

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 25th February, 1958.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Dr. H.G.H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (Speaker), Mr. J.E.T. BRANCKER (Leader of the Opposition), Hon. M.E. COX (Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour), Mr. L.E. SMITH, J.P., (Chairman of Committees), Hon. R.G. MAPP (Minister of Communications, Works and Housing), Mr. C.B. SEARLES, Mr. L. St.A. THORNE, Hon. D.D. GARNER, (Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries) and Mr. T.W. MILLER.

Prayers were read.

Messrs. Tudor and F. G. Smith (Cheers) entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

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

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following:-

- (a) Annual Report of the Sanitation Department for the parish of St. Michael.
- (b) Letter from the Clerk of the British Guiana Legislature forwarding a copy of a Resolution passed by the Legislature in connection with the Federation of the British West Indies.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier I beg to lay the following:-

- Message No. 4/1958 forwarding the Draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the financial year 1958-59.
- The Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment) No. 3 Order, 1958.
- The Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment) No. 4 Order, 1958.

Barbados Statistical Service - Selected Monthly Indicators - January, 1958.

Messrs. Walcott and Vaughan entered the House and took their seats.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$51,652 at the dis-

posal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1957 - 58, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1957 - 58, No. 72, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$5,711 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1957 - 58, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1957 - 58, No. 73, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$2,315 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1957-58, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1957-58, No. 74, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment) No.3 Order, 1958."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment) No.4 Order, 1958."

A Bill to provide for the taking of censuses and for the collection, compilation, analysis and publication of certain statistical information and for other matters relating thereto.

- A Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Land Acquisition Act, 1949.

Hon. M.E. COX: (On behalf of the Minister of Social Services)

Resolution to place the sum of \$22,716 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1957-58, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1957-58, No. 75, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICE

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Address:-

THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY TO
HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

The House of Assembly desire to thank Your Excellency for the Speech delivered on the occasion of the re opening of the Legislature for the Legislative Session 1958-59.

The House note with satisfaction the financial stability and economical advancement of the Island and

the many Constitutional changes and other matters referred to in Your Excellency's Address and beg to assure Your Excellency that all these and other matters submitted to them will be given their careful consideration and support, during the Session.
3.25 p.m.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the following be read a first time.

A Bill to provide for the taking of census and for the collection, compilation, analysis and publication of certain statistical information and for other matters relating thereto.

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

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

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914 be read a first time

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

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

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Land Acquisition Act, 1949 be read a first time

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

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

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. D.D. GARNER: 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. L. E. SMITH being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1957-58, No. 68.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, these two amounts are set out quite clearly in the Addendum. The first is for \$350 for "Training Scheme for Ships' Cooks."

As the Addendum sets out -

Great difficulty is now being experienced in supplying certificated ships' cooks for ships manned by Barbadian crews. In order to overcome this difficulty, Messrs. Thos. and Jas. Harrison Limited are instituting a scheme to enable suitable candidates to take a six weeks' course at an approved school of nautical cookery in the United Kingdom for the purpose of obtaining their tickets as chief cooks. In this way it will be possible to provide a pool of certificated cooks within a year from which selection can be made as needed. It is estimated that the cost of this scheme will be \$1,400, and it has been decided that this Government should contribute 25% of this cost, namely \$350.

The next part of this Resolution is for \$2,500 under Head XXV - Public Works.

This Officer is provided with an unfurnished Government flat at the Garrison. It is proposed, Mr. Chairman, to provide basic furniture for this flat at the cost of \$2,500, and he will be charged rent on the furniture at the rate of 3% of its value, the same rate at which we charge certain other officers whose flats are provided with basic furniture.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: This Resolution, as I pointed out last week, should have been put in order, because if you, look at the Order Paper, you will see we are supposed to debate a Resolution for \$2,800. I should like to ask you, therefore, which Resolution you are dealing with? The Resolution on the Order Paper is for \$2,800 and the Resolution that has been spoken of calls for \$2,850. I should like to know if you can get that put in order before I proceed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will notice that there is a mistake in the amount on the Order Paper and it should have read \$2,850; so the Resolution is correct.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Order Paper should have been corrected, Mr. Chairman, and it was not my business to do it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will have it corrected for the hon member.

Mr. WALCOTT: Thank you. The matter was raised last week, and it was the duty of the Leader of the House to have had it corrected.

Hon. M.E. COX: On a point of order. It was not a matter for me; it was a matter for the Clerk of the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: It was your business in fixing the Order Paper to see that it was corrected, because it was brought to your attention.

The Government that sends down this Resolution to furnish the Attorney General's house should be kicked immediately out of power in this colony. (Cheers from Opposition.) I heard the Hon. Introducer of this Resolution say that Government intends to do for this Officer what it does for other officers, to give the impression that this Officer is entitled to it. No other officer of the Crown gets a furnished house except by an Act or by anything we approve of, as in the case of the Chief Justice. This Officer is not entitled to a house by Government; far less is he entitled to be given furniture. He is like any other Civil Servant; he comes here and if there is a flat available, you provide him with a flat as you would anybody else; but there is nothing in the Acts of the colony which lays down that the Attorney General of Barbados is entitled to a furnished or unfurnished house. Doctors and Headmasters come under the Act, and we passed something for the Chief Justice and the Chief Secretary.
3.35 p. m.

The Attorney General is like any of the Civil Servants in the Service. What we must point out is this. On page 28 of the Godsall Report paragraph 44, Rent of Furniture, this is what he says:-

"Heavy furniture is not commonly supplied in Government Quarters in Barbados. In cases where it is so supplied, I recommend that an additional depreciation charge be made on it at the rate of 5% of the capital value of the furniture. This will cover interest but not abnormal repair or breakages. If the occupant of the quarters objects to this charge, the furniture can be removed and he can be permitted to supply his own."

This officer is not entitled to a free house or to furniture. Imagine this Government is providing this officer with something to which the Act does not say he is entitled! Not only do they do that, but they are taking up \$2,500 of the taxpayers' money to supply the furniture even against the recommendation of Mr. Godsall which is a recent recommendation on this matter. They are saying that rent will be charged for the furniture at the rate of 3% of its value per annum: which means to say that this officer who is now getting \$10,320 a year is unable to buy his furniture and because of that they will have to supply him with furniture.

Now, Sir, on page 111, paragraph 345, this is what Mr. Godsall has to say of the Attorney General: "This post at present carries a salary of \$8,160. Those of corresponding posts in British Guiana and Trinidad are \$11,040 and \$11,520 respectively. My proposed salary of \$10,320 for the post in Barbados maintains, I think, a reasonable relationship with those posts and also with the salaries which I later recommend for the higher posts in the Judiciary Department."

Mr. Chairman, I have nothing against the present incumbent but can you tell me why it is that a man whose salary is \$10,320 per annum and who is not entitled to free quarters should be given furniture to the cost of \$2,500 at the rate of 3% per annum for rent/ when in even a recent proposal of Mr. Godsall there was no recommendation that this officer was entitled to free quarters or furniture? I am going to tell you something more of the

house at the Garrison for this officer later on. Mr. Godsall made a recommendation to increase the salary of this officer by \$2,160 and that increase brings him now into the position where there are only three people in the Civil Establishment above him and they are the Governor, the Chief Justice, and the Chief Secretary. He now gets a salary of \$10,320 per annum. If this officer cannot buy furniture for his house, who else can buy? You are asking your Long Grade Clerk and Your Assistant Secretary to buy furniture, but you are saying that your Attorney General cannot buy! This wicked Government came in here and told us that they cannot bring down anything yet to increase pensioners who have retired 25 years ago. They cannot bring down anything to help these old people; yet they are bringing down something to help people who are getting a high salary. They have now come down with a recommendation to buy \$2,500 in furniture for the Attorney General whose salary is \$10,320 a year. I say that you all should be taken out of this House to Westbury Cemetery and buried without the normal religious ceremony! You cannot find money for the pensioners, but you have the effrontery to come in with a Resolution for \$2,500 odd to buy furniture for the Attorney General who is getting over \$10,000 a year. Sir are we going mad? Are we crazy? What is this? Is this not another aspect of colonialism? This is the same type of thing that the British Government exacts when they are packing people out to Africa to take up positions. This thing only goes on in Africa. They expect when you go to England you must live in the cold; but when they go to Africa, they cannot enjoy living in Africa without these things; they must have all of these trappings.

Now, Sir, you have Cabinet Government here; therefore the Chief Secretary is not sending down this thing now; your Cabinet Government has sent it down. What has happened to poor Sarah in Delamere Land, who has to rent a house? What has happened to all of us in Barbados? Do you think any hon. member on that side will do this with his money? Do you think that any of them would lend a servant of theirs money to pay back at the rate of 3%? But when it comes to public funds, they are digging their hands deep into it and depleting the funds to do all sort of nonsense while we have to draw our belts to put it there. We must do this thing for a man who gets more than \$10,000 a year!

Sir, this is not a case like that in which you have to furnish a house at the Hospital for doctors or like that in which you have to furnish a house for the Headmaster at Harrison College. The doctors at the Hospital have to live there but the Attorney General does not have to live on the spot. Sir, since the last Barbadian born Attorney General, they say that they do not want any more Barbadians to fill that post. Members of that Government have made people at the Colonial Office to believe that Barbadians are not fit to be Attorney Generals or Chief Justices; but they can be Premiers! It seems as if the Chief Justice and the Attorney General are running the colony and the Ministers are administering justice. This is the spectacle which you have. This gentleman was appointed Attorney General with the knowledge that there was no furnished house for him and with the knowledge that he was going to get a salary of \$10,320 per annum and out of it he would have to rent a house like Mr. Whyatt and Mr. Wylie. Mr. Whyatt came here as Attorney General and left and went to Kenya as Attorney General. Now he is Chief Justice of Singapore, and that position is soon coming to an end because Singapore is soon to become independent. Mr. Wylie was appointed Attorney General of British Guiana and he is now the Federal Attorney General.

3.35 p.m.

I will tell you more; the Ministers would have us to believe that there is a house provided for the Attorney General. There is no house provided for the Attorney General. If you put furniture in a house for the Attorney General, when this Attorney General leaves, the other Attorney General might not want it. Mr. Whyatt lived in St. Peter, and Mr. Wylie lived in the Garrison. Both of them rented

their furniture. Another Attorney General might decide to live in St. John, and he might say, "I do not want this furniture." Look at the ridiculousness of it! This recommendation of Mr. Godsall says "5% of the Capital cost." Imagine a man with a salary of \$10,000 a year and this Government decides to buy furniture for him, because he is in impecunious circumstances! That is the only justification which you could claim for buying furniture for the Attorney General. He is not entitled to it, and there is no Act which entitles him to it. No Civil Servant in Barbados other than the Governor, the Chief Secretary, and the Chief Justice gets any furniture from the Government. Why is it that we have to furnish this Attorney General's house? Look at this ridiculous position, where you are paying six shillings a week for furniture for the Attorney General just as if somebody rented a house in the Orleans from Stevedore Alleyne or one of those persons with a red book! That is the situation which you find today. A man who is earning \$10,000 a year, is paying six shillings a week rent for furniture! Imagine the ridiculousness of that; It will take this gentleman 33 years to amortize this loan.

They are picking up public money and spending it on a man who is getting \$10,000 a year to furnish his house! Because people come to them with any kind of story, they accept it! If this gentleman's income tax is too high for him, well, my income tax is too high for me too. If this man cannot get as much as he needs out of his \$10,000, then I cannot get as much as I need out of my \$220 a month. I have to look after my constituents; I cannot owe anybody; I live out of my means. I am not going to have a cocktail party tonight and then I cannot drink my tea tomorrow morning. (Laughter) What is the use of our coming here week after week and we hear that we have to draw our belts in respect of the Deep Water Harbour and so on? This is not money, this is cut plate; this is like a little boy who breaks a plate and the blue part is worth more than the white part. (Laughter). I am glad that this Resolution has come down at this time. The Federal Election is on next week. Imagine the Hon. Minister of Agriculture sitting down there and being a party to this wickedness! The people in St. Philip, with a lot of "chigoes" in their feet, want somebody to help them. The Government cannot bring down a Bill to increase the pensioners, but they can agree that a man who is working for \$10,000 a year must have his house furnished by them! You do not furnish houses for Civil Servants and you do not furnish houses for a postman; you do not lend them enough money to build their houses and pay you back, but you are talking about renting out furniture at 3%!

You are taxing the people of this community; you are making relatively poor men pay income tax, and you are taking our income tax and using it on people who are getting \$10,000 a year, because they are unable to furnish their houses! A new Attorney General comes here and you furnish his house, but there are those people whose houses need to be furnished; there are thousands of people whose houses need to be furnished. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that other hon. members will point out this wickedness too. We have already pointed it out in connection with Resolutions which have already been passed. Do you realise that, in essence, this is a question of increasing this man's salary? Do you realise that this is a revision of Mr. Godsall's recommendations? This man had no furnished quarters, but now you are giving him furnished quarters; This means that he is going to spend less on himself. Are you prepared to give women \$2 a day as a minimum wage? No, you could not give a woman that money. When we were asking to have men's wages increased, they fought like anything and they had to come back with a measly increase. The maximum for which a man can work is \$13.20 a week. It is only just now that I got an employer to pay a minimum of \$15 a week. You cannot do things for poor people; you find it difficult to do things for these people, but you can do things for other people! This Government has turned down a request for rock-blasters getting back-pay, and we have to open the matter again; but they have not turned down the request from the Attorney General for \$2,500.

3.45 p.m.

Now, Mr. Chairman, can you or anybody tell me and I am listening for one of the backbenchers if they dare get up- what will be the justification at this time for giving the Attorney General furniture unless he is unable to do it himself? You call upon a man to live in a certain house, like the Director of Agriculture who must live at Codrington; but the Attorney General can live in St. Andrew; he does not have to live near the Court. He can live at Sugar Hill in St. Joseph; it does not matter where he lives; but this is to show how generous Government is. We say that if an officer comes here and finds it difficult to get a house, Government has barracks at the Garrison which they have converted and which they rent at pepper-corn rent. Do you realise that it was only some years ago that we were renting the houses so cheaply up there, that Sir Archibald Cuke protested against the cheap rates which these people were paying, because they were so favoured as compared with other people in the community who were paying \$50, \$60, or \$70 for rent, while these people only paid something like \$20 a month and were working for three times as much money as those who paid more?

Now what is taking place? The Attorney General has come here and wants to live in a house which you have provided as quarters; the Chief Medical Officer, Dr. O'Mahony, lived in one; the Financial Secretary lives in one. All these Government Officers live in these flats, because in some cases if they have children, these flats are cheaper than renting one in the open market. Government has to accommodate them. But again, there is another set of Government officers who come here, and as I said before, they try to "hobnob" with the junior member for Christ Church and the senior member for St. George, and because they find these men living in palatial homes, they feel that since they are "hobnobbing" with these people, they should get them too, not out of their own pockets but out of the public purse.

Do you think there should not be sufficient of us here today to kick this out, and let the public see what Government intends to do? If they had to go to the public to get a vote on this, they could not get it, and nobody would return them to the House on this because nobody can claim that the Attorney General is so poor that he cannot provide his own furniture. It is easy to get an Attorney General, because there are lawyers up and down the West Indies. You can go out and murder a man tonight and come back in here and find a lawyer; so you do not have to worry. They are even easier to find than doctors. Law is one of the professions which West Indians take to like a duck takes to water; they take law in their stride, and only the dumb ones find it difficult to get through their law examinations. When it comes to the Attorney General and providing him with money, are you going to pay \$2,500 on a man's furniture and charge 3% on it? Godsall recommended 5% not 1 - and he was the man who carried out the recommendations for the poorer people in the service.

Do you know what this Government wants? They want a stiff strike by Government workers, and you will get it sooner or later. You want a good strike from the workers in this community against these atrocious actions. That is why you are afraid of them joining a Trade Union outside. Do you think we in the Trade Union could stand for this? Last year was the twentieth anniversary of the disturbances in Barbados; these things do not take long to get around. I see my erstwhile friend, the hon. junior member for St. Michael, sitting down over there unconcerned. It is just like the new calypso "Don't worry your head over me." He is unconcerned over spending this money on the Attorney General. Accidentally we were in the same place during the last election, and an old pensioner called him to his window and asked what was being done about pensions. He said he was fighting for it in the last Session and will fight for it again. I challenge him to say it is not so. This took place in Parris Gap during the 1956 elections. You are still fighting to get something done for pensioners, but you do not have to fight too long for the Attorney General. This Attorney General came here some time last year by the Elders and Fyffe Line, the "Camito;" and we now get an Attorney General who never lived in a house before! He had no furniture and for the first time now

that he has come here, he wants heavy furniture! Look how Government has accommodated him - and the junior member for St. James is there laughing like the cat that went into the milk; therefore, we get that sort of plague that is coming upon this earth. He can laugh because in the evening of his days he finds himself in the House of Assembly getting something he can look forward to.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not see why you should be attacking the hon. member for St. James.

Mr. WALCOTT: I say he can laugh at this matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He is laughing with his mouth.

Mr. WALCOTT: Therefore, when he laughs, it shows how he condones this. If you laugh at a funeral, it shows how much sympathy you have for the bereaved. It shows how much he is in sympathy with what we are doing for the Attorney General of Barbados who came here in October last year and had an increase in salary. Do you realise that the increase we have put on the Attorney General's salary is more than what some people work for - \$2,196 or whatever it might be? The members of the House of Assembly get very little more than \$2,160, and there is no question about responsibility when we come here, because these are the things we have to guard over. Without a qualm of conscience, Government is asking us to agree to this Resolution to furnish this gentleman's house at a figure and at a percentage lower than that which Godsall recommended - \$6.25 per month or \$75 a year for furniture. It will take him to be in that house for thirty-three years before he ever pays it back. So you are granting him the privilege of having furniture at a pepper-corn rate.

3.55 p.m.

He is not remaining here for thirty-five years because we do not have people employed in the service at that age. Are you doing this for the present incumbent only? Why should I get here today and make anybody believe that whoever is appointed Attorney General by the Secretary of State will get this concession? Moreover, we have plenty of Barbadians up and down the country that could have done this job. We have Mr. Fergusson, and other Barbadians by the legions. Instead of appointing such people, they come here and are burdening us with this idea of furnishing a house. I repeat, are we going backward, and doing things that are only done in Africa? All over the Commonwealth these English officials are being kicked out because the people of the country are not standing up for this colonial aspect any longer. Let the Attorney General come and furnish his house and live wherever he likes. He is not in the same position as a schoolmaster who must live at a certain place. He is not like a schoolmaster that we must give him a house to live in. He is not like a doctor at the Hospital. For what reason must we furnish a house for him? Is there any good reason? If this is the case, why should we not furnish the Clerk's House too as well as all these Reporters of this House? Some of these Reporters in here would like you to furnish their house for them and to allow them to pay three per cent.

Sir, how can I ever support this Resolution? What I am sorry about is that there are some hon. members of this House and even some hon. members of the opposition who are taking their parliamentary duties too lightly and that is the reason why over on that side there is the feeling that they can do whatever they like. The climate which you can see taking place up there is that those officials with their background feel that whatever they can get a Minister to do for them, it is going to pass the House. Because of that, you get the position where Civil Servants are playing up to Ministers so that the Ministers can grant them something. That is what is happening nowadays. Some months ago, you had the spectacle where a Civil Servant was drawing two salaries. He was getting something like \$1,000 a month. With this Ministerial set up, you can get Civil Servants whispering in Ministers' ears to get something passed.

Mr. Chairman, which of us on this side of the House owes the Attorney General any favour to cause us to sit here and seriously vote to furnish his house? I would not

vote for even the putting in of a Beatrice stove far more \$2,500 in furniture. There can be no justification whatsoever for that. The Attorney General is not an officer who is required to live in a Government-owned house. We are not furnishing Codrington House or a headmaster's house. Tomorrow, the Attorney General can leave this island. There can be no justification for this whatsoever.

For those hon. members who are not aware of what Mr. Godsall recommended, I will like them to know of it; therefore I will read it. This is what he recommended: "Heavy furniture is not commonly supplied in Government quarters in Barbados. In cases where it is so supplied, I recommend that an additional depreciation charge be made on it at the rate of five per cent of the capital value of the furniture. This will cover interest but not abnormal repairs or breakages. If the occupant of the quarter objects to this charge, the furniture can be removed and he can be permitted to supply his own."

Now, the Government has come down with the rate at three per cent. Some months ago, the Premier got up in here with his nonsense and told us something about the bank rate. He did not know as much about it as we know of Sputnik. Just that Government is taking up all the money which we are borrowing, taking money from the Labour Welfare Fund and from the Sugar Rehabilitation so as to build the Deep Water Harbour. The Government cannot find money to do that but it is going to take up \$2,500 to furnish a house for a man who gets \$860 a month! They say that they are going to rent him this furniture at 3%. This is just like your hiring a servant and she cannot buy a pair of pumps to come on the job. If the Attorney General cannot buy furniture for his house, ask him to resign. If the Attorney General with the salary which he is getting had the effrontery to come here and ask the Government to buy furniture for him and that he pay rent for it at that rate, then the Secretary of State for the Colonies should really recall him tomorrow. Where does he think he is? He is in the West Indies. Can we really seriously talk of passing this Resolution? Sir, if we do this for the Attorney General, you can see what is going to happen soon. The Director of Medical Services would soon want his house furnished and all the Heads of Departments would soon be coming for loans to furnish their houses, and soon and very soon we will have to build a house for each of the Ministers. The Attorney General is not an officer for whom we must do this thing. The Director of Medical Services, being high up in the hierarchy of Government servants, would ask for this if we do it for the Attorney General. I am really at a loss to know what is the justification for starting this new thing. Sir, I will tell you more. They have written "new" to this item. What hon. members must be aware of is that we have now before us the Estimates for the coming Financial Year. Without looking at the copy before me, I will bet you that they have it in the Estimates. I will search it to see if I am right. Sir, I now remember that they will not have to put it in because that would be done for 35 years.

