

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1955—56

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

28th February, 1956.

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

Present

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A. (*Premier*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*); His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. M. E. Cox, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J. P., (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Mrs. E. E. BOURNE and Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the 26th January, this year have been printed and circulated amongst honourable members and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will now be taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection, the Minutes were taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month ended 31st January this year.

BILLS RETURNED.

Also, I have received the following from the Other Place:—

The Legislative Council

To

The Honourable House of Assembly

The Legislative Council have the honour to return to the Honourable House of Assembly the

Bill intituled an Act to amend and consolidate the laws relating to Weights and Measures, which has been passed with amendments which are shewn written on the Bill.

H. A. CUKE,

President.

The Legislative Council,

21st February, 1956.

PAPERS LAID.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On behalf of His Excellency, I am commanded to lay the following:—

Report by the Conference on British Caribbean Federation.

Statement showing Gross Customs & Excise Receipts for ten months ended 31st January, 1956.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES.

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$8,012 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955—56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955—56, No. 73 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$209 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955—56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955—56, No. 74, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to authorise the Governor to enter into an agreement with a person to serve for a period of not more than two years as Chief Engineer, Waterworks Department, at a salary of \$11,520 per annum.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider these two Money Resolutions.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grants of sums of money for the service of the colony.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1955-56, No. 70.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I gave notice last week of this Resolution on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture who is not here and I am asking leave to take charge of the Resolution.

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

Public Markets

The first Head, which is Head IX under this Resolution is in relation, Mr. Chairman, to the Public Market. Members will see from the Note that it is for Supplementary items in connection with the Public Market — Market Attendant and Cleaner, Water, Repairs to Weights and Measures, Expenses in connection with the running of Refrigeration Plant, Operation of Eagle Hall Market and Repair and overhaul of Cold Storage Plant. As set out in the Note the position is a very straightforward one. The first Item of \$12 has arisen as a result of an oversight in the Department of Science and Agriculture. The annual increments for the year 1954-55 were not paid to the Market Attendants and Cleaners at Oistins and Speightstown until after the administration of the Markets had been taken over by the Superintendent of the Public Market with effect from 1st April, 1955. The amount is very small and the Committee is asked to vote only \$12.

As regards the Water rates the position is that owing to the late receipt of the bill the water rates (totalling \$397.60) for the last quarter of the financial year 1954-55 were not paid from that year's provision. More water has also been used at the market owing to the slaughter of a large number of animals; a large amount of water was also used immediately after hurricane Janet. Owing to the work of the Deep Water Harbour the labourers engaged have been using water for drinking and washing. It is also a fact that concrete mixing is going on at the market and that has led to a greater supply of water being required for these purposes.

For Repairs to Weights and Measures the small amount of \$40 is required, and as members know these are usually kept at the market. The next amount of \$938 is required for four cylinders of ammonia. This expense has been incurred because of the Refrigerating Plant and repairs thereto and these repairs have had to be met out of this Item and there is insufficient balance and the Committee is asked to vote a further \$938.

Item 39, (New) Operation of Eagle Hall Market. I think it is set out very fully in the Note as to why this amount is asked for to supplement the Estimates, because the operation of this market is now being taken over by the Government instead of being handled by the Vestry, and this amount is to pay the funds necessary up to the end of the present Financial Year. The salary of the Clerk etc. comes to \$100.

The last Item under this Head — to repair and overhaul the Cold Storage Plant, \$2,500 — is required for Messrs Barbados Foundry Ltd., who undertook the repairs and forwarded the bill, and the provision which the House voted was not suffi-

cient to meet these repairs and that exceeded the amount voted by \$2,519.90. The House is now asked to vote \$2,500.

I beg to move that Head IX — stand part.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like the hon. member to assure me that this amount for water rates does not concern the bottling of rum at the market. I take it that that is separate, because I know there was an occasion when it was mixed up at the Wharf with the Customs and bottling of rum, and I hope it is not so at the Market. I would just like to have the assurance because I intend to bring it up again. Sir, the next thing is that while I know that the principle has been agreed and I have no right to criticise it (I am not criticising it now), I would like to know whether the Government has been advised to hand the markets back to the Local Government Authorities in view of the fact that there is going to be a change.

Sir, I am wondering whether the Government before taking control for the new Financial Year, should not consider that question and not leave the Local Government Authorities, in particular the City Council, to become merely people who look after the sweeping of streets and Sanitary business and dish out Poor Relief. After having abolished the Vestries and setting up what is regarded as a modern system of Local Government I think they could at least administer the markets. I say that because with Mr. Lightburn here the Government might discuss it with him. I do not know whether it was his suggestion or if the Government wanted something more to do or to bother themselves about, but certainly Local Government at least should look after the market as other Local Government Organisations do.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, these notes are at times most amusing and they are getting funnier and funnier each time. I wonder whose job it is to write these notes; particularly about the water; more water has been used at the market owing to the slaughter of a large number of animals; the large amount of water was also used immediately after hurricane Janet. They do not say why. The labourers engaged on the Deep Water Harbour Works obtain water for drinking and washing. How much water could they have used to swell this budget? Water was used undoubtedly, but you could not out of all good reason tell us that it has contributed so much to increase this budget, and it does show how funny these explanations are becoming. They seem to think that the House wants information so much that they have to try to concoct reasons to give us.

Now, when I come to the Head, Repair and overhaul of Cold Storage Plant I see where \$2,500 is being asked for, and I understand that only yesterday hundreds and hundreds of pounds of meat were thrown away because of the fault of the plant. I wonder if this has been drawn to the attention of the Minister in charge of this Resolution; lots of meat were thrown away yesterday, and today we are voting money for repairs to something that has been repaired very recently. If he has not yet been informed, I wonder whether he would enquire into the running of this plant, how efficient it is, and if it is badly administered. I understand they do not work at night; they only work during the day, but there is no reason for this. When it is working during the day, it does not shut down; it should run all day and if necessary a thermometer should be placed there whereby through the 24 hours of the day the Superintend-

ent would be able to determine the temperature at any given time.

That can be done, and it should be done. It is hard on these butchers every now and again to have their meat thrown away. I understand that that happened only yesterday. I am asking the Hon. Minister to take up this matter. It is not his portfolio, but he can make notes and hand them to the appropriate Minister, and see if they can bring about the efficient running of this cold storage plant. We have to pay employees to have this plant running; it is not run by night and therefore they should see that it is run 12 hours a day, and that the door is shut before the engine is turned off.

12.35 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: As the honourable member has pointed out, it is a bit difficult for me to reply as adequately as I would like, in the absence of the appropriate Minister. However, I quite agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that it is a very serious thing if meat has to be thrown away. I promise the honourable member that I will draw the matter to the attention of the appropriate Minister when he returns. Our information was that under the new Administration, the running of the plant has considerably been improved; whereas previously the plant was turned off at some hours of the day for long periods which would lead to the deterioration of meat, I understand that that practice is not being carried on under the present Administration of the Superintendent of the Market. However, I will draw the matter to the attention of the Administration and to the attention of the appropriate Minister and let the honourable member and the House know what has been done to remedy the situation.

As regards the other point, I can only go by what I see here. The explanation is fully set out in the note as to why this increase has taken place. The honourable junior member for the City has raised the question of policy as regards the future administration of the Markets. That again, is a matter chiefly for the appropriate Minister; it is not a matter which directly concerns me, although it concerns the Government. It is a bit difficult, however, in the space of a couple of weeks, to adopt one policy and then return to a policy which you have abandoned.

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

Head XIV.—Judiciary.

Head XIV — Judiciary — was called.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The Item under this Head is again a straightforward matter. This amount of \$1,000 is due to the increased sittings of the West Indian Court of Appeal. There were four sittings of the West Indian Court of Appeal during the Financial Year, and it was announced late in January that another one would be held in Trinidad this month. The vote was estimated on previous sittings. The Committee is now being asked to vote this extra \$1,000 in respect of this Item. I beg to move that Head XIV stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

Head XXI.—Science and Agriculture.

Head XXI — Science and Agriculture — was called.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, this Expenditure is occasioned owing to the drifting of a

boat called the "Boysie Rose" to the Grenadines. The Government of Grenada very kindly towed the boat in to the harbour at St. George's and incurred the expense of \$70 as regards the salvaging of this boat. The owner of the boat has agreed to defray this expense which will be reimbursed to the Government of Grenada, and it was felt that we should reimburse this amount not only because the Government of Grenada should not be penalised for the very kind act which it has undertaken, but also to guard against the question of no assistance being rendered in cases similar to this which may occur in future. However, I do not think that the Government of a neighbouring Island would have refused this assistance. We are getting this expenditure repaid, but, in the meantime we are asking the Committee to vote this money for the reimbursement to the Government of Grenada. I beg to move that this Head stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, whoever is the owner of this boat, he is lucky to get anything in the way of salvage expense for \$70; that must be the lowest expenditure in the world. I do not like the idea of voting money under an Expenditure Head, as I said last week; and then Government is virtually lending out this money. I am wondering whether the Government could not have informed the House, if they felt so disposed to do, stretched a point even if it is not in accordance with the strict letter of the Law, and make this loan from the Fishing Boat Revolving Fund. I think that would be a better way of doing it because of the fact that it is a Revolving Fund, and it would be much easier to keep the accounts of the Fishing Boat Revolving Fund.

This Expenditure will be repaid by the owner of the boat. I think the Hon. Minister said that they are doing their best to get this money repaid. I think that a short-term loan from the Fund would be more conducive to getting back this money, because this Fund is for the purpose of loans, and this is an Expenditure Item with which we are dealing. I am not saying that if it is a fishing boat that they would be sticking more to the letter of the Law, but it is more in the spirit of a boat loan than to come under an Expenditure Head and then expect somebody to pay back the loan.

12.45 p.m.

I do not know what sort of book-keeping entries they make at the Accountant General's Office for this money. They would have had difficulty if the House did not decide in the way they did about another loan that was made from an Expenditure Head. The Government cannot take money voted for expenditure by this House and turn bankers and loan it out. It is a wrong principle.

From my reading of the explanation in the Note, this is somewhat in the nature of a loan and repayment will be made by the boat owner; therefore, I think it would have been better if you had advised the Fishery Officer to lend it. It is stated that this is a sail boat; I do not know if it is a yacht which is used for fishing or merely for pleasure. Since you are loaning money to boat owners for boats, it would have been better if you had done it that way and then acquaint the House that it was done, by a Statement, so as to let hon. members tacitly agree to it without any formal Resolution. After all, it is only \$70 and I do not think it will be much of a violation of principle as the Government voting money for expenditure and then using that expenditure for a loan to fishing boat owners.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Chairman, there is one point which I would like to enquire about from the Hon.

Minister in charge of this Resolution. As far as I understand, this expenditure is with respect to the sail boat "Boysie Rose" which drifted to Grenada and then became a total loss in the hurricane 'Janet'. If I am correct, the owner of this boat qualified for assistance in the relief which this House granted to fishing boat owners. If that assistance was given to him in order to replace his boat, I am wondering why this amount of \$70 was not taken into account then. Why should he be asked to make this \$70 an extra payment? If this boat was a total loss on account of hurricane "Janet" I will counsel the Government not to exact this payment from him. It is my firm opinion that this money could have been written off under the same assistance scheme given for Hurricane Relief. I do not know if the Hon. Minister in charge of this Resolution can help me with the information.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, first of all, that the impression which the hon. junior member for the City has of this matter is not strictly correct. As the hon. junior member for St. Michael has said, it is correct to say that this boat, "Boysie Rose", after it had been towed into St. George's harbour, was destroyed by the hurricane "Janet". What also happened was that this boat was not covered by insurance and the three members of the crew were repatriated to this Island by the Government of Grenada. The boat owner himself asked the Government of Grenada to tow his boat from where it had gone adrift and pointed out that the expense would be met by this Government. The Government of Grenada went ahead and towed the boat to St. George's Harbour on the word of the owner and then the boat was wrecked as a result of the hurricane. We pointed out to the Government of Grenada that the boat owner should pay the expenses of towing the boat and that we were not responsible because we did not ask them to do so. The Government of Grenada had put itself in this position through its kindness; it should have enquired of us about the matter before it had done so. In view of the possibility of cases such as that occurring again we have informed the boat owner that he will have to repay this expense.

Mr. LEWIS: It looks as if everything went wrong in this matter. We have boats called fishing boats and when you come in here and say "sail boat", that can be taken to mean a yacht or something for pleasure. I did not get the impression that this was a boat from which a man got his living. The people of Grenada had no right to take it upon themselves to tow this boat from where it had gone adrift before they cabled this Government about the matter. They should not have accepted the responsibility through a letter from an individual. It may have been a steamer. Do you know what salvaging a steamer would cost? I blame the Government of Grenada for undertaking to tow this boat before it had acquainted the Government of Barbados so as to know whether the Barbados Government will be willing to pay for it. This is slackness. I do not know if it was because this Government was expecting Grenada to vote the Federal Capital in Barbados that this Government did not want to offend them by telling them they should not accept an individual's pledge that this Government will pay something. I consider this gross slackness. I can well imagine a boat owner trying to get his boat from off the rocks and, in so doing, saying that this Government would undertake the expense.

I do not know if the Hon. Minister has understood what I was saying. There is a statement in the Note to the effect that repayment will be made by the owner of the boat. Is the Hon. Minister saying

that this is going to happen? It is not straightforward and I hope he will withdraw his remarks that I have misunderstood the situation.

12.55 p.m.

If this is a fishing boat and you want to assist, plenty of money was voted for the assistance of fishing boats after the hurricane, and if this is something that the Government allowed the individual to incur, is he the Premier or the Governor? It does not look satisfactory and the principle is a dangerous one, because it could be \$7,000 for salvaging a steamer not owned by somebody in Barbados.

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

Head XXIV.—Barbados Regiment.

Head XXIV—Barbados Regiment was called.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Head XXIV is set out in the Notes. It is a brief vote and I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

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

Head XXIX.—Miscellaneous Services.

Head XXIX — Miscellaneous Services — was called.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Under Head XXIX, it states here. "It was expected that after the large increase in the number of telegrams sent as a result of the hurricane, expenditure would return to normal and the supplementary provision of \$1,500 would have been enough to settle the accounts for the balance of the financial year. It is now clear that this supplement will not be sufficient and further supplementary provision of \$1,200 is sought. Of the amount of \$114,000 provided in the Estimates there remains a balance of \$13,781, and it is considered that supplementary provision of \$10,000 is necessary for the remainder of the financial year."

The cost of this printing, Mr. Chairman, is again a high item and supplementary provision for the sum of \$10,000 is needed for the remainder of this year.

For Repatriation of Barbadians the House is asked to vote \$300. The Note sets out the position quite clearly. Under Item 14, Registration of Voting, we will need \$27,600. The Registering Officers are busy compiling Registers for elections to the House of Assembly, and the Local Government. This amount is required to meet the claims up to 31st March, 1956.

I beg to move that Head XXIX—stand part.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, there is only one point which I wish to make with regard to Registration of Voters. I wish to draw it to the attention of the Government, because I do not think they are fully aware as to the method in which these people employed in Registering are being paid, and if they are aware they have accepted it without any investigation. There is one category of workers in this Registration set-up that I consider being underpaid, and I am speaking of the Clerical Staff that are doing the card system. It is quite an operation; there are three separate operations they have to do and I understand that they are being paid three cents for each registration.

Now, I understand in the breakdown that the Assistant Registering Officer gets 12 cents for Registration, that is, the fellow in the field who goes around and puts you and your family's name on

the list. The Registering Officer at present in charge of the Office gets four cents. Clerks get three cents.

Well, I have seen some of the work they have done and they themselves do not realise the amount of work they do, but they do feel they are underpaid at three cents and I feel a fair payment would have been double that, six cents. I would like the Government or the Minister to investigate that before it goes further, and before they settle it I wonder whether they should not take this sum here and reallocate it according to what I have stated and come back to the House for more money. I think it would cost about \$2,000 more, but if the Minister will promise to go into this matter and investigate it I will be very grateful indeed because I am sure it is not the intention of Government to underpay any category of worker. If I am wrong and three cents is correct, I will be happy to accept it. I have seen the work and it is straight forward, and they complete ever so much work in a week: and I am sure he will see that the amount paid is very small indeed. If he can give us the breakdown there and check the figures that I have called out I would like to know if there is something wrong with the information I have given, or if he is satisfied that that breakdown is correct and the work for three cents is not unduly burdensome.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, these figures and the payments for the Registering Officers and clerks and so on were based on figures recommended by the Chief Registering Officer and represent an increase on what they got at the last election—Clerical Assistants being paid at three cents and the Registering Officers at four cents, the Assistant Registering Officer at twelve cents and in some cases fifteen cents. I do not think any case of revision by the Government is necessary but if the request is put up it would be considered.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if there was one category I left out? What is the Chief Registering Officer getting? Could he let us know what the Chief Registering Officer is getting for the overall picture, because as I said it is his figures that the Government has gone on and I am not sure that at this stage now that I have drawn attention to it, the Chief Registering Officer would be satisfied that he has given the wrong figures; but he may feel that an adjustment should be made. He has put the rates for the whole category of labourers and the Government has accepted it. I am not saying that something has gone wrong, but will the Minister investigate and see whether the payment to these recorders at three cents is adequate or not? I hold that it is not adequate. They feel that it is half of what they should be getting and will the Minister in charge of this Resolution state what the Chief Registering Officer is getting in this break-down? 1.05 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: He is paid a lump sum of \$3,600; on the last occasion he was paid \$2,400. He has more work to do now than before. The first occasion on which I have heard that there is dissatisfaction is to-day from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I should like to say that if representations are made to us by the Chief Registering Officer, then we will consider them, but to-day is the first occasion on which I have heard that the amount which is being paid is too small. No such complaint has come to the Government either from the Chief Registering Officer or from the Registering Officers themselves.

Mr. GODDARD: The Hon. Minister says that he has not heard any such complaint before; well now that the complaint has been made, will he investigate the matter and ask the Chief Registering Officer

whether he is satisfied that this amount of 3c. is adequate for this job of registration?

Mr. LEWIS: Lest the Hon. Minister might think that there is only one member of this House who feels that way, I would like to say that I, too, have heard of the dissatisfaction; I feel that this is so important a job that it necessitates his immediate attention. I have heard other members of the House commenting that those people who are doing the actual writing feel that somebody else is getting the lion's share, and they are being asked to do work for nothing. I should like to say that this whole business of registering persons has gone on in a very slack manner. I am told that people are being registered for the local Government elections, whereas the general elections will be taking place before then, and people are quite confused over the matter.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I, too, can endorse the plea which is made for more money in respect of these workers. Some of them are employed at the Y.M.C.A., I have been invited upstairs to see the actual process and it is worth rather more than 3c. a card. It is a big job and it is a very important one; several things have to be done in order to register people properly, and I do not think that the contention for more money is far-fetched. This job is certainly worth more money.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I do not know what honourable members expect me to do other than tell them that when representations are officially put to the Government in the proper channels, of course, we will go into them. When the people concerned get together themselves and put these representations to the Government on their own behalf or through the Chief Registering Officer, of course, we will consider such representations.

Public Market

Mr. Chairman, I am just claiming the right of stating here that I have received some information relative to the point raised by the honourable junior member for Christ Church as regards the dumping of meat at the Market. The Superintendent of the Market says that he is not aware of any unusual loss of meat in the Market; he says that it is customary for meat of a poor quality to be dumped after storage for a week or longer when it is unsaleable. It is customary for all meat which has become unfit for sale to be dumped, and the amount of such meat is not much; but he has promised to give fuller details as regards this report of the dumping of a large quantity of meat as referred to by the honourable member.

Head XXIX C'td.

Mr. LEWIS: When the honourable junior member for Christ Church spoke about the Registering Officers, he said that he was not blaming the Government. I feel that the Hon. Minister should give the Opposition Members credit when they state a case in that way. You have got information from your Chief Registering Officer and you have acted upon it. These people have not brought any complaints to the Government, but they have complained to the representatives of the people in this House, and that is a source through which the Government should make investigations. Do not say that you want these people to do this, that and the other.

There are people who are doing this work only because they are glad to get this 3c. and if they feel that you are robbing them they will not tell you that, because they feel that they will not get this 3c. any longer. However, they will tell the representatives

of the people and therefore let the matter be investigated. The Chief Registering Officer is a big man, but he may not be big enough to say "I have made a mistake". You can use the House of Assembly to have the matter rectified. This is not a job for which you must have special qualifications; the qualifications are that you may have time on your hand and it is easy to get rid of you.

I rose to say that this is the second time that the honourable member has asked "What do you expect the Government to do?" But after today the Government would be wrong if they did not make an investigation into this matter. I would like to have that point clarified.

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I now beg to move that a Resolution for \$45,711 do now pass.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

1.15 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1955-56, No. 72.

Publicity Committee.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is for the sum of \$5,500. For years the Publicity Committee have been in contact with various Firms or Companies abroad with a view to having a film made of Barbados which can be shown abroad in the interest of the development of the Tourist Industry. The most recent offer has been made by a Dutch Firm called the Carillon Films Ltd.; that is not only the most recent offer, but so far, it is the most reasonable offer in contract prices.

We have offered to pay \$12.50 per minute. It will cost us \$6,000 (Canadian) approximately \$11,000 (B.W.I.). They have offered to show this film in North America, Canada and also in Venezuela later, in which case they will have to change the sound track to Spanish.

Let me say that this is the cheapest offer that the Committee has so far received and that this is a Company which has been highly recommended by the Canadian Trade Commissioner, Mr. Stollmeyer. Indeed the cost would have been higher were it not for the fact that this Company was taking pictures of the Trinidad Carnival at the invitation of the Trinidad Tourist Board and at the same time could include Barbados in their visit. As I have said, the cost of this film is \$6,000 (Canadian) roughly \$11,000 (B.W.I.) and this Government has agreed to the making of this film on a dollar for dollar basis with the Publicity Committee.

The Publicity Committee's grant for last year has been totally spent in its ordinary publicity which is done every year and the Publicity Committee therefore had to appeal to this Government for this assistance. I feel the opportunity is a good one to advertise this Island abroad and that it will attract more tourists. As hon. members know, the Tourist Industry in this island is facing more and more competition from places like Tobago and Jamaica. The people of Jamaica on the advice of the Industrial Bank Mission which visited there sometime ago are doubling their efforts and money in publicising Jamaica. The people of Trinidad and Tobago are also making increasingly strenuous efforts to publicise those islands; therefore we cannot sit back and rely on what we have and what nature has blessed us with and do not make an effort to meet this increased competition from those places. I

therefore feel that this is a good opportunity to publicise Barbados.

May I say that we have given support to it on the basis that the Tourist Industry would contribute half of the amount. Mr. Chairman, I have personally laid down the items that we are going to give this money on the condition that this film must become the property of the Publicity Committee and that it must be shown not only in North America but in the coloured population areas such as Harlem, Chicago and Boston where you have large West Indian communities. I have also laid it down that the film must depict life in Barbados as a whole. It should depict our agricultural and industrial activities and should not be confined to any particular social group or particular exclusive clubs just as some of those which you have on the St. James' Coast. I have laid down those conditions which have been accepted. Therefore, apart from the value of the film as a tourist attraction, it will show various aspects of life in Barbados and as a result will advertise all the features of this island both for tourists and otherwise in North America, Canada and later in Venezuela which is becoming a vast field for our tourist trade. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, it is good to hear the Hon Minister say that he has personally laid down conditions under which the film is to be made. It sounds as if the Government Ministers have some teeth. But when he says that he has laid down conditions under which this film should be made and that it shall reflect the life of Barbados as a whole I am wondering if he means that we should have a few coloured films of the women who sell pottery and a few plantation labourers heading canes or men with spiders drawing puncheons of molasses. I wonder if he has asked that the life of Barbados should be reflected in such a manner that it shows our coloured people in Barbados taking great part in the professional life of the colony such as in the teaching service and that it does not only show men hauling canes to a factory and behind a puncheon. Have you asked them to go into Harrison College—one of the main schools of this island—to take the picture of a classroom in progress? As you know, they can come and give the impression that it is a one-sided community, one side working as labourers and the other side being the aristocracy of Barbados.

