THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 6th March, 1958

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 1 o'clock p.m., today.

PRESENT

His Honour Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., *(Speaker);* Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, *(Leader of the Opposition);* Hon. M. E. COX *(Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour);* Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., *(Chairman of Committees);* Hon. R. G. MAPP *(Minister of Communications, Works and Housing);* Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: His Honour Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN *(Deputy Speaker);* Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, Mr. C. B. SEARLES: Mr. L. St.A. THORNE; and Hon. D. D. GARNER, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries);*

Prayers were read.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS and Mr. Tudor entered and took their seats.

MINUTES

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

PAPERS LAID

Hon. SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

"Brief Report on the activities of the Education Department for the period April, 1957 - February, 1958."

QUESTIONS

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. senior member for the City I wish to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Has any Report been made to Government by any Member of the Delegation held in Geneva from the 5th to the 28th June, 1957?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, does Government intend to lay a copy of such Report on the table of the Honourable House?

STATEMENT BY HON. SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS RE EXPENDITURE ON CHRIST CHURCH FOUNDATION SCHOOL.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the House the following:-

The sum of $44,340 representing the unexpended balance in the provisions of the 1956-57 Estimates was revoted in the 1957-58 Estimates under Capital Estimates, Head VI, Education Item 4, Christ Church Foundation School to "meet the cost of land acquisition." These last six words because they appear in the Note in the Estimates would tie the hands of the Department and the Auditor General if they were not modified because of things which happened subsequently.

The words in quotation marks, that is to say, the last six words, were used in the Note to this item since it was understood that all building costs were met, but certain outstanding amounts totalling $62,975 have been recently received and remain to be settled in respect of the construction of the school itself. These words of the Note precludes bills of this kind from the provision and I am asking the House if it has no objection to approve of the payment of these outstanding bills for this from the 1957-58 Estimates. In short, the House was notified that the money was only needed to acquire the land. If the House does not object, these bills will be paid under that vote although the note in the Estimates only applies to the acquisition of land.

HOUSE RESUMES CONSIDERATION OF ESTIMATES

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stand 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.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think the country can look forward with a certain degree of pleasurable anticipation to the circumstance that in the near future there will be presented on the floor of this House a Budget that bears some relationship to the Island's economic need - a budget in which the proposals for expenditure are in reality proposals for development; in other words, a real development budget. Since the budget before us bears no relationship to the real economic needs of the country nor has been framed with a view to expanding the country's economy, I do not intend , Mr. Speaker, to waste time today dealing with this aspect of the matter. I merely want to say in passing that a population which is increasing as rapidly as our needs specific proposals for housing, feeding and clothing it.

1.25 p.m.

Merely to extend the capital works programme and Public Works projects as this Budget proposes to do, is of little use at this particular time. What we really need is a budget with the emphasis on development and I am sure that the time will come pretty soon when we will have the opportunity of discussing this matter at greater length. Therefore, I propose to confine myself today purely to replying to some of the remarks made by the Introducer of the Budget.

It is a bit unfortunate that we have only had a few hours to get what purports to be the printed report of what the Hon. Premier has said, but since he is present, he is in a position to correct any misapprehension in the speech which he made on Tuesday, which might have appeared in public print. I should like to refer first of all to the statement that the contract for the building of the Deep Water Harbour has been drawn up in favour of the Barbados Government. To some extent, if the contractors decided that they could not carry out the contract price, the Government could levy on anything the contractors had on the site, and sell it, if necessary, to pay somebody else to carry on the work. This project is costing the country about $25 million, and I believe that before we are through, it may cost us about $30 million. Presumably, the contractors are insured in the contract against increases in labour cost or increases in the cost of materials. What the contractors have on the site constitues their rolling stock; I do not know the value of it, but it could hardly be expected to worth $50,000 or $100,000

Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that it is worth the $100,000. Mr. Speaker, if , we have to advance the contractors money on the contract, from time to time, if for instance, after getting $12, million or $15, million, and only about one-half of the actual work is completed, the contractors decided that they could not carry on, all we could do to indemnify ourselves is to sell out their rolling stock. In other words, we will have rolling stock to the tune of $100,000, I assume, against a contract which is worth $25 million and against which the contractors may have $12 million or $15 million. It is farcical for a man in the position of the Premier to make the statement that the contract is in favour of Barbados, purely because we have, so to speak, a mortgage against their rollingstock, if the contractors fail to carry out the contract. The rollingstock could not be worth more than 1/25 ths. or 1/50ths of the amount of the contract. If the Government of Barbados had in the contract a clause requiring specific performance of the contract compelling the contractors under any conditions, all things being equal, to finish the work, you could say that the Government is protected. It does not do this island any good for somebody in the position of the Premier - I am not speaking of him as an individual because we have grown to expect a lot of wild, irresponsible statements from him; but in the position which he occupies - it is not good for these statements to go abroad, because people will think that this is a community of bath bricks. Because we can levy on the rolling stock of the Contractors at any stage of the contract it is said that the contract is in our favour! Nothing could be further from the truth! If it is in our favour - I am not saying that Messrs Costain are likely to collect one-half or three-quarters of the amount of the contract and the proportionate amount of work is not done and they will feel that they can pull out.. They have a good reputation, and therefore, we can expect that they will honourably discharge their obligations on the contract. I merely do not want this Committee or the people outside to get the impression that security in terms of their contract is sufficient to indemnify the Government for their failure to carry out the contract at any stage of it. That is sheer nonsense.

Another point to which I should like to reply is this: the Introducer of the Budget said that secondary industries in a country like Barbados were naturally unpopular, but they could not afford not to give them more consideration if the Island's population continues to rise. Later on, he said that the Government's general policy arising out of that consideration was that they must continue to improve the present policy of employment to be met by the Island's capital programme of capital works in the Five Year Plan.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to remind the hon. member that he is quoting from a Newspaper. Rule 122 of the Rules of this House says this: "No member may read extracts from newspapers or documents other than the authorised report of the debates referring to debates in the House."

I am drawing the hon. member's attention to that Rule.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I can assure Your Honour that I have made very copious notes of what the Premier said. In other words, what we have gathered from the statement I have just quoted, is that the Public Works Programme bears some relation in the minds of the Government to the need for industrial development in Barbados.

1.35 p.m.

Now first and foremost, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say this: I do not intend to dilate today on the question of the need for Industrial Development in Barbados, because I have done that several times already; but I want to draw attention to the fact that Barbados is one of the only countries in the world in which the Government has decided to embark on an extensive Capital Works Programme either as an answer to the needs for Industrial Development, or if that is not the case, before it tackles Industrial Development. All other progressive countries in the world start their industrial development first and then their Capital Works Programme after, for the reason that when you put a considerable amount of new money in circulation, you are increasing the purchasing power of the people and it is sound economic thinking to see to it that as much of that money as possible remains inside the country. Nowadays, some countries go further than that and refuse to allow business places merely selling goods to be established in the country unless some percentage of the goods they are going to sell is manufactured in the country.

As an example of what I mean, we have just seen in the West Indies the establishment of branches of Woolworth and Company in Trinidad, Jamaica and Bar bados. Before Woolworth were allowed to put a branch of their firm in Mexico, they had to give the Mexican Government an undertaking that 90% of the goods they were going to sell would be manufactured in Mexico, because the Mexican Government was not prepared to allow them to bring goods in their country, sell them and then send the profits out of the country. Similarly, most progressive countries - and the Premier referred to India in his speech - like Jamaica, Trinidad and in many of the European or Asiatic countries in the course of development have side by side with an extensive Capital Works Programme built schools, houses, roads and other public works projects, providing and establishing in the community at least some of the basic necessities of life.

