

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 12th August, 1958.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P. (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Hon. R. G. MAPP (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Mr. L. St. A. THORNE; Mr. F. G. SMITH, B.A.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following from the Hon. Legislative Council.

"The Legislative Council have the honour to return to the Hon. House of Assembly the Bill to amend the Education Act, 1890-12 as amended by the Education (Amendment) Act, 1947 (1947-9) which has been passed with amendments which are shown written on the Bill.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 16 Order, 1958.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Factories Regulations, 1958.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 16 Order, 1958."

*Resolution to approve payment of salary to the present holder of the post of Chemist, Department of Science and Agriculture, in accordance with the salary scale applicable to Scientific Officers of the Research Branch of H.M. Overseas Civil Service as set out in the Schedule hereto.

Resolution to place the sum of \$17,186 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59, Part I - Current, as shown in the Sup-

plementary Estimates 1958-59, No. 15, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$89 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1958-59, No. 16, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Bay Street, as described in the Schedule to the Resolution, by the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the provision of a fish market.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

Sir, I should also like to inform the House that it is the intention of Government to adjourn the House from the 2nd September to the 7th October. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition asked on the last occasion whether it was Government's intention to have a summer recess, and I promised him to inform the House as soon as possible.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Orders Nos. 11, 10 and 9 in that order as the first three Orders of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to take Orders Nos. 11, 10 and 9 in that order as the first three Orders of the day, and unless there be an objection, leave will be granted.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to find Orders Nos. 11, 10 and 9, because there are so many Orders on the Order Paper.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 11 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 15 Order, 1958.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) No. 15 ORDER, 1958.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Order, Sir, deals with staff for the Judiciary. Hon. members will see that it is planned that the function for the opening of the new system should take place on the 15th; hence the urgency for this Order so that the required staff will be, so to speak, legalised for that purpose.
3.25 p.m.

As set out in the Addendum, when the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1956 and the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, 1956 are brought into force the Assistant Court of Appeal and the Bridgetown Petty Debt Court as such will cease to exist. The business of the former Court will be transferred partly to the Supreme Court and partly to the Police Magistrates' Courts, while the business of the latter Court will be transferred in full to the Magistrates' Courts, District "A". Temporary arrangements will be made under section 52 of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act for the disposal of all pending matters in the Assistant Court of Appeal's original jurisdiction.

That is, Sir, when this new Act comes into force, there will be still a backlog of cases to be dealt with by the Court of Appeal (Original Jurisdiction), and it is thought that the Assistant Court of Appeal in its Original Jurisdiction should still function until such time as the backlog is cleared off.

In view of the transfer of the work of the Bridgetown Petty Debt Court to the Magistrates' Courts, District "A", an additional post of Magistrate will be needed there as well as the existing staff of six Long Grade Clerks in the Petty Debt Court. It is proposed however to replace one of the posts of Long Grade Clerk by a post of Senior Clerk. All civil cases will be channelled into one Court and the Senior Clerk will supervise the clerical work therein.

I think the present procedure is that the Senior Clerk of the Court of Appeal as well as that of the Petty Debt Court should go out and the Judge of the Petty Debt Court will be replaced by another Magistrate whose function it is to take care of the civil cases and Petty Debt actions.

The increased jurisdiction of the Magistrates and increased duties in connection with liquor licences also make it necessary to increase the staff. It is therefore proposed to transfer all three posts of Long Grade Clerk from the Assistant Court of Appeal to these Courts and to add one post of Chief Clerk and Accountant (\$3,000-4,392). The post of Clerk, Assistant Court of Appeal (\$3,000-4,392) will be abolished as soon as the temporary arrangements referred to in the second paragraph of this Addendum come to an end.

As mentioned, when the Assistant Court of Appeal (Original Jurisdiction) goes out, then the post of Clerk of that Court will also go out.

It is considered that the responsibilities of the Clerks in charge of the Police Magistrates' Courts at Districts "B", "C", and "E" justify the creation of a post of Senior Clerk. It is proposed to substitute one post of Senior Clerk for one post of Long Grade Clerk in the cases of Districts "B" and "C" and to add one post of Senior Clerk in the case of District "E". There is a considerable amount of typing work at the District "B" and "C" Courts and it is accordingly intended to create one post of Stenographer to serve the needs of these two Courts.

In connection with this last sentence, I understand the practice of these two Clerks was that they used to take home at nights work to be done at home and it was considered that that practice should no longer exist. Consequently, this increase in status of the Clerk and the addition of the Stenographer is to stop that practice which is considered undesirable. All the work will be done in the Courts.

One Long Grade Clerk is at present attached to two Courts - District "D" and Hometown. In view of the increased duties referred to above and to enable the offices at both Courts to be opened throughout the week for the payment of fines, etc., it is proposed to staff each Court with a separate Long Grade Clerk. One other Clerk will also be needed as soon as the new Court is opened at Belleplaine and provision is made in the Order for that Officer.

In other words, there should be a separate Clerk for Hometown and one for District "D" and they should be attend-

ing their offices every day and doing their work there instead of taking it home at nights. In the case of the Belleplaine Court which will soon be opened, a Clerk will be provided for that Court.

There is a Schedule and in it you see a comparative list of the present staff and the proposed new staff for all these Courts.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the timing of this Resolution and the actual bringing of it before this House is necessary and with it, no member of this Hon. Chamber can have any quarrel because, as Your Honour well knows, next Friday morning at 10 o'clock the Head of the Administration will be declaring the Law Courts opened and the new legislation passed in 1956 will be coming into operation. Naturally, with the change over, additional staff will be required because the transitional period from the old out-moded method of judicial administration in this country to the more modern method will naturally cause some difficulties and will during the first few months cause some administrative hitches and, of course, as usual that will be got over with the cooperation of all concerned. As I have said, it is refreshing to see with the new administration that in the near future the court at Belleplaine is likely to be opened. I have asked questions in this honourable Chamber when the former Premier, now the Prime Minister of the West Indies, was responsible for this portfolio but I have not received any answers; it is refreshing to notice in this Resolution preparation is made for a Long Grade Clerk for that Court and in a very short time the people from that constituency may not be forced to cross the hostile borders of the constituency of my hon. friend on my right to get justice: they will get justice in their own territory.

It may appear at first by this Resolution that an additional magistracy is being created but I want to say that no additional magistracies are being created at all 3.35 p.m.

All it means is that there will be no Petty Debt Court and of course, the Acting Petty Debt Judge, who has not reached the retiring age, will have to be employed elsewhere; and it is just a question of altering the Establishment to justify the appointment of four Police Magistrates. The impression must not be created, as the Addendum to the Resolution at first led me to believe, that an additional post of Magistrate is needed as well as the existing staff of six Long Grade Clerks of the Petty Debt Court.

I am wondering whether the Government is convinced about the new set-up. Of course, the Premier can always assure me that the Resolution will be brought down on the advice of the Chief Justice and his Advisory Council. I, myself, have my grave doubts as to whether the turnover in the judicial administration will in any way be sped up unless we get a Magistrate or two more. By that I mean that the Police Magistrates, under the new Act, will be doing the work of the Petty Debt Court; they will also be doing most of the work from the Assistant Court of Appeal and, of course, the work as it is in these Courts today is quite a lot. I am wondering if you will not find, as time goes by, that the number of Magistrates appointed to this office is too small. The Government may feel that it is best to take a chance and on complaint at a future date, try and come back to the Legislature and ask for an additional Magistrate.

I should just like to draw to the Government's attention one or two matters in connection with the question of Magistracies. No Magistrate, either at District "A" or elsewhere, gets a telephone at Government's expense. I feel that just as Police Inspectors get their telephones paid for by the Government, the Government should also consider paying for the telephones which the Police Magistrates must have, because they are also coroners. If a Magistrate wanted to be cantankerous, he could easily

refuse to put a telephone in his home and force the Police to come to him at any time of the night by motor car or by any other means. He could easily say that the Government does not pay for the telephone and therefore he is not putting in any telephone. I am thinking that the Government should install telephones for Police Magistrates at the Government's expense or give them an allowance for such telephones. In the case of Officers who are necessary for administration after four o'clock, you have the Police Magistrate who may not only be granting bail, but he may have to visit some unfortunate person who might have been dead for four days and who has only just been discovered.

On the last occasion, when we were dealing with the question of the appointment of Crown Counsel, the matter led to a big bit of criticism as to the matter of salaries. I am conceding that the salary scale for Police Magistrates, which is in existence at the moment, needs no quarrel or worry because at that time, it was accepted that the salary was adequate. However, I am afraid that with the new administration and the extended jurisdiction of Magistrates and the mere fact that they will be called upon to do work which was formerly done by the Assistant Court of Appeal and the Petty Debt Court - I am wondering if the Government still thinks that the salary paid to Magistrates is adequate. There is, in certain countries, the accepted principle that no man should be appointed to a Police Magistracy unless he has done three years' practice at the Bar. I am submitting to the Government that that is absolutely necessary under the new system. Under the old system, where a Police Magistrate had convicted a person in his Court, all that person had to do was to say to the Police Magistrate, "I appeal". Under the 1905 Police Magistrates' Act, the Police Magistrate was forced to send on that appeal, whether there was merit in it or not. With the new changeover, you will find that, in order to send on an appeal, it will cost you \$25. No longer can you tell the Magistrate if you are convicted, "I appeal", but you have to look for \$25; and if you want able Counsel and Solicitor to represent you, you will have to look for some money, in order that your case may be argued before the Court of Appeal.

I hope that the Government will realise the importance of having in the first instance men who have had experience at the Bar, men who are suitable for the posts of Police Magistrates for the obvious reason - and this will cause a lot of heartburn to the public of Barbados who have been accustomed to a very cheap form of justice which is the chief ground for liking the Assistant Court of Appeal. It is absolutely necessary that the Magistrate who tries the case in the first instance should create confidence in his decision in the litigants' mind, because the right of appeal under the new Act has been completely lessened. The Government must bear in mind that the office of Police Magistrate under the new set-up is an office which requires the experience of a man of a certain standing or practice at the Bar. Again, if you are prepared to get a man who has stood the trouble, the toil and the ups and downs of the Bar for any considerable period, the salary scale offered for a Magistrate in this country is not likely to attract anybody. As a matter of fact, no lawyer from outside Barbados who is worth his salt as a Barrister is likely to come to Barbados to accept any post of Magistrate or of Crown Counsel at the figure which at present exists for these posts. You may get quite a few Lawyers who are actually ready and willing and able, but as the hon. senior member for St. Peter said on the last occasion in reply to me, there are lawyers and there are lawyers. Therefore, I am suggesting to the Government that if they are prepared to attract good legal material to Barbados to give the local administration a new life - and what I want to point out there is that the Government was told, in the case of the Attorney General, that you have to get this, and the other, you have to increase the salary so as to get a good man. Similarly, in the case of a Police Magistrate. You have had to make these concessions in the case of the Attorney General, because you could not get a good man otherwise.

3.45 p.m.

Of course, we have had to accept in the case of the Solicitor General, a man of not ten years' standing, because

the salaries for these Judicial Officers in Barbados are not comparable to those paid in either Jamaica or Trinidad or even British Guiana in some cases, and that is a point which Government will have to watch. We do not want the Barbados Magistracy to become the preserve only of Barbadians; you want legal brains, Mr. Speaker, both at the Bar and on the Bench wherever it can be found, and I am suggesting to Government that if they are really serious about getting men of calibre and quality for the offices of Magistrates in Barbados, the present salaries are not likely to attract them; and with the new administration, it is vital that you should have men of experience on the Bench, because the Barbadian has been accustomed, since the Court of Appeal Act was passed in 1900, to a type of justice which in the whole civilised world is unique; that is to say, it is cheap, it is reasonably speedy, the fines imposed are reasonably small, and it costs him nothing to appeal. From Friday, 15th August, he will get a shock; he will have to look for money to appeal; he has got to do certain things which, perhaps, he cannot handle. Of course, I do not want hon. members to think that it is going to be a field-day for Lawyers; it means we will have to work a little harder in order to get justice more speedily, but at the same time the public of Barbados which has been accustomed to this method of justice over a period of time - in my generation and in yours, Mr. Speaker - from a minute past ten on Friday you will get a shock when next week it is told that it cannot shout "I appeal" as it could on Thursday morning.

It is important and refreshing to find that the Judicial Department in Barbados is no longer becoming the neglected Department, but is now actually undergoing a new and almost unprecedented flow of fresh blood, which, of course, will be for the better interest of justice. These are suggestions which I am asking the Government to consider, and perhaps the Hon. Premier, who no doubt must have consulted the Chief Justice and his Attorney General, will be able to say whether he thinks that the Police Magistrate at District F can, as at present exists, administer three Courts really well. At present the Magistrate at District F is doing District D in St. Thomas and District F. He does District D on Mondays and Wednesdays and District F on Tuesdays and Fridays, and now he will have to do Belleplaine; so I am wondering whether the Premier after consultation has been assured that the Magistrate at District F will be able to do both Districts F and D and also Belleplaine adequately, so that he can give justice speedily to those who seek it.

My experience is, Sir, that the Magistrate who does District E and Hometown finds that the volume of work at these two Courts has increased almost beyond recognition. As a matter of fact, Sir, I do not know whether the hon. senior member for St. Peter has in any way by his conduct or attitude contributed to the increase of work at District E, but there has been such an increase that the Magistrate there is forced to sit late, and very often is forced to adjourn matters for some considerable time because the work keeps piling up. Has the Hon. Premier been assured that the Police Magistrate, in view of the increased volume of work both at Hometown and District E, can administer justice speedily in these two Courts? District C which has a separate Magistrate for itself is no different from District E in St. Peter which boasts of a town. Speightstown, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, is the second largest town in the island, probably only rivalled by the town in the constituency of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, and therefore I am suggesting to the Premier that these are factors which he will have to consider, and should have given some information on at the time of introducing this Resolution.

There can be no quarrel with this, Mr. Speaker. All we can do is to express regret that the Chief Justice, who has so recently come and has inaugurated this new judicial system, is forced to leave so soon. All we can hope is that the new Chief Justice, whoever he may be, preferably a West Indian, will come to us soon and that there will be no long interregnum. It is a pity that we are losing the present Chief Justice within a matter of months after his arrival, but at least I hope that he will be here long enough, or at least kept long enough if necessary, to see the first few

months of this new system which he has inaugurated.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, in education we had a system whereby a new Director came, made changes and left. I hope that the position in the case of the Judicial Administration, which is equally important, will not be the same, because without law and order no community can thrive. I hope the Premier will use his influence in the right quarters either to persuade the Chief Justice to remain for two or three months to see the first struggle of this new administration on its way before he hurries back to Trinidad where undoubtedly the system of justice—although not spreading throughout the general mass of people at least, the administrative part of it is more firmly established than ours; and it would be a pity for the Chief Justice to leave Barbados within two weeks of the introduction of this new system which he has inaugurated. He is a man of considerable experience and ability and he is likely to know, correct and advise Government on what are the difficulties when and as soon as they are brought to his attention. I know he is going to promotion; I know he is needed elsewhere; but we should not allow him, having started, to throw it so easily on his successor and leave us struggling. That is a point which I am sure the present Chief Justice will appreciate, and I think one which Government no doubt will understand. I saw somewhere where he is supposed to be leaving in September; in my opinion, September is a bit too soon for this new system, because not only has the system got to work, but the public itself for some time will at least feel a bit uneasy, because it is entirely different from the system to which it has been accustomed. We can only hope that the Chief Justice will remain long enough; we can only hope too that in view of the new changeover his successor will follow very closely on his heels, and we hope that both the litigants Counsel, Solicitors and those who have anything to do with the administration of justice will give their ready co-operation in order to see that this new system, which is long overdue, works well.

Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in supporting this Resolution. In spite of any criticisms which may come, I am confident that it will meet with the approval of the entire House, because I think everyone realises the necessity for it, and as a matter of fact, the only reason for any criticism is the delay in bringing it before us. I think we all wish that the new system as it is may give satisfaction to all who are forced to use it to obtain their rights and justice as we know them.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is much that I need comment on in respect of this Resolution, except to say that in connection with the remuneration of Magistrates, I think the Administration has power, after an appointment is made of a suitable and experienced person, to put that person at the top of the Grade. 3.55 p.m.

I think that today it would be possible to get an experienced man, that is to say, a lawyer of five years' experience and of reasonable competence if you start him at the top of the grade which would give him \$520 a month. You must bear in mind that that amount is net as he has to still bear expenses of chambers, telephone, messenger and anything of that kind. I think that the minimum of \$380 a month would be of no hope of getting any person—certainly no one of experienced calibre. If you avail yourself of the right to start him off at the top of the grade, I do not anticipate any great difficulty of getting an experienced man as magistrate.

Now, Sir, the Addendum reminds us that the Bridgetown Petty Debt Court, like the Assistant Court of Appeal, will cease to exist. There is a judge of that court and one cannot hear what he has to do in the new reorganisation. In the course of reorganisation, however desirable, no individual who has given long and faithful service to the judiciary as a whole should be overlooked or forgotten, as the case may be, and although I have heard something in respect of everybody else in the legal establishment I have heard nothing of the judge of the Bridgetown Petty Debt Court. We all know that that person happens to be Mr. Justice H. A. Vaughan. We thought that he would have

been appointed Solicitor General and it is a surprise to us that a man with his experience—that his substantive post would cease to exist without hearing of anything offered him.

I am throwing out this to remind those responsible that it is not necessary in this reorganisation to omit any person at present employed in the Judiciary of the Island, whether serving as a Magistrate or in whatever capacity. I think a barrister of 30 years standing who has not yet reached retirement standard and who has given many years' service to the colony—something like fifteen or eighteen years—should not be overlooked. His case may be overlooked and that is why I take this opportunity to publicly mention that the Bridgetown Petty Debt Court ceases to exist but that the judge of that Court has not ceased to exist and he is at the age when he can continue to serve the country in some Department.

The hon. and learned member for St. Andrew spoke about telephones. I agree that telephones should be installed at the residence of every Police Magistrate free of cost to that Magistrate. There are some members of the staff of the Department of Highways and Transport who have telephones installed at Government expense and one cannot really see any burning necessity for them to have phones; but it is quite different from the case of a Police Magistrate who in case of sudden death or a matter of urgency requires it. Certainly, the taxpayers of this island would willingly bear the cost of telephones in the home of every Police Magistrate.

AS Your Honour knows, at the Dist "E" Police Court there is a telephone at the end of that court for the members of the Police Department; but frequently when one requires a message to that Court or someone in that court, the Police may not be able to get it to the person because there may not be a member of the Police Force on the spot to relieve the person on duty to take the message that considerable distance. Let the Government also consider the necessity for a telephone in the building where the Dist. "E" court is carried on in Speightstown. It is certainly most necessary to have one there. In every instance save this one the telephone at the Police Station is in the one and same building as the Police Court and is available to the court; but that is not so in the case of Speightstown.

I would also say that certainly more than one stenographer is needed for the Dist "A" Police Courts. There is one lady there and when she happens to be ill or on vacation—and you must go on vacation from time to time—there is no one to carry on. The clerks are not really trained in shorthand; they cannot type, with the result that no work is done and no proceedings can be copied during the absence of the stenographers. There are not sufficient clerks who can type and those who can type have to type letters and such things; therefore you have to depend on one typist for the copying of proceedings. There should be more than one typist wholetime at the Dist "A" Police Courts especially when you are having four Magistrates and the work of four Magistrates to be typed.