So far as to where you propose that this film should be shown that is only a matter of choice.

The Hon. Minister has said that he has laid down certain conditions under which this film should be made and I was waiting to hear what the hon. junior member for Christ Church would say. I will only say a little word about what I expected he should comment on and I believe when I say it, it will cause him to get up and say something. The Hon. Minister said that we are receiving competition in the tourist industry from Trinidad and Tobago and Jamaica. Let me say that Barbados will never be able to compete with Jamaica so far as getting tourists from North America is concerned. If you know any thing of the map you will see that it is purely a matter of pound, shillings and pence that tourists from North America decided on going to Jamaica and it is because they can ride from Miami to Jamaica in a matter of three hours and if such tourists happen to come from a little further North such as from New York, they can ride to Kingston in a matter of six hours.

As long as you persist that these Pan American Airways and American Airlines cannot land here, then American Tourists are not going to come in British Planes in preference to their own, because

Pan American Airways have a plan of their own whereby you can get in a plane and pay for the passage the next year when you are ready to go on holiday, and if you are going to spend money to assist in this way, you can look and see that is the reason why Barbados cannot compete with Jamaica and Trinidad, because a man can leave in P.A.A., in Miami and travel direct to Jamaica without having to wait on a B.W.I.A. Viscount or Stratocruiser to take to him to New York, then to bring him to Jamaica. That is one of the things you will have to keep in mind when you talk about competition. There is no question of competition in preparing a film to show in South America in order to get them to come here. There are 165 million people in the United States and if you want to talk of that source you can get the statistics to prove that more American Tourists travel to Jamaica and Trinidad by American planes than by B.W.I.A., and it shows that their own countries are providing them with the means of travelling in those airlines on easy terms and they can travel to any part of the world. We have to open our Airport to them so that they can land here. The point I am going to raise now is for the benefit of the hon. junior member for Christ Church. There is one thing the Government need not worry about, but I am glad to say that the Government has assisted the people to have tourists come here and there has been a lot of talk about helping tourist trade.

Now, I want to tell the Hotel Owners in this Island something. They have to begin to understand that the tourists are not coming here to pay people in Barbados wages based on tips, but the Hotel Owners must see that they pay them too. That is a warning; I am not saying more today, I will deal with that latter. Sufficient unto the wise!

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, we who are really interested in the Tourist Industry have been hoping that we would have got a colour film depicting life in Barbados years ago. It is one of the best forms of advertising and if you were to hear some of the stories people who arrive in Barbados for their holiday tell, and you enquire why they come to Barbados, you would be amazed at how few people in South America know that Barbados exists. We often feel in our own liberal way that it is the duty of every South American to learn in School that Barbados occupies this position. We fool ourselves about it, but they do not know it. They have told me stories of trying to find information in New York by going to Information Offices and hearing something about Barbados, as being some small island with no information whatsoever, but they still come; and there is one thing that they all say, and that is "Why do you not advertise yourself more?" Our answer is that we are unable, because it takes a lot of money. The Hotel Industry has spent large sums in booklets and every year they have to be changed and they are sent North for distribution, but I am told that a colour film that could be used either on T.V. or among the Clubs would be of the greatest benefit to the publicity of Barbados in the Northern Hemisphere.

There are many clubs that exist, Women's Clubs, Men's Clubs etc., and they are only too glad to have a film which someone can get up and talk about. It gives a very pleasant feeling to see these places on a film. Very recently I saw one on Haiti and it was a beautiful job. As a matter of fact, those who saw it, whether they had money or not would like to go there because if it is anything like what the picture depicted it must be very beautiful indeed. Now, we have this opportunity of having this film taken at a very modest cost; it is only because these people happen to be in Trinidad and their expenses

for that have already been paid, that we are able to get them for this \$11,000, and I am glad to see that the Government has pitched in to help because the Tourist Development is putting up some of this money. Now, I also want to go a little further and say, because I have heard it expressed in certain quarters, that it is the intention or at least it is being toyed with in certain Ministerial quarters that some sort of head tax is to be instituted on people coming to Barbados. I am going to warn you, do not be so stupid to do it yet or anything like it in the near future. If it is one thing that tourists object to is direct taxation especially when they are coming to spend money. You may say that Bermuda does it, but I am not at all happy that a place in trying to develop an industry should institute these things until it is well established.

I have heard it hinted and I am expressing my opinion because once these things get started it is hard to stop them. Until you have actually developed the industry you have no right annoying people that are going to react; and that is enough. I hope the rumour I heard is not true.

Now, this film I understand—I have only met one of the fellows casually and he hopes to come to the House of Assembly and take a film of members and our setup. [A VOICE: You would have to increase the vote then.] I do not know whether we would entertain them in the Lobby, but this film is depicting a varied amount of features of colourful Barbados—I understand that the basket industry in St. Thomas is being filmed and the fishing industry off Bathsheba I understand is also taken. The scenery at Bathsheba is unique. I commend the Government very strongly indeed for bringing this about, and I also want to warn them that they would have to make many more of these, and when it comes to one for Venezuela that is going to cost them 1,000 U.S. dollars to have it done in Spanish and we will need more money, so do not think that this is the beginning and the end of a colour film for Barbados. This is a very good beginning and when the request comes to you for more money to make more productions to scatter across Canada and the States I wish you to give it the same reception that we are giving this today.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

Mr. LEWIS: That cannot be done unless the Hon. Minister first gets your permission, Mr. Speaker, to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member seeks my permission to move the adjournment, I will grant him that permission because there is the customary Rule.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking permission to move the adjournment of the House. I had forgotten that Rule.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

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

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

1.40 p.m.

On re-assembling,

THE ESTIMATES 1956—57

Budget Speech

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the consideration of the Estimates for the Financial Year, 1956—57.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in moving the consideration of the Estimates of Expenditure for the coming financial year, I will say that I have an advantage which I have not had in the recent past in that the House have had a copy of the Estimates in their hands for a longer period than usual. Owing to the sudden summons which West Indian Governments had to attend the Federation Conference in London, which has just ended, that has considerably upset the normal arrangements made for preparing the Estimates and for presenting the Budget. I want to pay tribute to the work of the different Departments which had to work under great pressure in order to get their Estimates ready for an earlier date and to attend to the Ministers' meetings in connection with the Departmental Estimates.

It is true that the time normally fixed is and was September, but the coming of the hurricane seemed to have held up the work of getting the Estimates into the Financial Secretary's Office until the hustle and bustle of the extra work caused by the Hurricane had ended. The House have had the advantage of seeing these Estimates since the 7th February, the date of the opening of the Federation Conference. Perhaps this is the proper place at shorter period, so that both the Financial Secretary and myself would have everything ready before we left for the Conference, all that has necessitated the omission of certain Items under different Heads. Therefore I shall, in due course ask, or the appropriate Minister responsible for the particular Department, will ask the leave of the House to insert other Items. [Mr. LEWIS: Circulate them.] They will be circulated.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to speak in general terms as to the financial position of the Colony before I deal specifically with the Heads to which attention has been drawn in the Memorandum. As honourable members know, we have approached the United Kingdom Government in connection with the Deep Water Harbour plans and in connection with Colonial Development and Welfare grants for the next five years. We have put our case before them, as we had to do, if we were seeking permission to raise a loan in the London Market, and one of the items to which I shall have cause to refer has been much debated, that is to say, the existence of reserve funds which, in the eyes of the United Kingdom Government, should be made use of to carry out our development programme. The upshot of this argument is that we got infinitely less Colonial Development and Welfare grants than what

we had asked for, and what we had up to a point anticipated.

2.35 p.m.

It is with some consolation that I am able to say that no colony which applied to the Colonial Office for a substantial sum of money got it. They were all disappointed,—perhaps not Trinidad because she is one of the rich colonies and she may not want a loan of the same magnitude as other colonies—but in common with Jamaica as well as Nigeria which made applications for increases afterwards, we were told what we got would be all we could get and none of us got anything more than the general promise that such reserves are still there but that Colonial Development and Welfare Funds would not be drawn upon until two years hence, and at the end of two years the British Government would examine how far each colony got with regard to the money which had been granted to it and also how well that money has been spent. In short, there would be a review in two years' time of the position of all the colonies that are asking for more money, and upon the state of their expenditure and development at that time would depend their chances of getting a further grant from C.D. & W. Funds.

As is pointed out here in paragraph 3 of the memorandum it was intended that the second Five-Year Plan should cover the period 1955—60, thus overlapping the 1952—57 Plan by two years and corresponding in time with plans made in other territories. The Government is still planning to spend in the period 1955—60 a sum in the vicinity of forty million dollars on major schemes for the development of the Island and the welfare of its people. The Plan is being revised and adjustments are being made in the proposals for financing this expenditure, but in the main they have not been altered. The sources of financing include the use of surplus revenue balances (about six and a half million dollars at 1st April, 1955) the Labour Welfare Fund (now approximately three and a half million dollars), grants from the Colonial Development and Welfare Fund (which are expected to amount to about three and a half million dollars during the period), loans to be raised locally (about six and three quarter million dollars), and a loan to yield about seventeen and a quarter million dollars to be raised in London for the Harbour scheme. If further external assistance is not received towards hurricane expenditure at present advanced from the General Revenue balance, it may be necessary to modify the proposals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we in common with the other colonies, as I have said a moment ago, had to rest our souls in patience with that promise of a revision in two years' time. Well, the hurricane came and it was perhaps unfortunate, as matters have since turned out, that Barbados did not approach the Colonial Office about this matter in the week in which the hurricane took place before doing any reconstruction ourselves. As honourable members will remember, a cable was sent to Grenada, British Guiana and to us by the British Government promising the making of an initial gift of £50,000 and also promising us that as soon as our reconstruction plans were made and submitted that sympathy would be given to the claims of Barbados. But there is a sting in the whole of that Message because it went on to say "bearing in mind the financial needs of Barbados and its resources." I may say that although on my first approach to the Colonial Office I was only accompanied by the Financial Secretary, when I visited Colonial Office on my subsequent visit I was accompanied by the

other five members of the Barbados Delegation who were all members of the Executive Committee. As you know, the Financial Secretary and the Attorney General attend the meetings of the Executive Committee. All six of us put it as strongly as possible to Colonial Office what our position was. We pointed out that we should not be penalised for having husbanded our resources in the past, and as a result having resources which we could use when the hurricane came by starting at once on work of reconstruction of houses. Let me remind this House that Jamaica had a hurricane in 1951 and it was not until 1953 that Jamaica started to rebuild houses. That colony took two years; we in Barbados did not let two hours pass before we started on our work of reconstruction. We started on the same afternoon of the hurricane. Unfortunately, that has not stood us in good stead. They have said "You in Barbados cannot say that you have no money to spend." They have said "You had the money and you have spent it in repairing and reconstruction." It is hard lines to be penalised for being good. However, we have managed to secure a promise which has not been made to any Colonial Territory and it is an exception to what has been laid down as regards to not touching any of Colonial Development and Welfare Fund for two years.

In order that there can be no mistake as to the future intention of Her Majesty's Government towards Barbados in this respect, I agreed with them on a statement which would be made public and I propose to read it now. We in London pointed out that while it is true that our reserves after the Hurricane were better than before because our Revenue from Income Tax and Customs duties happened to be much more than we anticipated, so actually we were better off than when we last approached the Colonial Office (that was actually so because we had a good rainfall), we still felt that we could present a case to the Treasury which the Treasury could look into. They told us that they have it as a principle that they do not give special aid as distinct from C.D. & W. unless the Colonial territory can show that it has not the money and is in need.

2.45 p.m.

This is the statement which has been agreed upon:—

Barbados Hurricane Rehabilitation and Development Programme.

"In August 1955 discussions were held with the Governor, the Premier and Financial Secretary of Barbados, on the development programme of the Barbados Government, which involved expenditure of £8¼ million. It was then expected that the Barbados Government would be able to carry out a programme of this magnitude, provided full use was made of the financial resources available. It was also agreed that the progress achieved should be reviewed in two years' time, to establish the extent to which the availability of finance was meeting up to the requirements of the programme.

Since then a disastrous hurricane has involved the Barbados Government in heavy expenditure on rehabilitation. The effect of this on their ability to carry out their development programme has now been discussed further with the Premier and his advisers in the light of changes in the finances of the Island Government since discussions of last August, and changes in the probable future calls upon it, for example, the possible need for a salary revision.

It is not yet clear what the detailed effect of these will be. It is agreed with H.M.G. that financial resources are available to carry out the next stage

of the development programme as planned. In twelve months' time the effect of these various changes upon financial resources available for carrying out the remainder of the programme will be able to be seen more clearly. In order to enable the Barbados Government to go ahead with its development programme as planned with complete confidence, H.M.G. will be prepared to provide further C.D. & W. assistance within the terms of the current Act of Parliament if it becomes clear that the effect of the hurricane has been such as to make it impossible for the Barbados Government to carry on, without further help, the agreed development plan."

I have the assurance of the Secretary of State for the Colonies himself that that means exactly what it says; that he has done for us what he has not done to another territory; that he has cut down the period in the case of Barbados to twelve months if it becomes clear that with the money we cannot go on with the Development Plan. They will probably allocate the money necessary for C.D. & W. within the terms of the Act because under C.D. & W. we have to come in for reconstruction and so on, so that while I cannot tell hon. members that the gift is promised, we have the complete assurance today that at the end of twelve months if it is seen that we cannot go on with our spending as we had proposed because we have spent this money on the hurricane, we can then apply and not wait for the general revision. Hon. members will note that the last sentence in paragraph 3 is no longer applicable because of what I have just read. It will not be necessary because of this clause.

Now, to finish this portion of my remarks as to our development programme, I will add that we propose to continue the development programme as planned and in the order in which it was planned, and the Government will take into consideration the possibility of amending our hospital extension plans in the light of the promise made by Her Majesty's Government. I know that all of us will be disappointed in having construed that cable to mean our reconstruction will cost or has cost from three to four million dollars, therefore, give us as near to three to four million dollars as possible, but I repeat I am convinced it is not a smart excuse that without our knowing it the expression is used in the first cable. Our financial need is so strong, it is interpreted by the United Kingdom Treasury that there is no hope that we can out of our funds get the actual cash, but the equivalent of not being let down has been given to us in this solemn assurance. The word "solemn" was actually used in the course of one of our discussions which Her Majesty's Government will not go back on, come what may, that our development plans will not suffer. I am glad to be able to say when the Delegation was in London we had further discussion in connection with the Deep Water Harbour. The position was discussed with the Consulting Engineers and they are drawing up detailed plans and specifications and they are preparing a model breakwater that it is necessary for us to construct. Towards the end of this year we expect that the Contractors and the Resident Engineer will arrive. It is too early to say yet what will be begun first, apart from what we are already doing—the approach roads. Maybe one firm of contractors will sub-contract for the work of dredging and that may begin first. In any event I am glad to be in a position to say that our discussions with the Consulting Engineer enable me to make the promise that the work on the Harbour will begin towards the end of the year.

Hon. members are well aware of course of the setting up of the New Housing Authority. If hon.

members will look at paragraph 5 of the Memorandum they will see the exact amount set out there for financing the New Authority — “\$350,000 is provided for the Authority as part of the capital of two and a half million dollars payable under the Act from General Revenue or Loan Funds.”

We are also making provision for a revote of \$100,000 for Civil Servant Housing. That amount is an instalment of the capital which is being provided for the particular purpose.

“In addition, there will be the statutory payment to the Authority from the Labour Welfare Fund of half a million dollars; and the Authority will also be responsible, under the Act, for the administration of the Labour Welfare (Housing Loan) Fund, which at 31st December 1955 stood at \$2,825,600.”

It has been discovered that the breakages in the mains are far more frequent than was anticipated and the Executive has decided that it is far better to spend getting these weak old mains replaced prior to the extension. It is not a question of postponing extension indefinitely but instead of doing some extensions and some repairs to mains, we have come to the conclusion that it would be quicker to get rid of the old mains and replace them by new ones.
2.55 p.m.

PERMISSION TO TAKE A PHOTOGRAPH OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to make an announcement to the House in order to ascertain the feeling of honourable members. I have been approached by the Film Company whom honourable members have heard mentioned during the discussion on a Resolution for \$5,500 with regard to the Publicity Committee — for the making of a colour film of Barbados. Those who are responsible for the production of that film would like to know if honourable members would accommodate them as far as having a photograph of the House taken downstairs. If honourable members express their willingness to accommodate these persons so far, we could have a temporary adjournment in order to facilitate the matter. I am just trying to ascertain the feeling of the House in this matter because I could not give any undertaking as to the acceptance of the House of the idea. These persons would also like to shoot a picture of the interior of the House itself. I would just like to know if honourable members would accommodate these persons by allowing a picture of honourable members to be taken downstairs.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I do not mind a picture of the House being taken, but I am not going in for any parade before any camera. I am not so fastidious about that; if these people want to take a photograph of the House they can come into the House and do that, but I am not in the mood for going on parade to have any picture taken.

Mr. GODDARD: I do not think that taking the photograph indoors would be as good as taking it out-of-doors, and I would like honourable members to be able to go to the foot of the stairs, so that the photograph can be taken. However, it is purely a matter for the House. This Film Company is taking other photographs as well.

Mr. LEWIS: I intended to make a similar suggestion as that made by the honourable member on my right (Mr. F. L. Walcott). I think that whatever is to be done about the House, these people should take the opportunity of doing it now that the House is sitting. They could have made that suggestion while we were at lunch, and they could have got something when we were coming back into the

House. I do not think that honourable members would accommodate them in this matter by just parading outside. I would like them to leave it out altogether or let them make the best of what they can get here, especially with the Hon. Premier introducing the Budget.

THE ESTIMATES 1956—57—Ct'd. The Budget Speech

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have made a slight reference to the Hospital. As honourable members know, proposals for building a new General Hospital on the Enmore site and converting some of the buildings of the old Hospital into a Tuberculosis Sanatorium have been examined in the past. No decision has been taken because we did not know exactly what the Colonial Office would do. A decision is yet to be taken because one can well see from the wording of the Message sent to us that we could go ahead and build a new Hospital. We do not propose that we should bind ourselves to anything; we have not been back to the Island long enough to have a meeting of the Executive Committee. I do not propose to say anything more than that an examination of the advisability of continuing with our present Hospital extension scheme or having a completely new Hospital at Enmore involving the Expenditure of \$1 million will take some consideration. We will continue with the rest of our development plans.

As to the question of schools and other educational buildings, they would have cost us nearly \$2 million as compared with \$1,378,000. The present Estimates cover the estimated cost of rebuilding Combermere School, and therefore the sum of \$340,000 has been included in the Capital Estimates for this year. Provision for the construction of the new Christ Church Foundation School at a cost of approximately \$400,000 has been made, towards which a grant of \$240,000 from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds has been approved. This was one of the things which I had in mind when I said that we have to be extremely careful in every single statement which comes from the Colonial Office. You do not get all money entailed in a scheme because some of it may be for new construction, and some of it may be for repairs. In respect of the Christ Church Foundation School, \$240,000 will come from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds although it will cost \$400,000.

In connection with Agriculture, the total Expenditure in the Capital Estimates is \$1,163,500, which includes \$700,000 for a meat and fish depot, \$75,000 for the new Central Market, \$120,000 to supplement the revolving fund for loans to fishermen, and \$200,000 for soil conservation. It is quite possible that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture may not be in his place when we are dealing with this Head “Agriculture”; I would say regrettably that we are finding difficulty in getting a really good soil conservation Officer. I say that because at some times we cannot get for the money we are paying, a person of sufficiently good calibre, and we may have to alter the whole amount which we are paying for such an Officer.

As regards the tenantry roads and highways reconstruction programmes they continue to be effected and the capital provision under the headings “Roads” and “Mechanical” amount to \$372,990. Over half a million dollars will be spent at the Airport in the coming year principally on the extension of the runway, and the enlargement of the terminal building.
3.05 p.m.

I do not think anybody would feel that we should not at this stage of our history make our airport as good within our financial resources as any that can be found anywhere in the Caribbean area. At the present moment, we propose to put the Airport in such a condition that it will be possible to take any civil plane that has been constructed or under construction or likely to be constructed in the foreseeable future. From the point of view of our knowledge of what a good Airport would mean to the Federal Capital, I think our Airport will answer up to all requirements.

Mr. Speaker, the Estimate of Miscellaneous Expenditure in 1956—57 amounts to \$221,912 including provision for the completion of the additions to the Town Hall. The 1952—57 Plan allowed \$429,000 for Miscellaneous Capital Expenditure and \$750,000 for New Government Offices and Parliament Buildings, but it is now estimated that the total Miscellaneous Capital Expenditure including Government Offices, which will cost \$580,549, will be in the vicinity of two million dollars.

Hon. members will remember when I read the first paragraph of this memorandum that I mentioned that with our talks with the Colonial Office, we stated that our Estimates of Revenue would substantially exceed our expenditure and as a result we have been able to make an addition to the current Five Year Plan. As mentioned in the first paragraph, the Government has been able to expand its programme because of the increase yields of revenue. In 1955, a sugar crop of 171,000 tons was produced as against an estimate of 160,000 tons and the negotiated price paid by the United Kingdom Government to the Commonwealth producers was \$195.60. There is an obvious error in the printing of Paragraph 12 of the Memorandum by the insertion of \$40 instead of £40. As honourable members know, there is no change in the negotiated price of £40. 15s. and it is quite likely that the figure of 170,000 tons as mentioned in the Memorandum as the estimation of the current year's crop will be reached. Doubtless, the honourable junior member for St. Andrew will be able to enlighten us on that point.

I do not propose to read the comparative table of the value of exports of sugar and sugar products and by-products of the last three years. I will only draw honourable members' attention to the comparative healthy position of the colony. There is still however, as is expected, an increase in the rise of imports. It seems as if in 1955 merchants were optimistic as regards the spending power of the public and the importation of consumers' goods has increased. I can give no particular reason for it except the general feeling that there was plenty of money in circulation. And against this increase in the value of imports, as I have already said, this healthy position of the colony is due in part to people in the United Kingdom sending back remittances and due to the fact that the tourist trade of last year was better than was expected. An indication of the financial position of the colony can be gauged by the fact that we did not have to guarantee, as we have promised the new Light and Power Company Limited, any of the loan that that Company was hoping to get in Barbados; it got it from the general public apparently with ease.

Honourable members are aware of the increase in the Bank rate which is now at 5½% and as a result it is not so good at this time to raise loans but Government feels that it will be still possible for it to raise the \$6¾ million which it requires for our Local Loan. I am sure as far as the Harbour Scheme is concerned that the squeeze which is taking place now

will not affect our raising that loan in London. It may affect the Bank rate, but my reading of the situation in Great Britain after discussing the matters involved with officials and non-officials is that the United Kingdom is in no worse a position at all than it was to the general public. I repeat that actually our getting a loan for the Deep water Harbour will not be affected although the Bank rate will be increased.

3.15 p.m.

I do not propose to read it all but I will draw hon. members' attention to the Approved Estimates for last year. The Approved and Revised Estimates show a balance of \$2m. We have been able to spend more, because, I repeat, of increased revenue. Hon. members will know how difficult it was for us therefore to come within the Treasury definition for financial need. The General Revenue balance is \$3,605,884, Capital Expenditure is now revised to exclude Colonial Development and Welfare Fund \$2,957,652. The Approved and Revised Estimates under the principal heads of Revenue are set out. Allowances are less, rents and royalties are what we anticipated interest and redemption somewhat more and the total Revenue as I read it before is \$14,272,208 and the revised \$16,304,071.

Now, hon. members will of course know that the increase of the sugar crop increased importation and customs duty; the aggregate on Customs Duty went up and that is responsible for the increase in revenue. Similarly, with Income Tax, I would like to say here that although my saying it makes no difference to those who are accustomed talking year after year, an earnest and honest attempt is made in estimating Income Tax, and what it is felt will be collected; and there is nothing diabolical on the part of the Government if some years we collect more than we anticipated.

