwater there; as a matter of fact, the land really belonged to people who were in England. I find it very difficult to understand how the little house next door costs \$6,000 unless the breakwater is to be included. I suggest to the Hon. Minister of Communications that he should acquire the house next to this one whose owner is quite willing to give the land at the side provided he would profit on the seaside. All the houses save two or three are in a very dilapidated condition; and as I have said, I hold no brief for the present owners. I did act in respect of a controversy over one of those properties. I think \$6,000 is a lot of money to pay for a little spot of land and I would like the Hon. Minister to give a breakdown of the figures.

6.40 p.m.
Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Before the Hon. Minister replies, I would like Mr. Chairman, to know how a window to the sea got under this Head, because this Head deals with housing. Is the window to the sea in Bay Street something to do with the general housing policy? Items Nos. 1 to 7 deals with housing but No. 8, to my mind, has no connection whatsoever with your housing policy.

What I would like to enquire from the Hon. Minister of Housing is: whether the Government can say anything with reference to the Richardson Report as regards housing. The report deals with housing and I would like to ask the Hon. Minister if the Government is in agreement with that suggestion of Professor Richardson. He states that you should aim now on capitalising on those people who want to own houses on the basis in which he has those people who would like to own houses in the way stated in the Report.

Sir, you have to bear in mind that there are thousands of people paying high rents, so you can relieve them of some of that pressure by building a house for them and allow them to pay for it with the rent that they would normally pay for a house. If you do that, it would mean that you are making a substantial step towards relieving the housing situation. I know the Hon. Minister has spoken in favour of rent restriction, but I can tell him that wherever I have visited I have seen rent restriction cause the renters of houses to be worse off than those in Barbados, because they make the people pay an uneconomical rent. I do hope the Government will see its way to carry out the suggestion by Professor Richardson.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will deal with the last question first, Mr. Chairman. Last Tuesday when the Housing Board came up for discussion, I appealed to hon. members to withhold any discussions they might like to make on housing until the Hous-

ing Bill was being considered. I would say in relation to the question raised by the hon. junior member for St. Peter that we have not yet discussed it.

I am afraid that I am unable to tell the hon. senior member for St. George how many square feet of land there is to that property; I have sent for the file to get the necessary information. If I remember correctly, when the Director of Public Works visited the area sometime last year, the individual concerned was willing to exchange the land provided that the Government constructed a breakwater to the back of her building. It was discovered then that the construction of the breakwater at the back of the building in which she lives would cost more than \$3,000. It was therefore decided to compensate her for the old place which was nothing else but an old wall building and to clean up the area. The major part of the money is for the construction of the breakwater wall on the site; I am sorry I have not got the file to hand. If there is any further information needed, I will be pleased to give it a later date.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Under Item 7 which is for Land Acquisition, I take it that this \$5,000 vote is only a token vote. I have stressed on many occasions in this Chamber the absolute necessity on the part of the Government if its housing scheme is to become a practical possibility in all the parishes of this island, it must acquire land for those houses. With land at \$2,500 an acre, (the cheapest offered to the Government) the \$5,000 voted here would only be sufficient to buy two acres.

When would this \$5,000 be spent? This amount is a revote from the last Estimates. I have already stressed and I am tired of repeating the necessity for the acquisition of land in the parish of St. John for a housing scheme. Is this \$5,000 to be spent for the acquisition of part of Colleton pasture? [A VOICE. That comes under Labour Welfare]. Is the Hon. Minister of Housing leaving it to the Housing Authority, before he comes down to this House with a substantial sum for the acquisition of land. The amount of \$5,000 which you have here to be voted strikes me as a very small sum if you have any intention of purchasing land for the type of housing scheme which is necessary for this island. 6.50 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: I do not quite understand what the Hon. Minister is saying about this particular property in Bay Street. There is an open spot of land adjoining the lands of Mr. Inniss; my understanding is that beyond that there is a narrow stretch of land which the Commissioners of Health look after because of some drain there. Then there is a small wall house and another stretch of land which they would be given for nothing, and then there is the upstairs house which is not in question at all. The breakwater which would have to be constructed on that property would hardly be 30 to 35 feet long, and if you pull down that house you could use the rubble to fill in that drain. What the Minister has told us is that they are not willing to exchange the land because the breakwater would cost more than \$3,000. I know that an estimate of \$17,000 was given for the whole stretch: I find it difficult to understand how the breakwater could cost more than \$3,000. The Hon. Minister is asking for \$6,000 and that is why I feel the House is entitled to know the area of land involved.

In matters of this kind I feel that the Minister should come in here with a diagram or sketch and demonstrate to hon. members what is going to be done; but we are voting this money and we do not know exactly how it is going to be spent. I cannot

understand why they want this \$6,000 unless they are buying more than one house. There are other problems involved too; the open space is not entirely in the hands of one person because the Commissioners of Health have some control of it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am entirely in agreement with the hon. member who has just sat down. I am sorry that the Minister does not have the facts here.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am suggesting that we postpone the consideration of this Head and go on with something else. I ask leave to postpone the consideration of this Head.

Mr. ALLDER: Before the consideration of this Head is postponed, I should like to say that I would not like them to remove from the stand where they now are. I do not think that they should build a breakwater behind somebody's house. The hon. senior member for St. George has suggested that the owner of this land would exchange it if the Government would build a breakwater behind the existing house.

Mr. BARROW: I am telling the Minister of Communications that he could have got the stretch of land there; all he had to do was to build a wall behind the existing wall. They are going to build a breakwater anyhow, and they could have got the additional land for nothing if they would build the breakwater. They are exchanging land all around; they exchanged land in St. Philip and they have exchanged land in Bay Street.

Mr. LEWIS: I see that money was spent in 1952-53. It was not under this Head last year and a note should have been put here to show where it came from.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister to postpone the consideration of this Head.

Head III—Medical Services

Head III—Medical Services was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$606,550 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Last year I asked the Hon. Minister about the amount of money which he proposed to spend in connection with this Head and I think he said he would get through with everything; now in the re-vote column you have \$249,000. I am asking the same question this year, because I would not like to put money in the Estimates which we cannot afford to spend. I should like to get an assurance that we can get through with these matters; I want to say generally that if you are going to build houses you should build good houses; but there is too much temptation in this island about building elaborate houses for people. The average wage in this community is \$10 a week and you should not subscribe to the idea that we are going to build elaborate houses for people. There is too much of that temptation in so far as doctors are concerned. 7.00 p.m.

There is a popular idea when you come to professional people, that you must put them to live in something different from that in which the ordinary human being lives. A man at a pumping station must live in a watchman's hut. In my view if a watchman can sleep on the floor a doctor can too. It will be all right when the hon. junior member for St. George builds something that you want posterity to see.

I have been noticing, (and you have to change the system) that when you build quarters for the mere humble sections of the Public Service they are given the minimum social amenities. When you are building for Heads of Departments and professional people it must be something very elaborate. I am not subscribing to that at all. They say that you cannot criticise doctors; I will criticise a doctor, a pope or a bishop. I want the Minister to tell me if he subscribes to the view that I have mentioned.

Build something simple for a doctor; we cannot afford these elaborate things; build simple houses so that you can build more houses. The Minister of Social Services may be scared when you talk about doctors; but a doctor has to work somewhere. I think that if you give a doctor clean and airy quarters that is the most that you should be expected to do. You do not have to make them too elaborate.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was hoping since this was moved that the Minister of Health would have told us something. These are quarters for Medical Staff, and the Note says, "Balance of the estimate of \$46,000 to provide two fully furnished quarters for Medical Staff at the General Hospital." While we agree in principle with the provision of these quarters, I would like to hear something more about it.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I would like to answer the honourable senior member for the City. You will remember that the original vote was \$48,000. It came to this House, and after some criticism I promised that these figures would be reviewed. Subsequently the figure was made \$46,000. Of that amount \$9,000 was passed; so that \$37,000 was left to be voted to go on with the rest of the building.

In answer to the honourable member for St. Peter who asked why we need all this money, I would say that the building has been delayed due to the non-arrival of steel; and also the building of the new laundry has been delayed because the boiler has not arrived. The steel is due to arrive in May and the boiler in August or September. So as far as the building programme is concerned, as soon as the material to which I have just referred arrives, we will finish the building of the Nursing Home. If the boiler arrives in time, it is quite likely that we will use this money in the course of the coming financial year. I am reminded, Sir, that the figure was originally \$54,000 and it has since been reduced to \$46,000.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am always convinced that the Leader of the House never goes out of his way to mislead anyone; so I am going to suggest to him to check on his figures again. I reserve any further comment. The Note says that this was the balance of the estimate of \$46,000 to provide for furnished quarters etc. You are actually asking us for \$3,700 and \$9,000 was voted if you recall aright. That makes \$46,000. I think that the Hon. Minister should apprise himself of the actual facts.

This was a Resolution in which the House criticised the question of the expense of building a garage. The Minister said that he would review the matter in the light of what honourable members had said, to see if there could be a reduction. The Resolution was passed with that assurance. I am sure that the Resolution was for \$9,000 out of \$46,000.

As I have said we always have confidence in the word of the Minister. If you will reduce this by \$2,000, I do not think there will be any more argument. Part of the real criticism was that we did not see the necessity for the actual fencing in of a house that was to be built on an area already fenced in. We

also considered it extravagant to build a garage for \$1,500 and we still consider it so.

I think the Minister gave an explanation of the circumstances relative to the building of a superintendent's house. He said that that was not the policy of the Government, but that there were special circumstances over which the Government had no control. He gave us an undertaking that in the circumstances, he would seek to get this vote reduced.