We are going to spend about $50 million, we are told, within a given period on a Development Programme. We are borrowing the most of it; we have to service the loan and amortise the capital involved. The expenditure of that $50 million will mean about $25 million in circulation in wages; the balance would go into materials, presumably. You are increasing, Mr. Speaker, the purchasing power of the community to the extent of the cost of labour involved in your Five Year Plan. Every single cent is going back outside the country, because we are still importing nearly all the things we need.

Now I defy any spokesman of the Government to tell me of any place in the world where your Capital Works Programme is regarded as an alternative to industrial development, or if that be not the case where you put your Capital Works Programme first and then talk vaguely at some time in the distant future of an industrial development programme; it is not done.

I have referred, Mr. Speaker, on more than one occasion to the fact that Barbados has been highly recommended - I am merely giving a single instance in which Government should have done the reverse to what it has done - as the headquarters for a shoe-manufacturing industry to serve ourselves, the Leewards and the Windwards, to manufacture a cheap line of working shoes for the working class people. When in terms of your development programme you put $25 million in circulation,

every bare-footed man and woman is thinking of wearing a pair of shoes; but you continue to allow those shoes to be imported from outside, when they could be manufactured in the colony. If the Government were minded to implement the proposals either on their own, or to invite someone to establish a shoe-manufacturing concern in the country! Jamaica is doing it and Trinidad is doing it. Within the last three years not less than eleven shoe factories have been established in Jamaica, and last year they turned out over 8,000 pairs of shoes; and they are employing over 1,200 people. Trinidad, also, Mr. Speaker, has seen fit to establish a number of shoe factories because The West Indies constitute a very important market for shoes. We take about one-tenth of the entire British production of shoes, which is about £10 million a year and we take about another million pounds from other countries in Europe and from America and Asia.

If, Mr. Speaker, we had at some stage along the line established a shoe industry in the country, to give only one example, not only would it provide employment in the country for unemployed people in a shoe manufacturing concern, but the national economy would benefit for the simple reason that the enormous sums of money expended every year on imported shoes would to some extent remain in the country.

I have been told that the Premier himself, is prone to pooh-pooh this idea of industrial development in Barbados. I know for a fact that at a meeting in St. John in 1956 ....

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am afraid I did not hear what the hon. member said, and I would like him to repeat it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said the Premier is prone to pooh-pooh the idea of industrial development in Barbados. At a public meeting in St. John in 1956, he said that "people are always asking me why Barbados lags behind the other West Indian Islands in industrial development; my answer is that we lead them in other things. We are the only island in which there is a Minister of Police;" the inference being that if the Minister of Police can control the unemployed, you do not want industrial development. I have been told by a sugar factory worker in St. James that during the last campaign, he said at a meeting in St. James people asked why there was not a cement factory in Barbados and he replied saying what was the point of putting a factory here when the people are going to pay the same price for the cement manufactured locally as they would pay for imported cement. If that is the sort of economic thinking that will guide this country, we will never get anywhere and therefore, we must pray to Providence that within the near future, the guiding hand of Government will be removed, because no other country in the world has ever thought of industrial development in such terms.

America has built up over the years her important position as an industrial country by not being afraid to pay even more for locally produced articles than articles they import, the theory being that the manufacture of goods in their own country provides employment for the people, and it is more advantageous to their economy than to be compelled to import everything they need.

1.45 p.m.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, are we to understand that Jamaica which has a cement factory and is now putting down a second, and Trinidad which also has one and is putting down a second from which every ounce of cement which is used in Barbados and the Windward Islands comes because we have no cement factory — do you think that that is justification for what the Hon. Premier is reported to have said, "what is the use of our owning one if the poor people have to pay the same price from the local plant as they would pay for it from a factory in Trinidad or elsewhere?" That is not good enough and I should like today to repeat that even now it is not too late for the same people who established the cement factories in Jamaica and Trinidad to be accepted here.

I would also repeat, as I have repeated several times, that since we have the raw materials for producing white cement which is unequalled anywhere else in the world very few countries manufacture white cement - that it can be a very important supply in this country and, as a matter of fact, British Guiana was seriously considering importing our raw materials to make cement. Though white cement is not in use as much as grey cement, there is still a great use for it.

If industrial development is going to be conditional by this sort of thing in Barbados, well then, we will never find ourselves anywhere, and we will go on treating Capital Expenditure as if it were industrial development, forgetting that after we build these buildings we have to maintain them and that they produce no revenue. All that this will lead to is increased taxation. Sir, it would be far better in my opinion, if some of the money spent on capital works had been spent on productive items like the East Coast Road, for the simple reason that it will contribute towards the cultivation of land which is now uncultivated. I do not need to give the figures now because those figures have been mentioned in here repeatedly, but the building of that road would require a large amount of labour, and when it is built it would be possible to cultivate land which is now lying uncultivated and which would produce food crops and things which would assist in expanding the island's economy. In other words, expenditure on the East Coast Road would be productive expenditure, and that is what the country needs

Somewhere along the line, the Hon. Premier apparently got wedded to the economic theory which was carried on in the time of Julius Caesar in Rome, which was that the prosperity of a country is to be measured in two terms: (1) the number of successful wars you could wage and (2) the number of important buildings you put up Well, if that was the economic theory 2,000 years ago, it does not follow that it can be sound economic theory today. In one respect, he is fulfilling one part of that economic concept and in the other it is obvious from the number of buildings which have been put up in the country that he believes that this would in some way or other either contribute to his own greatness or to the economy of the country. Mr. Speaker, I think it is easily seen that they cannot contribute to the economy of the country; they produce nothing at all. They are merely capital works for which we have repeatedly to vote increasing sums of money to keep them in condition , while they in themselves provide and contribute nothing to the economy of the country. That is why I said earlier that the emphasis at this stage with the rising unemployment should be on production and not merely on capital works.

Now, Sir, imagine the Hon. Premier also attempting to compare the position of India which has fallen down somewhat in its Development Plan with the position of Barbados. Of course, it is not my desire to recite his Development Plan or that of India but India's Development Plan is a Development Plan. It is a Development Plan in coal and oil and rolling stock, locomotives, in textiles, hydro electrical power and what not, and in all the commodities necessary for making a country great. India's Five Year Development Plan does not consist of a few items of public works expenditure as ours does. Let me say that India has over spent every year every single cent devoted to industrial development. What is the position locally with regard to the Industrial Board? The comparison is ludicrous. You have an Industrial Development Board which has already expended money. Ask them the manner in which it is proposed to allocate the present half million dollars for which they are now asking.

1.55 p.m.