As regards current expenditure Mr. Speaker a summary appears in paragraph 18. Hon. members will be able to compare the old Estimates with the revised ones. The Revised Estimates exceeds the original Estimates by ½ million dollars and if hon. members will turn to the printed copy of the Estimates they will see the expenditure for several heads. I just mentioned that what seems an obvious cause of the increase in Revenue is the Customs and Excise and taxation. I again say that an honest attempt and not a wild guessing is always made in giving the estimate from Income Tax and other taxation. Some of the increase in the yield in income tax this year is due to unexpected trading profits. When we prepare the Estimates nearly at the end of the year and they are approved by the Executive in January or February it is obviously impossible to estimate very accurately what we are likely to receive because it is still a month or so to go before the end of the financial year. I do not think, however, that in spite of what may have been said for party purposes or for the sake of criticism, Barbados has any reason whatever to regret any decisions taken in retaining certain rates of taxation or expanding a bit in other expenses because with this money allocated we, at any rate, are not left penniless or without some reserves to which we could turn our hand. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, I need expand on that because ever since during the war we raised our rates of Income Tax and we have been able to draw on those reserves and balances chiefly for expanding our housing programme and it was because of that that we are able to do hurricane reconstructions which unfortunately we had to do. Some of the increase, as hon. members will see if they look at the figures, is offset by expected savings under most of the other heads other than housing. Turn to page 5, of the

Memorandum, and you will see the estimated revenue for the Island for the year 1956-67.

The current Estimates are set out on that page to which I called attention. I do not think that there is anything special in that to which I should direct the special attention of hon. members of the House 3.25 p.m.

Over the page hon. members will see what are the Capital Estimates for this year and which are now being presented. There is the Harbour \$1,343,000; Housing, \$450,000; Development Board, \$250,000; and so on. The three chief items are the Harbour, \$1,343,000, Education, \$1,037,000 and Agriculture and Fisheries, \$1,129,000. The sources of our finance will be, Contribution from Current Revenue, \$250,000, Surplus Balances, \$2,958,000, Colonial Development and Welfare Grants, \$598,000 and Loans Funds, \$2,862,000. In respect of Colonial Development and Welfare grants, comparative summaries have been provided for the benefit of hon. members in the Memorandum which they have before them. The revenue which is set out on this page of the Memorandum shows nearly double the amount in 1956 of what it was 10 years ago when the Labour Party first began to direct the destinies of this island. I do not pretend, not even a Conservative Government would pretend, that that is due to the existence of a particular Government, but we have so managed our affairs that the increases in revenue have kept the balance between reckless expenditure and excessive hoarding. We have had our surplus balances, we have had reserves, we have had general revenue balances and we have certainly increased our expenditure along the lines which this Government has promised for many years and which are the things that any Government in power should spend money on so as to improve the standard of living of the population generally.

The Estimate of current expenditure is \$1,745,102 more than the approved estimate for last year. Recurrent expenditure is \$1,118,073 greater than the Approved Estimates for last year, and hon. members have summarised for their benefit, the heads under which these increases have come about. There is an increase of \$303,560 in respect of "Old Age Pensions," which amount is to meet the proposed increase in the rates of Old Age Pensions. The rise in the case of "Subsidies and Grants" is mainly due to the inclusion of the contribution of \$76,840 to the West India Regiment. I am afraid that this will have to continue for another year or so, until the Federation takes over the running of the finance of the West India Regiment. We have increased our contributions to the University College and the Regional Economic Committee, the amounts being \$40,200 and \$22,290 respectively. These latter sums will come under Federal command as well. The increase in respect of Education is due to the increments in Teachers' salaries and to the decision of the Government to do this year what it has recently postponed, that is to increase the number of Assistant Teachers. The figures shown as to the length of time in which Supernumerary Teachers have acted as Teachers made it no longer sensible to keep the number of persons, who were in effect permanent teachers, as Supernumeraries. Therefore 67 of these Teachers were raised from the Supernumerary class to the permanent staff, and that has, of course, caused an increase in the amount for Teachers.

I should say that this Government is not unmindful of the hardships of life not only for Teachers, but for others as well. This Government

is perfectly prepared to consider a regrading of Civil Servants' Salaries on which we are already working. I wish to say this, and I hope I shall not be misquoted: some of the clamour for increases in the salaries of Civil Servants is not based on any figures put up by Civil Servants as to an increase in the cost of living, — which needs to be compensated by a figure having some relevance to the exact amount of that increase in the cost of living — but it has been due to the difficulty which must face a Government like that of Barbados. If you have British Guiana, Trinidad and Jamaica with more resources than we have, making salary revisions and increasing the pay of their Civil Servants, then Barbadians, irrespective of the cost of living, will want a salary revision too. It is difficult, it is impossible, for us to have a race with Jamaica or Trinidad; and the sooner, especially with Federation coming, that Barbadians realise that our position should be half-way house between these Islands — that we should be looked upon as the elder brother of the Leewards and Windwards, occupying an intermediate position on the one hand between the smaller islands and Trinidad on the other hand, between Jamaica and B.G.—the better it will be for smooth relationships between the Civil Servants and the Government, and the better it will be for a broader approach to the question of salaries.

It is a difficult matter when it comes to the provision of technical and skilled persons; in some cases, it is difficult for people to come here for anything near what we pay. It is true that in some professional and technical posts, it is difficult to get people to leave England or any other Country even for what Jamaica and Trinidad pay, but it is better than what we are paying. The filling of the post of the Head of the Technical Institute in British Honduras and in Jamaica was just as difficult if not more difficult, than what we found in trying to get a Head for our Technical Institute. Therefore, it is not necessarily higher pay which will always attract a man, because even that higher pay will not be enough. I wish to make it quite clear that we will continue to lose useful people unless we find, somehow, the money to pay for a salary revision.

3.35 p.m.

Even at the risk of being misunderstood and criticised, I wish to say again that I will consider it a failing of duty on my part to the public if I did not point out that we cannot compete with Trinidad and Jamaica but we can consider from time to time the necessity for salary increases, which may be even as often in the normal times, let us say, as every five years and where the Government is firmly convinced that a regrading of Civil Servants is necessary.

I will say this in connection with professional people. As honourable members know, the Chief Justice is about to retire. I have been assured more than once that there is no chance of getting any Chief Justice to work for what we are at present paying. The Attorney Generalship is now vacant and I do not think that I am disclosing any particular secret when I say that there are no calls by any candidate to the post at the present salary. It is not just because of these things that there is need for a salary revision, but these things will give you some indication of what we must expect.

I think honourable members will wish me before I sit down to tell them something of what the Government proposes with respect to the Transport Service. The Attorney General, the Financial Secretary and myself when we were in England had a number of meetings with some outstanding persons connected with transport and we got some extremely useful ad-

vice and information given us as regards buses. We discussed with them the possibility of financing and improving the Transport Service but in view of the fact that the question of the Government taking over buses from concessionaires is the subject of arbitrary proceedings at the present moment in this Island, it would be improper for me to say anything more on the question except that our eyes were opened on a number of important matters in connection with transport in a big way.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that I need remind the House that transport is a public service of so great importance even in a small island like Barbados that great care and great thought must be given to any proposal for running a bus service by this means or that means or a combination of means.

One last word in regards to Expenditure just in order to give honourable members a break down. The Government has estimated for the sum of \$6,667,702 to be spent under Capital schemes during the year 1956-57. Of this amount, the sum of \$2,861,600 will be advanced by way of loans and the remainder of \$3,806,102 will be financed from Available Funds. Our contribution from Revenue to Available Funds is \$250,000, from General Revenue Balance \$2,957,652, and from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds \$598,450. I have already told the House about the terms under which they might make an Expenditure from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds and I do not propose to refer to it again.

Mr. Speaker, I will say that the question of a Government Printery is still under consideration and the only reason that we have not gone in full fledged for a Government Printery Scheme is because of the question of priority. We are quite convinced that it is necessary that the Government should have its own Printery but it is a question that the suggestion of a new Hospital arose and thereby caused us to have another thought in regard to Capital Expenditure. On this question, Mr. Speaker, we have intensified our investigations as to the limit of the necessary things by way of printing in a minor way other than setting up a large Printery and each Department of Government is asked to furnish an estimate of their requirements.

Now, I should like to mention one or two specific matters to which I referred in my last Budget Speech and maybe before. I am sure that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, at least, would deplore the fact if I sat down without some reference to industry especially the hotel industry. Let me assure this House that the Government has never departed from its views as to aids to industries. Of course, there must be aids to industries if the economy of the island is to be improved but it is becoming more and more imminent that these territories in the West Indies started off with aids to industries by jumping to the first model law they could lay their hands on to aid industry without any investigation or without any working out of the various Acts provided for the aiding of industries, and it shows that in many cases they were unreasonable.

3.45 p.m.

Hon. members know that there have been Economic Surveys in Jamaica chiefly, here and throughout the Caribbean by economists turned out both from the University of Oxford and Cambridge and it is one of the things that they all point to—the racing and chasing between the colonies for aid to Industries Bills without careful consideration to their suitability or applicability to West Indian conditions. I have never made it any secret nor am I going to make it a secret today because I have never been in favour of Income Tax on industry and I do not

care how often it is quoted against me; but in dealing with West Indian conditions, it is given in Trinidad and the position could be so easily understood on industry if we gave it here; that is my own personal view and that has been what the Government acted on. We are going to continue aid to industry; we have already extended this aid to industry which the House will be asked to pass soon on initial allowances in the new proposed amended income tax laws. We intend to stick to that and as long as this unco-ordinated competition of holding out aid to would-be manufacturers continues, we will have to give similar aid.

Hon. members will remember that during last year we not merely helped with our income tax concessions but that there were other concessions to industry that were considerable drawbacks. Free duty was granted on the following when we exported, gas cylinders, articles used in the making of soaps articles ranging from tin cans to cardboard boxes, and hon. members will remember that we altered the Customs Tariff Act so as to let in machinery for the manufacture of animal feed. I know that these are subjects which some hon. members will dilate upon; this is a democratic country. I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have not been as fortunate with the manufacturers and sellers of rum as I had hoped. Last year I announced that the Government was willing to take off duty on imported bottles for the rum sellers if they would use that money in advertising Barbados rum. I have never visited England during the war and I repeat, even on this last occasion, without being asked by people why they cannot get Barbados rum in the shops and why don't we people advertise Barbados rum? The answer is the one the hon. junior member for Christ Church gave in respect of the film: it costs too much. This Government is prepared to repeat its offer with rum. [A VOICE: Get the people in England to take off the tax from the rum.] We are perfectly prepared that if we can advertise Barbados for tourists we can advertise it for rum. [A VOICE: And sell it at what price?] When you are dealing with children you would expect to hear things like what the hon. member has said. But combined talk by West Indians from the British territories is worse than the rock of Gibraltar, but the fact that the other islands are likely to be more successful than Barbados stands out in the lack of one bottle in a hundred finding its way on the shelves of the shops in England. The fact that Barbados rum is what it is naturally makes our competitors do everything humanly possible in pushing their own sales. Hon. members will remember that Trinidad threatened to increase the duty on Barbados rum for obvious reasons and as a result this Government reduced the level of its export duty on rum to Trinidad. We now allow storage of rum in privately owned warehouses. In short, in spite of being a socialist Government, this Government gives the assurance it has given before that any reasonable measure designed to help industry which will of course increase General Revenue will, to put it at its lowest, have the sympathetic consideration of the Government. It is a little frustrating, however, to make a further reduction like the one we made in taking duty off rum and being left with a refusal by the shippers of rum. I repeat, as with double taxation in England, and with English manufacturers having to pay Income Tax in England, the competition we give them amounts to nothing, so with this question of rum duty I am certain that the talk by the West Indies and the British Government will have a result; but let us start at our end first, and I repeat my suggestion again to the rum industry this year.

Hon. members will appreciate the fact that I cannot take every single item that may be of interest to them, but if there are any questions of a general nature which hon. members would like me to answer before the debate is concluded, I shall be most happy to answer them. Naturally, I shall not go into details; details will be done by the respective Ministers in Committee, when their particular heads of expenditure are dealt with.

As I promised the House last year, we propose to follow as clearly as possible the English methods of introducing the Budget and declaring the method of taxation at the same time. I propose now to announce that there will be no change in the rate of income tax for this year and that in consequence a Bill setting out the rate of Income Tax will be introduced shortly. There will be no change in the rates; the exemptions which we promised last year and which I introduced just before the Delegation left for England in respect of medical expenses is I presume on the Order Paper and will be dealt with soon. As we see it in spite of the hurricane and in spite of the necessity to carry on the development plan, we do not think that it would be reasonable to increase the rates of Income Tax this year.

3.55 p.m.

I apologise to the House if I seem to have merely given honourable members a record of figures; but after all, every Budget Speech, no matter how clever a Chancellor he may be, is hardly anything more than a record of figures of the expenditure proposed for a year. At the same time, with the English Chancellor of the Exchequer's Budget Speech at any rate, the Income Tax proposals are given so that firms can know how to regulate their business and not suffer from a sense of frustration, as has existed in Barbados, when the Income Tax proposals came down months after the Budget was introduced. Finally, I thank honourable members for the patience with which they have heard me, and I again promise this: if there is anything of a general nature which I have omitted, it is because I consider that those things I have mentioned are of greater importance than other things which are well within the province of honourable members, and I need not have mentioned them.

I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply in order to consider the Estimates for the financial year 1956—57.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it is true that the Budget Speech of the Hon. Premier was a recital of the Memorandum on the Estimates which is before us, and he did not say anything more than what is in that Memorandum which was circulated to honourable members about two weeks ago. Here and there, the Hon. Premier made some facetious remarks about the aspects of taxation and industrialisation.

At this stage, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was saying that apart from some facetious remarks which the Hon. Premier made, his Budget Speech was a recital of the Memorandum. I think that any member of this House who was not responsible for the preparation of this Memorandum, must see that it gives us an opportunity of seeing certain aspects of the financial position of the Colony, and you are able to make some comments on that. To begin with, Sir, there cannot be any brooding about the matter, and you cannot allow the hurricane to be used as any means of saying that the Colony is in

some adverse position because if you look at page 7 of the Memorandum and at paragraph 20, you can see that the Revised Estimate for 1955—56 reveals that the Government is going to have a gross surplus of over \$2,013,827. When you have a hurricane and there is a surplus of over \$2 million on an expenditure of \$14 million, you can clearly see that that is a substantial percentage of the money which you expect in receipts for your island.

Anyone looking at the Estimates for last year can see what was the surplus budgeted for, and last year, we had a hurricane. When we were budgeting for a surplus of approximately \$400,000 to \$500,000, — I am making the same comment this year as I made last year — and it has turned out that the actual surplus is over \$2 million, you cannot begin with any brooding that your financial position is such that you have to be parsimonious and careful, because in a single year you can show a surplus of over \$2 million which represents a substantial increase of your revenue on \$14 million.

It is not that you are spending \$99 million like Trinidad, and therefore \$2 million is an infinitesimal part of \$99 million; but \$2 million is a substantial portion of \$14 million. In 1954—55, you had a surplus of \$3 million and therefore, you can safely say that this method of budgeting now for a surplus of \$492,816, does not reflect what you have been doing in the past, and the method of budgeting or estimating in the past cannot be regarded as being scientific. If it were scientific, there was some loophole with a view of getting more than you actually budgeted for, and you have put in this figure.

4.05 p.m.

Now, the Hon. Premier spoke at the beginning of his speech of the second Five Year Plan and said that it was included in this year's Estimates. What is astounding about that is that this Chamber does not know what are the contents of the second Five Year Plan nor does it know the reason why it has taken such an important part in the Memorandum. I say, by all means plan for your second Five Year of Development and Taxation. As things go from what was said, you can plan for eternity because you are here for eternity! But let us know what eternity plans you are making so that those of us who would not be caught up would know what plans you are making. This Memorandum does not state what are your proposed plans for the second five years, but it has been stated that the Colonial Office has made certain preparations to see that things are carried out as they were planned.

Now, the first paragraph of the Memorandum on the Estimates contains a very enlightening statement in the last sentence. It is stated that in the light of this and the needs of an expanding economy the Government has sought and obtained the Legislature's approval of important additions and modifications to the Plan. That deals with the first Five Year Plan. What did the Government estimate on in the first Five Year Plan? They worked on the datum that the average estimate of the Island's sugar crop annually was going to be 150,000 tons. Now, this average yearly estimate of 150,000 tons has been exceeded. We do not know what is the Government's datum figure for the annual sugar crop in the second Five Year Plan. No where has it been stated in this Memorandum. Are you planning on the same average annual tonnage as you did before 1952? Is that figure of 150,000 tons the basis for your second Five Year Plan or are you taking a datum figure which is in excess of 150,000 tons for your second Five Year Plan, in order that you may say that this is the

quantum by which you are estimating on the single industry which we have?

We find that the prosperity which we have enjoyed over the last period has been due to the fact that Government estimated for a revenue based on an average of 150,000 tons of sugar annually and that figure has been exceeded each year and that is the reason why you will find that we have had surpluses of \$3 million in one year and \$2 million in the next.

Now, this is important from the fact that certain references have been made about comparison of Barbados with Jamaica and Trinidad. I doubt whether any hon. member of this Chamber has ever used Trinidad or Jamaica as the basis of his argument for determining what our Civil Servants should receive as emoluments or remuneration from the Barbados Government. I will deal with that aspect of the matter later in my speech. I will only say now that the Hon. Premier made a statement about the matter and I have taken down the words. He spoke about Cost of Living very glibly as a means of determining whether Civil Servants should receive higher increases or not. As I have said, I shall not deal with that aspect of the matter at this stage because it will call for closer analysis. When this Government thinks of using the Cost of Living Index to determine what to pay Government Servants, I cannot but say that it is no wonder that employers in this Island, particularly after hearing that the Hon. Premier himself made the statement that unless the Cost of Living Index raises there should be no increase in wages, must come to the conclusion that an increase in wages to their employees is not justified. It is an elementary principle that the main determining matter or criterion in paying better wages or salaries to Civil Servants or private employees is the ability to pay. If there is no ability to pay, there can be no question whatsoever of what is the Cost of Living Index figure, or what is desirable, or what is really necessary, because we know that in many phases of life in order to provide for the things that are necessary you must have the wherewithal. You cannot buy the second suit no matter how much you may need it if you do not have the money to buy it. It ceases to be a necessity of your getting it when you do not have the money to buy it. There can be no question of your basing your remarks on the difficulty of retention of people in your Service in the top brackets when you have shown in two successive years that you have surpluses of \$3 million consecutively. Last year you showed a surplus of \$2 million. How can you begin to use any argument of your not being able to pay people because you are guided by the Cost of Living Index when you have all that as surplus? I will pause at this juncture to say that there seems to be a growing idea in the minds of some people that the money which Government collects is money which accrues in a meeting turn. Some people seem to think that we sit in the House of Assembly and collect this money. It is forgotten that it comes from all sections of the community by way of taxation and that it does not come from any particular section. This Memorandum is a classic one to show what I have been talking about.

From the analysis of last year's budget, it shows that the Approved Estimates for Customs and Excise were \$6,329,000 and the Revised Estimates were \$7,418,000 which is an increase of approximately \$1 million in Customs Duties this year. It shows that the community in general has paid up in Customs duty approximately \$1 million more than what was estimated in 1955-56, so it can be no question that this community does not pay for what it is enjoying. Now, that surplus of \$1 million

more on Customs and Excise was not estimated for. One may say that you are lucky to have received such large increases. But what has been your luck? It is due to your same datum figure of 150,000 tons of sugar which you planned for as an average crop and which has been something in the vicinity of 170,000 tons, that is to say, that you have exceeded your average by 20,000 tons. You will realise, Mr. Speaker, what is the value of 20, 25, or 30 thousand tons of sugar more than you expected to receive at the rate of £40. 15s. per ton. You will realise how the national income is increased by that.

Now, let us look at Taxation. When you say Taxation I take it that you mean income tax. Now the Approved Estimates for Taxation for 1955-56 were estimated at \$5,965,000 and your Revised Estimates have revealed that it is now \$6,618,500 which is again approximately another \$1 million surplus to what you estimated.

Now, Sir, on that I will deal with the last statement made by the Premier in so far as income tax rates and allowances are concerned to prove that the time has come — and I am not one of those people who subscribe to the idea that you should not pay taxation and direct taxation appropriate to your income to run the colony or for the benefit of the colony—but I do ask if the Premier and his Ministers are not aware on what allowances they have been based. Now, with a Budget of this nature and with what the income tax value on that amount is, does it not strike them in the face that the allowance to a single man or to a married man cannot be regarded as fair and in reality to 1956 and times such as these? That is to say, you give a married man an allowance of \$1300. Now you take any analysis of \$1300 today in the community and see a married man living any sort of conventional way of life and paying house rent, having to buy food, clothes and trying to prevent himself from being a charge on the community and see if you can regard that amount of money as a fair amount of allowance to provide for a man in this time.

I can argue that with house rents being what they are and especially if you are thinking not of cost of living but a reasonable standard of living on the basis; I believe you want to create somebody to provide you with a service; and I contend that is why we are in danger of not being able to recruit our own people that would not cost us as much. I go further and say the Government does not recruit local persons or West Indians as such but pay men from the United Kingdom and are forced with a colonial system of paying leave passages that does not rely on any independent community. That is to say, owing to our educational system and to some extent with some of our people today,—I do not know if in a way the Premier meant that you cannot find people in the West Indies with the ability and the calibre to fill these posts, and so you have to go outside. That shows what I am contending, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I draw this analogy at this stage to show the creation of this money for whom it is created and some of the difficulties we are likely to fall into. I will revert to the point I was making about expanding economy. The Government must do their best to stimulate in the community the question of expanding their economy. I do not mean that you must expect the Government to do all; and I believe there are private sources—voluntary organisations and the like—in any community that have certain tasks to perform; but when it comes to your fiscal policy, no one else in the community can control the fiscal policy in any territory or country better than the Government, and it is by the Gov-

ernment's fiscal policy that you determine the type of life you are going to live and the type of economy you are going to expand. If the Government's policy is one of contraction, therefore the community's economy is going to be contracted, and by contraction I do not mean because you are spending money on the programme and building, I mean this policy can be contracted on the basis that if your taxation policy is too rigid, it forces that contraction in the community: because what the Premier has not dealt with here in this Budget Speech is the national income of Barbados to show what has been the trend in the past four or five years. He has not even said what the next five year budget is likely to be and what reference you get in this budget as a difference in the matter of the balance of trade.

The community life in Barbados at all times depends on a one crop industry, therefore, you must depend on invisible income such as remittances you get from various sources. There are aspects of this memorandum that have not been clearly stated. When it speaks here of these important advantages and modifications, I believe it means the modifications and advantages such as the Government buildings or more or less the building programme, but there is one thing that has been missing in the Budget, or in any proposed Five Year Plan. Is there going to be any positive plan so far as industrialisation is concerned? In this it has been stated that we have money set aside for an Industrial Development Board, but the Government's policy on industrialisation in its memorandum has not been stated. That is so, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You can set up an Industrial Development Board but you should also have a particular industrial policy through which you expect your Industrial Board to work and to carry on. But nothing has been stated here even at the same time that your Industrial Board has been set up and I should like to see that. The Government in its own wisdom has appointed the personnel of the Industrial Board without making reference to any of the members of the Board because they think they would come in for criticism, and because in this small island people are very touchy about criticism; they regard it as a personal affront. But I do say I believe there are many more people in this community who have by their own dint of hard work and their courage stimulated in their own private capacities a greater volume of industrialisation and trade than what we have seen in the personnel of the Board. There are so many outstanding examples in this island that there would be difficulty in not finding five unconnected with politics that you could have been justified in choosing, and I say to a large extent that you would be depleting yourself out of the energy and wisdom of your community by not making the best of the best that is available.