If I recall the Resolution for capital works in respect of medical services, the \$9,000 was part of an estimate of \$46,000 which was made up as follows:—

HOUSE No. 1

Main Building

4 bedrooms, Living Room, Dining Room,	
Kitchen, toilet, etc.	\$16,500
Garage	1,500
Servant's Room & Toilet	1,500
Fencing	500
Paths & Entrance	1,000
Lighting	500
Contingencies	500

Furniture, fittings inclusive of crockery,	
cutlery, linen, stove etc.	2,200
Total	\$24,200

HOUSE No. 2

Main building

3 Bedrooms, Living Room, Dining Space,	
Kitchen, Toilet, etc.	\$14,500
Garage	1,500
Servant's Room & Toilet	1,500
Fencing	500
Paths & Entrance	1,000
Lighting	500
Contingencies	500

Furniture, fittings inclusive of crockery,	
cutlery, linen, stove, etc.	1,800
Total	\$21,800

7.10 p.m.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Those figures have been reduced by \$2,000. The building of the garage which was estimated at \$1,500 has been reduced to \$1,000. The \$500 which was estimated for lighting has been reduced to \$250.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What about the fencing?

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: The cheapest form of fencing is being provided. It will be of expanding metal and wallaba posts; and it is estimated at \$1,000.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Will you then move a reduction of this Item?

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to amend the amount under Item 2, Quarters, Medical Staff, to \$35,000. The total amount under the Head. Medical Services will then be \$606,550.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister of Social Services having made that amendment, it shows that the Government has actually took into consideration some of the arguments put by the Opposition over this question. I must however say that I do feel that the Government could have reduced the amount to a greater degree; and because I do not feel that it is necessary to fence in those

quarters with such expensive fencing. These quarters are built inside of Enmore. Why cannot you plant shrubs or sweet limes to form a fence? [A VOICE: That would take a matter of years before it becomes a suitable fence.]

The Hon. Minister of Communications and the Hon. Minister of Health said on the last occasion in dealing with this Item, that it was not the policy of the Government to build four-bedroom houses. I would now draw to their attention something which was drawn to my attention publicly. I understand that you have a very competent officer as Medical Superintendent, but I further understand that before he took this job in this island that he was assured through a letter which he has from Colonial Office and which he has shown to many people over here (you can check on it if you like) that he would be given a five or six-bedroom house to live in. He has actually said that he is not accepting a house with less than four bedrooms. I remember very well that on the last occasion we debated this matter we were rather critical; and the Hon. Minister said that it was not the policy of the Government to build four-bedroom houses, so I suppose he had to regularise a Colonial Office statement. While I am not one of those people who pretend to be socialists, (nor do I want to relegate doctors at the General Hospital to a one-bedroom house) I am suggesting as I have done on the last occasion that if you are building houses for those gentlemen, you should economise as much as possible; and I feel that you can economise in this way: you should embark upon building apartment houses. One of the houses which you are building now is costing approximately £5,000. I am wondering if you gave that medical officer a rent allowance if he would go and rent a four-bedroom house at, say, \$120 a month. I know the type of Englishmen you get out here. I do hope that this four-bedroom house which you are building now will be the last.

7.20 p.m.

I appreciate that you must provide houses for these doctors, but I suggest that you should get plans prepared as soon as possible. You have a competent man as your Director of Public Works and you should not build any three-room or four-room houses; you should build apartment houses. You could have one-roof houses and you could put five or six families in these apartment houses. I am glad that the Hon. Minister of Social Services has kept his word and has seen the wisdom of what we have been suggesting.

I am sorry that the hon. junior member for St. George is not in his seat. On the last occasion I argued that it was extravagant for anybody to build a garage costing \$1,500. People like the hon. junior member for St. Andrew would not build a garage for \$1,500 even if you give him a Rolls Royce. On the last occasion the hon. junior member for St. George said that it was reasonable to build a garage for \$1,500, and now the Government has conceded that a garage can be built for \$1,000; and that the figure of \$1,500 was too much for that purpose. On a space of 200 square feet a garage for \$600 would be an excellent garage for anybody in this country; and I still feel that the sum of \$1,000 for building a garage, (with the greatest respect to Captain Tomlin or anybody else) is still too much money for building a garage for anybody.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: It is proposed that this garage should have an entire concrete roof as a fire preventative. [Laughter].

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I would say that the way to hell is paved with good intentions. The Hon. Minister is so honest about this matter and he knows so little about it, that he has to put the straight honest story to you. The Hon. Minister says that they are

going to put a concrete roof on the garage; if that is so, what are you putting on the house? A concrete roof too? I am appealing to the Hon. Premier and the Hon. Minister of Social Services to be real.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: It is a matter for this Committee to say what kind of garage they want. To me it seems reasonable that you want a fire proof garage, inasmuch as I feel that this precaution should be taken against a fire hazard. Bearing in mind the cost of "Enmore" with its X-Ray equipment and so on, I think hon. members ought to realise that there should be as little fire hazard as possible.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The thing which would be most susceptible to fire would be the X-ray equipment; what kind of roof is on that building? It is reckless extravagance to tell me—

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Bearing in mind the criticisms which have been made, I will put the matter before the Director of Public Works and see if there can be any further reduction in the cost of this garage.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is correct. If you reduce the cost of this garage you will save money to build a T.B. Ward. I accept the Hon. Minister's word.

Mr. ALLDER: I take it that the honourable senior member for the City is trying to be satisfied with so little. To reduce this vote of \$46,000 for the erection of two sets of flats for Medical Officers by \$2,000 is nothing. Naturally you must have a fence of some sort, but that is not important; the quarters for these two medical officers should not cost the Government more than around \$30,000. You should allow the one which will house your senior officer to cost \$20,000 if you feel that he must be served better than the others, and the junior man should have an ample and commodious house costing \$10,000 but to pat yourself on the shoulder because you are spending \$44,000 instead of \$46,000 is definitely a joke. And it seems as if the Hon. Minister of Social Services was trying to live up to his promise of a reduction. If I were the Hon. Minister, I would reduce the amount by \$1.00 and let the honourable senior member for the City feel that he has achieved something. That is purely a principle and it does not reduce the total amount by which it should be reduced. This building costs too much and the number of people which it is proposed to house is not large enough. I would have preferred the Hon. Minister of Social Services to promise that he will not supply household equipment rather than he told that he has reduced the total amount by \$2,000; because I know that the recurrent expenditure which will be incurred by way of replacements is going to take up in a very short while the \$2,000 which he pretends to be saving now.

7.30 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has just said that this Committee can say what kind of garage it wants. I do not feel that the question of the garage is important. I wish that the hon. member had suggested that the Committee say what kind of flats should be supplied and at what cost; but he is not going to go that far.

I was anticipating that this vote would have been reduced by at least \$10,000. The hon. senior member for the City laughs. He knows that he can build a house for considerably less than that. I do not blame him when he claims that he can build a house for \$1,500, a house which anyone of us would be willing and proud to live in. The hon. member is trying to make that look fantastic. To build two flats for \$36,000 is definitely a possibility, and the hon. junior member for St. George knows that. If he were

building for himself you would be surprised to know how cheaply he would do it.

Of course it seems to me that there is no limit to the cost of Government construction although some hon. members who agree to such extravagance now, if they were building for themselves would build at much less than what it costs the Government. I am hoping that the hon. senior member for the City who seems to have much influence over the Hon. Minister of Social Services will further appeal to him to get the cost down by another \$2,000; and then when the Minister comes back, appeal to him to get it down by another \$2,000. By that time it will be down to a reasonable figure. It is definitely in need of reduction.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, when the Resolution was being discussed in the House I did say that I felt that it was rather unusual to find a two-storied building with an annexed garage and then a separate building for servants' quarters. If the hon. senior member for the City remembers, he will agree that I did say the usual thing was to find a garage, servants quarters and lavatory under one out-building, rather than to find it as it was planned here. It was for those reasons that I said that \$1,500 did not seem reasonable for a garage. The Minister of Social Services said that he would take it up.

I would like to impress upon the Minister of Social Services that on a two-storied building you seldom use the kind of roof that you plan to use here, because of the fear of reflecting the heat. You use concrete slabs. The Minister of Social Services said he would make inquiries into certain aspects of this matter, and I am wondering if he can say whether the garage will be separate and distinct or whether it will be connected to the main building.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I think as far as this debate is concerned we should concern ourselves with the criticisms made last time and whether they were taken into account. I cannot see how we can discuss under this Head some of the things that we are discussing. It is no use asking this Committee to say what garage it wants.

The suggestion was made that even if you build one house for the superintendent there should be a series of flats with another garage, because you had to provide quarters for ten others. Instead of having an individual garage for every house, have a common garage as cheaply as possible and part it off. Do you mean to tell me that you arranged to build a garage for \$1,500, you took off 33⅓ per cent. and then you will put a concrete roof on it? What kind of roof were you putting on before? I would like to hear today if all the suggestions that were made on the last occasion have been taken up with the Director of Public Works.

7.40 p.m.

The next thing is this: why should you be satisfied with only those two flats? I think a substantial sum of money should be sent down here to provide quarters for the other people. Those two flats are expected to be finished within three months and then you will have not a cent for the rest of the financial year to spend on the other personnel. Another thing is this: I think you should have a common garage for all of these medical personnel who will be residing at "Enmore". I know that you want the man who is in charge of the whole Hospital to have a separate place by himself; well, build a separate house for him but not for the others. I know of one doctor who asked for a five-bedroom house. I did not think the Secretary of State for the Colonies has any right telling him that he could get that. The Secretary

of State for the Colonies should say to such people that the conditions of employment are such and such.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Let me say that the doctor in question has a letter, and he is showing it around and saying that these are my terms of employment.

Mr. LEWIS: I am saying that the Secretary of State for the Colonies should tell him that your conditions of employment are such and such. He should not tell him the rooms of the house. Do you mean to say that if a doctor has ten or twelve children that you should provide a ten or twelve bedroom house for him? What I cannot understand is this: we have started putting up Ministerial Buildings, while we should have been making provision for the medical staff and bearing that in mind ever since we have bought "Enmore". I say again that the Secretary of State for the Colonies had no right to tell this gentleman that he could get a five-bedroom house. I think after this debate that you should get this thing reorientated. Get flats for these people and if you have one of them coming with a large family, give him two or three flats together. As far as the garages are concerned, you are building them separately and they are taking a lot of material. I feel they should be a common garage for all. Another thing we must bear in mind is that these separate houses are going to take a lot of plumbing; and the maintenance cost is going to be considerable. I really would like to hear something from the Hon. Minister of Communications along those lines.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I thought I had the plans of these houses but apparently they are in the office, I am sorry I do not have them here, but I would like to say that the principle for building these houses was agreed upon on the last occasion. As far as the letter is concerned, I heard about it from the hon. senior member for the City. I knew something about it. I have mentioned it already in higher quarters and it is being investigated.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Do you want me to tell you who told me of it? If so I can tell you.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am not saying that you were not told of it. What I did say was that I mentioned it at a meeting of the Executive Committee and the matter will be investigated. As far as the housing of the remaining Medical Staff is concerned, I said on the last occasion that when the Nurses accommodation at "Stockton" has been completed and the Nursing Sisters and nurses are housed, then we intend to review the situation as far as the general medical staff is concerned. That is the position as far as the rest of the medical staff is concerned. I cannot give you anything more on that now.