What I think is the grievance as regards this matter of the typists is that the money which formerly went into their pockets will now go back to the Government. The two dollars which they now receive for copying proceedings would now go to the Government. 4.05 p.m.

If that money will now be going to the Government, the Clerks will not be happy to do the work, because they will be deprived of what they have been accustomed to have—a reasonable honorarium for these additional services.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before we put the question, there are one or two points which have been made by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew and also by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy which I should like to answer. One point made by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew was with regard to the appointment of the Police Magistrate for the Belleplaine Court. My information is that under the reorganisation, that appoint-

ment is being considered. The hon. member also made the point that he did not think that the Magistrate who is now functioning at District "D" and at District "F" should carry on at Belleplaine. I want to tell him that under the reorganisation, that matter is also being considered.

The second point made was that there is the need for more Magistrates. Well, as in all cases, this is something which is being tried out. If we are satisfied that more Magistrates are needed they will be appointed later on. With regard to the question of the telephones for the Magistrates, I am not in a position to say anything about that. I do not know the reason why the Magistrates have not got these telephones. At this stage, all I will say is that I will see that that matter is examined.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER No. 14

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 14 Order, 1958."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this is another Resolution to approve a Civil Establishment Order for additional staff. In this case, this additional staff is required for the Maternity Hospital. As hon members will remember, the staff at the Maternity Hospital was always considered to be temporary until recently when an Order was made making them permanent officers. At the same time, there were certain substitutions. This Order provides for changes in the designation of posts at the Maternity Hospital as follows:- the Senior Resident Nurse Midwife to Senior Nurse Midwife and the Junior Resident Nurse Midwife and non-Resident Nurse Midwife to Nurse Midwife. There is also provision made for an increase in the number of posts of Nurse Midwife from two to three.

As hon. members will see from the Addendum to this Resolution, the Nursing Staff at the Maternity Hospital consists of one Matron, one Senior Resident Nurse Midwife, one Junior Resident Nurse Midwife and one non-Resident Nurse Midwife. With these changes, most of these officers who now "live in", will no longer "live in" or live on the premises.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with this Resolution, but it is not merely a question of increasing the staff; what we want is a Specialist Gynaecologist and Obstetrician. As you know, Sir, the chief export of Barbados is children. Although I agree with the Resolution, I would prefer to see a Resolution for the appointment of a Specialist Gynaecologist and Obstetrician who can help out these people. It is high time for a community which boasts of advanced medical services, to be able to boast of having a person who is a trained and qualified Specialist Gynaecologist and Obstetrician; it is high time that the Minister of Social Services consider the appointment of such an Officer as a necessity whether you have a new Hospital or not. You need such a Specialist today, just as you need him when you have a new Hospital; he can save quite a lot of children who perhaps have died, because of the lack of the services of this Specialist. I say that while we have good health services in Barbados, it is time that we have this Specialist.

As far as I am concerned, you need this Officer every day whether we have a new Hospital or not. The Hon. Minister of Social Services must look around and get a Specialist and come down to this House with the proposals for his appointment. We will not refuse to vote for such an appointment. Let the Minister come down with

this matter and let us pass the Resolution for getting this Officer as easily as we are passing this Resolution.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can say anything more than that we are considering this matter. I believe I am correct in saying that the hon. member is also aware that this matter is the concern of the Minister in the same way as Family Planning and other things are concerned. We are aware of the necessity of this Specialist Officer, but it is still a question of time.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) No. 15 ORDER

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 15 Order, 1958".

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution also deals with a Civil Establishment Order in respect of staff. On this occasion, it is a question of the appointment of additional Long Grade Clerks for the Customs Department. The need for this additional staff is due to three reasons which have been set out here. The first is because of an increase in the volume of trade. Steamships Agents have found it necessary to provide increased warehouse accommodation with the result that during the past year, three additional Steamers' Warehouses have been opened in separate buildings.

The second reason is that the work connected with the supervision of goods exported on drawback and the checking of drawback documents has increased to a great degree, and it is expected that that will still further increase with the granting of facilities to tourists.

The third reason is that the question of inter-island trade has not only become greater but the bulk of it is now being done by motor vessels. Due to the quick turn around of this type of craft as compared with sailing vessels, the work of landing and shipping of goods along the wharves has been accelerated. There is also the question of increased air traffic at Seawell Airport.

For those reasons, it has been found necessary to ask for these eight additional Long Grade Clerks, and I have no doubt that because of the increased work which has to be performed, this House will have no hesitation in passing this Resolution.

4.15 p.m.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, again this is necessary, but I would ask Government to consider getting good offices for the Customs. I do not know if the Premier has been there, but I do not know exactly how they manage to work in a place like that. The building itself should be put in proper shape, because I feel that for Civil Servants, who are called upon, as these Customs Officers must be because they bring in half of the Revenue, Government should give serious consideration to proper offices for them. If you go there, you must feel that they are not working under the best conditions to which they are entitled. When you go there you feel you are going into a barn, and therefore, I am asking Government to consider looking around for a proper building on the wharf and reconditioning it with a view to comforting these hard-working officers.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this Resolution, because I know the difficulties under which the Customs Department is labouring. They have even forgotten to put in another item here to call for more Officers. Recently, Government has decided to allow rum

dealers to put up their own warehouses, and whereas there was just one at the old market and there were two Officers in charge, today each warehouse which has to be opened on the Government side has to have an Officer. Only recently an Officer could not be provided when rum was needed to be put up for export, and it was only because of a shortage of Officers.

Another difficulty there is that they have not got a sufficiently large number of senior staff. Whether it is looked upon as a recruiting office for the senior staff to be picked and sent to other Departments, I do not know; but some encouragement should be made to keep these people who know the routine of Customs work longer than they do. The senior staff there, I think, is a very small number in relation to the junior staff, and the hold-up in passing of goods is complained of by commercial houses.

I support this, but I throw out the advice to those who have to transfer staff that they should not tamper very lightly with the senior staff and move it away into other Departments. I know that men have to be promoted and it is the intention of those responsible to give everyone as much experience in all Departments as possible, but this Department should not be hampered to that extent.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No.1 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour to move the House into Committee of Supply.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this is a Resolution under Head XXX, and it makes provision for items for the Inland Revenue Department through the introduction of the P.A.Y.E. system and also the introduction of Local Government which we hope will come off in the very near future.

Now, Sir, Item 21 deals with Stationery and the Addendum reads as follows:-

"The size of some of the forms required for the Adrema Printing Machine is too large for the machines at the Government Printing Office. It is therefore necessary that these forms be ordered from London through Adrema Limited. Supplementary provision of \$2,400 is therefore necessary."

We are not quite sure whether the paper used here would stand up to this Adrema Printing Machine, and we would be on the safe side to get these forms down from the Adrema people who have been using them for a long time and know what they will stand up to.

Item 28 is for Travelling Expenses for Valuation Officers.

Item 24 is for Office Equipment and Furniture and the note reads as follows:-

"During the Financial Year, 1957-58, \$25,500 was provided by Supplementary Estimate to purchase an Address Plate Machine. These funds lapsed at the end of the last Financial Year. A revote of \$21,015 is required to meet the purchase, installation and maintenance of the Address Plate Machine."

This money was voted during the last Financial year, but the machine did not come and therefore the money lapsed.

"The increase in the number of Income Tax Returns received as a result of the P.A.Y.E." has caused a filing accommodation problem. Three stationary cabinets are required to file the new returns at a cost of \$414.

The 45,000 plates which will make up the valuation roll will be arranged in street order and an alphabetical index to the plates will be necessary. Two eleven-drawer card index cabinets will be required to store the cards at an estimated cost of \$640."

The note to Item 25 reads as follows:-

"Adrema Embossing Equipment has been recently installed, but it has been found that owing to the amount of information to be put on each plate, it is not expected that more than 25 plates can be embossed per hour, which would take ten months for the work to be completed. It will therefore be necessary to arrange for the rental of an additional embossing machine from Trinidad and to contract out work to the Barbados Light and Power Company, who possesses an embossing machine. It is estimated that an amount of \$2,470 will be required to meet the rental and transportation charges for a machine from Trinidad, contract out work to the Barbados Light and Power Company and to employ temporary staff and pay overtime in order that the Valuation List be completed at an early date."

Then under Item 26 an amount of \$994 is required to set up the Trade Tax Filing System as follows:- 6 Filing Cabinets - \$720; 1 Card Index Cabinet - \$68; 1 stand for Card Index Cabinet - \$36; and Clerical Assistance - \$170.

I beg to move that this Resolution for \$29,333 do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I have been hoping for a long time to get an opportunity to speak on the Government Printing Press, and one has now afforded itself. If you look at Item 21, you will see that the Addendum states that "some of the forms required for the Adrema Printing Machine are too large for the machines at the Government Printing Office. It is therefore necessary that these forms be ordered from London through Adrema Limited. Supplementary provision of \$2,400 is therefore necessary."

4.25 p.m.

At the beginning, I must say that I do not want to hear the ignorant reference to what I am going to say that you are supporting private industry. I hold no brief for the former contractor of Government printing but I am informed by printers that this country has been led down a well with the glorified duplicating machines which we paid for to establish the Government Printing Office. Printers have told me that with the type of machines up there, you cannot even utilise that amount of man power because the type of machines is not a type suitable for modern printing work. We have an example here because the Government is forced although it has a printing office to contract work out to a place like the Barbados Light and Power Company. Here are the reasons: They say that the Adrema Embossing Equipment has been recently installed, but it has been found that owing to the amount of information to be put on each plate it is not expected that more than 25 plates can be embossed per hour which would take ten months for the work to be completed.

This is one of the few examples of the type of machinery that you were told to order at the Government Printing Office, which machinery was not geared to do the work you have to do. We should not act in any spiteful way; if you want a Printing Office, by all means have a Printing Office but do not start before you are ready. Do not tell us that you are going to save thousands of dollars on printing. If

I had the Resolution and the debate on the introduction of this Printing Office, you will see that the Hon. Minister who introduced it led the House to believe that there were going to be substantial savings. You cannot have these substantial savings in a modern age if you set out to buy the necessary equipment for the first time, because the capital cost would prevent you from having that substantial saving. You have this example that you have to give work out to a private company and you have to rent machinery in order that the Department of Inland Revenue may get through this work in time.

Now, Sir, what is going to be the position if at any time the machinery you have acquired needs repairing? As I have said, I have it on good authority - and it was no malicious information, because it is information from people who know about printing and they are people who are not interested in printing from the point of view of getting a job with the Government. They say that with the type of machines you have, they cannot begin to do the work you have. They also say that the mats which are in use by these machines are mats which cannot be used for a long time. I am saying that the whole thing needs a complete review in the light of modern trends.

The time has come when we cannot waste a penny of the taxpayers' money. The low standard of living in Barbados should shock many of us. Many of them are still living without the barest minimum necessities of life; therefore, Government cannot afford to spend money badly. You cannot afford it. Whoever is responsible for this Government Printing Office, let him take heed. I do not know the many other things which have to be given out to be done. We know of this one. No one knows what printing the Government Offices give out to be done because they do not require a Resolution like this to come before the House. What I am saying is this: do not start a Printing Office and call it a Printing Office on the basis of printing Resolutions and the sort of stuff which you print to give us. Last week, we spoke about contracting out work and Government said that it was against their policy to contract out work and they only contracted work out when it became necessary to do so.

Sir, you can see what the Government Printing Office costs us to run it. We are not against giving more money to run it, but what we want is productivity, and the maximum productivity for the money we are spending on it. Why erect a Printing Office which only consists of glorified duplicating machines? If you want a Printing Office by all means set about getting a modern Printing Office and not the nonsense which you have at Bay Street which consists of only printing by card plate and the sort of machinery which they have there. You do not want machinery at the Government Printing Office as would be suitable for business which the Barbados Light and Power Company does; you want machinery to suit the needs of a Government Printing Office. You do not want machinery to do small business, such as F.A.O. and U.N.E.S.C.O. has to do, or what machinery they will order because they know that they are not there for ever; therefore when they fold up, they will fold up with nothing costing them much. But you do not expect this country would fold up and go out of business. Why should we go and use the same thing as U.N.E.S.C.O. and F.A.O. and even I.L.O. would use? As I have said, I have got my information from printers and they were not malicious about it either. They said that the Government is wasting money in the machinery and the manpower it has up there because you cannot utilise it on a full scale. I will tell you that you have some men skilled in that craft and some are old printers; therefore, get the machinery to utilise the skill you have up there. As I have said, this is just an example of what is taking place. I am no printer but if the Department of Inland Revenue has a volume of work which required them to rent machinery and give out work on contract, that is one of the things which you should enquire into in order to see that you get the necessary machinery to do that work.

Sir, I have raised this point on the basis that a thorough investigation should be made into the Government Printing Office in order to find out to what extent you can

say it has met the needs of what the Government and the public require for the expenditure on it and for the needs to what you are committed. It is better for you to come and say that you have to change your whole views on printing and get a new type of machinery to do the work you want to do and that you cannot go on with the glorified duplicating machinery which you have there. For that reason I hope you will accept what I say on this matter in good faith. 4.35 p.m.

Some of them are broken down already. I take it that some investigation should be made so as to bring this thing up to date, so that we will not have a repetition such as the one we have here today.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is the result of certain representations made by the Barbados Automobile Association following an incident which took place with a visitor to this Island. We went into this proposal and we have decided to bring down this Bill to the House. The Objects and Reasons of this Bill are set out very clearly. As hon. members will see, under the law as it is at present, and as hon. members will know, every person who owns a motor vehicle on the first day of June in any year is required, when licensing that vehicle for use in this Island, to pay tax in respect of the whole licensing year. Every person who becomes the owner of a motor vehicle after the first day of June has to license it for the whole year. It is around that time that we have tourists coming to this Island - they come in greater number later in the year, but when they come in June the law relating to the licensing of motor vehicles applies to them. We feel that the requirements of this law operate very harshly against these temporary visitors and it is in order to facilitate them that we are asking the House to agree to this change.

The other object of this Bill is to amend the Act as far as the question of the weighing of motor vehicles is concerned. The process and the procedure involved for having a vehicle weighed is that a visitor is told to go down to the Reef Manure Works if he is living in St. Michael and then he has to go to the Cotton Factory. Visitors have to find these various places and that is a bit inconvenient to them. Of course, we have in mind in future that all vehicles should be weighed at the Department of Highways and Transport, but in order to have that done, we have to change the law as it is at present. There are other considerations involved and therefore, we have not brought that amendment into force yet. We are asking the House, in order to avoid this source of irritation to visitors, to agree to these small changes in the present Act so as to assist visitors.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I am not opposing the second reading of this Bill but what strikes me is this: if we are making this concession to tourists - I am not

saying that we should not make it—we should also consider the case of the local person, the middle-class person who finds it so extremely difficult, if not at times impossible, to pay his whole year's car licence. We should also consider even if not in this Bill, in another amending Bill to be introduced in the very near future in this Legislature, the case of the local person who really cannot afford to pay a whole year's licence at once. There are many such people in this Island, people who have to use these motor vehicles for their transport, because they have to leave their work too late or get to it too early or because they live in certain districts where it is difficult to get bus transportation and bicycles are of little use to them. I should like to say that the tourists are no more important than the local residents are, people who belong to this Island. I feel that we should give equally sympathetic consideration to the question of making it possible for the resident here to pay his licence with the same facilities as are now provided for the tourists; the local person who cannot afford to pay his twelve-month licence all at once, should be allowed to pay it in quarterly or half-yearly instalments.

4.45 p.m.

That does not mean that everybody will want to pay three months at a time; those who can afford to pay will continue to pay, but there are some, Mr. Speaker, who simply just cannot do it on their own; they have their little vehicle which they need to take around, and when they expect the Police to check it, they go around and borrow a certain sum in order to make up the amount which they have to pay for the year. If we can do it for tourists, we can do it for the local person and I recommend Government to give sympathetic consideration to an amending Bill along those lines in the near future.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I agree with this Bill because it gives a facility to tourists who come here for a short stay.

It was drawn to my attention only yesterday that this is the one island in the West Indies in which you cannot use an international driver's licence. That is important in the tourist industry. Only yesterday a Q.C. from Trinidad came here for a week and he wanted to drive a car; he took out his International Driver's Licence in Trinidad and he can take that to almost any part of the world, but Barbados is an exception. I think that driving in Trinidad is the worst, and I am throwing out the suggestion that the appropriate Minister should see what can be done to have Barbados brought in with the entire region for permits to be had for International Licences. That applies also to Barbadians going overseas, because they could be issued here, and when we go to Trinidad or to any of the other small islands and we have a friend with a car, we could use his car with the same freedom as if we were one of that area. I do hope that attention will be paid to that, because we are lagging behind the other islands in this respect.

I am in full agreement with this Bill because it gives another facility to the visitor whom we are trying to attract.

Mr. L. E. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of this Bill and with the remarks of the last two speakers. I think the point made by the hon. junior member for Christ Church is a serious one, because I think it is easier to find out where you can weigh a motor vehicle which has just come into the island, than to pick up the driving in this country right away. At the time when this Bill was being considered to help tourists, they should have considered our residents. If you are going to amend the Act in order that a stranger can pay three months, I do not see any harm in amending it to allow our people to pay quarterly, because it is a fact that there are some owners of vehicles who are really not in a position to own a car, but owing to their jobs and the movements of the bus, they either have to give up the job or get something to get them on the job. I am sure, Sir, that there is a man in my constituency—an ordinary man, although he might work for more than I do—who had to buy a motor car to get to his job, because the bus is no use to him. He has to be on the job at 5.30 a.m. or 6.30 a.m. whereas the bus leaves at 6.00

a.m.; sometimes he leaves his job at 9.30 p.m. and he has to rent a motor car. It would be nice if this man were able to pay quarterly, because he might have to pay for renting a car all that he worked for in a day. I am not saying that if he pays quarterly, he must put down his car and not pay for the other quarter; it should be just as it is at present. The licence is a yearly one, but you are allowed to pay half-year's taxes. If you pay for the first six months and do not work the car for the other six, you still have to pay.

There are lorry owners who work their lorries only during the crop season, and they find it very difficult to raise the whole amount; sometimes they find it difficult to raise the first set of gasoline; so we should do everything possible for them, and when thinking about "A" we should remember "B". The Parochial Treasurer would not be losing anything; it is only that he would have to wait a little longer for his taxes, but it is certain that he will get it. If you help these people they will feel they are getting a better Government. In my opinion you are helping tourists who will be able to pay half-year's taxes and go back in the first month. This is just like a person going to a wedding; he provides money to get his suit and pay for his car, and he gets his money to buy his grogs, and when the wedding is over he owes no person anything. Even with the taxi owners you have a chance of crediting a car to go to a funeral, but not to a wedding or an excursion. One does not know when a funeral is going to take place; so you have to hire a car to pay your last rites to a good friend whether or not you have money. If you provide this facility for a person who can bring his motor car for a month, I think that person would be a millionaire. The trouble with bringing this here is that in my opinion it is a little hard, because if you encouraged them to come here, then the local taxi owners would be able to rent them cars; and what they would pay would not prevent them from coming.

The residents of this country, especially the lorry owners, find it very difficult, because they have to provide tyres for their vehicles and keep it on the road; so it would be good to help these people. If you assist a lorry owner to pay for the first three months, he might be able to raise as much as would pay for the other nine months.

4.55 p.m.