A mere $1/2 million; that is all, and he goes on to speak of his Development Plan in the same breath as the Indian Development Plan. That is like comparing a snail with a tiger or some very fleet-footed animal in the jungle. If America goes to the assistance of India, it is because America feels that it is important to assist India with the many important development projects which it is undertaking; but do not let us draw the comparison that because India has fallen down and America has to come to her assistance, we too can fall down in our programme. All that means is that we will have to build one Police Station or some other project less, which is inconsequential to our terms of development.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I have already drawn the hon. member's attention to Rule 122, which I read for the benefit of the hon. member relative to quoting from unauthorised publications.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want to refer to the statement made in relation to emigration to Dominica. The Introducer of the Budget said that two years ago, he recalled when advice had been given to the Government about land settlement in Dominica. He said that he mentioned it on

the floor of this House. I am not saying that he did not say it, but I would like to be told when he said it and in what context he said it, so that I could refer to the official records to see it mentioned there. I have not been able to find anybody in this Chamber who heard it said, and even if he did say it, I know nothing about it. The fact that somebody gave him advice about land settlement in Dominica, is immaterial to me. What I know is this: about three or four years ago, an English Parliamentary Delegation came down here comprised of Labour and Conservative members, and the hon. junior member for Christ Church and myself and one or two others were deputed to take them around the Island one day. At the time there was being waged on the floor of the House a drive compelling the Government to lend people money to go to Great Britain in order to look for work. The Government had expressed its opposition to the proposal, the hon. senior member for St Joseph, himself, saying that the Government could not be expected to lend money to every Tom. Dick and Harry to go to England. During the course of our conversation that day, I asked this Parliamentary Delegation what was their reaction to the emphasis on emigration from the West Indies to Great Britain and they said frankly, that they had no objection in principle, but that there were questions of housing and other combinations, which, in their minds, would operate to preclude any satisfactory settlement in England of large numbers of West Indians who were looking for work. My answer was that they had nowhere else to go, employment was decreasing and if there were hopes of getting work in England they would go there. I asked them whether they thought that the British Parliament would assist some large-scale settlement scheme in the West Indies which would appear possible for the settlement of West Indians in British Guiana and British Honduras, and it was said that that would be received with open hands in Great Britain.

In passing, I should like to refer to the statement made by the Premier that political developments in British Honduras would prevent people from going there. It would be farcical to tell the public that the anti-British sentiment which had developed in British Honduras had prevented people from going there. The British Honduras Settlement Commission reported in 1948 and the anti-British sentiment in British Honduras is of more recent growth; that is only three or four years ago. It was only then that the principle was enunciated, which became the controlling factor in British Honduras' politics. The recommendation was made for the settlement of 100,000 West Indians in British Guiana and British Honduras. The proposal fell through, not because of political developments in British Honduras, but because simultaneously, it was recommended that there should be the settlement of Assyrians displaced persons in Europe - in the most highly fertile areas in British Honduras and British Guiana. In the case of British Guiana, it was recommended that the Kanaku-Rupunini area, which would compare with Kenya's highlands, would be suitable for European settlement. In the case of British Honduras, the Cayo region was recommended to be reserved for the displaced personnel from Europe. As a result, the entire West Indian Press raised a hullabaloo against the proposal to settle displaced persons from Europe in British Honduras and British Guiana to the exclusion of West Indians for political and other reasons It seemed to many of us at the time that the British Government was more concerned with the plight of these displaced Assyrians than it was concerned either with the question of the development of British Honduras or of that of British Guiana or finding more living space for people in hhe highly - populated areas in the West Indies. 2.05 p.m.

That was the West Indian reaction to the British Government who did not do anything at all, and the whole thing fell through. It is farcical to say in 1958 that somebody proposed to send 1,000 people to British Honduras and it fell through because of the political state of the island. It is true to say, of course, that within the last five years or so, certain elements in British Honduras have shown a marked hostility towards West Indian migration, but that in itself has nothing to do with the failure of employment as recommended in the Evans Commission Report.

Now to get back to the Parliamentary Delegation, I told the members of the Delegation and this is four years ago - that I myself felt that the most important thing to be done in the West Indies was for the West Indian Governments to get together and present concrete proposals to the British Government and ask for help to settle the surplus population in the area, and I received the assurance that this would receive support on the floor of the House of Commons. The following year, which was three years ago - and the Premier said he got this advice two years ago - I went to St. Lucia and Dominica because I felt those were the only two islands which offered possibilities of settlement. The very first person with whom I discussed the matter is the man who is now the Premier's Permanent Secretary, Mr. Pinard, in St. Lucia where he was then in the Civil Service. I told him that I did not think that St. Lucia offered many possibilities in spite of Vieux Fort; he did not comment on that but he agreed that Dominica offered tremendous possibilities. I went on to Dominica and discussed the matter with the Acting Administrator, Mr. Josse, who is now on the Federal staff, the Administrator, Mr. Lindo, was then in Jamaica. I discussed it with him, with Government officials and the Labour Department who were all interested. The Superintendent of Agriculture was so interested that he called a meeting of the Planters' Association at his office in Dominica to discuss the proposals I had. The meeting was attended by Mr. Baron who is now Minister of Trade and Production and a prominent planter in Dominica. Everyone of them welcomed with open arms any suggestion to assist in the development of Dominica by settling West Indians in the island and by opening up the interior. Let us say, Mr. Speaker, that all this happened three years ago, and let us say that two years ago, as the Premier said, somebody advised Government that Dominica offered possibilities for land settlement. What has he done about it? In his position as Premier, he can do many things. If he were not too lazy to go, he could at Government's expense go to investigate conditions himself; if he were not too disinterested in the matter, he could appoint a Commission at Government's expense to go and investigate the possibility. With his position as Premier, coupled with the fact that when he leaves this country he is getting a more than handsome cost of living allowance - something I understand like $40 a day or more - there can be no justification for him in not picking himself up and going to Dominica to see if the advice given to the Government were true. But he did nothing at all about it. Somebody told the Government two years ago that Dominica offered possibilities. Mr. Speaker, I go further and say that if he had at any time at all since then demonstrated the slightest interest in Dominica or the development of any West Indian island, Barbados would have been made the Federal Capital of the West Indies. Trinidad was made the Federal Capital purely because the Trinidad Government through the leadership of Dr. Williams displayed some interest in the economic development of the smaller islands; and if Dominica or any other West Indian Island felt that Barbados had the slightest interest in them or their development, they would have voted for Barbados to be the Federal Capital.

He is going to tell the House and the public that two years ago somebody gave Government advice, and he is only mentioning that now because I may want to claim, as he said, that I thought of the Dominica land settlement. I picked up myself at my own expense three years ago and saw the possibility at first hand, discussed it with every sensible person in Dominica, and came back and presented on the floor of this House a Memorandum embodying what I thought should be done, because Dominica has just been spending a lot of money on road development, and opening up a lot of the interior. As I said in the Address which I have twice presented on the floor of this House in the last Session and in the current one, these new roads have between them opened up about thirty thousand acres at virgin land. The road going to Roseau with the other roads in the eastern part of the island at La Plaine and Castle Bruce where they are now starting a development programme, has opened up very large areas of flat land very suitable for sugar cultivation, and the expenditure

of money for the development of roads would also open up areas for cultivation and for land settlement. The position is, Mr. Speaker, that in the development of Dominica or any attempt to utilise these thiry thousand acres of land would have made it possible to settle about 10,000 Barbadians or 10,000 West Indians in the island of Dominica.

I have the basis of a memorandum for land settlement proposals in Dominica, which, to be quite candid, I have never bothered to present to the West Indian public, because I thought it was a waste of time.