Now, I say that no broad statement of policy has been stated by the Government on industrialisation, and it is left to the Board or the personnel of the Board to really carry out a policy that has not been enunciated. My way of thinking of it is that it is a very serious omission because in India and in Pakistan, young and growing nations, they have seen fit to set up Industrialisation Development Boards similar to what the Government has done. They even made it a matter of policy to state what their policy on industrialisation was. Now I would say, Sir, before going further that when the Premier made these facetious remarks about industrialisation and his views about aid to industry, you can only reflect and say that he is not serious about these statements today. In 1956 he is not aware of

the changing economic position in the world today. The United Nations Economic and Social Organisation has undertaken, as a matter of policy for areas such as ours, to begin to foster economic development on the basis of industrialisation, because they have made it clear that there are certain aspects of industry that a Government would have to go in for and aspects that the private individual would go in for. One of the things that was wrong—and an eminent West Indian, Dr. Arthur Lewis, said it on a Commission of the United Nations and it was one of the things he recommended. In the development of undeveloped territories industrially one of the primary needs is attracting capital by offering incentives from the developed areas of the world to come to the undeveloped areas. It is purely a matter of common sense. You are going, as the Premier said, to London to borrow money from the London market because all the money is not available in the West Indies; therefore, it shows that you do not have what we will refer to as the liquid to do these things. Now if you do not have the liquid and you have to provide other things and you are asking for industries, therefore, it follows like night follows day that there is no need getting a bit worried by having something before you. Take the case of Munoz Marin, the man in Puerto Rico; it was through this bias in financial matters that he saw the necessity for making these differences in industry.

4.25 p.m.

Let us be quite frank and full about it. It is not a matter of ideology; it is purely a matter of commonsense. Whether we regard it as taxation policy or not, those areas which have given incentive to people have attracted them. With a one-crop industry, you cannot do otherwise whether you like it or not. On this question of industrialisation in Barbados, I do not pretend that there are wide areas and wide fields for industrialisation; I do not believe that we have enough natural resources for wide scale industrialisation; but the day you give more aid to industries, then you will open up fresh areas and therefore your areas will become areas which are full of riches. When the Hon. Premier made the remarks as to what is his personal view in these matters, you can only take those remarks as his personal view; but when we are dealing with a Budget Speech, the Premier of the Island cannot be just stating his personal views because his personal views might not be the views of other Ministers, especially with a Ministry which you cannot control. You must follow that up with the idea that that is the policy which you want your Government to pursue.

On this question of industrialisation, the Premier's views will have to be modified so as to meet the changed scene. There is no doubt about it that there has been a falling off of people in Agriculture. Sometimes when people become secure, they feel that everybody is secure, and they do not mind what becomes of others; and when it comes to industrial matters, there seems to be the idea that these things will take care of themselves. We can see quite clearly that in this Island, there is no Economic Adviser to the Governor, and no member of the Government can say although your national income has increased, what is the net effect on the unemployment population. What is the national income per head of population and what is the position today as compared with what it was five years ago. When you look at Agriculture, and see the gradual diminution of people in agriculture, you do not see any corresponding increase in other aspects, but you see an exodus of people going to the United Kingdom or wherever they can get to work. You have to be able to see that your fiscal policy must take care of your

trends. This Government needs not only a Financial Secretary, but also an Economic Adviser. We do not want merely a book-keeping method; in as far as your economic trends are concerned, nothing is indicated to you.

In paragraph 3 of the Memorandum on these Estimates, this is what is stated:—

"The second Five Year Plan had been drawn up and was about to be placed before the Legislature when the hurricane struck the Island."

We are not aware of where the second Five Year Plan is, and of how much damage the hurricane has done to the Plan; but we do know from this Memorandum that this Plan was to be placed before the Legislature, and it has not been placed before the Legislature. This Memorandum goes on to comment on something which has not yet been placed before us, and the premise is therefore that you know what this Plan is. This paragraph in the Memorandum goes on to state this:—

"It was intended that this Plan should cover the period 1955-60, thus over-lapping the 1952-57 Plan by two years and corresponding in time with plans made in other territories."

I should like to know what is meant by this phrase "corresponding in time with plans made in other territories." What is meant by that? What kind of territories? Does it mean other West Indian territories or other Colonial territories? What is the relationship between the Five Year Plan in Barbados with that of other people's plans? Is this just an empty phrase? Is it something which was written just to be filled in with words? What is the relationship between our Fiscal policy and Fiscal policy of Trinidad, which we are told we should not follow? It says this:—

"The Government is still planning to spend in the period 1955-60 a sum in the vicinity of forty million dollars on major schemes for the development of the Island and the welfare of its people."

This matter has not yet been placed before us so that we can see what this \$40 million in development relates to. Again there is no point in putting something in the Memorandum with which you cannot deal because it has found itself within the purview of the Estimates and we cannot deal with it like that. The Memorandum further states:—

"The Plan is being revised and adjustments are being made in the proposals for financing this expenditure, but in the main they have not been altered. The sources of finance include the use of surplus revenue balances (about six and a half million dollars at 1st April, 1955,) the Labour Welfare Fund (now approximately three and a half million dollars), grants from the Colonial Development and Welfare Fund (which are expected to amount to about three and half million dollars during the period), loans to be raised locally (about six and three quarter million dollars to be raised in London for the harbour scheme."

As far as the Labour Welfare Fund is concerned, each year you hear that this Fund has collected "X" million dollars. It is now \$3½ million, but under the new scheme of financing the new Housing Authority, the Minister of Housing gave this House the assurance that this Labour Welfare Fund which was created for a specific purpose, would be used for the specific purpose for which it was created, but in this Memorandum that is not stated. The Memorandum states that they are going to make a release of \$500,000 annually to be dealt with by the Housing Authority.

4.35 p.m.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I should like to know is why is it that the needs of agricultural

workers for housing can fall to such a low ebb that you can regulate with certainty for the next five years that do not need more than \$500,000 per annum for loans for that purpose. It has been reported to me that instructions have been issued to some people who are in charge of the Labour Welfare Fund not to give any relief or to restrict the relief to only those people who should really get it. I have had the experience of knowing that a worker was sent to the Labour Welfare (Housing Loans) Organisation sometime in August last year for relief and up to last month or early this month, he had not yet received the ordinary inspection which he was entitled to receive. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are not expanding the economy of the island if you can take money which amounts to \$3 million and keep it tucked away in some place. When you release only \$500,000 for housing loans, you are not allowing artisans in Barbados to get enough work; and you are preventing an improvement in the housing of workers. You are causing that type of housing to be restricted on the basis that you are not allowing the building of enough houses. Some of the people who work in agriculture build their own houses; some get carpenters to build them. Fortunately for the Government, it does not have to build houses for those people; all that the Government is called upon to do is to grant them a loan and those people repay it.

The Government should release money for loans to those people to the extent that it does not injure the Fund itself. When Government releases money for that purposes, not only is it providing them with security in shelter, but at the same time it is providing an expanding economy from what the people have to purchase and pay for the building of those houses.

Do you realise what it is going to mean this year to have more agricultural workers with their houses now that they are going to get more money on their wages through their basic wages being increased? They will be able to provide themselves with houses and will be in a better position to repay their loans. I think the Government knows that they are coming in for additional wages—something like 4.3 percent on the the total time. That additional increase in wages is going to release hundreds of thousands of dollars which are going to be reflected in the lumber yards as well as in additional Income tax. It is going to reflect an added prosperity to the Island. I point that out to you in order to show you that you have a restricted policy in regard to one of the most social aspects of your programme. The Government may be thinking of the Housing situation as a whole but they must bear in mind that the Labour Welfare Fund was not meant to be a substitute for the Housing problem of Barbados no more than the Civil Servants Housing was meant to be a scheme for the whole housing problem of Barbados.

If I may point something out to the Government it is indicated on page 5 of the Annual Estimates under Revenue that the interest and the Sinking Fund will realise \$400,000. It shows that your interest and Sinking Fund on these things which you can regard as those that you are committed to is something astronomical. Is it that you fear you do not have enough money to make loans to Civil Servants for housing? Or is it that you fear that you are not going to get back your money? Let me say that the money which you are going to loan to Civil Servants for housing and that which you are taking out of the Labour Welfare Fund to lend to Agricultural Workers for the same purpose is not a gift

to those people. It is money which you are going to put into a Revolving Fund. It is true that it will be tucked away, but it is not money that you are spending which you know you will not get back, just as if you were spending money on the purchase of a book and if you want another book you will have to take up more money to purchase it. This money which you will be putting by for loans for housing to these people will be put in a Revolving Fund; and with good administration it will revolve around and give relief to the community by giving good houses to the people, and in so doing will reduce the vicious system of high house rents. I believe it will be a very good and safe investment if the Government set aside more money for Civil Servants' housing; and Government need not have any fear of repayment because it can always get money from them as it can be deducted from their wages or salaries, whatever you term their emoluments to be.

I am suggesting to Government that this restricted policy on the Labour Welfare (Housing Loans) Fund is not in the best interest of the community and Government should at an early stage make the maximum relief by a greater loan from the Labour Welfare Fund to people in the sugar industry. You passed a Bill last year to increase the Labour Welfare Fund by collecting \$4.20 per ton for that purpose and at the same time you are restricting the money you are going to give to the same people by way of loans. Why have you put all this money to the Labour Welfare Fund and then you are not prepared to use it for the purpose which you deducted it to serve? You took out this money and put it to the Labour Welfare Fund to serve the people who work in the sugar industry on the basis of loans to them so as to aid them in the repairing and construction of their houses.

4.45 p.m.

The Conservative Party in their campaign tried to use one of these fast ones that people think at night and before the heat of the sun. Well, that is like a duppy parasol! This idea of giving people money and not allowing them to pay it back will not work. That is done in the electioneering stunts. Everytime there is electioneering, somebody rakes up some old gramophone and tries to wind it up and it would not work; before it gets half way it stops. It is nonsensical to talk about giving money out of the funds because it would collapse like a concertina. I cannot understand why there are restrictions at this stage when you have done your best to get more funds in it. It is false for the Government to attempt to make the Labour Welfare Fund be the creative source for general housing policy in the island. It was not intended to be so. It was intended to be a Labour Welfare Fund and for this specific purpose. I hope that when the appropriate Minister has to reply to that he will reply to it in no vague way; but quite definitely what worries me is that there is an attitude by some Ministers of what they do, they do. It doesn't matter; but if you have the responsibility for doing something you must tell those to whom you are responsible why you have done it. These are the essential elements of a Democratic Government. The reason why I say that is because from certain replies that have been made on this same Labour Welfare Fund the Minister responsible for Housing has not yet stated positively what the policy of the Labour Welfare Fund is. Are you going to use it for Labour Welfare purposes and for what it was created—to help people in the sugar industry? That is what we stated and I hope you will remember that. You can ask the Attorney General to look up the Act and see the words and see if there are any loopholes in the wording, and if you

can buy a Bay Estate, something at Cove Bay and something where for political expediency you can use it because you can always say you are housing people in the sugar industry. But I can find no positive statement by the Government as regards lending the same quantity of money to people in the sugar industry—people whose houses need repairs but who cannot do it because they cannot go to Mr. Haynes or Mr. Long to get the money and so have to wait eighteen months. On the other hand, Government can use it to buy a whole estate. [A VOICE: We are going to buy one in St. Peter.] You can buy one anywhere you like; I know you were responsible for doing the road in the "Whim." My time comes; but all you will get is cheap jibe from the Minister; that is the type of mentality that you have running a Government, that what you do you do for political party purposes, that is why he can say in a *sotto voce* remark he is going to buy one in St. Peter. St. Peter is a parish of this island and I am a member representing that parish, but he. . . .

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it when you say "he" you are referring to somebody other than the Minister.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I did not intend to be unparliamentary, but that remark which came from the hon. member saying that he will buy one in St. Peter had to be replied to. I say it should be the policy of this Government that the Labour Welfare Fund should be used in the agricultural industry, for workers in the sugar industry who want to repair and reconstruct their houses on the basis of lending money and repaying it as a loan, and I feel it is as solemn as the promise of the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the Premier in respect of loans now taking place. You cannot have solemn promises and do not allow them to get the full benefit from them. If the Government's policy is that instead of lending money they are going to build an estate for them, that is part of your scheme; but do not tell me, Sir, you are going to restrict the loans, because if you leave these homes wanting repair unattended to, they will deteriorate. I do not know if what I am saying does not make sense to the hon. member. A house must deteriorate if a man applying for a loan to repair it in February does not get it until February the next year.

Now, I am sure everyone in this community is pleased to know that so far as our hospital is concerned, positive attempts are made to do something about it in this financial year. There is only one mistake and that is this. I see in the Capital Estimates, Mr. Deputy Speaker that they propose spending \$6 million. I wonder if they can really spend \$6 million or whether that is put as a target and it is there for good reading.

Now, I have been noticing for some years, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they put things in the Budget that read well, but are not accomplished — which means a different thing. It is good reading when you take this but on close analysis can you spend it? To budget for something you are not going to spend is pulling a fast one as the American would say, and I do hope that what we budget for is something that we are going to receive. Now, what the Government must look upon is something that is scandalous, not from Government's point of view, but may be it is one of the legacies that Governments pass on to each other. Now, when you look at the idea of building another Combermere School at the cost of \$340,000, any one can say that this community has had one of the roughest deals that any community could have ever had, to be called upon now to pay \$340,000 for another school that cost this community substantial funds.

Nothing today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is more indifferent than the loss in the academic value to the children of this school by these repeated disruptions. You can only say it is a pity that they have not yet found ways and means for the community as a whole to be able to sue and get back from people things when you get these monstrosities coming upon you.

Now, we did not pick up this money, and everybody knows that living in a place like Barbados without any abundance of breadfruit trees, mango trees or citrus that we either work or starve, or, in the alternative, steal: which is not very bright. So you see when the community is left with an evil, I must offer my sympathy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we are landed with these costs to another school like Combermere. It is something that we must make comment on, because we do not find money to carry out these projects so easily.
4.55 p.m.

I do hope that what we propose to spend now will be well spent, and in the next five years we will not be called upon to spend a similar amount.

In so far as the Foundation School is concerned, this will be a matter in the details of the Estimates, but it does seem to me—I do not know on what the figures is based or what type of School they are going to build—that this sum of \$400,000 is a very high figure to be spent on building this School. I am not an expert in this matter, but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, these figures sometimes have me somewhat astounded to know why they are so high.

I hope the Hon. Premier will answer this point. It is a point which relates not to the Fiscal policy, up. As to an analysis of the subjects which are being dealt with by the respective Ministries, you but to the general policy under this Ministerial set have the subjects which are being dealt with by the Hon. Premier. I want to say this, that unless Almighty God has blessed any one individual with a monopoly of everything in life, it would be a human impossibility for any man to deal adequately with the subjects which are allocated to the Premier. He is responsible as Minister of Finance, he is Minister of Education with all the Schools under his control, he is in charge of legal matters, of Police and he has one of those nebulous portfolios—general purposes. I want to say that in the interest of the community and in the interest of commonsense, the Premier could as well see that the time has arrived when, if it is a matter of pride or self-esteem, he could as well relieve himself of one of these important portfolios in order that the work of the Colony can be more expeditiously dealt with. If he were as young as I am now, and with a little of my energy, (thank God for it,) then it would be understandable but an old man must understand that he is an old man, and do not worry to think that he can do these things which he could do when he was a young man. [Laughter]. Let somebody else do some of these things and do not think that they cannot be done as well as you can do them. When you pass on, these things have to be done whether they are done as well as you could do them, or not, they have to be done, and do not think that you will be resurrected to do these things. I feel that the community would be better served if the Premier were relieved of some of these portfolios, and the Ministers should tell him so.

I do not want to take the Premier's place and therefore I can make these statements quite objectively and dispassionately; but in the interest of the community, I am impertinent enough to say that the Premier should give consideration to relieving himself of some of these portfolios in order that things could be more properly dealt with.

At this stage Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I have made a remark about education in order to show to the public that the time has come when the Premier should look at things in this light, and not regard himself as being able to do all of these alone, and not regard it as something in which he should not be given assistance. I do not want the Premier's remarks to be taken in any controversial sense, but I would like his remarks to be taken for what they worth and what he intended them to be. In his closing remarks, the Premier made reference to the salaries of the Civil Servants and their possible revision; but he made this unfortunate statement that some of the clamour about wages in the Civil Service is not based on a rising cost of living. The Premier should know that for an increase in the salaries of Civil Servants to be based only on a rising cost of living, that cannot meet the day. As things are today, there may not be any sharp increase in the cost of living, but we know that there are other hidden things which you do not see in the Cost of Living Index, because that is only an indication of what has taken place. These remarks coming from the Premier would make others in the community take guidance from him. Fortunately the Government does not control the receiving end of workers in this Island in a general way.

When we come to deal with the body of the Estimates, there is a new Item which the Government is going to introduce, which will astound you, Mr. Speaker. You cannot believe it, Sir, but I had better not say what it is because they may amend it before we come to it. [Laughter]. However, Mr. Speaker, you will be shocked to know that the Government is putting in a new Item to the amount they are putting down.

When you look at the Estimates, you have to consider what are the present wages which the Government is paying and what are the conditions of work. Do you realise that when you look at the back of these Estimates in the Key Scale, you will find that the Government is today paying such low wages that as we find in private employment, employers are telling you they are not prepared to pay any more wages as long as the Government remains at that figure? You are aware, Sir, of the arguments which we have to use in order to show that a private industry cannot be measured by anything the Government is paying. They pay a Cost of Living Allowance, but when you look at the back of these Estimates, you will find something about a female labourer being paid 17c an hour and a male labourer is getting 21c an hour as a basic wage, which means that he works for about 7/- a day.

Of course he gets cost of living allowance along with that. As I have said before and I will repeat again, it is unfortunate in this island that the rates of pay of the Civil Servants are made in a single structure so that if you want to push up the wage rate of one particular set of labourers you will have to push up all the others. You have one type of labourer tied to the other and that is a legacy which you have to face.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Speaker, I understand it is your wish that I make a motion for the adjournment of the House for half an hour and if there is no objection, I beg to move that this House do now stand adjourned for half an hour.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to second that.

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

5.10 p.m.

On re-assembling.

BUDGET DEBATE — *Cont.*

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the honourable junior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to page 2 paragraph 14 of the memorandum of the Estimates. It is stated:

"As in the previous year the total exports in 1955 were valued approximately forty million dollars, while the value of imports was fifty-three million dollars (as compared with forty-eight and a half million dollars in 1954.) The rise in the total value of imports has therefore continued, indicating an upward trend not influenced by war or threat of war as existed in 1951 and 1952 when the value of imports rose from thirty-nine million to over fifty million dollars. Figures so far available show that the increase is attributable to the importation in 1955 of greater quantities of consumer goods. The further increase in the unfavourable visible trade balance is more than covered by remittances, tourists receipts and other invisibles."

I have quoted that paragraph because I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Premier when I mentioned earlier about income tax that the figures showed that Government had collected something within the vicinity of \$1 million more than they estimated from Income Tax. I would like him to say, without stating precisely the figure, what is his own conclusion about the matter. I do not believe this Government is in favour of making a distinction between earned and unearned income; perhaps they think that the community is small and the amount of people in the unearned income bracket is negligible; and because of that, they need not necessarily go to the trouble of making that qualification. I will not go as far as to say that the ordinary man liable to Income Tax does not have any allowance for certain things but as to the allowance you give of \$1,300 to a married man, you can very well say that that amount cannot be regarded as a reasonable amount as compared with what it was originally, now that standards of living have changed. Therefore it means that you are going to get more people paying Income Tax because you have a wider variety of people with better wages. I do not know if members of the Government are aware that the more you give people to spend and so increase their purchasing power, the more you expand the prosperity of the community. When you give people a better wage, you help them to do some more positive spending, which is reflected even in your customs revenue. It enables them to pursue a better way of life. If Government make an analysis of the people whom it aids by building a house for them to rent (you say a man working for \$15 per week or \$60 a month you will allow to rent a Government-aided house) it will see that by so doing, it does not allow them to do things for themselves. I say that in no disparaging way.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come when the Government should look into the question of the Revenue Equalisation Fund. The time has come when they should say if they are going to take out each year what they have already agreed upon in the light of changed circumstances. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that in this Budget no provision has been made for Federation, nor has there been anything

said about what the Federal proposals are likely to be more than that the financial and economic implications of it have to be carefully considered in planning for the future development of this Island; so you can see that all these things are subjected to the final conference on Federation.

I do suggest quite wisely that there is no point in your retaining or sticking to the figure in the Revenue Equalisation Fund if you find that by so doing you are withdrawing from the community (and by the community I mean even yourself) some money which could be well spent on things which you now avoid doing on the basis of having to put by something for a gloomy day.

Now, Sir, I am not aware of the conversations which the Hon. Premier had with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, but I am aware that the British Labour Party does not support the British Government in any parsimonious policy with respect to colonial development. Let me digress to say that despite what people here may think, the British Labour Party has as much chance of taking over the British Government as the Conservative Party which is now the Party in power. Mr. Creeche Jones of the British Labour Party has written a first-class manual on Colonial Development. From the Party's point of view, they never relate independence of the Colonies with any question of their getting assistance from the United Kingdom Government. Less than three weeks ago, I was talking to a member of the British Labour Party in the United States about what was reported at some of the talks of the Labour Party in England. He said that they were worried about emigration of West Indians to England on the basis that their attitude to the matter was that the United Kingdom Government should begin to create some sort of plan in West Indian context such as the Colombo Plan which was formulated to help these territories.

5.50 p.m.

So I do not subscribe to the fears that the United Kingdom can allow the Barbados Government or any of these Governments in the West Indies to become economically or financially bankrupt and that remains nobody's business. It is no more than I can safely prophesy that you, Mr. Speaker, and none of us in this Chamber are going to live long enough to see an economic collapse take place like in 1929. If that happened, I would take all modern economists and put them against a wall and shoot all of them — men like James Maynard Kean who saw efficient running of United Nations monetary funds and those international organisations that seek for the colonies. So we should have no fear in our minds that we are going to pass through a period where we are going to be unaided. This is a period where one Government will help another Government. We have an example in India. India did not tow the line of the United Nations. Mr. Nehru did not tow the line, but that did not prevent them from helping India. Pakistan was no more favourable; it did not prevent them from giving aid to Pakistan. Similarly with Burma, they did not tow the line, but it did not prevent them from receiving aid. So we have reached the stage of independence where we still labour under the colonial yoke and there can be no question of not having economic or financial aid when it comes to world-wide projects. As I said earlier with the Deep Water Harbour, do you know what the Deep Water Harbour is going to mean to the local population? We do not know yet, but we agree that it was something we should build though I believe in a narrow sense it is going to deprive some workers of their regular sources of employment; but these are chang-

ing times, and we cannot look at the fact that they are likely to lose a job here today and do not do something that, so far as the future is concerned, is going to mean something to your territory if you want to keep pace with modern trends; and it seems to me we have to point out these issues if the future is going to bring on these difficulties we have seen.

Now, your Customs and Excise Taxation as can be seen have produced an amount, approximately 15% or 20% more than you had budgeted for. In this Memorandum it is not stated quite clearly. Well, we are budgeting for these increases because they have often increased and our expenditure calls for more. If that were so, then I believe you would have increased your expenditure more than you have increased it now. You have not done so; that is to say, you have still gone on with an accurate increase in expenditure and you have not budgeted here for an increased expenditure that would go as an average between your two rising increases. You work on an import basis; there may be very good reason for that, but I would say that where there is need for expansion of our expenditure without in any way damaging your economy, there is no harm in doing so; and I will repeat again even if this island — as I said last year and it was used against me — had budgeted for a deficit last year, in truth it would not have been a deficit when you came to the final analysis, because you budgeted for \$200,000 last year and ended with \$400,000. But some people believe if you budget for a deficit, no one will make you a loan! It does not work this way.

There is a matter I would like to touch upon that is going to cause a little heartache to some people, but when you are in public life you have to look for these things. I am glad to see that provision is made for a new Housing Authority, but there is one thing I am alarmed about as a Barbadian, and that is that we cannot find in this island one single person to undertake any new task other than Mr. Chase and sometimes Sir John Saint. I want to say that the Government in providing this new authority should have given it a little bit of a new look, new life, but the only person the Government could find is a man who is going to receive \$3,000 as a lump sum for preparing the allocation allowed. Is he so pliable to the Government that they can only find him to do these jobs? It is a sad reflection on this island that a man of no outstanding ability — I want to say Sir John Saint is a man of outstanding ability and between himself and Mr. Chase there is a great difference, so there can be no question about that — can be singled out. Is he singled out because he is a white man and no black man can be found, that all black men must go home and live on pension? The reason I say that is this: I do not want to call names but I know there are many other men who could do these jobs and have done similar jobs in the island. What I am worried about — and I say this without any apology at all to the holder of the office, but with no view to damaging that you cannot speak of people in this community. Well, I would have to be in Westbury Cemetery to avoid that. By all means he has served well as a Government officer, but I would say this: an analysis of his service has not left any of these visible marks that you can say, "Well, look what he has done;" and it seems to me that it is a sad reflection on this community that we have to rely on people like that every time there is a job like this to be done. It does not seem that you are combing the community enough and you are putting money into retired people's pockets; not that I have any objection to

retired men, and I hope that the government will see that. I spoke about the Development Board and I know the views. I heard the views expressed on some occasion about the personnel of this Board. What I would say, Mr. Speaker, is that in a community as small and as compact as Barbados, you should aim at getting the various segments of the community represented on Boards of this nature. 6.00 p.m.