I will adhere to the comments which I have heard. I will further consult with the Director of the Public Works in order to see if any further economies in the building of these houses can be effected. I am sure that the Director of Public Works would do all he possibly can to spend as little as he can on these buildings. That has been his policy and I am sure he will carry on.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: As regards the fencing of these buildings I have had a little experience with fencing with wallaba posts and expanding metal, and that type of fencing is not as cheap or as suitable as the English wire fencing. I refer to that type of fencing as you can see around the British American Tobacco Factory. That fencing has its own posts. We all know that when you put up a fence with wallaba posts, no matter even if you put it up with reinforced concrete or anything you like, the water will eventually deal with the

wallaba posts at the level of the earth to rot it away. The cost of erecting a fence with wallaba posts and expanding metal or B.R.C. Metal is fairly expensive, and as a matter of fact, I have heard builders of repute say that they do not find favour with that type of fencing because in a short time the expanding metal gets full of rust. I merely mentioned it because you can look into it and work out the comparative cost between that type of fencing and the English wire fencing of which I made mention. It is brought here in different grades of wire mesh, strength and everything else.

The question that the sum of \$606,550 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

7.50 p.m.

Housing—Cont'd

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we go back to Item II since the Hon. Minister of Communications has the information under this Head.

Hon. M. E. COX: The information available is that it is proposed to build a breakwater behind the residence of the individual and a wall between the property in which she lives, and she will give up the other one. It is proposed to build benches on which people will sit and so on. I want to assure the hon. senior member for St. John that that is cheaper than if we had to buy the land.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I should like to add this: the hon. senior member for St. George mentioned the figure of \$1,700 for the property which is true. I was in the matter before the Ministerial System began and an estimate was given for the breakwater but Captain Tomlin has assured us that any breakwater at that cost would not last. The idea is that the sanitary authorities should give us the portion by Inniss' house and the wall would go behind the old lady's property. She will give up the intervening old house.

Mr. LEWIS: With the difficulty of getting houses today, will the people living in those houses find any difficulty in going elsewhere? I am wondering if they will be accommodated in the housing area.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will give the hon. member that assurance.

The question that the sum of \$180,100 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head IV—Education

Head IV—Education—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$722,700 be voted under this Head. Inasmuch as I did not have this portion of information in my speech dealing with the Technical Institute, I will say that the building has been completed. The Principal and the Deputy Principal have been appointed, the Scheme of government has been made and I think it has been laid on the table of the House a few weeks ago. Appointments to the Governing Body have been approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee and it is hoped that the first batch of apprentices will be approved so that the Institute might be opened in May. I have had the privilege of discussing the nature of the Board which should be running this institute with the hon. junior member for St. George who is extremely interested in matters of this sort.

Mr. LEWIS: If you rule me out of order, I will wholeheartedly agree with you Mr. Chairman;

I am going to make some observations on Combermere School. I would like to inquire why it is that the Governor-in-Executive Committee has appointed only seven members to the Governing Body of Combermere School; and members of the Governing Body have told me that they do not know what they are doing. They do not know if they are getting the cheques signed legally or not. [A MEMBER: The full Board has been appointed.]

I do not think it has been published in the *Official Gazette*.

Mr. ALLDER: I would like the Hon. Premier to give us some idea about this Open Air School. We would like to know what type of school the Government has in mind. [Hon. M. E. COX: Something like Jamaica.] I have not been to Jamaica. As regards the Combermere School, I understand that there is some confusion at that school; I am told that the Government has failed to reappoint the members of the Governing Body. The position of the attendants at the lunch room is not a certain one and the staff does not seem to know which Body they should go to for a redress.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Would the hon member care to repeat what he said?

Mr. ALLDER: I say that the staff operating the lunch room are uncertain of their position; they do not know to which authority they should go in order to have their grievancies redressed. Another thing is that there is some difficulty about the withdrawal of the grant of which the Government gave to the canteen. I am told that some poor children who were given scholarships have been fed there, and as a result of the withdrawal of the annual grant they may have to go without this lunch.

8.00 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: When I was introducing the Budget, I mentioned that matter. The Governing Body has been in the habit of paying during the vacation the Supervisor and the Maid. I did not agree with that. The amount comes to \$440 and that is too much money to give people for doing nothing.

The maids are paid during the vacation time. As I see it there is nothing to prevent them from getting another job. The alternative is to raise the cost of the meals, and we do not want to do that. The canteen is not intended to make a cent or lose a cent, and the meals are priced on that basis. I do not see that there will be any hardship if you allow the maids to go during the vacation.

As regards the open air school I will say again that the original idea was to put it at St. Christopher built was felt that inasmuch as Christ Church was already getting the Foundation School, plus the St. Lawrence School plus other things, I did not think that we should give them another school, and we contemplated putting the open air school at St. John instead.

We have a plan from Jamaica and we have on estimate from the Director of Public Works. To me the plan is pure hieroglyphics; but I am sure the hon. junior member for St. George can explain it. Only a builder could appreciate it. This type of school is estimated to cost \$120 instead of \$170 a desk. Captain Tomlin has built this type of school in other colonies in which he has served, and he has assured me that if properly sited, it should be very useful because it will be so much cheaper to the Government.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, what I would really like to ask about is Item I. Where this Technical Institute is concerned, can the Committee be told how the Government proposes to run

it? I am asking that, because there will be big demands on it now. I had the disconcerting news this morning that the Electric Company is likely to have to recruit people from abroad when they start their reorganisation programme because the number of technical people do not seem to be available here.

Now I see that the Headmaster's house at the Coleridge-Parry School will cost \$16,200. That seems a reasonable amount of money. Why is it that in this case you can get so much done for \$16,000 and you could not get it done in the case of quarters for medical staff at the General Hospital? What is the difference between the headmaster of a school and a junior doctor? You are building this house in a compound and the one at the Hospital in a compound, and this will cost \$10,000 less. Is it that you are building a very inferior house for the headmaster? Do not think that I am complaining because you can build a house for a headmaster for \$16,000; but I want to know the reason for the big increase when you are building one for a doctor. It makes me feel that when you are building a house for a native it is one thing; but when you are building one for an Englishman it must be something extraordinary.

I would like the Premier to tell me something more about this Open Air School. I know that he had the idea that you can teach children under a breadfruit tree. Will this be some sort of glorified breadfruit tree school? It is no use showing me the plan because I will not be able to understand it. What kind of school will it be? I am a practical man, and I am sceptical about getting wet when the rain falls.

Mr. ALLDER: I do not agree with the remark which the Premier has made when he suggested that the staff of the canteen should not be employed during the vacation. You train the staff to do this kind of work at the school, and you should not let them go when the school is on vacation, because they may get other employment and you will have to look for fresh staff and train them all over again.

What is the position with the boarding establishment at Lodge School? The key persons are paid full wages right through the vacation period while the others are paid 50 per cent of their wages during the vacation time.

Make sure that you do not treat them in such a way that they will seek work elsewhere and give you the trouble to look for new employees.
8.10 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of Order. The Hon. Premier was wrong; as well as the honourable senior member for St. John is wrong. The Government does not pay the staff at Combermere School; the Government does not pay them a cent; so the Government cannot control something for which it does not pay.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The Government does not directly pay the staffs of the Secondary Schools. They are merely subsidised. They have to show that they want, say \$2,000 before we give it to them. They have to satisfy us that they are not wasting the money. I do not think the honourable member needs any more information. We merely supply the deficit.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not agree with the Hon. Premier. The Governing Body employs two maids and a supervisor to carry on the canteen service which you have there. We do not want them to charge the children more than 1/6 for a hot meal. It is in the interest of the Staff that you keep him. You are arguing that the Supervisor and the maids should go and get work during the vacation, but you must bear in mind that you are dealing with meals for four and five hundred children; and if these peo-

ple go and get work during the vacation time when you re-open the school, you will have to get somebody new to prepare these meals. You must look at it in that light. At one time the canteen was turned over to the supervisor to run it and it was found that they had to charge the school children more per meal. I can tell you that the St. Michael's Vestry is paying 1/6 per meal for fifty children per day at this school now. Nobody wants to pay more per meal. There is a number of children who come to town and have to buy their meals, and they should not be called on to pay more than 1/6 per meal. I suggest that you should give the \$200 to pay these people during the vacation. I think it is niggardly and mean in the Government. I feel so and I say so.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If the honourable member will give way I would just say this for his benefit. Perhaps I may have put it too strongly. It has not been suggested that the supervisor should not be retained, but that the supervisor should not be paid a full salary during the vacation time. She should get a sort of retaining fee. As far as the maids are concerned, you need not pay them every week. Let us look at it in this way: during the tourist season a hotel may employ 50 people, but at the end of that season they discharge about 30 or 40 of them. Will the honourable member say because the hotel management does that that they are mean and niggardly?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I would just like to say this in reply. No hotel management is going to send away the head waiter at the close of the tourist season and wait until the season begins again to get him back and the other staff they want. All that this means is that you are spending \$400 to subsidise the canteen at Combermere School for the children who come from the country around 7.30 a.m. and who want to get a good hot meal. Can you not spend \$400 to subsidise that? I say if you cannot do that it is mean and niggardly. If the Governing Body of Combermere School have sent and asked you for \$300 or \$400 for that purpose and they show you —

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Again I must interrupt the honourable member. No decision has been sent to the Governing Body. I have suggested that the most they should do is to give the supervisor a sort of retaining fee. I am going to discuss the matter with Major Noot. My inclination is that you should allow the maids to get work in their vacation time but give the supervisor a sort of retaining fee. The matter has not gone any further than that. I will bear in mind what the honourable member has said when I discuss the matter with Major Noot and the Director of Education, which I hope would take place next Saturday morning.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do hope the Hon. Premier would bear in mind what I said when he discusses the matter with Major Noot. I have said that the maids are entitled to two weeks with pay at least. The Hon. Premier is a socialist and this Government is a socialist Government, and he should not express that view. If you are mindful of the report by the Headmaster of Harrison College of all the children who come from the country, you should not mind spending \$400 to subsidise this canteen.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.
8.20 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEWIS: I am seconding that motion and I am saying that when we come back do not let us discuss this matter under this Head. You will have to move for the re-consideration of Head XX in the Estimates in order to do so. I told you, Mr. Chairman, that you could rule me out of order and I will agree to it.

