

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, March 4, 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*); Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS, Kt., C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., (*Premier*); 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. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. E. StA. HOLDER; His Honour Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, (*Deputy Speaker*); Mrs. E. E. BOURNE; Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Mr. L. StA. THORNE; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E.; Mr. T. W. MILLER;

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the 11th February have been circulated, and unless any hon. member objects, they will be taken as read and confirmed.

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

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month ended 31st December, 1957.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) No. 2 Regulations, 1957.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Report of the Cane Fire Board for the year 1957.

Brief Report on the activities of the Department of Science and Agriculture in 1957.

Report of the Irrigation Board for the year 1957.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$3,000 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. 76, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$1,221 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. 77, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

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

Bill to make provision for the establishment and management of public markets and slaughterhouses, and the provision of cold stores and for matters incidental thereto and connected therewith.

Bill to make provision for the improvement and conservation of the soil and for the prevention of damage or deterioration by erosion to land in certain areas of the Island and for matters connected therewith.

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

Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled "The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) No. 2 Regulations, 1957".

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

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to make provision for the establishment and management of public markets and slaughterhouses, and the provision of cold stores and for matters incidental thereto and connected therewith be read a first time.

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

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to make provision for the improvement and conservation of the soil and for the prevention of damage or deterioration by erosion to land in certain areas of the Island; and for matters connected therewith be read a first time.

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

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

Mr. DOWDING: Before the business of the day commences, I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention the pretty sad state of affairs with hon. members having to come to this House to be then presented with the documents of this House. Due to, maybe, sickness, death, or some other reason, hon. members may fail to attend a meeting here. There is business which may possibly be dealt with by this House today, and I have now for the first time been given my papers.

I think it is a matter to which Your Honour should pay strict attention, because I do feel it is a privilege that hon. members should be in possession of the necessary documents before they enter and undertake the serious business of this House. As I said, I think it is a sad state of affairs to which this island is coming when hon. members cannot be delivered the documents of this House, but have to come to the House to pick them up themselves.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, if I am permitted to speak, I should like the hon. member to make his

position clear. It is not that he has just received the papers of the House, but his copy of the Estimates. It is true not, therefore, that the papers dealing with Resolutions, Bills and things of that sort, as he has always complained, have now reached him. It is the copy of the Estimates of Barbados which he has just received.

Mr. DOWDING: The hon. member is perfectly right.

Mr. SPEAKER: Copies of the Estimates were laid on Tuesday last; if the hon. member was not in his place, I quite agree it should have been mailed to him.

CONSIDERATION OF ESTIMATES, 1958-59.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier to move the consideration of the Draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the financial year, 1958-59.
3.25 p.m.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I hope that in spite of what take place in the Other Place, I shall succeed in being as distinct and clear as possible in presenting the budget for the year without having to make a marathon address. I think I can make the position of the Government in the Estimates quite clear and yet be short in the process.

I propose to do today what I have done on some other occasions, that is to introduce these Estimates, to have a motion seconded that consideration of these Estimates should take place and then adjourn for a couple of days so that the Opposition may have a chance to understand what I have said.

We of Barbados are in the happy position, as in some other countries, of having a Five-Year Development Plan in which we have set out what we propose to do from year to year and, therefore, much that has appeared in the Memorandum accompanying the Estimates and much will appear in my remarks will already be known as the policy of the Government for the year 1958-59. Therefore, if in consequence I have nothing startling to put before hon. members, it is because we have abandoned the three-year-old practice of budgeting from year to year, and for the past seven years have been for five-year periods.

We therefore put before the House what we propose to do in the Five-Year Plan for the coming financial year. Barbadians are commonly thought to be boastful but I think this Government is an exception. We do not sufficiently sometimes point out to opponents or to the rest of the world, our accomplishments, our hopes, and our endeavours to carry out these hopes. I think that any Government that has a record of actual achievement for the past years deserves to be praised; and without undue modesty, I can say that conditions are improving from year to year in this colony. I give credit to the fact that we have had years of good rainfall and therefore our sugar crops have been good ones. However, we cannot hope that our luck would forever last without some break and unfortunately it seems as if this year will be the beginning of a drought period, which we have not had for some eight years now. I say that both because of what we have pledged to do this year and what we hope to next year. We have to bear in mind that this year's rainfall - I mean the crop year's rainfall - was not what we liked it to be and as a result our present estimates may have to be considerably revised. Last year, we had a record crop of 204,525 tons which beat the previous years' crop of 187,000 which we considered was magnificent; therefore, when we topped the two hundred-thousand-ton mark, we very well felt that we could go on with our Development Plan. I should like to say here that of the record crop of 204,525 tons we exported 135,000 tons on quota and another 46,000 tons to Canada. The rest we consumed locally. We can rest assured that we did not produce too much, because we managed to sell it off. I say that because, as hon. members know, here and there you see hints and suggestions that some of the Commonwealth countries may have to cut down their sugar crop because of the quota. We hope we will not reach that stage.

This year's estimates of our sugar crop, as was given in the speech from the Throne, was about 190,000 tons. It is likely that we would have to cut down that amount to 175,000 tons because of the very weather of which I have spoken. There is the possibility that this estimate might even be less. The Department of Agriculture is generally conservative in its advice to the Government as to what the crop is likely to be and they are beginning to say that at the most it will be 175,000 tons but it may be less. We must also keep in mind the possibility that if this dry weather keeps up, next year's crop may also be low.

We have the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement and we have been fortunate in getting an addition of a year every year and although we have said it is for six years, every year it is for six years. This six-year agreement becomes a six-year agreement every year because as soon as you come to the end of one twelve months, you add on another year.

Our relations with Canada remain good and I have never made any secret personally or from the Government's point of view, without disliking or hating another country - whether it be the United Kingdom, U.S.A., France, Germany or any other country on earth that we feel the future of these territories is bound up with our continual good relationship and commercial ties with the Great Dominion of Canada. We aim constantly in our policy at keeping the Canadian market and expanding it, and we do hope it will continue. I feel that it is more than a hope; we have a certainty; the Canadians have expressed so much faith in the future of Federation of the West Indies and have exhibited so great a desire to have good relations with the individual colonies and the whole area that Barbados can continue in the confidence that our commercial ties with Canada will get even stronger. I had the good pleasure of meeting a very old friend whom I have met in other parts of the World. He is Dr. Claude Isbister Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce of the Dominion of Canada who as hon. members know has come here on a Flour Mission. I gave him the assurance which I have given the House - and I think he knows Barbadians quite well enough, at least those who met him in Ottawa, to know that this is the fundamental principle of Government's policy.

Speaking generally, the economy of the world affects us, we have to study carefully all the implications that are going on in the European trade area. We have to be very sure that we do not continue to do something which I am afraid we have done for the sake of uniformity; that is to say, we have failed to emphasise every possible repercussion that exists in any international obligations to which we are bound by virtue of our being a British Territory. Of course, within a very short time all these international agreements will have to be made by the Federal Government and I would like to say here in careful language - although I am so accustomed to abuse by opposition newspapers that it does not worry me in the least when I am misunderstood - but from the point of view of Barbados I think that in an occasion of this sort I should make the position of Barbados and the Barbados Government very plain.

3.35 p.m.

I wish to say to my friends and to my enemies alike that never, as long as I live, will I do anything to let down Barbados on the fundamental questions which to my mind are axiomatic in a Federation - questions of Customs Union, Tariffs, uniform external Tariffs and the question of Freedom of Movement of people. The House knows my views too well for me to dilate on them. It is not true that I have said anything which warrants the feeling - in spite of the Leader of the Opposition that I am going to the Federal Parliament with any idea of fighting just for Barbados. What is the point of a Federation in the Lower House, at any rate, if we are to fight just for our own territory? I need say any more than that. I shall not abandon these principles; I shall fight for them, because they are fundamental to the Federation and not just to Barbados.

If hon. members will turn to paragraph 11 of the Memorandum which accompanies these Estimates, they will see the actual figures set out there as regards our export and imports and visible trade balances. In para-

graph 12. they will see the invisible exports, the value to us of remittances sent from abroad and from tourism. The sum of \$9 million B.W.I. currency, we got last year from the tourist trade as compared with \$7.2 million in 1956; and hard currency which came in from the United States of America, Canada, and Venezuela in 1957 was the equivalent of \$5.8 million B.W.I. currency as compared with \$4.6 million B.W.I. in 1956. Remittances from persons abroad through the Post Office and other Government Agencies rose from \$4.7 million B.W.I. in 1956 to \$5.6 million B.W.I. in 1957.

It is therefore clear that our finances are heading in the right direction up to the present moment. We have to remember, however, the general trend of the world. Credit restrictions in Great Britain to curb inflation, on the one hand, and the possibility of a recession in the United States of America, on the other hand, have their repercussions in Barbados and the West Indies and we have got to watch very carefully what is happening.

I have got indirectly from two sorts of super-industrialists in the United States of America exactly opposite opinions as to the possibility of a recession in the United States of America. One who is world-famed, and one who is the head of a great industrial concern, seems to be absolutely sure that the United States of America is heading for a great recession. Another industrialist, perhaps not quite as famous, but almost as famous, and who certainly ought to know what he is saying, thinks that it is a scare and that the United States of America is not heading for a recession. In these circumstances, it behoves us to keep our ears open and our wits about us, and to remember that we must be on the lookout for any sign of events in the outer world which will effect our finances and our economy.

We know that to depend on the sugar industry alone is not enough. Every Government in recent years has felt that there has not been a difference as regards the pace we may go and has felt it its duty to introduce secondary industries. Secondary industries in a country like Barbados where there are few natural resources except cheap man-power and sugar are a problem, but we cannot afford not to give great consideration, if our rising population continues to rise as it is rising - we cannot afford not to give great consideration to the possible industrialisation of Barbados. Some of our opponents who like to see learning - I do not refer to those hon. members who are officially learning - sometimes quote Professor Arthur Lewis, and it is well to remember that Professor Arthur Lewis, who has given so much thought, care and attention to West Indian problems, has asserted that Barbados is the one place in the West Indies which should consider industrialisation, not because we have the resources and the rest of it, but because our people are hard working; if we can convince manufacturers abroad that they can get a better day's work out of Barbados than some other places I could name, there is a very great chance of getting manufacturers to set up what you might call branch industries in this Island.

Our general policy arising out of these considerations then is that we must continue our present policy of employment to be met by the capital programme of our Five Year Plan. It is, as hon. members know, a record this year, mostly because, we are spending \$8 1/2 million on the Deep Water Harbour in this good financial year. The Deep Water Harbour will naturally provide basic facilities for the development of trade and I need not repeat what I think more than one Government member has said before that is, that we intend to have a free port such as exist in a few other places in this world, whereby manufacturers can come here with their products without paying duty, process them, employ local people and sell those products abroad. In addition to that, as hon. members may have seen from a perusal of these Estimates, we are adding another \$1 1/2 million to the funds available to the Development Board to go on with the development of secondary industries; but I would remind the House that the policy of the Government has been given to them a couple of years ago in the Development Plan and each year now is only a reminder of what we propose to do in the particular year. We have the advantage and I hope I will not be accused of boasting - that so far, we have had to

modify the Five Year Development Plan very slightly.

As hon. members know - even some members of the Opposition may know - India has fallen on evil days as regards their second Five Year Plan and the United States of America contemplates coming to their aid. 3.45 p.m.

Continuation of Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:)

I, India, with her wealth, her brains and her millions finds it sometimes difficult to carry out her development plan, West Indian territories may be excused if they do not always stick to what they may have decided to do. Without boasting, I say it has been our good fortune here in Barbados that we have had only slight modifications, and we have not had to abandon anything we decided to do. Wide issues on Regional Development must obviously be left to the Federal Government. This does not mean that the Unit Government should not see to its development, and we propose in Barbados to continue our Unit Development plan side by side with any regional planning undertaken by the Federal Government.

It is more appropriate for me to mention at a later stage that one of our development plans is another land settlement scheme outside of Barbados. Let me remind hon. members that although the hon. senior member for St. Philip - I am sorry he is not in his place to hear me say it - may have given the impression that he first thought of Dominica, I have on the floor of this House some two and half years ago drawn to the attention of the House that some of the best agricultural development advice this Government has had, has been to think of Dominica rather than St. Lucia or any other colony. If therefore this Government tells you that it is thinking of a development scheme in Dominica, it is not because the hon. senior member for St. Philip wrote articles in his paper or in the Trinidad Guardian. It is a scheme, I repeat, which I am perfectly sure I mentioned in 1955 on the floor of this House.

Of course, just like with British Honduras where we were half way towards getting on - one of the leading politicians promised to take thousands of Barbadian agricultural labourers, but as you know an upset came and the P.U.P. was split; Mr. Price came into power, and that scheme unfortunately fell through. We have not forgotten that Barbadians are primarily agricultural, and we must get a land settlement scheme with a good beginning. Mussolini in spite of what he was did have the right idea. We must get something ready so that agricultural labourers could walk into a house, find a box of matches, a cutlass, seeds to plant and start. The average Barbadian is not a pioneer, cutting down virgin forests and buildings, and therefore any land scheme settlement which we devise would have to be carefully thought on and provision made not only for using land for vegetables, but a place not for a gambling house but as a dance room and of course, somewhere to play cricket; otherwise no Barbadian is going anywhere else.

Now if I may turn, Mr. Speaker, to the actual figures of Revenue and Expenditure, I hope not to tire the House with a long repetition of what is printed. As regards the Estimates of Revenue, I would just like to remind the House that our total estimated revenue for the coming year as printed is \$21,000,516. The amount to be raised from Income Tax is \$7,750,000 and from Customs and Excise \$9,875,000; this will be found in paragraph 19 of the Memorandum which accompanies the Estimates. The estimated expenditure on the current expenditure as shown in the printed Estimates totals \$20,429,378. Unfortunately there has been a printer's error; that is \$2,100 less than the actual total. There was a last minute reduction and an error appeared in the non-current expenditure under Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services, so that the total in non-recurrent expenditure is \$172,690; the total of the Head is \$751,765, which is a decrease of \$82,881 as compared with the 1957-58 Estimates, so that the estimated surplus which you will find in paragraphs 20, 21 and 22 of the Memorandum is \$573,238 instead of what is actually printed there.

The (actual) estimated Capital Expenditure is \$13,888,407, and it is proposed to finance it from the following sources; Loan Funds \$10,519,531; Surplus Balance \$2,577,351; contributions from Revenue \$750,000

and Colonial Development and Welfare \$792,000.

The largest item in expenditure, as hon. members must already guessed, is Education which is \$3,318,025. Obviously with the rising child population, we have to face an increased expenditure in Education. In addition, I am sure even the Opposition will be glad to hear that we have raised the number of supernumerary teachers from 95 to 220, thereby abolishing the danger and the possibility, which was more than a possibility in the last financial year, of using a Relief Teacher for a long number of months and not paying him as a supernumerary. Hon. members will realise that when we more than double the number of supernumeraries, the vote on education mounts and mounts. I think Barbadians are proud of their educational achievements and will feel that any Government in power should always bear in mind and do whatever they can do for the sake of schools and the teaching of our school children.