Now there is a tendency, and this Government is in some respects carrying on that tendency, that when it comes to Boards of different types, a merchant, or planter or somebody in some aspect of big business has, of necessity, more knowledge of dealing with matters than anybody else. I do not believe that any of the people of the Development Board has been selected by Organisations; I believe that they were selected as persons, but let us say that they are people in the main who represent the Chamber of Commerce. However, in a changing scene like this, where there is a Socialist Government in power, I think the pattern which is being used in the United Kingdom should be used in Barbados. In the United Kingdom you would not find a Board which would reflect people of the employing class on it. I would challenge any member of this House to name a Board of a similar character in Great Britain to-day, or any Board which has been appointed by the Labour Government between 1945 and 1950, on which the only appointees to it are the employing class.

One example springs to my mind at once. Sir Walter Citrine is the Chairman of the Government Electricity Board; he was the General Secretary of the British T.U.C. In Barbados it would be difficult to find people of that type on these Boards. People like ourselves would be excluded by the Act; we are not speaking in a personal sense, but these Boards actually reflect the views of the employing class. I should like to ask this: could only such people be capable of advising the Government and sitting on a Board which would stimulate trade? In this Country a planter or merchant does not stimulate trade. The five Ministers are men who, hitherto, people would say, were incapable of running the Government, because they had no previous knowledge of running any Government: but today they say that they are running the Government better than anybody has done before. However, they are sitting in judgement on issues, and they are actually condemning themselves. None of them has ever been on boards of this nature, but they say that there is no other person in the community who is capable of sitting on these Boards and running them like that. You are perpetuating the old mental approach to economic matters when you say that unless a man is a Manager of an estate or of a store, he is not capable of possessing views on such matters. I would say that I would not exclude such people from a Board. I do not want to be invidious and call names, but I would give two examples in my lifetime and I hope nobody will charge me for saying anything against the persons concerned.

The names of these members of the Development Board have been Gazetted. I have nothing against the personnel of the Board. One gentleman is Mr. Carew of Swan Street, but can he stimulate greater trade than Mr. Wilson also of Swan Street, who, by his initiative and drive, has built up one of the best businesses in the area while the others have been staid? You have to take people with drive, energy and dynamics; we are not talking about any political approach or mamby-pamby, and it is not a question of your father having left a business for you, and you could not make the best of it. The Act under which

this Board is created talks about stimulating trade. I am a Trade Unionist today and do you think that a man who has no organisation could tell me how to run mine? You have a man who cannot stimulate his own business and are you asking him to stimulate yours? No matter how affable and nice a man is likely to be, I feel that it is necessary for you to look around for the people who can help in these matters.

I am not looking for any argument, but "by their fruits ye shall know them." You have to produce results in your own walk of life so as to impress people. I have no objection to Sir John Saint as a man; my own objection is that he is placed in such a position that I wonder why the same man who is a member of the Executive Council and Chairman of the Public Service Commission which deals with the recruitment, retention and employment of Civil Servants, should be placed in what you would regard as a treble and an invidious position of being asked to be Chairman of a Board of that nature, and at the same time be a member of the Executive Council. Why is it that you are putting this man here? Do you mean to say that as Chairman of the Board he would know what the public would desire and that is why you have put him as Chairman? The Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour is responsible for that particular portfolio, and I suggest that you had better put that Minister as Chairman of this Board 6.10 p.m.

I take notice of that matter because in the United Kingdom I do not see them putting members of the Cabinet on such Boards. Lord Citrine, who is Chairman of the Electricity Commissioners is not a member of the Cabinet nor is Sir Bryan Robertson. The latter is Chairman of the Transport Commission. I am wondering why is it that you make this close association in Barbados. It does not seem to me to follow the practice in the United Kingdom.

The Hon. Premier dealt with the question of the salaries of officers such as the Attorney General and the Chief Justice. He has given the idea to-day that you should make a difference when it comes to the Civil Servants Salaries' Revision in respect of technical and professional posts such as that of Chief Justice. Earlier he said that we should not run in the race with Trinidad and Jamaica when it comes to paying salaries but later in his speech he said that you cannot ignore what is taking place in those colonies when you have to deal with people such as the Chief Justice; therefore, the Government is making comparison of Barbados with Jamaica and Trinidad from the point of view of the recruitment of top ranking officers. However, when it comes to the average cantoneer and artisan he does not make any comparison. As a matter of fact, nobody makes any comparison with the cantoneer or watchman or any of these people whatsoever. Nobody says that they should be paid on the same basis as a man doing similar work in Trinidad or Jamaica. What is the difficulty here is that you make comparison of certain posts here with certain similar posts abroad to which much higher salaries are paid but you never do it with people who work in the very low grades.

I have one statement to make about this matter. It is a serious indictment when you say that you cannot get a man to fill a post unless he can fit in a certain groove. The post of Attorney General has been vacant for some time. When the last holder of that post came to take up that position nobody knew of his ability. He was recruited by the Colonial Office. That officer has gone to British Guiana and I would say, without any reflection on him or any other officer, that I wonder what the Hon. Premier would have said if the present holder of the post of Puisne Judge was called upon to fill the

post. Personally, I believe he would say that he would not be of the calibre to fill the post but I would say that there is a Barbadian who is Chief Justice of British Guiana and if he were asked to fill the post of Chief Justice of Barbados before he was appointed Attorney General of British Guiana he would have gladly accepted the offer. He left Barbados as Judge of the Assistant Court of Appeal and went to British Guiana as Solicitor General. Do you mean to say that he would not have accepted the post of Chief Justice of Barbados if he were offered it? Do you mean to say that Sir Donald Jackson, who is a West Indian would not have accepted the post of Registrar of British Guiana? There are other people, such as Sir Donald Jackson and Mr. Holder who would be willing to accept posts such as the Chief Justiceship of Barbados at the same salary it is now and look on it as promotion for them. I do not know what salary Mr. Ferguson or Mr. Archer who are two Barbados Scholars get for the posts they hold in Trinidad but I see nothing so wrong with their character as to prevent them holding the top ranking post in the legal profession in this colony.

However, I do not want to hear that we are making the reflection on our own people by our saying that we do not have the men of calibre to hold the post of Chief Justice or Attorney General of the colony. I do not want to call any names, but I want to say this Mr. Speaker, I am an ordinary layman who keeps out of the Courts. Do you mean to tell me that Mr. Justice Chenery, a Barbadian, could not be Attorney General or Chief Justice of Barbados? Do you mean to tell me that he would not accept the post at the present salary? Does he not possess the best legal qualifications or the character to be Attorney General or Chief Justice of Barbados? Personally, I think the only thing which is against him is that he has too much intelligence as a coloured man. I do not think anyone can say that Mr. Justice Chenery is not a suitable person to adorn any of our high posts in the legal profession. Of course, if it is somebody's idea that a coloured Barbadian must not sit down in the seat of Chief Justice, well then, that is something different.

As honourable members know, in Barbados there are a lot of lawyers. If there is one thing which we have in our community, it is lawyers; they are nearly all-a-penny. They cannot get sufficient practice at the Bar and very soon you will find them pushing people out of the Civil Service. I cannot understand why the Government should be faced with so much difficulty in filling these posts on the present salary arrangement. It is true to say that Sir Allan Collymore is an eminent Chief Justice and a very nice man, but he was a young lawyer like anybody else in that profession. As a matter of fact, he was not heard of as Mr. Henderson Clarke was in his day, but today Sir Allan Collymore is regarded as a very sound judge. Do you mean to say that we have finished having people like that? Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if your post as Speaker of this House of Assembly were an elected one in which the Colonial Office had to concur in the appointment, you could not preside over our destinies because I do not know what qualifications they would lay down for a person to be able to fill the post. Perhaps, they might say that for a person to be qualified, he would have to be a lawyer of fifteen years standing.

6.20 p.m.

Now I am going to say this: there are enough capable West Indians that can hold every post that

we have in Barbados with few exceptions such as your Water Engineer and your Highways and Transport man and an excellent man you have in your Director of Public Works, Capt. Tomlin, and the reason why I say with few exceptions is because the average West Indian is not given the scope for employment in taking these professions. The type of industry that we have has absorbed the West Indians and when I say West Indians I mean coloured West Indians, and precluded our people from taking these professions; and so they were forced to take the legal profession in order to work for an independent living. And because they had to look for jobs it means we have to look outside for engineers and the like and therefore you get these exceptions; but you can get them in the West Indies. But what has happened is this: there is an innate prejudice against West Indians themselves holding these posts and they say you have to be recruited from outside. I am going to make this statement for the five Ministers running this island and not the Civil Servants: I want to ask where the five Ministers have been. If we can produce people in our own territory to run our own public affairs like the men who are running Trinidad, Jamaica and Grenada and so on, why can we not find other people in the survey to do administrative work? They have never been given the opportunity, and therefore you say they are incapable of doing administrative work and this question of the cost of your Civil Service would have been lower had it not been that maybe throughout the West Indies it is geared to something not of West Indian origin. By that I mean if your Civil Service in the West Indies must be based on English standards, therefore you will have leave passages of \$100,000 a year free of income tax. I say that because I would not like to see the Civil Service reduced to a stage where you regard them as incapable and the top posts have to be recruited from outside; because a man can get a better job in Trinidad his salary cannot be regarded as appropriate for the service he is performing.

The Premier made the point about the Transport Board that it was not his intention to say anything as he had to wait the decision of the arbitration. I said it already and I will say it again that it was a good day when the concessionaires refused to carry out the buses. It was a good day because had they carried out the buses the familiar words of the Premier "why run something if somebody is going to do it as good as you" would not have revealed that the present Chairman of the Transport Board is a capable man with ideas to spare and he can show this Government how a service for a small island like Barbados can run and put itself on a proper basis and how you can run it more economically than the sixteen or seventeen concessionaires who had them. The fact is that you can create a system which would prove to be economic and serve the public well. Had that not happened, a man of his ability would not have been used or forced to be used in the manner in which he is used now to show what can take place. We do not know the policy of Government on Transport but I would say that in the interest of the community more things like Transport that come within public utilities should be in the hands of the Government. You are gradually moving towards the stage in Barbados where it can be clearly seen that profits are hidden by private sources. Nobody really knows what money they make; we only hear of them when they lose money; but in the public interest many of the people who work for them have to work for wages that are below the subsistence level.

Now, I would say this for Captain Barron as a public officer. He is not only sympathetic and efficient, but he is human. He is not one of those technical officers that like to put something on drawing paper and it must work out without relation to human beings; and that is why he is as successful as he has been. And moreover, when it comes to salaries, this is what I have to admit: you cannot in Barbados keep men like Captain Barron and Captain Tomlin and may be Mr. Garrod on the basis of paying a salary to attract them as individuals, because at some time or other somebody with more wealth is going to take them away.

Now, I agree with the Premier that you cannot compete with Trinidad or Jamaica; you would be stupid if you tried. How can you do it with a budget of \$13 million or \$14 million as against \$99 million in Trinidad? You cannot compete with them, because the men who work in these islands show they are bigger territories; Jamaica has a budget of \$60 million to \$70 million and British Guiana \$40 million to \$50 million, but there are certain salary grades and recruitments that you cannot ignore and that is where I agree with them. So, I do not think any member of the Legislature here in this House has ever made these comparisons. Unfortunately or fortunately, which ever way you care to put it, the comparison is often made by people who have been Commissioners. The last changes we have had on the technical and professional staff were based on the changes that took place in British Guiana. The Ministerial construction of Barbados was not based on the British Guiana economy but the salaries for the Ministers were based on the British Guiana salaries for their Ministers. In British Guiana the Ministers receive £1,500 per annum and in Barbados £1,500; but I do not think that any one in Barbados would be entitled to say because British Guiana paid their Ministers £1,500 with an economy or budget of \$40 million, therefore, Barbados should pay their Ministers not £1,500 but £X in relation to what \$14 million is; the proportion to \$40 million, may be a quarter of the amount. But you can never run on these limits. You have to say certain things are comparable though not identical, and I do hope any Government in power will not find itself in an invidious position wishing to retain its power at the future elections by not paying heed to the requests of Civil Servants on the basis of salaries, if it is no more than saying a revision will be made. It is politics today at least to pay heed to those who are knocking at your door, because some Ministers were very cocky in themselves at the beginning of the year in thinking that they can ignore it, but I know as time draws near they cannot ignore it if they want to retain the position they hold so dear to themselves. With these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the approach that has been gradually made in constructing the budget is an improvement on what it used to be in that you can have a clearer picture of the things within the budget and we can more clearly and intelligently deal with the various heads.

I have spoken about the omission from our Officers in this Island such as an Economic Adviser, and I am hoping that in the Five Year Plan of Development, the Government will see the necessity of having the post of Economic Adviser. If you are going to spend this \$40 million in the next five years on Capital Development, it is necessary for the Government to have an Economic Adviser and not rely on the Financial Secretary to assume the Office of Economic Adviser.

6.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for the City, who seconded the motion for the adjournment, has the right to speak now.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, the first thing I would like to do on the Estimates is to call attention to what I regard as something, which, if it is not a breach of the Constitution, is something which needs serious consideration. It is to the effect that the Governor of this Colony, in so far as the people's taxes in the Treasury are concerned, has more power than the people's representatives. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when the members of the Executive Committee were not paid, and therefore you could regard it as an unlimited number to be appointed. Nowadays there is a salary attached to the Office and while I, as a representative of the people, cannot even give notice of a money Resolution, His Excellency the Governor is in a position today to pack the Executive Committee with members, and take their salaries out of the Treasury apparently without their being voted by this House. That is something which needs attention and I mention it so that the Premier can give attention to it. If you have an unlimited number of members for the Executive Committee, I think that in keeping with the Constitution, the Governor should at least send down a Message to this House saying that it is his intention to increase the members of the Executive Committee by one or two, whichever he likes. Here we have in the Estimates today that last year we voted \$5,760 for payment for the non-official members and non-House of Assembly members of the Executive Committee, and that number has been increased to four. The increase by one has taken place for sometime now, and not a cent of the money has been sanctioned by this House for the payment of that additional member. That is something which His Excellency the Governor should study in view of the fact that he has no right to create any charge on the Treasury and he should discuss the matter with the Secretary of State for the Colonies and let it be put straight.

That is my first comment on these Estimates. I have not voted any money for this increased membership of the Executive Committee, and I do not know where the salary has been coming from. It is not in keeping with the Constitution; when the Executive Committee Act was written, members were not paid and under the altered conditions the members of this House should be informed that such is going to create a charge on the Treasury. Let the Governor put as many Officials on the Executive Committee as he likes when they are not paid, but it is not in keeping with the written Constitution; as a matter of fact, the Constitution which we have does not even give the Premier the power to introduce a Resolution which has not been approved by the Executive Committee.

The next thing I would like to say is that I deplore the fact that this Government has not yet seen fit to adopt the system of having annual Sessions of Parliament. If I wanted now to remind the Premier of what he said last year. You, Mr. Speaker, could prevent me from referring to the debates because you could say that those debates are the debates of the same Session of the House. I do not think that that is fair to hon. members; you would have to give some latitude to hon. members for that to be done. I maintain that before a new Budget is introduced there should be some break in the Session. If we are copying England, we should put hon. members in a position to be able to quote from previous debates on the Estimates. As the position is now, I cannot say "This is what you said last year."

I do not know if it is the perversity of some member of the Government, or if it is the perversity

of the Financial Secretary aided and abetted by some member of the Government, possibly the Premier, that no notice has been taken of the error in the compilation of the Estimates, which error has been brought to their attention by a member of this House. I speak of myself. It is just, plain common-sense; it is nothing intellectual and yet no heed has been taken of it. Mr. Speaker, if you turn to pages 96 and 97 of these Estimates, you will see something which you do not see on any other page. They have had to summarise the Head "Pensions", they have "Fixed by Law, \$5,942"; "Authorised by Law, \$577,953;" and "To be voted, \$152,001." I am saying that "Authorised by Law" and "To be voted" is one and the same thing. If you had stuck to that wording in the Estimates, as a matter of fact, the Estimates are made up in such a way that you have reversed the process when you look at other Heads. They have invented a new wording "To be appropriated". How are you going to appropriate by voting fictitious Resolutions? You have never signed a Resolution involving the whole Estimates, Mr. Speaker. These are fictitious Resolutions, and the Resolutions which are introduced will come under the Appropriation Act.

When you turn to page 97, to the Head "Charges of Debt", these Estimates have again come in without having one cent to be voted. They have not even had the decency to say that that is appropriated, and when the Premier introduces his Appropriation Bill, every Item on this page will be in it. Why did this man ever change the method and for what? You should have put down "Fixed by Law," and when it comes to the wording "To be voted," he puts an asterisk under it.

6.40 p.m.

We know that travelling allowance is authorised by law but it still has to be voted and I honestly, Sir, cannot see why the criticisms of a member of this House which cannot be made by the people themselves should be superseded by the fancies of a Civil Servant. If the Hon. Premier had told the Financial Secretary that it is nonsense to make out the Estimates in this way he would not have persisted in making them out in this way. Every member will understand that it should be just as I have pointed out; but merely because I have drawn it to the Hon. Premier's attention the practice is continued. He caused the printers to make a change one year, I objected to it then and the identical thing has gone on since then. It is nonsense. I think it is impertinence. It is greater than that, it is insubordination.

When page 97 of these Estimates is to be considered when the House is in Committee, I would like to know how much money we will have to vote under the Head. All the money under that Head is already authorised by law. It is wrong; and two years ago the Financial Secretary got some piece of paper with "Authorised by Law" printed on it and stuck it on over the column "To be voted" and the next year he caused it to be printed that way and it has been printed that way now. I am going to move that this kind of nonsense by him should be investigated.

I cannot too often advise the members of this Government to pay some attention to the method by which the Estimates are introduced. Although you have Ministers responsible for all these various expenditures, the Hon. Premier alone should introduce Supplementary Estimates. Only this morning we had two Resolutions for Supplementary Estimates for Current Expenditure. One was introduced by the Minister of Trade and the other by the Minister of Agriculture because they wanted to advertise themselves. They are not the Minister of Finance;

let the Supplementary Resolutions be introduced by the Minister of Finance. He needs only to move that the Resolution do now pass and the Minister of Trade or whoever else it is that seconds the motion can do the talking on it. As I have said, if it is an omnibus Resolution the Minister of Finance may only move that the Head stand part. There is no question of talking first and last in Committee of Supply, a member can talk any time.

There is another thing. Under the Customs Tariff Act you get three or four Ministers introducing amendments merely because the particular aspect of the matter comes more under their attention. It is pure advertisement; it does not lend itself to commonsense; it looks as if they do not know what they are doing. Simplify the work of this Assembly and let us get on with it. Let one Minister introduce any amendments that are to be made to the Customs Tariff Act. [A VOICE: Why? the Hon. Premier likes this kind of higgledy-piggledy, nonsense; it fits into his peculiar brain] Why does he not let five or six Ministers introduce the various parts of the Annual Estimates? Why does he introduce the whole lot of Estimates himself and is not only concerned with only those Heads of his portfolio?

Mr. Speaker, on the broad method of taxation, (direct and indirect) I would just like to draw to the attention of the Government that there was a time when there was great disparity between the direct taxation which was low and the indirect taxation which was high. I may say that it is very confused as it is set out in the Memorandum. In the Statement of Revenue they put Customs by itself and Excise by itself and then give you the details of Customs and Excise together from 1949-50. While it is good not to collect your taxation somewhat by way of direct taxation alone—because it means that you are taxing people who are making money or who have it, and if you relieve them by way of indirect taxation through the reduction in Customs Duty you may in some way help them, it is inevitable that you relieve both rich and poor alike—the fact remains that you are relieving the poor by this method. At the present moment our indirect taxation is still above direct taxation and the fact that they are skipping to the other now does not spring from an effort to relieve the poor of Customs Duty. Nothing like that has been done. You have merely, in addition to collecting all the rates you collect for indirect taxation increased the direct taxation. I think that a Socialist Government should pay some attention to a matter of this sort and make a bigger effort to reduce such a thing as Customs Duty on the things used by the poor and the not so poor too.

6.50 p.m.

If they want to collect money knowing that they might lose in that respect, it is possible that they can make it up from another source by an excess profit tax if the goods on which they have been relieved from duty are sold at a profit. But in spite of the fact that the profit on those subject to taxation are near to each other, it is a fact that the Government of Barbados has done little to take Customs Duty off the things that are used generally by the community. Have a luxury tax and all these things that other people have; but relieve some of the taxes on the people; and you can do it without injuring yourself. As a matter of fact if you make it cheaper for people to buy things that way, you make it easier for them to pay a direct taxation. There are specific duties, Sir, as you know, that will apply to the rich and poor alike. I think that the case of tea is one that springs to mind when one is considering these things and if you put a specific duty on tea the highclass tea that a rich man will buy will be putting a lower grade of duty on the one the lower class

is forced to buy. So I think that at some time or other we should appoint a committee comprising of members from this House and outside of it to scrutinise the Customs Tariff and it will well repay the scrutiny. I never heard of anybody doing it. I know that our Customs tariff is controlled by GATT and Ottawa and certain other kinds of agreement, so do not let us say we have control over our finances. When the Federal Government comes and these two sources are turned over to them, look and see what we will be dealing with, seven million dollars in one and six million in the other and if we budget for fourteen million dollars, what is the rest the House of Assembly will play with—a few cents! Let us get our Tariff in order before that happens.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I claim that this Government has been taxing the people of this colony to put by reserves. They will find (as perhaps the Premier has found now and he does not know the reasons for it, but he has been told in England you cannot expect the people to take the matter when it is found that you are budgeting every year for a half million dollars surplus) that you are collecting two million dollars surplus and you are putting one million of that out of circulation in your Revenue Equalisation Fund; yet you go to them to borrow money. You have a public debt of four million dollars and in a few years you have built up a balance of perhaps six million dollars or over. That is not the sort of balance sheet you can carry to people and ask them to assist you. When you tax people you should spend their taxes on them: and you have no right to tax them to invest your money in other countries at a lower rate of interest and borrow money at a high rate of interest and make the people pay interest on it.

Mr. Speaker, I need only refer you to one of these Heads that I claim to be wrongly printed. I think that some hon. member has referred to it already. In 1953-54 we had capital expenditure and interest at \$184,000; we now have it at nearly \$400,000 and we are planning to borrow more at a time when the interest rate that we will have to pay for external loans may cause us to break our own laws. We may have to borrow money in England now at a higher rate than 6% whereas we have a law in Barbados where you would be put in for usury if you lent money at more than 6%. The Premier said that he was promised he would get all the help in preparing for the Deep Water Harbour; but he thinks that the interest rate in Great Britain, what they now refer to as the official rate, may hinder the lending. It is there to hinder the lending of money to people in England; it is not there to hinder the lending of money outside. The people want to stimulate export and they want the people in England to leave the goods so that they can export them; so what is a better method than not lending your money to people inside to inflate your economy, but lending it to people outside to pay an exorbitant rate of interest and to buy your own goods? I say this because there is a large scale practice that we carry on down here whereby half the money will stay in England for things purchased there: so I hope the Premier has not fallen for that type of argument.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not spend this money that we have, it will prevent people from giving us a loan and it will prevent people from coming to our assistance in time of need, like a disaster and these two things we are now up against. The Premier cannot say today with any certainty that the British Government is going to come to our aid as it has promised already. All he has been assured is that what is written in this despatch is true. Every word of it will be stuck to.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Peter referred to Income Tax and I think he hinted that increased allowances should be given. Mr. Speaker, I know that there are many people called upon to pay income tax today that are finding it extremely hard. Taxation itself is an expense in their budget; things are extremely expensive; and to my way of thinking, with no greater influx in the tourists coming to this island, the cost of living is going up: and it will go up in ways that the Government cannot control. But one thing the hon. member who referred to these allowances did not seem to remember is that the present allowances are pre-war.