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

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

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

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

The motion was put and agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
8.30 p.m.

ESTIMATES

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the House was in Committee on the Barbados Estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Estimates, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When we were last in Committee before the adjournment Head IV of the Capital Estimates was under consideration.

Mr. GODDARD: Under this Head I thought I would have seen something in connection with the Harrison College Canteen. In the Five Year Plan, I was made to understand that a school canteen would be provided for Harrison College; this is now the fourth year of these Capital Estimates. We have seen a lot of things done for these secondary schools and I would like to know from the Hon. Premier whether our hopes are justified or whether they will be dashed to the ground in respect of this canteen for Harrison College, or whether we are to wait for the second Five Year Plan. I am sure that the provision of this canteen was in the scheme. I have waited on every occasion to hear some mention of it; I should like to know whether it is coming or not.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Again I am expressing a personal opinion. I would like to see one canteen for the two schools; they are sufficiently near that you could run it. I have not had the faintest idea of that matter coming before me; if it was put up by the Government Body it might have died. My view is that it should have a canteen for the two schools, whether you run it on contract or by the Government Body. I personally think that it is a good thing to have a school canteen but from the point of view of overhead the two schools are so close that you could run one canteen. I assure the hon. member that I am in favour of it although I do not know that we could come down with a supplementary vote for it this year or if we will have to wait until next year.

Mr. GODDARD: I thank the Hon. Premier for that. I recall that three years ago plans were actually submitted for this scheme. I have inquired of the Headmaster (I think it was) and he told me that the scheme was accepted in the Five Year Plan. When the matter was omitted again this year I made a note about it; it is a fact that just as Combermere School needs its canteen, for the same reason Harrison College needs one. Many boys come from afar and a good solid meal in the middle of the day is necessary for them.

Canteens are a new thing; they started it at Combermere. A Canteen can be made to run with a very small grant from the Government, very efficiently and self-supporting. It is so obvious to all of us; but I am asking at this stage that some note be made of it. In passing I will say that I hope the Governing Body will put it up again to the

Education Department and to the Premier's Office for the next Five Year Plan.

9.20 p.m.

The question that the sum of \$722,700 be voted under Head IV—Education, was put and agreed to.

Head V—Agriculture

Head V — Agriculture was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$531,680 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, the House has heard me expressed on previous occasions my faith in the development of the small farmer. If I have a strong political conviction, if I hold an unshakeable creed where economic and social development of the West Indies is concerned, it is in the establishment of a sound peasantry. I do not share the pessimism of so many agriculturalists which I believe is disseminated by plantation owners, that the small unit must be an uneconomic unit.

By being interested in agriculture, and by reading literature connected with it, I notice it has been increasingly confirmed that with proper guidance and sound credit, a small acreage has the possibility of making the average West Indian peasant farmer an independent social unit in the community. It is not so now. I want to see one day in the West Indies the abolition of the mere agricultural labourer. I see no sum voted here for the acquisition of land for the establishment of a land settlement scheme. I should like to see appropriations for a definite policy of land settlement.

I repeat that I do not share in the prevailing pessimism that the small unit must necessarily fail. It fails where there is no agricultural education, and where there is no substantial credit. It fails where the unit is absolutely too small —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to know on what item the honourable member is speaking.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I am speaking on Item 4, Agricultural Development. In recent years there have been experimental units under the administration of the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture in Trinidad, and although the experiments have not been completed so far, optimistic reports have already been submitted. This House passed an Address sometime this season, (I think it was a little after Ministerial Status was introduced) for the buying of certain lands in St. Joseph with the possibility of a trial land settlement scheme. I consider that of the greatest importance; and I half expected that included in this Capital Expenditure there would have been an amount for the purchase of a certain acreage.

Regardless of what is said about industrialisation, it will never in these colonies solve the problem of unemployment entirely. Throughout the area there is an emphasis on agricultural education. There has recently been established in the colony of Trinidad an Agricultural Farm Scheme to which we have sent students. Do you think that the purpose of these late developments is for the expansion of the plantation system? If that is the purpose they are useless; they are useless because the plantation system is already efficient and nowhere more so than in this colony. The purpose of these agricultural schools and colleges is obviously the establishment of an independent peasantry.

I want to impress on the Minister of Agriculture that he must use pressure on his Government. He does not have to be an agricultural scientist to be convinced about what I am saying. There are many agricultural pamphlets and statements published on

experiments in the island of Puerto Rico. In that island there is a small agricultural settlement scheme in which estates have been cut up and a small peasantry launched.

I am not suggesting for one half moment an abolition of the plantation system; that would be economic chaos; but I emphasise that the introduction of a positive policy, a small farm policy, will be the correct thing for this island. In Jamaica land settlement has been the policy for years. But in this island, under the influence of the plantation owners, we have been led to believe that the peasant farmer is not a particularly important unit in the community. I want to see that belief ejected from the minds of those who have the economic development of this colony in their hands.

I have faith in the small peasant, and that faith is continually being confirmed by research into agricultural and economic statements on peasant development all over the world, in Africa, in Puerto Rico and in the East. My faith has never been shaken in that the economic salvation of these colonies lies in the land, but not in the plantation system.

We have to root out through education the idea that farming is a lowly occupation. You will get on farms in England some of the most educated people. In America where some of our boys emigrated, they have told us that you see the biggest men economically in the farming industry, so the idea that the tilling of the land is something menial and only for the low educated person is something which will lead to the uneconomic detriment of our people in these colonies. There exists in these parts what does not exist in other parts of the world, except for a few plantations in the East; and that is the predominance of the agricultural proletariat. I say again that we will never be an economical independent people until we have a prosperous agricultural proletariat. You should try to establish that; and I know that you can rely upon the small farmer to produce in the same way from his unit what is obtained from the large estates. If that is what you want to be assured of, the answer is obtained from experiments which have taken place all over the world. You can find the answer in the monthly information bulletins of the Caribbean Commission. One of the agricultural experts of the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture said that he has the faith that the small farmer in the West Indies can be developed to be the soundest and most economical in the area. That is the faith he has gained from the experiments which he has carried out and observed. Units of four acres and even as small as two acres can be worked profitably, planted in vegetables and greens. There are also other units where the emphasis is placed on dairying and there are also other units where consideration should be given to the growing of root crops. There are various types of small units that can be handled so as to prove economically successful and can achieve the economic independence of the small farmer.

Sir, lip service is not enough. It is time that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture impress upon the people that one of the means of producing employment in this colony and of increasing the economic independence of families is to embark on land settlement schemes. In the report published some years ago by a local agriculturalist, and which was the result of a commission which was set up by a former Governor on unemployment, it was suggested that we should experiment with a certain acreage to be rented out in one-acre lots to tenants in St. Philip to grow vegetables

with irrigation. And that suggestion came from the local plantation owners. They saw the possibility of establishing a number of independent small growers in this way and of its serving as a means of arresting unemployment. That suggestion was put into the report and I think it is time that the Hon. Minister get that report and study it. I am not satisfied in my mind that in a vote of \$531,680 no amount is included for the purchase of any land as a means of land settlement for the small growers. Sir, I would not like to witness another Estimates coming to this House without the inclusion of a sum for that purpose.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, what more would you expect in 1955 when you look through these Estimates? Would you not really expect to hear someone propounding an agricultural theory which savoured of commonsense and not of glorified nonsense? Could you think of a community like Barbados with a limited acreage of land being given out in four-acre lots. Because a man went to Puerto Rico and tried out some nonsense that proved to be unsound, should we also try it out here?

I am going to say that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture has done a very good job; and one should not give the impression that nothing is done for the peasants in this community, when you can see from this vote that \$80,000 is supposed to be used for the purchase of irrigation equipment for resale to small holders. You can talk about the small land holder in a place like British Guiana or Jamaica, but would you talk about it in a place like St. Kitts or Barbados?

Would the Hon. Minister of Agriculture tell me what are the Government's proposals so far as Dodds Plantation is concerned relative to using it as a Government farm to be worked on a co-operative basis? I do not think that the Government would have to go outside of its own scope to deal with Dodds on that basis. I would like to see the day when Dodds Plantation is being run on a co-operative basis instead of running it on the plantation basis. As it is now, the labourers who work with the Government on that plantation do not share in the profits from it.
9.40 p.m.

I think that that experiment at Dodds is a very good one; those of us who have made a study of this matter can only come to one conclusion. You have a Budget of \$14 million and the biggest industrial development you have is the Sugar Industry; you cannot destroy the individual development which you possess in your only industry. If you say that you can have a land settlement scheme, what is the acreage of land in Barbados for a social unit? When you talk about making a peasant an economic social unit, the hon member is a social unit too, but he does not possess anything; [Laughter]. If you want an independent economic social unit you cannot talk about Barbados doing that; can we do it by going to the sea and getting water and distilling it into some substance? We cannot become an independent social economic unit when we are always begging other countries to take people out of the island. Many people have owned land in this island at a high cost and they cannot produce anything on the land to relate to the economic unit. I asked the question as to the Government's policy in so far as making Dodds a co-operative farm; I asked that question last year. If a start could be made in that direction I think that the Government would be doing something worth while. I would suggest to the Government that there should be a Law on the Statute Book that on any Plantation or land where that land is not properly

utilised, the Government should have power to make use of that land. I do not think that that takes place in Barbados generally; there were one or two plantations which were bought in Barbados but the greatest use was not made of them. However, we do not subscribe to the idea of making an economic Land Settlement Scheme in view of the fact that there is a limited amount of land in Barbados. I am asking the Hon. Minister to take note of the point I have made about Dodds Plantation; and I will ask him if he will go into that question because I feel that Dodds should be run as a co-operative farm, and you would have an indication as to what are the true economics and how well it could work. I ask the Hon. Minister to let us know as soon as possible what the position is.