I did not refresh my memory with the figures, but I think, speaking generally, that we have still a higher portion of literacy than any country in Europe, strange as that may seem of a small colony which has been not so long inhabited. As is stated in the Memorandum, the figures, as I said, are mainly due to the increased salaries of teachers which we have added to the list. A Civil Establishment Order is of course necessary and will come down with the establishment of these posts of supernumerary teachers.

3 55 p.m.

They will of course be permanent and pensionable; no longer will they be Relief Teachers, I repeat, Relief Teachers are intended to be what they are according to the definition. If, say, a schoolmaster is ill for ten days, you do not do anything for the first five or seven days, but for the next three days you appoint a Relief Teacher and that Relief Teacher gets three day's work. He is not appointed by the month or anything like that. I do not think that is anything of a hardship on anybody who is holding on for a couple of days. But when a person has to hold on for somebody who is at Erdiston or doing anything like that, that teacher then becomes permanent and becomes pensionable.

Some hon. member may ask about the New Combermere. Although we are making provision for 700 boys, it is considered that Combermere is fully staffed at present and it is not proposed to make any arrangements for additional staff at that school although we have made arrangements for additional staff at all the other aided Secondary Schools, such as the Alleyne School, the Boys' Foundation School, the Girls' Foundation School, Harrison College and the Lodge School.

In connection with Education, I would just like to mention at this stage, if hon. members look at the Capital Estimates they would see that we have provided additional equipment for the Technical Institute in keeping with the approved plan for that Institute. Again, if hon. members look on page 141 at the summary of expenditure on Capital works, they will find our Education capital works is estimated to cost \$875,803. That is for such projects as finishing Combermere School, the Christ Church Foundation School and other such schools and the extension of elementary school buildings and the improved facilities at the Alleyne School. We proposed to re-organise the Alleyne School and that proposal is the result of a recommendation of Mr. Petter, who as you know was the adviser of the Colonial Development Organisation. We hoped that the Department of Education would carefully examine the recommendation and as a result we propose to introduce a bi-lateral system of education at the Alleyne School, and to do that we are extending a number of its class rooms. It is also proposed to extend the laboratory at the Lodge School and to provide the necessary equipment because of the increasing number of boys who are studying Science and with the other schemes which we propose to carry out at the Lodge School, we think that is money which can be said to be money well spent.

I do not propose to go into all the other things, I spoke of Education for obvious reasons. I do not propose to go into details of the other Heads of Department because when the House goes into Committee the Min-

isters responsible for their respective Departments are in a better position than myself to answer the questions that may be thrown at them by hon. members including the hon. senior member for St. George who will say something in his usual vociferous and stentorian, if not lucid style.

As to the amount of \$2,496 provided in the Current Estimates for Medical Services, that is a fairish proportion of our revenue which we expect to collect and I should like to let hon. members know what perhaps some of them may know already as regards the new hospital. I have already told the House that a firm of hospital architects is already working in conjunction with Captain Tomlin on the designing of the new Hospital.

Mr. Davis was out here a few months ago and we were fortunate to find that he and Mr. Tomlin got on considerably well and that there was no question of somebody more expert than the other. The work was done jointly and we are making headway. The Master plan and Estimates on it are expected from London very soon and the next stage will be the preparation of the site. It will take some time and some months before we begin, but we have made provision in this year's Estimates for a start to be made on the actual construction of the new Hospital before the end of this current year. We hope to start before the end of this year. We are at present carrying on negotiations for the acquisition of the Deanery in Martindales Road. That together with the site at Stockton would provide the site for the new hospital. The people who have seen it - the Colonial Office experts, and the Nuffield Foundation experts - have said that the combination of the Deanery and the Stockton sites would be as good as any other site. We are therefore taking it up.

As regards the other hospital services, provision is included for the supply of drugs for the treatment of tuberculosis free of charge to the clinics, and other public institutions (such as the Almshouses and so on) who may apply for these drugs. I am told that very good results have been made in the treatment of this disease Officers of the Enmore Health Centre.

As regards the B.C.G. Campaign, it officially came to an end on the 31st May, 1957. Provision however continues to be made for the programme in all schools for the vaccination of all new additions to the schools.

As regards the Mental Hospital, on account of the pressing need for more accommodation, provision is included in the Estimates for the addition of nine rooms and furniture for female paying patients. I hope that I do not give the impression that more females than males suffer the misfortune of having to go to the Mental Home. I hope the Hon. Minister on my immediate right will not feel badly if I say to the House that I understand that as a result of a recent religious revival in this colony more people are asking for admission to the Mental Hospital. The Hon. Minister of Social Services whom we are glad to see back in his place in the House of Assembly will give the House the details of the other aspects of social services.

I would just like to say that the applications by children of seven, eight and nine years for books at the Public Library have grown to such extent that some have had to be turned down. Is a terrible thing to happen in any community and so Government proposes to go on with the negotiations with Mr. A.E. Taylor, who has land adjoining the site of the Public Library, in order to buy some of that land from him to extend the Public Library. We will then not have to admit any longer such a thing as children being turned back from obtaining books. We intend to spread the idea, however, of a Post Office Library in every parish. We will be sending down legislation soon to buy the land in St. George for that purpose; the hon. senior member for St. George will be glad to know that the people of his parish would soon get facilities. The legislation I think is now being prepared in the Attorney General's office and it will soon be sent down to this House. We are also having a Branch Library on a part-time basis at the St. Thomas Social Centre.

4.05 p.m.

I have kept somewhat late in my Address, the reference to what is uppermost and most uppermost of all in the minds of Barbadians - the question of the development of agricultural schemes and schemes of development. The Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries devotes constant attention to the schemes which he has thought useful for agricultural development in Barbados. I think that this House will see in the coming financial year much to the benefit of the Community as a result of these schemes. The marketing of milk, the processing of corn, the storage of fish, the storage of vegetables, the abattoir - all of these things are under the constant attention of the Ministry. We now have three new markets, we will finish three markets during the financial year - one at Six Roads, one at Bay Street and one at Speightstown - and the Island will have eight markets in operation both in and out of Bridgetown. This is the first step towards the development of an efficient marketing system, the absence of which is one of the greatest handicaps to the enjoyment of a higher level of food production.

I want to say for the benefit of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy who is sure to pour out his heart for the poor unfortunate huckster who will be driven into these markets, that that is not so. Our policy will be to give the hawkers the facilities for going into the markets but we are not going to drive everybody off the streets. We know that wherever you go you will find an occasional man selling his articles. We are not going to say that every single human being must proceed into the market, or else he will be hailed before a Police Magistrate.

Part of the Legislation which was introduced earlier today by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is to make provision for the control of the markets: and during the next financial year, I think we can say that cold storage arrangements will have reached the stage of completion and been put into operation. We are still having difficulty, as doubtless the Hon. senior member for St. George is aware, in recruiting staff for the Department of Science and Agriculture, and we are extremely fortunate in obtaining the services of Mr. A. DeK. Frampton, formerly Agricultural Adviser to the Comptroller of Development and Welfare Organisation. That we have been able to get a man of his ability to give his services as Deputy Director of Agriculture is, I think, a stroke of luck for this Island.

I hope that hon. members, apart from the two hon. members for St. Andrew, has seen the soil conservation work which is being done in the Scotland area. I have seen from figures annually sent to me of soil erosion work in Italy, that the soil is more or less the same sort as that in the Scotland district. I am told that the present soil erosion expert is doing an excellent job. Legislation should have come down this morning - it will be handed in this afternoon - in respect of soil erosion in the Scotland area.

I think that the hon. senior member for St. George will be pleased to hear that we are again taking up actively the question of milk marketing. It is a difficult problem. I do not want to throw cold water on the scheme, but we do know that it has happened sometimes that in a pastureless Barbados, it is cheaper to buy imported powdered milk, than to rear milk-producing cattle. The Department of Agriculture is concerned with the creation of a milk marketing industry and is already discussing with an interested person the question of an early start.

I realise that as long as we have quotas under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement, as long as we are putting all our eggs into one basket, we have to use all our brains and the goodwill of the planters of this Island to intensify our agriculture and persist in modern and up-to-date schemes of animal husbandry and endeavour to stop importing all the stuff we import if we can produce it about as cheaply, let us say, as we can buy it from abroad. If this milk-marketing scheme really gets on foot this time - we have been talking about it for six years (Mr. DOWDING: Sixteen years.) Due to the fact that some of the rich people of this Island wanted the Government to finance it and hand it over to them to run it!

As regards fisheries, over sixty new boats went into operation last year making a total of 120 boats in the industry. In 1953-54, there were only 20 new boats. The increase, I am sure, as hon. members are aware, has

resulted in bringing in a great deal more fish, and it has instanced that the small supply which had been involved was only a recurrent affair. We intend to introduce legislation to control the dynamiting of fish for consideration in the Legislature very soon. A Colonial Development and Welfare Grant has already been approved for the purpose of carrying out a research into the hydrography and biology of the flying fish. That will be done by the McGill Research and Belairs Institute situated in St. James with the co-operation of the local Fisheries Department of the Department of Science and Agriculture. They have already been doing a great work, and they have been studying the habits of flying fish and putting at our disposal the result of their discoveries.

I shall deal now, Mr. Speaker, with the capital works which will involve great expenditure.
4.15 p.m.

As regards the Deep Water Harbour, when we go into Committee, I think the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works will have more information than I have about these libellous statements that have appeared in the Press about Messrs. Costain. I say, 'libellous, I think'. The information I have at the present moment is that a disgruntled employee of Costain has made a statement which can be taken to mean that Costain does not care whether or not the Barbados public is fleeced. So far, my information is that the allegation about a bad site and not knowing that they were going there is quite untrue; but as I said, the Hon. Minister concerned will deal with it.

We gave this contract to Messrs. Costain on the 20th June last year and the contractors have undertaken to complete the Harbour in fifty months. At this stage, I have just remembered that the hon. senior member for the City asked me some questions and was anxious to have replies, but if I do not reply, I am sure the Minister has all the answers. It is quite untrue obviously to say that Messrs. Costain came here to do a job involving all that money without knowing where they were going to build. They sent people just as many other firms did, including a Dutch firm which later did not tender, to visit the site and knew exactly what they were asked to do. Messrs. Costain has undertaken to build the Harbour in fifty months and since the arrival of their engineers, work has proceeded at a steady pace, both at the Harbour and in the quarry. I should remind hon. members that the Consulting Engineers, Messrs. Coode and Partners have Resident Engineers and staff on the site, and their function is to ensure that Messrs. Costain construct the Harbour to the specifications laid down.

While as I said the hon. member will give detailed answers, let me say this: I was assured at the Colonial Office and by Messrs. Coode that the present contract covers every loophole which in the course of years they have found contractors might slip through. The present contract could not be more tightly drawn up in favour of Government. If they say they cannot afford to go on at this rate, we are entitled to levy on everything they have on the site, sell it if necessary and use that money to pay somebody else to finish the job, because it has been found - and I am not calling names - that one or two contractors, Continentals chiefly, have undertaken to do work - and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and myself saw it with our own eyes in the Gold Coast - and then discovered that they could not afford to do it at that price, so that this present contract covers Barbados completely; they would have to pay anybody or any additional money. I say that provisionally to answer the question of what sort of contract we have. We have an excellent contract which helps this Government and not the contractors to the same extent. Perhaps I should not put it that way, but I should say that if anything, it will come down on the side of the Government and not on the side of the contractors. The Government is informed that the work is proceeding according to schedule and the contractors are well pleased with the local labour that is being employed so far on the Harbour.

In January, Sir Eric Millbourn who has been advising Government on various aspects of the project, visited the site and expressed great satisfaction with the progress which he saw. We have endeavoured to engage the services

of a Port Manager and found somebody of that extensive experience in the Far East who is, in his profession, at the top of the ladder. Unfortunately, we are told that he has taken ill and would not be able to come, and now we have to try to get somebody else.

I must pay tribute, Mr. Speaker, to the Town Planning Advisory Committee set up under the Chairmanship of the Adviser of Development and Welfare for the advice and help they have given us in making recommendations concerning the lay-out of the Harbour and the access roads either to be created or widened. Hon members know that we intend that the Harbour should be an economic proposition, and we are continuing to watch the position so that unnecessary expenditure should not be incurred.

As regards other building, the Ministry of Transport and Civil Aviation in the United Kingdom has approved of our proposals for the Terminal Building at Seawell, and therefore we propose to get on with the job as quickly as possible. It is envisaged that it will be completed in twelve months. I think I am going to suggest to the Minister to have another look at this, because I am told that air traffic has increased so considerably that in spite of our building an extensive Terminal at Seawell, we may find ourselves in a few months' time with a building too small to handle. Already a review has been done, but it looks as though we might have to do a greater review. Hon. members will be surprised to hear that as many as 7,000 people have been handled in a month at Seawell. \$337,000 was included in the Development Plan for this building in 1956, but the expansion of the passenger traffic has made it necessary to review that plan. We have prepared a new plan for the Terminal Building, and, as I said, it is a good thing for Barbados to know that the passenger traffic has increased so tremendously that we have to envisage probably spending more. The Hon. Minister is very concerned about it and working very hard on it.

Hon. members will have something to bite into later on when we remind them that we have had to revise our views on Road Transport. I have never said that our fares would not be raised. What I did say was that I was not convinced in July, 1955 that it was necessary to raise fares. We have had these buses, almost as bad as the fifty American Destroyers, thrown at us and we have had to take them; we spent a lot of money keeping them on the road, repairing and so on. We are putting down a first class system with the new Leylands and Mercedes-Benz which we have already bought, and we consider that to pay \$25,000 for a bus to give the efficient service which we are now giving should make us revise our views about the fare and stage structure which is somewhat chaotic. The Minister will explain what we propose to do; we will have a stage structure which will be uniform; everywhere will be so many miles for so much money and so on. I said 'chaotic' in the sense that you are able to travel a mile for three cents and two miles for three cents on other roads. It is better naturally for everybody to feel when they pay so much money for fare that they are going the same distance as their brother in some other parish.

We have recently got six Leyland buses and that brings the Board's fleet of units to 32. The Transport Board has been carrying out a reorganisation of its administrative practices; it has been laying in a store of spare parts so that these diesel buses can be kept fully operative. As the result of this, it is patent to everybody that there is better road transport service today. 4.25 p.m.

With this increased cost which arose out of necessity in buying these new buses, we feel that now we have these figures before us and now that we have ourselves tried out some of the routes, we cannot go on with the old fares. Nobody wants to increase the cost of living to the general public, but no Government is justified in coming in here every three months to ask this House to vote say \$300,000 because the Transport Board dropped \$300,000.

I should like to deal at this stage a little with the loans for houses. We included in our present Five-Year Development Plan a half million dollars for loans for houses for public officers. Almost all of that money has

been exhausted and there has been yet a number of applications for Civil Service Housing Loans to be met. It would take 1.8 million dollars to meet applications for that purpose and we have made negotiations which have been successful with the Bank for them to lend us that money to meet all the outstanding applications of Public Officers at the present moment. It would be necessary for the borrowers to pay 4 1/2% on loans and provision is made in these Draft Estimates to make up the 6% which is the rate of interest which the Bank is charging. It is also the proposed policy of this Government to transfer the functions of the Public Officers Housing Loan Authority to the Housing Authority; that is to say, instead of having the Housing Authority and a separate one for the Civil Servants, we will now have one single authority. A Bill will therefore be brought into the House shortly to amend the 1955 Housing Loan Officers Act to give effect to that.