7.00 p.m.

The present allowances are pre-war with the exception of an additional \$100 per annum for married persons. They were wrongly interfered with by this Legislature, and by the Government in 1941, and it took a long time before they could be restored; and so they are as they were before 1941. That is all that this present Government has done; it has given the people back the allowances which obtained previous to 1941. In that year, the War had then begun to make itself felt, and they should have given the people an additional allowance to tide them over. Give the individual an increased allowance and put an Excess Profits Tax on the people who were making profits. That is what every other place around here did, but we just cut down the personal allowances when things were getting expensive. I congratulate the Government on restoring the allowances, but, as I said then, they were merely restoring them.

There is a burning question with families in which both the husband and the wife have to work, and even with the allowance of \$1,300 for a married man, I think that the Government could consider in addition, that just as they are adding the wives' income to that of the husbands' for the purpose of taxation, they could make an allowance to the working wife. There are lots of people who get married today merely because husband and wife will work so as to maintain the home in what they regard as their circumstances in life; and Barbadians are not slow, not only to maintain what they inherit, but also to improve it which, I think, is a very commendable thing indeed. I think that the Government should consider giving a working wife an allowance. When a person is going to work, it is not the same thing as if you are sitting at home; and you cannot go to work in the same way as you are seen at home. After all, clothes are expensive.

I hope, Sir, that you will allow me to refer to a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, which is to give an allowance for Medical expenses. When we come to deal with that Bill, you will see that it is a hollow promise; which is practically nothing at all. A maximum of \$100 has been put on it, so that the Government is only giving a particular taxpayer the tax off \$100, so that the poorer you are, the less you will get. I shall have something to say about that when the actual Bill comes up for consideration.

Another change in the Estimates which could have been made with advantage, is that the Statistical Service should have been divorced from the Secretariat. I do not see any reason why the vote for the Statistical Service should be placed under the Secretariat. It is a special service, and if you cannot give it a special Head in the Estimates, then you can put it under the Head "Miscellaneous Services" and let a particular man be Head of the Department. Likewise with the Technical Institute. The Technical Institute has, or should have, since the passing of the Scheme of Government, a Board

of Directors or whatever you like to call them. It is in the same position as the grant-aided Secondary Schools; they even collect fees. There is no reason why the Director of Education should control that vote to the extent of having it under the Head "Education." Not only that, but I am sure that this Government has had to pay out more for clerical work because of a duplication in that work; but the Technical Institute will have to keep books, and the Education Office will have to keep books for it, which is not the case with the Schools. I am saying that that matter should be given some consideration and let the Board run the Institute just as the Board of Education runs Harrison College and many of the other Secondary Schools.

There is another thing in the Estimates which has given a wrong impression and which has come out of the brain of somebody from C.D. & W.; that is the Annexed Estimates. All the Annexed Estimates have come down to the Post Office which is a semi-Commercial Government concern. The Post Office is one of the most essential services to a civilised community; therefore let them be put back in the Estimates. Do not let them give the impression that the Post Office must make a profit, or that it is not doing anything. That is a wrong view, and a nonsensical view of it; the Post Office is the source by which you arrange your business, and therefore it is in a large measure responsible for the collection of your taxes.

7.10 p.m.

You should have some form of communication with people whom you want to buy your sugar or any kind of goods. It is from that source which you get your Revenue; it is the Post Office which is performing that service. You cannot get a better example than your Parcel Post Department which collects half a million dollars in Customs Duty and hands it over to the Customs. That Department gets no credit so far as the revenue producing aspect is concerned for that Revenue; the Customs get that credit and the Post Office has to pay all the Clerks that work in that Department. Therefore, it is nonsense to say that the Post Office does not pay any rent for the building they occupy.

Mr. Speaker, I come now to a part of these Estimates which I am sure the Hon. Premier will say that it is a hardy annual, but I do not care what he says in that respect. He was able to benefit intellectually through Government's subsidised facilities for Education and it should be his duty to aid others in getting such facilities free or all that we have to offer. I understand that since he is not giving four-fifths of his time to education in accordance with the promise he made, what we are getting now is of little use as to when he enjoyed those facilities.

Mr. Speaker, if you turn to page 134 of these Estimates, you will see that that is the answer to anybody who thinks that we cannot afford free secondary education. The answer is there. I cannot understand why stupid newspapers and other people cannot see with what I say in here year after year. As a matter of fact, no newspaper would print what I say; they only print the stupid views of people who say that this island cannot pay for Secondary Education.

Mr. Speaker, the revenue collected from all those Secondary Schools amounts to \$147,549, while the Government budgets for \$13 million and collects \$15 million a year — they might collect even \$16 million. Of course, they do not re-revise the Estimates, they leave it just so. One hundred and forty seven thousand dollars is a flea bite to this Government. It can afford \$2 million in surplus and take \$1 million of it to develop other countries

but it cannot give people free Secondary Education. It does not matter if you cannot find places for the children of the people in your Secondary Schools. Certainly you do not make it up by charging School fees. You can only find places for the children by building schools. This Government spends more than \$150,000 on one particular Item of Expenditure.

Now, this is what they received in School fees from the Secondary Schools:—

Combermere School			\$16,329
Alleyne School			2,182
Coleridge and Parry School			7,947
Alexandra School			5,808
Boys' Foundation School			6,555
Girls' Foundation			2,634
St. Michael's Girls' School			7,446
Harrison College			43,716
Lodge School			30,524
Queen's College			24,508
			\$147,549

I did not check the addition; I hope the people in the other side of the Building have checked it.

Mr. Speaker, you can see that it does not cost us anything more than that. Now, the total amount that is wanted for the running of those Schools is \$664,577 so that the Government is prepared to vote \$517,028 when it can vote \$664,577 without feeling it and get away from causing people to pay School fees. Not only that, but the majority of people who pay School fees for their children are poor people. This is a Socialist Government. Do members of the Government know what they would relieve in anxiety to the people of this colony if they take off this burden from the people? Do they know that they will prevent lots of people who are hard up from having to cringe and ask somebody to pay School Fees for their children, or having to take off their hat to somebody to ask them to give their child a scholarship? [A VOICE: You are talking nonsense.] I hear a member on my left say that I am talking nonsense. [ANOTHER VOICE: That is true.] Alright! One of these days you will see the light of my argument.

Take the Official Debates up and you will see that I told them that the amount they have been putting for one year to the Revenue Equalisation Fund could give free Secondary Education as well as to subsidise all the Secondary Schools in the Island. [A VOICE: Look at what the people are paying to send their children to the Modern High School.] Do not tell me anything about somebody going to the Modern High School and paying this and that. Those children who go to the Modern High School might be getting more benefit there for their money. Why doesn't the Government go to their own Secondary Schools and throw out some of the crooks they have teaching there. [A VOICE: That is strong language.] It is a fact and they still have them there; and neither one of the members of the Government can find out any of those whom they still have at those Schools because they are the people whom members of the Government love. Go to those Schools and find them out and ask them to leave. They are robbing the people. As far as some of these teachers are concerned, they should be fishing and fishing around the shores; they should not venture too far out.

7.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, in the matter of these loans I think it is incumbent upon the Premier to make a statement before this Budget Speech is over as to whether he intends to raise loans in England at

the present time, and in making that statement say the rate of interest that he thinks he will be able to get it at. He has not said today what he would get it at, but he has predicted that it will even be increased. The honourable member said he could predict from what he summed up up there — nobody told him — but from what he heard he feels the rate of interest is going up still. Do you think, Sir, we are in a position in a hurricane area to go and burden ourselves? Be careful of raising your loans at a time like this; give the impression that you are not going to raise a loan and when two or three people do that they will bring down the economy for external loans. I do not see anybody in the West Indies other than Manley in Jamaica that is willing to alter that position. Because they want a Bank rate in England to prevent inflation there is no reason why we should borrow the money and pay a high rate too. That is a serious position that the Premier of this country should take to heart. The honourable member for St. Peter referred to the Labour Welfare Fund. In my humble opinion if the Labour Welfare Fund is to remain so essentially a revolving fund, there will come a time in Barbados when you will have to put a ceiling to it. He will laugh at that suggestion because it comes from the Conservatives, but in my opinion you are going to have to lend the labourers money and give them part of it. You have to give them a part.

However, Sir, it was dubbed an election stunt. You cannot go on taking profits from the sugar industry by the millions every year and taking it out of taxation policy altogether. These funds are reaching millions every year and they are profits that were given to you. You are taking them out of taxation policy altogether but you cannot continue for eternity to get money with the understanding that you can lend it out. Let us imagine that the Labour Welfare Fund is used for the essential purpose of repairs and building houses for the workers. There will come a time when you will have fifty million dollars in it; you may not be able to spend that; you are not geared to spending all that money in Barbados. We have not the architects, masons and carpenters for spending money in the course of twelve months and you will have to give the people part of the money. When you spend up to a certain amount, you will have to stop and let the rest fall to tax and let it fall in a way where the Treasury will get 100%. If you had \$2 million in the Fishing Boat Loan Fund what would it avail you? Nothing. You would have to turn around and invest again and use the profits on it. There is a limit to this kind of thing and you have got to work it in a way that 5% or 10% will soon have to be a gift to these people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is some information here though I do not think it really concerns the Estimates but it is between the leaves of the Estimates. [A VOICE: You cannot abolish all taxes!] Mr. Speaker, the honourable junior member for St. John is like people who think if you abolish capital taxes the people will die tomorrow. Let a Government come into power and give a free taxation and you will see; they can do it. It is lamentable to think that the actual figures are here and some honourable member can say that the figures I have given are wrong.

However, Sir, I am referring to a statement of Assets and Liabilities and I am wondering whether perhaps I should get this information from the Accountant General; but for a lifetime now, Sir, I have seen in the liabilities of this colony a Cotton

Spinning Plant (Revolving) Fund Account and an Experimental Cotton Spinning Unit (Suspense) Account. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we decide what this is; let somebody tell us. If it is the money you sold the plant for, give it back to the people. I do not think we have any Cotton Spinning Plant or any Experimental Cotton Spinning Unit; I have not heard about it, so why do we keep it in the Estimates?

Mr. Speaker, the last Item I am referring to is one I always refer to, and I warn the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing not to allow people to fool him in this matter. Could he not see that the Government was in difficulty in raising a loan in Barbados and certainly the Government security should be the best? They had to resort to the Savings Bank money that they themselves control. The Electric Light and Power Company can come and raise its loan in Barbados with great ease and they did not give them anything. I do not know how they came to give Hon. K. R. Hunte and Mr. Bryden the directorships, perhaps on the preference shares; but we have two local directors for this company. I was thinking that the Government would get the directorship, but they have not been able to do that. [A VOICE: Has the Government money in it.] They told me they could get one without having money in it, but may be they got it for themselves and not the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am bringing in the Electric Light and Power Company because it is that Company that is getting..... [A VOICE: Adams brought it in.] I am dealing with what he brought in.

On page 120 we have pumping expenses; it is true you are touching most services, but on the last occasion we could not get any guarantee that they were really doing more pumping for putting this out. The Electric Company has raised the rates on them and these pumping expenses are now reaching a total of \$300,000; and this Government is selling natural gas through the Natural Gas Corporation. They have the energy and they have shifted to electricity using the Electric Company as their main source, with their own energy somewhat in the nature of a standby.

7.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, to my way of thinking, that is wrong. The Government should find some method by means of which it should cut down these pumping expenses and use them for extending the water supply to the people in their homes. That is possible. The Electric Company does not want you to make them any gift of \$300,000, but as long as they can get that revenue from the Government, I do not see why they should bother even to raise any loan, except that they want to give Barbadians some shares in the Company. When the Government talks about taking over this Company, I hope that it will not be done just like how the Bus Service was taken over.

I think I have referred to matters to which I feel honourable members may not refer, and I am wondering now if the Government wants to do some of the other business which it has on the Order Paper, and if they would accept at this stage a motion that the further consideration of these Estimates be postponed. I think that the whole object of starting these Estimates was to get a couple of speeches over and then we should meet tomorrow, and possibly on Thursday. It is true that I could go on to speak for a little longer, but I am not one of those honourable members who want to talk for the sake of talking. As you know, Sir, I usually pick out a few things which I am sure honourable members will not comment

on, and I leave further comments for the various Heads in the Estimates.

I appreciate the fact that the Estimates were introduced earlier this year than last year and that would give a reasonable time for honourable members to consider them. However, I deplore the fact that the House was not out of Session for a little time before the Estimates were actually considered, and members had been invited to type out a list of the information they wanted in respect of the various Heads. I would like to spend a few minutes longer and tell the House that there is also the question of the X-ray Services at the Hospital. I am sorry that the Hon. Minister of Social Services is not in his place, but I would like him to remember that I raised the question, and I gave him the opportunity of discovering what is really the situation up there and to inform honourable members of the subject when he comes to deal with the Head "General Hospital."

There is another matter on which I am inviting the Hon. Minister of Social Services to make a statement during the consideration of the Estimates or when we come to deal with the particular Head. It is that there is a rumour to the effect that the person who had been treated at the Eye Department of the Hospital, and who was eventually sent to Trinidad for a special treatment there, has not received any Medical assistance. I have heard it rumoured that the man still has the piece of foreign matter in his eye, and I think that during the consideration of these Estimates some statement should be made as to whether that is true or not. I am not saying that so as to criticize anybody, especially the Hon. Minister of Social Services, because I feel that if it were so and he knew it, he would have said so. I am asking that the Hon. Minister ascertain the information and give the House a report as to the cure, or the extent of the cure, that this poor individual has received. If this individual could not be assisted and still there was a vote, that is most unfortunate, and the people of Trinidad, while they might have tried their best, should reduce their charges.

I, too, must make some comment on a matter which has been referred to by the honourable junior member of St. Peter. We are voting the sum of \$150,000 to our new Housing Authority and we are providing a substantial sum of money for our Development Board, and I must say that there is great substance in what the honourable junior member for St. Peter has had to say. It is difficult for me to conceive that this island is so lacking in ability amongst its male or female population, that one particular man has to be put on the Transport Board and look after the registration of voters, and in addition to that, to be Chairman of the Housing Authority. I should imagine that even with two or three Housing Authority meetings he would find that it was considerable work. To co-ordinate them into one and ask this man to look after the Bus Service, which is a job in itself, and to look after housing including the Civil Servants, Labour Welfare Housing and things of that sort, is either saying that this man is a superman or that all the other Barbadians are incapable of doing a good job of that sort.

Either one of them is wrong and both of them may be wrong. When it comes to the Hon. Sir John Saint I quite agree with you. I have said already that whereas the Government is saying that the Civil Service has an employing body and the people in it are not employed by politicians, we still have a member of the Executive Committee itself, who is a member of the Government itself, in these numerous positions; and while I am willing to bow to the knowledge of Sir John Saint, I do not think that it is possible that

one man can diffuse his energies in all these ways and give entire satisfaction.

Mr. Speaker, at this juncture, I beg to move that further consideration of this Order be postponed.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I hope that all honourable members who said that they would be willing to speak today have spoken. What Government suggested was that we should get on with as much of the speaking as possible today. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition intimated that he was not speaking tonight. I just want to make it clear that it is our desire that there should be as much speaking on this motion tonight as possible, but that it is not Government's intention to consider any of the Heads of the Estimates tonight.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second the motion of the honourable junior member for the City.

The question that further consideration of this Order be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

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

7.40 p.m.

On re-assembling.

LEAVE PASSAGES ORDER

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone No. 3 Order and to take Order No. 12 as the next Order of the day.

Leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Leave Passages) (Amendment) Order 1956.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This is a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Leave Passages) (Amendment) Order 1956" made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the second day of February, 1956, under the provisions of section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949. This Order deals with amendments to these leave passages. Article 2 reads as follows:—

2. Article 2 of the Civil Establishment (Leave Passages) Order, 1952, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the principal Order) is hereby amended by substituting for the definition of the expression "service" the following definition:

" 'service' means —

- (a) resident service at the qualifying salary in the Island or on duty outside the Island;
- (b) in addition to the service mentioned in the preceding paragraph in the case of an officer transferred to this Island from the public service of a British Colony such period of service within that Colony at the qualifying salary in respect of which the officer was eligible for leave corresponding to vacation leave at the date of his transfer:

Provided that such service shall only be taken into account in cases where the transfer of the officer without his first taking such leave was at the request of this Government; and includes such service before the commencement of this Order."

In short instead of just having the old definition of a number of years' service in Barbados or on duty outside the island, you will have this amendment. Obviously, the Financial Secretary last week was still on duty in the service of Barbados outside the island. In addition to that service, the case of an officer transferred to Barbados to the public service, the period of service at which he becomes eligible for leave will count along with his time of service in Barbados provided when he was transferred to Barbados this Government requested his Government to send him here speedily and to forego his period of leave. Normally, an officer going from one colony to another has his leave before coming to the new colony. If this colony is anxious to have his services and wants him to give up his leave it would count as though he had spent the time; that is the effect of this Act.

Article 3 reads as follows:—

3. Article 3 of the principle Order is hereby amended by adding thereto the following—

"Provided that no officer shall be entitled to the payment of passages during the last twelve months of his service:

The whole principle of Leave Passage is that you give a person leave to take a holiday to have a rest in order that he may come back to his post in this island refreshed and be better able to perform his duties. It was felt wrong that an officer should get leave in the last year of his service; he would be out of the island with full pay, passages paid and then you still have to give extra. This is not pre-retirement leave. That is the object with which leave passages are granted, in order that the person may be able to do their duty. The second proviso is that —

"Provided also that an officer recruited overseas who has completed not less than twenty-four months of his tour of service shall be entitled, when proceeding on pre-retirement leave to such proportion of the cost of a passage for himself and his wife, if married, to his home country as the period of service so completed bears to forty-two months."

I think that speaks for itself. You cannot allow a man to wait until the last six months of his service, then go on leave and pay his leave passage to England and back, and then allow him to retire. I repeat, it is not pre-retirement leave.

Article 4 as amended in paragraph 1 is amended as follows:—

4. Article 4 of the principal Order is hereby amended in the following respects:—

- (a) in paragraph (1) by adding at the end thereof the words "or, in the case of a return passage, double such cost."
- (b) in paragraph (2) by adding thereto the following proviso:—

"Provided that the Governor may extend such period in any of the following cases —

- (i) in the event of serious illness to the officer, his wife or children
- (ii) in the event of an alteration in the schedule under which the passages were booked;
- (iii) where the officer's departure has been delayed at the request of Government made subsequently to the booking of the passage."

In short, the original Order provided for the time in which the officer must go. If however his wife or children happens to fall ill the Government may extend the period during which he is to go on leave; or if any alteration in the schedule of the

plane on which the passages were booked, or as has happened not infrequently, where leave was granted to an officer and then his services are required in this island and is asked to remain. This governs the period of which he must go on leave.

These are the provisions of the Order, Mr. Speaker, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

9.00 p.m.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter in which you cannot sympathise with the Government. The Government is after reducing the cost of leave passages, but they have chosen on the wrong method of dealing with it. They want to reduce leave passages so that no provision will be made for local persons and so that the only people that will be entitled to leave passages would be those from overseas. If they want to do that they should say so.

Look at the proviso in paragraph 3 of this Order. It says:—

“Provided that no officer shall be entitled to the payment of passages during the last twelve months of his service;

Provided also that an officer recruited overseas who has completed not less than twenty-four months of his tour of service shall be entitled, when proceeding on pre-retirement leave, to such proportion of the cost of a passage for himself and his wife, if married, to his home country as the period of service so completed bears to forty-two months.”

Hon. M. E. COX: They will go back home.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: You have to send him back home anyhow. The honourable member does not even know that before there was the matter of leave passages, you had to send a person back home. That is nothing new. The Hon. Minister of Communications does not know that one of the conditions is that you have to pay for recruitment here. The idea in the past was that when an Officer was going on leave, he did not get any leave passage. The Hon. Minister does not realise that every public Officer over a certain salary is entitled to so many months pre-retirement leave. In the last 12 months of a man's service you provide leave passages. If you are going in the third year, you can get three-quarters of the leave passage, but if you are going in the last year, you cannot get anything at all. This Government is so wise, that they can do that.

Another point is this: if the exigencies of the work are such, the Government has to give you permission to go on leave; you cannot go whenever you like. Sometimes some Officers' leave has to be postponed. Let us take the case of the Acting Labour Commissioner; the Labour Commissioner has been seconded to the United Kingdom, and this Officer has to act for a period. The Government has refused him leave on the basis that he cannot go unless the circumstances are very grave. If, tomorrow, this man decides to retire from the Government, you will say that he cannot get his leave although he is entitled to it. Leave is a privilege, it is not a right; you can only get leave if it suits the Government to grant you leave. However, it is not fair to a man to deny him his leave. The circumstances may not permit a man to get leave until the last year of his service, and is it fair to him to deny him his leave passage?

I want to say this: a man who is getting holidays with pay, can beat you and burn down your house and you still have to give him holidays with pay. If a man has qualified for his leave, why deny it to him? I sympathise with the Government that leave passages may be an expensive thing, and if you

want to deny the local people this leave, well, say so. As far as paragraph 3 of this Order is concerned, you may have a man who is working for 10 years, 24 years or 34 years who has never been on leave, and this provision would be unreasonable. Imagine that you have been working for 10 years with the Government; in that period you could have had leave twice. A man may decide in the last year of his service when he is retiring, that he will have a little holiday in the United States of America. Take a man like Mr. Gay; he has been a teacher for the whole time, and the only occasion on which he will see England is in the evening of his days. It costs the Government less for people like that to go on leave. If all the Officers went on leave in the last year of their service, do you know how much less it would cost the Government in leave passages? Why are you going to deny a man his leave passage, because he is going when he is retiring and is not coming back to you? Are you acting like those employers who belong to the 18th century, who after you have worked for them, for so long, think that you are not deserving of anything because you are leaving?

The Premier knows as well as I do that the Government of Barbados was pressed into the position of agreeing with leave passages, because we were one of the last territories in the Caribbean area to agree with granting leave passages. British Guiana and Trinidad and the smaller Islands were granting leave passages and we were faced with the problem of the recruitment and retention of Officers, and a Committee went into the matter. It was then stated that the only way in which Barbados could retain and recruit Officers from abroad, or even within the Caribbean area was if we were prepared to grant them leave passages. That was not based on whether you were coming back in the first year or the last year; and on examination, we found that the local people should be given the privilege of leave passages too. It was felt that it was not fair only to give leave passages to those who came from abroad; the basis was that we had to pay leave passages in order to come into line with the other territories. I would say, as a scientific argument, that a man who is recruited locally in truth and in fact is not entitled in a general way to leave passages.

9.10 p.m.

It is said that if I recruit you in Barbados I do not have to send you anywhere by means of leave passages, but in the Public Service not only in Barbados it has been agreed upon that when you provide leave passages you do not only provide leave passages for those whom you recruit overseas; you provide leave passages for all the officers. It is true that the idea of Leave Passages is a legacy which we have got from colonial system on account of the fact that United Kingdom officers working in Africa said that that country was hot; and on account of that they must be given some allowance to help them to get back to a cold climate every now and then on a vacation. With all that, I cannot see this Government agreeing that in a local officer's last year of service he should not be granted leave passage. When he applies for it in his last year of service that is something which can be an accident and nothing which he has worked out by design.

After all, Sir, how long this idea of granting Leave Passages started? Few people in the Public Service have ever had the opportunity of going on long leave until the time they are about to retire. Why deny an officer the privilege of going on leave with leave passage? It is not going to cost the Government anything more from any rewarding idea to

grant an officer leave before his last year of service but not in his last year of service. It is too bad when people are not modern enough to see that there are changes in the light of modern conditions. Who would imagine that this Government would suggest today that an officer should be disqualified for leave passage because he asked for it on the eve of his retirement. Would it be fair for the Government to tell any officer that he cannot go on leave because it is the last year of his service?