With regard to "Other Schemes," I should like to know if there are any schemes under the Agricultural Department. I do not know whether the Hon. Minister has answered the question as to whether they have abandoned the idea of the establishment of a Milk Depot. That would be a good scheme if you could have something like it in Barbados; it would provide much employment for people and I would say that the Government should give serious consideration to the use of the Price Stabilization Fund in connection with development schemes. If you have a capital development scheme you could prevent people from going to British Guiana. I do feel that the division in this Milk Scheme would work well; if the Government can embark on the expenditure of money in the Pig Breeding Scheme, this Milk Scheme means more to the nutrition of the island than any scheme. I think sufficient influence could be brought to bear on them to co-operate in the scheme. I would like to know that the scheme can be got going.

9.50 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, in this colony of Barbados we have produced some rather peculiar hybrids such as the sugar cane plants we produce at Codrington; and we have produced the hon. junior member for St. John. We have also now produced the most interesting hybrid of all: the agricultural proletariat. I do not entirely blame the hon. member for fulminating against the evils of the plantation system, because the lead was set by no less a person than the Premier himself when he gave evidence before the Royal Commission. At that time he supported the proposition now put up by the hon. junior member for St. John: that this agricultural proletariat, the hybrid to which I referred, should be settled on the land in Barbados. I would like to ask where are they now.

The purpose of a land settlement scheme, which the hon. member does not seem to appreciate, is to bring unproductive land into cultivation. It is not to take land which has already been intensively and intensely cultivated and shift people from one part of the island to another, or to disturb in any way the economic unit which is the best, the unit which is the size of the plantation or factory as the case may be.

Now I would entirely agree with the hon. member if he had suggested that the people who work on the estates and in the factories of this island should get a greater share in the product of their labour; but it is a well-known fact that here in Barbados our sugar industry is as productive as that in any comparable area in any part of the world.

As I said just now, I do not entirely blame the member for St. John because it was the Premier

himself who told Mr. Morgan Jones that the economic salvation of Barbados laid in cutting up the whole island. When the figures of the island's population and the total acreage of land were worked out, Mr. Morgan Jones pointed out that they would have to take the children and the old people into consideration; and then the Premier shifted the argument and worked it out on a family basis. The result of that new proposition was that you would be left with 60,000 people who could not be settled anywhere, not even on the beaches. The late Mr. Morgan Jones asked what were you going to do with those 60,000, and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph said exactly what he said on Tuesday: "We must try to get rid of people." The solution of the problem is to get rid of them, by the gas chamber I presume.

That is the same argument which 16 years later the member for St. John is repeating; something which has been discredited even by the member who first tried to put forward that proposition. Now Mr. Chairman, the position is this: we have 106,000 acres in the island. In Barbados not only has our agriculture become highly intensified, but an interesting fact which is often overlooked by the people who say that Barbados is the most densely populated place in the British Commonwealth, is that the land utilisation in this island is four times what it is in the U.K. Under cultivation in Barbados are 94,346 acres of land out of a total acreage of 106,470. Now Mr. Chairman, in the U.K. whereas only 23% of the total land mass is under cultivation, in Barbados that figure is 90%; so that when you are comparing the population statistics of Barbados and the U.K., you have to reduce that common factor and multiply by four.

I want to tell the honourable member for St. John that the minute you start to cut up the land in Barbados and give everyone a half acre as he and the Premier would like to do, the sugar production would drop to about one third of what it is now. Because they pretend to be socialists they never take the trouble to find out what it means. We would like those who work in the sugar industry to have a greater share at the highest level of productivity, no matter what the entrepreneur unit would be. Then the member talks about the agricultural proletariat living on the land.

The Minister of Agriculture is a man who takes his job seriously. What I would like him to do—When I used the word "man" I was not suggesting that he was a hybrid like the honourable junior member for St. John. I think that he could perform a great service to the people of this island if he persuaded the Government to set up a Tennessee Valley authority in a seventh of the land area of this island; I am referring to the districts where erosion is taking such a heavy toll of agricultural production.

10.00 p.m.

That is a challenge to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. If we can increase the arable acreage in the island under cultivation by one-seventh, it stands to reason that we can increase our agricultural output, and that is apart from intensification.

There is no point in taking anybody from Cable and Wireless and somebody else who is a Government servant, (maybe because they are working at the Peasants' Loan Bank) and sending them on tour to see about soil erosion. You need an over-riding authority like a tenancy authority; and there should be concerted efforts by the people in the district, and also possible legislation to prevent any one individual plantation owner or peasant from

breaking the possibilities of the success of this scheme. If they tackle these things in a peaceful way, they will be doomed a failure. The whole of the Scotland district should be brought under the same control as the Tennessee Valley which is a shining example of the fact that when Government and the people want to solve their economic problems, they can do it so long as they go about it in the right way. The \$100,000 you have set down here for soil conservation is a joke; you want \$2½ million. If the Government is serious about this matter, it would take control of the whole of St. Andrew including all the estates and properties of honourable members of this Chamber. Government can allow the people to live there and share in any profit which may accrue to the Government as a result of the scheme, and when the scheme has proved a success you can then give back the properties to the people concerned. This district involves one-seventh of the land area of the island and it is time we do something about it.

I will end on the note of the Socialist-Conservative hybrids with which this Government is now afflicted. I must say again that the scheme at Seawell was wrong and inequitable, because of the insufficiency of land which you had there. You could not do justice to the people with that amount of land, and as a result it would inevitably end up as a scheme of favouritism. If you have unproductive land you can start a land settlement scheme; but if you have only about 25 acres of land to divide, you can only give it to four or five people whom you favour. You can never solve the unemployment problem of this island by removing people from one part of the island to another; that is why at the beginning I said that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture can make his name in the whole of the West Indies. He can have people coming from the North, West, South and East to see the success he is making in the soil conservation programme.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, it is expected that a Trade Unionist would be opposed to the expansion of the peasantry, because the expansion of the peasantry means a reduction in the number of agricultural labourers in the first place, and secondly a reduction in the number of workers in the Union. No Trade Union in the world supports the multiplication of the peasantry. When agricultural labourers are placed in a position where they can be independent, they are no longer workers in the sense that a Trade Union looks upon them. It is not surprising to me that a Trade Unionist is opposed to my favourite scheme; it is inevitable.

When it comes to the argument of the last honourable member who just sat down, (the honourable senior member for St. George) he imagines that everybody must have a piece of land. He thinks that all the citizens would have to cultivate the land and there will be no need for lawyers, doctors and other persons. He does not know that there is such a thing as exchange of labour; that does not exist at all to him. Sir, the most serious contention against my proposal has not been mentioned; and that is the danger of fragmentation. That is the most serious objection to my proposal; but I have calculated for that, because my land settlement scheme is not based on a freehold scheme; a modern land settlement scheme does not favour freehold. So long as you give security of tenure to the cultivator you will get a proper development other things being equal. Security of tenure does not necessarily mean ownership.

Let us take the question of the agricultural labourers; there are about 23,000 agricultural

labourers in this colony. Let us suppose that each of them has an average family of five; you will get about five thousand families requiring land. Suppose you distribute five per family, that will mean 2,500 for distribution. There are 64,000 acres under cultivation in this country. Sir, I have no doubt at all in my mind (and nobody can take it out of my mind) that the multiplication of independent peasantry is essential for the social advancement of the community. Nobody can shake that faith in me; not even if I live until I am 99 years old. The people of this country are only obsessed with sugar, and the honourable member who has just sat down said that the sugar production of this colony would be reduced by one-fifth by a land settlement scheme. I was saying that the sugar production by the average peasant is almost equal to that of the plantation owner; the average peasant gets around 25 tons of cane per acre and the average by the plantation owner is around 33 tons. [A VOICE: You are talking nonsense!] I have got that from an agricultural report; and I have been backed up in my argument by people who have made agriculture and economics their study.

10.10 p.m.

They are talking about small holders. You have small holders in Goodland (without anything like an acre of land) and they support themselves and send their children to high schools out of green vegetables. They have something like a quarter of an acre of land and they carry on expensive cultivation. Sir Frank Stockdale and his Agricultural Adviser wrote about the possibility of developing dairy farming as a means of increasing employment in this island, and I have read enough about successful experiment. There is a place in East Africa with three and a half acres in one settlement, and 7,000 plot owners and one cultivator with two and a half acres produce coffee bringing him £600 annually. Can we get that done in Barbados? I can bring the Commonwealth Producer to establish that. There are certain parts of this island where crops like cocoanuts could be cultivated and produced independently. In certain parts of this island tree crops of a certain grade are giving families a living. In West Africa, there is a great cocoa industry and a place like the Gold Coast procured a great deal from the cultivation of cocoa; the Gold Coast cultivators are producing cocoa by the small peasant cultivation. There are examples from all over the world of the success of small farms; and because Barbados have an area of 166 square miles and has 64,000 cultivable acres, that does not alter the principle of the possible success of the establishment of an economic peasantry. I have not said that this is the complete solution of the unemployment here; but I do say and emphasise that it is a very important part of that solution, and the problem will remain in its immensity until that policy has been embarked upon. That is my political conviction and no rational argument can be brought to dispute it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I do not think that we are going to pay so much attention to the Gold Coast because there are certain happenings there which we do not admire. The honourable member began by saying that a Trade Unionist never believes in the cutting up of land. You can meet a hypocrite but he can be sincere in his speech; the honourable member was the secretary of a Trade Union but he was a hypocrite then. Even if he believes in Trade Unionism he was only a peacock dressing up in other people's feathers. Any man can be a hypocrite; it is easy to be a hypocrite. The honourable member must relate his argument to Barbados, not to West Africa or Nigeria; with the acreage of land under cultivation how can you have land settlement to develop an economic unit? Doctor Arthur Lewis has told us that

owing to the cultivation in Barbados a land settlement scheme which is based on the cutting up of land is not economic.