I hope the House will forgive me for going back to the Deep Water Harbour, as I omitted to state when dealing with that that the Consultant Engineer's recommendation in connection with the tenders for bulk sugar installation has been received and as soon as certain marginal details are set out, we hope to make an award in the near future; then we hope that the bulk sugar shipment would operate towards the close of the 1956 sugar crop.

I said just a moment ago dealing with the loans that I would like to make a statement and I hope it will prevent silly controversy from some hon. members of the Opposition. I am told that some people are almost being goaded into not paying back housing loans. That might be due to speeches at election time by candidates who wanted to get votes from the people, but I will like to state that if those people who have borrowed money for housing do not repay their housing Loans, there would be no money going into Revolving Fund, and it would prevent other people from getting a loan because there would be no Revolving Fund. The Housing Authority will continue its programme and will make a concerted drive to collect outstanding loans by some agricultural labourers. In spite of the bad advice by some people that the money is theirs and they should not pay it back, this Government must make a drive to get in the arrears so that borrowers may get the benefit of having the fund revolving.

Highway improvements continue to be made. Expanding them in many cases is essential and Government proposes to continue the widening of roads and the cutting off of corners and so on. As regards tenantry roads, many still remain to be done and the tenantry road programme will continue. I do not know whether it is more true of lawyers than of doctors that it is sometimes difficult to get into a certain district after rain to clients or patients, as the case may be, but I think people who drive around the country districts have seen a marked improvement in the state of tenantry roads in every parish.

The Development Board which began its operation in March last year has so far lent out \$308,000 to various enterprises. Such as for the development of a printing office at the Garrison among other things, and it has purchased a site at Grajettes at which it proposes to establish an industrial concern.

I do not think it is necessary to remind hon. members of the state of emigration, though I regret to say that I have only today received a letter which is not too hopeful about our emigration prospects.

As regards tourism, as hon. members already know, we propose to establish a Statutory Tourist Board and we propose to give the Board a minimum sum of \$150,000 to help it, if it helps itself. Too often this Government - not the past Government - has provided more funds than the merchants provided in this respect. We are willing to help; but it is their business and they must show a willingness to help themselves too.

I think hon. members would like to hear a little about food subsidies prospects. I think everybody in the Island knows by now that British Guiana failed to deliver all the rice they promised us and we had to buy rice outside which was about two-thirds of our requirements.

One hundred thousand bags are coming from Siam and as a result the price has increased. As a matter of fact, Siamese rice costs the same l.o.b. as that of British Guiana but naturally the longer hauls from Siam to here has increased the cost.

4.35 p.m.

We have decided to remove the subsidy from pickled pork and thereby save \$66,500, and to apply that subsidy for subsidising an additional 20,000 bags of brown crystal sugar. We are now subsidising 40,000 bags and that amount is said to be too small. Some shopkeepers are attempting to do a little mixing, and so on, and it is thought by the Government and by those who advise us that it is better to subsidise more brown sugar and take the subsidy off pickled pork, because we are subsidising local pork. It is better to encourage the Barbadian to corn his own pork, rather than put money into the pockets of the big Argentine pork sellers.

If hon. members will turn to paragraph 24 of the Memorandum on the Estimates, they will see what I do not propose to do now, because it has been done there for them a summary of the Estimates. It will be seen there that we are going to borrow \$10 1/4 million in the coming financial year. If hon. members will look at paragraph 25 of the Memorandum, they will get additional information which they must be hoping to get from me.

Mr. Speaker, I will soon end my Address by referring to the revenue side. We propose to introduce a Bill to amend the old 1754 Rate of Interest Act. I want my words to be carefully reported, accoustics or no accoustics, by the Press. We do not propose to have the amendment in such a way that local people will have to pay more than 6% interest which they have been paying over the last 200 years on loans for buying land. If the bank rate is raised to 7% and the bank will only lend at 7%, obviously, you would be asking people to break the law by charging 7% when they cannot charge 7%. I propose to get the Attorney General to put teeth in this Bill; any smart attempts to get money out of this country purporting to be money already borrowed abroad will meet with a gaol sentence. We have to safeguard these financial transactions over and over again; we have got to safeguard them just as we have had to make use of the Post Office to open letters in order to take out American currency and prevent it from leaving this Island. When we have a serious disease we must have a drastic remedy, and as long as the rate of interest in this Island for loans apart from the commercial banks remains at 6%, I do not see any hardship on people who today go to Solicitors and borrow money at 6%. We shall make such provision as to enable purely internal loans to be continued, but when we are told that the Colonial Development Corporation is prepared to put money in Barbados now, and by their charter they are bound to charge more than 6%, therefore, we cannot ask them to forget their charter and charge only 5%. However, we are not making any general rise in the rate of interest on loans.

As we have pointed out in the Memorandum, it has been our policy annually that, as far as we can, we will finance our capital works from our own reserves. The Deep Water Harbour, of course, is to be financed to a great extent from loans for which this generation and future generations will pay; but in order to make up for our depleted surplus, we will introduce certain taxation measures. We will avoid taxation which will affect the poor sections of the community. All we are asking people in the lower income groups to do, is to save as much money as possible in order that a Government loan might be put out in the Island of Barbados. We are asking the rich, the middle-class and the poor to invest money in their own country, but we have no intention of doing anything to make the poor man's food or his clothing any dearer than it is now. We are asking all classes in Barbados, because we have to swim or sink together, to avoid rash, reckless and luxurious expenditure and to invest money in their own country in order that we may continue to improve the present standard of living. We propose, therefore, not to change the income tax rates, but we propose as from today with effect from today, to raise the preferential and the general rates of duty on all spirits imported in this Island; we propose to make an

increase of \$3 a gallon which will give us \$120,000. It is not a great deal, it is true, but if you can afford to buy whiskey at \$6.50, you can afford to pay \$7 for it. The preferential and general rates of duty on cigarettes imported into the Island will be increased by 60 cents a pound which will give us \$21,000, which is not much, it is true. We are not taxing "Trumpeter" cigarettes, but if you want to smoke an imported cigarette, you have to pay a little more for it. As from tomorrow, your "Du Maurier" cigarettes will cost you more.

I should like to say at this stage, that the price of local cigarettes has gone up recently. The Government has had nothing in this Island to do with it. I give the warning now - I am not dogmatic on it because I have not talked it over with the Ministry or with the representatives of the industry; but if in some business in Bridgetown increases are made, not justified on the ground of higher trade rates or production costs, we will re-impose the system of price control which we have taken off. We have not increased the price of cigarettes; we have seen that in the Press, and that is all.

We have considered the question of imposing a tax on bachelors, but I have not yet had the chance of a discussion with the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. (Laughter). The Government with our depleted surplus and increased capital expenditure has seen fit only to tax those things as from today, things on which we feel people can afford to pay.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I have not wearied hon. members and I hope that, at the same time, I have covered every aspect of our Budget and have given a certain amount of detail which will be filled out by myself when my particular Heads are being dealt with in Committee and by other hon. members when their respective Heads are being dealt with in Committee.

4.45 p.m.

I think I shall make the usual motion because it is not proposed to go on with further discussion. I think that is the view too of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I think it is the view of the Leader of the Opposition that we should do as we have done before, that is, as is done in Great Britain, to make an initial introduction and leave it to the Opposition to prepare their reply for a further date.

I beg to move that this House go into Committee of Supply to consider the Estimates for this year. Some other member can move the adjournment of the debate.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not going to accept that proposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is the proposition of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. WALCOTT: He is not going to prevent me from debating this.

I am not concerned with the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please take this seat?

Mr. WALCOTT: If you allow that, you will be breaking the Rules of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot tell me what to do.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not telling you what to do, but I am saying that I am an elected member of this House.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Premier intimated, I beg to move that this debate be postponed. I have already discussed it with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and we have agreed that after the Premier has made his speech, we would postpone the debate until Thursday when further discussions can be carried on on the Estimates with Your Honour in the Chair.

I want it to be clearly understood that we have absolutely no intention to forestall anybody from speaking as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has intimated, because everybody knows that he talks all the time on things of which he knows nothing. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has agreed that after the Hon. Premier has made his speech, we will adjourn the debate until Thursday to discuss the Estimates, after hon. members has studied the speech made by the Premier.

I beg to move that this debate be postponed.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Now there are two motions before this House. A motion was made that this House go into Committee, and I am therefore speaking on that motion.

Since you have allowed the Hon. Leader of the House the latitude to say that I as an elected member speak on matters of which I know nothing, I would say quite politely to him that I know more about what I talk than he will ever know, and if he wants to challenge me, I challenge him to choose anything to show that his knowledge on matters debated in this House of Assembly surpasses mine. I am going to use my right; I am no member of the official Opposition, and any time any matter comes here, I am going to deal with it as I think fit.

I have given careful attention to what the Hon. Premier said, as I do not sleep in this House when the Government proposes any matter.

I am going to allow you to look at all the Parliamentary Procedures in May's and when you are finished you can let me know if I can proceed.

I think, Sir, that if you want an opportunity to study the Rules, you may intimate to me and I will make a motion for the Adjournment during which period you will have an opportunity to read them and come back and make a ruling; but it seems difficult for me to proceed when I cannot attract Your Honour's attention. I do not believe you intend to be impolite, but it is impolite if I am addressing the Chair for the Chair to be reading all the time. If Your Honour is impervious to the normal conduct of Parliamentary Procedure in that Chair should set an example, I will have to speak and ignore you.

The Hon. Premier in one of his statements said that as a result of the recent religious revival, more patients are applying to the Mental Hospital. It is no wonder that he has made that statement, because anyone who is so irreligious as he is would have the belief that religion has such a bad effect on people that it is likely to make people mad. That is the sort of person whom we have today dominating public life.

Those of us who have the opportunity of studying the budget, were very glad to see that at this stage our revenue has reached the figure of \$21,000,000, and the proposed expenditure for the year is \$20,429,378. On closer examination and from what has been stated, there is a proposal to increase the revenue of this colony by increasing the duty on spirits and on tobacco.

4.55 p.m.

It is not my intention at this stage to deal with the statement which has been made so far as this is concerned. What I am concerned about is the statement that the savings in Barbados have increased over the years. We are very glad to see that the savings have increased but what we are sorry about is that while the savings have increased, at the same time there has not been the corresponding increase in industrial development. A recent statement was made that people were investing their money outside of Barbados in order to escape the local interest rate legislation of 6% and that they were exporting sums of money from this colony to be invested abroad. What should be drawn to the Government's attention at this stage is the fact that people are willing to invest their money abroad and we should encourage those who control the Government to make it possible that these people invest that same money in Barbados. Unfortunately, Barbados has not received the encouragement which should be given for industrial development and even in this budget, there is a classic indication that all the amount which you envisage for your Development Board to spend is only half a million dollars. If it is your intention to really encourage industrial development, how can anyone seriously think that half a million dollars added to the Development Board can act as a stimulus to any investors who want to invest money in this island in this year? There are many views which you can adopt to act as a stimulus and, as stated by the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour last week, and which was repeated by the Hon. Premier in here today, that in view of the fact that our resources are not great, the question of industrialisation cannot be accelerated at a pace as has been suggested and as has been done in other places. The Hon. Premier was at pains to say that Professor Arthur Lewis has stated

that Barbados can be a territory in which industrialisation can take place owing to its stability and its labour force and owing to the other favourable factors. Professor Arthur Lewis said so in 1948. Ten years have past but what positive action has been taken to carry out his statement? The Development Board is not a Board with funds at its disposal. It is not a Corporation like the Colonial Development Corporation. It is not a Corporation like the Industrial Development Corporation in Puerto Rico. Therefore the same industrial pattern which has taken place in Barbados over the last 300 years is the same industrial pattern which is being allowed to take place now. In the Sugar Industry for instance, nothing is being done to make a by-product from sugar other than molasses and rum. That should be a study for any industrial development just it has been done in other countries where they use the megasse for making by-products. There is also the question of electricity, and in this island where the Government states that it has a housing policy, there is no point in the Government believing that all the houses which are needed in Barbados can be built by the Government. You should have a Development Corporation which would be able to encourage building societies for the purpose of helping people by the way of accelerating loans for people who have to build houses. That should be an aspect of development in a community such as Barbados. Building societies have proved to be successful in many parts of the world and there is no doubt that in Barbados where there is the tendency for people to build their own houses that the opportunity should be afforded such people who would like to obtain loans to build their own houses and that could be a stimulus not only for the people in the building trade but could be the means of providing more houses; and at the same time if there is any difficulty of obtaining rates suitable, the people would be able to obtain them at a level which would be appropriate to the living conditions in the community.

Sir, any of us who have paid any attention to these things in this island knows that at this stage of our own development we cannot develop the country if what is stated here today or previously is going to be the policy to be adopted, because if you adopt the policy that we are only a sugar producing colony and that policy is carried much further than it has been carried already, it would mean that at every stage we would not be able to support the ever-growing population of the colony and to give them the social services which should be given them.

Sir, it becomes necessary for us to look towards the future. We cannot escape looking at every possible avenue or development of this country. In these Estimates, the Capital Estimates have been inflated by the building of the Deep Water Harbour. Do not allow ourselves to be led away with the feeling that the \$13 million which have been stated here is all expenditure. If you look carefully you will see that \$8,800,000 is for the Deep Water Harbour. Why at this stage some White Paper is not written about the Government's real industrial policy? It should not be on the basis of your saying that you are getting money from tourism, or remittances, because even these remittances come back for various purposes. It cannot be taken that all remittances are income to the Island out of investments because very often, in recent years many people have been borrowing money to take them to the United Kingdom and some of them are sending back remittances to repay the loans they had.

5.05 p.m.

There was also a statement which was made and which was outside the context of this question of the Estimates. It was the question on which it was said by the Premier that he wanted to make clear to his friends and his enemies alike - I would be among the latter - on the question of Customs Union and Freedom of Movement, the stand which he intends to take on behalf of the West Indies. I do not think that anybody in this Assembly who understands the whole idea of Customs Union and Freedom of Movement, would begin to think that within the Federal structure any person could claim that Customs Union and Freedom of Movement should be postponed and that that is something for which any one person has to fight. What should be made clear and not allow unthinking Barbadians to believe is that Freedom of

Movement means some sort of industrial development, which is taken to mean that you are providing avenues for Barbadians to travel in search of employment. If anybody gives that impression, it is not only false, but dangerous. The question of Freedom of Movement is not on the basis of Barbadians looking for employment; you have your territory and you have Freedom of Movement in it, not on the narrow basis that you are moving in search of employment. You cannot say in Barbados that the purpose of Freedom of Movement is that you are going to find employment; you move within the territory, because it is a free territory. You have to move within the territory, but it is not like going to the United States of America. In that country, there is no question of moving from Philadelphia to New York, because there is movement; it is a part of the state and you have freedom of movement as of right. You have to show \$100 in order to go to Trinidad, and you cannot expect Trinidad to retain that. How can you have that? How can Trinidad or any other territory maintain any such stipulation?