.. . ... I gave a bare outline in the Address which I tabled here on my return from Dominica in 1955. I explained in some detail what the opening of these new roads meant, and I said, Sir, the British and West Indian Governments should be asked to appoint a Commission to go there comprised of West Indian and United Kingdom representatives and discover what the actual position was for themselves.

2.15 p.m.

My own opinion was that a Dominica Development Corporation should have been established with about $15 million or $20 million in capital to provide housing, roads, hospital facilities, schools, refrigeration, and so on and making facilities for the utilisation of tremendous land areas in Dominica so as to assist in making the region more self sufficient, especially in foodstuffs and things like that. I have here with me now a copy of the Report of the Road Development Programme undertaken by the Dominica Government Government itself. Significantly enough this memorandum was given to me by no less a person than the man who is now Director of Highways and Transport in Barbados, Mr. Grant. He was at the time Director of Public Works in Dominica. I am not going into every possible thing completed by the Dominican Government in this respect, but Mr Grant has brought out for me in detail the cost and actual programme of public works which has already been undertaken by the Dominican Government with the assistance, of course, of Colonial Development and Welfare funds.

Now, I say all of this, Mr. Speaker, not with any attempt to tire the House but merely to make it plain to the Committee with reference to the words of the Hon. Premier and his trying to infer that I did not think of anything first, that he has not had the idea in 20 years although he said that somebody had given him the advice. They did not give it to me. As I have said, I knew nothing about it, and up to now I know nothing of any advice being given to the Government; therefore, I hope, before the debates are circulated, that he would be kind enough to give the House the date. I am sure it must appear in the official records when he made any reference, vague or otherwise, to any land settlement scheme. As I have said, I know nothing about it, and I also repeat that if he had the slightest interest whatsoever in the development of the area or in finding work for the unemployed of Barbados, he would have taken some section on the advice given him two years ago. He ought to be ashamed to admit that in the position he occupies with the advantages of doing something more than an ordinary member can do, and without cost of a single cent to himself, he has sat lazily and done nothing at all about it. Nothing could be more indifferent. As a matter of fact, the inference is that if I were not now debating the question, although he said that he knew about it two years ago, this House would not know that somebody was advising the Government about land settlement in Dominica, either to Barbados or the West Indies.

All the popularity and support that Trinidad has enjoyed resulting in her being the seat of the Federal Government springs from the fact that the Hon. Dr. Williams said that he was prepared to assist in the development of the smaller islands. He said that he was prepared to go further and see to it that their economic developments run parallel with Trinidad's. He said that that will also take place simultaneously with Trinidad, and because of that the people of the smaller islands - all of them - gathered around him as bees gather around honey and voted that the Federal Capital be placed in Trinidad - which is something which we never hoped for but which we were entitled to, had the Hon. Premier displayed the slightest interest in matters West Indian. But, of course, if by his record he has done absolutely nothing to develop Barbados, it follows without any further argument that nobody would believe he would be interested in the development of somewhere else.

I cannot understand for the life of me what he intends to do for the people of this country. Every single proposal for emigration of people in this Island, when it was first made, he opposed it. From way back in 1943 and 1944 he was more interested in raising objections to proposals for emigration than in supporting proposals for it. He retarded industrial development; he prevented us for years from having aids to pioneer industries or the establishment of hotels. One would understand, if he were interested or if he were actually engaged in the promotion of these things, his marking time on proposals on land settlement outside. He today admits that he had this advice two years ago. He had it a year after I made it on the floor of the House. If he wanted to ignore me, well, he could have ignored me; but if he wants to justify the emoluments which he draws as Premier of Barbados and the confidence which the people repose in him, well then, get up and do something and do not treat every suggestion with utter contempt. Do you think it augurs well in Dominica this morning for Dominicans to hear and learn that two years ago somebody advised the Barbados Government about land settlement possibilities and the Hon. Premier never breathed a whisper about it? Let us say that he has not taken any action at all on the matter. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the Island deserves a better fate at his hands and if he is the man who aspires to be the Leader of the Federated West Indies, Dominica deserves a better fate from his hands. He is so busily engaged in evolving what he calls strategy and thinking out new tricks that he has not got the time to pay appropriate attention to these aspects of the economic life of the area, which in truth and in fact are deserving of more attention than anything else to which he says he is devoting attention.

2.25 p.m.

I want also to refer at this stage to the question of Federation. We have before us the amount which is this country's contribution this year towards Federation, an amount of $640,000. For some reason or other, the Introducer of the Budget imported into his Budget Speech his hackneyed themes about Freedom of Movement and Customs Union. The community has grown tired of hearing in recent days that undertakings from the Leaders of the Governments of Trinidad and Jamaica with respect to these two Items have influenced the Leader of the Government Party to participate in federal politics. I want to make it perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, that when we voted this $640,000 for Federation as our contribution towards the cost of Federation, none of us, with the exception of the Premier, perhaps, did that, because we have this nebulous undertaking from the Chief Minister of Trinidad and the Chief Minister of Jamaica to the effect that at some distant date in the future they hope to see Freedom of Movement and Customs Union become an accomplished fact, because neither of them has said so far that the matter will be attended to, except that it will be given future consideration. The matter is yet to be considered. We voted this money because we believe in Federation; we voted it because while we accept in principle that the theories of Freedom of Movement and Customs Union are indispensibly bound up with the success of Federation, we do not regard that, as the Premier seems to regard it, as being the beginning and the end of Federation. It is merely fooling the public at this stage to make it appear that, because we have these undertakings about Freedom of Movement and Customs Union, we can more readily enter into Federation. It is possible that by the time the Jamaica and the Trinidad Government complete their deliberations on these two matters and reach some conclusion these two matters in themselves may really mean something to Barbados if Barbados wants them to mean something to her; but at the moment they mean nothing.

If we were starting off now with Freedom of Movement and Customs Union, what would they really mean to this country? Would any Barbadians find work in Trinidad, Jamaica or Dominica or any other Island in the West Indies merely by going there? There is unemployment in Trinidad now; last year the Trinidad

Government had to vote something like $3/4 million to provide special work for agricultural workers in the rural areas after the crop, so that they would not be idle; and even when that was done, the Trinidad Public Works staff were protesting that, because work was found for these workers in the rural areas, they were left unemployed. There is really no work to be found in Trinidad now, and worst still, there is no place for West Indians to go there to live.

The Trinidad Government has had to get houses for the Federal staff, and they were running about some seven to eight miles from Port of Spain and paying £25,000 for houses which cost £5,000 to build. I saw with my own eyes people bull-dozing hills seven miles from the city in order to get land to accommodate houses and that land was being sold at $5 a square foot. I do not think that with the influx of people in Trinidad, they will find housing accommodation, because it is not there. More important still, this question of Freedom of Movement will cut both ways. There are a number of Islands referred to as the smaller Islands, and they make reference to our standard of living in Barbados as being higher than theirs. I am submitting that you will have more Dominicans and Vincentians coming here if we have Freedom of Movement than you would have Barbadians going to Trinidad looking for work.

With Freedom of Movement, there is at present a large number of St. Lucians and Dominicans in Barbados engaged in agriculture, cane cutting and what not; if you were to go to St. George or St. James, you would find them. I understand that Bulkeley's Plantation has just been building houses for these people and large numbers are employed as domestic helps in homes, hotels and what not.

2.35 p.m.