My idea about this matter is that if the Government wants to abolish Leave Passages it should say so. This Government has a slavish mentality. It must be a model employer; it should not be like some people looking about for cheap labour.

Sir, if an officer qualifies for leave (and the whole idea about it is qualification) he should be given leave even if it is the last year of his service. Do you mean to say that if a man works with you for the past 25 years and is entitled to leave, because it is the last year of his service that you are going to deprive him of it? That is most spiteful and unrewarding. According to your theory, he is not coming back to work with you; therefore you put in a Clause to say that he should not be granted leave passage. But at the same time you are saying that if an overseas officer works with you for two years, he can get leave and Leave Passage and he can also get pre-retirement leave. You also put in a Clause stating that an officer who is recruited from overseas and who has completed 24 months of this tour of service shall be entitled when proceeding on pre-retirement leave to such proportion of the cost of a passage for himself and his wife, if married, to his home country as the period of service so completed bears to 42 months. That means if you recruit a man from overseas and he has two years of service prior to his retirement he is entitled to leave passage for himself and his wife. But in a preceding paragraph you are saying that if a local officer works with you for 25 years and is retiring, he is not entitled to leave passage during the last twelve months of his service.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the honourable member who has just spoken will not think that he is singing a solo in this matter. I recall when this question of Leave Passages came before this Chamber, members of this House were somewhat divided with the Government that it should only be granted to officers from abroad. I remember that the idea of honourable members on this side of the Table was that it should be granted to all or none. That is what we said then and that is how I feel now. I feel it should not only be for officials from overseas but it should also be for other officers here. I am going to make an appeal to the Government and I hope they will consider it very sensible. What is contained in this Order is very unfair; it is absolutely unfair. Actually members of the Government have no national spirit to bring this Order down. What you are saying is in truth and in fact that Leave Passages have been effected by a few School Masters and School Mistresses who have been taking advantage of it by their just taking it and coming back into the class-room for a month before going on retirement. I am coming to their rescue. It is true to say that that has been happening but Leave Passages is only one thing. Let me say that the average Schoolmaster in this country started to work at a salary of \$5 per month and for all his years' service, now that he is able to enjoy Leave Passages, on the only opportunity which is given him to go abroad you are saying that he will not be entitled to it if it is the last year of his service. Bear

in mind he has raised a family on \$10, \$12 and \$40 per month. He has never had sufficient money to put by for a vacation outside of Barbados. As a matter of fact, I know there are many people who are entitled to it but who will not ask for it because they cannot find the money to pay for board and lodging in another country; and because of that they have to let it stay until the eve of their retirement when they can make arrangements to borrow sufficient money on the gratuities which they will get, so that when they get the gratuity they will be able to pay it back.

9.20 p.m.

That is the plain simple truth. There are still a number of applicants like the bulk of school teachers or the Policeman type. There have been some who got leave passages, went to America and came back and went back into the school for a month and died after. I am not going to be as hot and rash as the hon. member who just sat down. I am asking the hon. member to reconsider this. You are putting the local people who have borne the brunt of the day in the heat of this country and who have given the best of their labour, at a disadvantage; and my appeal is to postpone this Order and go over it again, and see how many people it will affect. I know several people wanting to go abroad who come and say: I can get leave passage now, but I have not got \$15 to pay if I go to England and the only thing to do is to wait until the end of six months to get a gratuity to pay for it." They can only do it in the evening of their days. Where is the sympathy and reason in putting local Civil Servants at such a disadvantage as poor men?

I appeal to the Government; I am going to vote against it. But this is a very strong appeal. I do not want to be personal; I do not want to call names but there are many in the general Civil Service now who went on in the usual way and had no rapid promotion. There are several school-masters in this colony whose salary in recent years got to this bracket and so entitled them to Leave Passages; but they cannot pay the passage to America or Canada. You just do not land in America; you must have money. Tell me which schoolmaster after raising a family and working for \$60 a month would have money to pay Leave Passage. As a matter of fact, the Hon. Minister of Social Services knows what I am saying is correct. Teachers allowed Leave Passage in the last six months before retirement have to borrow money to go abroad.

Why deny your own local Civil Servants? You will remember well that when this Bill came before the House, it was dealing with members of the Civil Service of this country; and members of this House said we felt it should be for all our Civil Servants in certain brackets, and it was discovered that Trinidad and British Guiana granted Leave Passages to people other than imported officials. Now I cannot imagine that the members of this Government had really read this or taken it seriously when they brought this amendment. What are they trying to save? Maybe a little money, but how much! And then, Mr. Speaker, are you going to bring this regulation into operation from 1st May, 1955? What happens to those persons who were planning their leave a year or so ago? They have never had the opportunity of getting together \$400 or \$500 to be able to enjoy themselves abroad until they could face some friend or solicitor with the plain straight fact that at the end of six months they were entitled to a gratuity, and ever if they died he would be entitled to get this money back. Nobody will lend money until you can show actual security — even the receipt of a gratuity with their return. I suggest that it be

withdrawn; if not, I am going to vote against it. It is not fair: and I know that hon. members of the Government feel it should not be brought here today. I feel those who realise what a handicap it will be to local members of the Civil Service or Government employees could never support this, because in it you have "This Order shall be deemed to have come into operation on the first day of May, 1955." Has the Government taken into consideration how many people it will actually affect? You are really passing legislation to the effect that you are unmindful of the harm you are doing to people. They have been working along the line and saying: "This is the rest I will get; this is what I have been working for for a long time. I am going to give my wife a share of the years I have been working for nothing in particular by going abroad and seeing some place for the forty or fifty years I have been married." And now as from May 1955 these people will be denied the opportunity! I do not think it is fair; it is not right. This is putting your own local people in this country at a great disadvantage. I am not going to support it unless you withdraw it and reconsider it. I am trying to catch the Premier's eye to see if he has been moved by any speeches made over here. I am suggesting, Sir, that the matter be postponed for further consideration. We cannot amend it, sir, but we can postpone it. The Government can do anything [Applause] that is what they said. The Premier is very hard upon this, but the other Ministers however believe the arguments used over here are reasonable. Let us postpone it. [A VOICE: Why don't we throw it out?] We do not have the numbers.

I beg to move that this Order be postponed.

9.30 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, the granting of leave passage was an expedient bit of legislation which I have had to swallow with some difficulty, and some of those honourable members who are now present also suffered from the point of view of conscience, when this idea of granting leave passages was agreed to. Most of the honourable members who are now pretentiously speaking against this Resolution, have also been very vociferous against the granting of leave passages at the time when it was introduced with the extensiveness with which it was introduced.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of Order. I am one of those honourable members who spoke in favour of the Resolution, and I want to say that the honourable member is not speaking the truth.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of Order.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member is mis-quoting.

Mr. ALLDER: I accept the position and I realised the difficulty in our getting masters from overseas; I therefore agreed that we should do something to try and hold those people whom we had, and to contract those whom we wanted from overseas. However, I never agreed with the Government in carrying out the principle of embracing every Tom, Dick and Harry who get salaries. I felt that the members of the Clergy should not have been included with their wives and their children. I feel that the scavenger is as important a servant of the Government as the technician in the laboratory; each of them contributes to the welfare of the community and if each of them did his best in his position respectively, then one is entitled to the same privilege as the other.

The granting of leave passages was only class legislation. You may have somebody who earns \$1 less than you, and he might have sacrificed his body as a servant for many years, and that man is not entitled to the same privilege as you are entitled to. Some of these lower-paid employees have sacrificed

themselves more than those who are granted these big pensions and leave passages. [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: He is against the payment of pensions.] The honourable member speaks for six hours and I am sure that what he says in that six hours could be said in six minutes! [Laughter.] We have to tolerate the honourable member when he goes all around the moon, and therefore he must listen to those who have more than he has. He must be able to get the automotons in here to assist him when he wants them to do so. I am saying that I am glad to see that the Government has decided to change its policy with regard to leave passages, and I say that it has not gone far enough. The only members of the Civil Service to whom I would give the benefit of leave passages would be the highly technical officer who is attached to the Hospital, or officers attached to other Institutions of Health or certain qualified Masters at Secondary Schools. I know that you cannot pick up a mathematician as easily as you can pick up an honourable junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I only rise to say this: similarly, it is as easy to pick up an honourable senior member for St. John. It is only since the honourable member has got on the Governing Body of the Lodge School—

Mr. ALLDER: I do not want any ambition. [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Well, without ambition you should be dead. You said that you would shoot yourself if you did not get into the House.] I would shoot myself if I were like the honourable member; bombastic and politically cheap.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member not to make such loud asides.

Mr. ALLDER: However, I am not telling the honourable member not to support what he likes; I cannot control the honourable member's political behaviour. It is a great bit of effrontery when he tries to say what I should support. I have not been brought here by the honourable member, and I am taking my politics as I see best. Here it is: we are spending \$40,000 a year on leave passages, which only benefits a handful of Civil Servants, and such Civil Servants can retire *ad lib*, and I may say that they are prostituting this retiring age, too. We had no right having this retiring age at 55 years, because a cantooner cannot retire at 55 years and get a half cent from the Government; yet he slaves very laboriously in the hot sun in the interest of the Government.

9.40 p.m.

Look at the hundreds of employees in the lower scale brackets whom we have working for the Government. Can any of them say that they are entitled to any Leave Passages? Even if they said so they would not be considered. If the other people want to be tourists their salaries are reasonable enough for them to go on leave without Leave Passage. I heard the honourable member to say when he was delivering his Budget Speech that the revenue of the island was between \$14 million and \$15 million and he went on to suggest that Barbados should not attempt to do the things that other colonies did. I would like to remind honourable members of the importance of consistency in their politics.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation.

VOICES: Order, Order.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Every time I rise you can hear hon. members saying "Order, Order," yet they do not know what I rise to say.

Mr. SPEAKER: If hon. members would just look up and see that I am in the Chair and address their remarks to me without allowing any provocation to debar them from doing so, they will conduct them-

selves in a manner befitting this Chamber; but if honourable members would not address their remarks to the Chair and listen to every provocation given in asides there will always be a row.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. The hon. senior member for St. John said that what I said in my speech on the budget is inconsistent to what I have said on this Order. There is no comparison between what I said then and what I am saying now. What I am saying now has nothing to do with the budget speech because I am not proposing anything new now. This is something which is the law of the land.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, what I would prefer Government to do is to hold this Leave Passages Order in abeyance, and, whenever it feels like bringing down a Bill to change it very effectively, to do so. Government should see that only essential servants should benefit from it. If that is done, there will be a saving from it. I would like to know that the hundreds of nurses whom we have at the General Hospital and the Mental Hospital, the porters, the Cantoneers, the masons and people of that sort, who get a considerably lower salary than any person who qualifies for Leave Passages, get an increase in their wages or salary. [A VOICE: That is cheap politics.] This is not a question of talking politics; the hon. member wants me to talk his language. Mr. Speaker, I opposed Leave Passages when it was first introduced in this House and counselled Government not to vote on it. I am glad to see that they are changing their mind on it. [A VOICE: There is no change about this.] This is a change, however small it may be; and I hope it is the thin edge of the wedge to reduce the cost of Leave Passages considerably.

I always felt that our revenue could not afford Leave Passages. The hon. senior member for the City has revealed something further when he said that certain beneficiaries under this scheme have had to involve themselves in a loan to be able to benefit from it. That is one reason why Government should refuse to carry on with it. Government should be the last person to encourage persons in its employ to involve themselves in certain expenses which they can very well do without. If certain officers of this Service want to travel to Europe, let them pull their pockets and pay their way. The cantoneers and the people who work at the Pumping Stations night and day for 365 days in a year cannot afford even leave. If a hurricane comes tomorrow, there are some cantoneers who will not be able to get a day's pay. As a matter of fact, they are not paid for Bank-holidays though it is not through any fault of their own that they are unable to turn out to work.

Sir, let us pay attention to that type of worker. We think too often of giving more benefits to one set of Civil Servants. I have nothing against Civil Servants who are able to enjoy Leave Passages but I feel that Government should not bear the cost. Let us pay attention to Relief Teachers. Some of these teachers have to travel from Bridgetown to St. Lucy just to earn \$1.50, \$1.68, or \$2.00 a day and they have to pay transportation out of that. Let hon. members pay some attention to those people.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is rambling now.

Mr. ALLDER: However, Mr. Speaker, I want the Government to give consideration to that. I am serious in what I say with respect to this leave passage business. I am suggesting to Government

that whenever the time is opportune, to change the law with regard to Leave Passages considerably.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, apparently the hon. senior member for St. John is labouring under the illusion that in this Order the Government proposes to amend or reduce the amount it is paying out on Leave Passages. When the question of Leave Passages was originally before the House I was its strongest opponent and its bitterest critic. I told the Government on that occasion that Leave Passages were introduced (at the time they were introduced) in certain colonies of the British Empire for special reasons. In places like British Honduras, British Guiana and some of the East African colonies which were physically unhealthy it was pointed out that officers in those colonies from England were entitled to Leave Passage to get back home after a certain tour of duty.

9.50 p.m.

Well, I saw no reason why Barbados with its exceptionally healthy climate and its highly favourable living conditions should be called upon to pay Leave Passages in the same way as some of the unhealthy colonies in the Empire; and I still maintain that position today. The Government at that time were concerned with giving special concessions to officials coming in from outside and in order to make it appear more palatable had to extend the application of leave passages to a qualifying age which would bring in some of the locally employed Civil Servants. Now, at the time when they necessitated Leave Passages we went further in that some of the unhealthy colonies to which I made reference gave both the Officer and his wife Leave Passage and there were other colonies not doing it. They were giving the Officer alone, and if the Government were really desirous of keeping the expense of Leave Passage down to a minimum, the first thing they would have done would be to refuse to extend the Leave Passage allowance to the Officer's wife and make the Officer entitled to a loan.

Well now, personally, I do not know what is the real reason for bringing this Order before the House, but in it, Sir, you see an insidious attempt by the Government to carry out its original policy by giving the blue eyed boys from England the facilities for working, and discriminating against the local Civil Servants. There is rank discrimination against the local Civil Servants. There are in this colony numbers of hard-working Civil Servants in the public service, in the teaching profession and other parts of the service who might only qualify for Leave Passages during the last years of service; others may not qualify for it before, financially speaking. Numbers of them also might have been so taken up with raising a family—paying for a girl's or boy's education—that they cannot afford to take up the money — or borrow it to spend on a trip abroad before they were on the verge of retirement when they would get a lump sum to pay for the holiday expenses.

Will you believe, Mr. Speaker, that this Government, comprised as it is, is saying that any English official coming here for two years is entitled to an appropriate cost of Leave Passage but a man who has served in the colony for 40 years cannot get it? It does not appear that they can be in their right senses. [VOICES: Shame! Shame!] But I can see no reason for discriminating against local Civil Servants and that is all this Resolution attempts to do. Any English official coming here from Timbucktoo or Honolulu for 24 months is entitled to Leave Passage. Under Section 3, we have:—

“Provided also that an officer recruited overseas who has completed not less than twenty-four months

of his tour of service shall be entitled when proceeding on pre-retirement leave, to such proportion of the cost of a passage of himself and his wife, if married, to his home country as the period of service so completed bears to forty-two months."

After all, Mr. Speaker, take the case of a Barbadian living here all his life, contributing his life blood to the Government service and making his contribution to the progress of the community in whatever sphere he might find himself; and two years before retirement at which he is entitled to Leave Passage (or because he is about to retire) he feels he is entitled to take his leave. This will mean, Mr. Speaker, that members of the Civil Service, like say, the Headmaster of St. Giles' Boys' School, Mr. Cumberbatch, and many I can think of who take advantage out of the facility of Leave Passage to go on a trip immediately before retiring, will not in future be able to do that. If they want to go during the last twelve months of their service they are not legally entitled to it; but we bring in Mr. So-and-so who has never served in the country before, paid no taxation, or contributed to the national income, but because he is a blue-eyed baby boy coming from England, he is entitled to Leave Passage after forty-two months of service! If the Government were thinking of some special means of discriminating against local Civil Servants they could have found a better method. There can be no justification for it. I really cannot find out what could be the motive or reason for the introduction of this Order. I really cannot believe, as has been suggested by other speakers that this is just a malicious piece of legislation solely made to prevent local Civil Servants from getting Leave Passages. I cannot believe that the present Government could stoop to anything like that; it does not sound possible to me. Nor can I believe that if the Government is desirous of retrenching Leave Passages that they would resort to this method. The provisions for non-entitlement to Leave Passage should apply to an Officer coming from outside, and not to a local person because it is not a question of his return passage: it is a question of his Leave Passage. If the officer comes here on contract, the provision by which we have to pay his passage to and from the place of his recruitment is an entirely different matter from what we would call his holiday with pay; and therefore, if you are going to say that in the last twelve months of service he is not entitled to Leave Passage, it should apply to the officer coming from abroad and not to the officer at home.

10.00 p.m.

I am not going to agree to discriminate against the one in favour of the other. There could be no moral justification for it, and the service which these people would have rendered to the Government for all these years entitles them just as much to leave passages as anybody else. My contention has always been that you should not give any leave passages, but if you are giving them to a British Official, then see that the local Civil Servant gets them as well.

Mr. BARROW: There are two important principles involved in the Order which is now engaging the attention of this Hon. Chamber. In 1950, the question of leave passages first came before this House, and the members of the House were vociferous in their opinion at that time that the conditions which were set out in the Order which was before the House, were not universal enough in their application. I would like to remind the honourable senior member for St. John that in 1952, when the Leave Passages Order was introduced by the person who now enjoys the position of Premier of this Island,

seconded by the honourable senior member for St. Michael, who is now known as the Minister of Communications, this Order was passed without any debate at all. The honourable senior member for St. Philip is saying that there were certain principles involved in the passing of this Order in 1952. If there were any principles involved, I would like to say that no honourable member of this House who is present in the House, had the courage of his convictions to express what those principles were.

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of Order. The honourable member is wrong; because all honourable members except the honourable senior member for St. George, will readily remember that a big noise came down in this Honourable House as a result of the disapproval by certain honourable members of the Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: I forgive the honourable senior member for St. John for the mistake he has made, because he did not even do the members of his constituency the honour of being present when the Order was passed in 1952. The honourable member is mixing up the debate in 1950 which was introduced by your colleague, Mr. Speaker, with what happened in 1952 when the Civil Establishment (Leave Passages) Order was passed. In the official debate of June 17, 1952, the Order was called and the Hon. Premier moved the passing of the Resolution; the motion was seconded by the honourable senior member for St. Michael. It was agreed *enem. con.* and the Resolution was passed. The Civil Establishment (Payment of Passages) Order was introduced and seconded by the same honourable members and it was passed without debate. No matter what misgivings honourable members might have had in their breasts, they did not take the opportunity of expressing them on that particular date.

Mr. ALLDER: I know that the honourable member is quoting the debates because of my speech. If one were to take the argument which the honourable member is putting up, one would feel that it was in 1952, when the introduction of Leave Passages took place, and no statements were made against the Resolution; therefore, honourable members are breaking new ground now. Why does the honourable member go back to 1950?

Mr. BARROW: The honourable member has got the 1950 Order confused with the Amendment which is now before the House. In 1952, the honourable junior member for St. James, whose voice is not heard in the Councils of State, solicited the Government to make a slight alteration. When the Order was made in 1952, there were 203 Civil Servants qualifying for leave passages.

I would like to refer to some of the ground which has been so carefully covered by the honourable senior member for St. Philip. In Trinidad, Jamaica, British Guiana and in some of those Colonies, which are not strictly Crown Colonies, and in others which are Crown Colonies, due to the rigours of the climate and other factors, there was the difficulty of getting people to leave their country or to leave the English fireside to come to the rigours of a tropical climate, and therefore those Colonies have had to offer inducement to some Officers in order to get them to come out at all. At the end of 2½ years, these people were given the cost of their passages back home, so that before they succumbed to the malaria and other things from which you are supposed to suffer in these benighted Colonies, they could return home and enjoy their last days with their families.

10.10 p.m.

Service in the Colonial Empire was regarded then as going into the firing line. For three hundred years the Government of Barbados, composed as it was then of people of a different social, economic

and racial complexion than what it is now, did not consider that either our climate or conditions in this sunlit spot of the Caribbean or whatever rhapsody you may want to pay to this unfortunate area in which we live was not conducive to people from overseas. [A VOICE: What is unfortunate?] It is unfortunate because of this Government which we have.

In 1952 when we had a Socialist Government, the Bill for Leave Passages was brought down and at the time the Government was administered by Mr. Savage. He started off his career as an office boy and he has displayed certain atavistic tendencies in British Guiana that have caused his return to the place whence he came. Mr. Savage came to this island with a specific mandate from the Conservative British Government to put all the conditions of service in Barbados on the same footing as the most backward and unhealthy and perhaps the most wealthy British Colonies. Having achieved that and made the hon. senior member for St. Joseph to succumb to his blandishments, he returned to England and then went to another place in the West Indies — British Guiana — where he succeeded in bringing what a member of the British House of Commons has termed as an indictment against the whole nation.

Mr. Savage decided when he could get Leave Passage in British Guiana to return to England but he did not have to return to British Guiana because they decided that the climate in British Guiana was too unhealthy for him. Of course they did not mention whether it was the political, social or geographical climate. He is the man who has inflicted this punishment on the unfortunate taxpayer of Barbados. He returned to England with his health in good shape and after Mr. Gordon Walker and some other M.P. paid a visit to British Guiana and saw for themselves the political climates of British Guiana they returned to England and said that he should refund to the British Government or the taxpayers the money which he filched from their Treasury. All that he knew before he left British Guiana because he left with all his luggage and did not intend to go back. That is the principle which we are fighting here tonight. That ex-office boy who is now director for Crown Agents has inflicted this punishment on the people.

Sir, I am not discussing the deals which he used but I am discussing the principle. We decided that our own officers should be entitled to Leave Passages and I am going to tell the Government what is happening with our Civil Servants today. I will digress to say that the Civil Service Association is the most spineless irresponsible and unworthy body of Civil Servants in the whole Caribbean area today. They accept any kind of nonsense inflicted on them by the Government without raising a single protest. I do not want to get in bad grace with anybody whom we have in the Police Force because when you have a Police State you can find yourself short of a job. We have a Ministry presided over by the Minister of Labour whose job it is to slant the news and re-orientate the debates of this Chamber. We have a high ranking Police Officer (I do not necessarily mean a local officer) who said he was not interested in leave passage because he could not afford to take advantage of it and there are many Civil Servants who are in a similar position; so it is clear and apparent that this Leave Passages Order was passed for the benefit of ex-patriates who came to Barbados.

It is a positive fact as I said previously in this Chamber that there are officials in the Crown Agents Office in London and some Officials in the Colonial Office who have on more than one occasion told applicants for jobs in Barbados when there is a job going not to apply for it because they are trying to get

more money for the post and it will not be in the person's interest to apply for it at that time. I say that without any fear of contradiction. I think I am the only person in this Chamber who has worked in the Colonial Office. I also have had the privilege of being a graduate in the United Kingdom, not Ireland or Scotland. I found that every job which a colony advertised for did not appear in the British Press at all; it was always somebody's friend who applied and got the job.

It is from a situation like that that you get all these English Officers down here. If you take Mr. Garrod who is Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department, he gets a salary of \$1,000 a month plus his pension. When he accepted the job there was no cost of living attached to it but it has been put on since. Now, all of a sudden they have discovered that there is apparently a conspiracy among the higher paid officials to catch the "Golfito"—because too many natives were travelling on the "Ariguani"—and that has caused the Government to bring down this Leave Passages Order. That is the climate in which this Leave Passages Order was introduced but in order to make it palatable you had to see that even the Long Grade Clerk had an opportunity to take advantage of it so you made the qualifying salaries the top of the Long Grade Clerk's salary.