On the question of Customs Union, you cannot have freedom of goods within the area without being subject to customs duty from one area to the other. What has not been explained is this; Customs Union will be on the basis of a common tariff on all the goods entering the area and you can see that that is going to be the problem. In Barbados, the approved estimate on customs and excise is \$8,670,000 and the revised estimate is \$9,400,000 of the anticipated \$20 million odd which Barbados is going to receive.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member addressing the Chair?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I was just answering a point here. Approximately \$9 1/2 million out of the \$20 million odd comes from customs and excise, and that gives an idea as to how much these territories depend on Customs duty. You can see here that the whole estimated amount of revenue is \$20 million and out of that, an estimated amount of over \$9 million comes from customs and excise; therefore, when you are dealing with Customs Union, we agree that these are the technical difficulties which are going to arise, not on the basis of trading within the area, but on the basis of what is going to be the common tariff. Any intelligent Barbadian must see that if Barbados has now, in these times, to depend on customs revenue, if the biggest Head of the Budget will come from customs revenue, then you will have to see that there is going to be a common tariff which will not deplete your own revenue to a substantial extent, because it would mean that you would have to look to other avenues for taxation; and it is not so easy to find other avenues of taxation when you have been taxing people from customs for, it may be, 300 years.

It is on the basis that when we speak about customs union, we must regard the fact that Customs Union will be divided into two sections - Freedom of trade within the area and what you will have as a common tariff. I believe that if that is put in its proper perspective there will be no question of people feeling that there will be one person advocating Customs Union and Freedom of Movement, because that would be in the Federation.

It is true that your annual Budget is only a part of your over all plan, and there will be certain basic things which you have to consider. My greatest comment on this Budget is not on the things which we have already decided, because we have decided on the question of the Deep Water Harbour, the question of housing, water supplies, medical supplies, education, agriculture and communications. Although the question of the bus service is not a good one, yet it is already a *fait accompli*. The emphasis is on what we should do to stimulate greater development.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I have tempted you to that position, but the Hon. Leader of the House has a golden opportunity, now that the Federal Elections are on, to go all over the Island and make the statement which he has just made. However, this is likely to be the last occasion on which I am going to have the opportunity of saying something on the Budget in this House. I am not saying that in any boasting way; I am saying so and even the Powers-that-be on the other side cannot pre-

vent the people from acting in the way in which they feel they should act.

5.15 p.m.

I do not want to give the impression that this freedom of movement would mean industrial development for us, because Barbadians are likely to create in the minds of Trinidadians and Jamaicans that we are not interested in developing our own country, but are only providing people to go to their country, or that they must make the development while we stay and only send people down. We do not want to give the impression that Barbados would not industrialise, and therefore with our growing population at the rate of 3,000 per annum, this is something which we must consider seriously.

I was very pleased to hear from the Premier that he realises the difficulty which we are facing with a growing population; but though he has said that, there is nothing that has come forward from the budget to show what they intend to do. Half million dollars is only a trickle and really cannot stimulate a climate for industrial development. The savings deposited outside this island in the last ten years are something colossal for a country of this size. The amount of money invested outside is something which we should put our minds to harness for industrial development. At this stage it is not a question of asking people to save more money; it is a question of asking them to invest more. Poor people do not have much savings, but I would say that if you cannot encourage people and create a climate for greater industrial development among your industrialists, you are in a very gloomy period. I would say that Government should not undertake to give the Development Board, but it should be reconstructed to suit these needs, and you should put at the disposal of the Development Corporation some more million dollars in order not only to give pioneer industries status, but to help them to go into the things which they find difficult to hold on to.

Take the classic example of the Electric Company; you are now saying that you are going to grant the Development Corporation the right to have a greater amount of money. 6% will not apply to these people nor to the Banks, and that is where you stultify your very development. I am not ready to open up the flood gates for people to charge a higher rate of interest, but look what you are doing to the people who have money. You are going to allow the Colonial Development to invest, because you are borrowing money from outside, and because of that they will have the opportunity of having more of their investments in Barbados which is discriminatory. You are going to discriminate and discrimination on that basis is going to be an injury to the people of Barbados, because you cannot spite the people who have money; you can spite a man looking for a job.

There is \$10 million in Colonial Development and in Nova Scotia Bank for investment purposes; C.D.C. can invest money in Barbados in a project at a higher rate of interest, but local people cannot do it. I am only pointing out the psychological aspect of it. Human nature is human nature all over the world. If a man has money to invest, you have to make it more favourable for him to invest, because the Bank rate in England has gone up and you can pass all the laws you like to say he cannot send it out; yet he will not invest it locally. This is no time, Mr. Speaker, to have restrictive measures on invested capital. You talk about India but I can lend you a book on the First Five Year Development Plan for India by Nehru. India has invested capital in projects which Barbados has to catch up on; they push money into schemes, and as you know the Indian economy is what they regard as a mixed economy, that is, mixed with co-operatives, private enterprise and Government. There are millions creating a sort of co-operative commonwealth within India on the basis of the type of economy which is evolving and which is different from that which exists in the West. So I do not favour the idea of the relaxation of the interest rates in Barbados as a general policy. If you are going to touch it all, you have to be very careful that you do not touch it and create a condition which is worse than if you had not. We have a standard local borrowing rate, and the amount of money which you have on deposit will represent a certain

amount; but if we have to lend more money than we have on deposit, it means we have to go outside and borrow; if we have to borrow from the London market, it means we have to charge 7%. The interest rate in the United Kingdom has stultified the amount of loans that can be made for industry in Barbados or the colonies, because if there is not enough money on deposit, the situation, Mr. Speaker, is that they cannot lend you at 6% if they are borrowing at 7%, so on that basis they find it difficult to make loans above what they have on deposit. If you say you are going to amend the Act to accommodate that situation, what is going to be the situation for yourself? That is why it is time that Government, if they put enough money into any Development Corporation, should be able to frame their policy in a general way and say "this is Government's policy;" and then that policy can work in the Development Corporation.

What could have been a better example for Government to set up a Corporation in than the bus service? You are not running the whole bus service; some private people are running part of it, but if you look at the capital which was used out of the Public Treasury for the purpose of transport, you could have set up a corporation and invite these people who want to run buses; you could put in 51% of the capital so that you would have the controlling share, and that would be a means of not spending as much as you have done now, because you would have got some of the people to do that. Public transport as you can see, Mr. Speaker, is something which the community depends on, and I cannot understand why as that was an example in which a public corporation could have worked, you did not work it. What has taken place is that you have a Transport Board, and though you have that there is nothing that deals with things under the Transport Board. I am thinking of having this broad Development Corporation vested with powers which can be of great assistance to this community, and I say that based on our years of experience.

5.25 p.m.

We have seen now, Sir, that in this year there is going to be a short crop and that the amount of money in circulation is going to be substantial. Not only is it going to be as substantial within the crop year, but it is going to be substantial in the out of crop year because the tendency here is that whenever you have a short crop, planters usually do a little drawing in of their expenditure. What you are going to find is that in 1958 there is going to be fewer dollars and in 1959 there is going to be less employment in the sugar industry. That is the main flow of our industry; so you can see with all that we are doing in so far as services, you must have industrial support to keep it up. We have heard today that of our new hospital would be started

this year, but when this hospital starts operating, it is not going to take you more than five years to find out that there are still going to be two people sleeping in a bed. Do you think that all of our hospital requirements will end with this new hospital. Because of all of that, it becomes necessary to look upon these matters in the light of taking every single opportunity to industrialise. I do not believe that it is as urgent at any period of our history as it is now, because with the question of Federation more money is being taken out of our own budget to go towards the Federation. I may say at this stage that I am going to Trinidad to the Federal Parliament and nobody can stop me.

On the question of regional planning, you must bear in mind that obviously we cannot talk only of regional planning because, as we can see, nine million dollars is not too much to plan for. But the planning which we have to think of is that of creating a climate here for industrialisation. Those of us who have travelled know that. Let us be quite frank about it. We still have to break down a lot of insularity among the islands and so far as Barbados is concerned, Barbados has not yet created an industrial climate; therefore, if we do not do it now and we are depending to start something when we enter the Federal set-up, do not believe that it is going to be done for you in that set up.

I see something like it every day. I will give you an example, Mr. Speaker. This morning I was speaking

on behalf of workers who have been laid off at foundries. If I may show you how serious it is: a man knows a trade at a foundry here. It has now come to a point where you teach a man to be a fitter or moulder and then you say you are treating him the same way as if he were a man sweeping your yard. Do you realise that at the two foundries which we have here, members of the Trade Union body had to be seriously discussing the question of men who are laid off and who are employed on the basis of only 20 to 22 weeks in a year? Those people are tradesmen. That is a position in which you have to see whether you can make arrangements to give employment at a full level. Some factory owners say that they can buy in Great Britain the things they get from the foundries at a cheaper price. If they can get these things at cheaper prices outside, then you will have more unemployment at your doorstep. You will have to think seriously of rationalising your policy. It should not be a question of asking an employer to buy a thing here at higher prices. We as a community must realise that when you have a situation in which you manpower which is semi-skilled cannot have full employment because the things which they turn out can be had at a cheaper rate outside, then you have to think of giving those sources some encouragement. You will have to review the situation in order that you can keep these people employed yearly; if not, it will rebound at you. I brought that as an example, Mr. Speaker, in trades where there is no fluctuation and where there is not the normal vagaries of the weather. This is a position where you can see that there is a question of your encouraging these things. Therefore, I am suggesting that that is just an example of what I have before my mind. Sir, I meet these things daily in my work and it on that basis that I feel all aspects of industry and trade should be studied.

Now, Sir, it is difficult for anyone in my position to suggest that you should do this or that. It is difficult for me to say what you should do about Customs or about tariffs and trade; these are things which call for examination to prevent something which is likely to be of a danger to the community. All I say is that in Barbados you cannot afford to have more people unemployed.

Now, the Hon. Premier made a statement about the Deep Water Harbour and the general effect it is going to have on trade. We feel that the Deep Water Harbour is necessary not on the basis of the effect it is going to have on trade, but on the basis that you have to be in a world with things that you must have. A Deep Water Harbour is just the same to you as your airport. However, you cannot lose sight of the fact that there are going to be fewer people employed. There are going to be more people unemployed because Government proposes to have a bulk installation at the Deep Water Harbour pier, and that bulk installation is going to mean that produce porters would be unemployed and that fewer lighters would be used. You would have a few barges, but that is all; and the Government is not in a position to say what are the likely numbers to be affected by this.

5.35 p.m.

Even a dole, a provident Fund or pension cannot take the place of employment, because it means that you are still out of employment. You are not gainfully employed and your talents are not producing any benefit in the community. You are receiving what you are not putting into the community by your effort. It is a fact that we are building a Deep Water Harbour and we have to think of other things today; how are you going to take up the slack from the labour force which will be looking for work? Those who have gone in are coming out, and the ones who are looking to go in cannot go in, and therefore, you have this collision taking place; you have a two way traffic. In facing this situation, it becomes necessary for us to study other avenues of industrial development. It has been drawn to my attention that there is some money in Barbados for industrial development, and therefore, every effort should be made to have that money invested and every encouragement should be given to people in this direction.

I believe that at this stage with the surpluses shown and the things which are taking place, the Government should not be unwilling to bend over backwards, so to speak, in order to create a climate in which people

who have money to invest will feel that they can invest it here, with the Government co-operating with the investors from the point of view of lifting up our industrial development on the basis of employment. You have Public Works, but you must remember that Public Works in themselves do not create the sort of capital works which should go on from time to time. You build a Hospital, but it takes something else to keep it going; and so with a School. No intelligent person in the world would say that you should not build your Hospital or your schools, because one of the bedrocks in the development of any country is your school. I am drawing this analogy; we build the Technical Institute at Richmond and what is going to be the position when you erect this school and you find that the people who go there for that type of training find that they cannot get enough employment in Barbados from a situation in which nothing has been done to harness it? The Trade Union had to come in with a plea to guarantee 30 hours' work when people cannot get 45 hours' work. The situation has become so serious that we have to make a guarantee for minimum hours of employment, because the employers say that they do not have the work with which to supply the people. I come up against these things and you can well understand the amount of frustration there is when you are in that position. There are a number of people who, when they reach a certain stage in a certain trade, feel that they should go to the United Kingdom.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why I could not accept what has been proposed this afternoon - I said from last week that as a member of this Chamber, I undertake to look at these things in the light in which they appeal to me. In so far as what has been put forward by the Leader of the Opposition, I say that the Leader of the Opposition speaks for members of his party; he does not speak for me.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If I may crave the indulgence of the House to make a point which I should have made when I was on my feet, I am asking leave to make that point and be not restricted from replying at the end of the debate. I should have made it quite clear that in raising capital, we intend to introduce legislation at an early date to enable the interest on any loan to be raised locally by the Government to be entirely exempted from the payment of income tax when the bonds are the bona fide ownership of persons not resident in the Island. That is what Great Britain is doing this year. We have been advised that people who come in from Canada and other places would leave money down here and invest it if they were sure that they would not have to pay income tax on the interest on their bonds. That is being done for non-residents and we are going to do it here.

The question that the further debate on this motion be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

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

Mr. F.G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I find myself in some confusion as to what the Government should do at this particular period. At one time they suspend the sitting of the House and at another time, they move the adjournment of the House. I do not follow that.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

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

Mr. F.G. SMITH: I beg to move that this sitting of the House be suspended for half an hour.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: You cannot do that; you are not a member of the Government. (A MEMBER: Any member can move the suspension of the sitting.)

SUSPENSION

Hon. M.E. COX: I beg to move that this sitting of

the House be suspended for half an hour.

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

The question that this sitting of the House be suspended for half an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Speaker suspended the sitting accordingly.

5.45 p.m.

On Resumption.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour; to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

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. 70

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to take charge of this Resolution standing in the name of the Hon. Premier.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to take charge of the Resolution standing in the name of the Hon. Premier, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave was granted. Head 3 was called.

Hon. M.E. COX: The note to Head III, Item 8 - Incidentals, explains that "Supplementary provision of \$ 420 is required under Item 8 - Incidentals to meet the additional cost of maintenance of accounting machines, the provision of which did not cover a full year, the rental of a typewriter for temporary use in the Accountant General's Department and increased charges in respect of electricity."

I beg to move that Head III, Item 8, Incidentals stand part.

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

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

Head XXV - PUBLIC WORKS was called.

Hon. M.E. COX: The note explains the position quite fully, and I do not know if it is necessary to read it. I think it is pretty straightforward.

I beg to move that Head XXV - Public Works stand part.

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

Mr. F.G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I want to draw to the attention of Government which calls itself socialist, that appearing throughout the Estimates and throughout this Resolution you find this phrase "caused by the increase in the rates charged for electricity." I hope that these words will impinge themselves on the minds of hon. members over there. This phrase offends me to think that the Electric Company charge what they like and the taxpayers have to pay for it.

Hon. M.E. COX: I think the hon. member will appreciate that these rates were raised after the Estimates were laid in the House last year, and therefore we have to pay them for now. After this financial year, it might not be necessary to come with these Supplementary Resolutions, because we have already provided for the increase in the 1958-59 Estimates.

Mr. F.G. SMITH: I am not quarrelling with the Resolution. All I am saying is that as a socialist Government you have to introduce Supplementary Resolutions

to pay for an organisation which should be publicly owned.

Mr. GODDARD: I should remind the hon. member that they have not nationalised the bus service and they are about to increase the fares; so when Government takes over these things, you are going to get increases just the same.