The emphasis should not be on freedom of movement but what else can you expect from a Government like this? Other Governments are thinking in terms of economical development; the Chief Minister of Jamaica and the Chief Minister of Trinidad tell us that they are remaining home not because they have not got freedom of movement, but because they want to ensure the economic development of their unit territories; but the Premier of Barbados is telling us that the all important thing of Federation is freedom of movement and customs union. In other words, all Barbados must expect from Federation is the legal capacity to travel freely about the federal area looking for work, because God Almighty has ordained that we are the only West Indian race to be running from hole to hole looking for work, now in the United States, now in Panama, now in England, now in Curacao, in Bermuda and anywhere it finds work. Apparently, it was never intended by the Divinity that the country should be so economically developed as to find work for its inhabitants at home! Every utterance, every proposal and every policy of Government support this contention. He himself told you in his Budget speech that their Capital Works Programme is presented in terms of economic development; that is what he is reported as saying. It is the very lowest indication of any kind of West Indian statemanship; it is a disgrace to Barbadian thinking, for Barbados to admit to the West Indies and to the whole world that the main thing we are concerned with from Federation at the moment is to go somewhere and look for work. That is why I began by saying that what the country really needs is a development budget, a budget that is planned in terms of expanding production and not merely in terms of collecting a few items of public works expenditure, putting them together and presenting them to the public as a budget.

With regard to the new taxation proposals which I understand are expected to yield about $140,000, the least said about that the better. The new taxation is immaterial to the people of this country; all it might mean might be help to rum manufacturers, because the people who now drink whiskey might turn to rum. I do not accept his complacency over the position in so far as it applies to Trumpeter cigarettes, because the increased taxation of cigarettes only applies to imported tobacco, and he himself admits that Trumpeter cigarettes have increased in price. Unless the Trumpeter cigarette factory can produce facts to show that production costs have gone up, all it means is that there was a budget leak and that the Trumpeter Ltd., people heard that the cost of imported cigarettes was going up after the Estimates, and they put up the cost of cigarettes before because they would have no justification in pushing them up after. Unless the cost of producing Trumpeters has gone up, the increase is unjustified, and somewhere along the line the Trumpeter cigarette people must have known or heard that taxation on imported cigarettes was going up, and therefore, they felt, now is the time for them to put a little more on, because they were not paying any more excise.

If they put it up after they would be asked for a reason for so doing, because the increase does not apply to them. This is not a matter which should be accepted with the complacency implied in the casual reference to it by the Premier in his Budget speech. There is no reason at all why the Trumpeter manufacturers should be allowed to profiteer out of the increase on the tariff on imported tobacco, and they should be called upon by the Minister of Trade for an explanation as to why the increase was jacked up a fortnight ago, and if they cannot justify, it they should be compelled to revert to the former selling price or the matter should be fixed under the Emergency Regulations; the Comptroller of Supplies should by an Emergency Order fix the price at which cigarettes should be sold. I say that with all seriousness, and I say that Government owes it as a duty to the community to investigate the matter. It is more than passing strange that on the eve of the increase in the tariff on imported tobacco, local tobacco, which is not subject at all in the budget proposals to increase, should cost the country more.

On this question of controls and prices, I believe the time is ripe for an enquiry into the general prices of food in this community. There is something wrong somewhere because the cost of food is going up every day, and some items of food which you buy at certain prices in Barbados you can get much cheaper in Trinidad. The last price on bacon is $1.60 per lb. Every coal-miner and every working man in Great Britain has a ration of bacon on mornings. Bacon at $1.60 per lb. is completely beyond the working class man in Barbados. Butter, another steady diet which should be used by the community, is increasing in price which is beyond the reach of the average man or woman The price of New Zealand butter is $1.10 per lb; in Trinidad it is 79¢ a pound, and I cannot for the life of me understand why this should be so, because the whole world knows that at the moment butter is not an item in short supply. There is a surplus in America, and as a matter of fact America has been giving tons and tons of butter all over Europe in order to relieve their farmers of surpluses, and they are giving away so much that Australia and New Zealand cannot sell the butter which they are producing now. That reminds me that I was told the other day that you can actually import New Zealand butter via London to Barbados cheaper than you can buy it direct from New Zealand itself. New Zealand and Australia have a contract to supply Great Britain with this product and whether or not the price is cheaper on the British market, I am told that it is possible to import butter manufactured in Australia and New Zealand from firms in London more cheaply than you can import it from New Zealand directly. I think the Minister of Trade should also investigate the report that quite recently a Commission Agent from Trinidad was offering New Zealand butter on the local market at a cheaper price than is now current.

2.45 p.m.

In any case, Sir, I am suggesting that, owing to the fact that because of the rising prices of the most essential commodities and food-stuffs, many of them are placed beyond the reach of large sections of the population, the time has come that immediately there should be set up an enquiry into the price of foodstuffs in Barbados to see whether those prices are increased by the manufacturing rate or if by profiteering by the middle man at this end Whatever be the cause, I think the enquiry should bring about some measure of relief to the hard-pressed people of this Island. Butter is selling here at $1 per pound when it is selling in Trinidad at 79 cents per pound. That is not a matter which could be viewed with satisfaction or complacency.

Now, on this question of food and food crops and what not, I recall that the hon. Introducer of the Budget

made reference to the fact that it is proposed to have a free port area when the Harbour Scheme is completed. I think that Bermuda and the Bahamas now have a free port area and I am told that Jamaica has one too; and I think you will remember that some years ago when Mr. Albert Gomes was Chief Minister of Trinidad, he proposed that Trinidad should also have a free port area. Presumably, if Mr. Gomes had been returned to power, Trinidad would have had a free port area already.

I refer to this fact because I want to suggest that appropriate attention should be paid to the question of private bonds. When the Harbour Scheme is completed, due attention must be paid to the question of warehousing, as to whether private firms are going to be allowed to have their own private bonds or whether the Government will have their own bonded warehouses. I do not know on what principle bonds are given to merchants in Bridgetown. I have been told about a recent case in which a private firm asked for a bond and the Comptroller of Customs refused to grant the application and it was overruled by the Minister of Trade and the bond was given to the applicant. Well, nobody knows exactly what are the principles under which these applications are granted. The mere fact that the Minister felt justified in granting the bond to the applicant and the Comptroller of Customs thought that it was wrong, should cause this matter to be gone into in the interest of the Civil Service. The reports carried on around the City are that this firm applied for a bond and the Comptroller of Customs said that he should not have the bond and he was overruled by the Minister of Trade

Hon. M.E. COX: There is no such thing which happened in my Ministry - nothing of the sort

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not saying that it happened with him. I do not know if it happened in his Ministry or under the Ministry of some previous Minister, but I am saying that the Report is authentic. I am not saying that the applicant should not be granted a bond.

Hon. M.E.COX: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I would be very pleased if the hon. member would mention the name of the firm. Picking up something by the way is not good enough. I would be glad if he mentions the name of the firm. I have never heard of it before.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Hon. Minister said he has never heard of it before, I once heard somebody saying in this House - I think it was a former Attorney General - that a husband is the last person to hear of his wife's infidelities, and it is also possible that a Minister is the last person to hear about irregularities in his Department Let me say that I am not any one man C.I.D. for the Government and the same way I hear when anything is discussed outside, some member of the Government can hear it too. The Hon. Minister can investigate what I say to find out whether it is true.

2.55 p.m.