4.05 p.m.

Imagine renting the Attorney General furniture at six shillings a week! He cannot buy furniture! If he wants to buy furniture befitting his office, let him go to the bank and borrow the money. Any bank in Barbados would lend money to a man whose salary is \$10,000 a year. How do you run your business, Mr. Chairman? - On a loan. Where you have a man drawing a salary of \$10,000 a year with a pension behind it, do you not think that they would lend him this money? This gentleman could go to Barclays Bank or he could go to the Bank of Nova Scotia. This is like the Trinidad Car loans issue. The only reason why this gentleman does not want to go to the bank and borrow money, is due to the fact that he would have to pay 6% interest on it. Do you think that he could not get money to spend on his furniture. We paid his passage and everything else; he is entitled to leave passages for himself and his wife and his children, and could he not find money to buy furniture? I am a Barbadian, I pay my taxes and I have to buy my furniture. What greater contribution is this gentleman making to this country than anybody else?

Mr. Chairman, I have said what I had to say. I cannot vote for this Resolution under the perils of hell. I will say this: we have to let the public know how much we disapprove of this state of affairs and it is for that reason that I think I have said enough on this matter. I warn the members of the Opposition not to ask any questions, but to say what they have to say on this matter. There is no member of this Opposition who would support this Resolution. Far from the Attorney General, we owe it to the constituents who sent us here, not to support this Resolution. This is ridiculous; we should have a funeral procession of the members over there, not in the sense of an ordinary funeral procession, but one from the Almshouse down to the Cemetery.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is as indefensible and as unjustifiable as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has made out. There cannot be any excuse at all for coming to this Chamber this afternoon to tell us that an unfurnished Government flat at the Garrison has been made available for the use of the Attorney General and it is proposed to provide basic furniture for use by this Officer at an estimated cost of \$2,500. When this Officer was appointed to this post, presumably he was not promised an unfurnished Government flat; presumably when the office was known to be vacant, persons who were interested in becoming the Attorney General of Barbados did not know that they would have been entitled to an unfurnished Government flat, and they did not know that it would be furnished with furniture of this type; but now that the appointment has been made, we see that favouritism has come in and the Government has decided to provide the holder of this office not only with a flat, but also to supply it with basic furniture to be used by him at this estimated cost of \$2,500. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has pointed out, it was the Salaries' Commissioner, Mr. Godsall, who recommended that rent should be charged at the rate of 5%; yet this individual had so soon found with the Government that one might well feel that he is being regarded by them - and I hope quite wrongly - as a potential, political football. We know now that there is nothing which the Government is not prepared to do for that type of person. They start off by charging a rent of 3% instead of 5% which Mr. Godsall advocated. Mr. Godsall is an approved Salaries' Commissioner; we were told when he was selected as a Salaries' Commissioner, that we had the best man available in the whole world or in the whole universe. He recommended a 5% rental; but now that we are dealing with this gentleman, who has already endeared himself to the hearts of the Ministers, we find that with their usual magnanimity with someone who they feel will play ball, they are charging a ridiculously low rental rate of 3%.

What is the position with regard to this gentleman's furniture? Where is he living up to now? What furniture, if any, has he got where he is living? Of course, these are rhetorical questions which I am posing. What is he doing without furniture? He has been in this island since October or from the beginning of November, and what has he been doing without basic furniture or doing without it? Has he been sleeping at hotels? How has he been getting on without basic furniture which is to cost \$2,500? We are not thinking of Persian rugs; basic furniture means a bed, a couch, a table, chairs and things of that sort and enamel ware. If he has had basic furniture, what has happened to it that we should be now asked to buy this furniture at this cost of \$2,500?

The salary of this Officer is \$860 a month. The people who did not apply for this post did not apply for it because the salary was only \$860 and they knew nothing about Government quarters being made available and basic furniture being granted at a peppercorn rental. They did not apply because a salary of \$860 a month was not adequate for those persons who would have applied for the post; however, this officer has become so impressive in the eyes and the minds of Her Majesty's present advisers - it is heartening to think that they will not be here much longer in the capacity of Her Majesty's advisers.

4.15 p.m.

We are asked to provide this money and we have been told that there is the question of providing furniture in other respects. We were told for years, Mr. Chairman, that people could not be provided with money for furniture in the Housing Schemes. There was no money available, no grant and no vote, and it would be beyond the ingenuity and resources of the members of the Government to find some means whereby the people in the Housing Scheme at Clinketts in St. Lucy could get assistance in the new Housing Scheme to put in new furniture. It is the same Government who is dealing with the higher-ups, the sort of persons they love to deal with and for whom there is no limit to the amount of favours they would do, and which has no hesitation in coming before us this afternoon to ask us to vote this \$2,500. It is the same Government, Mr. Chairman, which cannot provide money to pay a Christmas bonus to the lowest paid public employees. Why didn't he ask for something more? He would have got it as far as the present Government is concerned. Anybody at top can get anything he wants, but anybody at bottom has a chance only just before elections.

Now, Sir, we are invited to pass this money for the Attorney General. As you know, the Attorney General today does nothing as much of the work as former holders of that office used to do. It is a tradition in England that the Attorney General finds himself in the Courts prosecuting murder cases at the Old Bailey, as it is called in England. When last has the Attorney General of Barbados prosecuted a murder case? That is the least he is expected to do because of the importance of the case. What is the taking of human life that the Attorney General cannot come down to the Courts at Grand Sessions and lead the prosecution at a trial of murder? Is that done nowadays? What is the justification for this proposed increase, except that he is regarded by the present Government as a most likeable person, a person whom they feel they can handle? As long as they feel they can handle him, they give him anything he wants.

Now there is another aspect to it, Sir. If you provide the Attorney General with a flat and with basic furniture for his use, what about the Solicitor General? Isn't he justified in having some in his home? What about the getting him furniture at pepper-corn rent? What about the Legal Draughtsman? You are creating a precedent. Either you are creating an unfair, unjust and immoral precedent that you will only provide this help for the higher-ups, or a precedent which you will follow through to people right down the line if you provide this for the leading Crown Law Officer. There is no reason why the junior Crown Law Officer and all the Crown Law Officers down the line should not get this help; there is no reason why from the Commissioner of Police right down to the Privates should not get it; and there is no reason why we should not give this help to every Department of Government service. As soon as this passes, Mr. Chairman, you will have Government Heads of Departments in every branch of the service coming, and quite rightly so, to Government and if the individuals are likeable persons, you know the Resolutions will come to us to provide the money to give them the furniture for their comforts which is called basic furniture. I should really like to know what is regarded as basic furniture and how this Attorney General was faring without it. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if he has it already, or whether it has been ordered and he only needs to get it tomorrow morning, just as in the case of the Resolution for the Governor's car which was passed some time ago. I wonder if the furniture has already been provided and you are just now waiting to pay for it. I do not see how he could be doing without a bedstead, some chairs and a table. He must have been using basic furniture; whose was he using?

This is a Resolution absolutely without anything to commend it and it does not deserve a vote from any honest individual in this Committee, not one who is serious in the responsibility with regard to the people he represents as guardian of the purse strings.

Now, Sir, the other part of this Resolution deals with a vote of \$350 for this course. I am rather interested in the phrase, Mr. Chairman. I do not know if you have

come across it, but these people will be taking a six weeks' course in the United Kingdom in nautical cookery. I wonder if nautical cookery is so different from any cookery that we have to send them away. I am glad the opportunity is being given to them to go away and take this course, and I notice that they will be "obtaining their tickets as chief cooks." I suppose the word "ticket" is equivalent to "certificate" or "diploma". I wonder what is the difference between nautical cookery and other cookery - territorial cookery, land cookery or good cookery.

As to that part, I have no objection to voting \$350; but so far as the \$2,500 is concerned, that is a difficult question, and consequently Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the amount be reduced from \$2,850 to \$350. I beg to move the delation of \$2,500 from this vote.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is very bad that we should be called upon to vote for this at all. What is more regrettable is that I will have to say something behind the Premier's back. This Resolution for \$2,500 as the Addendum sets out quite clearly and very regrettably says that "an unfurnished Government flat at the Garrison has been made available for the use of the Attorney General and it is proposed to provide basic furniture for use by this officer at an estimated cost of \$2,500.

Rent will be charged for the furniture at the rate of 3% of its value per annum."

As a matter of fact, Sir, I do not really know where to begin with this Resolution. Sometimes I begin to think of the Tenets of the Barbados Government socialism: 'he that hath shall have more given unto him; he that hath nothing shall starve and die.' This is the most shameless bit of legislation we have been asked to pass for a long time, and I am sure those of us in the Opposition will not be aparty to it, although members of the Government will be voting for it.

4.25 p.m.

Some of them will vote against their conscience, but, nevertheless, they will vote for it.

Now, Sir, the salary of the Attorney General is \$10,320 a year which is \$860 a month. That is a lot of money in any kind of money whether it be Chinese, English, West Indian or any kind of money. We are asked to vote this money to supply furniture for this officer's house. Would to God that every Head of Department in the Service ask the Government to supply them with furniture to furnish their house by the end of the year. You have either six or seven Police Magistrates. Why did they not ask for furniture?

Sir, you cannot compare this matter with your buying furniture for Government House because we are entitled by right of our position to say to the Governor that we have somebody to bring to Government House to see him. Are you saying by this that a man who works for \$10,320 is not in a position to buy furniture? Sir, do you know what is most painful of all in this? I regret very much that the Hon. Premier is not in here. Just a few weeks ago, you have actually revised the salaries of all your Government employees and other Civil Servants but you have a lot of people who have worked for you and given a lot to this country but who have now retired and you have done nothing for them. I came across a retired man who after 44 years' service - he is about 84 years old - was only getting \$11 a month as pension. Does it mean nothing to you that an 84 year old man who gave 44 years of service is only drawing \$11 a month?

(A VOICE: What was his salary when he went out?) The original salary of that man was \$30 a month.

Sir, you must be very careful. The hon. and learned Premier came in here and said that his reasons for not coming down with something for these people is because he was sure the Opposition would not want to know that the people who are in receipt of big pensions would be receiving cost of living to their pensions. What sort of double talk is this to say that, and in the same breath to say that a man who is getting \$860 a month cannot buy furniture to put in his house?

Let us examine this Resolution. The Addendum says that rent will be charged at the rate of 3 per cent per annum.

I heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter say that this is like the Trinidad car loans. I know nothing about that. Of course, they have not given us a breakdown of this matter yet but I take it that they are putting in a refrigerator among other household furniture. You say that you are charging three percent for this furniture which I understand would come to roughly \$75 a year. I will say that the Attorney General is a very lucky man. None of us over on this side of the Table would have to curry favour with the Attorney General but this is what I would say to the Hon. Premier who must be the person who is responsible for this, because there is hardly another Minister who would be responsible for it. This smells to high heaven, it stinks.

The first Attorney General of Barbados that you had since Mr. E.K. Walcott, a Barbadian, was Mr. Whyatt and you had Mr. Wylie after that. Mr. Whyatt was sent to Kenya. For these two Englishmen you did not provide furniture. If you had come in here and said that you had found difficulty in getting a house for the Attorney General or that he had found difficulty in getting a house to rent, I could see some reason. You cannot say that you have found difficulty in buying furniture because you can send him down to Harrison with a credit note. Above all, you should do things in a business-like way. In the God-sall Report, five percent is recommended for rent of furniture. I would like to know - and I am sure the Hon. Minister in charge would be able to answer me - what guided the Government to reduce that to three per cent because if as I understand it furniture must depreciate - and it must depreciate as rapidly in the Attorney General's house as anybody else's then how can you justify your charging three per cent merely on this \$2,500? I think this is a very ridiculous state of affairs. If the Attorney General could not get a note backed or could not get furniture on credit, then if the Government had to lend him money or to furnish him with a house and furniture, I think the minimum which they should charge him for that should be six per cent. How on earth can they think of charging him only three percent? Sir, I am the only nonsocialist in the House at the moment; the other hon. members profess to be socialists; if this is socialism, God help socialism!

The Hon. Premier said on one occasion in this House when we were dealing with a measure for a maid at Combermere School getting \$8 a month but was not being paid when the School was on vacation -

Mr. CHAIRMAN knocked the gavel.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I did not think you were paying any attention to me; that is why I said that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Combermere School has nothing to do with this Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not dealing with Combermere School. That is where you make a mistake. I said that on one occasion in this House we were dealing with a Resolution to pay \$8 a month to a maid who was employed in the Canteen at Combermere School and the Hon. Premier said during the course of the debate that during the vacation they could not pay her. If you could not pay her for the two months or so when the school was on vacation, then, how can you pay for this furniture for the Attorney General's house? When you came down here for money to give an ex-Manager at Dodds a gratuity and reduced pension.

Mr. CHAIRMAN knocked the gavel.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Do you mean to say that I cannot talk about that?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You can talk about anything which is before us; the Manager of Dodds is not before us.

Mr. MOTTLEY: He is not actually before us but I am bringing him before you now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do not worry to bring him in.

Mr. MOTTLEY: They brought in a Bill dealing with him already.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Deal with the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Since you are paying me so much attention now, I will deal with the Resolution. I was saying that they have asked for \$2,500 to furnish the Attorney

General's house and I drew to the Government's attention on an occasion when we were dealing with the Wood Pension Bill that in my capacity as Churchwarden of St. Michael I had seen a number of people who had worked on Government farms and who had given of their best as agricultural labourers and were now retired and not one thing had been done for them. For 20 to 27 years they work with Government and not one thing was done for them by this Government which professes to be a Socialist Government and whose members say that they are the only people who look after the poor. It is the members of that same Government who have the brass and temerity to come in here with a Resolution for \$2,500 to furnish a house for a man who is getting \$860 a month! 4.35 p.m.

A salary of \$860 a month is a lot of money. You have had the brass to come in here and say that you want money to furnish the Attorney General's house. This is a Barrister, he is in the Colonial Service; he went to other places, besides Barbados, and now he is here. Captain Tomlin, the Director of Public Works, came out here and he sold his furniture when he was going on leave. Do you know that he made more money on his sale than he paid for the furniture? Very often people come here and have a sale of their furniture when they are going away and sometimes they make more money on it.

Mr. Chairman, for the Government to ask us to agree to furnish a house for the Attorney General, is really asking us too much. This House was not unreasonable when the Government came down here and asked us to buy a house for the Chief Justice; we pointed out to them that they were only throwing away money at the Garrison next door to communal latrines; we told them to buy a house befitting the Officer. It is not a question here of the Government saying that it is hard to get a house, because everybody would be reasonable with them; but they do not say that. As a matter of fact, the Attorney General of Barbados could have his note backed in Bridgetown - in fact, he would not want his note backed at all. He could get his furniture and pay for it monthly. It is really shameful to be knocking about this matter in this House. Apparently, the Premier is conveniently ill. I thought that the reason for the postponement of the Resolution - last week was due to the fact that the Premier was not here to deal with it. (Hon. M.E. COX: I understand that the Opposition was tired.) No, the Opposition was not tired. We intended to remain here until four o'clock in the morning. I thought that we would give the Premier the opportunity to reply and show some reason for this Resolution.

I was not here when the Hon. Leader of the House introduced this Resolution, but I do not think that he could have said very much on it. If you could look into his conscience, you would see that he was saying, "I am doing this against my conscience." I would put my head to the block tonight that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is saying that they are doing this thing against their consciences. If the Hon. Minister of Agriculture were in the Opposition and this Resolution came down here, why, he would fly to the roof; but he is in the Government, otherwise - he would be worse than Billy Graham.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order, I have left Egypt's land; I am not in that land any longer.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But you may cross the River Jordan and go to the Black Sea. I will lend you a hand when you want to come back across. I want to say that even the most junior member of this House who has strayed from the happy band of bachelors (*Laughter.*) I am sure, would have the courage to speak on this Resolution, despite what the Attorney General would say - and this is nothing against the Attorney General of Barbados; this is a matter of principle. I am no socialist if this is socialism. If I were to vote this \$2,500 to put furniture in the house of a man who is getting \$860 a month and leave out poor people who cannot even buy kerosene oil - before I would do that, I would ask God to take me. The Government should do first things first. Deep down in their hearts, they know that this is wrong. We feel that the Attorney General of this country should be told that he

can have a flat at the Garrison, but he will have to furnish it.

What will happen next? The Attorney General may get promotion to Trinidad or British Guiana or he might become the Federal Chief Justice; and the wife of the new Attorney General might say, "I do not like that dining table," or "I want a deep sleep mattress." What are you going to do? I believe that money has its uses; if I got \$860 a month, I would spend my money on my comforts; I think this is a question of taking the means out of this country, because if this gentleman is promoted somewhere else it has happened that a Governor's wife wanted a new carpet - what is going to happen when another Attorney General is appointed? Are you going to say that you are getting furniture for that Attorney General? Do you believe that the furniture which was built for the Lobby of this House was built at Glendairy Prison? Why do you not get furniture for the Attorney General's house built at Glendairy Prison too? We asked them to bring down something for the retired people who have given their best to the country and the Hon. Leader of the House asked what were the salaries they were getting that they are getting such low pensions? I say that the sum of \$860 a month is a lot of money in any currency.

4.45 p.m.

None of us thought that we would live to see the Attorney General get \$10,000 a year in Barbados; that is a lot of money anywhere. You have a lot of old retired people who have given of their best to put all of us here. Should you therefore give them \$12 a month as pension? The Premier says that he cannot find money to do that, but he can find \$2,500 to furnish the house of a man who is getting \$860 a month! Are you doing that with the idea that after his Income Tax comes out, he can save as much as he can? When we have finished talking about the Attorney General, somebody will point at us and say, "he is the fellow who talked about it." I never opened my mouth in this House when members here talked about the Harbour Master being a South African. I do not have to apologise for it, but sometimes a little gentleman comes out of you even although you are not a gentleman. When his wife lowered herself to insult me at a social function

Mr. CHAIRMAN knocked the gavel.

As soon as you criticise any of these people in here, they try to insult you when they hold social functions. Happiness is where you find it, and I can enjoy myself anywhere.

Mr. T.W. MILLER: Hear, hear!

Mr. MOTTLEY: I hear my colleague saying "hear, hear; he knows exactly what I am saying is true. That is why a lot of hon. members in this House are afraid of their social positions; but I believe that if you are outspoken, and discharge your conscience about something, people will respect you more for it. What has guided Government to spend \$2,500 and charge 3% on it when Godsall recommended 5%? You are going to give him basic furniture, and I take it that must mean a mattress. The Attorney General is not going to remain here all the time; he is going to leave after promotion, and when you buy furniture, it depreciates. You are only charging 3% because it is not your money, but if you had to take that money out of your own bank accounts, you were not going to furnish his house and charge 3%. If I were the Attorney General, I would want you to do it too; I would take my money and go to Cottle Catford, ask them to lend it out at 6% and ask Government to furnish my house and pay them at 3%. That is good business, Mr. Chairman.

In these days when Government has intimated that money must be used under the Usury Act because the Bank of England rate is 7%, I cannot see how they can agree to doing this. The situation is that the Bank of England's rate is 7%, and the local borrowing rate is 6%, and no person can get anything at less than 6%. Everybody knows that money is being invested outside in British Guiana and Trinidad; but the Barbados Government is very generous to its Attorney General, and not to its general run of employees, because if one of the cantoniers wanted \$2,500 to buy a house, he would have to get

his grandmother and grandfather to pawn everything and the interest would not be at 3%.

Hon. M.E. COX: That is not correct.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Leader of the House says that it is not true; the real point is that they cannot get it.

According to the terms of employment of doctors at the Hospital, you must furnish a place for them, because those are the terms under which you employ them; but not so with the Attorney General. Ask Government what the doctors are paying! I challenge Government to deny that every doctor at the Hospital is paying 6%, not only on the house but on the furniture too. Those that have a lot must have more. The Attorney General is in a position to buy furniture, but you are giving him more. I am surprised that you haven't offered him at 1 1/2%. I am not voting for this, and I will have a lot more to say.

I, therefore, second the motion of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that the Resolution be reduced by \$2,500, for the simple reason that the Resolution has another item for \$350.

As a matter of fact, I do not intend to vote against that \$350, because it is to allow some of our men to be trained as ships' cooks with the Harrison Line. They are finding it difficult to get proper cooks, and are asking for this money as part of the cost of training these men.

As regards the \$2,500, I feel so strongly on it that this should be a vote of censure on this Government. To me this is using your power in things unfit, and in my opinion, and in my opinion, you are unfit to be called a socialist Government in asking for this money to furnish the home of a man who is getting \$860 a month. If the hon. junior member for St. John, the Deputy Speaker, had been over here, you would see what his reaction would be as an honest man to this. I do not mean what he is today.

Mr. VAUGHAN: rose

I did not say that he was not an honest man and I never intended to say so. The hon. junior member for St. John knows that I would not make such cracks about him, but I know him sufficiently well not only in this House, but on political platforms to say that if he had not been a member of the Government Party, he would tear this to pieces.

4.55 p.m.
My colleague seems to have left the House and I think he should stay out and do not vote for this Resolution because you have a very touchy electorate in the City and he knows that. Do you know, Sir, if you came to get money for renovating one of the flats for the Attorney General, if I stood alone and the entire Opposition was against it, I would vote with the Government?