The question that Head XXV - Public Works stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXVI - PENSIONS was called.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Head XXVI stand part, Item 3 deals with Police and Fire Brigade pensions and gratuities and Item 6 - Public Pensions and Gratuities.

I should like to say at this stage, as I know hon. members may want to raise the question of increased pensions to Government pensioners, that the delay in coming to the House for increased pensions for those who have retired is no fault of the Government. I say that now because I know from time to time I have seen reports in the Press, some of which I regard as nonsensical, which more or less try to infuriate the minds of pensioners. Perhaps some are written by the pensioners themselves. I read one referring to me at one time as saying that pensioners would be prepared to vote for my colleague but for me if we were to have another election; but I would like to say here and now that a vote is the right of an individual, and that individual has the right to cast that vote in whatever direction he likes and for whom he likes. If I am satisfied that I am doing something that is right, I have no fear because in this political life, after one has been elected, he does not always maintain all the friends that may have elected him in the first place; he may lose some of those friends; but equally so, some of the enemies which he had at that time will become his friends. So we can appreciate the set up as it is.

I have always been a strong supporter of increasing pensions especially to those who receive such small pensions every month. It was not at all due to this Government that many of them received very small pensions, but rather to the Government of that day who paid very small salaries and wages in order that they might hoard up something from one generation to another. Government has been for some time now working out these pensions. I am sure, Sir, that the Auditor General's Department is going full blast and trying to collect all the names of those pensioners, trying to find when they retired and how many years they put in, and it is the intention of this Government to have what can be considered as a minimum pension. In other words - I do not want to be quoted as accurate, but - suppose a man was getting \$3, maybe, after he has served ten years on a very small wage; Government feels that \$3 is nothing to a poor fellow like that and is working out a pension with a view to fixing a minimum pension so that a man will not get less than \$X; and then, from there on, you can attach your percentage basis accordingly. I say that now, so that members who will speak will understand what Government is doing; but I want to assure you that it is no fault of ours that we have not yet been able to come to this House and say we want \$X to pay these people. Very detailed work is involved in getting the number of pensioners, when they retired, and how many years of service they put in. The Auditor General, I said, has been working on it for some time. Only about three or four weeks ago we held a meeting and thought that everything was finalised, but we were up against a few snags which had to be solved. That is why, I repeat, we have not been able to come to this House with a Resolution to pay these pensioners the increase which Government intends to give them. It is Government's intention to increase just as we have increased in the case of salaries, and as in the past when salaries were increased we gave a percentage increase to pensioners, it is our intention to give an increase now to pensioners, but everything is being worked out. I say that so that members will know what Government is doing. But, again I say, it involves quite a lot of work, and I hope that before the financial year is ended we will be able, in a week or

two to come down (A VOICE: Before elections!) The member knows me too well. I say what I believe is right and take the consequences. (A VOICE: Wouldn't that be before elections?) It might not be before elections because if a Resolution is brought in, it has to be laid, and for the benefit of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, it has to be circulated and he has to have a dream before it is debated; otherwise he would be prepared to raise the matter on the floor of the House. I want our position to be made clear and I hope that will suffice members that it is not a dead issue, but it is being pursued with the hope of getting it here as soon as possible.

I beg to move that Head XXVI - Pensions, stand part.
6.30 p.m.

Hon. F.E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. F.G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Opposition welcome the assurance given by the Hon. Leader of this House that this matter which has been long overlooked by the present Government is receiving their immediate attention. The Opposition feels very strongly - we may be wrong that this matter of increases for pensioners is a matter which should have received Government's consideration and should have been brought down to this Chamber already. However, we do welcome the assurance given by the Government that this matter would come down in the immediate future.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I do know that, when you are dealing with a matter of this sort, it takes some time, and I have never had any doubt as to the Government's intention in connection with this matter of giving some sort of consideration to its pensioners who had retired. I do remember the Hon. Premier saying sometime ago that they had to go into the matter and it was difficult, because they wanted to make sure that people who were in receipt of handsome pensions would not be drawing full cost of living bonuses. In reply just now, the hon. Leader of the House said that they propose to give this cost of living bonus or some other emolument and that the Auditor General was going through the List. It does take a long time and I know that; but, however, I feel I am absolutely correct in saying that unless you are running something very badly or something is going on which is very lop-sided, you should be able at a glance, within two hours, to know how many pensioners they are and what they are getting. That information should be supplied to the Hon. Premier or the particular Minister's office within two hours if the proper records are kept; and I am sure that there must be a proper record kept in order to tell how many pensioners there are who draw pensions. I never had any opportunity of doing any mathematics, but I am sure I would take this matter up and give it to you in a month correctly. I personally think that you can arrive at it quite easily.

I appreciate more than anything else that it is going to be the Government's policy to give a minimum pension. I take the Hon. Leader of the House to mean a minimum pension in respect of years of service. What he stated may create a false impression. All I would warn is that before you can do that you have to be very careful. It is not just your giving a minimum pension; it means a minimum for a number of years. I am very glad to hear that; and if I have the honour to be knocking around in Local Government, I would see that a similar thing is done to Local Government pensioners.

The Hon. Leader of the House said that it would come down within two weeks. I am sorry he did not say within a week. As long as you are in the Opposition, it is always the desire of the people who want to get something done or want something questioned. (A VOICE: To come to the Minister.) Oh no! to a member of the Opposition. As soon as you become a Minister, you become a diehard. As a matter of fact, I am going to quote the hon. senior member for St. Michael. He actually said that it is the duty of the Government to conserve, as far as the Government is concerned. On another occasion when it might suit him to say so, he would take the word "conservative" and twist it around. It is a fact that as

soon as you occupy any office in Government, you become a Conservative; it is your duty to conserve. How can you very well say, "let us have increased pensions" because somebody comes along and say so? I am always faced with that sort of thing; therefore I know what it is to be faced with that sort of thing. I will put it in a broader way. You cannot very well say; "Yes; I know the cost of living is hard on you; therefore I am going to give you a 50% increase." I can imagine hon. members on the other side campaigning for a seat in the Legislature and saying that sort of thing, but not when they get into the House. (A VOICE: We do not make false promises.) When you say that, that is only a statement which you made, but which you could not carry out. However, you are administering Government and you have to go into these things carefully. In counsel to you is that you are taking a very long time on the matter; but whatever you do, I am hoping that within a few weeks you will come in with something to give pensioners an increased and retrospectively as from 1st April, 1957, because I feel that a great number of these pensioners owe shopkeepers. I know of a retired post man who had put in 44 years' service who was only drawing \$9 a month. I say that you should give them retrospective pay as from April, 1957, because I have a full sense of my responsibility. As you ought to know, I am in sympathy with you as anybody else in this country, and I believe I am more in sympathy with you than hon. members over there. I am suggesting to you, when you come down with this Resolution for increased pensions to Government pensioners, do not just bring it down as from the day it passes the Legislature, but let it be retrospective as from 1st April, 1957. I am suggesting that they get it retrospectively just as employees of the Government. Sir, I am supporting the passing of this item and I hope as regards the statement which the Hon. Minister has made in respect of this matter, although he has taken umbrage in saying that it would come down in two weeks, that he will bring it down in a week. 6.45 p.m.

It must be done, and we should get it done before the Estimates are finished.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who has just sat down makes these statements, putting something in the Government's head to do, which is something that the Government cannot do. How could he expect the Government to bring down this matter from April, 1957, when salaries were increased from April 1956? Mr. Godsall's Report gave the salaried people increases from April, 1956, and is the hon. member suggesting that these pensioners should get their increases as from 1957? Why should they have to wait for a year longer than the other people.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The hon. member knows well enough that what I meant by that statement is that these people should be given their increases on a basis similar to that on which Government employees have been given their increases. Even if I said that they should be given these increases from 1957, I meant from 1956. The hon. member knew that I meant that, but he wanted to bite somebody this afternoon, and I am coming next. (Laughter)

Mr. WALCOTT: What I want to point out is the retrospective date, which should be 1956. However, I rose to point out what the reason which has been given us is something different from the Hon. Leader of the House is saying today. The Hon. Leader of the House is saying today that we should not blame the Government, but the previous statement was that the Government is not bringing down this matter until they are satisfied that they are not going to pension anybody at the top.

The question of this matter being debated is the policy of the Government. Are you suggesting that this matter will take the Government 15 months to deal with it? This present Government, has been in power last session the period is from the 18th December, 1956 - so that this matter was in operation as something which they were considering.

The Hon. Minister did not realise the point raised by the hon. senior member for the City. When you look at

the Estimates on page 167, you will find the list of people added on. We are not asking the Government to increase the pension of the Chief Justice which is \$548 a month. We are not asking then to increase the pension the Minister Without Portfolio who is getting a total of \$1,180 a month; What we are asking them to do, is to look at these pensioners who were on pension prior to 1956, and if there is any difficulty in estimating what these pensions will be, then it is difficult for the Government to get any thing done. Are you suggesting that where there is a pension list, that that is not known? You do not pay people pensions by guess. We are not going to accept from the Government that it is difficult to get at the pensions. When we hear the hon. member say that when you lose friends you get some more, we are glad to hear him say that, because that applies to all of us.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, there is very little that I want to say especially when the Hon. Leader of the House has made all the points in favour of the Government. It is easy for the hon. senior member for the City to know exactly how many pensioners we have. Some people may get \$10 a month as a pension, because their salaries were very poor, and they may have been receiving a pension long ago. Others may have stayed there for so short a time, that they may only be getting \$20 a month, but when they go to Madagascar, Mauritius, elsewhere, they get so much and so much a year; and it would be difficult, as the Hon. Leader of the House has said, to keep an account of them. If it were a question of vote catching, we could have come down with this matter a week or so before the elections; but the Auditor General has pointed out that it is very difficult to get at this matter. I do not think that the hon. senior member for the City is right in saying that we twisted the meaning of the word "Conservative". The Conservatives twisted it themselves; sometimes, it is "conservative", sometimes it is "progressive conservative" and sometimes it is the "Barbados National Party". I have heard that they are going to change it again before the next election. (Laughter).

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

HEAD XXIX - MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services - was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the notes to this Head explain the position very clearly. (I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule.)

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

The question was put and agreed to.

HEAD XXXIII - CIVIL AVIATION

Head XXXIII - Civil Aviation - was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: As to this Head, again, the note is very explanatory. I beg to move that Head XXXIII stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that The Resolution or the sum of \$226,680 do now pass.

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

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

6.55. p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1957-58, No. 72.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is for the sum of \$51,652.

Head XIV - JUDICIARY was called.

Hon. M.E. COX: The note to Head XIV - Judiciary, Item 25 explains that vouchers for the sums of \$240 and \$160 due to the Revising Officer and to Clerical Assistance respectively as salary payments for the months of February and March, 1957, were not submitted at the end of the last financial year. We have been for some time trying to get not only Government

Departments but firms which deal with Government to send in vouchers before the end of the financial year; but this is slightly different. We always try to get in these vouchers around the 15th of the month in order that the money can be paid out by the end of the financial year; but you will see from this note that they were not submitted at the end of the last financial year, as there was some doubts as to the emoluments to which the Revising Officer was entitled under the provision of Section 17 of the Vestries (Qualification and Registration of Voters) Act, 1950, as well as under those of Section 66 of the Representation of the People Act, 1955.

I beg to move that Head XIV - Judiciary, stand part.

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

Mr. F.G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I welcome this Resolution, especially Item 47. I should like to find out from the Hon. Leader of the House when the Court is likely to be opened, because you will appreciate that the people in St. Andrew are forced to go to Bissex; that is a drag both of energy as well as shoe-sole. I see here that \$15 is required to provide stationery for the new Court at Belleplaine. To me that seems very small amount for a Court that must necessarily start without books, but I suppose the Minister will tell me that they will get the Fees and Fines Books which may be kept at some other Court. \$15 is a very small amount, because occasionally Counsel borrow foolscap to take notes on evidence when they have run out.

Under Item 47 an amount of \$12 is required for the payment of a cleaner for the new Court at Belleplaine St. Andrew at the rate of \$4 per month. The provision is for three months only, January to March, 1958. This is a very small amount for the person who is to be employed. It is true it is a small Court and I do not think it would take very long to be swept, but I still feel that \$4 per month is small for a woman who must clean this Court twice or maybe three times a week and four four weeks that would be twelve days for this small amount. I do not see how I can support the paying of \$4 per month to one of my constituents. I welcome the idea of appointing a cleaner, but I would be failing in my duty as a representative of that parish, if I condoned the payment of \$4 per month; and of course, it should also be in relation to the amount paid to other cleaners from other Courts. I do agree that the Court at Belleplaine is unlikely to be sitting every day, but at least if it sits twice a week, that is eight days per month and this amount would work out at 50¢ per day - which could not be fair to a woman who has to push tables and chairs around and possibly scrub. I cannot support that as it stands.

I welcome the idea of knowing that the Court will be opened, but I would like to know from the Minister how he arrived at the figure of \$4 per month for cleaning the Court at Belleplaine.

Mrs. BOURNE: Like my colleague, I think even if it is a part-time job, this is a very small amount. I should like to draw the Governments' attention to the fact that the Court is not yet opened and it is not strange to go near and see that the glasses are smashed; there is scarcely a window that is not smashed. This may not have been done, Mr. Chairman, by my constituents, but by the children. The Community Centre is quite near to the Court, and I do not know whether when the boys are playing cricket the ball strikes the windows. I am drawing to Governments attention, therefore, that they would have to make provision to replace the windows before the Court is opened. I have been trying to find out who takes care of it, but nobody can tell me though it has been there for quite a few weeks.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, irrespective of whose constituency it is, that is material. What matters is that there can be no justification even for a part-time wage or a part part-time wage of \$4 per month, and I would counsel the Hon. Leader of the House to give us some more information, which I know he will pass on, before pressing for us to vote this amount, because how will it appear for this House to go down on record as voting a salary of \$4 a month for a cleaner? That is not even a pension; that is nothing at all. I am not blaming anyone at the moment but I will suggest to the hon.

member that that needs further explanation before we can be asked to pass that amount. Wherever it is, even in St. Andrew, we cannot vote for it. I thought there was some mistake when I first read it for \$4 a week or \$14 a month, but it cannot go down that we are paying a part time salary of \$4 a month, and we should not pass it unless we have more information; otherwise, I definitely cannot support it, whatever happens. I see no reason why the hon member should not agree to have that item postponed until he gets more information. I know that the particular member who is in charge of this is not one of those Ministers who likes to show stubbornness or obstinacy, and it is known that he will listen to reason at times, and I think a word to the wise is sufficient. We cannot let this go down on record, because it would make us the laughing stock of the Caribbean that we are solemnly passing a vote to pay someone \$4 a month.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I have not got the file here to give all the information, but if I remember correctly, this question was raised some time ago. It was explained then that these cleaners are being paid so much and so much per square foot, which is the rate paid to all cleaners; those who work in Bridgetown, St. Lucy, St. John., St. Joseph and all over the place. As the hon. senior member for St. Andrew said, this is a small place and I doubt whether it requires cleaning more than once a week, because this is a sort of alternative Court for St. Andrew. This does not replace the Court at Bissex, but to accommodate cases of people in St. Andrew.

7.05 p.m.

I promise the hon. member that I will go into it very carefully again; but I must remind you that in the God-sall Report, these rates were also revised and provision was made for this. Anyhow, I would go into it again and report at some future date.