As you know, Sir, we no longer have six Grades in the Civil Service; we only have three — the Long Grade, then the Executive and the Administrative levels. With all that, there is not a single Long Grade Civil Servant who—unless he gets outside income which he can only get either by running a poultry farm or winning a Sweepstake ticket—can afford to take himself and family to England even although you are paying the Leave Passage. You even have Civil Servants who work for £1,000 per annum who cannot afford it.

10.20 p.m.

Now, when you get above Long Grade this is what happens: you have Civil Servants and many other people working for in excess of £600 a year who still cannot afford Leave Passage. There are certain officers who applied since 1952 who have not got Leave Passage up to now and some of them are 50 to 55 years old. What you are saying is this: Barbados does not recruit people from other West Indian Islands; they prefer to recruit them from England, other West Indian Islands recruit Barbadians, and unless you are an Englishman—I do not want to mince matters—and unless you have been keeping in good relation with the Head of your Department before you come to retire, you will not be entitled to Leave Passage. I would like the Minister for Social Services to see this. Some of his best friends are going to suffer under this Order; people who like him have rendered stalwart service to this colony for thirty and forty years. There is the device that if you take overseas leave that you must come back and serve a month before you retire. What better time is there for a man who has rendered service to the Government to enjoy life in peace and quiet than after he has retired? I will go further and say I am serving notice that my Party intends to do what some of the more enlightened Governments of the Caribbean do. Our policy will be that you are entitled after three or four years to a certain amount of money to pay for a trip outside if you want to go; but some of them may have six or seven children for whom they have to provide secondary education; therefore, we say that even if you do not go outside you are entitled to draw that money and pay off some of your debts. What I am saying is, that this Leave Passage is only a deferred payment of your salary. It is something which you have had to pay out of your salary, but it has been withheld and given at the end of three years for one's holiday outside the island, but if you spend

it in the island it is part and parcel of your salary; and it is part of our manifesto, so if Government wants to steal it, steal it now. A person will be entitled to draw the money and pay off some of his debts. Some West Indian islands go further. Apart from Leave Passage they have created schemes whereby a Civil Servant in debt can go to a lumber yard on a credit scheme, and also get his home groceries. We know that the more we talk about these matters, the more we expose the lack of consistency and the lack of underlying principles of action. They have to do that because when they go anywhere in which there are English officials, all they do is get up and pass a vote of thanks. It is not a party or group of men with any christian principles; therefore we know in advance exactly what the situation is. As far as I am concerned and my colleagues, we can never support an amendment like this. I cannot understand what could have brought into focus the whole historical and other considerations which motivated the Government in the passing of the Amendment Order, but without quoting the remarks of honourable members which they made in 1952 on this matter, their only guide can be their conscience. But as far as I am concerned I would like the Premier to get up and explain this Order that only a man who comes from outside can get Leave Passage if he has done two years service and not a local man at all. We are going to set a premium on buying an importee; we are going to flood the Barbados Government service because we do not want our own people to know how Government is organised or what tricks they are up to and I challenge him to get up now, and I go further and say that I know in a certain regional body in the West Indies — and I know this for an absolute fact and I can go in Court and give evidence — that certain English officials have said in matters about the Federation, we have to keep them in the jobs and preserve the English tradition. In that they have one champion and he is on the other side of this House. There is no West Indian that is going to support them in this.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, my recollection of Leave Passage Order is that the Government came to this House at one time and they really provided for these high salary officials and the House itself asked that other categories be included. To such an extent is that true that the principal Order is the 1952 Order. So far as I see here, there was a postponement and I do not know whether it died or not. The Principal Order is the 1952 Order because the Government brought down what the House asked. In other words, the Government at that time was confining it to very highly paid officials and school teachers. However, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we have adopted a principle of Leave Passages, it seems to me a pity and wrong that we should alter it in this way. If we cannot go low down in the salary scale as we would like at present, let us cut it out. If you have adopted the principle of Leave Passages, you cannot cut across that principle. What about Barbadians working in other colonies, is this going to be adopted? Is this a Caribbean system or peculiar to Barbados? Are we going to apply it to people who come to us from the neighbouring islands?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot regard it as necessary to insist on a man taking his leave at the end of his time and insist that he comes back here. It is not a Training Scheme. I know of an officer now and though we have actually passed a Bill and in spite of what we might pass here tonight in connection with these Leave Passages, I am referring to the Entomologist in the Department of Science and Agriculture; he has come back to work. Sir, you are going to have two principles operating. Why is it that the Government has gone back to bring this Resolution

into operation from the 1st May, 1955? It is evidently to catch somebody, and by the time this is passed the number of persons who would be caught by this will make other arrangements. They will arrange for instance to get their Leave Passages before the time for their retirement, so I do not know that you are going to do so well.

10.30 p.m.

You might find that you have caught yourself out with it. You may have an Officer who might be very valuable at a time when there is a hurricane or when some other emergency has come, and you might want to retain his services rather than that he go on leave. Are you going to deny the Government his services? But you will have to let him go now.

This proposal does not seem right to me, and for that reason I would appeal to the Government generally not to accept the argument of the honourable senior member for St. John, because he might be against the granting of leave passages. Let us bring in an Address and ask the Government to cease the granting of leave passages, but we cannot condemn the whole principle of the payment of leave passages now, because we are altering some of the circumstances under which they are granted.

I would appeal to the Hon. Premier to see that something is wrong here. In paragraph (b) of Clause 2 of this Order, it says this:—

“Provided that such service shall only be taken into account in cases where the transfer of the officer without his first taking such leave was at the request of this Government;”

I do not know if I have ever seen any provision like that in anything before. When you come to paragraph 4, sub-paragraph (iii) says this:—

“Where the officer's departure has been delayed at the request of Government made subsequently to the booking of the passage.”

I should like to ask how can you get this made subsequently to the booking of the passage? It seems to me that there has been some slack drafting here; let us say “the Government of Barbados.” I do not think it will pay this Government to be spiteful or otherwise to its employees in a matter of this sort. If somebody has earned something, I think that the Government should afford him not only a pension, but something by which he can go away, refresh himself and live a little longer. If you are going to say that leave passages are costing so much a year, and you are changing it to so much, I do not see that there is anything wrong about that. This Order says, that this proposal is to be retrospective as from 1st May, 1955, and I think that that is something which is radically wrong. You thought of this matter at the beginning of 1956 and you said “let us see whom we can catch with it,” and you go back a year ago. I have not heard that explained.

The Government has had some searching of conscience in so far as this Order is concerned. An Addendum should really be “Objects and Reasons.” The Addendum to this Order says this:—

“This Order entitled “The Civil Establishment (Leave Passages) (Amendment) Order, 1956.” has been laid in the Legislature.

This Resolution seeks to give legislative effect to provisions contained in the Order.”

That is all the information which is in the Order; it does not set out here that you have discovered that you are paying out too much. That is not in the Addendum at all; when we get these Papers, we should be able to say “this is the Government's reasons for these things,” and not keep them back, and tomorrow you might hear that an entirely different explanation was given. If you are ashamed of what you are doing, you just put down that this Resolu-

tion is to give legislative effect to the provisions contained in the Order.

10.40 p.m.

That shows me right away when I read it that somebody is ashamed of this Order. If you take up the Addendum you will see that is the reason for cutting out this. I am going to give Government the opportunity for a little further consideration of this matter in order that they might see if they can come to a conclusion in the light of what the House has said. Of course, they have paid out for Leave Passages and still have several millions of dollars to spare.

I was not in the House at the time when the Bill for Leave Passages was passed but I know that Government brought it down for teachers who were running out of the island at the time and certain other people. They brought the Order down with a restricted number of people to the House but the House said "No", if you are giving it to the big fellows, you must also give it to the small people." What is contained in this Order does not seem an honest and fair deal, nor can you say that you have not got the money to give it to all. You are collecting more money now than ever. You have \$2 million as surplus every year; therefore you can see that it is absolutely unnecessary to alter this Order. Do not spite a few people because when they take it they are not coming back into service.

What happened with respect to the case of the Attorney General of this colony was that he did get Leave Passages from this colony but, of course, he did not get the return passage because the Colony to which he was appointed might have paid it for him to get there. It is a fact that you sent him and his wife to New Zealand.

Sir, I will second the motion for postponement of this matter

Another thing which I would like to draw to the attention of the House is that I have been against the Attorney General of this colony for the compiling of the proclamations and laws of this colony. It is wise business that where they have originated they should not be compiled. If you want to refer to the Schedule of this Leave Passage Order you would not be able to do so because it has been left out. There is nobody to check it. Do you know that all the mistakes that are made in the laws will not be corrected? It is because the person who makes these laws should not compile them. Here it is, we have them compiled by the Attorney General now. Once upon a time there were people in the Courts who used to do it but now the Attorney General is compiling his own laws, proclamations and Regulations. If there is any money in the Estimates set down under an Item for the Attorney General, compiling these Laws, Proclamations and Regulations, I shall oppose it. It is a wrong principle and these are things which old members of this House who had some sense of responsibility and who used to act with high integrity used to look into. It is not right in principle that these laws should be compiled by the Attorney General and I had it in mind to mention ever since.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am going to repeat what I said before and hon. members who have been reading the *Official Gazette* ought to know that what I said originally on the matter was perfectly correct. The object of granting Leave Passages was to enable people in the Service to break the monotony and hardship of their work to go abroad and come back refreshed in order to continue their service to the colony. That is the whole object of Leave Passages. What the hon. member has said is perfectly correct. It started with our losing Masters at Harrison College. They said that they would stay here for less than

what they could get in Trinidad if only it could be made possible for them to go abroad and see their parents and come back. I will make no secret of it whatsoever. We did not pretend that the general principle of it was agreeable to all of us. We said that if you did it that way you are still going to lose Masters and Mistresses. There was a great hullabaloo and you will see, and rightly so, why you should limit it only to those people.

I remember when the original Order was discussed that the hon. senior member for St. Philip came in with a written list of his own. There was no Ministerial System then and some of us on the Government might have thought one thing about the matter, and some the other. The hon. senior member for St. Philip, among other hon. members, strongly criticised this method of doing it and he wanted to give it to people far down in the scale of Civil Servants; as a matter of fact, he said that all Civil Servants should get it. The Government saw how strong the Opposition was for picking out certain people and eventually agreed to lowering it to what it was. That was the whole argument on the matter at the time. It is absurd to draw out the argument about an officer giving service for 40 years and coming out of the Service should get it when the whole object of the Bill was to give it so that the officer should come back and work.

10.50 p.m.

It would be monstrous for a Government deliberately, when a man can be spared, to tell him he cannot be spared and then tell him in the last twelve months he can have his leave if he likes. But the Order prevents us from doing so. Over and over again honourable members talk of depriving a man of his leave. You can get leave but we are not going to pay for it. They are confusing leave with payment. We do not consider that this Government should take up its money and pay a man who asks for leave at the end of July or at the end of June and comes back and says, "I am going home." I repeat it would be arbitrary — it would be criminal if that man wants leave and he knows that in order to get Leave paid for, he must ask for it thirteen months or twelve months and a day before he is due to leave the service altogether. It would be completely wrong to say he cannot go if he can be spared, and prevent him from getting his Leave Passage paid simply by putting him off. Therefore, from now on if you want leave, you must apply for it twelve months before you retire. It is perfectly fair. There are some people who would not take leave. They have to be told to go and spend time at Bathsheba. It is wrong in the interest of good worth as a Civil Servant for Government to allow a man not to take leave; but a man should be made to go home and rest and not stay on his job. That, Mr. Speaker, answers any questions about hardship to men after giving all their years' service. Inasmuch as Government is interested in paying, you must go for a holiday and come back and give us another year of service. Thus, as honourable members will see, this amendment covers several points and it coincides with the Ministers' feeling that we have had — and I go further and say that certain matters were being done administratively of which Ministers were not aware at the time they were being done; and it brought to the fore what you might call anomalies in the working of the Leave Passages in this Amended Order. One is a man, and I have no cause to hide anything, who would otherwise have been deprived of his Leave Passage because he came to this island — [A VOICE: An Englishman?] he is not an Englishman and even if he were an Englishman principle is principle —

or might come to this island before he took his leave in the colony in which he was working and it was felt that it would be unfair to ask him to give up his leave and then not have the benefit of that leave.

Now, honourable members — I can only say deliberately, they cannot be so stupid—must have deliberately confused ordinary Leave Passages with Pre-retirement Leave. Pre-retirement Leave applies to every colony in the British Empire. A man is about to go on leave, he gets six months pre-retirement leave, and he gets his passage paid back to his country. This is far from making any distinction in favour of an Englishman or to an importee. This cuts down the privilege now enjoyed. If a man came here from England and served for three months or a year, or for any period of a year and then retired, or if he is 64 years and about to retire he could get six months leave and his passage paid, although he might only have served this colony for six months. That is the general principle of pre-retirement Leave. I am only saying that to show how far you are from using the argument that you are hitting at Barbadians in the first proviso and helping Englishmen in the second. A Barbadian is not going home anywhere. A Barbadian gets his pre-retirement leave and he goes to Bay Street or wherever he lives. As honourable members will put it, that deals with everybody, Barbadian or otherwise, who is going to get Leave Passages; it applies also to my present Acting Secretary. It also applies to Mr. Walwyn the Magistrate. It is nothing against a Barbadian as such. It applies to anybody who wants Leave Passages who cannot get it in the last twelve months of employment. The proviso for Pre-retirement cuts down the privilege which an Englishman now enjoys. To get pre-retirement he must at least serve two years; he can get pre-retirement Leave but no pay. We cut down the privilege so that provided you have been here for two years you will get leave in proportion of 24:42. How can that be said to be giving a particular privilege to Englishmen and not cutting down the privilege he now enjoys? In answer to the remark about if we intend to cut off Leave Passages I entirely agree with it. We have to consider very seriously the present expense on Leave Passages. I was rather amused to hear the honourable member for the City say we have the money, after all I have told him. We have had a hurricane, spent \$4 million already, and have the assurance that our Five Year Development Plan is not going to suffer as we have already set it up. You know we are going in for salary revision; you know that we are considering building a new Hospital and that if we find after six months that we cannot carry on with our Five Year Plan we can go back to the British Government for the help they promised to give us.

11.00 p.m.

If we are now coming with any salary revision to the extent to which we are going in for a salary revision, or if we are now coming in with a new Hospital to the extent that we can have a new Hospital, then we have to cut out something else; therefore, when the hon. member speaks of our having money, the reverse is true. With what object would a Government want to cut this provision out except that we want money?

I do not think that there is anything else to which I have to reply, because such points as have arisen out of the Order I have already dealt with in my original remarks. I repeat that far from

trying to catch anybody, the retrospective date was made to help and not to hinder.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, arising out of the last remarks of the Hon. Premier, we have now been told that the basic reason for introducing this Order is from the point of view of expenditure. I do not agree with our rushing through with this Order tonight because I am sure that even he himself has not considered it as carefully as he might have. Therefore, Sir, there is everything to be gained by delaying the consideration of this Order. When the Adams Report recommended the payment of leave passages, Commissioner Adams

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member in order? He was speaking on the motion for postponement.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is speaking on the motion for postponement.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The hon. member must not address his remarks on the substantive motion, but on the motion for postponement. He is now going back to the Adams Report; he is not speaking on the motion for postponement.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will endeavour to keep the hon. member to that motion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, if I am supporting the motion for postponement, I must give my reasons for doing so. Commissioner Adams said that if we want to retrench on the money which we are spending on leave passages, this is not the way to do it. Commissioner Adams recommended that leave passages should apply to the Officer alone and not to his wife, and that they should be paid once in five years, not in four years. But the Government was so flushed with money, and so bigoted that they decided to pay these leave passages every four years, not five. If they wanted to retrench, why do they not go to the five years as recommended by the Commissioner? Why fool people that they want to retrench in a manner which cannot save them one single cent, if they do not want to discriminate against the local employees? From the very beginning, the Government had it in mind that they would only assist with leave passages those who were recommended for them in the Adams Report, but they came down to other people. I want to say that there is absolutely no justification for rushing through this Order tonight. If we refuse to postpone the consideration of this Order, and finalise it tonight, all that the Government will have done is to demonstrate even more clearly that it has at heart the interest of a few expatriates, and is completely unconcerned with the position of hard-working Barbadian Civil Servants who have contributed their best to the welfare of the Country.

Any member of this House who looks at this matter from the correct point of view cannot fail to vote for its postponement.

11.10 p.m.

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

Ayes: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BARROW, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY—5.

Noes:—Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. VAUGHAN and Mr. ALLDER—9.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was then put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes:—Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. VAUGHAN and Mr. ALLDER—9.

Noes: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BARROW, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY—5

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: That is the close of Government's business.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go to Private Members Business, and take Order No. 1 of which I am in charge. It is a short Vestry Bill to enable the parish of St. Thomas to extend the limit of their borrowing to £500. Hon. members are acquainted with this type of Bill because a few of the other parishes had similar bills passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I see that notice of this Bill was given on the 24th January last. Can you say whether it has been fully advertised?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I should expect so. At any rate, I will leave it over until the next meeting of the House.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, it is the desire of the Government to go on with the consideration of the Draft Estimates on Thursday and I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday 1st March, 1956 at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Speaking on the adjournment, there is one thing which I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Hon. Minister of Social Services just raising a question with respect to his taking charge of an Item under Private Members Business, I would like to know what is your ruling with respect to a Minister dealing with matters under Private Business. I know you have ruled out private members from taking charge of Government Business. I want to know what is the procedure for members of the Government taking charge of Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: Every member of the House is a private member in one sense and inasmuch as the measure which the Hon. Minister of Services is taking charge of is a private Bill coming from his constituency and sponsored by the Vestry of the said parish, I think it is right for him to deal with it. These Bills are usually sponsored by the Vestry of the particular parish and then put in the hands of the representatives to get them considered in the House. Ministers are still representatives of the parish to which they belong. They are Private Members in their constituency.

Lobby of the House

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am taking the occasion to comment on something which took place in our Lobby to-day. We met today after an adjournment for a week. I do not know if the money under our Incidental Vote has run out but no face towels could be had in our Lobby to-day. What I saw for members to use were a few tissues. At least, Sir, we could have been provided with a waste paper basket or some receptacle like that for these things. I would not have liked anybody, apart from hon. members to go in our wash room to find it in the terrible condition that it is in now. It is a good thing that the light there is rather dull because if anybody went there they would not be able to see its condition. I think some better arrangement could be made for the sanitary condition of this House. I would also like to know the reason for so doing.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will promise the hon. member to go into the question to know what is the reason.
11.20 p.m.

Addresses Passed by the House

Mr. E. W. BARROW: I would like to remind the hon member for the City that the conditions under which we laboured in this Chamber have considerably improved since I made protest to eating sandwiches off the tablecloth. When I came to this Chamber, there was no provision made: but after much protest from myself and other members and after about 18 months to two years you still had to eat off the tablecloth without the benefit of cutlery or crockery or anything else. So if we have to put up with temporary inconvenience in the lounge, I do not think that hon. members should be too harsh at this juncture but a little word in the right place might be of some help. I would like to draw to the officer of the Government administering the colony that when an Address is passed in the event of Government business and everything being taken into consideration, the public of Barbados expect some indication that the Address will be either implemented or that some reply would be made. I refer specifically to an Address on the administration of justice which was taken to Government House by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy at Your Honour's command. We have heard nothing. A Commissioner is now in Trinidad — a much more progressive colony than Barbados in nearly every respect especially in the Judiciary. They have seen it fit to get one of the best qualified men in England to investigate conditions in that colony. We who pride ourselves as having an almost endless stream of super-experts coming here from the United Kingdom to advise on one thing or another seem rather reluctant to have the administration of justice in Barbados investigated. As I said before, I would not like the members, especially the administering officers, to feel that in passing that Address that we were making any aspersions over the conduct of anyone in his public office or otherwise, but we must assert our ancient rights and privileges; and I think that the motion for the adjournment is an appropriate time to draw it to the attention of the Government that we do expect some courtesy in these matters. It is possible that the Head of the Administration of this colony may have had counsel from other people that it is not necessary to pay any attention to us: or that if he did not pay any attention, nobody in Barbados would worry unduly because it is almost a normal state of affairs to ignore the House of Assembly; but we have far too old a tradition to allow it to be nullified in Parliamentary Democracy and in Ministerial Status, and I hope very much that some attention will be paid by the Administration to Addresses which we have passed in this Chamber.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am merely using this opportunity to mention in passing that the House is deeply concerned over the fact that up to now there has been no official statement in respect of the matter of an American Flag bearing airline using Seawell Airport. It was the subject of an Address passed by this House to the Governor not so long ago. The Minister of Communications and Works since then has been to the United Kingdom and according to a statement he made before he left, he is supposed to have raised this question with the appropriate quarters while in Britain. Whatever has been the result of the discussion he had with the Colonial Office, if he had any, we are still in doubt. But, Mr. Speaker, Barbadians were mystified to read in the public press that the colony's chief delegate to the Federal talks recently held in London made the statement in claiming that Barbados had several advantages including an international airport. That was a most amusing statement and the only information we can give or the only deduction we

can make is that the United Kingdom Government has already agreed to the granting of Seawell to be used by American airlines and told the Government so, while the information has not been passed on to the public. Sir, it is difficult to understand how the Premier, so far as the position occupied by him at an important parley like that, could get up and make the statement that Barbados is already an international airport. The House is entitled to know something about the Address we passed on the use of Seawell by American Airlines. It is disrespectful to the House and the country to be treated with this indifference on a matter like this, and long before now the Minister of Communications should have given some information to the public as to what is the present development in the matter. Apparently, the Government or the Head of the Administration think that when this responsible body pass an Address like that, it can be ignored and if we refuse to raise the question and the matter they would be justified in so thinking. We are entitled to demand that some recognition be taken of our demands and apart from that, Sir, the proper Administration of the country should demand that a matter of this sort should be treated with some consideration and given more attention on the part of the Administration that it has been. Apparently the idea is that anything the House of Assembly does can be ignored. The Minister of Communications himself said he would discuss it. One would expect that if he went there and discussed it that when he came back he would give the decisions on the discussions, but we are left I believe at the same spot, like Alice in Wonderland, as when he left. This matter is too important to allow it to rest there, and if due attention is not paid to it, within a reasonable period of time, we shall have to take more formal steps to bring the Head of the Administration to give us satisfaction on the matter.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, you could hardly expect that I would allow these hon. members to remain three musketeers. It is not humanly possible for me to remain silent when we are dealing with Pan American Airways. I do agree with the last question of replying to Addresses which have been passed by this Chamber; whether the replies are favourable or not, we are entitled to some replies. I intend to deal with this matter when we come back to consider the Estimates, and therefore it is not my idea to prolong any debate on this matter at this hour of the night. The members of the Government must appreciate that there is a new form of Government, and they

must also appreciate that they will not be there all the time. If they were in the position of the Opposition, they would certainly feel that they are entitled to replies to questions which they have asked. That is how we feel about it.

With a Ministerial system of Government, we know that the Governor will discuss a matter with the appropriate Minister, but we should be entitled to a reply. The only thing I saw about this matter of the Airport was in a West Indian newspaper sometime ago when something was said about our having an International Airport. I think that there was sufficient indication to the Head of the Administration to let him see that we passed an Address with full sense of our responsibility, and we are entitled to a reply. When that Address was passed, we looked at the matter from a broad angle. You hear that the Government had no money, but when we come back to the Estimates, I will show you how much money would come to the Island as a result of having these Pan American flights. We want to do everything to bring money and improvement to Barbados, and my feeling is that we should have some reply to this Address.

What I am thinking of particularly, is not merely an American Flag-bearing Airline, but if anything has been done, let us have something coming from America. It is not merely for us to say this, but, Mr. Speaker, when you claim those ancient rights and privileges and what not, when we pass Addresses here, we are entitled to replies; let us not have any idea of their sitting back and doing nothing about them. When we return to the Estimates, I will say some strong things. I am sensible that when one member of the House of Assembly says anything, do not fool yourself that it has not got some expression in the House. I repeat, that when an Address has been passed by this House, we are entitled to some reply saying what is being done; we cannot go on fooling the people all the time. I warn the Government how the people of this Country feel about this matter; we shall have an opportunity of discussing the attitude of the Administration towards addresses which have been passed by this House.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Thursday next 1st March, 1956. at 3 o'clock p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

11.50 p.m.