Let us take the hon. senior member for St. John, who is as dignified as he is honest as he can be termed. I suppose his honesty goes so far that he has to be dishonest to his conscience and vote for his Party. Sir, surely you can be dishonest to your conscience and be honest to your Party. The hon. member taught in schools in St. John and even although he had no right in Jamaica a couple of days ago, he went there and saw what Higher Education is (Laughter.) I know that deep down in his conscience he does not agree with this Resolution. Mr. Chairman, I feel that deep down in your conscience you too do not agree with this. As to the hon. junior member for St. James, I know that he is honest and he will vote for this Resolution anyhow.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are making sport at the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is part of my duty. I can make as much sport as I like of the hon. members over there.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow that any more.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Tell me what I am doing unparliamentary. It is part of my duty to make as much sport as I like as long as I am doing it with parliamentary dignity. You really have escaped my making sport at you because you are Chairman and I respect your office. I come now to the hon. and genial lady member for St. Andrew.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member to desist from doing that; I am not entertaining it. If you persist in doing that I will have to rule you out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, what am I out of order in doing?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are straying from the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: In what manner am I straying from the Resolution? Are you suggesting that I should not make any reference to the hon. senior member for St. Andrew? I am merely saying that I knew her father well enough and have been in here with him. I am suggesting that he was a stalwart in support of freedom in this Chamber. He may not have made any mark that he was a Socialist but he was a revered human being. Sir, is that saying anything derogatory about her? I do not think you should display such uneasiness in the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, apparently you want to see all heat in this Chamber. Do you know the reason why I am adopting this attitude? I sense the strong feelings of hon. members in this House on this Resolution and if I do not adopt this attitude it is my feeling that there will be a lot of fisticuffs. I can tell you, Sir, that they really feel very strong about this Resolution. They came here bursting with anger about it.

Do you want to know something? This Opposition knows well enough that numerically we have not the strength but as far as the ability to talk we have it. We know that whenever we finish debating this Resolution, it will be passed; therefore, our object is to keep the money in the Treasury for another hour at least. If we get through too quickly they will say that we were like three blind mice.

Sir, perhaps this furniture must have been bought already. Do you remember when we were debating the Resolution for the floats, we told the Hon. Leader of the House that we knew a lot of the money had already been spent? Sir, next Friday is Nomination Day and I can tell you that up to the wee hour of one o'clock last night when members of the Government Party left Roebuck Street, the Hon. Premier did not come to the meeting. The hon. member sitting next to me knows that that is the way of the Hon. Premier. He does things that way and that is why the hon. member came out of that party. The Hon. Premier will wait until Thursday night to say who are the candidates from that party for the Federal elections.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are straying.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sure you will bear with me. Sir, I am going to let some other hon. member speak now. You need not be anxious; you have a long time to sit there tonight on this Resolution. If you want to adjourn for tea or dinner, just appeal to hon. members over on this side, but sit down and make yourself comfortable; this \$2,500 is not going out of the Treasury so easily. We do not think it is right and we are going to talk and do more talking on it. The hon. lady member for St. Andrew is very unique in this Chamber. She is the only hon. member who can claim to be the second generation in this House. The hon. member on my left - the hon. senior member for St. Lucy is also one whose father was a representative but his adjourn was not for long.
5.05 p.m.

Mr. TALMA: In my view, this is a clear case of one who has found favour in the sight of the Premier in particular. The present Attorney General is being granted preferential treatment, treatment which other Attorneys General have not received. Under internal self-government and with the Premier sitting there in absolute control, he has made up his mind to treat in this way this particular lawyer who will interpret the law in his way and which will probably not be the correct way. The Premier has picked out this particular individual and granted him preferential treatment, thereby creating a precedent. In the past, the Governor, the Chief Justice and the Colonial Secretary were the only three persons who were entitled to a house furnished with basic furniture. There is a difference between heavy furniture and basic furniture; heavy furniture is given to people who deserve houses; people of the agricultural community are those who must live where they work and they are given heavy furniture, but others are given basic furniture. This is the thin end of the wedge; and if this Resolution goes through for the At-

torney General, other Resolutions will have to go through for other Heads of Departments and, eventually, the Ministers will be given their proper places. If the Attorney General gets a furnished house, and if the Ministers get furnished houses, that would be perfectly in order, because in the flow of things, a Minister is higher than the Attorney General. This is definitely an attempt made to create a precedent and it is simply a question of the Attorney General having found favour in the sight of the Premier. Under self-government, the Premier sits as Chairman and he has decided that the Attorney General must have this furniture. To attack those Ministers over there would be unfair to them; the person who should be attacked is absent and missing. In my opinion, the further consideration of this Resolution should be postponed so that the attack can be launched in the proper quarter. The Ministers are innocent. (Mr. MOTTLEY: They are responsible.) The person who should be attacked is absent. They could not decide to create a precedent in giving the Attorney General basic furniture to the extent of \$2,500; that could not have been decided by them; they could never agree to that. That is the decision of the Premier. I think that the A.D.C. or whoever reports back to Government House, should be here to report properly; he should come in here and see the feeling of this House on this matter. I am not in a position to attack the Attorney General, because personally, he might be quite a good Attorney General, but the fact that he has found favour with the Premier shows that there is some form of weakness somewhere. (Not only are they creating a precedent in giving the Attorney General basic furniture, but also in the rate of the rental of the furniture. The rental rate has been 5% at all times, but, in this case, the Attorney General has found such great favour with the Government that the rental rate of the furniture is now 3%. People like the Agricultural Officers and Doctors at the General Hospital - people who must live where they work are given furniture; it is essential that certain officers reside where they work; but in this case, it does not concern the Government where the Attorney General lives. The former Attorney General lived in St. James; he rented a house and he must have bought his furniture. He is now the Attorney General of the Federated West Indies; he is an outstanding man; and yet they did not give him any furniture; but this man comes along and they want to give him furniture! What about the thousands of people in Christ Church who are living in little houses provided by the Government - something for which I had to fight, something which I had to get out of them? That is why I remained there; I was trying to get something done in Christ Church. What about the thousands of little shacks all over the country? What about those Government houses at Sayes Court?)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is straying from the Resolution.

Mr. TALMA: I am speaking of Government houses. With all due respect to you, Sir, Government employees are Government employees, whether you are Attorney General or cantonnier or agricultural worker. They are all Government employees in the final analysis. I am saying that in this particular case, not only is there a flat furnished for the Attorney General, but it is to be furnished to the tune of \$2,500! What about the average worker at Sayes Court or Gall Hill, to say nothing of the island wide housing schemes? In these schemes I have had a very big hand, schemes for which the Government is getting the credit, but the Government has not seen fit to revise its policy in respect of them. The only revision of policy is in connection with the ones who have, but for the ones who have not, the old slave policy remains. They must lie down and sleep where they can.
5.15 p.m.

Hon. M.E. COX: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, a voice from gallery: Man, sit down.

The Police removed the offender from the Gallery.

Hon. M.E. COX: As I was saying, Sir, I am sure that the hon. member knows that the cases are not on all-fours. In the case of houses which Government built for

the working class people, there are sold to the people on the hire-purchase system, and the tenants eventually become the owners of these houses. (A VOICE: Which houses?) The Gall Hill houses, for instance. In this case, the question of Government providing furnished quarters for Government Officers is distinct from officers who need not be officers of Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member suggesting that all of the Government houses are being built on the hire-purchase system?

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, there are different types of housing schemes of which I am fully aware. Certain houses are the aided self-help, others Government have built and others are on the rental basis; but I am saying that the Minister's point does not run any red herring across any trail, because in any event they are not entitled to any loan to purchase furniture; and in the case of houses that remain the property of Government that facility of borrowing money to buy furniture is not given. There are no facilities for borrowing money for furniture and there are no Government houses which are rented and which remain Government owned which are fitted out with furniture.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not quite as strong this evening as I would like to be, but I could not sit here and allow this to go through without expressing my entire disapproval; disapproval in toto. I shall be voting against it and I am hoping that the Premier will have the courage to come here and take charge of a Resolution which he makes and which he puts others to face the music for.

Mr. HUSBANDS and F. G. SMITH rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I really did not see who got up first, but I am going to leave it to the two of you.

Mr. F.G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to the Resolution. I have the honour to be a member of the same Honourable Societies as the Hon. Attorney General, and although I am conscious of the difficulties which Government said they experienced in finding an Attorney General for this country, I cannot see how any Government which calls itself socialist can bring down a Resolution of this nature, and there are certain questions which I am going to pose to the Hon. Leader of this House, to which I would like an answer. If Government had come to this House and said they had a good man to make Attorney General, and that the only reason he would come to this colony is if he were provided with a furnished house, and if the Government could convince the Opposition that this man is so great a legal brain that his services would be of inestimable value to this country, I should find myself joining with the Government in providing these facilities, because I know for a fact, that in certain of the other West Indian islands with socialist or so-called socialist Governments, houses are provided for certain officers including the Attorney General.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: On a point of information. The hon. members have summed up the position quite accurately, and I am going to quote something for his benefit. When this officer was transferred to this colony, there was great difficulty in securing an officer and he was assured that there were no quarters available at present, but that there was every possibility that an official residence would be provided. It is Government quarters and we are asking for them to be furnished for him.

Mr. F.G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works for the attempt he has made to justify this unwarranted expenditure; I am saying that the Attorney General came to this country nearly five months ago knowing that there was no official residence, and he accepted the job in this country. If the Hon. Minister who has just spoken or the Hon. Leader of the House can tell me that the Attorney General came from Africa, can he tell me whether he had furniture of his own but sold it and kept the money or put it on the bank, or whether he lived in a house furnished by the African Government in Africa where he was serving at the time? If you can say that the African Government gave him a house or that he sold his furniture or had none, we might be voting furniture for a man who had to buy furniture in Africa, sold it, put the money on

the bank and has come here to fleece the bare-footed people of this country of the sum of \$2,500.

I would like to know how my colleague can get up and vote for this. Ask them to put furniture in the housing scheme at Belleplaine. I am waiting to see whether you are going to say "aye" to a Resolution of this nature when there are houses built for the working class people in Belleplaine with the kitchen in the front and no furniture. I could not vote for this a thousand times; I would be dishonest to the masses of this country who pay taxes, to myself and to the people whom I have to honour to represent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I had the honour of being in Jamaica, and I had the honour of seeing the P.N.P. in operation, and I can say that the backbenchers on the occasions on which I was in the House did get up and justify a Government measure. I am throwing out the challenge to any member of the Government as a backbencher to get up and justify voting this expenditure for a man who is getting over \$10,000 a year, and not be a mere "yes" man. This is not chicken feed; there are a number of people who, for a whole life time, never worked for \$10,000 in all, and this officer is getting it every year out of the taxpayers' money. Yet we are singling him out to provide furniture for him at a rental of 3%.

I am always amazed that the Government can bring down measures like this and come to the country and justify an expenditure of money of this nature, and the working classes will still continue to put them in power in spite of heinous things like this. This is taking advantage of ignorant people, because if you are sensible, you cannot support a Government, who would, at this stage of our development and not having a cent for the Deep Water Harbour, and shivering because we did not have rain for two months, do a thing like this. I have no grouse for the Attorney General; I saw him when he was called to the Bar. As a man, he earns his living and I earn mine; and I want that to be quite clear. I am not annoyed with the Attorney General if he can get Government to give him furniture for \$10,000. If you made me Attorney General, I would accept it, and you could not blame me.

5.25 p.m.

Therefore, you can only blame the people who lean to his suggestion or the suggestion from his friends for an amount for this. Generally speaking, we have to make a contribution to the Federal Government and we are giving the people the impression that we have millions of dollars in Barbados. A Socialist Government, if it must be socialist, must have some sense of priority. This is not the first thing which needs to be done. Can you compare this as urgent as your giving something more to the Old Age Pensioner who is getting \$1.80 a week? Compare them with the Attorney General.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. member. Pensioners are not in this Resolution.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: I know they are not. That is why I am saying that they are left out altogether. There is money here that can give something more to Old Age Pensioners who are now getting \$1.80 a week. You cannot give anything to Government Pensioners who slaved for you, but you can give the Attorney General this money to furnish his house. What has he done to justify it? He is going to pay 20.8333 cents a day for this furniture. The Old Age Pensioner is getting only 25.7142 cents a day. How can we be really serious when we say that we represent the working-class people? I would like to hear the Hon. Leader of the House justifying this. He has been a champion in days gone by of the working-class but he has associated himself with people who cannot spell socialist.

If the country were in a healthy condition and we had attended to matters which we knew to be of more importance, well then, we could consider this. As I have said, a Socialist Government must have a sense of priority. This should not be put before us until we had attended to the needs of the people whom we represent. I really would like my colleague to persuade the Government to lend people in our constituency \$10 to buy some necessary furniture or even a two-burner oil stove. As I see it, my

colleague is going to sit there and when the time comes, she is going to vote with the Government. O di immortales!

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, I do not think the Hon. Minister should be very anxious to reply because if I were in his position, I would wait until I had heard all the speeches from the other side before I reply. It must normally be expected that a Resolution of this sort would call down very serious opposition from the ranks of hon. members on this side of the table because it is really a departure all the way. Never before in the history of this island has any Government ever attempted to bring down a Resolution of this sort in favour of an Attorney General. That in itself would cause all hon. members who are alert and who are interested in the ways Government monies are being spent to be very, very anxious to see what good reasons Government had to bring down a Resolution of this nature.

Now, Sir, this Resolution is to provide \$2,500 in basic furniture for the house of the Attorney General and, of course, that furniture would be rented at 3 per cent.

A VOICE: Let us adjourn now.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, if I move the motion that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again, I hope there would be no suspension of sittings or any bogey business because if any sort of attempt is made on that plane, it would be a very serious matter in this House. This would be red Tuesday or black Tuesday. There would be no mincing of business with me.

Sir, I now beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. Speaker accordingly left the Chair.
5.35 p.m.

On re-assembling.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the suspension of the sitting, the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. L. E. SMITH being in the Chair.

The question that the figures proposed to be reduced stand part of the Resolution, was put and resolved in the affirmative on the declaration of the Chairman that "The Ayes have it."

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

Ayes: Mr. SPEAKER, Hon. M.E. COX, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. R.G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. THORNE, SEARLES and BRYAN - 8.

Noes: Mr. BRANCKER - 1.

RESOLUTION POSTPONED

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to postpone the consideration of the next Resolution, the Resolution for \$226,680, in-as much as this Resolution was not circulated before today. If I remember correctly, I saw my copy of the Resolution on the Table today, and I presume that hon. members only got their copies today.

I ask leave to postpone this Resolution.

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

ADVANCE TO THE GOVERNING BODY OF LODGE SCHOOL

Hon. M.E. COX: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is for the sum of \$3,430 to be advanced from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of making a loan free of interest and repayable over a period of six years to the Governing Body of Lodge School for the purchase of a motor vehicle and the payment of insurance and licence. This vehicle is for the purpose of transporting students from the Lodge School to the Technical Institute at Richmond.

The Addendum states this:

"The Headmaster of the Lodge School has reported that the Governing Body is experiencing considerable difficulties in their attempt to provide suitable transportation for the pupils attending the Technical Institute at Richmond, St. Michael. In the circumstances the Governing Body of the Lodge School has applied for financial assistance towards the purchase of a motor vehicle to be used by the school primarily for the purpose of providing transport for pupils of the technical classes to and from the Institute. It is also proposed to use the vehicle for conveying school teams for games, athletic and aquatic meetings, transporting boarders to and from Seawell Airport and educational tours. At present pupils of the Lodge school meet the cost of transport engaged for such purposes."

I think that hon. members will agree that this is a deserving case. Inasmuch as these children are far away from the regular transport facilities, the Government has agreed to make the Governing Body of the Lodge School this loan for the purpose of purchasing this vehicle and the Governing Body has agreed to repay the loan in six years' time.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks to make a loan to the Governing Body of the Lodge School. Sir, we all appreciate the beginning which is now being made in field of technical education, especially when they are streaming boys from the Secondary Schools to take advantages of the courses provided at the Technical Institute. However, Sir, we are in Committee and, of course, I have another opportunity of speaking; I would like to draw to the attention of the Government the fact that nothing is worse than a Government giving the impression that its representatives in Parliament seek to destroy confidence on the part of those who have to oppose them. Sir, we have just got through a Resolution which was being rushed through as far as one could see---

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must speak on the Resolution which is in front of us.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I suspected that some monkey business would have taken place, and as one of the representatives of the people, I feel that such action is grossly unfair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must speak on the Resolution which is before us.

Mr. HUSBANDS: This Resolution seeks to provide a loan for the Governing Body of the Lodge School, in order that they may be able to convey the pupils of the School to the Technical Institute and to other places, and, as I said, we do appreciate the beginnings which are being made in this direction. We are asked to grant these facilities and therefore, we should have every possible opportunity of examining this Resolution, and to let the Government know our feelings on it. Whenever, and in whatever way opportunity is debarred from us, we must be very outspoken and we must condemn the Government on such action every time. There are times, and you know, Mr. Chairman, there are matters of such importance which necessitate the ringing of the Bell. There are occasions when there are matters of major importance being discussed in this Chamber and Mr. Speaker or the Chairman of Committees will feel it necessary by the Rules of this House and by May's Parliamentary Procedure, which is

sometimes quoted in this Chamber, to have the Bell rung so as to resumon members in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not speaking on this Resolution.

(Mr. MOTTLEY: He is right.)

Mr. HUSBANDS: A money Resolution is one of those items which, when presented in the Legislature, must be discussed and hon. members must have the opportunity and facilities of being resummoned to this Chamber to speak on such a Resolution. That is why I am speaking in this fashion.

6.15 p.m.

That is the tenor of my speech, because when we are passing the taxpayers' money, we have to be extremely careful and ours is still the powers. That power does not reside in Government; it resides in Parliament. That is my point, and I am going to repeat that it has gone down very hard with me when some time ago I saw some monkey business was going to take place.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is out of order. You are not speaking on the Resolution, and if you persist, I will have to rule you out of order.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, you will rule me out and in, as long as I have the privilege in Parliament. Mr. Chairman, you cannot prevent me from getting back in St. Peter, and I am going to keep within the Rules of the House. I am going to demean in this Chamber and every hon. member will have to respect me. I cannot say that for members of the Government this afternoon.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. HUSBANDS: When a money Resolution is being presented, I claim and reclaim that I must have every privilege and opportunity to examine and re-examine what is put before me and that opportunity has been denied me most glaringly. Nobody can deny that, and the Resolution was not presented to the Labour Party for discussion.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member refused

Mr. HUSBANDS: What point of order has he risen on?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member rose on a point of order.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The only way to know it is a point of order is to hear him.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Chairman, I am a member representing the parish of St. James, and I have as much right as he has. No member of this Party has done anything which prevented them from coming to the House not long ago; they deliberately stood out. (A VOICE: That is not true.) The only member of the Opposition who was present was the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, I know you are a man of fair-play, so the same latitude you gave to that member, I want you to extend to me. The hon. member did not make a point of order. He does not know what is a point of order, and you heard it; so he has given me some opportunity now, Sir. The hon. member said we absented ourselves; we did not stay away; we did not hear the bell.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member is prepared to speak on the Resolution, you may do so; but if you try to stray away from the point, I will have to rule you out of order - a thing I would not like to do, especially to the hon. member.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, I am not

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking you to keep to the Resolution.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am going to be as polite and as careful as I possibly can be, and as far as this Resolution before us is concerned, I think that the Committee will have the opportunity - and that includes myself - of examining and re-examining this Resolution since it involves the expenditure of money. and as long as we are in Committee, we intend to make the most of our time in doing justice to those whom we represent.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I intend to support my colleagues, and I am going to support him by asking other members to reject this Resolution as a mark of protest. I am going to deal with the body of this Resolution. Maybe he is more confident in the members of that

Party than I am. I do not have that confidence. I have been in the House on many occasions, and last week I saw what happened, and I intend to do that each time in order not to make up a quorum.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not speaking on the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: I know you will ask me to speak on the Resolution, but when you ask us to accommodate you by making a motion to go out for tea, if I am speaking you will have to die in that Chair before I give you relief.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is out of order. I never asked you to relieve me.

Mr. WALCOTT: You will never be able to

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must keep to the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am going to keep to the Resolution, and I know how to do it. This Resolution seeks to make a loan to Lodge School of \$3,430 for the purpose of buying a motor vehicle to take the children from Lodge School to the Technical School.

Now we heard some months ago that these were private schools - Combermere School and all the others are private schools. Why not ask the old pupils of the schools for the money to bring these children to the Institute? This is only to show the nonsense which has been spoken in the past in trying to show that the schools are private; but there are public schools, getting public money, and when it comes to a loan to purchase a motor vehicle, they have to come to the House to ask for it. I am going to ask hon. members to examine it carefully and not to look at it in the light that they are asking for a loan. This is eye-wash, and it shows that the Minister of Education knows nothing about the Department which he is running. You do not have to come here to seek a loan for this school. What has happened to the Estimates of this school? The Government of Barbados makes up to the Governing Body the difference in revenue which they did not collect themselves; that is to say, if they could show you that their revenue is equivalent to \$1,000 and the total they needed is \$10,000 you are going to give them the difference which is \$9,000; so it is not a question of a loan. You are making a grant because next year they have to show you what is their revenue in order to get the difference in money, so you are asking us now to put in the Estimates for them this amount of money. As a matter of fact, in their bookkeeping, they will put something in the Estimates that normally they would not have paid for. This means that the Lodge School people really and truly want a van not purely on what it is to be used for, because if you lend Lodge School money to purchase a van, you can go to any school and lend money for any extra curricular duties which they have to perform. But the important thing about this Resolution is that in the Estimates you have before you, this estimate gives you the right to giving Harrison College or Lodge School what they want.

Are you in a position to tell us if the Lodge School gets all the money it needs from you, or whether they have to ask for more money next year?