Mr. GODDARD: It is a ridiculous thing to pay a man four dollars a month, even if he is employed part-time. There should be a minimum for which you should work, and then of course you should pay so much per square foot. This seems very ridiculous indeed. Is it paid fortnightly or weekly? Just \$4 a month! It makes bad reading and if you are employing a person on a part time basis, there should still be a minimum to that. Do you know that is going to be the result of this? Somebody is going to complain about it and then they will be told that they are paid the handsome sum of \$4 a month.

Mr. BRANCKER: I know in cases where payment is not more than \$4 a month, not one of those people can afford new suits. Therefore, I cannot see my way to support it in the absence of any further information and in the absence of any information from the Trade Union members of this Chamber who are unfortunately absent. As the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said, it reads badly.

Mr. F.G. SMITH: I just want to say that at present the Police Courts of District "F" caters to the two parishes of St. Andrew and St. Joseph and the Police Magistrate sits there at least twice per week. No legislation has been brought down to regulate how often the Police Magistrate must sit, what cases are to be heard at the Belleplaine Court or anything like that. Presumably, all cases from St. Andrew would be heard at the Belleplaine Court and all cases from St. Joseph will be heard at Dist. "F". Is the Hon. Minister in a position to say whether more cases come from St. Joseph than from St. Andrew? I do not know. In the absence of legislation to that effect it may require a cleaner to clean this place more than once per week; therefore I would have to divide the House on this matter unless the Hon. Minister is conciliatory and postpone this.

Hon. M.E. COX: If the hon. member looks at the Draft Estimates which is before us, he will see on page 53 in respect of Item 53, Education, Cleaning, the note: "to provide for the part time employment of cleaners of buildings and grounds at Primary and Secondary Modern Schools. Provision to meet cost of cleaning at three cents per sq.ft and major upkeep of grounds." That explains the matter.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee divid-

ing as follows:-

Ayes: Mr. Speaker, Hon. M.E. Cox, Hon. D.D. Garner, Hon. R.G. Mapp, Hon. F.E. Miller, Mr. Holder, Mrs. Bourne, Mr. Thorne, Mr. Searles and Mr. T.W. Miller - 10.

Noes: Mr. Goddard, Mr. F.G. Smith and Mr. Brancker - 3.

HEAD XX - EDUCATION

Head XX, Education, was called.

Head XX, Education, was called

Hon. M.E. COX: I beg to move that Head XX stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, as to the Item, Examination Expenses, the note observes that the increase in expenditure is due to the increased number of candidates entered by grant-aided Secondary Schools, increase in the entrance fees payable to the Oxford and Cambridge Examining Board and the increase number of candidates entered for the local First Grade and Second Grade Exhibition Examinations. Now, Sir, as you know, the Government is still making provision for paying the entrance fees for the examinations of pupils in grant-aided secondary schools. I am contending, as I have so often contended, that so long as Government has not provided secondary schools for all the children, it is also the duty of the Government in the case of examination candidates of the Private Secondary schools to accept the responsibility of paying their examination fees. You cannot get into Harrison College, the Lodge School or Queen's College, and Private Secondary Schools are established in order to cope with that demand because, as I have said, the Government is not providing enough Secondary Schools to meet the demand. How then could it be possible or be fair for the pupils of these private secondary schools to have to pay examination fees? This has been raised several times and it is a matter which the Government should not treat with indifference. As I look at the hon. senior member for St. John whom the public regards as the de jure Minister of Education, I feel he will give this Committee the benefit of his opinion on the matter. Does he not agree that it is the duty of the Government to provide for the examination expenses of pupils of the private secondary schools just as the Government looks after the examination and entrance fees of the pupils of the Grant-Aided Secondary Schools?

Hon. members will remember that not long ago the Hon. Premier looked at the Combermere School as a private School. If that is so and it only has a Governing Body, so is the Modern High School, the Barbados Academy and such schools; and inasmuch as there is not enough room for children of these schools in the grant-aided secondary schools - and they are entitled to secondary schools - why should their parents be further burdened with having to pay the examination entrance fees? I do not say that they should be entered willy-nilly for as many subjects as they like.

7.15 p.m.

My point is that they should have an efficient Department of Education to satisfy themselves that the entrants from these private schools have a reasonable chance of success, because they are not under the supervision of the Department. The Government should have the fees of these pupils paid, or if the parents are still required to "rake and scrape" in order to enter their children for the examinations, at least in the case of all of those who get through, the Government should refund to those parents, the monies which they have paid in order to enter their children for these examinations. It is not their fault if the children do not get into these grant-aided schools. If you want a first Grade School to which to send a boy, you go to the Lodge School or Harrison College, and if you want a second-grade education, you go to the Combermere or Coleridge-Parry School. In the case of a girl, it is Queen's College as a first Grade School or the Alexandra as a second grade school. People send their children to the private school, because they have not been accepted in any one of the grant-aided schools.

I would commend to the hon. senior member for St. John the idea that he cogitate over the matter and let him put it to the proper authority until such short time as he himself might become the proper authority in matters of education. Just as he represented them with dignity at the U.C.W.I. in Jamaica, I am sure that in this matter he can also make recommendations and try to persuade members of the Cabinet, recalcitrant as they may be, that it is absolutely necessary that the examination fees of these children who get through their examinations and who are from the private secondary schools, be refunded to the parents even if the Government is not prepared to pay the entrance fees of those who have decided to sit. There are not as many children from these schools as there are from other schools, and it is the duty of the Government to provide education for all children who want to and who will benefit materially from it. You should not say that these children should not be sent to these private schools when you do not provide a sufficient number of secondary schools. I want to say that if Combermere School is a private School as the Hon. Premier has said not so long ago, then so are the Barbados Academy and the Regent High School.

Mr. F.G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am interested to discover if some of the money which we are asked to vote today is due to the increased number of candidates who have entered for the local First and Second Grade Exhibitions. That in itself betrays the fact that there is a thirst for higher education among the population of this country. Whatever the Government may say, they have not built in this country during the time that they have been in power, one additional secondary school. I defy the Hon. Minister of Education to deny that. They have rebuilt the Foundation School; they have rebuilt the Alleyne School, but they have not, in the entire time during which they have been in power, built one additional school. That is something of which the Government should be ashamed; in the time that they have been in power, they have not added to Barbados, in order to show their interest in education, an additional secondary school to what they have inherited from the Conservatives. They have rebuilt a lovely place to accommodate more children, but what has the Labour Government done to leave behind them in the form of a secondary school, which was not in existence previously, to show that they have been interested in education? That is something to be ashamed of especially in an age when you have increased the standard of living of the masses and they are crying out for higher education; even the man on the waterfront is trying to give his children the education which he himself did not have.

At least the Government should have built one secondary school in addition to those which they have inherited from the Conservatives to mark their existence in power and their interest in the working classes. You are seeing that the working class man is entering his child for more First and Second Grade Exhibitions. I do not like to compare Barbados with Jamaica, but Jamaica's goal is free secondary education, as the hon. senior member for St. John can tell you, if he went to Jamaica and took an interest in things educational. This year alone, Jamaica awarded 1,500 scholarships to secondary schools in the Island. In a talk which I had with the Jamaica Minister of Education, I gathered that they intend to go on to increase that number progressively from year to year. I would like to see the Socialist Government in power, even although they find it impossible with their limited resources to grant free secondary education in view of their capital expenditure - I would like to see them grant more scholarships in this country. I would like to see more scholarships to secondary schools in this Island granted by the Government in power. Of course, you have every excuse this year for granting more scholarships; you can call them Federation Scholarships and I would prefer to see more scholarships granted than fireworks going up in the air. I would prefer to see the Government provide something which would result in the attainment reached by the Premier and His Honour the Speaker: but of course, secondary education is no criterion of ability; you may go out and study and still you may not attain what is

desired.

I would like the Government to mark this year of Federation by granting more scholarships to the people of this colony. I am asking the Government to build a new secondary school, to see that before they go out of power by 1961 (Hon. M.E. COX: What?), they would have added a secondary school which was not there before they came into power. Generations would then be mindful of the little contribution which they have made and they would pass and say: "This is the only thing the Labour Government did when it was in power." 7.25 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, no doubt we will have to support this but this is just the opposite to what they term socialism. In June three of my children will be taking the Oxford and Cambridge Certificate, and I do not have to pay one cent. In June, my servant's child will be taking the same certificate, but she has to pay; and a Socialist Government is in power! My maid whose child will take the School Certificate will have to borrow and bum; (A VOICE: You will give her the money!) That will happen because she is working with me and I am not like the bums of the Government; I give. Let us be serious about it. For the twelve years that I have been arguing that all the time, and every time I speak on this matter I have to look at the hon. senior member for St. John. I would like him to say whether I am wrong, Party or no Party.

You come with this Resolution for this money and the Addendum states that "the increase in expenditure is due to the increased number of candidates entered by grant-aided Secondary Schools, increase in the entrance fees payable to the Oxford and Cambridge Examining Board, and the increased number of candidates entered for the local first grade and second grade exhibition examinations."

Would it surprise the Hon. Leader of the House that a few private schools who set up Science laboratories and who offer children for certain subjects have been told to bring everything, even a very towel, because Government would not be providing for them? My colleague on my right has a son at Lodge School; he can pay for forty children; I can pay for mine and they can walk into the Harrison College Laboratory and take the examination and everything is provided for them; but the bare-footed boy from St. Philip or from St. John whose mother works in the field and who has to get a pair of shoes to come to town, because he cannot get into Harrison College, Combermere or some other Government School, must bring everything to use in the Government Laboratory or otherwise he cannot take the examination! This is something serious, and something which I have been preaching all the time as being wrong. I should like to hear the Hon. Speaker on this. I am pulling you out one by one. We know that ability is not confined to any class, social or otherwise.

People have sent their children to Mr. Batson's School to the Washington, to Lynch's Secondary School, to the Modern and other private secondary schools because the Government cannot provide accommodation for any more children. The least you could do therefore is to pay the fees for examination. They can take the examinations, but their parents must find the money because they were not fortunate to get into the Government aided schools. It is not because they do not have the ability, but because it is the survival of the fittest. When the Entrance Examination to Harrison College is being held, four hundred children apply. As a Governor of Harrison College I asked the direct question of the Headmaster who told me that 120 boys are eligible to enter but because there are only places for twenty, you have to choose twenty, though 120 have reached the required standard.

(Mr. THORNE took the Chair.)

Therefore the other hundred boys must find some other school to go to, and they go to the Washington, Regent, Modern High School, Lynch's Secondary, the McDonald and so on, and I am sure not one of you can deny these schools for the work they are doing. Do you realise that they are offering competition for the Barbados scholarship? Do you realise that a letter was sent

out saying that no children should go unless they were from Government aided schools such as Combermere, Foundation, Harrison College and so on without the permission of the Premier? Of course, I understand that the letter was changed. Do you realise that one of these boys distinguished himself in nine months with 95% in Chemistry? I am not being personal. The Government pays for my colleague's son and for mine. Something must be radically wrong. For God's sake, change it! It is not only the power who send their children to Harrison College that elect you to power, but to the contrary. Things like this would burn people out; it would burn out the hon. junior member for St. Philip, perhaps not now that he is in Government. If he were not in Government I should like to hear him on this. For years, Sir, I have been hammering this. What is the answer? This is unanswerable. So long as children reach the required standard and are taking the School Certificate - it does not matter whether they are from the Lodge School, Combermere, Harrison College, Modern High School, Washington or elsewhere - you should pay or them. You could start up by saying that unless children outside of Government Schools can get so many subjects, they would have to pay the fees. You should do something to show you are doing something for them. Do you realise that with the increased number of children taking the School Certificate, that comparatively more are taken from private secondary schools than from Government Schools, and the results are just as good, and in some cases better? Yet you are continuing with this policy that you will only pay the cost. The Hon. Leader of the House knows what I am saying is correct, and I hope that they will change that policy before the next School Certificate is taken by these schools. At least something should be done to help these people. I am not pleading a case for myself. Fate has been kind to me and I can pay for my children. (A VOICE: Fate has not come your way.) Unlike the hon. member who said that, my father died when I was five days old; yet I have found myself in this position.

There are people who come to me and say they have children at secondary schools and would like the fees; and there are a number of school masters who have to look for fees to pay for the boys to take the examinations. I have paid fees for a child who after the examination got nine subjects, but his mother had eleven children and could not find the money. Government can find money to pay for the sons of Ministers, merchants and doctors because they have the influence to get into Harrison College, but these children's parents have to beg! Yet they come out with eight and nine subjects. We are only saying that the person who is responsible for education should make some recommendation whereby you can pay for those children outside of Government schools who are taking the Certificate at "A" and "O" levels 7.35 p.m.

As I have said a moment ago, the worst thing of all was since the pupils of these private schools had been taking science subjects, the Government through its Department of Education wrote to tell those pupils who were not pupils from Government Secondary Schools that they had to bring every possible thing to the examination room, from a towel. Is not that unkind and unfair? What are you practising? You cannot answer it. It cannot be answered. Perhaps you would say that you have been doing so much otherwise.

Sir, I hope the next time something dealing with this comes before us that you would have other arrangements made to accommodate the pupils from private secondary schools as well. The Hon. Minister knows what I am saying is true and I hope he will use his influence to bring about a change. The hon. junior member for the City is not a member of our Party but he has said something which is correct, that is, that you should not be paying the examination entrance fees for boys and girls only because they got entrance into one of the Government-aided schools. Where else in the world would this sort of thing happen? In Trinidad you have Roman Catholic Secondary Schools and the pupils of all secondary schools either pay to take it or the Government pay for

all to take it.

What are you doing? You are saying that the taxpayers of this country must contribute to the paying of the examination entrance fees of those taking the examination for the five Barbados Scholarships, but if my child and your child do not get entrance into a Government-aided secondary school, if he goes to the Washington, the Modern or Lynch's Secondary School, you and I will have to pay the fees for him to take the scholarship examination. Get out of that! You are saying that so long as he goes to one of your grant-aided schools he can win one of those scholarships because you would pay the fees; but if he goes to a private secondary school, no matter how bright he is, he will not have the opportunity of your paying the fees. In other words, if the boy who won the Barbados Scholarship from the Boys' Foundation School was going to the Washington High School, his mother would have had to sell her bucket to pay the fees!

You may say that that is something which existed for years and years but you have got into power. I have been hammering at this thing for a long time now. Do change it! You are putting some children at a disadvantage and through no fault of their own; but just because they were not lucky enough to gain entrance into a Government Secondary School.

I agree that you should not allow him to sit for as many subjects as he likes before he satisfies you of his ability to take those subjects. The Headmaster or somebody like him should satisfy the Ministry of Education that the child has reached the standard where he can offer to write for the School Certificate, and so long as he satisfies the Ministry of Education that he has reached that standard, you should pay the fees for him as you pay the fees for my child and the children of the hon. junior member for Christ Church who are going to a Government Secondary School. Sir, can you see that the way it is now is wrong? Gone are the days when you should have a privileged thing like that.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the Hon. Minister of Education is not in his place. I remember sometime ago hearing from a very high authority in the Education Department that the Government would be considering pruning the number of candidates who would be offering themselves for these public examinations. I think it was suggested with an eye to the cost which was rapidly mounting as far as the payment for those examinations were concerned. It appears as if year after year Government must have been watching this expenditure and has become very concerned that this expense is running higher and higher.