I repeat, that the Comptroller of Customs is not infallible, but there must be some theory on which these things are founded. I have mentioned the incident in the larger context of the whole question of private bonding. On the latter question of free port warehousing, when the Deep Water Harbour is completed, a system would have to be provided. Are we going to allow the private bonds to continue, or is the Government going to provide bonds? By and large, it is difficult to award a private bond to one individual and to resist the applications of others who may have equal grounds for wanting a private bond. There must be some accepted principle in operation, so that the system should continue even as it is.

On the question of increasing the interest rates, the Government which has a justifiable reputation for making itself ridiculous, is apparently trying to add to its reputation on this question. We are told that the Act will be amended in order to prevent increased rates of interest on money loaned outside the country, but not internally. Mr. Speaker, what special type of nonsense is this? Do you think that anybody would lend money locally at 6% if they could loan it outside at 7% or 8%? There cannot be any restriction on the free flow of money within the sterling area. There is no reason why an investor with £10,000 to invest in Barbados should not loan it out at 8% or 10% in Trinidad. It is farcical to say that you are going to restrict the rate of interest on local loans, while the same people can lend money outside at a higher rate of interest. All this means is that the Clause preventing local loans will not apply at all, because there will be no money for local investment. Even as the position is now, the money market is tight and are Barbadians not going to be allowed to lend large sums of money to British Guiana and Trinidad where there are higher interest rates? To say that interest rates on local loans will still be at 6% and that local investors cannot lend out money at more than 6% interest is another way of saying that no local person can borrow money in Barbados. It is farcical to think that, with the need of money for development by banks, every cent of surplus capital in Barbados will not find itself – the Government itself is not making capital available for local development as it should do. In Jamaica, the United States of America and in some parts of Africa, there are now in operation specially designed Government plans for making money available on small loans to businessmen who can provide proper guarantees, in order to assist in the development of smaller industries and what not. A few small businesses are helped with small loans either to establish or develop small industries and the practice is a very current one in the United States of America. There is nothing of the sort here, and therefore, the Government has to be very, very careful and cautious as to how, by legislation, it further restricts the possibilities of getting money on loan for development in the Island. The money market is very tight, as I have said, and if simultanously with this amendment to the Act under reference, the Government proposes to increase its allocations for housing from Government funds and also to set up a Small Industries Loan Board or to widen the scope of the Development Board to embrace this sort of activity - unless the Government is going to do these things, it will mean that opportunities for small businessmen or small wage earners, either to employ themselves or, in some cases, to get houses in which to live, are going to be restricted further.

3 05 p.m.

We cannot afford, Sir, to be party to this sort of thing. Nobody knows at present how long the present Bank of England rates will continue and the Government will be advised to make haste slowly in this issue of tampering with local interest rates. People of course must be allowed to get the most that their money can earn under certain conditions, but at the same time the rights of people in the unrestricted money market and the freest possible offer of capital loans have to be protected.

I do feel, Sir, that with the money which the Government has to play with, the present unsatisfactory manner under which the Development Board operates will come to an end. I hope that the appropropriate Minister will in due course furnish the House with the list of industries and individuals who have already been assisted with funds from the Board and also with a list of the applications which it is proposed to grant with the allocation in the current Budget, because we have been told that the existing applications already double the amount for which the current Budget provides.

There have been some rather disquieting rumours in connection with one or two grants by the Board and it appears, Mr. Speaker, that the policy under which the Board is directed is not exactly the policy which many of us, especially on this side of the House, would like to see in operation. We really expect the money advanced to the Board to be expended on the development in the fullest sense of the word. There can be no excuse for helping one individual in his present business and refusing applications from similar individuals in similar business. The entire question of development loans and industrial development needs to be overhauled, because if as it is, Government is loth to endeavour to attract new investors to the country on the grounds that they come in and operate and make profits which will go out of the country, then Government needs to be reminded that the profits on the items which they would manufacture in Barbados are at present being made by people outside the country. If foreign firms come here and manufacture these commodities, it is true they are

entitled to take the profits out of the country; but in the process of manufacturing in Barbados, work should be found for people in this and other things in connection with the industry, and it must result to some extent in the expansion of the country's economy. Therefore the claim that foreign investors should not be welcomed on the grounds that they are going to take their profits out of the country is not within the best interest of the country. In developing, the country would have to be compelled to make this sacrifice with the sure and certain hope that after the time allowed in the Pioneer Industries Legislation has expired, these industries will contribute their share to the revenue of the country by taxation; and in any case, Sir, the only way to get the country industrialised is either by admitting foreign investors or by Government putting up the capital and starting an industry in Barbados. They have not got the capital and the know-how, and it must be their policy if the country must have development to be satisfied at this stage to do what so many countries in the world are doing and take every possible step to attract investors into the colony.

The increasing rate of population, Sir, coupled with the mechanisation of the country's main industry, means the annual increase in the number of unemployed and unless we want the standard of living to decline, we have to begin now to lay the foundations for new industries and new employment possibilities in this island of Barbados.

I submit, Sir, that in this respect freedom of move ment constitutes no answer at all to the problem.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for three quarters of an hour.

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

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

3.15 p.m.

On reassembling

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the manner in which certain affairs of this House are conducted precludes me from making any intelligent contribution to the discussion on these Estimates. I think this House can well take to heart the words of a recent wit who said that argument is an exchange of ignorance and discussion is the exchange of intelligence. When one has only had a document like these Draft Estimates in his hands for 48 hours, an intelligent man can only be ignorant of its contention, far less some other people It is regrettable, Sir, that an honest man who is duty bound to do his best towards his constituency and the island should be treated in such a manner and it can do no more than what is occurring in this House of Assembly, that is, the harbouring of ignorance. If hon. members were allowed time to be properly prepared, if they took their duties properly and if the affairs of the House were conducted seriously, we would then have serious debate. I would go further and say that the petty personalities which are brought up from time to time are not the affairs of this House or of the people; you should leave that at home. I attended this meeting this afternoon partly through a sense of duty; otherwise I would not be here.

Sir, recently, somewhere towards the end of December and before the 8th January this year, I was present at a discussion between two gentlemen and myself whose names I will mention later. The discussion was on the Deep Water Harbour project. The statement made by the Hon. Premier in his opening remarks has made me even more certain that I should categorically, emphatically, honestly and without bias or prejudice state what occurred at that particular time, because I consider it is in the interest of this island that it should be investigated to the hilt. The Hon. Premier stated that in his opinion remarks which were written in a letter to the Press regarding the matter were libellous. I hope he will correct me if I am wrong.

Now, Sir, this discussion occurred before the 8th January. I will also remind the Hon. Premier that he said that this gentleman was a disgruntled employee, and therefore he must have been disgruntled before the 8th January. The letter was written by Mr. O.H. Johnson whom I understand the initials "O.H.J." referred to in the "Trinidad Guardian" and I would say, in my opinion, the letter is not as strong as it should have been from what I was told as a result of that discussion. On my entering the discussion with these two gentlemen of whom the other is Mr. Bellamy who was employed by Messrs Costain's Ltd., and to whom I was introduced on two occasions before, when I heard what was going on in the first phases of the building of the Deep Water Harbour, I immediately turned to Mr. Bellamy and told him: "Mr. Bellamy, I have only known you casually; but I want, before you go on any further with the statement which you are making, to let you know that I am a member of the House of Assembly of Barbados. If you, Mr. Bellamy, feel that what you have told me or that what you are going to say is something which I cannot repeat to the public of Barbados, tell me before you go any further." That, Sir, is a categorical statement by me. Mr. Bellamy was warned that I was a member of this House of Assembly and that it was my duty, as I saw it, to report what he had said; therefore I told him that if he did not want me to do so to immediately tell me or cease the discussion or speak to me in confidence. Mr. Bellamy said: "You can speak it anywhere you like."