6.25 p.m.

Are you in a position to tell me if Lodge School got all of the money which they wanted from you to be spent during the coming financial year? Have they asked for more money? If you intend to give them \$81,000 odd as you did last year, then this loan business is only eyewash. You say that they are going to pay back the loan within six years' time. You also say that they are charging the boys a fee for using this vehicle. There is no point your saying that you are charging the boys, because, as a matter of fact, you charge the boys at Harrison College too something like \$1 a month for games. Let us look at the Draft Estimates for the coming financial year and see what is set down as regards this school. The total expenditure amounts to \$142,607 and the revenue is made up as follows: Full Fee Payers \$24,696, Part Fee Payers \$1,020, Statutory Exhibitioners \$248, Other Fees \$72, Endowments \$68, Boarding Account \$1,200, Statutory Grant \$2,400, Other Sources \$654, making a total revenue of \$31,358; therefore, your grant-in-aid will come to \$111,249. When

you come in here and say that you are making a loan to the Lodge School, what are you telling the public in truth and in fact? What you are doing is giving the Lodge School a grant-in-aid because that school would never be able to pay this money back. Are you saying that you are not giving them a grant-in-aid in so far as this is concerned because this is not part of the curriculum or are you saying that because they say that they are going to pay back the Government this loan? Who will repair this van? Will the school boys have to repair it?

This is what hon. members of the Opposition must understand in their parliamentary duties. As a mark of protest you must vote against something if something goes wrong. The Chairman is saying that what happened a few minutes ago is something which you cannot protest against. Sir, I am saying that the idea of asking us to make a loan to the Lodge School which is a grant-aided school is ludicrous. You have represented to us that the Lodge School is performing an educational facility for the pupils of that school; therefore, what is the point of asking us to make a loan to them? I am at pains to point this out because on the last occasion when we were discussing Combermere School it was stated that these were all private schools and the Governing Bodies of them could pay whatever salary they liked to a master if they could get the money. I would say that if you carried that argument to its extreme, you will be able to say if the Governing Body can pay whatever salaries they like, then the Governing Body of the Lodge School should not come to the Government for a loan on this occasion because this is something for which you can say that that school can hold a dance or a fair in order to raise the money.

My objection to this today is because I consider that we are doing something which is stupid. There is no question of a loan to the Lodge School because in your very Estimates for the coming year you are making an increase in your grant-in-aid to that school. You can do this by an increase in your grant-in-aid. Do not come and tell us that you are making a loan to them when you are going to give them an increase in grant-in-aid. All of these things should go in the Estimates. You should either approve or disapprove of this expenditure. If this is expenditure which you feel the Lodge School should undertake, then it is not a question of your lending them the money; it should be a question of your increasing the grant-in-aid. What is the use your telling the school that you are lending them this money without interest? Where is the school going to get back this money except from the pupils? If these children have to go to the Technical Institute for training, are you suggesting now that they must pay extra for it on the basis of what you have arranged? I say that you should not only get buses to take them to schools but, as a matter of fact, the children of these schools should go to school free. What is going to happen to the poor man's son when he cannot get the fare? What are the fees which these people are going to charge the pupils? These and other things are the reason why I would not vote for this Resolution. If you are providing an educational facility for the children of this school and it is regarded as part of the curriculum, why should a child be called upon to pay bus fare from one part of the school to the other? This is not like playing a game of cricket or football, because a pupil need not play any games. What are the good reasons for your doing this? Why can't you increase the grant-in-aid to the school and put it as part of your Estimates to the school if you are satisfied with the expenditure?

6.35 p.m.

The Addendum says this: "The Headmaster of the Lodge School has reported that the Governing Body is experiencing considerable difficulties in their attempt to provide suitable transportation for the pupils attending the Technical Institute at Richmond, St. Michael."

This is something of which the Government has approved; the Government has said that you can send boys from the Lodge School, Harrison College and Combermere to the Technical Institute at Richmond. This is, therefore, a part of the Government's programme. The Addendum goes on to state this:

"In the circumstances, the Governing Body of the Lodge School has applied for financial assistance towards the purchase of a motor vehicle to be used by the School primarily for the purpose of providing transport for pupils of the Technical Classes to and from the Institute."

In addition to that, they say this: "It is also proposed to use the vehicle for conveying school teams for games, athletics and aquatic meetings, transporting boarders to and from Seawell Airport and educational tours. At present pupils of the Lodge School meet the cost of transport engaged for such purposes."

That is to say that from time immemorial when boys from the Lodge School are playing football in Bridgetown, they get a pick up or a bus, or a lorry and they pay the cost of transportation; but now this is something different. According to the Addendum to the Resolution, this vehicle is primarily for the purpose of transporting these boys to the Technical Institute. Are you making these boys pay for that as if they are playing football or cricket? Why is it that you are calling upon these school boys to pay this transportation in respect of another part of their education? This School is in the parish of St. John, but this is no different from the Ministerial Buildings at Bay Street, because you do not make the Clerks pay their transportation to Bridgetown. I think it should be the business of the Governing Body of the School to arrange how they can use the van when it comes to transporting the boys to games and so on. That would be a matter of internal arrangement (A MEMBER: I want to hear you, (the hon. senior member for St. John) on this.) This is a matter of basic common sense. The hon. senior member for St. John cannot say anything different from what they have sent down here with that sort of oligarchy with dictatorial rule. It is foolishness to talk of providing Lodge School with a van and you do not make the provision for it in your Estimates. All they are talking about is making a loan and somebody repaying it in six years' time, but who is going to repair the van? It is purely because the idiot whom we have as Minister of Education does not study these things (ASIDES) He is an idiot; do you think I am afraid to repeat that? If a man goes to Oxford and he comes back as an idiot, he is an Oxford idiot; and if he goes to Bromley, and he is an idiot, then he is a Bromley idiot. Because a man went through the doors of Oxford, do you think that this is the way to dispense justice? This is no more than eyewash. If it was a question of Harrison College, what would you do? (A MEMBER: They would have to explain this matter.) What more can they explain than what is stated in the Addendum? Paragraph 2 of the Addendum states this:

"During the current academic year only one group of boys is attending the Institute, but next year two groups of boys will go on two different days and in 1959-60 three groups will be going on three different days. It is feared that, unless the transport problem is solved satisfactorily, the boys will be reluctant to attend the Institute and this important aspect of the scheme of the Technical Institute, so far as Lodge is concerned, will be jeopardised."

You must save it from being jeopardised. Why not put the provision in the Estimates and say that this is a part of the grant-in-aid, which you are giving to the Governing Body? The last paragraph of the Addendum states:

"It is therefore proposed to grant the Governing Body an interest free loan of \$3,430, repayable over a period of six years, for the purchase of a motor vehicle and the payment of insurance and licence. It is expected that the running costs of motor vehicle operated by the Governing Body can be met from the revenue which the vehicle would earn from the services proposed."

I should like to ask what kind of vehicle will you get to last for six years running up and down from St. John to Bridgetown and at the end of six years you will still have it? Can you not see that before the period of six years is out the Governing Body would not have paid off for this van and they would have to buy a new van? I am not supporting any action of the Government like this; this Resolution in itself need not have come before this House because it is an eyewash Resolution. Those are the grounds on which I am opposing this Resolution.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I quite agree with what my colleague has said. He has clearly explained that it is not necessary to make a loan to the Governing Body of the Lodge School for the purposes set out in the Resolution. There is one point which I would like to make and it is this: there is more than one technical stream going to this Institute and I see that there is really no time guarantee for the repayment of this loan. It is hoped that this Loan will be repaid within six years. Since this loan is to be repaid from the revenue collected, how can you be certain that the revenue will be collected regularly? In one year you may have a technical stream of 40 pupils, in another year, you may have 20 pupils and in another you may have 10 pupils. The Addendum to this Resolution states, "The running cost of the motor vehicle operated by the Governing Body can be met from the revenue which the vehicle would earn from the services proposed." but there is no guarantee of that whatever. Who can tell hon. members that there is any assurance whatever in the repayment of this loan in any number of years? My colleague is absolutely right. If technical education has now arrived in Barbados, the boys of Lodge School, as distinct from the boys of Harrison College and of Combermere School, should not have to pay their transportation expenses from the Lodge School to the Technical Institute. Why should the boys from the Lodge School be singled out and asked to pay these transportation expenses which would be a considerable amount in the course of a year? This would mean added expense to the parents. Why should the pupils of Lodge School, apart from any other pupils, have to pay for, or involve themselves in the added expense of contributing to, the running expenses of this vehicle?

6.45 p.m.

Sir, if you read the Resolution, it does not say the price of the vehicle; it says the running expenses of the vehicle. I hope hon. members will read the Addendum carefully and see that it reads: "It is expected that the running costs of motor vehicle operated by the Governing Body can be met from the revenue which the vehicle would earn from the services proposed." Hon. members must not deceive themselves. I do not know if a mistake has crept in here, but certainly there are not paying for it at all; they are only paying for the operating costs, and that is why I say in Committee we should talk and re-talk, examine and re-examine before we say "aye." Every single opportunity should be vouchsafed to us in the expenditure of public money and I go one step further than him to say that when the Addendum is read more carefully, we will see that we are only paying for the running cost. This is not good enough.

I am not asking like the hon. senior member for the City for a speech by the hon. senior member for St. John, who is a member of the Lodge School Board, to express anything on this Resolution, but I know if he reads it carefully he would not deceive himself. He would not be able to deceive himself because he is a former Headmaster; he can read and understand that this is for the purpose of running the vehicle, and not paying for it. The running costs of the motor vehicle operated by the Governing Body can be met from the revenue which the vehicle would earn from the services proposed. I quite agree that if this vehicle is to be used for the service of Lodge School, expenses should be charged for taking the boys to Seawell and back to the school when they come in from Venezuela, Dominica and elsewhere. I know a lot about this Lodge School business, because I was once among them and gained a lot of experience on that Board, an experience which I shall never live long enough to forget. When any vehicle goes to Seawell, I think the boys should pay, but not when it comes to education, because Technical education has more than arrived in Barbados. We know something about it, because we have had a Commission out here which gave us a most invaluable Report quite recently, and as a member of the Governing Body of the Institute, I know they are making good strides in education at that place. I therefore think that Technical Education is just another form of education and one which the world is in dire need of, and we need it. We need mathematicians,

engineers, metal workers and what not, and therefore it is education which should not mean a further imposition on the boys of Lodge School alone.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Now, Sir, the hon. junior member for St. Peter might have been a little hot on this Resolution at the beginning, but I am sure when they come to analyse all that he has said, they will realise that in fact, this is not being done in a very scientific way. Lodge School is a grant-in-aid school, and if you look at the Estimates, you will find (a) Full Fee Payers \$24,552; (b) Part Fee Payers \$1,020; (c) Statutory Exhibitioners \$1,248; (d) Other Fees \$72, and right away down the line; but the money which you require to run the school, to pay masters and to repair buildings etc., must be \$112,651. When I said I wanted to hear the hon. senior member for St. John, I knew that he was on the Board, and would be able to give more light on the matter. Nobody is opposing the idea of voting this money, but let us deal with the merits. This is a Resolution asking for the sum of \$3,430 to be loaned to buy a van for the purpose of carrying these children from the school to the Technical Institute, and it tells you that this scheme might be wrecked if this is not done. If your scheme of technical education at Richmond is part of the Government scheme, and you happen to have Lodge School as one of the first grade schools in another part of the island, it would be Government's duty to try and get these children there.

Let us say that ten of us had children at Lodge School and the masters in dealing with them find that my child would be suited for technical education, my colleague's for classics, and another for mathematics and so on; but they are drawn from families who can ill afford to find sixty cents a day to send them to Richmond. The Governing Body's next step would be to discuss this matter and tell the Government that it wants some means of transportation. If I were in Government I would agree with the hon. junior member for St. Peter that the Governing Body of Lodge School has nothing because it has to ask for over \$110,000 to run the school; therefore you ought to send the children there. All you need to do here is to say that you have started a new system of education; there are boys at Lodge School which is twelve miles from town, and a number of boys cannot afford to pay bus fares; and you are asking us to provide a van for \$3,600. I agree with the hon. member that the Minister of Education has not given this a thought. Nobody is opposing this idea; but merely to come here and say that it is proposed to grant the Governing Body an interest-free loan is not good enough, especially to a school that only collects \$24,000 in school fees and which needs more than \$110,000 to run it. In other words, what you really need is another teacher whom you would have to give travelling allowance, and therefore, this is nonsense. Out of common decency you can set it right. As a matter of fact, I am blaming the spineless people at Lodge School for not seeing that.

You have 400 boys at Lodge School who are drawn from every walk of life; the specialist decides on the boys suited for the technical stream; one boy's father may be a cane cutter in Blades Hill, drives a cart in Cottage Bottom, a bookkeeper somewhere, and so on; but he can ill afford to find 60¢ a day for the boy to go from the school to Bridgetown and return. I blame the spineless men who sit there and haven't the guts to tell the Minister of Education that they want a van.

6.55 p.m.

Let me put it this way: the Addendum says that the Headmaster of the Lodge School has reported that the Governing Body is experiencing difficulties in their attempt to provide suitable transportation for the pupils attending the Technical Institute at Richmond, St. Michael. I am going to criticise the Governing Body (A VOICE: Why?) I am a member of a Governing Body. When I sit down around a table with other members - and my colleague on my right would tell you so everyone of them save me has high school and Oxford education, but when I begin to talk I talk commonsense; I am a father of children. Sir, the reason why this has come down as it is is because all of them are a lot of fools. (A VOICE: How can you say that.)

In the interest of the children of this School, the specialist decides who are to go to the Technical Institute. I will grant him what I think is his and that is that he should have some experience. My point is this: after you have decided what is your policy of education, it is for the Governing body to get the children to the Technical Institute. Their job is to say that they have only \$24,000 coming in by way of fee paying pupils; therefore they have to ask you for the balance of so much thousand dollars to run the school. You say that they are asking you to lend them money.

The Addendum goes on to say that it is expected that the running costs of the motor vehicle operated by the Governing Body can be met from the revenue which the vehicle would earn from the services proposed. Are you going to license it as a public vehicle to carry passengers? I am throwing this out as a warning. If you license that as a public vehicle to carry passengers, you are going to get somebody stopping it and you will have to take him up and take him to school. What you really want is a private vehicle owned by the Lodge School to transport these children to the Technical Institute. It is not the fault of the Lodge School that the Technical Institute is not in St. John. If it were in St. John, this is the policy which I would have adopted as a member of the Governing Body of Harrison College. I would say, let us go to the Government about getting the boys up there. I would say to the other governors: "look gentlemen, when you look around you will see that we have the sons of wharfmen, the sons of nurses and of domestic servants attending this school and they cannot pay the bus fare to go up to the Technical Institute; let us send them up there; therefore let us provide them with transport." It is part of your new educational system. You came in here and said so. I really would like to hear the hon. senior member for St. John say something on this matter. The Addendum says that one group of boys is going now and I wish that hon. member could tell me how many boys are there in a group. If he can tell me that, I would be able to gauge how much they are going to charge each boy. I suppose you are going to have a chauffeur and that this van is going to be part of the set up of the Lodge School. It is no fault of the Lodge School that the Technical Institute is at Richmond, St. Michael and the Lodge School is situated in that part of the island. In other words, all you are saying by this policy of education is that there is a form room of the Lodge School which is now at down Richmond, St. Michael; therefore instead of walking across to another part of the school or to Society or to Codrington High School, these boys would have to walk to Richmond, St. Michael. Well, it is too far for them to walk; therefore, they will have to drive. Who should be blamed for this? This is one occasion when I must be honest with this matter. I really cannot see anybody else but the Headmaster and the Governing Body to blame for this. (A VOICE: You are wrong.) That is my view. In this matter they have asked for this. The Addendum to the Resolution reads as follows: "The Headmaster of the Lodge School has reported that the Governing Body is experiencing considerable difficulties in their attempt to provide suitable transportation for the pupils attending the Technical Institute at Richmond, St. Michael." I say that they are spineless.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member address the Chair?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I never yet had anybody controlling what I have to say. The Addendum goes on to read as follows: "in the circumstances the Governing Body of the Lodge School has applied for financial assistance towards the purchase of a motor vehicle to be used by the school primarily for the purpose of providing transport for pupils of the technical classes to and from the Institute."

With all of that, this spineless body applied for a loan.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is not fair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You get up and say that it is not true. They are a spineless body through their inability

to put up a case. Why have they asked for assistance to get a van? It is because they want it to carry these Children to the Technical Institute. What I would say is this: your Minister of Education does not have the time to pay attention to these matters. If he had the time to pay attention to this matter, he would be able to agree with what the hon. senior member for St. Peter and myself say in here. Of course, they do not like the views of the hon. senior member for St. Peter and that is the reason why he has not been re-appointed to the Governing Body of the Coleridge -Parry and I would say that the only reason why I am on the Governing Body of Harrison College is because the law says that I should be a member. When that law changes I will not be there because they say I talk too powerfully. Sir, in passing, let me say that I am proud to be a governor of Harrison College. Once, the Headmaster superannuated a boy and sent him home telling that no useful purpose could be gained by his staying at the school. The boy came to me hat in hand and crying. I told him that if he was rude to the Headmaster I will have no talk with him. He told me what had happened and I went to Harrison College and persuaded the Headmaster to take him back. Do you know that boy sat the Barbados Scholarship and won? I defy any master to tell me ---.

Mr. F.G. SMITH: You are straying.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Only wild dogs stray.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member address the Chair?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was saying, Sir, that although they have sent down this stupidity here, if the Minister of Education had sufficient time to pay attention to this matter, if he could give four-fifths of his time as he promised to education, he would say: "look what this spineless body sent down to me." We told you that some of your children must go to the Technical Institute for training.

7.05 p.m.

I say that it would have been his duty to tell us that. We should put in the Estimates an amount of money to provide for this transportation, so that these children who are taken from the Lodge School to Richmond, should be transported free of cost, just as if they were going across to Society which is nearby. The hon. senior member for St. Peter said that as a mark of protest, we should vote against this Resolution and I am inclined to agree with him, because of the attitude which was adopted here this afternoon. I am glad to see that His Honour the Speaker has come back in the House so that he can hear what I am saying in here and not from behind the bar of the House. If you ask that we report progress ---

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: How am I out of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The matter of reporting progress has already been passed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member has said that he is not opposed to this matter; I am not opposed to it either. I say that it should be given as a free gift; the Government should provide this transport. All I want to say is this, that as a mark of protest, because earlier in the afternoon the hon. senior member for St. Philip intimated that no motion should be made for reporting progress ---

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not in this Resolution; what the hon. member is saying now is entirely out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am referring to the fact that you allowed the hon. senior member for St. Peter to say why he was voting against this Resolution, and it was because of the attitude adopted by the Government earlier in the afternoon. I say that while I do not agree with him on a certain point; yet I agree with him on another point.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am speaking on the Resolution. Both hon. members for St. Peter said that the reason why they would vote against this Resolution is because of the attitude adopted by the Government earlier in the afternoon. We persuaded the hon. junior member for St. Peter

to make the motion for reporting progress, because we felt that it was honourable and above board and we felt that it was time, I would not say for you to have tea, but it was time for you to be relieved from sitting in that Chair for so long. We did that and we feel that what took place was most ungracious after the hon. member tried to find out from the Government that there was no monkey business in this matter. I said that it was honourable and above board for that motion to be made and the hon. member made the motion. But in the new way of adjourning the House, when you take the opportunity when hon. members are outside of the Chamber to put questions, because the Government does not want to hear the views of the Opposition - I say that every opportunity should be given to members of the Opposition to speak, and members of the Government would have voted for this Resolution anyhow.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Has the hon. member not heard the sound of this gavel? I am not entertaining any debate on this. Nobody did any person any wrong this afternoon.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is true, but if I were in here, I would have talked.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I did not want to say anything on the matter, because I did not want to hear any debate on it. The hon. member may continue.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I shall leave that alone, but what I say is this: when the Speaker realises that a debate has stifled I am speaking on general principles now ---

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Speak on the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Speaker would not undertake to stifle a debate. If the sitting of the House were suspended and you had argued why the matter should be postponed, the next thing you know is that the Government comes in after the suspension, no Bell is rung, and I know that the Government would say that a member of the Opposition was present and he could have spoken until other hon. members came in ---

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not speaking on the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am drawing to your attention the fact that we will trick them some day. We will move for the recommittal of that Resolution or on the adjournment of the House, we will talk on it because we feel that the attitude of the Government was grossly unfair. As to your knocking the gavel, you see, Mr. Chairman, I am so emotional that at sometimes I cannot hear when you are knocking the gavel.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are going back on the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: When we are getting to your age and to mine, we cannot go forward, we have to go backward (Laughter.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must address the Chair

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am moving that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed, so that the Government can come back with some other provision for this school. The Government should say that they are not making any loans.

7.15 p.m.

You are going to make a loan to them when they have no money, because you are finding money for them every year. You will have to provide money in next year's grant to pay for this. They cannot pay a driver less than \$15 a week which is \$780 a year, and if you are going to buy a Hillman, you are going to use 20 gallons of gas a week and then you have to think of depreciation, because it will take about \$150 a year on a Hillman if you are running it up there. What are you going to charge the boys at the end of the time. I am addressing this Chamber, it is true, but my remarks are directed to the hon. senior member or St. John who has had a great experience in handling this matter and is a member of the Governing Body of Lodge School, and who possibly had to give some of these boys lunch on days.