It is the start which they need. Lots of us are able to buy new cars but we are not able to pay for them cash. Just a few years after the war, a garage was not crediting you with a new car and because of that there were not many new cars on the roads. Nowadays you see more new cars on the road than old ones because you have a chance of paying down something on one and paying the balance in instalments. To ask you to pay three thousand dollars for a car cash, you will see very few on the road. I can tell you, Sir, that I saw more old cars in England than new ones and I think the purchase tax and such things prevented persons from getting a new car. As I have said, you see more new cars here than old ones nowadays and it is no wonder when foreigners come here, especially Englishmen, they go back and say that Barbados is not as badly off as they thought because they saw more new cars than what they see at home.

I am appealing to the Hon. Minister to take this seriously and think over the matter. You can easily bring down an amendment so that everybody—stranger, friend, folk and resident can benefit. Amend it in such a way that every person who wants to and who is not able to pay in six months be allowed to pay quarterly. Bear in mind that they will still owe for the year. I think we will be doing the country a service.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker I would like to lend my support for what it is worth to the remarks of the hon. junior member for Christ Church on the question of international licensing. I think it is certainly something which is worth doing because not only is it a facility for assistance to tourists but something of great assistance to our own Barbadian people, if and when they have to go abroad.

I would say one thing. The issuing of international licences would cause a little extra trouble on our traffic

branch of the police because it is much more stringent in the granting of licences than I have seen anywhere else. I think that is something for which the traffic branch should be commended.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, just one thing. As far as I am aware, we have already passed a Bill providing for an international licence to be had in Barbados. I think that Bill was passed in 1956. If hon. members would check it up, they will see that that is today the law of the land but I do not think it is generally known.

So far as the other point is concerned, this is a facility for persons who have come here for a month. It is a far more difficult business when it comes to the point mooted by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. That is not so easy; that is a very difficult proposition. I do not think you will find it put in practice anywhere. I will repeat, this is simply a facility so as to facilitate persons who come here for only one month.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: I understand the hon. senior member for St. Joseph to say that not only was his a question of the use of international licence in Barbados by foreigners but the issuing of them to local residents who from time to time may want to go abroad.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: That is reciprocal.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: That is not so.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to take up the hon. member on a point of order, I can appreciate that point because, as I reflect, I do not think it is reciprocal. It has been represented to me that people who go to the United Kingdom now very soon will run into great difficulty in getting licences from the Police. They used to give them but they say that the local Government should issue these licences. In fact, I delayed this Bill because I felt that some of these other matters could have been included in this Bill but in order not to delay it any longer through redrafting of certain other matters, I have gone ahead with it.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. Minister. In addition to that, it will also bring in revenue. In a country like Jamaica when you get licences from them, they issue a Jamaican licence for so much but if you want an international licence, you have to pay a pound. Similarly here, if you get a local licence you pay so much and if you want an international licence, you pay a fee; therefore, when you travel abroad you will have it. We can accept international licences from overseas. It is not reciprocal.

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

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

The question that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative

without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
5.10 p.m.

On re-assembling

BARBADOS DEVELOPMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:— To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Barbados Development Act, 1955.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Barbados Development Act, 1955. I shall begin by saying that when this Act was passed, certain powers were given to the Board in so far as development projects are concerned. It was apparently not then intended that the Board should advance loans to Hotel Proprietors and Guest House owners. For some time now the Board has been considering this aspect of development; and after considering it very carefully, the Board has come to the conclusion that encouragement by way of loan to Hoteliers can and will do a lot of good in promoting tourism in this Island which will now assist considerably in the unemployment situation.

Perhaps I should say at this stage, because it may be thrown at me by someone although it would not make any difference to me — that I am one of those who were never wedded to the idea of, nor was very enthusiastic over the development of tourism in this Island. Perhaps I should give my reasons for that, because no doubt there were in this Island quite a lot of discriminatory practices in so far as hotel accommodation and otherwise was concerned. If you will remember, Sir, in 1956, we amended the Shops' Act, 1945, making it unlawful for anyone to be denied entry and facilities in places such as these under the pretext of colour, race or creed. In that case, that Bill gave legal status, so far as the Government is concerned, against discrimination in this Island, in respect of hotels, guesthouses and shops. That is a measure of safeguard and in that case, I think, although it was not for that reason alone, we can give greater and more assistance to the Hotel Industry.

One of our main reasons — and I might say one of my main reasons for not assisting this industry was that I did not want to see Barbados become any Bahamas or Bermuda where all the racial discriminatory practices are concerned; but I am satisfied that in our position as the Government of this country, we can pass laws, if we feel that the rights of individuals in this country are being encroached upon, to wipe out such practices and I think that we are pretty safe today, being a Labour Government which has the interest of the masses of this Island at heart. I think we are in a very safe position unlike Bermuda or the Bahamas, and therefore, we can proceed as speedily as possible to support the Tourist Industry and the Hotel Industry.

As I have already said, this Bill seeks to amend the Act in order to allow the Development Board to advance loans to Hoteliers. It may be said, as was hinted some time ago somewhere else, that if this Bill is passed — and I know it will be passed — the Board may more or less concentrate on advancing loans to hotels at the expense of other industries. When this matter was discussed in January, Sir Grantley Adams was then Premier and I was present at a meeting of the Development Board. At that time, all aspects of development were discussed and gone into very carefully, and we were then convinced that it was in the interest of this colony to allow the Board permission to make loans to hotels. Consequent upon that, we sent a letter to the Board informing the Board of our decision and I shall read a part of that letter. While we agree to amend the Act in order to permit the Board to lend money to these Hoteliers, at the same time it should not be done at the expense of the other industries. We actually stated this in this letter which was a letter from the Ministry of Trade:

"I am directed to inform you that the Barbados Development Act should be amended to enable the Board to make loans for development to the Hotel Industry. I

am to add that this Government wishes to assist the development of small industries in the more limited sense and we therefore do not wish the Board to adopt a lending policy which would assist Hoteliers at the expense of the small industrialists or businessmen."

That is what was passed on to the Board and it is this Government's policy; while we agree that loans should be made, these loans should not be made at the expense of other industrialists or business men.
5.55 p.m.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, it was agreed to amend the Bill in order that these loans may be made to hoteliers. I anticipate that while perhaps there may not be opposition to the Bill in principle, some members may discuss the actual administration of the Board; but I should like to say now that insofar as the Board is concerned, I wish and hope that members will appreciate that this Board operates on a confidential basis, although it is true that the Board must under the Act send a Report to the Governor-in-Executive Committee after which that Report must be laid on the table of the House every year. I am sure those who are really responsible people will appreciate that the transactions of this Board are of a confidential nature, because I am sure that no member of this House would like to know that he went to a Bank in this island and effected a loan, and then see his loan in the Paper where everybody can read that Mr. X had a loan of "Y" dollars. (A VOICE: It is known with the Peasants Loan Bank). I agree with the hon. member that the Peasants Loan Bank is like that as well as the Agricultural Bank, but it was never intended that these transactions should be of a confidential nature. The reason for that is that under the Peasants Loan Bank and the Agricultural Loan Bank, Government ought to be in a position to know where it stands, whether the individual has already effected a loan and to what extent, so as to make sure that there is security for the loans. In this case, this is of a confidential nature. My words might easily fall to the ground, and I must confess it is a matter entirely for members if they care to peep behind the scenes and get information to give the public, whether it is the truth or a lie, but I am merely saying that I am sure that if, as I understand, publicity is given to the transactions of this Board, - and I understand some members intend to give this information - then the whole thing is finished.

Well, Sir, as far as this Board is concerned, I go further and say that this Government has implicit confidence in the administration and the membership of that Board; and while there may be some aggrieved person, at the same time we are satisfied that whatever decision the Board came to, they did it with the best faith and without any feeling of partiality or discrimination.

The Bill as it stands, Sir, is to give power to the Board to make loans for the purposes set out in the Bill. Relief is not available under the Hotel Aids Act, 1956 for construction of hotels, purchasing or leasing buildings and building sites for use as hotels. It is considered that the limited funds available should be exclusively devoted to constructing a building for use as or to form part of a hotel, provided that such building has not been used as a hotel or part of a hotel at any time during a period of two years immediately preceding the date of purchase; for the purchase or lease of land to be used for the construction of a hotel or part of a hotel; and for extending, altering or reconstructing a building for use as or to form part of a hotel. This therefore would exclude the case of an existing hotel which has merely changed hands without addition to available accommodation. In other words, no loan can be advanced from this fund for somebody to purchase a hotel from another person. The loans are to be advanced for the purpose of making additional accommodation, adding more rooms to hotels or guesthouses, as the case may be, in order to accommodate more people.

I am not going to say much more at this stage because I anticipate that there will be some talk; but as I said, Sir, Government has confidence in the Board, and I do not know if it could have a better selection of members.

This Bill, Sir, is similar to that existing in Jamaica, and in the Report of the 1951 World Bank, they have even advocated that Government should find money or give money to hotel proprietors to pay for interest on mortgages and things of that sort. We have not gone to that extent and it is not intended at this stage to go to that extent. Members will appreciate that under the Development Board Act this capital is risk capital; the Development Board only comes in to play a part where it would be difficult for a potential industrialist to obtain loans. The Board is there to assist people along those lines in order to develop various economies and industries in the island.

There has been some rumour about the Board advancing loans to hoteliers without authority. As I said on Tuesday last in a Statement, no loans have been advanced to any hotel proprietor. As a matter of fact, there is no reason why they cannot approve loans. After all, I do not think there is any harm in anybody planning in advance; most intelligent people always plan in advance. If the Board is given an undertaking by Government who has a majority and whose duty it is to see potential legislation is passed, what is wrong with the Board going into any applications which the Board might receive and decide whether or not they are going to grant these loans? There is absolutely nothing wrong with that.

6.05 p.m.

I should like to tell hon. members that under the Act provision is made whereby the Board cannot advance any loans higher than \$25,000 without the approval of the Ministry or the Governor-in-Executive Committee. I can say that no loans have been referred to the Governor-in-Executive Committee and I am satisfied that no loans have made; therefore, if an hon. member is prepared to speak on that, I give him the assurance that no loans are made and all these loans are above \$25,000; therefore, they will have to come to the Cabinet before these loans are agreed to.

I think, Sir, that that explains the purpose of this amendment and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. WALCOTT rose to speak.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister wanted to know if I rose to second the motion. Yes, I rose to second it for the purpose of debate. The hon. introducer said he anticipated a lot of talk on this Bill. We can put the minds of the Hon. Minister and members of the Government at rest on that. We will speak at length. The day we lose the right to debate things in here, it will be a sad day. What do you expect? Do you expect us to bring guns? It is better for us to debate these matters in accordance with the manner of Parliament. There is too much of the feeling that members other than members of the Government should not even discuss a matter too long. I have heard it stated in this Chamber by a Minister that it is a waste of time coming back here to deal with a matter.

First of all, the Hon. Minister who introduced this Bill did not give us a progress report and I thought he would have taken the opportunity to give us a progress report now that he is at a stage of going a little further, because he is amending the Act to include something which was not included in the first instance. At least, you would have thought that when this position was put today you would have been given something of what had taken place by the Board up to today. We all clamoured for the bringing into being of this Development Board, and we thought that we were a bit late in making provision for development. A Bill of this sort was passed in Puerto Rico ten years before we did anything about it and they have been doing it in Jamaica for sometime. We have had experience and the world has grown accustomed to development projects as a means of developing trade in places where you can do it.

I hope our Official Reporter will not make the mistake which the Commercial Reporters made when they did not follow me in what I said on this matter on the last occasion. I hope they will follow me for the purpose of the records. The Hon. Minister spoke of risk capital. He said

that you are working on loans on risk capital. We do have to enter into things where the average employer would not enter because the returns may not suit the investment of such capital. This idea caught on because it is the investment of capital which you get in certain projects which would not normally go into those projects, but you do so because the projects mean something to the community as a whole. To get such investment of capital into such projects, you as a Government must risk capital on those projects.

I propose to show Government although the Hon. Minister has not given us a progress report that this Development Board should have done more during the course of its operation and the Government should take some share of the blame. I will draw hon. members' attention to Section 17 of this Act and what it states is this:

"The Governor-in-Executive Committee may, after consultation with the chairman, or in the event of the chairman being absent abroad the deputy chairman, give to the Board directions of a general character as to the policy to be followed in the exercise and performance of their functions in relation to matters appearing to him to concern the public interest, and the Board shall give effect to any such directions."

"Governor-in-Executive Committee" in this new light must mean the Minister. He must have the responsibility of the Governor-in-Executive Committee because of the introduction of the Cabinet System of Government. The Governor-in-Executive Committee cannot undertake what I have read out. The Governor-in-Executive Committee cannot have that talk of policy when this Act says that the Governor-in-Executive Committee may give to the Board directions of a general character relating to the policy to be followed; that is a matter for the Cabinet today, and more so it is a matter for the Minister under whose control this portfolio falls. I want the hon. Minister to understand that he has functions to perform as regards this Board. He can use his imagination and he must use his imagination: it is not for the Governor-in-Executive Committee because we hope soon to have these things re-written. The Hon. Minister said that the Hon. Premier and himself went to the Board and they had discussions.

Hon. M. E. COX: I did not say that. The Board has to come to us.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thought that the Board had a Board Room. How long since has it become *infra dig* for the Minister to visit a Board Room of any constituted body when they are having a meeting? It is not a question of asking the hon. Minister to go into somebody's backyard. The Minister had been invited to attend. What is the point of order in your saying they have to come to us? I hope the Ministers are not getting so childish as to get so inflated by their importance that they cannot leave the Government Headquarters and go to a meeting of a Board; if there must be a meeting with them, must the Board come up to Bay Street?

Hon. M. E. COX: That is nonsense.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is nonsense for you to have risen on a point of order.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I only rose just now to say what I said and I will not have the hon. member misquoting me.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I will not worry with what the Hon. Minister has said. He did say that he attended a meeting of the Board: so I do not know if it were held at his office or not. I take it that this Development Board as a constituted body would have a board room. If the Hon. Ministers think that they are not to attend Board meetings, that is a segment of the mentality of the people we have to deal with in this year of grace. Be that as it may, we must draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister that the real power which is his is not the type of power which he is worrying about. Section 17 of this Act shows the power which the Minister has in this direction. 6.15 p.m.

What is going to be wrong is what is going to be revealed. (Hon. M. E. COX: Come to the point.) Do you notice, Mr. Speaker, how the hon. member likes to intervene? I will deal with him coolly and calmly. The hon. member made a point of the nonsense which has been passed and I will deal with that as the last item in my speech. He spoke about a Bill having been passed so as to stop discrimination; but no Bill has been passed to prevent people from shunting you into the back rooms of hotels. However, I will deal with that in detail at the end of my speech. The Hon. Minister has the opportunity to stimulate trade. This Bill is a copy of what was in the original Act. This Bill is a Bill for enabling the Barbados Development Board to lend money for the purpose of constructing hotels, purchasing or leasing buildings and building sites for use as hotels and extending, altering or reconstructing buildings to be used as hotels. Then Section 7 of the Principal Act says this:

"It shall be the duty of the Board to stimulate, facilitate and undertake the development of industry in this Island and to stimulate, facilitate and undertake the development of agricultural undertakings or projects not in the opinion of the Board already well established in the Island."

It is within that framework that the Hon. Minister has spoken. I want to draw to the attention of the House the fact that the Hon. Minister did not think it fit to tell us today what he has done in collaboration with the Board to carry out this work; that is, to stimulate, facilitate and undertake the development of industry in this Island. I would have thought that he would have taken this opportunity to say what was taking place.

I quite agree with this amendment to assist the Hotel Industry, because it is another aspect of stimulating trade and widening the whole picture from the industrial point of view. What I am concerned about is to find out from the Hon. Minister what is his general policy in a general way. If you go to the Board - the Act says that you have the right to tell the Board in a general way what is the policy to be carried out. I am drawing instances to the attention of the House in order to show that we are still groping in the dark for some of the things which we should do. Nature has blessed this Island, being pitched on this part of the world where, on the one side, there is the Caribbean sea, and on the other side, there is the Atlantic Ocean; we are blessed in a way in which the other territories are not blessed. Can you see something sweeping on your shores and it is running wild in shrubs - you cannot talk about the Tourist Industry in this country without talking about the beauty and aesthetic side too. When you come back to the east side of this country - hon. members will remember that Sir John Saint was a Chairman of a Board known as the Seasonal Unemployment Committee. I hope Your Honour will pardon me for saying this, but I think that you should give instructions to the Librarian and the Clerk of the House that all records be brought up to date in this Chamber so that we can get things without difficulty from the Library. Sir John Saint made positive recommendations in relation to what could be done on the east side of this country from the development point of view. He is the Chairman of this Board and I would like to know what is wrong with the Industrial Board investigating the means of opening up things on the east side of this Island. Apart from the other things which were to be done, there was the question of bringing into cultivation things that were lying fallow. I think that that is something which should be drawn to the attention of the Hon. Minister. When you go to the Bathsheba coast and you look on - I even asked the Minister of Social Services on one occasion if it did not appeal to him that there should be a boulevard erected on that coast, instead of the ugly looking place, where people can enjoy a good scenery. In many Latin-American countries, you would have a building on the waterfront so that people will have a nice view.

On the east side of this country nothing has been done. Is it not the job of the Development Board to look after that? I do not know if it has slipped the Hon. Minister, but he gave an idea that this Bill has something to do with hotels which have already been started. He might not have meant

This is not the first time that I have said this: I have said it from the beginning. I am not thinking of any place, because everybody will realise that I would not be appointed to this Board, because I would not ask this Government to put me on anything. I have been elected to this Chamber on the votes of the workers, and I would be a hypocrite not to feel that the workers should have a voice on this Board. As far as the hon. junior member for Christ Church is concerned, I would say that we know how to work hard so as to hold against the employers. I am not making a plea for the East Coast Road in any way other than from the point of view of development; the construction of this road is a project with which the Development Board should proceed. With the reasons which Sir John Saint gave when he was Chairman of the Seasonal Unemployment Committee, why does the Minister not think that this is a project which should be undertaken? I want to make it clear that as long as I am elected as a member of this House, I will talk; the day I am dumb, I will not stand for election.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. senior member for St. Peter has made some very able and sensible points in this debate. The Hon. Minister must have imagined and must have thought that in a country like Barbados where so little has been done in the past for economic development and where in the past so few industries have sprung up in contrast to those in Trinidad and Jamaica, members of this House, who are fully conscious of the position in which Barbados might find itself as being left with the sugar industry, feel that in a debate of this nature—if they have any intelligence or any love of their country, this is the type of debate which they would welcome. I think that on all sides of this House, we are agreed that the necessity for the Development Board is there and was there for some time.

As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, it is regrettable that the Government of this country did not realise the necessity for such a Board at an earlier stage of their power and their control of Government. As hon. members will remember, the Board was established for a long time; the money was there, but the Board did not function for four years. I think hon. members on this side of the House will agree that the development of tourism as being the alternative to sugar and being a means of bringing more money into this country, and thereby increasing the national wealth, is something which Socialists should welcome; but at the same time whether the Board consists of workers' representatives or of capitalists, it is our bounden duty, if it comes to our knowledge that all is not well with this Board, then from a sense of responsibility, it is our duty to criticise it.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter is right when he says that he thought that the Hon. Minister would have given a progress report. As you know, Sir, under the old Act, this Board had certain functions which are being extended by this amendment to the Act. I am asking the Hon. Minister to tell this House and the public how many industries have been helped or assisted up to the present moment. A progress report, I say, is absolutely necessary, because the Government has given and is still giving authority to the Development Board to spend \$1 million which it had earmarked for the Development plan. In the Development Plan 1955-60 in respect of the Development Board, this is what is stated:-

"Under the Development Board Act, 1955 (1955-36), a Board has been appointed, and steps have been taken to secure the services of a capable manager. It is estimated that during 1955/60 the Board will require \$1 million for loans to new undertakings and other operations designed to foster development."