Mr. VAUGHAN: On a point of Order. He made no such statement; he supported land settlement wherever he thought it would be a success. He did not dogmatise; he made a statement and left things to our judgment. I have studied the book.
10.20 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: That is indefensible; we have no marginal lands. We are not an undeveloped territory; and you cannot shift the sort of economic system you have into a different system and say that you can make people better off.

When you begin to talk about Trade Unionists, I will say that I am a Trade Unionist; and I am proud to be one. The fact is that you do not know what some people are. I do not believe that the hon. junior member for St. John can say clearly what he is. He is a weather cock!

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, in this House mine was perhaps the first voice raised advocating land settlement. I remember as far back as 1939 to 1940 when the war first started and a very wealthy Barbadian planter, Mr. Gordon Rose got torpedoed, I urged the Government of that day to acquire his estates in St. Thomas for the purpose of land settlement. I did that, because the main idea in my mind behind a land settlement scheme is not only the possibility of making some of the land in the community available to the people who work it, but also to enable them to share in the profits from the land.

Now during the course of this debate there have been one or two misconceptions which I should like to eradicate. The hon. senior member for St. George under cultivation have been acquired by governments for the express purpose of land settlement. In Jamaica Bustamante acquired several thousands of acres of land under cultivation. Estates cut up and people were settled on them. The same thing happened in St. Vincent where the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation early in its history, made a grant to acquire Mount Rose Estate for the purpose of land settlement. When Nehru first acquired power in India he expropriated over 200,000 absentee proprietors, and similarly in Yugoslavia when the Communists took over, land under cultivation was expropriated, some with compensation and some without. Even in Puerto Rico under extensive development schemes plantations were acquired under cultivation and cut up for land settlement; they cut up in five acre lots, ten acre lots, 20 acre lots.

Now it is impossible not to agree that it has been found today, that the fragmentation of land into minute sections purely for land settlement as such is not always to the advantage of the country in which it is done. The hon. senior member for Christ Church attempted to meet that argument by saying that in his opinion even if you fragment land, you should parcel it out in leasehold tenure. But that is not the entire answer because the danger of fragmentation lies not so much in the fact that the man to whom you give a lot may not work it efficiently, but that when he dies he may leave four or five children neither of whom may be interested in agriculture, and he may leave each of them a quarter acre which they are not going to work.

So the most recent and sensible theory on the matter is that instead of fragmenting it leasehold or freehold without being sure that it will be efficiently developed all the time, the Government itself sets up an agency to acquire land and operate it, and employ people on it at the regular wages, but with this difference: at the end of the working year all

the profits derived from the land being worked instead of going into the hands of one single plantation owner, are divided between all the workers who work on that land.

In other words, Sir, when we talk about abolishing the plantation system it is not so much perhaps a question of extending the ownership of land as ensuring that the profits derived from plantations, instead of finding their way into the pockets of one or two people, go into the pockets of the hundreds of people who cultivate it.

I am inclined to the view that in a country like this where admittedly there is paucity of land for cultivation, it is immoral to allow two-thirds of the bulk of the arable acreage to remain in the hands of the plantation owners. It is not fair to allow less than 200 big plantation owners to hold the great bulk of the arable acreage while the bulk of the population remains landless. This is obviously not in the interest of the community.

I am suggesting that two things should be done. The first is to put a ceiling on the amount of land that any individual should be allowed to own in Barbados. I would not allow any company or individual to own more than 500 acres.

10.30 p.m.

Within the past ten years we have witnessed the spectacle of one individual acquiring nearly 3,000 acres outright. That is not right. What we have to do is to see today that no individual or company should not acquire more than 10 acres; and whenever plantations or large acres of land come into the market, the Government or its agency should acquire them. They should be run by efficient managers who should not be less efficient than those who run them for local land owners. You should pay them a stated wage and at the end of the year when allowance is taken out for rolling stock and depreciation and there is no loss, you should divide the balance of money among the people who work on the estate. I have said this in this House before.

[A VOICE: Are you going to buy up all the estates in the island?] Not necessarily so. If for instance your government agency, (let us call it the Agricultural Development Corporation) acquires 1,000 acres of land at a cost of £25,000 or £30,000 and it takes a labour force of 120 people to work it, those men and women should be paid stated wages the same as are paid to similar people who work with private owners; and at the end of the year when the crop is reaped and there is a profit, you should put by so much for capital cost, so much for depreciation and books, and the remainder should be divided among the 120 people who work on the estate. It is a fact that the smallest of these collective farmers receive as much as £28 as their share for one year's working on the farm. You should give them wages and allow them to share in the profits. It is better for Government to acquire land than for that land to be passed on by inheritance to a son-in-law or daughter who have not got the faintest interest in agriculture and who will leave it lying fallow. It is highly possible that a man with the greatest interest in agriculture could have a son who will not have the faintest interest in it; and if his father gives it to him or he succeeds to it by inheritance, all he would do with it is to allow it to run in pasture. On a parallel with our industrial development we need agricultural development, and we should ensure that by and large, the profits which accrue from agriculture do not continue to go into the small coffers of the community; and we should see to it that their great grand children are not born rich and independent and the people who pro-

duce it just eke out an existence from it and find themselves in old age practically without anything. The question of making a little more land available to peasants is not as fantastic as it sounds. [A VOICE: Why did you oppose the division of land at Seawell among peasants?] Of course I opposed the Seawell scheme; but the honourable member knows well enough why I opposed it. When you have so little land for distribution you should not give it to the few favoured people whom you gave it to at Seawell. I said then what I said now; that is, that two acres of agricultural land under irrigation would support a family.

What I want to emphasise is that we should not condemn land settlement merely because this is a small island, or merely because all the land is already well cultivated, or merely because there is supposedly no land left lying fallow or unproductive. They are many of us who can put our hands on hundreds of acres which are worked on the plantation system and which would produce more, if they were put in the hands of efficient small cultivators. If you go down to St. James, St. Peter and St. Lucy and even in Christ Church, you will find plantations not producing what they should; and you will find a lot of people running to buy anyone of them if any of them were put on the market for sale. Sir, the more sensible thing to do is to prohibit this monopolising of all the arable acreage in the country by the few who always held it. You should be prepared to buy all you can; and whether or not you give it out by freehold, leasehold or government agency, by all means endeavour to see that a considerable portion of the sugar industry is divided among the maximum people in the industry.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I thought the Hon. Minister would have answered the question put by me. Now sir, all night we have been discussing something which is not under this Head; I think we should not discuss something which is not under this Head. The honourable junior member for St. John deplored that something was not under this Head and we discussed that the whole night—not that it was not a very interesting debate. I would say that when people are selling plantations the labourers of the plantations are perpetually buying them for the new owners and not getting anything for themselves. The labourers buy them for Mr. A who sells them to Mr. B, and those poor labourers pay the interest of somebody instead of they getting money.

The Government already has a land settlement scheme at Seawell which they say is highly successful; and that has not been disputed. We already have units of Four Acres which the experts have advised the Government is an economical unit or nearly so. Let us get a report from them now to see whether they feel that a unit of four acres is not too much.

10.40 p.m.

You have here the sum of \$150,000 in respect of a Fish Cold Storage. I believe that in this Report issued on the Cold Storage Plant at the Public Market, the expert gave some advice that the Plant was suffering from underwork, and I am wondering what are we spending this \$150,000 in. I notice that the Deputy Director of Agriculture seems to be an expert on Cold Storage; I would like to know if the Hon. Minister is in a position to tell us if any of Dr. Fulton's recommendations in so far as the Cold Storage Plant at the Public Market is concerned, have been carried out.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The question of the establishment of land settlement scheme is at present re-

ceiving the active consideration of the Government. [Voices: Hear, Hear]. Hon. members will remember that Doctor Buie was here last year and his recommendation is receiving close study by the Scotland District Conservation Board. Arrangements have been made for the appointment of a permanent Soil Conservationist who will take over from the team of demonstration experts who are expected shortly to visit the Scotland area. That entails land settlement too. Over and above that, the question of the establishment of a land settlement scheme whether it be on a profit making basis or whether it be four-acre lots which has not proved to be unsuccessful is under consideration. The position is that the Government is setting up a land settlement division by the department, and we intend to establish two or three land settlement schemes in different parts of the island. The policy we have agreed upon so far is that Dodds Plantation should be worked on a profit-sharing basis.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter has referred to the prospects of the Central Milk Depot; I mentioned something in this connection during the early part of the consideration of the Estimates, but I will repeat what the present position is. The Stockbreeders' Association has either not yet evinced any faith or confidence in itself, or it has no funds available; the Government has gone into the matter very carefully and it is willing out of the savings effected from bulk purchasing, to provide roughly 60% of the money and the Stockbreeders' Association is expected if it has any faith in any concern, to provide the necessary amount of milk to make a success of the scheme. If they cannot find the other 40% they should come out and say so. It is not that the Government is not doing anything to assist in the establishment of a Central Milk Depot, because for the last number of years the Government has been considering this question. We have to try and do something to establish ourselves; a great sum is involved in the setting up of this depot. The Government has just discovered an avenue of revenue whereby money can be produced to assist in this scheme; to say that the Government is not anxious, willing and ready to assist in the establishment of a Central Milk Depot, is unfounded. The Stockbreeders took something like under six months before they replied to a letter and they reiterated what they said years ago. The whole question is whether they have confidence in themselves to provide this 40% and in the Government to provide the other 60%; that is the point. You must first establish yourself before the Government can rush to your assistance.

The question of the Fish Cold Storage is entirely something new. If the hon. junior member for the City reads the Report by the Deputy Director of Agriculture in connection with the establishment of fishing boats, he would appreciate what the true position is.