I therefore beg to move that this Resolution be postponed. I am going further than Government by suggest-

ing that this money should be given as a grant to Lodge School, because in time we will have to ask for it for Harrison College or Combermere School. When Combermere goes to Waterford where there will be 600 odd boys, there will be a number who will not be able to find 60¢ a week to pay to go to Richmond and you will have to provide them with transportation. My colleague, the hon. junior member for the City, will tell you that we spend more for transportation, lunch and what not for the number of scholarship in St. Michael than for school fees.

I should still like, despite what other hon. members would say, to hear the hon. senior member for St. John, because he must have a conscience and he has experience and knows that the arguments are correct; he was born in the circumstances, he is a member of the Governing Body of that school, and is Acting Minister of Education, because he had an opportunity of going to Jamaica.

I beg to move that this matter be postponed.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few remarks before any other member speaks, because I want to remind the hon. member that I am dealing with this Resolution, if the hon. senior member for the City will appreciate that, and not the hon. senior member for St. John.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir, I know the Hon. Minister is dealing with it. If the hon. member had been dealing with something on public health, I would suggest asking the Speaker. This is dealing with education, and I have the greatest respect for the elementary school headmaster who is now on the Lodge School Board. It is not fair to the hon. senior member for St. John to say that you are dealing with this matter, because I was only asking to hear his point of view as a schoolmaster and as a member of the Governing Body.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have seen you allow points of disorder.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is more than a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: In fairness to the Minister, the hon. member is a backbencher and I wanted to hear him out of the respect which I have for him as a schoolmaster

Hon. M.E. COX: This is a question of policy and only deals with transportation; therefore, it is not necessary to have any expert advice so far as education is concerned to deal with this particular matter. Perhaps the hon. member who spoke before, did not realise this school is divided into two parts: one is the academic side and the other is the boarding side. (VOICES FROM OPPOSITION: Oh, no.) (Laughter.)

A VOICE: Let the man talk.

Hon. M.E. COX: If we had come to this House with this Resolution as a gift, the first thing the members on the opposite side would say is that here is a boarding school; these people are charging for transportation to town and back; and when students go down the islands, and this Government is taking up the taxpayers' money and frittering it away by giving these people a vehicle to run around in. That would be the cry. If they do not say it now, it is purely because the Federal Elections are around the corner.

This vehicle, as I said, is to serve two purposes; at present the school hires motor cars to transport these children to and from Seawell, and that is part of the cost of boarding.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The hon. member said that this is part of boarding. Am I to understand that only boarders from Lodge are going to Richmond?

Hon. M.E. COX: If the hon. member was listening, he would have heard that I was dealing with the question of transportation as stated in the Addendum. This vehicle is used partly for that purpose and partly for bringing the children to the Technical Institute as well as taking them to places where they play various games. Government feels and rightly so that this money should be treated as a matter of a loan and not as a gift as suggested by the hon. member, because as soon as this vehicle is purchased, the Governing Body of Lodge School will no longer hire cars or chart buses to take these children to and from

Seawell or to places where they play games. They will use this vehicle and charge money for it. If you give them this as a free gift, there is nothing to prevent the other schools including elementary schools from asking for the same type of transportation to take their children to Richmond, and for that matter to play games all over the island. Why discriminate? It will go as far as that; but Government is saying it will loan them \$3,430 interest free and let them pay it back over a period of six years. It is up to them how they find the money; if they decide to transport the children free, it is a matter for them. As I understand it, the children have not got to pay out of their pockets, for transportation to games; I do not know if that is true. That money, I think, comes from the Games Fund or something like that. But if, as I said, this vehicle is going to be a licensed vehicle for trading purposes and they are going to make money from it, there is absolutely no reason why Government should make it a gift to them.

7.25 p.m.

The hon. member has quoted figures as to what has already been spent on the Lodge School. The amount of \$31,358 is estimated as revenue and the Government is granting that school \$111,249. That is for the coming financial year. By those figures you can see the vast contribution which is already given to the school.

This vehicle to be used for hire-purposes. Boarders pay for their transportation and for their boarding and this vehicle will be used for the purpose of transporting them. (A VOICE: How will they be able to repay?) It is a matter for the school how they will find the money to repay for the vehicle. I do say that it would be breaking new ground if Government had decided to grant the gift of purchasing a vehicle for that school because all the schools in the Island would have the same right to apply for one. (A VOICE: Why?) All schools from which children go to the Technical Institute would have that same right to apply. (A VOICE: Would that be a crime or a Socialist Government to do?) All schools would be able to claim similar facilities. I want to say here and now that it is not the Government's intention to make this grant a free gift and it is the Government's intention that the Governing Body of this school should repay this loan.

Mr. THORNE and Mr. WALCOTT rose to speak.

Mr. THORNE took his seat.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. John caught my eye first.

Mr. WALCOTT: If the hon. senior member for St. John has sat down, he has given way to me. It is not a question of your calling on him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. John will proceed.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not giving way to that sort of behaviour. If the hon. senior member for St. John has given away to me, I do not wish any dictatorship from you.

Mr. T.W. MILLER: He sat because you would not sit.

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot spell "sit".

Mr. T.W. MILLER: I am not an ingrate.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not an ignoramus.

Mr. T.W. MILLER: Adams fed you with both hands and all you are doing is cursing him Tuesday after Tuesday.

Mr. WALCOTT: When you find a boy like that, he should be imprisoned. I am going to deal with you later.

Mr. CHAIRMAN rapped the gavel.

Mr. T.W. MILLER: You will have to deal with your own. Who do you think you are? You are ungrateful. Adams fed you with both hands in the hour of need and now you want to cut his throat.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. junior member for the City to cease with that.

Mr. T.W. MILLER: You should still be a dock porter in Swan Street.

Mr. WALCOTT: I can deal with him.

Mr. T.W. MILLER: Ingratitude is worse than witchcraft.

Mr. CHAIRMAN rapped the gavel.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not want him to withdraw. No withdrawing for me; when I am finished with him he is going out.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. Will you sit? Will you allow me to say one word?

Mr. WALCOTT: I am listening to you. I do not have to sit to listen.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. junior member for the City. I do not think that you would want me to warn you over your behaviour as to the interruption of the hon. senior member for St. Peter. You are a new member of this House and every new member should read the Rules first of all. I do not know if you ever read the Rules where it is an offence, when an hon. member is speaking, for another one to interrupt him. I am asking you not to let it happen again; otherwise I will have to deal with you according to the Rules. This is the second time I have to speak to you of such behaviour. The next time you do it I will have to deal with you accordingly and with regret.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter may proceed.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I stated my views on this matter earlier and, of course, you would not expect me if I were an angel with wings in my back to allow another unprovoked attack by the hon. junior member for the City to pass by unnoticed. If the hon. member is suffering from a guilty conscience and his conscience is in any way worrying him so far as his relationship with the Labour Party or the Government is concerned, there are many churches and many altars to which he can go and pray. When the hon. member whose character and political conduct are so well known for the actions he has done in this community already ---

Mr. T.W. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. If you can allow the hon. senior member for St. Peter to take his line in that strain, you will have to carry out what you just said to me. I entered this House independent of any member of this House.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is no point of order.

Mr. MILLER: Whenever I leave this House, I go to my home. He cannot threaten me, bully me or otherwise. When he meets me, he meets his match.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Already the hon. member is asking you to appeal to me. I want to appeal to him if he says that I have met his match.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. Will you listen to me? Let us turn from such debating. I am asking you not to carry on with that sort of thing any more.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not going to carry it any further than vindicating myself against the vulgarity of the hon. member. If it suits members of the Government to sit and smile while this is going on, it will continue to go on. The hon. junior member for the City has said that I have met my match. Of course, if he does not want me to go on with this in here he can go outside and let me deal with him outside. When you get an hon. member whose political conduct is of such. -

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That will not carry us any further. I am asking you to desist from carrying on with that.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not going to carry on in the way the hon. member has carried on. My vocabulary is different from his. It is not my fault that his vocabulary is so limited. When you hear him make these statements, you would not believe that he is the same man whom that Party over there refused to run in 1951 and that it was I who went to his defence in 1951. You now get him talking about somebody being ungrateful when the same Adams would not have anything to do with him and it was I who

went to his defence.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St Peter again. I am asking you to listen for the sound of the gavel. I was knocking it all the time and you would not stop speaking. I am asking you to desist from that. Let us deal with the Resolution. If you are going to speak on the Resolution, you may do so.
7.35 p.m.

Mr WALCOTT: You very well realised that I was speaking on the Resolution and the hon. member in his vulgarity, the hon. member who has never made a speech in here at all on this Resolution, says in that tirade he has made that I have met my match. Politically, what match is he for me? I know I cannot match with him; I know that I am poor, but I know I have never had any shady dealings so that I had to run helter-skelter and ask him to assist me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will have to rule the hon. member out of order, if he continues like that.

Mr. WALCOTT: I would not force you to do that, but I must ask you ---

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think that the hon. member has said enough; everybody knows what you mean to say. *(Laughter.)*

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this is the Lenten season. When the Master went into the Temple, he did not react, when he saw what was in the Temple, in the same way as when he was preaching on the Mount. Nobody has asked that anything be withdrawn, and in fact, I would not ask anybody to withdraw anything. I know that my debating skill is greater than that of the hon. member and I can deal with him. The hon. member is not much with which to deal. (Mr. T.W. MILLER: Time will prove it.) The hon. member says that time will prove it. In reply to what the hon. member has said - well, we know that he is incapable of using parliamentary language and he can use vulgar language which is more appropriate to be used in other quarters. He will have his time to reply, but now we are expressing ourselves, it is difficult for him to make himself clear.

The Hon. Leader of the House has gone completely away from us in the point he has made. The Addendum to this Resolution states this: "In the circumstances, the Governing Body of the Lodge School has applied for financial assistance towards the purchase of a motor vehicle to be used by the School primarily for the purpose of providing transport for pupils of the technical classes to and from the Institute."

We have to underline the word "primarily". The hon. member says that the Governing Body has to provide transport for these children to go to the Technical Institute, and he was asked why do they not provide transport for all the schools to go to the Technical Institute. The Technical Institute is in St. Michael and the Lodge School is in St. John. The reason why the question of transportation between the Lodge School and the Technical Institute has come up, is because the institutions are not side by side. If it were a question of going to Codrington College, the question would not have arisen, because the children would walk over there. We see that in our Estimates the sum of \$111,249 is provided as a grant to the Lodge School. This Resolution is for \$3,430 and it is a part of what you have estimated for this School; it is the part of the educational programme of the country. The Lodge School is carrying out a part of the educational programme as if these children were called upon to do science at Harrison College. It would not be any question of differentiation between children doing laboratory work at the Lodge School as compared with doing work at the Technical Institute.

The hon. member has roped in the argument about providing the school with transportation to Seawell Airport. The reason why the Government is providing this transport is not because they have to send their children to Seawell; the reason is that they have to send the children to the Technical Institute. What has Seawell got to do with it? When you are attending the University, you have to get the train to take you to and fro; how can you

ask the Government to provide a service for people coming from Dominica to take them to the Airport?

As to the question of games, that again is part of your school life. The Barbados Government provides money to keep the Harrison College grounds in order as well as it provides money to keep the Lodge School grounds in order. The Government has bought land to provide grounds for Elementary Schools and the Government provides things for Speech Days. What we are saying is this: in making up your Estimates for this van, you would have to show here what is done at other schools. If you provide the Lodge School with a van - the hon. member says that it will be used for hire. It is not used for hire; it is used for transporting the pupils to the school. The Governing Body does not intend to hire out this van; when we vote this \$3,430 and they buy a van, what they get as revenue from the use of the van goes into the revenue of the school and it is reflected in the amount of money which you now give them. It is just like the school fees. In respect of the Lodge School, you have in the Estimates in the Appendix full fee payers, \$24,696, part fee payers \$1,020, boarding account \$1,200, and so on. You have all of these things and the hon. member does not know what he is talking about. In these Estimates, the Government must know what is the revenue of this School. The boarding is put down in the Estimates and every source of revenue must be presented to the Department before you can get your grant.
7.45 p.m.

You cannot give them as a loan because the School is not a trading institution. It is not making any profit on the public, because it provides a service. In the Estimates this school has no Trust Fund; the Endowment of the school is \$68; so it has no funds and depends on the grant-in-aid from Government and school fees. If you have a van which is to be used to transport the children to the Institute and to cricket and football, it would have to be reflected in the revenue of the school. Therefore as the hon. member says, any boy who is going to the Institute must pay bus fares to go there, but we say far from that, the utmost encouragement must be given to the boys to go there, because it is part of your educational system. The question of going to Seawell does not arise. What the hon. member is mixing up is the boarding establishment and providing services and charging the boys for taking them to and from Seawell Airport. The question of being a boarder does not arise because part of his fees are taken for the use of the van. At Harrison College a fee is paid to help with games but the Governing Body has to show the revenue of the School in order to receive the grant-in-aid from the Government. This school cannot pay back the debt in six years' time, because the position with the van according to the Addendum of this Resolution is that the primary reason for the van is to take the boys to the Technical Institute. If a boy were at the St. Joseph Modern Secondary School and he had to go to the Technical Institute, would it be reasonable to ask him to pay his bus fares to go there? What is wrong with the Education Department making a grant to pupils to cover transportation to the Institute which is part of your Educational system? That is the point which I raised which has nothing to do with the idea of voting against it.

Mr. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, making a few observations with respect to the Resolution which is before the House, I should like to begin by saying first of all to the Leader of the House that I am a believer in the old maxim "he who would command must first learn to obey;" therefore it is not my intention to try to represent the Government on this matter nor to tread on any ground which the Minister should more or less cultivate. What I really want to do is to reply to a statement made by the hon. senior member for the City who has dubbed the Governing Body of the Lodge School as a spineless people.

Now his reason for having dubbed us spineless is that he feels we should have asked for a grant and not a loan. Now if you take the Resolution which is before the House and read it, you will see nowhere about it stated that the Governing Body asked for any loan. The para-

graph which he commented on is this: "The Headmaster of the Lodge School has reported that the Governing Body is experiencing considerable difficulties in their attempt to provide suitable transportation for the pupils attending the Technical Institute at Richmond, St. Michael. In the circumstances the Governing Body of the Lodge School has applied for financial assistance towards the purchase of a motor vehicle to be used by the school primarily for the purpose of providing transport for pupils of the technical classes to and from the Institute." If we asked for financial assistance, does that necessarily mean we have asked for a loan? Could we not have asked for a grant? I am saying it is no fault of ours if the hon. senior member for the City thinks us spineless; it is no fault of ours that he has displayed such an abysmal ignorance of the English language. In his attempt to show off his experience on a Board, he has made a mess of things. This Resolution asks for financial assistance and I would caution the hon. member to be more cautious when he wants to parade.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, having been silent now all afternoon, I think it is now time for me to say something. I am sure I shall not be speaking for more than five minutes before the debate will take a very serious turn; but first let me just comment on the very short and very to-the-point speech made by the hon. senior member for St. John. Listening to it, I was convinced that I had never heard by a backbencher of a Party a more devastating attack on the Party itself, considering what he has said; and it is great credit to his cleverness and to his skill that he has been able to attack his own Party under cover of answering a member of the Opposition. What did he say? He carefully drew the attention of this Committee to the literal wording of the Addendum to the Resolution under discussion, and in pointing out that in the Addendum the Governing Body has asked Government for financial assistance and not for a loan or a grant or anything, he is saying that if criticisms are now being made on what is being proposed, it is because the Government which he supports chooses to lend money to the Governing Body of a school instead of giving it. As I said, I honour him for his adroitness, because I myself could scarcely have attacked it in such a clever manner. Having disposed of that, and being grateful to him for doing my work for me, so to speak, I want to pass on to a much more serious aspect of this matter. I shall have much to say about the Resolution itself, but the principle upon which it rests needs quite a lot of examination.

It must be news to a lot of people in this country to know that the curriculum of the Lodge School is being changed and altered without it being told to them that there was going to be some change in the scheme of government of the school.

7.55 p.m.

Do you realise what a departure it is for Government to introduce technical instructions in a First Grade School? I am glad for once that the Minister of Education is here because this matter is so important that it should never be kept from the people of this Island. I should have more to say on that in a few moments I just mentioned that to let the Committee know that this matter is more important than we think.

Sir, I go on further to say that no member of my Party would really waste time debating the pros and cons of loaning or not loaning, because we as a Party are publicly pledged to free secondary education and having pledged that, we automatically say that our thoughts would run in the way of deciding how much we could afford and then giving the School, as much as would run it; not only that school but the whole lot. That would be our policy.

The Hon. Minister of Labour who intervened in this debate talked about it being the fear of the Government that all schools would have the right to claim the same facilities, and that elementary schools which take part in this scheme would also claim that right and privilege. Let me say that it is the first time I have heard that children from the elementary schools go to the Technical Institute at Richmond except in the normal approved way.

The Richmond Modern School is a school to which children are sent from the elementary schools because it is what is called a senior school; therefore, they must be separate, the Richmond Modern School from the Technical Institute. Our immediate attitude would be, if any secondary school in the interest of its curriculum wanted that facility, it would be given as a general principle. But the Government of Barbados has reasons why it chooses to lend the Governing Body of the Lodge School money to buy a van and not to give it. And the reason is not the fear that other people may claim the right of such facility because the first duty of a Government is to govern, and if any other school came to you about requiring the same facility, you could consider the case and then refuse; therefore, that argument cannot hold water. There is no argument in saying that Government would be obliged when it has to consider each case separately.

The reason for this being a loan and not a free gift is based on political trickery. It has not been disclosed to this Committee yet, but I propose to say what it is. Mr. Charles A. Speede who was a member of the Democratic Labour Party, is doing all this work of transporting boys from the Lodge School. We have this before us as a consequence of a proposition being put to him that he should run with the Government Party in case the Federal candidate, the hon. junior member for St. John, succeeds in obtaining a seat in the Federal Parliament. (A VOICE: That is your invention.) This is no invention of mine; that is the whole part of the matter. Mr. Speede has rejected what they brought to him.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I do not have anything before me about Mr. Speede doing that work. I understand that it was a gentleman by the name of Mr. Rayside who was doing it. Nothing can be more silly than what the hon. member has just said.

Mr. TUDOR: Let the hon. senior member for St. John who knows more about it say something, if he chooses to intervene in this matter.

Mr. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of explanation and so as to save the hon. senior member for St. Lucy the trouble of continuing to perjure his soul. The position is this: As a result of the fact that children from that school are taking a course of training at the Technical Institute, they have to go down to town at present for one day a week. The Headmaster has been trying very hard to get the same gentleman who was referred to by the hon. member - Mr. Speede - to undertake to bring these boys to the Institute and back to the School, but he found it impossible to do so. We then approached Mr. Hinds, the concessionaire, and he too said that he could not do it. He is using his car to transport boys to the Seawell Airport when they are leaving the island but he said that he could not take on the responsibility of taking them to the Technical Institute. As a result of having made efforts throughout the parish and failing, the Governing Body of the School decided to ask the Government to give them a loan to enable them to purchase a van which could be used for transporting these children. There is no political issue in it at all.

Mr. TUDOR: I never said that he knew all of the story because he only spoke half of it. I knew that he could not deny that Mr. Speede had been threatened because he did not see eye to eye with a certain political party. (A VOICE: By whom and for what?) It is for them to find out. (Laughter) They want Mr. Speede to run as their candidate for St. John.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I do not even know Mr. Speede.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You ought to know him.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member who just intervened in this debate with a sotto voce remark that he does not even know Mr. Speede, really saying that he does not know Mr. Speede? Let him deny it on oath.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I will say it on oath and on my mother's grave. I do not know Mr. Speede, let alone approaching him and asking him to run for an election.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining anything

about Mr. Speede any more. Deal with the Resolution
 Mr. TUDOR: I do not know what the hon. member opposite is fretting himself about.
 8.05 p.m.

Let alone threatening him, I have never said anything about threatening him. It is nice to hear from his own lips that he did ---

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member not to refer to Mr. Speede

Mr. TUDOR: These things have to be spoken, because unless you know what is behind this Resolution you will never be able to debate it properly; and that lies at the back of it. I repeat, that it is within my knowledge that Mr. Speede was approached by members of the Government Party, and asked to run.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member not to worry about any approach to Mr. Speede or anything like that. Let us deal with the Resolution.

Mr. TUDOR: Without that, there is enough to terrify him. Let them alone. I think I have said enough on that matter to let it be understood what is the background of this matter. I would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that a Governing Body who wanted financial assistance would have been asked by the Government to set out clearly why it finds it impossible to carry on a particular service. There is a lot which is missed in this country because the people of this Island do not like to hold up hon. members opposite to the principles which the profess. This is the sort of thing - you do not know if the Governing Body is buying a van or anything else. There is an alternative which has not been thought of; this is the sort of thing which you should encourage individuals to do. If you are anxious to raise the standard of living and the prospects of people, let a contract be given to an individual person (Hon. M.E. COX: Private enterprise?) Why not? What is wrong with private enterprise, provided that it is really private and really enterprising? You support monopolies and allow them to get rich. I know more about this than the whole lot of them over there. There is nothing wrong with private enterprise. What they support is monopolies. What you should be encouraging is individual persons bringing out their vehicles to transport these children to and from the school. You do not even have to consider giving the Governing Body cars or whatever it is. Whatever is difficult to see about the matter can be explained quite easily if Governing Bodies would go more carefully into the conditions of their own schools and see how the requirements could be met. If the Lodge School finds that it has to take larger and larger numbers of children to the Technical School or elsewhere and it requires more transport than Mr. Speede or Mr. Rayside could provide, then you could advertise and call for tenders for the transport of these children.