The Government has just permitted this Board to make loans up to \$1 million for the period 1957-59 of the very money which was earmarked for the Five Year Plan. If the Government is so satisfied at this stage to give additional power to the Board to spend in a two-year period money which has been earmarked for the Five Year Plan --

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. That is not correct. That is misleading. The Five Year Plan ends in 1960, and the Government has agreed that the million dollars can be spent by the end of 1959. It is not correct to say that the Government is allowing this money to be spent in two years. The Five Year Plan ends in 1960. 6.55 p.m.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: I am saying, and he can correct this if he likes, that the Government has allowed the Board to spend within the period, 1957-59, the entire \$1 million earmarked for the Five Year Plan which expires in 1960. Let him deny that. I am making statements of fact, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I am saying that the Minister, in view of the fact that the necessity for this sort of rapid expenditure has been given, should give this House and the public a Progress Report of the industries which they have enticed to come to Barbados, the industries encouraged locally and the plans and policies for the future. That has not been done, Mr. Speaker, but the Minister may take the opportunity in his reply to this debate to give us some idea of what has been happening.

You will agree, Mr. Speaker, that any Board in this country that spends public money and is lending out as much as \$1 million of public funds cannot have any confidential transactions. The mere fact that they are spending \$1 million earned by hard-working people of this country who cannot borrow 6 cents from a Solicitor or a neighbour cannot give rise to any confidential relationship. I am not a member of the Board, so how are we bound by what transpires at the Board? I am here to see that the \$1 million which we sadly need and which we can barely afford to spend is not frittered away in enabling people who are wealthy to become wealthier, or spent in a way which will enable people to establish more industries for the particular country. Therefore, Sir, the Minister was trying in a very tactful way to get members to feel that if they knew how much John Brown got from the Development Board, it was a matter of confidence and they should not say it. I shall refrain as far as is consistent with my duty as a member of this Chamber and as a man who has contributed to that \$1 million. I have not given up the money which I have contributed in Income Tax; so, Mr. Speaker, any of my money, whether it be 6 cents or \$100, which goes to any project in Barbados and is to be spent in enabling people who are already wealthy to become wealthier must arouse my indignation and my ire.

Now, Sir, I am saying that the Minister should get up and deny that the Manager of this Board is entitled to sign cheques by himself on the Current Account. The Manager of the Board is the man who can sign cheques "his one" as the Bajan says. What sort of business are you running? Yet the Minister is telling me that I must not criticise that. Mr. Shepherd can sign cheques on the Current Account and that must be regarded as fair and right, and the Minister is saying that the Body is above board. Except he is our Saviour, Mr. Speaker, there can be no justification, in administering a public Board, for one man to be able to put his hand to cheques. Let the Minister get up and deny that and tell the public that I am making a misleading statement when I say that. He must be another Jesus, or his hand is probably hairy in the palm. Are you telling me that he can sign cheques alone and that can be right in a publicly administered Corporation with the amount of money which we voted for it? Let us start getting rational; let us start getting some sense. Let the Minister tell the public of Barbados that what I said is not so. On the Deposit Account either the Chairman or the Deputy Chairman with a member can sign, but on the Current Account Mr. Shepherd alone can sign cheques. If that is properly run Government business, I do not know what this country is coming to.

I am not accusing Mr. Shepherd of dishonesty, but I am saying that a Government conscious of the small resources of this country should see to it that no man is in a position to sign cheques, especially a Manager who is dealing with public funds of such great amounts. He did not interrupt me to say that is not true. Must we sit

here as members of this Chamber with circumstances like these and say they are confidential and not say anything about them? Is that fair? Would any Government expect Opposition members to sit here and say it is right for one man in his own person to sign cheques on a Current Account of a Development Corporation with \$1 million spent in two years which was earmarked for a Five Year Plan? I want the assurance from the Minister this evening that that method will be corrected.

I think it is time, too, that the public should know who are the members of this Board. The Manager is a gentleman called Mr. Shepherd, an Englishman; then there is a man called Mr. Norton, an Englishman from C.D. & W.; then there is Mr. Dale an Englishman from Barclays Bank; Sir John Saint; there was Mr. Secchi; Mr. Maurice Cave; Mr. Lucie-Smith; Mr. E. L. Ward and Mr. Carew from Swan Street; that is the composition of this Board.

I think, Sir, that the hon. senior member for St. Peter has a point when he says that to assume that workers can no longer sit on Boards involving the spending of money or the shaping of policy is ridiculous in the extreme. All those people whom I have called, Mr. Speaker, are in some way connected with the wealth of this country, and therefore I think it is fair at this stage to show the composition of this Board so that people will begin to see how this Board must think, how they must view development in Barbados and whom they are likely to help of those who ask for loans.

Now let us go further, Mr. Speaker. \$1 million is a lot of money. In lending out money to some firm or business, you have got to take risks, but I would like the Minister to consider some of the risks which they have taken in lending out money to people under this very Development Board. I will give an instance of what I mean; you will get an example of a firm whose total assets are \$100,000; loans, mortgage and overdraft before they get a draft amount to \$96,000. Would you believe it that this Corporation has lent a firm \$24,000 on a second mortgage ranking after a mortgage of another big company in Barbados, and has turned down other businesses of a similar type? Do you know that the owner of this business is a foreigner and that the Board turned down a local Barbadian?

7.05 p.m.

The amount of \$100,000 is his own estimate of his estimated assets. His loans and overdrafts and what he has on first mortgage amount to \$96,000 and the Barbados Development Board will lend him \$24,000 to rank as second mortgage! It is true, you have to take chances. They are prepared to go to that extent to lend somebody money to develop a business which cannot employ people in Barbados in any appreciable number. That is one example and there are countless others. I can call names; I have nothing to hide.

I want the Government and the Hon. Minister in charge to know that under that particular section as well as the following section they can lay down lines of policy. That section says that the Governor-in-Executive Committee may after consultation with the Chairman give to the Board directions of a general character as to the policy to be followed in the exercise and performance of their functions in relation to matters appearing to him to concern the public interest and the Board shall give effect to any such directions. The next Section says that the power of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to give directions to the Board shall extend to the giving to them of directions: (a) as to the disposal of capital assets; or (b) as to the application of proceeds of such disposals, notwithstanding that the direction may be of a specific character. I have only cited one example so far to show that this Board is going out of its way to help foreigners who are not really engaged in business that may be called development at all. They helped a man to extend his printing press and even if that causes him to employ six more people that is not really an industry which can be called development. When you loan a man money to employ twelve more people, I cannot call that an industry which you should have. Let the man get private capital to do that.

Government has to watch out because I know for a fact that \$400,000 is already promised out to hotel proprietors and, as a matter of fact, some of them have already started to enlarge on the promise of the Development Board. One firm who wants a hotel with twelve rooms is to get \$75,000. It is true that in any sum needed over \$25,000 the Governor-in-Executive Committee will have a say in the matter, but if a man has already started on the promise of getting \$75,000, he may well argue that it is a breach of faith to cut it down.

It may interest you to know that all the hotel owners who have been promised these loans are all foreigners. Why does not Government operate a hotel of their own? Because we are struggling to get a tourist trade established in Barbados, it does not mean that every Tom, Dick and Harry can run to the Development Board and get money. I can tell the Hon. Minister who is to get \$400,000, who is to get \$60,000 and who is to get \$75,000. All of those loans to those persons have been approved already. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to call names, and I am refraining from doing it. If the Hon. Minister gets up and says I am telling lies, he can check it from the Minutes of the Board. I shall not do it because I do not want to prejudice anybody.

Let us go a little further. I do not want the Hon. Minister to go into detail but the Government has a habit wherever it has established a Board, like the Transport Board, the Natural Gas Corporation and the Development Board, to say that they have established a Board and therefore it does not concern them. They are concerned, they say, with the policy but the day to day administration does not concern them. If you are the responsible Minister, you are not going to meddle into the affairs; but when you find they are not doing things in the interest of the community it is your duty to step in. Does the Government know that as regards this whole question of development, one Board - the Natural Gas Corporation - has done something to undermine the Government's entire industrial policy? They have raised the rates on gas when one of the essential things to an industry is cheap fuel. I am telling the Government this. If it does not keep an eye on these things it is going to be sabotaged. If the Government does not keep an eye on the Development Board, the people there will lend money only to their friends. What the hon. senior member for St. Peter said is true and everybody who lives here knows it. From a financial and commercial point of view, the members of the Government do not run Barbados. The Big Six are in evidence as they were three hundred years ago except that in former days the planters and the merchants were two separate and distinct classes but today they own both plantations and commercial interests. Today, the stranglehold is as great, if not more pernicious than it was 300 years ago and that is something which the Government has to watch. They have to investigate this. Many big people in this country are getting money more easily than people who are struggling. Here again, I do not want to call names. A few small businessmen have applied to this Board for money and they have not received a cent at all, but other big businessmen have applied and their applications have been no problem at all. If the Hon. Minister should say that is not true, I will give him the name of a firm which got \$25,000. As a matter of fact, if you owe one of the Big Six and you were recommended by them you can get a piece of change from the Development Board. I am not blaming the Minister for that. We are blaming him for not laying down directions as regards policy and not giving us a progress report of this Board. If the loan does not amount to \$25,000, it will not reach the Governor-in-Executive Committee at all and that is why I am warning the Hon. Minister about the hotel part of it. He should know something about it because he said, as far as he knows, all of the loans exceed \$25,000; therefore, if these loans are not properly given and if the Board passes them, (and they passed them) then the Hon. Minister will be blamed for the matter unless he saw that proper security and proper precaution were taken. I am not blaming the Minister because under the Act it is quite clear that if the loan does not amount to \$25,000 it will not reach him; that will be purely a matter for the Board itself. But I am warning him that unless he investigates and keeps his ears to the ground, he will find that the

Board will be lending only to people who owe the Big Six, and lending to firms who have white partners. What else do you find? Now that public opinion is beginning to crystallise against them, they are inducing people of the same industry as the one which they would not assist to come in so that they will be able to say that you have an industry similar to yours. The Development Board is refusing to lend an organisation money and is persuading Swedes and even Trinidadians to compete with this local coloured man in the community. I cannot put it plainer. If the Minister says I am telling lies, I will tell him the name so that he can check on it.

7.15 p.m.

Again, if he wants me to give him a name in respect of that type of thing, I can give him. You have the Development Board refusing to give an industry money, but it has given a Swede the opportunity of competing with a local man. If the Hon. Minister says that I am lying, he can check on it. Let me recapitulate. You get them lending money to white persons easily; you get them lending money to big people easily, but when a coloured man comes up, they try to induce people to come in from outside and they are lending money to people who are closely connected with the Board. I do not want to call any names, because on that particular occasion two members of the Board refused to vote. Barclays Bank is involved. I cannot go any closer to the wind, Mr. Speaker, because I would capsize. (Laughter) That is why I am steering a bit away.

I should like to say that this debate in connection with this matter cannot stifle industrialisation. The moment you find that people in this country cannot get money easily, we cannot allow the Board, comprised as it is, to put up money willy-nilly and discriminate against local people. If it is a white firm, it is an easy matter. If you are bringing in white persons who have been selected by them, it is easy. They have told a coloured man: "If you will let Mr. So-and-so come in, then we will lend you a piece of change." Of course, as regards the hoteliers who have been earmarked for the big piece of change which will have to go to the Minister, nine-tenths of them, if not all of them, are non-Barbadians. I think I have said enough on this occasion to warn the Hon. Minister. It may be a question of raising capital, but you cannot lend out money to the tune of \$24,000 on machinery. I sometimes wonder how business is conducted in this country.

Do you realise, Mr. Speaker, that this Board is lending out amounts of \$17,000 on machinery? I say that they are lending money on machinery; they have lent \$47,500 to one firm on machinery and all a man has to do is to take out what he has in the bank and "skidaddle." Every chance which you take may turn out well, but this Development Board is risking too much. They are lending money to firms which are heavily mortgaged and whose assets cannot pay off loans if anything happens; they are lending money on machinery and personal guarantees. An investigation of this matter, Mr. Speaker, will make you think that people have gone mad. These people should get money on security; a Solicitor will not lend you as much as \$50 on a chattel house, because tomorrow night you may have a fire. The Insurance Companies will not lend you money on a house - the Clerk of this House will tell you that; but this Board will lend out thousands and thousands of dollars on machinery.

I think I have said enough on the matter, but I want to assure the House as my main burden that Mr. Shepherd cannot sign cheques on a Current Account. Mr. Speaker, a hint to the wise is sufficient. The matter is really amusing. I am really sorry that I cannot quote my figures out of deference to the Minister. I can show you where big firms have shares in a concern and are getting money; members of the "Big Six" have shares here and there and they are getting money. (Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The figures are "cooked.") If and when the time comes for me to use these figures I will pelt them across the House.

I think I have said enough to warn the Hon. Minister that he has got to go into this matter very carefully and avoid any feeling of discrimination, and prevent the Board,

composed as it is, not only from imperilling the future of local industries, but also to prevent them from enabling people in business to get too big. What I mean by that is this: naturally, if you start lending money to hoteliers - the figures which I have here will show that everybody is rushing so much so that the sum of \$400,000 has been earmarked, but there are still two other hoteliers knocking at the door, and the Board may have to cut down on the figures of some of them. The figure in respect of one case is \$50,000 and you may have to cut it down to \$25,000, but the rush is on. We have to do something for our self-respect and dignity, but everything is being placed on the altar of tourism. For years these hotels have refused to do anything for Barbadians and now the rush is on. (A MEMBER: Not everybody). Well, there are a few exceptions, but still there are quite a few of them.

Finally, let me quote an example. I do not want to press this point. As soon as you start taking points, the Government will say that you are stopping tourism. That does not matter to me, but if we feel that there is no discrimination in Barbados, we are talking absolute nonsense, because only two or three weeks ago, three American visitors came down here to stay at a Guest House. They were dressed very sharply and they were charming, they went to Island Inn Guest House and the Taxi driver was looking after them. When they went there in their Sacks, they were asked if they had come in to look for work as domestics.

7.25 p.m.

That is what I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, and eventually they managed to squeeze in at the Aquatic Club. I can call the three names, if necessary. One wore a sack and another wore a chemise and they looked real sharp; and when they went to Island Inn, the woman asked them if they were looking for a servant's job, but eventually she took them around, showed them the rooms and told them the price of them. Do not let us praise it too far because in 1958 no Royal patronage should be given to a place like the Yacht Club; it has no right to be called the Royal Yacht Club; the "Royal" should have been knocked off a long time ago.

Anyhow, Sir, I have said enough to warn the Minister that things are going on behind his back which he does not know. They approach him because he is a Minister and they would be very nice to him, but when they turn their backs they all laugh and grin when they drink their gin. You must always be on the lookout and be on guard because this Development Board is going to ruin development in Barbados. I personally know of no industry which it has set up, because the Minister has not given a Progress Report. Perhaps you might say that the fishing industry is an industry, and it is a good thing; but the only thing I have to quarrel with in the fishing industry is the security which the Board accepted for a loan of \$47,000. My only quarrel with that is that the security is too fishy.

However, Sir, I am sure that what I have said today is with a full sense of my responsibility. No one in this Chamber is more concerned with development than I am, because I feel that in Barbados if we are really serious about development and production, we should have an economic or development unit as happens in Jamaica and Trinidad. If you want to see a country that is interested in industrial development, you should see Jamaica. Not only have they established offices in New York, but in London, apart from the fact that the Prime Minister of that country has surrounded himself with the best economic brains his country is producing. Similarly in Trinidad, you have a Development and Planning unit which in due course will give direction to the Development Corporation. You cannot have people running loose as this Development Board is doing here; the Minister should surround himself not with people like the Financial Secretary, but with people who have a good sense of economic planning and real, proper economic training. The Chief Minister of Trinidad today has one of his own boys who has just come back from Oxford and spent a year with the World Bank in Washington getting experience; the Chief Minister of Jamaica has all the best economists in the West Indies.

What have we got in Barbados? A Financial Secretary in the Cabinet. No wonder our economic planning and our financial advance are not really good, because we have not really set about economic planning, apart from pushing \$1 million on these people. I am not saying that the Minister should do it, but he should have around him proper men. Barbados boasts of the highest standard of education; so do not tell me that you cannot find enough men of vision and economic training for the Minister to establish an Economic Planning unit which will enable him to give directions to this Board. Now what I mean by that Mr. Speaker, is that I am sorry for the Minister who in his position cannot give directions; but looking at the Board as I have said no direction can be given unless it comes from a Board of equally qualified and equally trained men. Can you see this Board taking seriously any direction they get on economic planning? Can you imagine the Financial Secretary going to call on Mr. Dale about figures and being taken seriously? Do you see Mr. Shepherd taking him seriously? Apart from missing the bus in the early stages of economic development - and you will agree that we are far behind Trinidad and Jamaica - we have still got a long way to go, because we have got to see that this Board does not fritter away its resources in projects meant purely for assisting friends, relatives or people of the same nationality.

Mr. T. W. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, previously the Development Board and the \$1 million given to it by the Government was intended, as I understand it, to assist local industries. Now we have an amendment before us this afternoon to assist hotels. Well it is one or two things; either the management of the Board knows nothing about industries other than tourism, or it is using every bit of its influence to see that hotels are assisted. I do not want to be misunderstood. I am in favour of the principle of this Bill and also in assisting hotels in the interest of tourism; I can appreciate only too well what it means to this country. But, Mr. Speaker, if you want to know the value of money, try to borrow it.

Now the Minister in charge of this Bill has made it absolutely clear that the Government has implicit confidence in the Development Board. As a backbencher of the Government, I am prepared to say that if the rumours which are going around against this Board are true, then neither the Government nor the Minister should have any confidence in the Board, and the entire Board should be called upon to resign. (*Cheers from Opposition*) I am not mincing any matters because it is unlike me. I have a sense of responsibility in this Chamber, and what is more, the \$1 million which the Development Board has is the taxpayers' money and we are custodians of it; and if any member whether of the Government or the Opposition saw any of the taxpayers' money being frittered away and could not get up and express himself, he would not be worthy of their votes in the future. I want it to be perfectly clear that any criticism which I may level at the Development Board is not criticism of the Government or of the Minister, because there is no Minister who sees after the day to day running of any Department.

7.35 p.m.

Often, even the policy they go against.

Mr. Speaker, the Manager of the Development Board at times reminds me of the programme which comes over Rediffusion entitled: "The Man called Sheppard." I liken him to the Man of Barbados. I am going to deal with the discrimination of the Development Board. It is all well and good to say that we have passed an Act to stop discrimination and things of that sort. Every word said by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew is true. The hon. member is not in the strict sense a member of the Opposition; neither am I siding with him when I say that what he says is true, because it is also within my knowledge.