This initial amount is for a start to be made in the erection of the building. This is the amount which it is expected to spend in the coming financial year, but the total amount is \$625,000; and when you put in the amount for a generating plant as a standby it will be another \$180,000. That is to be spent this year. It will be of obvious benefit not only to the fishermen, but also to the public generally. It will serve as an inducement to fishermen to improve their catches by fishing on a more economical basis. I would say here that the central meat plant can also be put into operation if the necessary co-operation is received.

10.50 p.m.

The question that the sum of \$531,680 be voted under the Head was put and agreed to.

Head VI.—Communications

Head — VI — Communications — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$622,000 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask what about the Rural Amenities Scheme. It was said that we would hear something about it. I have been assured outside that the honourable member on my immediate right (Mr. Miller) is offering the Government a little difficulty in getting on with the scheme in Speightstown because he owns some land there.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable junior member for St. Peter is speaking.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am asking the Minister a question; this is a scheme that would come under his portfolio. I would also like to draw this to his attention: it has been brought to my notice that the Government intends to collect a tax for cars parked on the Central Foundry site; that is nonsense. You should begin to build on the site rather than make it into a car park. If the Government is looking for money let them explore other sources from which they can really get money.

This is what I want to tell the Minister. I am satisfied that we have some of the best roads in the Caribbean, and therefore the life of a motor car here must be increased. The Minister with that in mind should examine the tax rates which motorcar owners now pay and see if they cannot be increased. I do not think that any car owner could object to paying a reasonable increase. Because of the condition of our roads they do not have trouble with springs and tyres; and anyone who uses a car frequently will tell you that you cannot get a life of 22,000 miles from a tyre. In some other West Indian colonies you could only get a quarter of that. But I do object to this pin prick of charging people for parking cars on the Central Foundry site. It looks like going out of your way to use this place for that purpose when it should definitely not be used for such a purpose.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, it is true that the honourable member said he was asking the Minister a question. But he said he understood that I was giving trouble with land that I own in Speightstown. When I learned for the first time that the Government was interested in the land, I had a query from the Government's solicitors and I said that I would take whatever they would offer or less. They subsequently wrote offering a figure. They then requested some papers which I did not have at the time that I bought the bit of land. I am told that the cost of getting those papers is more than the Government would pay. The documents that I have are in the hands of the Government's Solicitors.

I am sorry that my honourable friend learned that I was giving trouble. The fact is that the Solicitors were not satisfied with the documents that I held; they said they would have to do something with them. It is so much confusion that I would like to be relieved of it and never hear about it again. I am now told that I am giving trouble.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, as regards what the honourable junior member for St. Peter asked about the land in Speightstown, there were five owners of land in that area, three of whom have already agreed to sell; and I think they have already received their money. The other two owners include the honourable junior member for St. George. What he said not long ago is correct. He is quite willing to sell at the price offered, but it is a question of title

deeds. As a result the Government has decided to acquire compulsorily.

So far as the car park on the Central Foundry site is concerned, I think hon. members will remember that in the Annual Estimates for 1954-55, provision was made for the purchase of slot machines and tickets for collecting fees from parkers, so that is nothing new. Everybody admits that land is very valuable; and I do not think it is anything wrong if the Government charge fees for parking cars there. 11.00 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Now that reference has been made to slot machines and the car park at the Central Foundry site, I want to point out that when members of this Chamber come here they should have a proper place to park their cars. No hon. member should be placed in the invidious position where he cannot find any position to park his car. I think it will be well if you reserved some of the Central Foundry site so that people who have business in this Chamber would have somewhere to park their cars.

Mr. GODDARD: Under Item 2, Highways, Reconstruction, Other Scheme, for which the sum of \$500,000 is set down, the Note accompanying it says "for widening and improving bends and corners on certain highways." I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister of Communications to the fact that there are many such bends in Christ Church that really needs attention. As you know Sir, St. Lawrence road is probably the most busiest road in the island, and although it has received some attention, yet there is still a bend along there which needs some attention. A similar bend is on Hastings road by Pavilion Court. With a purchase of small bits of land those bends can be remedied. As I have said, there are many such bends along that highway. There is another one by Lyrias on the Sargeants Village road. My attention was drawn to it about six months ago and since then three accidents have taken place there. The most recent is that in which a lorry overturned with a load of mould. It is these small things which need to be done at once.

The next item is with respect to the East Coast Road. I see there is a new provision of \$1,000 for that road, and the Note to it says "Cost of survey and plans; Section 1 and 2 from Corbin's Village to Cattlewash and from Cattlewash to Highway F at Bathsheba." If the Hon. Minister of Communications can say something on that, we would be grateful.

Item 6 deals with a Bar to the Careenage. The \$19,000 set down for that purpose was voted last year but not spent, and it is being revoted this year. I understand that the person who tendered for that job could not get covered for the insurance; and I am wondering if the Government is still hoping that the same person would do the job this year. If the Hon. Minister can give me some information on these three items, I would be grateful.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will promise the hon. junior member for Christ Church to draw to the attention of the Director of Highways and Transport the bends in the highways which were mentioned by him, and if possible, to have one or two of them improved during this financial year.

As regards the East Coast Road, as you have seen from the Note accompanying this vote, the sum of \$1,000 in the Estimates is for the carrying out of a survey and the preparation of plans, but I do not think we will be able to begin construction during this year. We are going to include it in the next Five Year Plan.

As regards the point about the bar to the Careenage, we have had some difficulty. (I would say great

difficulty in getting the gentleman to carry out the contract after being successful in getting the job. Apparently, his legal representatives wanted to read more into the terms of the contract than was originally set out when tenders were invited. It is not correct to say that the successful tender could not get covered for the risk. I think I am correct in saying that Messrs. J. B. Leslie and Company Ltd., who represents Lloyds were quite willing to cover him. So far as coverage is concerned, he is assured of that by Messrs. J. B. Leslie and Co. As I have said, I think he got entangled by his legal advisers; who were trying to make the Government a party to the carrying out of the contract a situation which no doubt would put the Government in a most awkward position. However, it would appear that we are getting near to the end of these negotiations, and it is expected that within the very near future work will be started on this bar.

The question that the sum of \$622,000 be voted under Head VI Communications, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head VII — Miscellaneous Head VII—Miscellaneous was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, before I move the passing of the amount under this Head, as I have said earlier in the day, I am asking leave to add another new Head under this Head to be known as Head 2 Minor Handicrafts.

The sum of \$50,000 if provided in the Five Year Plan for Minor Handicrafts and it was felt earlier, that we should wait until the coming into being of the Development Board to begin this work. Government has reconsidered its decision in the light of information received from Jamaica and Trinidad, where the matter of handicrafts is part of the Social Welfare set-up. As a result Government has come down with this sum. The details will be found in the memorandum which I have circulated a few days ago; and the amount asked for is \$15,350. With your permission I am including that sum under this Head and the amount will now be \$807,391. I beg to move that the sum of \$807,391 now stand part.
11.10 p.m.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Under what Department will this be run and what things do they contemplate to start with?

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I thought I had said that it would be run by the Social Welfare Department as is done in Trinidad and Jamaica. This is what the Note says: "It is proposed to develop a Basketry and Fibre Industry during the 1955—56 financial year along the lines recommended in the Report of the Minor Handicrafts Development Committee. The scheme will be supervised by a standing Advisory Committee on Handicrafts to be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

Mr. MILLER: Honourable members will probably remember that for the last five years I have been asking about a Post Office and Library to serve the parish of St. George. What I would like to say is this: I have been told that the Government wants to use the land at Gun Hill, a strip of land owned by a gentleman alongside of that land. From what I have heard that is not the most suitable area for the erection of this Post Office and Library. It would seem to me to be more reasonable to put the Library and Post Office on an area of the Glebe Land which would be more available to you, and people would not have to walk uphill to get to the Library and Post Office. It should be placed in a position where it would better suit the parish.

Mr. VAUGHAN: What I fail to notice is any sum included for the construction of a Library and Community Hall in the parish of St. John. I have heard about it, but the Hon. Minister of Social Services will probably inform me about this matter.

Hon. M. E. COX: You will not find that here; it is under Labour Welfare. In reply to the honourable junior member for St. George I will say that it was the intention to establish this Post Office and Library at Gun Hill; but since the honourable member has raised that point we will consider it.

The question that the sum of \$807,391 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Re-Committal of Head XXV

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to re-commit Head XXV, "Public Works Department" for the purpose of increasing the amount of Item 6 "Tracer and additional clerk from \$1,388 to \$1,872. It has been represented to the Government that this individual does a considerable amount of work as far as drawing and so on is concerned, and it was left to the Governor to make adjustments.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that this gentleman does a considerable amount of work in this capital programme; he is an established officer and it was represented to the Government that his remuneration should be increased. The Estimates only provided for \$1,388 and therefore we are asking that this amount be increased to \$1,872; he is still within the scale of \$2,280.

I beg to move that the sum of \$209,301 be voted under this Head.
11.20 p.m.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this method of doing things. Last year I told the Minister when this post of Tracer was created that I did not like the idea of taking people in the Works Departments of the Government and giving them more favourable treatment than others in the Service. The post was \$1,388 per annum last year; now it is \$1,872. The hon. member says that the officer has more work to do. Are there not other people in the Service with more work to do? Will you increase a man's salary purely on the basis that he has a little more work to do this year than he had last year? I could more understand it if he was given an incremental increase if he had studied and obtained qualifications that made him more qualified than he was. It is not fair to adopt a policy of giving people in the Works Departments more favourable treatment than you give to other people in the Service.

I am protesting now against this on behalf of those who may be afraid to protest. There must be special circumstances to make you do things like these. It seems to me that some members of the Government do not regard matters of principle at all. They do anything as long as it is expedient. The Government will find itself butting up on some problems. If I had control of the Service I would put the Government on the spot one morning. The Government wants a strike; and they would get it if they were dealing with groups that are not as polite as members of the Civil Establishment.

Are they going to give key scale people more money because they have a little more work to do?