The Governing Body of the Lodge School cannot escape some censure in this matter, although by far the greater part of the blame must be laid on the shoulders of the Government. Grants-in-aid to the secondary schools of this Island are free gifts from the Treasury to the Governing Bodies of these schools. The very simplest and easiest way to accomplish what is required in this Resolution, is to submit a particular Estimate dealing with the Lodge School or the secondary schools of the amount which is required and would not have found it necessary to have a debate on this matter. Any member of this House would be prepared to pass a gift to the Lodge School and the Government would be committed to find money for the upkeep of these schools. It is a very good thing that we are able to debate this matter and I think that the motion for the postponement is quite in order. In consequence of the points made by the hon. senior member for the City, I beg to second the motion for the postponement of this Resolution

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I have given profound study to this question; I went through it and read over every line that the Governing Body of the Lodge School wrote to us. I went through it with the Director of Education, the Cabinet Secretary and my own Secretary. The Government was approached by the Gov-

erning Body who asked us to buy a Volkswagen and allow them to pay one-half of the running costs and the Government was to pay the other half. I want to say that education this year will cost us \$3,380,025. We are spending pretty nearly \$600,000 more on education this year than we spent last year. Hon. members have their Estimates in their hands and they can check the figures. Because we had to go down three or four feet for foundations - at Combermere we seem to hit some fantastic log of mud of fourteen to fifteen feet we will have to come back for an additional vote of something over \$100,000. The Government, therefore, cannot make a grant to the Governing Body of Lodge School. That is the simple explanation for this Resolution.

I have, with great regret, gone slow on a Secondary Modern School in Christ Church, one at the Pine and one in St. George. I regret that when you have the educational vote and you find yourself spending more on one particular item, you have to cut off not from the Waterworks, not from Highways and Transport, but from Education. If we did not have to spend this extra money on Combermere School - we have not even started to flatten the fields either at the Foundation School or Combermere. The field at Combermere is going to be one of the worst looking at the present time. You have to find money for bulldozing the ground and so on. I doubt whether, on educational matters, I have gone into them more thoroughly than I have done in the case of Lodge School. There has been a lot of correspondence on this matter.
 8.15 p.m.

I have urged that the concessionaires should be made to take these Lodge School boys to the Institute. Mr. Hinds has written a letter to us in which he is charging \$15 per trip no matter how many boys were going, but he has subsequently reduced the charge to \$12.75 as the hon. member or St. John has said. I insisted that a decision should not be made, but that we should go back to the Director of Highways and Transport and see if he could not force Mr. Hinds to take these boys to school, but it would have been awkward because of the different times; as the hon. member has said, there would be one trip a day in the first year, two trips in the second year and three trips in the third year. As far back as March last year, the question arose and the Headmaster called on the Director of Education to discuss this question of transport and suggested that a bus should be placed at the disposal of the school on a direct route for the journey to and from the Institute at a reduced rate for the boys travelling and to passengers taken in for the direct journey. The concessionaire was interviewed in connection with the reduction of fares and he agreed to give the same rebate to Lodge School as he gives to other school children travelling on the bus.

More correspondence ensued and the Director wrote to my Permanent Secretary and pointed out that the Headmaster had interviewed Mr. Hinds who had given a verbal assurance that he would make the necessary agreement. It was considered that the most satisfactory solution of the problem would be for the Government to purchase a Volkswagen or similar means of transport to be used by the school, and half of the running cost would be borne by the pupils using the transport to and from the Institute and Government would defray the cost of the other half by a grant in the school's annual estimates; but we could not for the purpose of economy give them the money. We put this to the Director of Education who said he knew what the financial position was and proposed that we could make arrangements with one of the Government Transport Buses to take these boys to and fro every day which would not clash with the concessionaires. The Minister of Communications and Works went into that and the Director again drew attention to the position. He reminded my Ministry what the Governing Body had asked for and wanted us to get ahead with the matter. Mr. Newsam wrote saying that he had interviewed Mr. Hinds who was prepared to reduce the charge from \$15 to \$12.75, but later Mr. Hinds said that he could not do it. Today, for the first time in my life I have heard that Mr. Speede or Mr. Rayside had anything to do with this. The hon.

senior member for St. Lucy will be found out and has been found out and is always being found out not to care if truth is fiction or fiction truth. I do not know Mr. Speede or never heard of him. When I was told by Mr. Newsam in a Minute on how Lodge School could pay for the running of this van, I was told that these boys came from Dominica and other islands and took taxis from Seawell to get to Lodge School. I did not ask whose taxis were used because I thought there were Mr. Dear's; I did not know that Mr. Speede provided a taxi service. I was merely told that instead of paying the money to taxis, the boys could pay the money to the Governing Body of Lodge School for travelling from Seawell to the School and from the School to Seawell when they were going home.

I will tell the Committee, Sir, the whole history as I know it, and as I refreshed my memory from the file it was pointed out to us in a letter sent to the Permanent Secretary in September, that the Headmaster of Lodge School supplied certain information. The vehicle would cost about \$3,290; the number of boys going to the Technical Institute in the first year would be 15, and there would be one trip a week; for the year 1958-59, the number would be approximately 35 and there would be two trips a week; and in 1959-60 the number would be approximately 55 boys and the number of trips would be three per week. Besides the main purpose for which the vehicle would be used it would be used for taking boys to cricket, football, hockey etc.; for taking them to Seawell, to lectures at the British Council, and for the transportation of goods and chemicals from town. The amount of revenue collected by the school would be \$1,665 while the amount of expenditure would be \$1,664, but it was pointed out to Mr. Newsam that he had to put in an estimate on transportation for the school which should come under the school's account for having to do this.

Similarly, they put in an estimate an expenditure and depreciation which seemed pretty high and which was deducted, so that actually according to these corrections which arose in the Department of Education, the boys travelling from the school to the Institute would have to pay a sum which would be going to the Governing Body. The amount for taking them to cricket would be \$150, to the Institute, \$355, to and from Seawell Airport, \$540; and for taking the boys to a doctor, a further sum would be provided from fees. There was also a charge of \$300 for miscellaneous trips paid by the school. We accepted these figures because we had checked and asked what was happening in the past and whether boys going to cricket matches and so on had to spend all that money.

I repeat without wanting to claim any specific credit for myself that we did this thing very thoroughly, because always in my mind was the feeling that a bus should do it and I was convinced that this was the better course, especially after Mr. Hinds pointed out the uncertainty of this travelling. On the other side, we made provision for a chauffeur, gasoline, oil and incidentals. The chauffeur would be employed on a part time basis, because he would not be needed all day long.

8.25 p.m.

Let me say that we weighed it very thoroughly. He would not be employed all the time. When these children come to the Island he will go to the Seawell Airport and carry them to the Lodge School; so, obviously, he would be hired on a part time basis. Those are the figures at which he would be paid. As I have said, all of that was gone into most thoroughly. Having heard and read what Mr. Hinds said, having heard what the Governing Body asked for and what Mr. Newsam said. We then came to the conclusion that the best thing was to allow them to purchase this Volkswagen by helping them with a loan and, in consequence, we sent down the Resolution to the House. Can anyone blame the Government for what it has done? It was nothing haphazard; it was the best solution of all the alternatives. We cannot afford to give. If I tell hon. members that we cannot go on with our Five Year Plan on the same level unless the Bank Rate falls or unless we add fresh taxation, do you think they are going to be pleased about it? I do not want to make the mistake by using the word "retrenchment"

but we have to cut down on certain of our projects until we know for certain that the Bank Rate is coming down and that our interest will be less than it will be. I have heard people saying that it will come down in a month's time and I have heard other people saying it will come down in a year but until the British Government say something, we do not know where we are.

I regret very much that I have to admit that we have gone back a bit on our plans and that we are unable to begin certain educational buildings because we have found out that the money to do all the things which we planned to do as regards education is not there. Absolutely unforeseeable additional expenditure has taken place chiefly on the Combermere School and the Foundation School. We have tried our best to lessen it by shifting the Science Block from where the mould is very deep and putting it where the foundation is not so deep. When you have to spend \$15,000 which you did not contemplate sending, you just cannot chuck money at the Lodge School or anybody else.

I only hope hon. members will see, when they were first attacking this Resolution that it is not in any niggardly or miserly spirit we are doing anything when it comes to the Lodge School, but it is that the educational vote, like the Hospital vote is a vote which we have to watch very carefully. Nobody wants to have fewer class rooms than the birth rate calls for. Nobody wants fewer beds in the Hospitals than are necessary. Nobody wants two people sleeping in a bed, and so on. We Barbadians criticise ourselves more than anybody else. I heard Mr. Manley say the other day that in Jamaica two pregnant women were having children in the same bed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Either that is shocking or he is a liar.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: It is all very well to criticise the Government but Hospital beds, nurses, and doctors all over the world are in short supply; so when you criticise us, remember that the same criticism can be applied even to the United States of America with all of its wealth. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that I have digressed a bit.

I hope that I am not wearying hon. members but I hope I have satisfied them with the explanation. I have given the one cause for this Resolution coming down as it is; otherwise we would have come down here and asked for a grant. Let me say that I have been in the Opposition so long before that I forget sometimes that the Opposition have to talk. They cannot do anything more than to talk. For so many years I have been sitting over on the other side that I should know that they have to get up and talk although they mean nothing by it but you must prove that you exist for some purpose.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I think the hon. member knows quite well that it is part of the democratic process.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: We know that it is part of the democratic process that members of the Government can persuade members of the Opposition to come over and join us.

Sir, before I sit down, I want to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative the Committee dividing as follows:-

Ayes: Mr. Vaughan, Hon. Sir Grantley Adams, Hon. M.E. Cox, Hon. D. D. Garner, Mrs. Bourne, Mr. Thorne, Mr. Searles, Mr. T.W. Miller and Mr. Bryan - 9.
Noes: Mr. Mottley, Mr. Talma, Mr. F.G. Smith, Mr. Tudor and Mr. Crawford - 5.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. Deputy SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.
8.35 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. F.G. SMITH: I beg to second that. In doing so, as one of the most junior members of this House, I should like to know what is the procedure when the sitting of the House is suspended for half an hour or for three-quarters of an hour? Must the Bell be rung or should it not be rung? Do you synchronise your watches before you go out of the House, so that the Speaker's watch or the Deputy Speaker's watch shows the same time as those of hon. members? Do you listen to the Public Buildings clock and put your watch in order or do you set your watch by that of the Leader of the House or do we just come in to find that the time has gone and the Resolution is passed?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair and there is no quorum, the Bell is rung in order to summon more hon. members. If there is no necessity for ringing the Bell, then the House continues.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is true that you have not been asked to give a ruling; your opinion has just been given in an off hand manner. It is interesting to note that your first reaction was that the Bell should be rung and then you allowed yourself to be corrected by the Clerk. The point is this: if the House has its sitting suspended for such and such a time, whether it is suspended for half an hour, or otherwise, it is the Speaker's duty to inform the Clerk of some means of resummoning members to the House. Instructions should be given that the Bell be rung, three short blasts of the Bell would resummon members, or the Speaker should instruct the Clerk to inform each individual member that he is going to resume the Chair. There is no clock in the Dining Room; there is no clock anywhere. (Hon. M.E. COX: There are watches on the hands of hon. members.) There are watches on the hands of hon. members, it is true, but hon. members should know that the time is that time which the Speaker directs.

We are speaking here, because we want to make the matter clear. I am not criticising the occupant of the Chair in Committee, but do you know what has happened in this sitting? The matter which was being discussed in Committee was not, in our view, properly debated.

Hon. M.E. COX: On a point of order. There is a Rule of this House which states that you cannot reflect on a vote of the House. The House has already taken a vote on that matter and therefore, the hon. member cannot debate it. (Mr. MOTTLEY: We are reflecting on the procedure, not on the vote.)

Mr. TUDOR: I do not think you would agree with the hon. member; I cannot even remember how we voted.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order. On two grounds, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking you to rule the hon. member out of order. The whole object of the procedure of the suspension of the sitting is to prevent an adjournment. If they feel that they can make a motion for the adjournment as a counter motion, I suggest that that should be ruled out of order. That is the first ground. The second ground is this: The House of Commons does not adjourn either for tea or for dinner; therefore, any question of speaking on an adjournment could only apply to an adjournment for tomorrow's sitting. Hon. members seem to think that if we make a motion for the suspension of the sitting, they have the right to talk; all we have done is to copy the House of Commons Rules and you have to ask what the House of Commons Rules refer to. A motion for speaking on the adjournment refers to speaking until tomorrow afternoon, not to walk out there for half an hour. (Mr. MOTTLEY: I will amend my motion for the adjournment until tomorrow.) It is for the Chair to rule, but there again, you cannot put any amendment for the adjournment when the motion before the House is for the suspension of the sitting. It is just like a Message from Her Majesty the Queen or the Governor and so on; you cannot debate anything when you have been summoned to the Other Place. If the hon. members want to listen or if they want to learn, (Mr. MOTTLEY: There is nothing for us to learn.) If it is my dying breath, I will see that

the amended Rules of this House are passed pretty soon and hon. members can filibuster until nine o'clock every morning of every week. I will sit down here and see that they go on.

Mr. TUDOR: Look who is being asked to be the Leader of the West Indian nation! Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, I am continuing my speech. When you hear people talk about their dying day, it is not too far off. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to say this in order to set the records straight. Hon. members on this side of the House have only been accommodating the Government with this announcement about the suspension of the sitting, because all of us know that we are acting contrary to the Rules of this House when we do that; and it cannot be supposed that any of our Rules has been given up.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That accommodation of the Government is very convenient.

Mr. TUDOR: A motion for the suspension of the sitting of the House is a motion just like any other motion and it can be debated or amended; therefore, an amendment to the motion for suspension is quite in order, and the Premier knows that. It is not true to say that the suspension of the sitting of this or the other Chamber is the same as obeying a summons to attend on the Queen or the Governor in the Other Place. When you suspend your sitting the Mace is left there, but when you are summoned to the Other Place, Mr. Speaker is preceded by the Marshal carrying the Mace. The trouble in this House is that whenever the hon. senior member for St. Joseph intervenes in a matter, he always comes down on the silly side of it with his misleading theories. I think that it is time that we resist all of these arguments and be equally as determined to uphold parliamentary procedure and the rights of hon. members as he is determined out of his own mouth to destroy them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what must be borne in mind is this: the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has said that when the House of Commons adjourns for tea or dinner, there is no motion for adjournment. (Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I never said that.)

8.45 p.m.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I said we have copied the House of Commons' Rules on procedure which says that on the motion for the Adjournment, you can discuss anything under the sun. The House of Commons does not adjourn for tea or dinner, therefore, if we copy the Rule we can only copy the procedure which applies to an adjournment or tomorrow's Sitting - and they sit from day to day - therefore, an adjournment for tea or dinner is not a real adjournment, and that is why matters of that nature are dealt with in the House of Commons under the title "Suspension" because you do not adjourn for another Sitting, but your Sitting continues and is only suspended. I said in connection with going to the Other Place, it is only analogous, and obviously an adjournment for tea or dinner is not quite the same as going there to hear the Governor's speech. Similarly, when we go to the Other Place summoned by the Queen's representative, it is not an adjournment of the House, it is a temporary suspension to hear a Message from the Throne. (A VOICE: It is not a suspension either.) I would not honour the hon. member by taking notice of his interruption; he should stick to salt-fish or something like that of which he knows something. Like the hon. junior member for St. Lucy whom I notice is keeping quiet, I have been practising Law for a long time, so I happen to know Constitutional Law and Practice of the House of Commons, and the only reason why he would contradict anything I say is because he wants to support his colleague; but he knows what I am saying is the alphabet of Parliamentary Procedure.

The question that the House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour was put and resolved in the negative without division.

The question that the Sitting be now suspended for three quarters of an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.

On Resumption

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention that there is no quorum, and ask that the Bell be rung.

Mr. Speaker instructed the Clerk to ring the Bell and a quorum was obtained.

APPOINTMENT OF TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. senior member for St. John be appointed Chairman of Committees for the remainder of today's Sitting.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: When this Sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee of supply, Mr. THORNE being in the Chair.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I really did not intend adding anything to this debate on this particular matter, because the ground has already been covered so thoroughly by other hon. members on this side of the Table; but the remarks of the Minister of Education are certainly deserving of reply. Stripped of all the padding and all the superfluous data, his contention is that the Government could not afford to make a grant of the \$3,000 odd asked for by the Lodge School for the purpose of getting transport for the boys to the Technical Institute purely on the grounds of economy. He said he had gone into the matter very thoroughly, discussed it from every angle and regrettably had to come to the conclusion that the economy of the island could not afford it.

Well, Mr. Chairman, if he spent a lot of time on it, and this is the conclusion to which he came, then God help the country if he had not spent a lot of time on it, because never in my life have I heard such nonsense propounded as he advanced here tonight. He said that education is costing the country this year about \$600,000 more than anticipated. Well, Mr. Chairman, the fact that we are going to spend \$3,600,000 on education this year out of a total Revenue of \$21 million does not necessarily mean that you are going to spend too much on education. It may in reality mean that we were spending too little before.

But, Mr. Chairman, this \$600,000 which we are going to spend more than we bargained for, is not because Government is expanding the educational system, bringing in free education for secondary schools, making compulsory education or any new radical departure like that; it is because they are spending \$600,000 on the new Combermere School at Waterford. Who sent them to Waterford? I am yet to hear one single member from this House on the Other side ratifying the decision to build the new Combermere School at Waterford. For the life of me, I cannot see that it is a proper site. He said we are spending \$115,000 more on the foundation than we bargained for. If that is true, Mr. Chairman, that is the biggest.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I could probably spend the whole night correcting the hon. member's deliberate inaccuracies. I mentioned in the course of my address, that we would have to look for \$115,000 more. I mentioned in some other portion of my address that one of the extra bits of expenditure was due to the fact that we had to go down farther with the foundation than we thought, and shift the science block. I did not say that it cost 115,000. Are we building the foundation for Buckingham Palace?

9.00 p.m.

I know it is difficult, but he must try occasionally to quote people accurately.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This is one time I am not to blame for it. He said they were spending \$600,000 on Combermere School.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I said nothing of the sort. I said on education this year.

Mr. CRAWFORD: He deliberately said that the foundations are costing \$115,000 more.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I never said anything of the sort.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Whatever they are spending, it is scandalous. I do not know what amount they are spending on Combermere School. He said that we cannot give the Lodge School this money because the Foundation School and the Combermere School are costing us more money, and I say that they should not cost us any more money. The area of the Combermere School could not be more than 16,000 square feet and I am almost sure that tests on that area were made before they started to put up the buildings.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I must interrupt the hon. member. It is not that tests were not made, but even the richest oil companies sink one hundred dry wells before they find oil. Several tests were made but we discovered something which was unknown before. We discovered there was a pond which was filled in and they happened to pick this unfortunate spot.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That serves you right for going to Waterford. You had no right putting that school there at all. Surely, the Hon. Premier does not expect us to take him seriously when he most solemnly declares that Government could not afford to give Lodge School a grant for \$3,000 to purchase a motor van. He just came in here with a Resolution for \$8,000 to air condition the Other Place; yet they cannot find \$3,000 to purchase a motor lorry for the use of the Lodge School. He comes in here and to hear him speak you would think he was Pope Pius delivering some famous encyclical letter. He says: "We cannot afford to do it on grounds of economy." We came in here today and voted \$2,500 to provide furniture for an officer who was not provided with furniture before. If we can afford to spend \$2,500 to provide furniture for the Attorney General's apartment which is something which was never done before in the entire history of the Island, certainly we can afford to grant \$3,000 to the Lodge School for this purpose. It is sheer tomfoolery, Mr. Chairman; it is the height of absurdity. The Hon. Premier must be thinking that everybody in this country are absolute fools, and therefore his solemn pronouncements must be taken seriously and looked upon as if he were the oracle at Delphi that has spoken. To tell us that you cannot afford to do so on grounds of economy is the most farcical argument he could pronounce at anytime.

Sir, I do not agree with that. There must be some other reason operating in the minds of the Ministers, which caused them not to give this money to the Lodge School as a grant. They say that this is done in this manner on grounds of economy. The scandalous manner, Mr. Chairman, in which this Government is squandering amounts of infinitely greater magnitude would not lead you to believe that. Look at the money which we are squandering on transport. If the Governor wanted a new car for \$5,000 he would have it; and if his wife did not like the colour of the upholstery, you will see the Government coming down for money to buy a new car. You would not hear any of these fancy excuses if they wanted to provide for the fancy wants of any Government Officials; you will find money for it. Can you hear of anything more fanciful than the \$2,500 which has just been passed for furniture for the Attorney General's Department? For all that, he comes in here with all the pomposity and mock seriousness of a Benito Mussolini and gets up and says: "I want the House to understand that we could not do this purely on grounds of economy." He thinks he is talking in Fairchild Street or in Ruebuck Street. He would come in here with the same mock solemnity and waste \$3,000 next week. It is just that this Government does not have any great sympathy for the extension of education of the country. Certainly, some of the money which we are squandering

could be used to provide compulsory education. Just fancy this Government has voted over \$8,000 to air-condition the Upper Chamber, a Chamber which meets at the most three times a month and for a few hours each time. We can afford to aircondition that Chamber for three times as much as this amount.

When the time comes to peruse the Estimates which are presented to us today you are going to find over a million dollars being squandered in many directions to satisfy the whims and fancies of Government officials and cronies. If anyone were to ask the Minister of Transport to come up and see how they are putting a bridge across the Zambesi River, we will find money to pay for that.

9.10 p.m.

But, Sir on grounds of economy, can you imagine a more suitable ground than to agree to a grant to justify the establishment of the Technical Institute at Richmond? If people cannot find themselves there, then we may as well close down the Institute. I put it to you, Mr. Acting Chairman, that the Governing Body of the Lodge School knows that we can afford this money as a grant. I put it to you seriously that they do not intend to pay it back.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: That is a grave reflection on the Governing Body of the Lodge School. We have already loaned them \$6,000 in 1949 and they are supposed to pay it back within 10 years; they have been paying back the money at the rate of \$600 annually.