I believe that this Bill should be postponed and an investigation made into the working of that Board. I doubt whether it can stand the light of examination. I repeat, the aims and objects of that Board are to assist people but why in the name of God should it assist people in that way? I know of six parties whom that Board has approved

of loans, to the tune of \$75,000 for one party. It is all well and good to speak about the functions of this Board as confidential; but when you are borrowing money from the Government, there is nothing confidential about that. The proof that there is nothing confidential about that is that the Peasants Loan Bank publishes the names of all those who undertake to get loans from that Board. Mr. Speaker, some of the people to whom the Development Board approved of granting a loan could not get one red cent from either of the Banks in Barbados and I will give the reason why. No solicitor or firm in Barbados will lend you money without having first security on it. That is why I said earlier that if you want to know the value of money, just try to borrow it. No Bank would lend anybody money on second mortgage; they must have the first mortgage; if not, you cannot get it.

I do not want it to be said that I am preaching any colour prejudice but I am going to state what is what. This Board has promised to lend this money to six white foreigners. It is the Barbados taxpayers' money which is about to be loaned out. I happen to know that one of these people is a bankrupt. The Minister is not responsible for it, neither is the Government. The Government has appointed that Board and has invested it with certain powers. As and when those powers are abused is the time to call a halt. Of these six white foreigners, three of them are promised \$75,000 another one \$60,000 and two others \$40,000. This is the bone of contention chiefly where I am concerned. A brick company owned by shareholders of Barbados comprised of barefooted, naked people who have put up over \$200,000 is being denied one red cent from the Development Board. This Board is denying a company which is trying to provide bricks so that poor people of this country can build houses of bricks which by all means is better than board; and what is more, this Development Board is discriminating by calling upon this company to allow them to send in their auditors when this Board has not suggested that to any of the six parties whom I have just mentioned. This Board is suggesting to this company that it will not be able to lend the company any money unless it brings in one or two partners and those partners must be approved by the Development Board. It is all right to say that we have implicit faith in the Board. A man has implicit faith in his wife until she deserts him. This matter should be investigated and if what is alleged is true - I do not make it out to be a fact - that Board should resign.

There is another point. The Hon. Minister has said that the Board has the right to lend out money up to \$25,000 but nothing more than that; therefore the Board can lend out sums like \$60,000 and the \$75,000 which I have mentioned, those matters will have to be referred to the Cabinet. Mr. Speaker, \$25,000 is a lot of money and you can loan two hundred people that amount. I say again that this Board is helping its friends. I believe when the Hon. Minister replies he will make mention of the coloured business man who has got a loan. I know the facts about that case too. I can tell him that that man has not taken all of the loan because he is afraid of the interest, and I can also tell him that man did not get that loan as a means of furthering his business: he got it in order to pay off an outstanding debt to someone similar to the personnel of that Board. Any Board comprised as the Development Board does not sympathise with the ambitions and aspirations of the common man. This is a Socialist Government but it is not only the common man about whom we are concerned. What we want done is that which is right and fair. As I have said before, you have even got a bankrupt who has been approved by the Board for a loan who could not get one red cent from any bank or solicitor. You should not have that thing happening in this year of grace. We are not speaking against tourism or lending money for the construction of hotels. We are speaking against the functions of the Board proper and I believe if an investigation is made and the findings are as we know them, the manager, Mr. Shepherd should be dismissed.

7.45 p.m.

You can liken him to any South African. He is practising nothing else but discrimination and they are running

the Board to suit their own ends and purposes, not for the purpose for which the Government intends.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I should like to begin first of all, by dispelling any illusions that might have been created by the remarks of the Hon. Introducer of this Bill as regards the secrecy and the confidential nature of any loans made by this Board. I think, Sir, that if a firm or individual has a case to put up to a Government Board for a loan, that firm or individual should not be ashamed of the fact that it or he is borrowing money from the Government, being made known to the public. All down through the years the planters have been borrowing money from the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank, the peasants have been borrowing money from the Peasants' Loan Bank, fishermen have been borrowing money from the Fund and as a condition to the lending of this money in all these cases, the fact that they are borrowing money has to be made public and that for obvious reasons. If we want to borrow money for the purpose of buying a house, for educating a child or in respect of illness, we know that the fact that we have made that loan is publicly registered in the Registry. Anybody can go to the Registry and find out your debts or my debts or anybody else's debts; therefore, for the Minister to claim that loans from public funds for this purpose should be confidential is sheer absurdity.

If I want to borrow money from the Barbados Development Board for the purpose of establishing an industry or erecting a hotel, my security should be good enough to substantiate the loan. The facts and figures given to the Government should be such that nobody could question the loan; therefore, Mr. Speaker, if it is laid down that these loans should be made public, there should not be any quarrel about that. However, for a Minister to come in here and tell us as regards the \$2 million which we are making available to the people from the Barbados Development Board, that at any time it is wrong to make any reference to the people who have availed themselves of these funds, is, to my mind, an unnecessary protection of people who are resorting to public funds for the purpose of furthering their own material ambitions. If the people themselves can go so far, they should have no objection to any public reference to the loans.

A lot of censure has so far been made against the Manager of the Development Board; but as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has pointed out, one has to begin by realising that the Board operates within the policy which has been laid down by the Government. If the Government had a dynamic industrial policy from the time this Board had been set up, all the money available to the Board to date would have been expended; but it is a fact that the Board itself has been hampered in making loans for the development of industries for the simple reason that the Government is yet to enunciate a proper industrial development policy. Within the last three years there have been a number of applications from people who wanted to establish industries of one kind or another in Barbados. Americans, Europeans and even Venezuelans wanted to establish industries here and most of them have fallen down, because Barbados at present has no proper Pioneer Industries legislation.

The Hon. Minister of Trade would have to admit that for over a year a new application for providing pioneer aid has been in the Ministry. He would have to admit that the country would have had more industries established already if we had offered the concessions provided by Trinidad and Jamaica. The Government itself is to be blamed for failing to provide the legislative climate in which new industries could flourish. For the last three or four months, it is common knowledge in Bridgetown, to quote one example, that a firm was anxious to establish a pasteurization milk plant in Barbados. The history of the Government's failure to establish a pasteurization plant is well known and therefore, there is no need to go into the facts. However, there are certain people who know that the dairy industry in Barbados is faced with extinction and that close on \$2 million is being spent on milk imported into this country annually; if people like them know what a second industry would mean in Barbados, there cannot be any excuse for the indifference with which

the Government has been treating people who had in mind the establishment of a pasteurization plant and creamery in this island.

I have been told by local people that there are people who are only waiting for the O.K. of the Government to start this industry; but we know that, traditionally, the members of the Government only pay lip service to the question of economic expansion in Barbados. Therefore, if it appears now that the Development Board is concentrating more on the expansion of tourism than on the expansion of industries, the Government alone is to be blamed. I, for one, would prefer to see every single cent under the control of the Industrial Development Board spent on industrial expansion, because while we may have a good season with tourism, we are not so sure as to how long it will last. Therefore, I would prefer to see our money put in industries which will offer more in the way of permanency, than put in tourism. As a matter of fact, this Government is famous for doing first things last and last things first. If in 1946, the Government had given to the hotels what they had asked for - and I may say that they did not ask for capital; all they asked for was exemption from taxation for a period of five years. 7.55 p.m.

All they asked for then was exemption from taxation for five years and they would provide their own capital; but they did not get it. Now we are being told that we are to pick up the funds allocated for industrial expansion and spend them in tourism. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that for the next few years this part of the world will do very well from tourism. Even in a year like this when there are so many major attractions in Europe, like the Fair at Brussels and the Centenary at Lourdes, and other outstanding attractions in Europe, yet still the number of people coming to this area has increased, and I think one very good point in our favour is the fact that as a big drawing tourist centre, Miami seems to be on the way out. Thousands of North Americans who go to Miami every year are now finding themselves in the Caribbean. I understand that they have had two or three very severe winters in Florida, and for reasons which of course have not been clearly defined, Americans who really want to enjoy a warm winter season are deserting Miami for the West Indies and Central and South America, so that for the next few years in so far as tourism is concerned, we may well be on to a good thing. But as I said, Sir, we cannot be absolutely sure that the bottom will not draw out of the tourist bucket in the foreseeable future, and therefore I sincerely hope that the Board will understand that its emphasis must be on industrial development rather than on tourist development.

The hon. junior member for the City made reference to the fact that among the applications for loans for hotel expansion, there are some to the tune of \$75,000. In one case of which I am aware, this \$75,000 is against collateral security which in itself could not be worth more than \$33,600. The property is not on the seaside; it is inland. The owners have no stake in Barbados; they have only been here recently and I doubt whether they pay Income Tax in Barbados; and to take up \$75,000 to lend them against a new property for which they paid £7,000 seems to be the essence of stupidity, because newer hotels on the beaches are bound to offer a concern like this very serious competition, and if the security is not enough for the loan, where are we? By any standard to any of us in here, \$75,000 represent a lot of money, and therefore there is something in the contention that the members of the Board are not correctly discharging their responsibility to the public. I go as far as to say that the Development Board in so far as lending money for hotel expansion is concerned, should not extend credit at all except on the same basis as it is extended by any firm of Solicitors or any banking institution in the City.

We cannot afford, Mr. Speaker, to play fast and loose with large sums of money like that merely in blind worship at the shrine of tourism. Making allowances, Mr. Speaker, for all that we hope to obtain, there can be no justification for these unnecessary risks. I am almost certain that in some of these cases, we are not going to get the money back. The moment there is an adverse season or two, people

with no stake in this country and without adequate collateral to justify the loan will pack up their trunks and go and leave us holding the bag. Apart from that, Mr. Speaker, one has to wonder what terms for repayment are being offered. To service a loan of \$75,000 at 6% would be nearly \$400 a month, and then, Sir, if they are going to pay it back in about ten years, it means that they have got to look for, in the first year or two, nearly \$1,000 a month right through the year. Any business that can offer these prospects, Mr. Speaker, should be such a business enterprise as to attract credit from any banking institution or any firm of Solicitors; but apparently although the prospects are so great, the recognised institutions are fighting shy of them, while the Development Board is holding the baby because the Board get its funds from a limitless Treasury!

If, Mr. Speaker, the people in this country are to have confidence in the Board, then there must be some check to the allegations made on the floor of the House today, and the Board must be told, although they have money for the purpose which is outlined in the amendment to this Bill, yet still they are expected to expend these funds judiciously as if they were their own private funds, and not to squander them *ad lib* to the first people who come along without adequate security and without imposing normal money borrowing conditions. I am not going to waste my time, Mr. Speaker, doing as I have done repeatedly in the past, explaining the line along which a proper development programme in Barbados should run. It is common knowledge that way back in 1946 I introduced in this Chamber a Bill to set up an Industrial Development Board, and only a few years ago the Government decided to introduce legislation for the purpose.

8.05 p.m.

I also at length on repeated occasions outlined the lines along which in my opinion the country could be with advantage developed industrially. The hon. junior member for St. Andrew made reference to what has been done by Trinidad and Jamaica and he could have told the House that new industries in Jamaica now employ something like 15,000 people. He also could have told the House that merely because we employ an official and call him Manager of the Development Board and pay him a reasonable salary, it does not follow that policy should be formulated, initiated and carried through by him. Is the Hon. Minister prepared to say if we import two million shoes, we want a shoe factory and seek to establish a shoe factory or to get someone to come in and establish it? But apart from that, I accuse them of blocking attempts of people with the know-how to come here and establish industries, and that has been so in not one case or two. So long as they remain holding the reins of office, so long as the country will remain industrially backward.

I want to ask a simple question. Is there any possibility of seeing that this Government prepares a detailed programme of industrial development and submits it to the country? They are at the last moment converted to the tourist industry because it offers them an opportunity of salvaging their own conscience. I say, Sir, that simultaneously with this, they should be doing other things, so that if and when there is a recess in tourism or the bottom falls out of the tourist bucket, they will have something else on which to hold. I say that because if you give a detailed study to the tourist industry, you will see that your graph may be up in certain areas for certain periods. Then, human nature being what it is, and with the change of times, it will move somewhere else. If we emphasise too much the tourism part at the expense of other things we may wake up one morning when it is too late to find we have made fools of ourselves.

There is no single industry that offers more to Barbados today immediately than the development of the dairy industry. It offers employment and enrichment of the land as well as a saving in export of money which we have worked for here so hard and what not, and a general overall improvement in the economy of the country. Sir, you would not believe that they are actually sitting tight on cut and dried proposals for expanding the dairy industry from people who do not want one single cent from them. I am not prepared, Mr. Speaker, to expose in any detail the

number of new industries which they have allowed to slip out of the colony for the last four years, but some hon. member referred to the fact that the Natural Gas Corporation has increased its rates by 15% for industrial purposes. We have in this country a bottled gas industry which is even exploiting the country more than the Natural Gas Corporation is. That bottled gas is imported from Trinidad. It must be within the knowledge of the Hon. Minister of Trade that attempts were made within the last two years to supplant natural gas by bottled gas to consumers by people who had the money and the know-how. Ask them why the plan was abandoned and failed. It was abandoned for some of the flimsy reasons they had for refusing to assist in the establishing of new industries.

I repeat, Sir, that I know nothing of the actual day to day working of the Development Board, but I do know that whoever is responsible, whether the Manager or whatever he is, he could by now have done a far better job for the economic expansion of Barbados if the Government had the local climate suitable for pioneer industries in Barbados. Unless and until they do that, unless and until they give similar concessions to pioneer industries as those which had to be given in Trinidad and Jamaica - and for some time now - we will get nowhere.

The hon. member referred to the fact that Jamaica has an office in London and one in New York for the purpose of attracting new industries. Barbados can put an office nowhere because they have nothing to offer. If the Manager of the Development Board asked them to put an office in New York or London, they cannot do it because Barbados does not offer what Jamaica or Trinidad offers; therefore, merely to blame the Manager of the Board for the economic stagnation of the Board when in truth and in fact the fault lies in the Government is not fair. The Board can only act within the confines of lines laid down by the Government. Mr. Shepherd cannot formulate policy and ask people to come here to invest money in industrial enterprises when the Government of Barbados is offering to its potential investors less inducement than is being offered elsewhere in the area. We must take pattern by the fact that although there are even bigger efforts in Jamaica for expansion of tourism and although Trinidad is to put down a million dollar hotel, they are not merely concerning themselves with tourism; their efforts at industrial expansion are even greater than their efforts to capture a share of what so far as we know may in the not distant future turn out to be a very transient tourist trade.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

8.15 p.m.

BARBADOS DEVELOPMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: On the suspension of the sitting the House was debating the second reading of a Bill to amend the Barbados Development Act, 1955.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, although much criticism has been hurled at the Barbados Development Board and the workings of it during the debate on this Bill, no hon. member has yet said that what we are doing here today is wrong. As a matter of fact, as far as I remember, when the Barbados Development Board was being created, I said then that the hotel industry should be included for development and assistance from the Board. It was said that they would have a special Board of their own which we all know is something of another nature. One or two hon. members have voiced two things and they have even suggested that the Tourist Board should pay attention to the development of the East Coast Road in its programme. That, we all agree, should be done, but that it should be done by the Government and not by either of these Boards,

because they were not created for that purpose. They can draw the Government's attention to the matter, but hon. members of this House have already done that from time to time. The East Coast Road would undoubtedly assist the tourist industry tremendously, because it would open up that entire area which we think is so beautiful and so cool and which lends itself so admirably as another area in Barbados for the establishment of hotels.

As to the composition of the Board, all the names were read out here tonight; and from what I know of that Board, it will have my confidence. On that Board there are persons of integrity; they are well balanced and their primary, and I would say, their only object in being created as a Board is to invest money. Any of us who had money to invest and wanted to hand it to someone for that purpose, would look to people of that type whose job it is to invest money. The Chairman of the Board is Sir John Saint and although he is not a financier, he has been so closely connected with development in Barbados and for so many years that we know he has the interest of Barbados at heart. He is an Englishman, but he has made Barbados his home and we have confidence as to his integrity and ability to direct that Board along proper channels.

Mr. Maurice Cave is Chairman of the Barbados Mutual Life Assurance Company; he has a responsible job and he is daily making loans to people in all walks of life in real estate and in other businesses not only in Barbados but in the West Indies. Therefore, he should be quite *au fait* with the requirements which are necessary for some investors. As to the other members of the Board, I will say that they are no less interested in Barbados than those I have mentioned. Some are bankers in their own right and they are businessmen in Bridgetown. The duties of this Board are to lend money to people and organisations which will not qualify in their own right from private sources. By that I mean that there is a greater element of risk where the Board is concerned and that is what they are supposed to do. I do not mean to say that if a good risk or a very secure risk is there and they feel that it is for the purpose of strengthening the economy of the island and assisting an existing industry or a new industry in Barbados, it is not their duty to look after it. This sum of \$1 million looks like a lot of money to Barbadians, but for development purposes, it is a very small amount indeed. We have seen a list passed around here, whether it is correct or not, of existing hotels which have made application for loans and it takes up quite a sizable portion of what the Board has to invest.

This Board has been functioning - we have not yet seen a report and therefore, we are unable to say how many industries and of what size have been established and what amounts have been issued. It is too early, therefore to condemn the Board in the manner in which some hon. members have done. The Board should be given an opportunity to show results and to attack them at this early stage is, I think, wrong. If it is just a question of drawing to the attention of the public or to the attention of the Board that hon. members feel that they are rather reckless in the issuing of these funds and that they are not taking adequate security, I do not know; but I cannot for one moment, think that this Board, comprised as it is, would lend money to people without having proper security. That criticism, of course, can be answered by the Government.

It is not my duty to answer any criticism, but I am only doing it, because the Board - I have not any dealings with them; I am glad to say that my family which is largely interested in the tourist industry has not had to make any application for any sum of money. (Hear! hear!) However, if it were necessary for me to do so, the Board is there for that purpose and I would not hesitate to use the facilities of the Board, because I am a taxpayer, I am a Barbadian; and if as we have interest in hotels, we feel it necessary as the time and occasion arose that we would have to ask the Board to lend us money, I do not think we would hesitate to do so at all.

9.10 p.m.

I wish the public generally to have confidence in the Board, and I want all dealings with the Board to withstand any public scrutiny. These are public funds and I would like to see not only the hotel industry but industries generally well established and thriving in Barbados. For too long we have been talking about having a single economy in Barbados and being too dependent on sugar, and we have been looking for other industries to assist the sugar industry. Even the sugar people today are realising that we should get something else. I have not heard a single member mention an industry which has been assisted or any new industry that can be attracted into Barbados. Industries are not things you have on a shelf and which you take down and dust off. When we have industries, we will then attract people with money into this area because that is what they are looking for today more than anything else. They want to know if they bring their capital to Barbados that it is going to be respected and fairly treated; they want to assist in development; but they are not going to bring their money here if they once feel that it is in danger of being misappropriated or lost or embarrassed to the point that no dividends can be paid. When we have done that, we have done a bigger job than the Development Board can do. Let us create in Barbados a healthy feeling for investment. Too many of these Latin American countries have thrust away opportunities; they want their places developed; they know the money is there, but refuse to give it without security and without confidence which is necessary before it will come.

Government can get loans from overseas of a limited amount and bring it in for certain development, but the big money which is going to produce taxes and increase for further development is private capital. That is what we want to attract and that is what we should go all out to attract. When we have that confidence with foreign investors coming in and setting an example for others to follow, we will have all the money we want; but we must give it that start. Of all the industries that we have seen to strengthen the economy of Barbados, I see nothing more suited to us than a healthy tourist industry; that is why we are putting our money into it, because we feel it has a future; but it will only have a future if we do those things which I have just mentioned. Let us help ourselves; let us realise that money is needed, but it must not be threatened. Let us talk sensibly about it and not be afraid to let people come and make money, because in the making of money they are creating money for all.