Having heard that from one in authority in the Education Department and seeing what little information is found in the Note to the item in the Addendum, I am sorry that the Hon. Premier is not in his place to give this Committee some more information because unless the Government has abandoned that watchfulness, of which I have just spoken, all of us are in duty bound to criticise legislation of this sort in this day. The hon. senior member for the City is quite right when he said that there appears to be some discrimination not only against the children, but against the parents who send their children to private secondary schools. If it is true that the Government proposes to limit the number of candidates for these examinations since some of them might not be thought fit to reach the standard to write the Examination, there is some good economic sense in that. It is useless for a headmaster to offer a boy for five or six subjects when he knows that the boy is only likely to get through in one. If that is the policy of the Government, we can understand it; but all hon. members of this House would agree that education is the one thing about which every Barbadian parent is primarily concerned. A Barbadian parent is very conscious of his position and he lives and strives to make his son or daughter a better educated man or woman than he and to give them a better opportunity to meet life than he. That bespeaks the reason why there are in our midst so many private secondary schools, and the Barbados Government cannot hope to disregard the existence of such schools because they perform a very useful pur-

pose in the community. What is more, I understand that Government has some control over them or that there was a time when Government was hoping to have some control over these private schools. I do not know what the Government has done in the matter, but there was the suggestion that certain of these private secondary schools might be inspected by the Education Department and if approved by that Department would be considered as approved secondary schools. If that is so, why not then should the children of such approved secondary schools be permitted to have the examination entrance fees paid for them in subjects which they are likely to pass?

7.45 p.m.

I do not think that this is any submission with which anybody could find any fault. It should not be a mere matter of chance that because one child is more fortunate to get admittance in a secondary school he should have his fees paid for him; and another child, because he was not so fortunate, should not have his fees paid for him. That may be the case because of the number of candidates competing in any school, whether it is grant aided or private. I do not know if the Hon. Minister's deputy has any access to his files, but I would like to know if the Government, as I have been told, is carrying out the policy of sifting and eliminating those candidates who are not likely to pass. We would appreciate that because, from an economic point of view, it might be a waste of Government funds involved when Head teachers ---

At this stage, the Chairman of Committees resumed the Chair.

Mr. HUSBANDS: As I was saying, Sir, that from an economic point of view, it might be a waste of Government funds when Head teachers indiscriminately offer candidates who are not likely to pass in a number of subjects. I hope that the Hon. Leader of the House will be able to inform me if he knows enough about the intention of the Government as far as putting a brake on the number of candidates who offer themselves for these examinations with a view to eliminating those who would not be considered likely to pass; that is sheer economics. I have heard that note sounded by an authority in the Education Department and that is why I have mentioned it here tonight.

As certain private secondary schools can be considered as having been approved by the Education Department, there is no reason why pupils who are attending these schools and who reach a certain educational level, should not be offered as candidates for these examinations and also have their fees paid for them by the Government, at any rate, in those subjects in which they are likely to pass. That would also apply to private schools as well as grant-aided schools.

As the hon. senior member for the City has put it very strongly politically, people who return members of this House should have paid for them, the fees of their children attending private schools as well as those attending grant-aided schools.

Hon. M.E. COX: I will promise the hon. members to report to the Minister of Education the criticisms which have been made by hon. members; but I would like to say that, from my experience within recent days, there are quite a few pupils from some of these schools which are not grant-aided schools, who have been submitted for these examinations in respect of whom, I feel, the Headmasters knew very well that they did not have the ghost of a chance of passing in any of the subjects. I have known of some of these cases, and I think it is a betrayal of the responsibility of the Headmasters of some of these private schools to do a thing like that. As soon as an individual is put up and he does not pass, out he goes from the school. I think that something should be done in the matter; the Minister of Education will have to go into this matter, because it is not fair to those parents to pay to private schools these fees which are more than they pay to Government-aided schools and then the children go out of school. I have not got the information required; the file which deals with the particular matter is not here.

There is another point which I would like to make and it is a point in reply to the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. Out of the abundance of exuberance which he wants to bring before the Committee, I guess at this particular stage although he is not going to succeed, the hon. member has said that the Government has not up to now, built one new secondary school in this Island. I am sure that whenever the hon. member reflects, he will agree that that statement is misleading. I am not saying that it is wilful, but to say that we have not built one new secondary school (MEMBERS: Additional school.)

Mr. F.G. SMITH: On a point of order. I said that they have not built an additional secondary school. I said that they have rebuilt the Foundation School, but they have not added one new secondary school to what the Conservatives have handed over to them.

Hon. M.E. COX: I accept that. As the hon. member knows, the Government had to replace three schools - new schools starting from the foundation. The position is that if these schools were in a good condition, we would have been able to build three additional schools. What is the position? The first school we had to rebuild was the Coleridge-Parry school. Everybody knows the old hut which is on the pasture; everybody knows the old Coleridge School building. (A MEMBER: It is still there.) We had to build a brandnew school between 1949 and 1950 in order to accommodate many more children than the two schools put together used to accommodate (Mr. MOTTLEY: That is correct.) In the case of the Foundation School, we have spent over \$1/2 million to build a new school. (MEMBERS: C.D. & W. Funds.) Whether it is C.D. & W. funds or not, I think that hon. members will appreciate the fact that C.D. & W. never gives an outright grant. We have spent something like over \$1/2 million to build the Foundation School, and hon. members know that that school was an old rotten shed up there. (Mr. MOTTLEY: It is not the people; it is the school.) We have built a new school which carries twice the accommodation it used to carry before. That is added accommodation in addition to the construction of a new school.

As regards Combermere, that is no fault of ours; Combermere was built in the good old days when the conservatives were in charge. What has happened? That School always fell down.
7.55 p.m.

Combermere School fell down twice. We had to spend a considerable amount of money on it in 1949 and again in 1954/55, and in the end we had to build the new school. That also has taken another \$1/2 million. I repeat if we did not build this new school out and out, surely we would have had that money to make these conditions; so it is not really fair to get up on the floor of the House and make the public believe that the Government has done nothing by way of providing accommodation.

Mr. F.G. SMITH: On a point of order...

Hon. M.E. COX: Added accommodation ..

Mr. F.G. SMITH: On a point of order I said additional accommodation.

Hon. M.E. COX: Surely if a school was big enough to carry only two hundred pupils and you build a new school to carry seven hundred, the position is clear that you have substantial additional accommodation.

I am sure the hon. member will appreciate, as I have explained on more than one occasion, in simple terms that anyone can understand, that Government has no money. It depends on the people of the island to get revenue. Whenever you get that revenue every year, you allot so much to housing, water, roads, education and so on. The next year when you get the revenue you allot a certain amount to the various items and it goes on like that. (A VOICE: Is that really true?) It is just like a man receiving \$50 a month who would like to spend \$200; but he cannot do so because he has not got it. He can only get the things which he can afford with the \$50, and accordingly as he goes on he will get the others; it is the same with Government, and I am sure every hon. member will appreciate that. I will again say that nobody can expect this Government to clean up in five years body can expect this Government to clean up in five or six years time the mess which has been left by those

who once ruled this country for over three hundred years.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I must reply to that I will start where he left off. He has contradicted the speech of the Hon. Premier. I must thank him first for his lecture on how Government raises money; that is news to us and very enlightening information.

On the question of schools, however, I just want to remind the hon. member that he has not contradicted the hon. member, because Government has not built an additional school. You have given additional accommodation. Then he went on to talk about cleaning up the mess left by other Governments. Do you recall the Premier at the opening of the school in King Street echoing my sentiments when he stated that we enjoyed a system of education in Barbados second to none? Do you remember that he said we were very proud of our standard of literacy? Was it not the wooden building at Coleridge School that produced the hon. and learned Abel Greenidge? We realise that you have more revenue and that conditions have changed, but the fact is that you had men with foresight and interest in human beings to have schools for secondary education. What mess have you cleaned up? You came along and found the Coleridge-Parry School, Alexandra, Combermere, Queens College, Foundation Boys and Girls. Have you built another? You have enlarged the building as any reasonable, sensible Government would do. After every War, Great Britain and the United States provided more accommodation for education. You have done nothing. The people who have made Barbados great where education is concerned were the Conservative regime, but you have come along and built on it.

Hon. M. E. COX: I did not say of schools alone; I was speaking generally.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You said we could not expect Government to clean up the mess in these schools and I cannot sit here and let that go by.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, I said when Government collects revenue, it has to put education right, and in the general term said we have to clean up the mess that was left.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You cannot deny that you took over education from a Conservative Government that was old as other West Indian Islands. You took people from here and sent them to New Orleans. The Hon. Speaker will tell you that when they were trying to get men from the West Indian Islands, Government sent people to Howard University the white doctors refused to deal with the people who had just been made free from slavery - to see whether they could take a course in medicine. A lot of people decry church schools, but I can call a list of doctors who laid the foundation for what we have today. We did not believe that it was the building with cow-pen windows which produced a first-class man in Lloyd Thompson.

I think the Hon. Leader of the House will agree with me that it can be sensed that he is very strong upon the matter of what can be termed as discrimination between children who attend private schools and those who attend Government aided schools. I agree with him that we cannot allow these boys to take these examinations regardless of what happens, but I should draw this to the hon. member's attention. He said that a lot of these private school masters send up children knowing well that they cannot pass. Is he aware that Coleridge-Parry School had 100% failure in five subjects? You had the same thing at Harrison College at one time, and nobody asked them to pay back the fees. I am not saying that two wrongs make a right, nor am I saying that private schools should put up as many as they want, but there should be some sort of elimination.

I have the distinction of being on Harrison College Governing Body and knew of a case where a boy was put out of school because it was thought that he would not serve any useful purpose in taking the examination.
8.05 p.m.

I can speak with authority on this. At Harrison College a boy had been superannuated. He was told to go home as no useful purpose would be served by his remaining at school. He found my house and after he explained to me, I said I would try to get him back into school. He

was re-admitted to Harrison College and in three months he wrote the examination for the Barbados Scholarship and won. If private secondary schools are registered with the approval of the Education Department and the children are put up for examinations, I say the Government should pay the fees. Do not talk of failures! Your ColeridgeParry Secondary School is Government-aided and it had 100% failures in five subjects; therefore, you cannot say if the Washington or the Modern High Schools had put them up, they put them up knowing that they would have failed the examination. I will tell you this. Where a headmaster and an assistant headmaster are drawing a salary in a Government Secondary School they do not care whether the boys they put up boys for examinations and get 100% failures because as soon as the public knows about that, they would cease sending their children to that school. Sir, we hope when you come down the next time with a similar Resolution that you will tell us that you have seen the wisdom of our argument. Do not come back here and say the educational authorities say that this cannot be done.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, while it is true to say that generally speaking this was a legacy of sub-standard conditions, yet one has to bear in mind in this matter that this is the solemn point of view of the Government in power. A Government must not give the impression that because it has spent some money extending secondary education or constructing a few public works projects that in everybody else's opinion, they have done all that could have been done or that they have done all that they should have done first. In these matters it is a question as to what projects the Government of the day awards what is called priority; that is to say, this Government may feel that the limit of expenditure on new education facilities should be a million or half million dollars and it would be best expended to provide additional accommodation. Another Government may feel that the limit of expenditure on new education facilities should be a million or half million dollars and it would in view of the inadequacy of the amount spent on education and in view of the importance of education, it should spend three million dollars; therefore, instead of spending a million dollars on taking over the buses and modernising the bus service -

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Oh no, get back to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am saying that it is a question of priority and every Government would have its own opinion of what it considers is priority and what is first. For me, before I spend money on Leave Passages ---

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is straying.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not straying, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Speak on the Resolution; do not go to Leave Passages.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am presenting to the House what is the original conception of what the Government is spending on education. The Minister's conception, you have spent the maximum you can spend on education. I do not agree with him because Government has allocated large sums on expenditure which we do not regard as priority. I mentioned two items. I said that I would not spend money on Leave Passages and I said --

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. That is a reflection on a vote of the House and the Rules are against that. That has been agreed to by this House and is the law of the land. The hon. senior member for St. Philip was a member of the House when that was agreed to.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I never agreed with it.

Hon. M.E. COX: That means nothing; it is reflection on a vote of this House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Have you heard anything like that before? If a member does not agree in principle with anything done by the Government, he is not privileged to say so! You cannot tell me that because the Rule says that you cannot reflect on a vote of the House (which is not entirely in this context) that I cannot say when even the Government is at present revising its policy on Leave Passages, that I would not give priority to Leave Passages. I say it is a question of awarding of priorities according to the particular outlook or the

conception of the Government in power. One Government might feel that compulsory education must come before anything else. One Government might conceivably feel that before you extend secondary education you should put in force compulsory education; therefore, no Government needs pat itself on the back and say that with the available material we have done the best for the country. What they can say is that they have done what in their opinion is the best. In truth and fact, their conception that what they are doing is the best for the country does not make it follow that it is the best for the country; and therefore, Sir, we on this side of the table feel, in view of that, that secondary education facilities have been always very limited throughout the island.

I have continually reminded the House that the old Education Board which was drafted since 1890 visualised the establishment of a secondary school in every parish of the island. It is true to say that the Conservatives were either too indifferent to carry out that programme, or the funds of that day were not sufficient to carry out that programme, but certainly with the funds which we have at our disposal in the last ten years, with a Socialist Government wedded to the idea that matters educational must come first in their proper perspective, then the country could have afforded the construction of one or more secondary schools in other parts of the island. Look at the money which we have collected towards the Labour Welfare Funds.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is going too far.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am doing nothing of the kind.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member to keep to the Resolution. Keep to the Head that is in front of us. I am not entertaining anything about school buildings Labour Welfare Funds or anything like that at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In every democratic parliament in discussing a money Resolution, members are entitled to reflect on the particular matter before them. That is common parliamentary procedure and, therefore, Sir, that is why you have to allow a certain amount of discussion on the vote before the House.
8.15 p.m.

I am pointing out to the Government the sources from which, in my opinion, they could have got more money for education. I am not discussing in principle the Labour Welfare Fund or the Price Stabilization Fund or anything like that; I am pointing out that if they had the money to play with, they could have utilised it in building more schools. As self-satisfied as the Government may feel, and desirous as it is of patting itself on the back in what it has done on matters of education, it does not necessarily follow that sufficient has been done or that more could not have been done or that they have awarded priority to those matters which deserve prior attention.

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

HEAD XXIV - BARBADOS REGIMENT

Head XXIV - Barbados Regiment - was called.

Hon. M.E. COX: I beg to move that Head XXIV stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD XXIX - MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services - was called.

Hon. M.E. COX: I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part of the schedule.

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

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

Hon. M.E. COX: I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$51,652 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1957-58, No. 73

Refund of Customs Duty - Pre-Federal Commissions

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is for the sum of \$5,711. The Addendum explains quite fully the purpose of this Resolution. It is to provide for the payment of an ex gratia refund of customs duty to the Commissioners of Health for the parish of St. Michael on two Bedford Refuse Collectors imported by the Commissioners and for the expenses of the Pre-Federal Commissions.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1957-58, No. 74.