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of order. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph has got up for the third or fourth time and he has not said that he is speaking on a point of order. He should set an example even although you cannot always follow his example.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: After the hon. member has sat down, I am perfectly prepared to speak; but the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has to say something, because of the quarrel which his colleagues had with him outside.

Mr. BRANCKER: When I was speaking, the hon. member was not in here; he might have been in Jordans Lane.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Whenever the hon. senior member for St. Joseph rises, I will give way, because each time he gets up, he puts his foot further in. The point really is ---

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: I should like hon. members to realise that they should be prepared to set a certain standard and maintain it. I am looking to every hon. member for that. The hon. senior member for St. Philip may proceed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am suggesting that the Government has to find some other reason for refusing to do things which should be done than to put forward this theory; there are too many examples of deliberately throwing money down the drain than to come in here and plead economy for not doing what they ought to do. It is an absolute waste of time and we could not allow the hon. member to get away with it. He cannot satisfy some of the idiots with whom he is associated that the Government cannot afford this money on the ground of economy. If they want to demonstrate that they are not as idiotic as he is, then they would refuse to vote for this Resolution on the grounds of having the loan to be repaid. Everyone of them must know that if the Government can afford to do the things we are doing, then they can afford to make these transport facilities available to the Lodge School, and the Alleyne School and the Coleridge-Parry School which are almost equally distant from the Technical Institute as the Lodge School is. If the Technical Institute is to function in the most efficient manner and provide facilities for the maximum number for which it has been established, then there is the obligation to see that some endeavour is made to facilitate people who should find themselves there from time to time in order to benefit from it.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, a very interesting point arises here as far as this loan is concerned. This application comes from the Governing Body of Lodge School and the Hon. Premier remembers quite rightly that this same Governing Body has, on a former occasion, obtained a

loan from the Government to the tune of \$6,000, I think. I wonder, if the streaming of pupils began to be operated from the Coleridge-Parry School and it was thought necessary by the Governing Body of that School to apply for some form of aid in transporting pupils from that School to the Technical Institute, whether the Government would give them assistance by way of a loan. The Coleridge-Parry School has no means of revenue whatever. I know that there is some means of revenue obtained from the boarding establishment at the Lodge School, but the Coleridge-Parry School has no land rented out and there is no revenue to be obtained from the boarding pupils, nor is there any other source of revenue known to me as a member of the Governing Body of the School. I wonder if the Government would give the Coleridge Parry School a grant or what would the position be? Would the Premier come to the House and ask for a grant? We have no money and therefore, we would have no means of paying back a loan. Since Technical education has come to us, no active expense should accrue to the parents of pupils who want to avail themselves of the facilities available at the Institute, by way of transportation. We read here quite clearly in the Addendum to the Resolution that the running costs are to be borne from the charges made for transporting these children and that is an added expense to the children. In the case of the one school of which I have the honour of serving on the Governing Body, when the time comes to stream the pupils technically and have them transported to the Technical Institute, they have to grant us all the money or leave us out.

9.20 p.m.

I think the Premier should be very interested in what I have said, because it may soon come when we may have to say we need financial assistance. We cannot borrow one penny, so you would have to give us or leave us out.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, like my colleague on my right I do not think I would have to say much more in this debate except that I understand that after I had spoken and the Premier had been replying, during my absence, he naturally took advantage out to say- and I hope I quote him correctly - that "he (referring to myself) does not care whether truth is fiction or fiction truth." I hope that he is accurately quoted.

Well now, I do not wish to spend much time replying to him, because I have got more serious aspects of this question to discuss. But if there were one member of this Assembly who found truth stranger than fiction, it would have to be the person who stood on a public platform and boasted to the people of this island that if every cane top was cut down and there were no cane crops, there would still be work for everybody because he has \$60 million to spend. That is what he said.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: He being whom? (*Laughter from Opposition.*) The hon. member always says something which is untrue, and as he goes along he tries to say something which will catch on. Who outside of the lunatic asylum would say that?

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am glad that he got up to accuse himself even before I had to verify it for him.

The second point is this: In the course of another debate he said, and I heard him myself, that I should stick to salt-fish. I want to say this in my own defence; I do not think he insulted me when he said that. The whole point about Barbadian life is that quite a number of people have used salt-fish casks and potato carts in their journey to success, and since it is only cowards who throw away their weapons, any successful man ought to hang what ever has earned him success in his roof as a trophy; his grandmother's potato cart and my father's salt-fish casks are both trophies.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: That may be very funny in the Oxford Union when an adolescent is talking to other adolescents. I am not chucking anything at the hon. member; if the hon. member can sell salt-fish better than he can talk, there is no shame in it as long as you sell it and put the money in the proper pocket.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this

Resolution and the need for a van at Lodge School have been demonstrated in this House today. There is not much that I can add to this debate.

I have heard from one quarter that it was because of a lack of funds that an outright gift could not be granted. The main purpose for the request of the Governing Body for this van is primarily to bring children from Lodge School to the Technical Institute. That being so, I wonder if some schemes could not be worked out by Government whereby the cost of transporting these children from Lodge School to the Technical Institute could not be met and charged in the Estimates. In other words, the cost of operating this van, gasoline, wear and tear, and fees to driver, which will have to be paid back to Government and which will form the running expenses, I thought, would have been derived from Boarders going to town on Saturday mornings, going to Seawell and so on for which I agree they should be charged. The main purpose of this is to take the children to the Institute in St. Michael and then back to the school. That should be charged on a separate Head, and the Education Department should meet that Bill. By that means, many of the poor children attending the Technical Institute would be sent there and back, and the cost would be met from the Education Grant. This is only a half way measure to meet the initial request of the Governing Body for an outright grant. For a school of that size and in its location, it is imperative and necessary for some means of transport to be available there. If any child took sick and had to be sent to the Hospital, it means calling on a master to use his car to provide transportation. It is true that if the van is in town with the children, and a boy at the school takes ill, he would still have to get to the Hospital, but there is no reason why a school situated like Lodge School, and with 400 children, should not have its own transportation for the benefit of taking them to the Technical Institute without having to call on them to pay bus-fares both ways, and now that we will soon be discussing the Estimates, I would suggest to the Minister of Education that a sum be put in for that purpose so that it can be credited to the running expenses of this van.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, when we debated this matter at first, apparently the Premier, although in the precincts of the building, was not in the House and did not pay much attention to what we said. After listening to him, I think I owe an apology to the Governing Body of the Lodge School, because I said then from the information which I had - and there was none particularly - that the Governing Body had been spineless not to have asked for this as an outright gift. I myself felt that it should be an outright gift but the Minister would give us no information. As the Premier was not here at the time. I have to marshal a few facts and make a few points again.

I moved the postponement of this, because I wanted information. Government thinks it is good enough to write this type of thing and push it before us. The Premier gave a background of the whole thing. We think that Technical Education is about the best thing that has been done for education in this island in the last century, and that is something which everybody must appreciate. It is part of the Government's system of education today, and from my experience as a Governor of Harrison College, I know what I am speaking about. How are you going to work this system of technical education? You have erected a Technical Institute in one part of the island, because it suits the Government - and rightly so - to put it at Richmond School. You, therefore begin to draw from the various secondary and first grade schools in the island.

9.30 p.m.

Now, your secondary schools are placed in St. Andrew, St. John, St. Philip and St. Michael. The great majority of these children will be coming from outside Parishes to this Institute. The great majority of these children are selected by the masters who decide where a boy reaches a certain age whether he is fit or shows an aptitude for technical education or not. That is how I understand it.

Let us face facts. The reason why we say that this should be an outright gift is because we feel from the figures which the Hon. Premier has given us - that is, there would be forty pupils in 1958 who would be going to this Technical Institute - that the great majority are pupils of families who can ill afford to pay sixty cents for the fare. (A VOICE: No, No.) Give me a chance. I was not finished speaking. It is 30 cents going and 30 cents coming. Sir, I am not one who agrees with free secondary education because I know this Island cannot afford it. But if technical education is part of the educational system which you are offering these pupils and you are offering them free so to speak, we contend that not only should you give a mobile unit to the Lodge School but you should also consider giving one to the West Secondary School and another to the Princess Margaret School in St. Philip, as well as one to the Alleyne School in St. Andrew. There is nothing wrong in doing that.

Now, you are getting 40 coming from the Lodge School and you say that they are going to buy a Volkswagen. You cannot buy a Volkswagen for \$3,400; you can only buy a Hillman with that money.

You go on to say in the Addendum to this Resolution that "the Headmaster of Lodge School has reported that the Governing Body is experiencing considerable difficulties in their attempt to provide suitable transportation for the pupils attending the Technical Institute at Richmond, St. Michael. In the circumstances, the Governing Body of the Lodge School has applied for financial assistance towards the purchase of a motor vehicle to be used by the School primarily for the purpose of providing transport for pupils of the technical classes to and from the Institute." You said that they have asked for assistance. At first, I said that they were spineless in not coming right out and asking you for a gift. Now the Hon. Premier has brought it out to us, I feel that this amount should be in your Estimates and that this mobile unit should be attached to the School. I do not agree that this van should be used for bringing any pupils from Seawell to the School. If you can send your son from Trinidad to the Lodge School, then do you mean to say that you cannot pay for taking him from Seawell Airport to the Lodge School? You cannot come in here with that statement to me.

You go on to say in the Addendum: "It is also proposed to use the vehicle for conveying school teams for games, athletic and aquatic meetings, transporting boarders to and from Seawell Airport and on educational tours." If you buy a little car that holds only six people, how can you do that with it? Do you know what you get for \$3,400 today in the absence of a luxury tax?

You are providing this as a means of transport for boys from Lodge School to the Technical seat of education at Richmonds. I look at the matter in this way. The majority of boys at the Lodge School are drawn from the parishes of St. Philip, St. John and around that area. If they have to go to the Lodge School and some of them have to be taken to the Technical Institute for training I feel it is part of the duty of the Educational Authorities to provide those boys who have to go from the Lodge School to the Technical Institute with means of transport. It is the same thing as your saying that that is a form of the Lodge School which you have at Richmond; therefore I see nothing wrong in your providing mobile transportation for them. I cannot see why it should be by way of any loan. Let me repeat, do not fool yourself that any Volkswagen is for \$3,400. The Lodge School is not getting anything coming here duty free.

There is another thing which you have to watch carefully. You have to be careful with the Lodge School for the simple reason that there are several masters who board children themselves. These masters take their cars and meet their Boarders at the Lodge School and they also transport them to and from the Seawell Airport. What you put in the Addendum is only a little sop. If you can afford to send your child to a Boarding School in Barbados when you are living in another Island, why should I provide to bring him from the Seawell Airport? I cannot pay to send my children to a Boarding School nor can my ser-

vant pay. The hon. senior member for St. Philip can pay because he has never acknowledged his children and I believe the hon. junior member for Christ Church can afford to pay. (Laughter). Sir, one cannot get too serious in debating a matter of this sort.

Now, I was saying that \$3,400 is the price for one of those little cars. If those people from other islands can afford to send their children to the Lodge School, they can send something to convey them from the Seawell Airport to that school. Do you know that the Hon Minister said at first that there was an academic side and a boarding side? You have your boarding establishment and then you have your general school. You have 402 children at the Lodge School.

9.40 p.m.

You have 400 odd children at the Lodge School; you are going to buy something for \$3,430 and it is not a bus. Let us say that it is a new Hillman Volkswagen and you have three persons sitting in front and four behind; are you buying something only for the transportation of the boarders? I will not vote for that sort of thing; it looks a little fishy to me. I understand voting this money as a gift, as a means of taking these children to Seawell and so on. There are sons of some people who, if they are selected to go to the Technical Institute and they want to go there, have cars at their disposal and they can go. There are some 400 odd children at the Lodge School, and of that number, perhaps, 200 are drawn from parents who cannot afford to pay for their transportation. May I ask this question of the Premier? When he spoke of about \$12 or \$15 a trip, who paid that money? Did it come out of the pockets of the children? The hon. junior member for St. Philip has just had passed a Vestry Act in respect of the award of exhibitions, and if a boy is put in the technical Institute, do you mean that he must find the money to go down there? The Premier said that the concessionaires would not do the transportation, but who paid the money? If you are carrying these children to the Technical Institute now, and the Governing Body is paying this \$12 or \$15 a trip, then the Governing Body is doing what they should do.

I am not suggesting that you should discriminate between these children; I feel that as long as you have boys at the Lodge School, whether it is the son of the hon. member on my left (Mr. Goddard) or otherwise and he has to be sent to the Technical Institute, he should go. I will come out straight now; I would like to hear the suggestion that Dr. Manning's children should go to the Technical Institute. If this is a part of your educational scheme, then the children should be transported free of cost. Let me say here that I will go on the housetop and proclaim that this is a wonderful thing which has been brought about in respect of education. You have your Technical Institute, you have the Alleyne School and you have the Coleridge-Parry School. Personally, I feel that you should have about three or four mobile units for the purpose of transporting the pupils from these Schools to the Technical Institute. The Hon Premier knows as well as I do that you are not going to get certain people sending their children there; in the case of certain people, you know that they are going off to McGill. You may have children who are the sons of labouring people and do you know what is the desire of people today? It is to see that their children go further than they have gone. I know what the position is; we advertised some vacant Vestry Scholarships and we had over 1,000 applications for possibly six places! I feel that the Premier was only drawing that red herring across the trail. He could tell us about the Deep Water Harbour and about the Hospital or about anything else, but we could also say that they spend money on things which are really not necessary.

When the hon. senior member for St. Philip referred to air-conditioning in the Other Place, he was quite right. We are saying that \$8,000 could give them two units. I will tell you this: at the Modern Secondary Schools there are a number of children whose teachers would like to transport them to the Institute, but they cannot afford it. I sincerely hope that the Premier, after listening to what we have said here tonight, will review the matter now that

he has exposed that the Governing Body of the Lodge School had asked the Government for a gift and the Government said that they could not make it a gift, but they would make a loan.

There is one further point which I would like to make. The Premier said that it was an indictment against the Lodge School, when an hon. member said something about the Governing Body not intending to pay back the money; the Premier said that the Governing Body had borrowed \$6,000 in 1949 and they were repaying it annually at the rate of \$600. I do not know the reason why the Government had loaned the Governing Body that money. I do not know if it was in respect of the Boarding Establishment out of which they do not get much. As regards the Boarding Establishment at this School, the children are paying money for it, and that is nothing to do with the Government. If the Government loaned them that money for the purpose of extending that establishment, that is all well and good; but how can the Government say that as regards a part of the new scheme of education, this transportation should not be provided free of cost? I am submitting that one unit could be used for one section and another unit could be used for the Coleridge-Parry School and so on.

9.50 p.m.

I feel, Sir, that while we will vote for this today, I agree with the hon. junior member for Christ Church that you should put it in the Estimates and make it the property of the Education Department, and not the property of Lodge School, because you have your Institute in St. Michael, and these children will be drawn from every walk of life and can ill afford to pay for transportation. If this van were made the property of the Education Board, it could be put at the disposal of all schools for the purpose of taking the children to the Technical Institute free of tax.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I will not be as long as the hon. member, but I should like to say that this cannot be put as the property of the Education Board. You cannot put anything of this size as the property of the Education Board. I am not voting for it, but since I have spoken something else has come up and it is the question of cost. The cost is infinitesimal. The budget for last year was \$18,000,000 and your surplus was \$2 million. You are going to lend this school \$3,000 to be paid back over a period of six years. Let us look at the logic of this matter. Some years ago, Harrison College wanted a lawn mower, but it was used by Empire, Pickwick and other cricket clubs. Nobody made a fuss over the grounds being used by these people, but the lawn mower was part of the capital equipment of the Governing Body. Private employees in Bridgetown have agreed to send some of their workmen to this Technical Institute, and they are going to pay for their transportation. This is another branch of the Government's educational system and therefore, if you are sending them there, let us put aside the question of Seawell. The question of money cannot be seriously used as a means of saying that you cannot do it, because you cannot reasonably tell any person that this is a great expenditure. This amount of money in relation to your \$21 million Revenue is like a mosquito on the back of a rhinoceros.

It is only in Barbados that we have a climate where people can say certain things; and it is only in Barbados where people can perpetuate snobbery and hear someone who claims to be a socialist telling somebody about selling salt-fish. I am sure that if James Griffith had been in here listening to this debate, the British Labour Party would never agree to a subvention to support a Party whose members are going to advance the method which people should take of earning a living.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I interrupt the hon. member to say that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has defended himself on that matter already?

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not concerned with what the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has done; I am concerned, as a member of this House, with the remarks which were made in my presence about selling salt-fish. If you are

creating a climate in Barbados in which people who profess to be socialists can deride people for the line of vocation which they take, we will have to look into our history and ask whether we are going to consider bringing a man from the bottom up. There are so many members on that side who have derived their position from selling salt-fish. The Hon. Speaker's father was a shop-keeper, the Minister of Agriculture is a shop-keeper, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew's father was a shop-keeper, and I have been in his shop and eaten salt fish myself; so when we hear these remarks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am still aware, gentlemen, that I am not dealing with children. When I ask you to allow any member who is speaking to get through, please do so. I used that word "gentlemen" in its literal sense.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, in concluding my remarks on this Resolution, I feel that someone should stand up for these principles, and we cannot have it being thrown at hon. members that anything they or their families did has anything to do with their thinking, because if professional men are going to use this Chamber as a means of deriding other people, I say democracy is very weak indeed, and I hope that when the occasion arises and people say these things, that there would not be the question of saying that anybody was misquoted.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The hon. senior member for the City must have misunderstood me. No money was paid to Mr. Hinds. In the negotiations, Mr. Hinds said he would charge \$15 a trip, no matter how many boys were travelling; that was thought too much. He was written to and he decided to reduce the amount to \$12.75; that too was thought to be too much and negotiations broke down. The Director of Highways and Transport was asked whether arrangements could be made for a bus belonging to the Transport Board to take the children and that broke down. Although this might create a howl, I wondered whether we could borrow a van from District C - not allowing a policeman to drive - because it would cost Government nothing. I tried every method and there is no good talking about the reasons I gave. I have had sometimes to turn down supplementary Resolutions for \$100, because if you have ten Resolutions for \$100, that amounts to \$1,000, and when you find yourself budgeting for a couple of million dollars more than you budgeted for last year, you have to be very careful. Hon. members have the figures in front of them and they will see that the estimated Revenue is \$21 million and the estimated Expenditure is \$20 million for the first time in the history of Barbados. Of course, this is nothing in comparison with Trinidad and Jamaica and we are lucky that we have good rainfall and good crops; but every time you make a Five Year Plan and these Supplementary Resolutions come in, you have got to watch your money. We do not say that if something goes up in Waterworks we have to stop building schools, but if something goes up in one school, we say: "let us go slow on another part of the Education vote." 10.00 p.m.

I repeat, in Mr. Theobalds' time I put in something for the erection of Rendezvous School. It appeared in the Estimates or two years running now, and it has not yet been built. That is my only point. To answer the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. junior member for St. Peter, of course when the Coleridge-Parry School shows out that it cannot get these children to the Technical Institute and they make representations to us we would have to consider that. Nobody has asked them to have a loan. Some hon. members do not like to hear these things but if it is put to us that we have some poor children who have to go to the Technical Institute and we would have to pay the fares for them, would this Government say no? But if somebody wants to become an engineer and his father is rolling in money, and he is boarding at the School, why stop him from paying fares to attend the Technical Institute? These boys at the present moment pay Mr. Speede or Mr. Dear or whoever it is to bring them from Seawell to the Lodge School. Why prevent them from paying that money into the Governing Body?

Let me say this; perhaps it is my fault that I did not say it earlier. I did read exactly what the Governing Body said. They said that they wanted financial assistance.

We took that to mean a grant. At one time it was suggested that they pay half the running cost and we pay half, but when we had the memorandum which came up to the Cabinet, actually one of the things to which we had to agree was whether we could grant them this loan and we approved of it and sent it down here. We decided on repayment in six years. The Governing Body of the Lodge School said that the redemption of the loan of \$3,450 over six years would not create a hardship. When they told us that, what must we do? Must we say, no? They introduced all of this to us, about credit terms and fares to the Seawell Airport which are now paid to private people. Chemicals for their laboratory are brought up by private people. Why not make use of that van for that sort of thing? The Coleridge-Parry School being poor, if they say: "we cannot afford to get pupils to the Institute," we would have to devise some scheme to get them there. Hon. members know that I have preached over and over again that some scholarships should not only provide free fees, but also free books and free transport. There are some parents who cannot afford to pay for books and who cannot afford to pay for transport for their children. Do you think this Government in those individual cases would refuse to give a completely free scholarship? Therefore, I say again to the hon. junior member for St. Peter that if the Coleridge-Parry School makes application that they have some boys to send to the Technical Institute and the parents of those boys are too poor to pay their fares, we may not go to the extent of buying another van but we will devise some scheme to get them there. There is no point in lending that school money when we know that school money when we know that they cannot pay it back but we know that the Lodge School can pay it back. Perhaps, we can devise such a scheme where we can use the same van which belongs to the Lodge School. If the Lodge School boys go to the Technical Institute on a Monday and Friday, we can say "let the boys of the Coleridge Parry come on another day" and we may use that van. (A VOICE: How could you do that?) What is wrong in sending boys from the Coleridge-Parry another day, using the Lodge School van and crediting them with a sum of money for the use of their van. (Laughter.) (A VOICE: It does not work like that.) There can be chuckles at what I have just said. There is nothing in this world that is impossible; you only have to sit down and work it out.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is a fact, Mr. Chairman, that you will have boys from a particular form attending the Technical Institute on a particular evening. If it is an evening for Fourth Form boys, how can you send boys from the Fourth Form of the Lodge School on one evening and boys from the Coleridge-Parry School of the same form on another evening?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I appreciate what the Hon. Premier has just said. I asked him the question who paid, and he did not answer it. He said that these arrangements were made but they broke down. Who paid for transport? Is the Hon. Premier saying tonight that up to now no boys from the Lodge School have started to go to Richmond? He said that the negotiations started and they broke down, but what he has failed to tell us is who paid. As a matter of fact, they started to go from last year.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The boys paid.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the boys paid, what I am trying to get at is this. The Hon. Premier has said in his reply to the hon. junior member for St. Peter that if the Coleridge-Parry starts to send boys to the Technical Institute and you can prove to us that you have poor boys there, boys whose parents cannot afford to pay the transport, the Government will do it. Do you mean to say that at the Lodge School you do not have similar boys? There is no difference in boys drawn from the Lodge School to those drawn from the Coleridge-Parry.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. He should have heard me. I said that if the Governing Body which runs the school says: "we are going to pay for poor boys," how can the Government object to that whether it is the Lodge School, the Coleridge Parry, or any where else?