It was felt in the beginning that this Bill would have a stormy passage. I did not speak earlier because I wanted to hear what were the objections; when boiled down they are not against the Bill, because all members feel, Sir, by what they have said, that they are quite prepared to allow the Development Board to lend money to the hotel industry. Some are afraid that too much may be lent to the hotel industry to the exclusion of the other industries; that is reasonable. The only answer to that is that we need more money. This is not for new hotels, because \$1 million would not go far in building a new hotel, and we do wish to spread it as far as possible and help the small businessman before the big businessman, because he is not in as good a position to borrow from private banks as big businessmen. All the hotels on this unofficial list are deserving, and I am very pleased that the attitude is not against the Bill, but against the working of the Board. I cannot substantiate that and I can only speak of the composition of the Board as I know it, and I have confidence in it. Nothing has gone wrong yet, and I do not expect anything to go wrong. I am sure that the precautions they will take in the investment of public funds will be as good as any we can give.

I cannot see the object of a man lending money without proper security, but again I say that you are not lending it with the same security which the Barbados Mutual Life Assurance or a Bank would lend it. You are lending it with a little more risk because that was the purpose of the Development Board; it is the purpose of the Development Boards from Puerto Rico down to Trinidad. If it were not so there would be nothing in it. They are to lend and stimulate things, but if they can get proper security - and they should

set out to get all the security they can - so much the better, and the wider they can spread their interest. The hotel industry is in need of funds and it will be money well spent.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, like my colleague who has just sat down, I rise in support of this Bill which seeks to bolster our economy. From time immemorial we have heard that we should not rely on our one crop economy, and now that an attempt is being made to bolster the economy of this country, we can only wish it success and hope that the functions of the Board will live up to every expectation.

At this stage, Sir, having been an ex-Minister and having participated in the appointment of this Board at the time it was set up, it would not be right if I attempted to criticise the personnel of the Board in any marked manner. 9.20 p.m.

I will say this in passing. In my view, composition of this Board is top heavy and although it may be comprised of men of high calibre, yet it should be comprised also of persons who represent workers and who have a better knowledge of small hotels and small guest houses. I think that the small hotels and small guest houses have very little representation on this Board and I will feel very pleased if the Hon. Minister would make a special note of that and see that the burden of criticism here tonight is not so much on the principle of the Bill but on the composition of the Board. I feel if attention is paid in the future to the composition of the Board, whether you add to the number there or make an amendment so that workers' representatives and people who have an intimate knowledge and experience in the working of small hotels and small guest houses - which do a great deal of good to our brethren and sisters in the other islands who can ill afford to pay the high rates as are charged at the large hotels - a lot of the criticisms which were levelled here tonight would not have been made at all.

I am not in a position to criticise the Manager or the individual members of the Board as I cannot prove anything has gone wrong, as it seems the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has proved or appears to have proved. I will say this. I see no reason why the Board should be given such wide powers. On final analysis, the criticisms would have to be levelled on the Minister. When a Board has power to lend out \$25,000 without reference to the Minister or to the Governor-in-Executive Committee, it is hardly fair to attack the Minister on all loans of \$25,000 in which he has no say whatsoever. I think an amendment should be made to Clause 23, sub-section 4 which states that where the loans sought to be borrowed exceeds \$25,000 the Board shall obtain the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee before making such loan. Twenty-five thousand dollars, as things go in this island, is an enormous sum of money and to give the Board power to effect loans amounting to \$25,000 without reference to the Governor-in-Executive Committee who is now the appropriate Minister is hardly proper. The Manager sees after the day to day administration and he has power to make loans up to \$25,000, and it would hardly be until some report is passed at the end of the year that the Minister would be aware of the number of loans made up to \$25,000. The Minister would have to stand up to the attacks and answer questions about matters on which he has little or no knowledge. I say that it is wrong to give this Manager too much power, no matter of how high a calibre he may be or the qualifications he may have, because he can hardly know conditions in Barbados as well as people who have been living in Barbados all their lives.

While I am on that point, I would say this. I can hardly expect to find loans being actually doled out without the normal business practice being followed. We have a Queen's Solicitor whose very function is to effect Government loans on the final analysis. It is doing work in that matter that he actually secures his fees. To suggest that the Board would dole out \$10,000, \$20,000 or \$25,000 and that the Queen's Solicitor who should be the appropriate solicitor to handle Government funds, does not make the normal investigations and normal searches in accordance with normal business practice to see how far or how incumbent the property is, is folly. It is presuming that the Queen's Solicitor is an ignoramus, and that the Board which by

general consent should be comprised of men of ability does not know what it is doing. I can hardly presume that a Board constituted such as that would lend out the taxpayers' money and fritter it away without seeing that proper security is available. I speak from my little experience in matters of that sort.

Sir, I do not intend to make any lengthy speech, but I can see that the Act needs further amendment and the wonderful things which this Bill proposes to do as outlined in the Objects and Reasons and which we have only now found out should be done although the Opposition fought on its own behalf - I refer to my colleague, the hon. senior member for the City and other hon. members of the Opposition in bygone days who fought day in and day out to have this Bill brought before the House - it is only now the Government has seen the wisdom of bringing this amendment to stimulate, facilitate and undertake the development of hotels in this island in accordance with the provisions of sections 23 A and 23 B of this Act.

May be, I should wait until the Bill goes into Committee, but there is a very objectionable proviso in Clause 4 to Clause 23 (a) and (b). It states that this money can be loaned for constructing a building for use as or to form part of a hotel; for the purchase of a building for use as or to form part of a hotel; Provided that such building has not been used as a hotel or part of a hotel at any time during a period of two years immediately preceding the date of purchase.

I think that will cut across a lot of the ideals of this Bill because by this proviso, you are destroying the opportunity of anyone who has been in this hotel business for two years and who may have a house and want to improve on it. By this you are depriving that person of assistance. The Bill itself is a laudable one and on the face of it the personnel of the Board is a bit top heavy in that too few Barbadians, putting it plainly, are on this Board. I am not one who is a stickler on a point like that, but in a case of this nature I feel more Barbadians should be placed on this Board; and it will be a sad reflection for people who have been in the small hotel and guest house business if they are not given assistance through the proviso to that Clause to which I have just made reference.

Sir, while I am on my feet, I shall attempt to answer the subtle reflection which I take it was levelled at me by having been Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries in the last Government. I refer to a certain part of the speech made by my colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Philip. 9.30 p.m.

He censured not only this Government, but the Governments in the past for not having undertaken pasteurisation and the establishment of a central milk plant. I think that I should say this. I am not going out of the way to assist the present Minister of Agriculture; he can answer for himself; but I will give him a little background of the matter and I will give him the answer as far as I know it. Every attempt has been made to foster and bring about the establishment of a central milk plant in this Island; but what we have suffered from is the services of a person with the actual "know-how"

We had here a gentleman in the person of Mr. Rose as Deputy Director of Agriculture; he was the expert and the Minister was also in favour of the establishment of a central milk plant. The Minister himself cannot do that, but he has to get a scientific man to bring such a scheme into being, a man with the "know-how". It was therefore very unfortunate for this Island to lose the services of Mr. Rose who was one of the most competent men in the Agricultural Department; it was very unfortunate that Mr. Rose was not given an increase in salary or a personal allowance so as to enable him to balance his budget if I make it as crudely as that. He was not given any personal allowance or inducement to remain here and establish a central milk plant on which we have been working for a long time and which we were on the point of establishing. You will find that the Agricultural Department has been depleted in staff and that that Officer who has

served for about two or three years, when he was about to establish this project, had to ask for a transfer, because the financial arrangements were unsuitable. That is what has happened during my term of office.

It is not that Mr. Rose or the Director of Agriculture is ignoring this matter or has not done any research work, but the point is that the staff at the Department is far from what it should be, with the result that the Deputy Director of Agriculture is given multifarious duties to perform and he has not got enough time to devote to a project of this nature. In other words, the Deputy Director of Agriculture has too much to do. I am suggesting to the Hon. Minister that the only way in which you can tackle a thing of this sort is to see that a special expert is imported on a contract basis for two or three years or whatever time is fit, so as to establish this central milk plant. To expect the Deputy Director of Agriculture or the Director of Agriculture to find enough time to devote to a special project like that, well, you would probably never see such a project come into existence.

In answer to my colleague, I will say this further. He has reflected somewhat on my administration, if I may put it in that way, and I would say that although the establishment of the central milk plant has our blessing, the matter is not as simple as what meets the eye. Every available acre of land in Barbados is under sugar cane, and if you are thinking of establishing this milk plant you must have pasturage. It is all right to jump up and talk a lot about this matter about which you have little knowledge, but you have to go into the economics and find out if you have enough pasturage to feed the thousands and thousands of cattle so as to get this pasteurisation plant and creamery functioning. It is not therefore a question of talking for the sake of talking; you have to go about your facts.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I cannot say much on this matter; I am supporting this Bill, and I am doing so wholeheartedly. I want to say that I do not object to any criticism of any Board; any Board which is administering and spending public money, must be subject to criticism, and criticism from the floor of this House will cause Boards to be loyal and do their duty and be like Caesar's wife. On the other hand, I must confess that although I do not know the entire personnel of the Board, among those persons who are on the Board, is Sir John Saint to whom I believe we, in this country, owe a debt of gratitude. There is this exception; I can remember that a former member of this House made what was considered a most unjustifiable criticism of Sir John Saint. However, I think that Sir John Saint is a man on whom you can very well depend for doing justice. In saying that, I think I have said enough; you have people on the Board in whom you can have confidence.

I think that the Government is wrong in not having any politicians on this Board. I do not feel that this Board should be full of politicians, but I feel that you should have a man with experience on this Board. Nevertheless, it is a good thing for members of this House to be members of that Board so that when statements are made in this House, first-class replies can be made; even before the appropriate Minister replies, we can have first-class replies made by members of this House. I should like to say this: if I want to borrow money and I go to Barclays Bank or to anybody in Bridgetown and borrow it, that is my private business; but I will never agree that where you have a Development Board and you are spending \$2 million, any Minister should have the temerity to come into this House and say that it is a hush-hush policy. It is everybody's business when you are spending everybody's money; therefore, I am not making any mistake about that.

I want to say something about these hotel loans. I am one of those who feel that because you do something for me, you have done it for a nation. I have never had any social kick because I am no social climber.
9.40 p.m.

If hon. members are afraid to say this, I am going to say it. I understand that they have granted a loan of \$40,000 to Mr. Anthony of the Maresol Beach Hotel; he is in the business and I take it that the Board has gone into it and know what they are doing. They have agreed to a loan to Mrs. Glowacki. This is my business and whoever wants to stop me reading this can come and stop me. When I borrow money from the Agricultural Bank it was advertised in the paper, so there is nothing wrong with advertising these. Mrs. Glowacki at Eastry House was loaned \$75,000, and in passing let me say this: if somebody gets one of these schemes and decides that he can put up a hotel in some plantation house away in the country for a lot of money, you must be very careful. One thing which the Board must know is that in the development of hotels, what Barbados has to offer are sunshine and beaches. If I decide to spend a lot of money in St. George in a hotel, there is no reason why the Board should say if I chose to throw away \$100,000 in something which is worth \$30,000, that I should not get more than that. I take it that the Board has acted on principle, but I shall await further criticism on that.

I have heard a lot about foreigners with which I do not agree. The whole idea of the Development Board is to attract people with "know-how" and capital in Barbados; therefore it does not matter whether or not you are a foreigner. I see nothing wrong with \$75,000 for Mr. Peter Morgan at the St. Lawrence Hotel. If you are borrowing money, you are borrowing it, and people can know; but if you have a private treaty between yourself and a Bank, nobody must know. You are lending Miss Robinson from Bagshot \$75,000 for twelve additional rooms. This hush-hush policy is absolute nonsense; we were elected here and we are entitled to know. To the Coral Reef Club you are lending \$75,000 for twelve additional rooms. Then there are the Rockley Beach Hotel, the Hastings Hotel and Hotel Royal.

Do you know why it should not be a hush-hush policy? I have no chip on my shoulder, but I have children. I am in a party with my colleague, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, and if I thought he was running a hotel and the colour of a man's skin was a recommendation, I would have to blast him out of existence. I want to say that despite what the Archbishop said about the West Indies, there are a lot of things that are practised which are not right. People of colour are not admitted to some hotels, and I do not consider that Government funds should be lent to these people for them to use other reasons for not admitting people of colour. If I thought the Marine, the Windsor or the Royal were doing so, I would say the same thing; but no place has the right to borrow the hard earned money of the people of this country and then practise discrimination. Nobody wants to have people in a hotel or guesthouse who behave badly, and anyone who does, whether white or black, should be put out.

You, Mr. Speaker, know what I am saying. You know what you suffered because of the colour of your skin in Bermuda, and only a few of us had the courage to defend you, because you were not a University man; if you were a University man, you would have got a lot of defending. Why shouldn't we publish the names of those people who are borrowing the money put up by the people of this country? Private Clubs have a right to admit white or coloured persons, but if they do not want black people, they should not; but if you are going to run a public institution in the name of a Club such as those listed here and borrow public money, what is wrong with the Minister publishing the names? If it is private, let them go to the Banks. I support this Bill and would like to see more latitude given by the Development Board than by the Banks.

If I were asked to value Mr. Robinson's or Mr. Peter Morgan's place, I would not under normal circumstances lend them \$15,000; but with a Development Board you would take all the circumstances and potentialities into consideration, see the value of the property, see the returns to Government, see what they can actually do if

they develop; you must take a different view from a bank. You would not because the property is worth £10,000 lend the owner two-thirds of the money. There are some people in the hotel industry to whom I would lend the maximum; but that too depends on the individual. In private business there are some people to whom you lend two-thirds of the value of the property; some people depend on collateral. There are some people who understand more about hotels than others. I do not think the Board should take the same risk with those who have just come in as with those who can show experience over a period of years and where Government knows it is drawing so much in parochial and other taxes out of the business. I am not surprised at hon. members looking at it from the point of view of a Bank and lending on the capital security, because no Bank would lend without security; but this is a Development Board and Government has wedded itself to develop the tourist industry, as it is the one industry which they have accepted next to the sugar industry, and therefore you want to provide enough accommodation which you are providing through the Development Board, and therefore greater latitude should be given under the circumstances.

I support this Bill strongly, but I say that the names should be known. I am not worried about Peter Morgan, because everybody knows that there is no bar at his Club; but if you are going to lend to Clubs which are going to use some other excuse for not allowing entry, either nature's passport or through pigmentation, I do not agree with it. I am not one of those people who believe that because you hug me, you have done something. I have children and am only here for a little while, and therefore I want to see something worthwhile. Some people believe that as soon as you cater to them, you have catered to the nation, but that is not right; if you have me, you should have everybody else.

I feel it should be a stipulation of the Government to make the names of those who are borrowing money known. What the hon. junior member for St. Andrew said about the two ladies is correct. Incidentally, he did not go far enough; they were graduates from the United States. Fortunately, we have some very great people - great in the sense that they are not narrow - and this practice cannot continue.

I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill, but I do feel that the Hon. Minister should make it clear that there is nothing wrong with the criticism of this Board. Like my colleague I have heard a lot of things floating about too. I have also heard that money would not be lent to small people, but I think I know Sir John Saint and Mr. Maurice Cave as well as anybody in this country, and neither of them would deny a man because of his colour. In passing let me say that I believe you can make it known more if you will lend not only to hotels. Those of us who understand what is happening know that they charge from \$15 to \$40 down the Coast. I believe a lot of that can do us harm, but for those working-class people who come from the United States you want a place that charges \$7 or \$8 a day. You are lending Eastry House money to put in a Swimming Pool when we have beaches all over the island. I am airing this to get these names in the Press, because they have no right to say it is private business.
10.00 p.m.

What I should like to see you do is to make provision that these names should be published in the Press. You should also allow people who run small guest houses to have the opportunity of getting a loan. It is a fact that a tremendous number of West Indians want to come to the Island but they are not interested in any \$40 a day board and lodging. I was just saying to the hon. junior member for Christ Church that someone said to me a few days ago that in the United States you have a large fraternity of school teachers who actually get their holiday in the summer, which is the off season for tourist trade in Barbados, and he suggested that hotel owners could very well run a reduced rate for these people. The hon. member told me that it was being thought of now. It is a fact that thousands of teachers get their holiday in the summer time when

our hotels are empty; therefore, if you reduce your rates for them, you will do a tremendous lot of trade.

The hon. senior member for St. Philip talked about the Development Board. I will say this. It is not good enough for the Development Board to sit down on its own haunches. We have reached the stage when there should be a Development Board of the Caribbean or a Tourist Development Board of the Caribbean with offices in Canada, and America, with each unit contributing towards it and somebody in that office saying what can be offered in Barbados and the other islands. It should be regional instead of someone just sitting down here and seeing if we can get somebody to come here. I feel this thing must be done in a big way, not by just saying that we have Mr. Shepherd.

I have here a tremendous lot of notes and anytime you see me come on the floor of the House with something, I have chapter and verse for saying it. I am not going to shout now; I support this. I would like the Hon. Minister to know that those names should be published. Let the small people who run guest houses get a loan and not only those people who want \$75,000. I walk the streets and I look around. I know what is in the atmosphere. I saw a lot of hotel owners and I know what they wanted. There are a lot of these small guest house people and what they want is beyond their resources; therefore, you have got to help them too. I hope when this thing is advertised that more guest house people will make applications for loans.

As regards the question of the \$25,000 limit which the Manager of the Board is allowed to handle, I do not agree, if you are having a Board to decide the matter, that it should go back to the Minister. You have a Board and you have Auditors; therefore, as long as you have that, why send it back to the Minister to say whether you must loan \$25,000? You put a limit which the Board cannot go over. If there is an application for a loan above that amount, let that go before the Minister for approval.

I wish to let it be known that this House of Assembly which is responsible for the funds of the people will never tolerate any idea of any proprietor of a place going by the name of a club being able to give board and lodging only when his cousins come from the United States or the South or some place like that, and when there are empty rooms he is telling you to see the Marine Hotel or the Royal. I know what they practise; I know what they tell you. We will not lend any one cent to anybody who wants to shelve his place under the title of a club and who is carrying on as we know he is carrying on. I repeat, the names of those people who applied for loans should be published in the Press for people to see them. You have promised Glowacki and Marcel loans of \$40,000 each; Mr. Peter Morgan \$75,000, Mr. Maffei \$60,000, Mr. Robinson \$75,000 and Coral Reef \$75,000. Whose money is it? It is not Barclay's; it is the people's money. What do you do with people who want a loan from the Agricultural Bank? When Sandy Lane Limited wants money from this Bank, you do not lend them without publishing it in the Press.
10.10 p.m.

You are in business, and if you want to go in for this policy, then you must go in for it in the right way; but they will develop and nobody will know how they develop. I suggest that this policy should be made public. I am supporting this Bill.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Bill which is before this House is like the prospectus of a limited liability company registered under the Act; but we have heard a most alarming proposition advanced by the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour who is suggesting that the shareholders in the company - the members of the general public of Barbados - should not be allowed to see the balance sheets at the end of the year.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order.