You do not pay them any sort of money that is reasonable; and when rain falls you do not pay them for that day's work. Then you have someone working as a maid at Combermere and you say do not pay them when the school is on holiday. You should agree on a guaranteed wage. A man has to live 52 weeks in every year. Will you deduct eight weeks from a man's wages and then give it to someone else in a better position. You are sitting on a volcano in these things.

It looks too much as if the Government is picking out people for special favours. The Government will find itself in an embarrassing position. If the Librarian of the House says he is editing debates until 12 midnight and he wants more money you will have to say yes. If you are doing these things to other people you will have to do it to him; and you will have to do it to the other people that we keep here until morning. I would be the first to lead them off on this.

The question that the sum of \$209,301 be voted under the Head was put and agreed to.

Head XXVII — Recommitted

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to reconsider Head XXVII for the purpose of putting in an amount of \$82,500. We forgot to put that in. The sum in the first column is "authorised by law". Therefore it has to come in the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not like these things. I do not like putting in things at this stage unless they are things that arose in the course of debate. We have reconsidered two or three Heads already today. It may happen one day that it may be a contentious matter. It savours of something that you did not want to let hon. members know.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If you look at Head XXVII you will find the first column "authorised by law" that has to come in the Appropriation Bill. When we did the Head we read the first column and not the other. We missed that. That was "authorised by law" and not "fixed by law".

There being no objection leave was granted.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$360,661 be voted under this Head.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

11.30 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of resolutions in Committee on the Estimates, 1955-56, totalling \$13,792,012.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Mr. Chairman reported to Mr. Speaker who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 19 as the next order of the day.

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

Appropriation Bill

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the

Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ending on the 31st March, 1956.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ending on the thirty first day of March one thousand nine hundred and fifty-six be now read a second time.

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

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am moving that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill and that it be the instruction to the Committee that the Bill be taken as read.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Bill be taken as read.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. G. H. Adams, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

11.40 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 17 as the next order of the day and of that order to deal with the resolution for \$831,064.

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

On the motion of Dr. Cummins, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Insurance of Gov't Buildings

Hon. M. E. COX: Of this Resolution for \$2,007, the amount of \$1,963 is required in connection with the insurance of Government Buildings. The Note says this "The value of Government buildings insured is now estimated at \$11,617,800 and based on the rate of 5/- in the £100, the contribution payable to the Public Buildings (Insurance) Fund now amounts to \$29,045. Also, due to an increase of over \$300,000 in the value of insured buildings since the premium was revised, there has been another increase in the premium. To meet these expenses, supplementary provision of \$1,963 is required."

The remaining \$44. is to meet allowances for shortages under Head 111, Accountant General. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to know if this is the agreed policy which the Government intends to pursue all the time, or if they have any complaints about the general insurance of their buildings. The Government buildings can be insured in a different way from that in which they are

insured now; I would like to know if the Government sees the need of effecting a saving by the means of insurance.

Hon. M. E. COX: In the very near future the Government intends to go into this question of insurance in all these matters.

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

Notification Of Infectious Diseases

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: The next Resolution Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for \$100 to cover expenses in connection with the notification of infectious diseases. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Capital Works

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The next Resolution is for the sum of \$831,064 to meet the expenditure during the financial year 1955—56 on Capital Works including in the Estimates for 1955—56, Part II—Capital, A—Loan Funds. The Items are all set out in the Addendum to this Resolution. In connection with the first Item, Barbados Development Board, the Government is contemplating the production of a Manual for this island and this will be of immense value to Barbados. I am sure that everybody will agree that we should produce something of this sort which will be of immense value to Barbados; and it may cost in the neighbourhood of \$3,000. We have got Estimates and we are seeking others in order to see how best we can produce it; it must not fall below the standard of those in other places in the British Empire. Full details will be brought to the Legislative in due course.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: There are statements I am going to make; one is in connection with the Barbados Development Board, and the other is in respect of Loans for Higher Education. Everybody will agree that the Government had made a positive effort with this Development Board, but there seems to be a general tendency in Barbados when it comes to the matter of development with the Government to think that only business people are suitable and fit to go on these Boards. It seems to me that throughout the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth the tendency is changed; and it is one in which you take people out of their own organisations. There is a tendency that members of the Trade Union Movement are not asked to serve on these Boards. I am not dealing with myself as a member of a Trade Union, but there is a tendency that if anybody says anything about which he is connected he is asking for an invitation. As a matter of policy, it has been recognised that where you have organisations which form an economic part of the society as a whole, they should not be left out. I do not feel that businessmen in Bridgetown should have any more right on these Boards than the members of a Workers' Organisation. I make that point quite boldly because it seems that we are not following the pattern adopted by Puerto Rico, Gold Coast, India, Pakistan or many of the other progressive countries.

11.50 p.m.

The other point which I want to make is on this question of loans for higher education. I note here that \$16,000 is supposed to be voted under this Head. It is a very admirable scheme, and we all agree with it; but I would like to draw to the attention of the Government that if you are going

to loan parents money to educate their children, you must look into your general taxation policy. If you are going to lend money for this purpose, do you not think it a wise policy to give to these people who are providing money out of their pockets an allowance to help them educate their children? You are loaning people money at a rate of interest that you are not going to recover from them. If you are doing that, I see nothing wrong with giving an allowance to a man who is spending money out of his pocket.

As regards housing for Civil Servants you are lending Civil Servants money. I would like to see more money provided when people work for a steady income and you know how they are going to pay it back. It is the best way of reducing the housing shortage and the best way of straightening out rent difficulties. The more people like Civil Servants who can build their own homes the more houses will be released to other members of the community.

I do not see that it is fair for a man who works and owns a house and who is living in that house to be told that it is taxable to be added to his income tax; it seems to me that that is killing thrift. A man should not be called upon to pay income tax on a house which he has acquired and which he himself is living in. You are penalising a man for being thrifty. This form of income tax should only apply to people who are renting out their houses. It seems illogical when on one hand you help people to own their own houses and then take it back from them in income tax.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word or two on the question of higher education. I have been saying for a long time that when there is any member of the community who is willing to send a son or a daughter abroad for his or her education, the man should be given an exemption on up to \$600 a month. I believe that that would provide an inducement which the Government is not particularly aware of at the moment.

As regards the Development Board, I agree with the idea of having a Trade Unionist there. I am also asking the Government to be sure that people with some ability in industries are on that Board. Government should be very careful with the establishment of this Board. It is a very important Board, and you should have on it people with some knowledge of industry.

I am asking the Premier to give me some sort of assurance about the exemption to which I have referred. It does not mean that you will have 100 boys going up to University every year.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I cannot give the honourable member the assurance for which he is asking. If the honourable member would spend a little time with his solicitor, he might give him a little help on that point. The whole object of taxation is that it should fall on the shoulders best able to bear it. *Ex hypothesi* if you can send your son to the University you can pay income tax. To do otherwise it will mean that people less able than you would have to pay it for you. If the honourable member goes to the right lawyer he might get some assistance.

No one can object in principle to what the honourable junior member for St. Peter said; it is a matter which I am considering. There is something in the idea that a person who has saved money and bought a house should not have that house taxable for income tax. I assure the honourable member that I am considering that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member's theory about income tax would be alright for a Government which is making provision for the people.

The Government today will lend money to a man to educate his child although the man himself is likely to pay income tax. The honourable member knows that it is not correct to say that because a man can send his son to the University *ex hypothesi* he can pay income tax.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If you can send your son to the University —

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am still speaking Mr. Chairman. The Premier knows that sending your son to the University is not always a test of your ability to pay income tax; there are people who will make sacrifices to educate the right child. He knows that you owe your children certain obligations, and one of the greatest obligations is to give him a good education. I do not think that his argument is correct, because you may send your child to the University at the sacrifice of mortgaging your house.

I am not suggesting what the honourable junior member for St. George has suggested about giving an allowance up to £1,500 per annum. You ask people to pay income tax when they can afford to pay it. At the same time I am not saying that because a man educates his child he should not get some allowance.

The more encouragement in education the Government gives to people who are likely to educate their children, the better it is for the Government; it relieves government of having to make these loans. I feel the point which has been raised should be considered under present day circumstances and not under the old theory that those who can afford to pay should do so.

12.02 a.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Is the honourable member saying that the person has to pay income tax on the money which you lend him?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am saying that the Government is lending money out of the Public Treasury to certain people who are likely to be taxable to send their children to the University. There are many people who send their children to the University College of the West Indies, (some of them senior clerks in the Service) who only are doing so because their children have the ability. Those parents should be given some sort of relief. I am not suggesting £1,500; I would not dream of asking for that amount.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member has made a statement that you can pay income tax so long as you can send your child to the University, but that is not always so. I know of a father and mother who are working and paying income tax but who are living on the assistance of two of their children to keep one at the University. It is a fact that some parents are paying income tax who cannot afford to pay; they have to rely on the assistance of other members of the family and probably an older child to help them. There is no argument at all because you can send your child to the University that you can pay income tax. I feel you will be doing this country a good service if you really re-examined that question.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I know of someone who has a son at the University and he has to pay for him, and he also has a daughter at St. Michael's Girls' School. He is in poor circumstance, therefore you give him off taxation. What I am saying is that you can give off taxation to a father who perhaps had to mortgage his house to send his son to a University; but you do not give up taxation to someone who is sending their child to the University because they are in the lower brackets.

Mr. WALCOTT: Why was the Government forced to give loans for higher education? The Government in giving the reason said that there was pressure from such people for relief from Income Tax. The question is that when a parent forces himself to send his child to the University, that child is going to be a benefit to this colony; and I am one of those people who would not say that people with University education do not mean anything to the community; they mean something to the community. If you consider giving parents an allowance I do not think it will do any harm.

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

On motion of Hon. Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. Chairman reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and then agreed to.

EXPIRING LAWS BILL

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to deal with Order No. 5 which will be the last thing to be done.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier; second reading of a Bill to continue various expiring laws.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

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

12.10 a.m.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Preamble was postponed.

The two Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

The Preamble was called and agreed to.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

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

The motion was put and agreed to.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to move, Mr. Speaker that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 22nd. inst. at 3 p.m.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next the 22nd. inst. at 3 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

12.20 a.m.