Mr. MOTTLEY: All I am saying is that the Government is providing technical education as part of the educa-

tional system of the colony. Just as you provide a laboratory at Harrison College for boys to do science, you are providing technical education for certain boys. It is your duty, therefore, and not that of the Governing Body, if there are boys and I submit they are whose parents cannot afford to pay these fares and who have been recommended for the technical stream, to provide this facility for them. The Hon. Premier said that if you found it necessary to do it in St. Peter, he will do it. Are you saying that you do not have the same thing at the Lodge School? Surely those children who have, say, a rich father in Dominica or Venezuela, can get their own transport to go to the Technical Institute. Do you know that at the Lodge School some of the pupils have their own cars? I am not interested in them; I am thinking of the pupils of that school who are drawn from the homes of poor people.

10.10 p.m.

I am thinking of the children who are drawn from the homes of the working class people and the amount for transportation would mean a tremendous lot to them. All I am saying is that since the Governing Body has asked for financial assistance, you have shown that there has not been sufficient interest displayed from the point of view of the Ministry of Education. If the Governing Body has asked for financial assistance, I think that the Ministry of Education should say: "In view of the fact that this is our means of Technical Education and we cannot put on a wing to every secondary school in every parish for carrying on technical education, we have put the Institute at one place in Barbados and therefore, we must get you there." The Premier's answer to that is, that if children in Dominica, St. Lucia or Trinidad have rich parents, why should we pay to get there? I agree that such children should get there, but the majority of the children at the Lodge School are drawn from the homes of a certain class of people.

At this stage, I am expressing the hope that the children who are entering the Lodge School are getting there by way of a test. Where the working-class people are sending their children to these schools, it is the duty of the Government to look after getting them to the Technical Institute. I must confess that the Premier has not convinced me one bit by his argument, that he could not afford to grant this \$3,430 to the Lodge School because of the expense of Combermere and other expenses. While I will vote for this Resolution tonight, I am suggesting to the Premier that the position must be reviewed. As night follows day, the Secondary Modern school children have to be transported to this Institute. He is saying that the Governing Body says that it will pay, but are you going to sit down and wait for the Governing Body to do that? There are some Governing Bodies - I am sorry to say it comprised of people who come from right down at the bottom of the ladder and who pretend that they do not know the privations through which they have passed. I have spoken with a lot of boys who know what they have passed through; you have people who are barely working for enough to exist. However, from my considered opinion, while we will vote for this Resolution tonight, I am submitting that this matter must be reviewed.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I thank the Premier for the assurance which he has given me. We really cannot hope to appreciate the lack of integration of policy when it comes to these schools. The Hon. Premier has asked what on earth is there to prevent the coming into effect of some agreement whereby the Governing Body of the Lodge School might lend this van to the Governing Body of another school.

Sir, I have had some experience with the Governing Body of the Lodge School; I do not cast any reflection on them, but I know the composition of that Governing Body, and if the Premier thinks he knows one-half as much about them as I do, with all due deference to you, Sir, and your colleague, the hon. junior member for St. John, the Hon. Premier is deceiving himself. He is practising self-deception if he believes or imagines that the Governing Body of the Lodge School is borrowing this money and will enter into any agreement to lend this van to another Governing Body. Do not let him deceive himself; he would

not be deceiving me. You, Mr. Acting Chairman, are beginning to know it; you have found some members whom I have left. I cannot believe that this Government will pursue such a lack of integration in these matters. The Government must have foresight. The Premier is the Minister of Education and this hotch potch manner of doing these things does not appeal to me. I know the hard-hearted gentlemen of earth, and they are people, some of them with their collars turned behind, who are sitting on the Governing Body of the Lodge School; I am sure that they will reject the acceptance of the loan before they did anything like lending this van to another Governing Body.

I appreciate the assurance which the Premier has given as to the help which the Government would extend to schemes operating from the Coleridge School, but do not let us accept any promise about the Governing Body of the Lodge School lending this van to another Governing Body; it is not going to work. I am not imagining anything I am a practical man, and I know whom you are up against in these matters. The Premier has a different plan. They know how to meet him; but when they meet me or you, the matter is a different one.

10.20 p.m.

This is no appeal to him. I would prefer in fairness to the Premier to see the formulation of a policy that would mean some sort of integration in relation to what are the services which Government will provide in connection with technical education. I would feel happier about that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am wondering whether the hon. senior member for the City still wants to have his motion put

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will withdraw it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is asking leave to withdraw his motion, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

The question that the Resolution for the sum of \$3,430 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1957-58, No. 71

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is for the sum of \$192,000 to be advanced to the Development Board. As hon. members will see from the Addendum, in 1956-57 Estimates, the sum of \$250,000 was provided, but in view of the fact that the Board did not function in the early part of the year, only \$58,00 was spent. The money has already been committed and we are asking now for a revote of the balance, which is \$192,000 in order that the Board can get on with its business.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, one would have expected on an occasion like this when you need funds for a Board that the public would at least have been treated with the courtesy of being told what has taken place since the Board has been functioning, and what are the likelihoods of industrial development. The purpose of this Board was to stimulate greater development opportunities and stimulate an industrial climate. It is true that the Government has shown no positive policy in stimulating industrial expansion, though there is on the Board, I understand, a Secretary who is a very good man. Unfortunately, the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour has not shown that he has any flair for this sort of thing, because since he has become Minister of Trade, we have not seen or heard any positive pronouncement so far as industrial expansion is concerned. What has taken place in other territories has not taken place in Barbados. For instance, Trinidad has shown a greater interest; the Minister of Trade in Trinidad went on visits to other territories. In Jamaica the Minister of Trade has been very militant in his industrial expansion, but we have not seen a similar thing exhibited here. For instance, nobody outside of Barbados knows if there is a Minister of Trade in Barbados.

I was looking for the Minister's speech at the last I.L.O. meeting, but I did not have enough time, so I cannot quote him verbatim; but at that meeting, he made a speech the burden of which was what we had done; but in it he indicated that when it comes to industrial development, we are developing sugar and there is no opportunity for other things. I should have liked to have his speech here, because I wanted to remind him of what he said.

We have reached such a stage in the development of sugar that sugar-producing territories like Barbados should send representatives abroad to see the fields in which sugar is not being used (because this Government budgets on sugar) and see if we cannot stimulate an interest in sugar. The countries that grow wheat try to stimulate greater interest in the people that use it. There are certain parts of Africa where sugar is not used, and there are certain other parts of the world where you would have to state a positive policy.

This is the only country I know of where a Government professing to be Socialist has set up a Development Board and has not put on it one person to represent the people. I am by no means making a plea to be on it, because you know I prefer to be on something to which I am elected. You could not find in Great Britain with the Conservative Government a Development Board with nobody to put the case for the workers. Nobody can say that this Development Board will not deal with matters which are of interest to the workers, and that therefore there should not be anyone there to represent them. A Development Board has just been set up in Trinidad on which there is a workers' representative. This Development Board here has been set up under the same circumstances as twenty five years ago when a Conservative Government was in power. The Barbados Workers Union represent fifteen thousand people, and in actual representation it would go up to about one hundred thousand people including all the people in the sugar industry. This is something that should be given serious attention. You cannot have an organisation dealing with Industrial development and not have a workers' representative on it and yet say you are representing the whole community. Why should it be that bankers and people from the Chamber of Commerce are on it, and there is nobody to represent the workers? You are setting the example where you think the workers are so ignorant that you do not need anybody intelligent to deal with them. I say that, Mr. Chairman, because when you provide them with \$192,000, you need some people on this Board who can say something for the workers.

A survey was made some years ago when Sir John Saint was Chairman, but I think it is time that another survey be made in Barbados of its industrial potentialities.
10.30 p.m.

Some years ago, Professor Arthur Lewis came here and I asked a question and the Hon. Premier had a discussion with him. I am talking from the point of view of policy. You should not wait until Jamaica grabs all she wants because, simultaneously, all of these territories are getting into the market and creating an atmosphere and we do not believe the Federal Government can create an industrial atmosphere for us. How are you going to build, or aid or encourage? Apart from income tax you are collecting Customs Duties. What are you going to do to help some people in industrial concerns? What are the fields in which you are prepared to start something along with your encouraging others? For instance, I do not know whether this is an industrial project, but the Government has some land at Dodds Plantation. I do not know to what extent there is any change in policy in developing that land. What I really want to stress is that you need a climate of your own from which you can encourage these things. The situation which prevails today is one where we are relying on sugar although we have seen that the sugar industry is taking less people both on the land and in the manufacture of the project. From the point of view of a positive policy for industrial expansion, we are getting nothing from the Government and we simply cannot wait until the door is shut. You must have some particu-

lar policy to carry out; but you have none. That is what is taking place and that is the reason why we get these vague pronouncements. So far, we are spending \$21 million this year. But when you balance this \$21 million which you are about to spend against the 230,000 population of this country, then you have to say that we will have to create a climate so as to do something to help these people. We cannot depend on what was done before; we cannot rely on the same industrial pattern which existed 50 years ago to provide sustenance for this population. If we continue with the same policy, we would not even be able to maintain the standard which we now have; we have to provide some industrial development to maintain this ever growing population. Family planning cannot be the answer to that; the industrial climate must be created through which you would have an industrial flow for your people.

It is about time that the Government prepare a White Paper on industrial development. What are your plans? As far as I know, there is no plan or no policy. For four years we were hoping that we would have seen something. We have a Development Board working which is not telling us anything about what it is doing.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the hon. member who has just sat down should be the only person to raise this matter on an occasion like this. It is curious that of all private corporations which were set up by this Government, this Development Corporation is one of which you know very little. We know really what the Housing Authority is doing; we know what the Transport Board has done and the Natural Gas Corporation keeps us informed from time to time; but there is an atmosphere of silence behind the Development Board. This silence is partly explained by the nature of this Board but that is not the whole explanation. This organisation is only lending body. When a Board like that has only lent out \$58,000 in a few months it is not doing much and I hope the Hon. Minister will furnish us, if he has the information, with the particulars of the loans by this Development Board. I understand that Mr. Shearn of the Letchworth Printery at the Garrison has benefitted from this Board as well as one or two other people; and while I have nothing to say on that score, that is an indication of the wrong approach to this whole problem.

The idea of setting up the Development Board was not entirely for helping existing business and enterprises which are in themselves not wealth producing. The purpose, as we all understood it then, was to create more wealth and it is in the light of whether this Board creates more wealth or not that its activities would have to be judged.

First of all, I think more money ought to be placed at the disposal of that particular Board. We cannot seriously talk of producing more wealth on just a few dollars. It is clear that they do not contemplate much expansion to be done with only \$1 million to spend and certainly you cannot get much expansion in the way in which it is proposed to spend it.

My second point is that the policy of the Development Board ought to be twofold. On one side it should be the exclusive activity of the Development Board to confine itself to economic and industrial expansion and in that activity the Board ought to, first of all, help enterprises already existing to promote their expansion and extension and, secondly, as an alternative, to set out on its own in investments. By that it would be creating jobs for people.

The Government of Barbados is saying that it is spending \$1 million on development, but it will be no good if other avenues for employment are not created. The whole point of spending \$1 million is that you should be able to say at the end of your five-year period that the million dollars thus invested has created jobs for 2,000 more people, and because of the revenue that has accrued from the new enterprises, Government has got \$1,200,000 to its good. That is the whole purpose of development. On the other side, of course, the function of the Development Board ought to be to assist small industries and when I say small, I really mean small. There is more need in this country for people with small businesses to get loans

of about \$1,000 or \$2,000 so as to give them a push, and there are enterprising business men in this Island who only want a push, literally speaking, and for reasons which you can easily see are discouraged from approaching the Development Board, because the level of this Board's activities is somewhat above or beyond the activities of these small business people.

10.40 p.m.

There is a case in point; there are some small hotels and boarding houses on the southern and, in some cases, the Western coast of this Island which ought to be encouraged to expand and develop. I am not now thinking of hotels or establishments in the category covered by the Marine Hotel or the Crane Hotel, because they will have the means of financing themselves, which means will be denied the smaller people; but it would be helpful to the tourist trade materially if some help could be given to these small hotels. Do you realise what it is to a person who is accommodating ten people to be able to change the whole cooking facilities of the house and to install a couple of gas ranges and things like that? That would mean a lot of business; secondly - and here again this is an aspect of the tourist trade which we should not forget - the souvenir industry of the Island is in need of help.

It is only recently that people in public life are beginning to understand these potentialities. You cannot keep the tourist industry to the level of permitting certain people to display their beads or necklaces, or to purchases made of sea shells. Of course, they do not love the phase of factory manufacture very well, but the handicraft itself as an art contributes largely to the tourist industry. There are men and women of this Island who can confer great benefits on the tourist industry if they could be helped with small loans to set up workshops and perhaps acquire the tools and materials for producing these things in an easier fashion. There are also those who would need small loans for advertisement purposes, so that tourists coming in from abroad would know exactly that there is an attractive and expanding souvenir and handicraft industry in this Island which calls for their patronage. That is how I look at it. Small enterprises have much to contribute to the tourist industry and it would be more than easy, proper guarantees being given, for a person to borrow \$1,000 or \$2,000 and get on with the job which the Government cannot do or is doing inadequately, but which manufacturers would find time to do.

The next thing would be for the Board itself to plunge into the field of industry either by itself opening up avenues for employment, or in conjunction with the large scale industries already established. Those are the two tests which I feel the Board is called upon to face and the development of this Island will depend largely on how these tests are faced.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Acting Chairman, I should just like to reply briefly to some points which have been made. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has told this Committee that the Trinidad and Jamaica Ministers were going all around and he did not see the same activity being exercised by the Ministers of Barbados outside Barbados schemes. However, I am yet to see what either of those Ministers to whom the hon. member has referred, has achieved by the trips he has made. What has the Minister of Trinidad or the Minister of Jamaica achieved more than creating bad feelings between Canada, Trinidad and Jamaica? What has either of them done beyond that? We may not have as much money as Trinidad and we may count ourselves as being more responsible; but as to getting up and going out, that should not be thrown at us. We have met with great difficulty in finding a Manager for the Development Board. The hon. member referred to the Secretary, but the Secretary of the Board is the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Trade. It is only late last year that we were able to recruit a suitable candidate to manage the affairs of the Board. The Board is primarily concerned with the advancing of money to various people who come forward to establish industries and to improve on the industries which have already been esta-

blished. That has been going on and I am sure that hon. members will appreciate the fact that in so far as this Board is concerned, it is something similar to a Bank; and as to the individuals to whom advances have been made, it will be appreciated that we should not be calling names and saying that Mr. "X" has this and that. This Board is acting in the same capacity as a bank, that is, advancing loans to individuals for development purposes and more especially in the field of industry.

For the little time during which the Board has been operating, it has advanced \$58,000, and it has already been further committed. The sum of \$250,000 was voted in the Capital Estimates last year and the \$192,000 for which we are now asking is in respect of the year when we had no person to manage the Board. The point was made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy about the advancement of loans and I would like to assure him that there was some advances made.

As regards the hoteliers, we have agreed that, in order to get the matter beyond every shadow of doubt, the Act should be amended in order to advance loans to those people who run small hotels and who are prepared to make additional rooms in those hotels for the purpose of accommodating more people.

As to the question of the handicraft industry, that has also been gone into very carefully. I can assure this Committee that this is also an item to which the Board has given quite a lot of consideration. Although no money has yet been advanced to people, well, it is not the fault of the Board that no advances have been made.

10.50 p.m.

I think hon. members will also appreciate the fact that in so far as Barbados is concerned, much as we would like to see quite a lot of industries going up, due to the fact that we have practically no raw material, that is a handicap to the development and establishment of industries. Anybody who knows will appreciate that, but I know for a fact that we have very soon to bring a Pioneer Industries Bill before the House; there are a few industries which are now afoot and which I hope in the very near future will be established, and which will come under the Pioneer Industries legislation as soon as we get it through. Government is as keen as any other Government in supporting and encouraging the establishment of industries in this island.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member is hoping that I will not speak tonight, but I am going to. From his point of view, I can understand why we are in this position and will be until another Government comes into power, because if he is saying that I can produce nothing that Jamaica Minister has done, there is a better climate than Barbados to which industrialists can look. The recent mission which the Minister of Trade in Jamaica made to Canada was not the only one he has been on; he has been to the United States and from reading the Jamaican newspapers, you can see the amount of industrial expansion taking place in that colony. The same is true of Trinidad, but it is no wonder that we are like this because the hon. Minister talks about raw material. He is going to tell me that in a community like this we have no raw materials to industrialise. Before he gets someone to advise him, he makes this pontifical statement that the only way you can industrialise is to have raw material, and in a sotto voce he mentioned "power". If the Electric Company is not generating electrical power, let us see what it means on the basis of having the industrial power which you need. In Jamaica, they have decided to take over electricity because they regard it as the forerunner of industrial life.

Eight years ago, Professor Arthur Lewis said that because there was no raw material in Barbados, that did not prevent you from creating a climate of industrial development. You have to be prepared to put money into certain projects which you believe can be of use to the community. We in Barbados would have to do something which normally we would not have to do. With this population, you have to create things among people. The hon. member does not know the amount of money in the Savings Bank; but savings went up to \$10,000 over the last ten years

and was deposited in other banks outside of Barbados and used on industries outside of this island. Let him ask about the amount of savings which were created in this country; it is not a question of lending money, because Barbados had its money used outside. We want an atmosphere through which to have these things; but unfortunately we get out of the horse's mouth that their minds do not run along these lines, because development for them means Cabinet Government, and that is all you need; but when it comes to something positive in other matters, they themselves have not created the situation for it. This is part of the over-all scheme of lending money. You can see what we are in for.

The Minister of Trade said that we have no raw material and no power; so it means that this island will have to be the back-wash of the other federating territories when it comes to industrial development. All you can hear now is freedom of movement, but you are creating a prejudice against Barbados in that we do not want to develop our country, but that they are to develop their countries for Barbadian labour to come in. That is the climate which you will create by this attitude. We have to let people understand that we are ready and willing to develop our country and to give people an opportunity to invest money. We have to urge them to do things in order to provide more employment and the ancillaries that will come from this development. We know that every time we put up factories, you get a lot of people for whom we must provide a service. Government is going to build a Deep Water Harbour which is going to throw people out of employment because you are going to use a lot of machinery; therefore you have to think of other developments because there would be so many jobs less in the community than before. You have got to get down to doing that now and not wait until the day comes.

It is unfortunate that we have a Minister who looks upon these things in this calm light and say that we have to go outside. When we spend money on education, it does not reflect in the year in which we spend it; the money which is spent on school boys does not reflect during that time but in the community when they grow up. We are products of the education money which was spent forty or fifty years ago. If you look at the time when that money was spent, you will see it is like a mushroom and you would never have said what you did say. We are at a stage where we have to do these things as soon as we begin to stir among other people.

11.00 p.m.

Barbados is a small place in the world, but there is nothing to prevent us from trying every avenue. The Manager of the Development Board went to San Francisco sometime ago. You have to continue going around to create a climate for industrialisation. Before the disturbances took place in Venezuela, did you not see that the Ministers of the Board of Trade went to Venezuela and Mexico?

We have to think in creative terms to do some things for ourselves even out of the ruins of the past generation. I do not like to hear a responsible Minister saying that on the question of industrial development we have nothing. That is the wrong atmosphere to create because it makes your people become feeble bodied.

You should not let the people feel that they are living without a hope and, above all, you should not let the industrialists have a feeling that there is no hope. There are young men who are looking for jobs and if they feel that nothing will be stirring up from the point of view of industrial development then you are in for a bad time. The Hon. Minister has only emphasized what he said last year. Without reading the speech, he said today or re-emphasized that it is a question of our lacking in resources and industrial power. Those are the things which we do not have. When it comes to creative things he does not think that it is necessary.

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

On motion of Hon. M. E. Cox, seconded by Hon. D. D. Garner, Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee and the postponement of one.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 4th March, 1958, at 3 O'clock p.m.

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

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

There was a time when these people did not worry to think about Latin American trade. The countries of Latin America are next door to us; yet we do not know what is taking place in these territories and there is nothing wrong in knowing. Latin America is a vast area comprised of Venezuela, Guatemala, Brazil and other places; yet you do not know what is taking place in these territories. It is wise that we should be aiming at creating the maximum we can get by visiting these places. We would fail here and there, but that is a matter of experimentation. If the United States Government had not taken that view, may be the Tennessee Valley would not have been there because many people said that the Tennessee Valley Authorities would have failed