Mr. BARROW: The hon. member does not stop to understand -

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I have said no-

thing of the kind. I did not say that the public must not see the balance sheet of this company. I explained that six months after the year of operation, in every year, the accounts, the whole transactions of the Board, must be put before the Governor-in-Executive Committee after which a copy will be placed on the Table of the House and be published; but the hon. member cannot speak the truth even by mistake.

Mr. BARROW: I object to those remarks, and I am asking that they be withdrawn. If the hon. member does not understand the metaphor - - -

Hon. M. E. COX: I understand.

Mr. SPEAKER: Both hon. members are now on their feet; both hon. members will sit. To the Hon. Minister who has introduced this Bill; the hon. junior member for St. John has taken exception to the personal reference made to him and I am asking the Hon. Minister to withdraw that reference, the reference that the hon. member cannot speak the truth even by mistake.

Hon. M. E. COX: I withdraw that.

Mr. BARROW: It is difficult for one to have to penetrate the denseness of some of the hon. members of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to say this: words which are used in debate may be quite parliamentary, but they may give cause for offence. If they give cause for offence, I will ask any hon. member of this House who uses such words to withdraw them. As soon as they give cause for offence, we are going to have disorder, and I do not want to have any semblance of disorder in this Chamber. Let the debate proceed in an orderly manner.

Mr. BARROW: I very much appreciate Your Honour's getting up and asking for order in the debate. Nobody has heard me accuse anyone of not speaking the truth. I said that I find it very difficult to penetrate the denseness of some hon. members on the opposite side of this House. (ASIDES)

Mr. SPEAKER: Every hon. member must be heard in debate.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, can the blind lead the blind? Fancy the hon. junior member for St. Philip trying to prod the hon. senior member for St. Michael! It is very trying when one is endeavouring to do his job, to have to descend to the level of paraphrasing everything for the members on that side of the House. (ASIDES)

Mr. SPEAKER: I want hon. members on this side of the House to realise that I must hear the member who is speaking. It does not matter to me if hon. members do not want to hear him; if they do not want to hear him, they can just not listen to him. However, I must hear the member who is speaking, and hon. members must not prevent me from hearing him.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to get on with my remarks on this Bill and with Your Honour's permission, I will do so. I am not responsible for the failure of understanding of hon. members over there and if the hon. senior member for St. Michael does not understand what I am saying, he should not be so prone to jump to his feet and curse people and use unparliamentary language. He should give himself time for sober reflection.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I am not like the hon. member.

Mr. BARROW: I have asked the hon. member to withdraw the remarks he made in reference to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has withdrawn those remarks.

Mr. BARROW: Did he withdraw them audibly? (ASIDES) When the hon. member suggests to other hon. members something which is tantamount to saying that

there should be a conspiracy and silence over the operations of the Barbados Development Board, that is like the Directors of a company telling the shareholders that they cannot know what is going on in the company; and if the hon. senior member for St. Michael does not understand that that is the inference which people will draw from the remarks which he made in his introduction of this Bill, then it is very unfortunate that he spoke at all or that he ever entered this Chamber or that he holds a Ministerial portfolio at all.

Hon. M. E. COX: I object to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing to which to object.

Hon. M. E. COX: Let the hon. member disclose whence he bought his property.

Mr. BARROW: I did not get any loan from the Barbados Development Board, nor did I bribe anybody in order to buy it. It is only natural that the hon. member should be a bit jittery in this matter. When I hear a supposedly responsible Minister of the Government tell hon. members of an elected Chamber that they cannot or should not try to dabble into the operations of a statutory body like the Barbados Development Board, you cannot very well blame hon. members on this side of the House if we, like some of the backbenchers of the Government, say or feel that there is something which the members of the Government want to conceal. I am very glad that those hon. members who have information at their disposal have criticised the policy of the Development Board in the light of the information which they have obtained. I would have been the last person to suggest that one should have a kind of witch hunt about this matter. The hon. member, if I understand him rightly, should have the experience of the Blue Waters Hotel as to the fear of its construction, because of discrimination. I want to say that if we have discrimination in hotels in Barbados, it is the fault of the Barbados Labour Party, because they have been in power long enough to be able to wipe out and eradicate that stigma which is levelled against us and which operates against us on occasions when we would like best to forget it. I want to make that absolutely clear. In the case of Blue Waters Hotel, they used as an excuse that helping hotels will lead to discrimination.

My personal experience is that the Barbadian of a certain calibre - I want to make this absolutely clear and if they want to understand who I mean they can look around the table and they will see who I mean - is the most obsequious, subservient individual when it comes to standing up for his rights and civil liberties as you can find anywhere else in the West Indies.
10.20 p.m.

When that subservience is reflected in the attitude of members of the Government Party, it does not hold well for the future democratization of this country. Anyone in Barbados who is prepared to stand up for his rights is labelled as some kind of rebel, revolutionary, enemy or something of that kind. A very high ecclesiastic of this island, a former Bishop of Barbados, criticised these conditions and there was no more room for him in Barbados; and that was during the dispensation of the present Government.

Now the Archbishop of the West Indies a few weeks ago had cause to refer to the fact that the West Indian influence of racial discrimination could be found only in Barbados and the Bahamas. The Prime Minister of Barbados took it upon himself to give the lie to the Archbishop of the West Indies. I prefer, Mr. Speaker, to sin with the Archbishop of the West Indies than to bathe in the righteousness of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. Until we Barbadians become a bit more unethical and a little bit less self-complacent, we will not be able to see our problem in a better light and go far in evolving the solution to this problem.

I turn now to the Bill which is before us and which like every other member I will support, but perhaps for

entirely different reasons from those which have been advanced by the speakers on the Government side or some of the speakers on this side of the House, with certain reservations. I do not think we need to worry at all about whether the money which we lend to hotels is spent in the development of places which perhaps might exercise discriminatory practices against members of the public either from within or from without this island, because that is a problem which we Barbadians have to break down ourselves. There is no amount of legislation put on the Statute Book that a man cannot get around when it comes to a question which is a social and economic problem of this kind. Any hotel which borrows money from the Development Board and which is built to carry out discriminatory practices in Barbados with 93% of the people in it of African origin, I suggest, should borrow as much money as possible; if they can do it and get away with it, they are entitled to it. If we in Barbados are content to sit down and let our taxes be expended in avenues of that kind which exclude us from participation in this expenditure, I say these people are more or less geniuses, and therefore if they can get away with it in a place like Barbados in the year of grace 1958, I think there must be something to be said for discrimination and I do not see any well thinking Barbadian needing any enactment on the Statute Book. It could not happen in Jamaica. You would not normally find a waiter or a lighterman going to the Marine Hotel and taking his wife to dinner, but why should he not go to a Hotel and have dinner if he won money at the races? In their house there are many mansions for hotel owners, but only in the past eighteen months have they been putting water in the houses which Government is building for the working-class people of this island. They do not have any ambition for their own people, but when they lend money to the big businessmen, you must not peep into their affairs.

Now when we deal with this question of legislation, it is a myth which has been propagated throughout the length and breadth of the Caribbean that we have some anti-discriminatory legislation in Barbados. The only place in the West Indies where you have proper anti-discrimination legislation is in the Bahamas, legislation introduced by a man called Mr. A. Dupuch, the Editor of the Daily Newspaper in Nassau, some three or four years ago, and it is as comprehensive as the F.E.C.P. Bill in the United States, a Federal Bill. What do we have in Barbados? A Shops Act which designates the hours of work for shop assistants, and then on the eve of the Federation Conference a spurious amendment was put into the Shops Act to the effect that "Subject to the provisions of this Section, no person, otherwise lawfully entitled" What do they mean by that? They mean "otherwise lawfully entitled." "shall be refused....." How does a human being become "otherwise lawfully entitled?" By the colour of your skin? ".... (a) access to any shop; or (b) opportunity to avail himself of any facility, service or amenity offered to the public by any shop by way of trade or business or incidental thereto on account of the race, colour or creed of such person." The proprietor of any shop who refuses to give access contrary to that Sub-section shall be guilty of an offence against the provisions of the Act. That is the sole anti-discrimination legislation in Barbados, so how can they criticise the Venerable Archbishop of the West Indies when that is all they have got?

If you go into J. & R. Bakeries to buy a loaf of bread, they can refuse to sell you as long as they do not tell you that they refuse to sell on the grounds of race, creed or colour. In other words, if I were dispatching in a shop, I could look at any hon. member of this House and say I am not going to sell him a loaf of bread, that I am not selling him not on the grounds of race, colour or creed, but because he has on a brown suit and I don't like brown suits; or I can say that the bread is for our customers. *Mutatis mutandis*, if you belong to a hotel 'otherwise lawfully entitled' or if you are a member of this Club. We were so shameless that we passed a measure like this on the eve of the Federation Conference to induce other delegates to vote for Barbados to be the Federal Capital. The very fact that we had to introduce legislation of this kind is an admission that there is something wrong in the state of Denmark; and up to now I have not heard of one

single prosecution. Not one person has made a complaint to the Police that he has been refused service in a shop or refused admission to a hotel and has been told and informed by the hotel keeper or by the shop keeper, as the case may be, that he is refusing such a service on the grounds of race, creed or colour. The only thing they did not put in was religion; so the farce continues.

We have Residential Clubs, Membership Clubs and Proprietary Clubs, and the owners can tell you that the place is full or that they are not open to business any longer. Another thing which is not generally known to members of the public right here in Barbados is that a Judge of the West Indian Federal Court was refused a haircut on the grounds that he was coloured and they did not cut coloured people's hair; and we want to encourage tourists to Barbados. On another occasion the hon. junior member for St. Thomas just before the Federation Conference asked the Press of this island not to publish - because it would be embarrassing to the Labour Government in Barbados - that a certain Water Polo Committee had refused to allow a coloured Policeman to play for that Club. That was the hon. member who is now the Premier. 10.30 p.m.

Now, you cannot keep these things; you have to resolve these problems by a spirit of co-operation. The hon. senior member for St. Michael says I cannot prove that. There are 18 people whom I can bring to prove that. Let the hon. senior member for St. Michael invite the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to deny that. How dare him to get up and tell the Archbishop of the West Indies that he is a liar! What the Archbishop said is true but it has nothing to do with hotel development.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not allowing the hon. member to reiterate that point because it is not pertinent to the debate.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, I heard the introducer of this Bill making great stress of their failure to bring in a Bill of this kind. He said that it was because they were afraid of the colour question.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. BARROW: I cannot always speak the language which the hon. member speaks.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is correct. You cannot speak the truth.

Mr. BARROW: May be, Sir, I cannot choose the words he has chosen to use; I put it in the way we understand it on this side. I will ask the hon. junior member for Christ Church if he said that is not true, how they account for the failure of the Government to bring down effective legislation to assist the hotel industry in the Act we are dealing with now; if it were not said time after time, that the expansion of the tourist industry would introduce more discrimination and discriminatory practices in this island of Barbados. That is something which is well known to all members of the public.

I want to say this to both sides and when I say both sides I mean the Government Party, the industrialists and hotel owners of this country. I want to tell the management of the British West Indian Airways and all those club owners and hotel owners who feel that a man would leave Alabama, North Carolina or South Carolina and come to the West Indies - a place which he knows to be predominantly inhabited by Africans - that such a tourist would not expect to meet the same Caucasian that he has been accustomed to. The very fact that the finger of accusation has been pointed to them about racial prejudice, is the very fact that an American living in the South who comes down to the West Indies would want to give full expression to his soul and would want to get away from the inhibitions and expositions which have spurned him in his country. He does not want to see the Caucasian or the Nordic Caucasian; he expects coming to the sunlit Caribbean to see the happy and sunlit faces of the African, not the drawn and

pinched faces of a people of a different type. The very fact that these people leave their homes for a short time to come here shows that they do not want to be entrenched in their prejudices, and they want to release the bondage of the restrictions of their particular society. If not, they would not come to the Caribbean at all and that is why a place like Haiti which does not pander to the tourist is doing so much better than Barbados in this respect.

When the average tourist comes to Barbados, although the aim is to take money off him, they do not provide him with any entertainment nor does he know how the people live and because he wants to find out, he has to go and get the information from the taxi driver who drives him about. I would say that there are some very good taxi drivers here. The taxidriver has to be a sort of ambassador to visitors because the visitors are not normally drawn into contact with the very people whom they come down here to see, and that is one of the reasons the hoteliers here do not do as much as they should do. Until these narrow-minded, bigoted people, both of the Government and of the people in the trade, recognise that that is the impelling factor which drives people from the northern countries to our shores, they will not materialise all the potentialities which reward the hotel industry in its development.

I am not going to say anything which would please anybody; I am saying what a lot of people would like to articulate but which is denied by the Press and by their representatives. I therefore say that we have no anti-discrimination Act in Barbados that is effective at all. You have come down with an amendment to the Shops Act saying that you cannot tell a man that you are not going to serve him on the grounds of race, creed or colour but there is no legislation which says that a shop or any other institution of a private or public nature should not refuse to give jobs to people on grounds of race, colour or creed. They have legislation against that in America and people criticise the Americans all the time. We have been parading our old patched up shirt to the general public of the West Indies by saying: "Look at my back. I have an anti-discrimination bill," but what is it? It has a lot of big holes and patches in it. You are exposing yourself that you have a big dirty collar when you know you have a multicoloured garment like Joseph's coat. That probably may be offensive to the hon. senior member for St. Michael or because it is a simile he may not be able to understand it. There is only one side to this question. The moment you begin to think in these terms, it shows subconsciously that your mind is operating along these lines and you are resenting these people either on the basis of class, creed or colour. 10.40 p.m.

The other thing to which I think the hon. senior member for the City made reference was this: I would like the hotel industry, if they are using the taxpayers' money, to get away from this idea that a tourist is somebody who comes from the North of the Tropic of Cancer. The whole of the United States of America is within the Tropic of Cancer, as is the United Kingdom and Europe. Right in the West Indies you have a terrific potential. In the Spanish Main, Venezuela, Surinam and British Guiana, you have a terrific potential which would be far more lucrative to this Island than the North American trade. The only person who benefits from the North American trade *qua* North American trade is the British Treasury by the dollars transferred from the invisible export of the North American tourists who come down here. The best potentials are Trinidad, Jamaica and the other West Indian Islands - Civil Servants and businessmen who do not want to go to the expense of going either to the United Kingdom or the United States of America - that is the tourist trade on which we should be concentrating. However, we have built the Almighty Dollar into something which is far above its significance to our economy.

There is not one hotel owner in Barbados who can tell Your Honour or any other member of this House what the net dollar earnings of Barbados are; that is kept as a closely guarded secret. I invite the Hon. Minister of Finance to get up now and tell the members of this House

that we use even one-third of our net dollar earnings every year. We have to accept a lot of inferior goods, both in the building trade and for hotel construction, brought down here from the United Kingdom - and some British goods are very good; others are very shoddy and not up to the standard of the demand of the public which we expect; yet they cannot tell us for all of these years why they cannot import material from the United States of America which is more durable than that which is imported from the United Kingdom. That is one aspect of the Development Board which should be investigated - the allocation of our dollar earnings - so that the hotel industry and other industries can benefit from the hard currency areas which are superior in quality to those which we now import from the United Kingdom. This idea of 'British is best' is very good for British industrialists, but it does not tally with the realities of present day international trade and competition.

Mr. Speaker, in the Island of Antigua the hotels have been able to borrow money from the Government for a little time now. There are nine new hotels going up in Antigua this year. If we allow the Barbados Development Board to hamstring the efforts of industrialists, in the first instance, and of hotel owners in the second instance, then we will find that we are losing a lot of our tourist trade to Islands like Antigua.

In the first instance, Antigua has better sea-bathing than Barbados has; we have to face up to that whether we like it or not. It is not true to say that we have the best sea-bathing, in Barbados. That is the kind of thing that they use to make Barbadians feel happy; not only does Antigua have better beaches than Barbados, but it also has better harbours for sailing facilities. In the third place Antigua is only two-thirds of the distance from the American nation having regard to Barbados. It is nearer to the American nation than Barbados. In other words, it is easier to go to Antigua from North America than it is to come to Barbados. Therefore, the inducements which we offer to people whom we want to attract to these shores have got to be so much greater than the inducements which these other people are offering. Therefore, if the members of the Development Board believe that they are doing a favour to anybody who wants money to extend or build a new hotel, they are going to find that they are hamstringing the efforts of the development in Barbados and that they are operating in detriment to the community as a whole. Every time the Government sets up some Statutory Board, whether it is the Labour Welfare Board or the Peasants' Loan Bank or any other Board of that nature, everything is shrouded in nepotism, patronage and matters of that kind. They talk about the laws' delay, but what about the kind of delay where you apply for pioneer status or for a loan for months and months and all you can get from a Permanent Secretary or some other Government official is that the Minister is out of the Island and they are going to introduce new legislation? That sort of thing goes on for years and years. There are some people who have applied for industrial assistance for many years, and up to now they cannot get any assistance at all, whereas other people receive prompt attention. There is an unfortunate belief that there is a certain element of patronage or something worse than that being imposed on this undertaking. I say that this is a thing which we will have to watch very carefully and stamp out. We even pride ourselves about the lack of corruption that there is in Barbados; I am not so sure that that is entirely justified when it comes to undertakings of this kind. There are many industrialists and businessmen in this Chamber right now sitting around this table who are cognizant of what I am talking about, but a word to the wise is sufficient. I do not want any official to come down here from England, any official whose sole object is the nineteenth century imperialism, which is to try and get as rich as possible and as quickly as possible out of this Island. 10.50 p.m.

We are struggling now for a place in the sun. The other aspect of the matter which was referred to by the hon. senior member for St. Peter was this: if we want to develop we have to infuse a spirit of optimism and a spirit of

cooperation in the people of Barbados themselves. We want to make the people of Barbados feel that they are part and parcel of this matter; they have to feel that, like Operation "Boot Strap" introduced by the Governor Munoz-Marín in Puerto Rico, where the people could feel the dynamism of the new development and where they felt they were part and parcel, and their own individual efforts must be concentrated to make this matter a success. If you get up in a Parliamentary Democracy and tell the elected representatives of the people that they are not entitled or you implore them not to enquire too closely into this matter, you get the idea that this is a family set-up for friends, and certain people will be able to borrow money at a lower rate of interest than in the outside market, because there is no doubt that you can get money for hotel development if you are prepared to pay interest on the money. But the whole thing boils down to this: here is some quick capital and they do not have to worry about interest. As a matter of fact, the amendment to the Development Board Act contains provisions which permit the Board to waive the question of interest or even the recovery of capital in any given period. These are terms which the ordinary businessman would not normally be able to solicit or achieve with the ordinary money market, and therefore they are really getting something from the Government for nothing in a way; all the more reason why, like the peasant and the smallholder and even the sugar planter, the general public and the world at large should know that these undertakings have borrowed money from the Government, so that they would be able to watch what is going on.

It is not impossible, although there are provisions in the Bill for the inspection of books and accounts, for a man to borrow \$60,000, spend \$30,000 on the project and have a good time on the other \$30,000; all the more reason why there should be that kind of publicity and security in the expenditure of public funds as there are in the Labour Welfare, Peasant Loans and Agricultural Bank Funds. I see no harm in that at all; this is public money. If you want to be private, you should borrow money from your cousin; but when you come to borrow the taxpayers' money, we feel that the taxpayers ought to know how that money is being spent and who is spending it. That is one safe-guard of democracy; so when the hon. member said this is of a confidential nature, I do not know what fore-warning he had of the information which other members disclosed here on the floor of the House. When he said that the Board operates in a confidential nature, he means confidential to the extent that income tax should be confidential. You cannot say that the salary a Government servant gets is confidential; how he disposes of his income may be confidential; but when he draws money from the Treasury, you cannot treat that as confidential. We want to know how much the Financial Secretary is getting for his job; we want to know how much of the taxpayers' money is being spent in a particular project, because if all we can see are two overgrown tennis lawns for \$5,000, naturally we will begin to ask questions.