Incidentals -- Reporting and Printing Debates of the Legislature

Hon. M.E. COX: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is for the sum of \$2,315, in connection with "Incidentals" and the "Reporting and Printing the Debates of the Legislature." The notes explain the position fully. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1957-58, No. 75.

General Hospital

Hon. F.E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is a Resolution for \$22,716 under Head XX111 of the Estimates - General Hospital. Hon. members will observe that I was at pains to make the notes as explanatory and as full as possible. All that is required in the way of information has been set out in the Notes; however, if there is any further information required by members of the Opposition, I shall be happy to give that added information. These various Items in the Schedule are all concerned with one Institution - the General Hospital.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. Cox, seconded by Hon. D. D. Garner, the Chairman reported the passing of five Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. M. E. Cox seconded by Hon. D. D. Garner in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee of Supply were read a first and second time and agreed to.

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

8.30 pm

On Resumption.

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

(Mr. SPEAKER instructed the Clerk to ring the bell, after which a quorum was obtained.)

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Order No.3 and to take Order No.4 as the

next order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to postpone Order No.3 and to take Order No.4 as the next order of the Day, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection leave was granted.

CUSTOMS TARIFF (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1958

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that some time previously, I indicated during discussion on a Resolution for a sum of money for the Transport Board that among the various measures which the Government intended to adopt to improve the transport system was one to encourage private concessionaires to improve the bus service. This is made even more imperative by the fact that, as was stated previously and repeated in the Budget speech today by the Premier, we intend to adjust fares and fare stages. I think the House will agree that if we are to adjust these fare stages and ask the public to pay more, we must at the same time insist that concessionaires provide a proper service for the travelling public. To that end, the concession agreements are being altered and very soon that agreement will be brought down in the form of a schedule to the Act. This Bill which is before us now is to give effect to one of these measures for improving the service rendered by private concessionaires.

The House will see from examination of this Bill that it provides for duty free admission of new omnibuses of an approved type. By that, we hope, in fact, we intend to see to it that these concessionaires provide buses of a very modern type for the public and do away with any old outmoded traps such as were formerly provided for the travelling public. The House will also notice that this concession provides for drawback on duty in cases where duty has already been paid. Hon. members will recall that I made a statement to the House; but before that statement was made, we received applications from certain bus owners who had already ordered buses through the agents here of the type that we would like to see on the roads in Barbados. As hon. members are aware they cost a pretty high sum and therefore we feel that this Bill should take into account the fact that these owners, when it was being framed, had already ordered these new buses for the benefit of the travelling public.

I do not think, Sir, that I need say more. I feel hon. members will agree from the point of view of improving the bus service that any subsidy, slight as it is, which the Government can give to bring about such improvement, should be welcome or should be agreed to by this Chamber.

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

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, the Opposition is not opposing this Bill, but there is information which we would like. The Objects and Reasons state that this Bill is to encourage the use in the Island for passenger transport of approved type of omnibuses.

In respect of the type of omnibus which you are going to allow concessionaires to import, is it or is it not a fact that there are certain private persons running buses today in the island who have not yet signed any concession?

Mr. SPEAKER: In my opinion, the hon. member is out of order. This has nothing to do with private concessions; it concerns the importing of a new type of bus.

Mr. BRANCKER: But it speaks of a type of bus imported by or on behalf of specified persons, and I trust your Objects and Reasons read the same way as mine. I am enquiring whether these specified persons include anybody who has not signed a concession, because it would be entirely out of order to permit such a person to be provided with duty free admission of new motor omnibuses. If the persons are concessioned, certainly they can have it; but if not, I submit it would not

be correct; it would be encouraging law breaking for such persons to be allowed and to receive legislation sanction for the importation and duty free admission of this particular type of bus.

Now another point which I should like some information on is this: as regards the new type of omnibus, does that mean that the Government will decide before hand and notify the importer what buses he may import or restrict him to say, the Leylands or Mercedes, or will approval be given in respect of any bus named and chosen by the specific person which he wants and in respect of which there is no objection? In other words, are they saying "yes" you import buses duty free but they must be either X,Y or Z, or will they leave it to the specific person to select the type of bus which he will approve of personally and which he can afford or for which he can get credit from the local agents, and you will then decide whether or not to give sanction to that bus chosen by him and not originally by them?

This Bill, Sir, is an open admission by Government that there is no policy for nationalising the public passenger transport in effect or even contemplated. I see no objection in allowing specific persons provided as I say, they are in order and the buses are being run on proper lines within the law of this country. I am wondering whether there will be any number of motor omnibuses which will be permitted to be admitted duty free. Are they going to be limited to the number which these specific persons at the moment have on the roads in this island or will there be a number greater than that to include additional buses for the public which certainly has need of more buses to cope with it?

The information which I am seeking is simply whether there will be any limit to the number of buses which it is proposed to let in dut, free on behalf of these specified persons.

10.30 p.m.

Mr. F.G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I too welcome this Bill even at this late stage, and by that I mean that we are now permitting private concessionaires to import buses like those which the Government have for a considerable sum of money on this particular venture. I think, like the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, that the mere fact that the Government is forced to bring down a Bill of this nature is a token that the Government does not intend to nationalise the industry because they are allowing by the passage of this Bill a certain part of the transport business to be run by private concessionaires. Of course, my conception of nationalisation, and my Party's conception of nationalisation is not that part of the industry should be run by private concessionaires and part by Government, but that Government, if it intends to nationalise the industry, should nationalise the whole industry.

The Government, by bringing in this Bill, is trying to ask private concessionaires to set the same comfort which the Government is setting in the comfort of passenger transport which it is only fair to say that the public has a right to expect. What I should like to know is whether the buses which Government has in mind that the concessionaires should import are to be of the same type which Government has imported or whether a small bus of similar carrying capacity would satisfy Government. What is the Government's idea of the specific type of bus that these private concessionaires should import? Can the Hon. Minister tell us whether buses of the type - not necessarily of the make - as those which Government has recently imported are what is contemplated by the Government as the right type of bus they should import? As a matter of fact, at the present time, I have seen one or two new buses imported by private concessionaires, the Diamond Motor Bus Company and the Liberty Motor Bus Company. Is that the type of bus which Government has in mind to allow concessionaires to import?

Of course, the Opposition will have something more to say when the Government attempts to increase bus fares and we would be very strong on that. However, Sir we welcome the Bill as a whole. Our primary concern is that the travelling public should have the best available in the country.

Sir, all I would like to know is whether the type

of bus operated by the Diamond Bus Company as well as the Liberty Bus Company as well as the type operated by you is the type which you desire to remain on the road and whether it is your endeavour to get away from the old open type buses.

Hon. R.G.MAPP: Mr. Speaker, the Opposition members have said that they are in favour of this Bill. I thank them for seeing the wisdom behind a policy such as this. Without debating any political philosophy or even the way we run transport, whether we should nationalise or not, they would see that whatever policy we adopt, we should have one object in view and that is to improve the bus service to the public and that is the effort of my Ministry Sir, I welcome their support and I will now attempt to answer some of their questions.

The last hon member who spoke asked whether it was our desire that the concessionaires should import the same type of bus as that which Government has imported. I say, yes. We do not want to encourage the oldest type of buses; we wish to encourage buses of a diesel type and the type which the Transport Board has on the road. We are not insisting that it would be necessary to import buses of one make. The whole object of this Bill is to allow concessionaires to import the latest type of buses. I think the hon. member can set his mind at rest and I think I can give him that assurance. As the hon. member knows, the Director of Transport will consult the Minister on this aspect.

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

On motion of Hon. R. G. Mapp, seconded by Hon. D. D. Garner, Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Throne being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. R.G.MAPP: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Now, Mr. Acting Chairman, that brings me to the point to which I was referring in the House. It is proposed that between the 1st day of November, 1957 and the 1st day of November, 1962, that all new motor omnibuses imported into this Island should be of a design approved by the Director of Highways and Transport so long as they are imported by or on behalf of the Transport Board or by or on behalf of a person having a concession from the said director in respect of a road or route under the Motor Vehicle and Road Traffic Regulations 1952. That is why I raised the point just now. I happen to know I am within certain legal circles - that someone is operating a route for which he has no concession because it was not signed. Therefore lest the law should be broken - I do not like anything like that to happen - that is the reason why I raised that point earlier. If the person has not signed the concession and is only running the route because he or she has some favour, and is to have the benefit of duty-free admission of his or her buses then, I do not know why that should be.

10.40 p.m.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: I do not know from what circle the hon. member got that, because, so far as I know, before a concessionaire can operate a concession, he has to sign an Agreement, and they operate under the old Agreement.

Mr. F.G. SMITH: What the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said, has come as a surprise to the Hon. Minister, but I have had the same information. It is something which we can investigate; it is not a scandal, because I have heard it from the horse's mouth. Let them check on it and see whether it is true or not.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What the two hon. members have said, is being said. (*Asides.*) Has the concession been signed now? It might have been signed last week. We were thinking about Christmas time, and we knew as a fact that the concession was not signed. We want to give every man a chance; we do not want to hurt anybody.

The question that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. R. G. Mapp, seconded by Hon. D. D. Garner, the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. R. G. Mapp seconded by Hon. D. D. Garner in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1958."

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1958."

Hon. F.E. MILLER: Mr Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order. It was put in the name of the Hon. Premier during my illness.

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

Hon. F.E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I do not know that we should entail any waste of time of this House. This Resolution is a very simple Resolution; the Addendum is particularly clear and again hon. members will observe that much interest and time have been spent in bringing forward details in order to save any waste of time by way of discussion by hon. members on the opposite side of the House.

The Order has been laid in the Legislature and I do not think it is necessary for me to go into the details. The Order provides for staff adjustments and increases. As regards the Department of the Bacteriologist and Pathologist, there is the replacement of the present structure of one Senior Laboratory Assistant and two Laboratory Assistants by an arrangement which provides for a staff of five, and no more than two Senior Laboratory Assistants will be appointed at any one time; and there is an increase in the number of Laboratory Attendants from one to two.

In connection with the Health Centre St. Michael, we are increasing the number of Staff Nurses from one to three and we are creating the post of Accounts Clerk. I may say that the hon. senior member for the City will support this proposal because it deals with the curative side.

When we come to the General Hospital, we are making a change in the post of Warden, Nurses' Home, to the post of Manageress, which is the general practice in overseas Hospitals. We thought that we would upgrade that post and abolish the post of Chief Warden.

If there is any further information other than what is set out here which hon. members would like to have I shall be happy to give it to them. With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, No. 2, 1958.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 2 Order, 1958."

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take charge of this Order.

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

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, due to the considerable increase in the volume of traffic at the Airport, it was found necessary to make provision for this increased Staff.
10.50 p.m.

As hon. members will see, it is to make provisional increase in Air Traffic Control Officers, and we are also increasing the Grade of the Assistant Director of Civil Aviation, who has recently qualified under a Course in the United Kingdom. A recommendation was made in the Godsall Report to make provision for him as soon as he qualified to go up to this grade, and we are putting him under Grade 2 instead of the Grade he is now at.

As I said earlier, we have to increase the number of Control Officers because of the increased volume of traffic at the Airport, which makes it necessary to have them.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) No. 3 ORDER, 1958.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 3 Order 1958.

Hon. F.E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the leave of the House to take charge of this Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to take charge of the Resolution and unless any hon. member objects, leave will be granted.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Hon. F.E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, again this is a simple Resolution. We have been at pains to set out the particulars in the Addendum so as not to waste any time on debating this matter.

This Civil Establishment Order is for the appointment of an Information Officer. His duties are set out in detail and I do not know that it is at all necessary to waste the time of the Assembly over this matter, unless there is for any reason any information which hon. members would like. I think you will agree that we have reached the stage where there is pressing need for the services of an Information Officer, and with those few remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think a little research will disclose that a few years ago I gave notice of my intention to see whether Government would bring about the appointment of such an officer in the service. I do agree with the Hon. Minister that this is a pressing need, more especially today. You must have someone actually between Government and the people for the dissemination of information. Even members of this Chamber at times are at a great disadvantage when they themselves cannot give all the desired information necessary on some particular subject matter for the benefit of their constituents, and I think although it is belated, we are very much in favour of this Order.

I do feel that this is an occasion for me just to say that I do hope that every opportunity will be taken to sift out and appoint a very courteous and knowledgeable person, because this is a very important office; and when it is once filled, I should not like to have one in office who could not give in a proper way the necessary information that might be required of him. It is very important, and I am very glad to see what I thought of five years ago, Government has had the wisdom to bring down. This Officer, I feel, especially today with Federation and what not, is of great importance to this community, and I hope that any such officer appointed will appreciate one thing, that he will not be a servant of any particular Minister, be it the Premier or anybody else, but a servant of the people, and it will be necessary for such information which by law can be released, to be released. It will be his duty to release such information for the

benefit of the public in the most courteous and lucid way so as to avoid false rumours. I have much pleasure in supporting this and I am proud it is now a reality.

Mr F.G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Official Opposition welcome the appointment of an Information Officer in this colony. In 1954 in this colony we had the introduction of Ministerial Government, and it must have been patently obvious to the Government then that there would be need for someone who would be the medium through which all new aspects of Governmental policy and programme could be communicated, and it is refreshing to notice even at this late stage that the Government in power sees the necessity for this post. It has come rather late, because a position of this kind would have been of inestimable value to the country a year or two ago when Federation was less of an accomplished fact and was more in the stage of development than it is today, because if the Information Officer had been appointed a year ago, he would have been able according to one of his duties, to utilise the medium of the radio to the fullest possible extent in putting on programmes which are of public interest, and I think the Government will appreciate that even although they may deny the Opposition the right of putting their point of view on the Broadcasting Station, at least an unbiased Information Officer would have enlightened the people on all aspects of Federation which is all the Opposition is concerned about, and was only trying to do when the hon. senior member for St. Lucy made a request to Government.

Government should be very cautious to see to it that they appoint a man who is not only knowledgeable, not only a man is au fait with the Constitutional Development of this country and of the West Indies, but a man who in the performance of his task will be a man of integrity, a man who is unbiased and unprejudiced, because I think it should be clear to the Government that unless they have a monopoly of power till the cows come home, if this man's activities betray the slightest signs of bias, he cannot expect to serve in another Government. 11.00 p.m.

Therefore, in his own interest and for his own survival, a man should be appointed who would be knowledgeable and who would be able to put forward in simple manner such programmes as Government indicates.

The Opposition thinks that the Government is a bit late in doing this, but we should on this occasion give them the support which they are likely to get when they bring down matters which are of interest to the people of Barbados. This is one measure which would redound to the education of the masses. We welcome the spending of the taxpayers' money on something like this to educate the masses if it is not done on a propaganda basis, and if it is done in a way in which education should be undertaken.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for the day.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Speaker, I of Private Members' Business standing in my name be put as Order No. 1 of Private Members' Business.

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

HON. M. E. COX: Sir, in moving the adjournment of the House, I would just like to say as regards Polling Day, the 25th March, on which the Federal Elections are to be held, that the Government and the Cabinet have been considering this question very carefully for some time and the Cabinet has come to the conclusion that in order to give the voters of this island the opportunity to cast their votes on that day, the Government and the Cabinet is advising His Excellency the Governor to declare the 25th March a Public Holiday. We think that this would facilitate matters in so far as the Elections are concerned.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, 6th March, 1958, at 1 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.

11.10 p.m.