Now, Sir, this matter is a serious one - one which I view with utmost seriousness. Mr. Bellamy spoke in the presence of Mr. O.H. Johnson and myself after having been told what I just said and warned by me that I was a member of the House of Assembly and would re peat it if I felt it was my duty. I cannot repeat him ver batim and, unfortunately, I would have brought this to the notice of the House of Assembly before, but January has been a calamitous month for me in more ways than one. I have had my father's death, a young friend's death and, recently, a closer relation's death Apart from all that, it is crop time and I have a lot of trouble to get my factory working properly. Because of all that, I was absent when it was discussed in this House and it is necessary, after the statement made by the Hon. Premier, to be absolutely clear on this whole thing because the impression given to this House by the Minister when it was discussed - from what I have read - is that this was a simple matter which could be looked after, and the impression given me yesterday by the Hon. Premier when he referred to it was that that was a statement made by a disgruntled employee and therefore, should not have any significance.

Sir, when I entered into the discussion, Mr. Bellamy said that Messrs Costain, when they arrived in Barbados and saw the conditions of the site for the proposed Deep Water Harbour were amazed because the conditions of the site as seen by them on arrival were nothing in comparison with the reports that they had from Barbados. Mr. Bellamy to me seems to be a man who has great experience in this kind of work from the manner in which he was talking. Let me say that if anybody hears that the man is a hard drinker, he was not under the influence of any alcohol when he was speaking to us; neither was Mr. Johnson nor I. We were not doing anything more than seriously discussing the matter, and, therefore, I want to repeat that it is my impression that Mr. Bellamy was sincerely giving his idea of the facts as he had seen them. I understand that since this occurrence Mr. Bellamy has disappeared. Well, perhaps, it might be a wise thing for him to come back to Barbados even at Government's expense in order to find out whether what he said is a fact or not.

4.15 p.m.

After saying that on a particular day, for the whole day, they could only get three buckets full out of the spot, he said - I speak under correction here, but he said - that this is the fourteenth or sixteenth site on which he has been working.

Now, Sir, a man who has been working on fourteen or sixteen sites of Deep Water Harbours must have wide experience particularly, if he has been ---

Hon Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of Order, I am glad that the hon. member is making this speech,

but I want to get the facts clearly. The hon. member has mentioned three buckets full, but three buckets full from where?

Mr. DOWDING: Three buckets full of the dredge from the bottom. I was in my little shack at Paynes Bay and the sea was as calm as possible. He went on to state that he has never seen anything like it, and that every penny that Mr. Johnson and myself had put in it would be lost. I turned to him and said; "You mean the taxpayers money?" He said, "Yes." He said: "This harbour project will never be completed as long as you live." Those are the few facts, which I think have been particularly garbled, of the whole thing.

Other discussion took place about various currents and so on, but I think the points which are relevant to this argument is that here is a man who is employed by a reputable firm, and I should like to know, if he has been employed by them on fourteen or sixteen harbours and comes to this harbour and says that the conditions reported are absolutely unfavourable, what would they think in England? He said that this harbour will never be finished and that every cent - he used the word penny - of the taxpayers' money would be lost and that it would never work.

I think that all hon. members of this House know that I do not speak for the sake of speaking. I think hon. members should see that in my parliamentary life, I have never got on the floor of this House and accused any man wrongfully. I view this matter seriously, and I want the Government also to view it seriously. It is, in my opinion, a very big question - I mean this Deep Water Harbour undertaking. What I have said is the discussion which took place; what I have said is factual. I have not been able to repeat the words verbatim, but the facts are there. What I have stated was said by Mr. Bellamy before the 8th January, this year, in the presence of Mr. Johnson and myself, Mr. Bellamy having been warned by me that I am a member of the House of Assembly, and I felt it my duty to repeat what had been said.

Now, the Premier in his speech has mentioned that Messrs. Costain will construct this harbour within fifty months. Mr. Bellamy said that it will never be finished. The Premier also mentioned that there is a Consulting Engineer and a Resident Engineer on the spot to ensure that the contractor constructs the harbour according to the specifications. There is no fault to be found in having someone there to ensure that the specifications are being carried out; but these specifications have a specific manner of going wrong when the job has been finished. I have had a certain amount of dealings with specifications and so forth, and I wonder if any interim report is being made to the Government to the effect that specification No. so and-so dealing with so and-so has been completed to my satisfaction, signed by Messrs Coode or whoever they are. Because there are reputable firms today, it is not always wise to trust them. We must have some trust in people; but we cannot absolutely trust them.

In the Government, there may be those who can check an interim report on the specifications and see what is correct; at least, they should be able to check the interim report and verify that that report is satisfactory signed by the correct person or, if necessary, forwarded to the firm's Head Office for return to Barbados duly signed as being correct. You have the specifications as to the job being finished and they are specifying that some part is constructed of cement; however, when you look at the outside it may be made of wood, but you do not know whether there is any cement in it or not I do feel that careful supervision by the Ministry responsible for these specifications being carried out correctly should be undertaken

4.25 p.m.

The assurance of the Colonial Office is another thing. They will have tried to do their best, and their assurance will come from out of the fact that they have obtained the best; but, Sir, how often have we found that the best is not good enough? It will be a sad day for Barbados if the best is not good enough. I spoke, I think, a long time ago on this contract I would like to warn the Premier on this particular point. He said somewhere that the contract could not have been more tightly drawn up in favour of the Government.

Now, I have taken some trouble to investigate as many of these schemes as I possibly could, and I would like to ask him if there is any one case where due to the fact, as he said later on in his speech, that the contractors got to a point and then said they could not carry on, they did not eventually get what they demanded. I should like him to tell me of one case where in the building of a Deep Water Harbour where the contractors contracted for $X, and then asked for $X plus, they did not get it through the Courts. I warn him, Sir, that these contracts are extremely vulnerable to all types and conditions obtaining from year to year, and I warn him that there is no such thing as a tight contract. No firm is going to come in for a tight contract. If you try to build a house under a tight contract, there is not one contractor who is going to undertake to do it. They will do it at cost plus. I know of a recent instance of a big man close to a point where he wanted to build his house and it took him £20,000 at cost plus; he could not have got it at $10,000 on a tight contract.

I do not know if the Premier has read these contracts, but I have had the privilege of seeing these documents, and I bet the Premier that when he looks over the back of the document he will see so much writing in fine print that nobody knows what will happen in the end. I cast no aspersions against the people concerned. I am a businessman and I do business in a business-like way. Contracts of that sort are impractical under today's conditions. What stock has Costain got here that would be worth anything in comparison with what we would be spending in a year's time? The trucks which they have cannot be used locally and as soon as they are finished, they will dump them in the careenage. It is that clause alone that puts me on my "P"s and "Q"s. I am not saying that Costain is not a reputable firm, but the stock which they have here for the construction of the Harbour which can be levied on is a small entity in comparison with the millions of dollars which we are going to spend. There are only two trucks with cranes and probably about nine others, a couple of jacks and a few other things, and frankly I would take that with a little pinch of salt.