The Chairman of the Board is not omniscient; most of the members of the Board are busy businessmen, and the Chairman would have administrative functions to perform. If you have 2 1/4 acres of land at Pie Corner, before you get the money you have to read your name published abroad in the Press of this island that you are borrowing so much money and have so many acres of land. Why should hotel owners be ashamed? What is confidential about that?

If Barclays Bank wanted to call up a new capital, what would they do? The law says that they must publish a full disclosure and a Director who issues a prospectus, to get back to my original point, which withholds from subscribers any material fact can be imprisoned. One member here has remarked on the case of Lord Kylsant. What about Horatio Bottomley? He raised a lot of money for Great Britain during the War, but it did not prevent him from being imprisoned. If Barclays Bank or the Barbados Light and Power Company wanted more money to develop, they not only have to say how much they want, but they

have to publish and make available to potential subscribers all the relevant indebtedness of the Company, the Capital holdings, the number of shares already subscribed and matters of that kind; and now we get a Development Board operating in a hole-in-the-corner wall. What development is there in that? This is not a Hotel Owners Mutual Benefits Society; this is taxpayers' money they are using, and I would be the last person to uphold the suggestion such as that made by the hon. senior member for St. Michael.

I was glad to hear the member say that Government has confidence in the Board. I have not seen them do anything yet, and I want to see what they are going to do when they spend the rest of \$1 million between now and the end of 1959. There was a time when the East Coast Road could have been built for \$600,000; there is a terrific potential in the eastern shores of this island, as some hon. members have already said, in the way of tourist attractions and agricultural expansion. The East Coast Road would generate that kind of stimulus to the economy of this island that would provide jobs for all sorts of people. I wonder if we have not put the cart before the horse.

I want to see hotels develop, but when you build all these rooms - and Antigua is ahead of you and Trinidad is building elaborate hotels - where are you going to take the people to drive and on what beaches will they bathe? Surely, tourists coming to this island, apart from the agricultural aspect of such a scheme as the East Coast Road, would certainly like to see the other side of the island, and therefore I say that the Government ought to consider very quickly the implementation of all the suggestions which have been made from year to year and from time to time in and outside of this House about the construction of the East Coast Road. There is no doubt that it would be something for the benefit of the island.

There is just one more myth which I would like to explode, and I know that the gentlemen who engage in the hotel trade will not particularly like my saying so. It has often been urged that the liberalisation of policy towards the hotel industry in this island would lead to more jobs being created for the unemployed people in Barbados. Now I want to say this: I am not one of those persons who is of the opinion that the money percolates down to the bottom-most strata of the society in this island or even half way down. I think that aspect of the matter has been greatly overrated. If I support the expansion of the hotel industry, it is because every little bit helps; but I think that many members have by now read "Industrial Development in the Caribbean" published by Professor Lewis some eight or nine years ago where it is said that the capital outlay for the creation of a single primary job in the West Indies and Barbados was the particular case at point - was estimated at something like \$10,000 B.W.I. For every primary job you can say there are 2 1/2 secondary jobs if that job is not a service itself. A job is not a service; it is a creation of goods. Let us put it this way: if you are setting up a factory to turn out bicycles and 100 people are employed in that factory, for that 100 persons you will find probably another 200 who will be employed in the secondary jobs, the service supplying these 100 persons with work in the factory; but if your capital investment is going up in a service itself - after all a laundry is a service, it is not a production of consumer goods - and if you spend \$10,000 in the service itself, there are no secondary jobs behind that, or the multiplier effect of that investment in the service will not be as great as that in a production enterprise. That is the whole secret of the matter, so they have greatly over-rated the idea of investment in the hotel industry.

11.00 p.m.

There are greater benefits to the investors in the hotel industry. The money goes into the pockets of the hotel owners. Do you think that the butler or the caterers get more wages because more tourists come here? Do you think that if so many thousand tourists come here, the owners of these hotels will increase the salaries of their barmen, bell hops and chambermaids in proportion with the number of persons coming down here? Do you think that the number of persons employed in the industry in-

creases in proportion to the number of persons coming here? That is not true. I will challenge the hon. junior member for Christ Church who is interested in the hotel industry to show me figures to convince me that it is otherwise. No matter how big your hotel, or how bigger it will be, you are not going to employ more managers. You are not going to have three managers; you still will have one manager. May be, you will have two receptionists but you will still have one chef. The level of employment is not necessarily increased to the number of tourists coming into the island. Of course, it will increase somewhat in some instances, but not in every branch. It may be an increase in the number of chambermaids because there would be more rooms to look after but the management does not increase; therefore we must examine this myth very carefully that tourists coming to the island mean that more money is spread over the population. It does not necessarily mean that the money is spread. As a matter of fact, the money is not spread at all; it is localised. It may spread a little employment but what we want to see is more productive employment. Until the Government wakes up and gets dynamic we will have to be content with these sops. The tourist industry does not necessarily mean more employment but it is one which must be recognised here in view of the financial difficulties which the Mother Country has run into. However, it is an industry which we will have to keep firmly under our control by what we are doing, and in order to exercise that control we have to keep our eyes on the hard earned money of the taxpayers which we are giving to the Barbados Development Board to loan out.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will have to reply to the remarks of the hon. member who has just sat down because he has given a dissertation on some of everything. He spoke of Alabama, South Africa and some of everything, but absolutely nothing to do with the debate before the House. However, he referred to the Bill which we passed in 1956 which had as its objects the wiping out of discriminatory practices in hotels and places like those. He himself referred to a case in which a gentleman went to get a haircut and after waiting for sometime he was told "I am afraid we do not cut that hair." He said that we are doing nothing. This is what we did. We sat here and passed a Bill amending the Shops Act and this is what we said in that Bill:

"Subject to the provisions of this section, no person, otherwise lawfully entitled, shall be refused - (a) access to any shop; or (b) opportunity himself of any facility, service or amenity offered to the public by any shop by way of trade or business or incidental thereto on account of the race, colour or creed of such person."

We passed that. If that does not wipe out or tend to wipe out discrimination, what else would? We are not saying by enacting this legislation we can wipe out racial discrimination but we have placed on record for the public and other people concerned to see that this Government does not countenance any discrimination; therefore, as long as you pass a law which you consider is good for the country, you have done your best but it does not mean that it will be the end of the matter. It is just like the intergration law which was passed in America. Although the law was passed, you still have a lot of people who practise the Little Rock segregation. But the law is there and that is what we have done in this case.

Now, Sir, the hon. member said this: It is still clear to us; we can still remember every now and again. He said that Barbadians are obsequious, fallen and servile. 11.10 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I said that there are people of certain calibre in Barbados epitomised by some people on the opposite side. I am a Barbadian; therefore I can say what I like.

Hon. M. E. COX: I can expect any nasty thing he says because he can only do that.

Mr. BARROW: I object to that.

Hon. M. E. COX: If he objects to that, I will withdraw it.

Mr. BARROW: Did he say it loudly enough?

Hon. M. E. COX: If he throws stones he will get a million thrown back at him. He says that Barbadians are obsequious and servile; he also said that they do not want capital to come to Barbados because they cannot appreciate.....

Mr. BARROW: I must correct the hon. member. I said that there is a certain calibre of people who are obsequious. What is the hon. member's object in persisting in what is patently inconsistent with the truth of what I said?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has repeatedly said that what he said was that there are Barbadians of a certain calibre epitomised by hon. members on that side of the House.

Hon. M. E. COX: I appreciate that, but that is the only thing which he can do. That is a reflection on members of this House. The hon. member referred to Jamaica which would not have any discrimination; he said that the Jamaican Government would move in on hotels, but we are obsequious and servile. Is it not true that Mr. Bustamante had to go to the hotels and threaten to close them down? (Mr. BARROW: That is the point I made.) Discrimination still exists in that colony and he knows it too; but he has tried to hoodwink those who cannot follow him, those who do not know of the frothings of his stomach. He went on to say that we were responsible for racial discrimination in Barbados. How can anybody accuse us of that, when we, as a Party, came on the scene and tried to break down a system which was three hundred years old, where only a handful of people ruled with an iron rod the working classes of this Island? The hon. member is only a baby; he has not done a day's work yet and he wants to reap the best of everything. He comes in here to criticise people who have given their lives and sacrificed their all to bring about this movement and bring Barbados out of the mire and dirt in which they were.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is directing his remarks to the hon. junior member for St. John.

Hon. M. E. COX: That may be so, but I cannot afford to let him get away with anything in this House for the benefit of the people who do not understand.

As to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I am sorry that he is not now in his place. In his opening remarks, he asked for a progress report. As far as that is concerned, if you refer to Section 34 of the Act - in other words, I am not prepared to give a progress report, because up to the present it has not yet been reported in Executive Committee. Section 34 of the Act says this - before I quote the Section, I should like to say that when I made my remarks about the transactions of loans being confidential, I did not mean that the House of Assembly should and would not see these transactions, because the very Act provides that six months from the end of any year, the Board must submit a report. This is what the Section says:-

"The Board shall not later than six months from the end of each year submit to the Governor-in-Executive Committee a report containing

(a) an account of its transactions throughout the preceding year in such detail as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may direct and

(b) a statement of the accounts of the Board audited in accordance with the provisions of section thirty-three of this Act.

A copy of the report together with a copy of the auditor's report shall be printed and laid on the table of both Houses of the Legislature and published in the *Official Gazette*."

What secrecy is there? How could we be accused of trying to keep it in a conspiratorial way - that is a matter to which he always refers. Everybody conspires but he does not. How could I, in face of this Section, make this House believe that the transactions of the Board will never come before the House when the Act itself says that a Report is to be laid on the table of both Houses of the Legislature and published in the Official Gazette for everybody to read? All I was saying is that no person likes, if he has effected a loan anywhere, to see it published in the Newspaper and I was merely saying, and I still believe I am right in saying it despite the remarks of the hon. senior member for the City that he read this, that and the other in the Press of what I said.

A lot of money is spent by authorities about which the public knows nothing and will never know about it either. All I was saying is that in my opinion, it is not fair to say that Mr. "A" got a loan and he wanted to build this, that or the other; I do not think it is in my place to mention that at this stage. As soon as the Report is before the House, that is the time for hon. members to see it. That is my opinion and if I am wrong, I still believe it. I get a lot of invitations to functions; I am no social climber as the hon. senior member for the City has said; I will always be on the floor with the people. Nothing gets to my head; it cannot get there. (*Laughter*) (Mr. MOTTLEY: Nothing at all.) I am not referring to the hon. senior member for the City. A lot of them talk a lot of nonsense, but they are only too glad to hold on to the coat tails of some people.

11.20 p.m.

Now the hon. senior member for St. Peter referred to the absence of a representative of the workers of this Board. I am not in a position to say why a member is not on the Board, but I will say that we have made it a policy that as far as the establishment of these Boards is concerned, all shades of opinion should be represented on the Board. I can only refer to two of our last Boards. The President of the Barbados Workers Union is a member of the Housing Board; I was responsible for the portfolio at the time and I asked the Union to put up two or three names. Another member of the Union is a member of the Fancy Molasses Marketing Board; but for one reason or another a member was not selected to this Board, and I do not think that Government can be accused of ignoring the workers on this occasion. He asked, in my opinion, the childish question, whether the Minister had given any direction of policy as regards other industries. That is the Minister's business.

Now the hon. junior member for St. Andrew made a statement that the Manager was signing cheques on the Current Account. I have made an investigation and found out that the Manager does not sign these cheques; he signs cheques for Petty Cash and salaries, and as far as I remember, salaries amount to the Manager's, and maybe two girls in the office. For anything other than that, the cheques are signed by the Chairman and the Manager, or a member and the Manager.

An attack was made, Sir, on the Board and it was said that the Board was lending out money without security and lending to foreign and white people and things of that sort with the exception, as one member said, of one coloured person. That is not true. That is a misleading statement which our Report, when put before the House will reveal. I must say again that we have confidence in this Board, and despite the attacks that were made on it, Government has no reason whatever to change its mind where this Board is concerned. On this Board, as the hon. member for the City said, is Sir John Saint to whom this country owes its all for the work which he has done unstintingly and unselfishly. He has done a remarkably good job for the years he was here and still is doing it. I know that people in all walks of life regard him as a man of the highest integrity and probity, and I am sure, that so far as Sir John Saint is concerned, he would not do anything of a discriminatory or partial nature. I am convinced that he went into the various applications which were presented to him from time to time, and when he decided, even though he might have decided against some of them,

yet it was done with the highest motive and intention. Other members of the Board are Mr. Maurice Cave; Mr. Lucie-Smith; Mr. Money, who is in charge of Barclays Bank; Mr. E. L. Ward; Mr. Grieve and Mr. Carew. If members want to question the integrity of any member whom they might know better than I, it is a matter for them; but I know of nothing I can say against them, and therefore I accept them as men of honesty and integrity.

Now, Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Philip said that if we had assisted the hotels in 1946, it would not be necessary to come with this Bill now when that Bill was before the House, because all they wanted at that time was to be allowed to bring in material for constructing duty free. That is not correct either.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said more than that, Sir. I said duty free materials and income tax concessions.

Hon. M. E. COX: Now, Sir, the member had a Bill before this House when he was then a member of this Government, and I well remember that he brought down here a Resolution to provide the Governor with a sea-side house, and whenever the Speaker got to that item on the Order Paper, the member would walk out.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of explanation, I hope the Minister has not got a piece-meal memory; otherwise he will remember that the Deputy Leader and the Leader said consistently that they were not supporting it. If they were not supporting it, how could it be passed when they had a majority?

Hon. M. E. COX: He did not even attempt to discuss the Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: As a matter of fact, that is not true. If the hon. member wants an explanation, I will give it to him. I was actually asked by the Acting Governor, Mr. John Rankine, whether I would bring the Bill to the House, because both Adams and Springer refused to do it.

Hon. M. E. COX: That Bill was on the Order Paper and every time the Speaker got to that item, the member would - I would not say "walk out" - absent himself. He never attempted to discuss it. (Mr. CRAWFORD: What for?) I agree with the hon. member.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member can go a little further and find out from Adams and Springer why they were not passing it, or ask the hon. junior member for Christ Church. It would make very unpleasant hearing.

Hon. M. E. COX: Now, Sir, he went on to say that the Board should only lend money to persons to whom the Bank would lend money. I am sure that if the member will try to remember, when this Bill was before the House, it was made clear - and even since - that this Development Board was to assist people who would find it difficult to get loans from Banks or from any solicitor; that is why it was brought here.

11.30 p.m.

Because it was risk capital is the reason why we brought it here. For example, if a man wanted to start a shoe-maker's shop to build shoes, he could not on his own walk down Broad Street and say that he wanted \$1,000 to start to build a shoe factory but, surely, if he went to the Development Board and discussed the matter with them and the Board saw that the proposition is a feasible one the Board without collateral security could decide to help this man. That is the position; that is the principle on which this Bill was based.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot see how it can be a point of order when the Hon. Minister is giving his explanation to the background of the Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: But he has accused me of failing to recall -

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is developing his point. Do not anticipate.

Mr. CRAWFORD: But the Hon. Minister can anticipate.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, at this stage; it may be later.

Hon. M. E. COX: As I was saying, Sir, what is the position of C.D.C.? They do the same things. C.D.C. started a groundnut scheme because nobody was interested in it and that corporation was there to put up capital for potential investors into such things. That is what this Development Board is for. In Jamaica the same thing happens. We are always accused of not trying to encourage industry, of not trying to encourage people to come to the island to set up industries; but as soon as we decide to follow the other territories, the hon. members opposite find some other cause for complaint. They say, when the Government is right, that it is wrong and when the Government is wrong, it is doubly wrong for them.

I do not want to quote this Report of the Minister of the International Bank with respect to constructional development because this book is really not intended for this House. Can I get your permission?

Mr. SPEAKER: You can quote the passage.

Hon. M. E. COX: This is what it says: "Although adequate profits are apparently being made in the hotel industry as a whole, investment in the industry is still regarded as rather speculative so that it is difficult to attract mortgage capital either at home or abroad;" And it goes on to say: "Only in years where a considerable nucleus of hotels already exist is additional investment considered relatively safe; but it is obvious if the tourist industry is to expand, development would have to be pushed in new areas. The opening of such areas to the tourist trade, however, is likely to involve abnormal risks. In such cases it may take considerable time before a number of tourists are attracted to make the investments profitable. In such cases Government may guarantee at its discretion payment of interest and principal on mortgage in order to give needed stimulus to development." That is what was recommended for Jamaica. We are not going as far as that. We are lending them money where they find it difficult to get it and we are saying they must pay back this money at 6% interest. We are accused of lending them money without collateral security, and a heap of opprobrium and censure is thrown at the head of the Board for doing not even as much as Trinidad, Jamaica and Puerto Rico included. It is true that they have built hotels in those places. The Hotel Hilton in Puerto Rico was built by the Puerto Rican Government. We have not done that. We are only saying where these people find it difficult to raise money, and we feel that is something worth taking a risk, we from this Board will lend them money. We are doing that and we are accused by the hon. senior member for St. Philip, as is customary, of blocking people from coming to the island. Now that we are encouraging them to come, we are still wrong according to him.

The hon. member talked about a dairy industry but I think it is on record - and I have a copy of the report of Professor Lewis which was written in 1951 which shows the number of people who can be absorbed in the hotel industry as against the agricultural industry.

Now, Sir, criticism was levelled at the Manager of the Development Board and it was said that he took it upon himself to advance loans to people in the hotel industry and the hon. senior member for Christ Church felt that that

should not be done. The Manager of the Board cannot loan anything to anybody. Although the loan may be advanced to the person, the Manager is not the person who is responsible for that. It is the Board. When the Board decides a loan should be advanced to an applicant, it is the Board that takes the responsibility.

Again, I repeat for the last time - and I think it is unfortunate because it was raised on the floor of the House - somebody seems to be getting around and more or less lobbying members of that Board. They pointed to a case where some particular person was being turned down by that Board from getting a loan. If what they say has happened I am sorry, but I would say this: I only heard about this case after I came back to the island last week. The decision was taken when I was out of the island and I am not saying that to mean that if I were here it would have made any difference; but what I do feel is that when a person is turned down from raising a loan, the person should have the right to see the Minister concerned on it. I would be prepared to instruct the Board to refer such cases to the Minister, but I want to make this very clear. It is all wrong to throw mud at honest, decent people; it will only cause you not to get any body proper to sit on these boards; you only will get inferior stuff. All I am saying is that the individual should have the right to make some sort of appeal which would not be decided by the Minister because the last thing which a Minister would want to do would be to take the responsibility for advancing a loan to anybody. If perhaps we had a discussion with the aggrieved person in this case I think a lot of this debate would be unnecessary and that is why there should be some means of discussion at ministerial level even if in the last instance, the Board would be responsible for taking the final decision.

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

The four clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Hon. M. E. COX: That concludes Government Business for the Day. I do not think that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has any matter with which he wants to deal and therefore, I shall fix the Order Paper.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 19th August, 1958, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 19th August, 1958, at 3 o'clock p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 11.45 p.m.