Well, Sir, that finishes my remarks so far as the Harbour is concerned. I do hope that the Hon. Premier and his Ministers will take what I have said seriously, because I can assure them that that is truthfully and honestly what was said to me by Mr. Bellamy who gave me the impression that he was a capable and experienced man

As far as the Estimates are concerned, I can say little because to me they are no more than a sort of auditor's statement of revenue and expenditure. It holds no sort of policy that one can grip to say that in the next five years due to such and such an action, your colony's revenue will be increased by so much. To me it is purely a collection of figures sent in by Heads of Departments and consolidated into the Estimates; it is nothing more than that and hardly warrants any more discussion. I should like to say, however, that it is noticeable that there is no assistance in these days to the man in the middle, especially in the lower middle. Today, Sir, we seem to have a tendency to go forward with a propensity to spend, and I repeat that I do hope that Government will send for five copies of Professor Hahn "Commonsense Economics" for the Hon. Ministers. "The propensity to work and not the propensity to spend is the foundation of national income and wealth," and that is as sound today as it was at the beginning of the world. Hard work is the basis of all success It is noticeable that you are putting more machines, accounting machines, more officers and spending more money on the Civil Service, but we do not hear of the dispensation of any of these people.

I am not for one moment, as I know it would be said, trying to put anybody out of a job; what I am trying to say is that if thought was given to the future and proper policy, we would be able in five years' time to be like Puerto Rico where instead of the people going mad from sickness, they go mad with the anxiety to buy Cadillacs. That is proved from the figures I have in my own house. Personally, I would like to see all the people in Barbados going mad with the desire to buy Cadillacs

because frankly I have known them for a long time; some of them would buy three, as one fellow I know in New York who is a friend of my family for several years, and still not be mad, and they would be successful men and women.

4.35 p.m.

So to me, Sir, this mounting and mounting expenditure seems to foreshadow bad things. I am not a pessimist: but this year's crop is not up to the standard we had hoped; and unless the weather changes it would fall below the standard which the Hon. Premier or the Director of Agriculture hopes. I think the time has come for us to look into our house and see whether it is not becoming too top heavy. I am not referring to the heavy administration; I am using a Bajan term. You should not leave out thinking of the man in the middle and do not give him any opportunity. I feel that the man in the lower middle should have all the good things such as those who are able to ride in Jaguars at their expense. That in my opinion is not right. These Civil Servants get loans for cars; they get Leave Passages; now they are getting funds in order that they can build a new house, and they also have security of tenure. Do not think, Sir, that they are not secure. Some of them are so secure in their jobs that they will never go.

I have seen a little information in the newspaper from the Fisheries Department about $8,000. I do not like to believe rumours, but I am a bit worried about things in this Island. I hear rumours of another fellow going who is not coming back, and there are situations where people are coming to you and bringing an open order. I am stating this and stating it fearlessly because it has happened to me personally. A fellow brought to me an open order. It does not matter if I am villified for saying it. The order was brought to me open. He wanted "X". when he saw the price of X, it was Y less 10%. He came back to me and asked: "what about my 10%?" I said: "wait a minute! You have come to the wrong department." He said that with the customers he deals with, he can get 10%. I said: "You would not get it here or the Government would not get it here." However, he bought X and neither of them got the 10%.

Sir, I am a bit worried that we are becoming overburdened with people who are peculiarly interested in themselves and not in their jobs. I know that there are several people in the Service who are doing a grand job and giving good service on a whole. I think we must stop pampering and giving them everything they want just for the sake of their raising a finger. If we do that, we would be in a better position to cut our cloth to suit our backs. I repeat, there are certain individuals whose names I hope we will soon see published in the newspapers, and I hope if things are proven in the Department which has been mentioned in the newspapers, that no effort will be made to remove the gentleman secretly out of Barbados but every effort made to remove him publicly to Glendairy. The people's funds are the people's funds, and they are not to be dealt with in a casual manner.

Again, Sir, I repeat that I regret I have found it necessary to speak without sufficient evidence and facts, but it seems to me that this Government takes an awful long time to move on such things, and I would like to see speed. If there is no doubt as to what was published in the Advocate of the monies concerning a particular Department, moving with speed will be the means of making sure that if anybody has manhandled monies which do not belong to him and belong to the taxpayers, that person is brought to justice. If we start to work, we would find that we would be able to undertake a great deal more that could be of lasting benefit to this island and we would find ourselves in a better position.

Sir, I heard it mooted sometime in the past that there would be some scheme whereby the lower middle class people of the island would be able to obtain a house in the same way that Civil Servants can. I feel that those people are just as much a pillar of the island and more so than Civil Servants; therefore, they are just as much entitled to the Labour Welfare Housing Loan which is for only a certain class of worker. What is happening to the man in the middle? Is he not a class too? Very often his position is worse than that of the labouring class, some of whom are working for more than $100 a week in factories or around Bridgetown. I hope some day that the Government will see the suffering and the plight of the middle class people of the island.

I regret very much, Sir, that I have not seen anything included in these Estimates to ease the man in the middle of his taxes, of his housing problems or of his educational problems. I am not considered to be a man in the middle class; I am considered as one in the rich class, and frankly, Sir, what it takes me to educate my children hurts my purse strings to the point of going to Mr. Barclay, like the Hon. Premier, to get him to lend me money. (Laughter). I expected to hear the jubilations or jeers from those who get their money directly in their hands I repeat it must be a great burden on those people to educate five or six children with the means and salaries which the local economy offers them at present. In the past you could get yams, potatoes and even milk free, but nowadays it is a different thing. You want Klim and you have to spend money to get it. Sir, I am thinking of the people in the middle class. Many of them are only doing a part-time job either in the country or in the City. I think of them as the forgotten souls, as far as this Government is concerned. This Government has not shown me that it is interested in the man in the middle.

4.45 p.m.

While I am on the subject of Education, a matter on which I am even stronger than the Premier, I still say that there is need for some improvement in Education in this Island. As I have said in this Assembly before, I receive letters daily from girls and boys who write me either from England or for employment and it hurts my heart to see them spell "there" "they". They are not being properly grounded somewhere along the line. I go even further and say that some of those who have not got to the top of the big schools have had to leave them due to conditions. With the middle-class people, if the fathers have gone on, the mothers have to send the children to school and when these children go into offices, they are incapable of writing proper English. I could hand to the Minister of Education or to any official of the Department, the type of letter which is written; it is impossible for any boy or girl to get a decent job if he or she cannot write proper English If they would pay more attention to the A.B.C. and get their English properly written, these boys and girls would get better jobs.

Personally, I have to take boys and girls quietly and coolly and teach them what they should have been taught in the preparatory forms. There is a hindrance to these boys and girls. I know of some who, if they had the command of the King's English at their disposal, would be able to get much further on in life. I hope that with the extra money which is being spent on Education, that Department and one other Department will never complain. The money which is spent on Education and Agriculture in this Island must of necessity bring us more than one hundredfold of benefit. I have been fortunate to be able to assist a number of boys to get to England, and I call it the $64 question, because they always want $64. I am receiving letters and photographs from these people; the pride with which they write as to how their employers are satisfied with them and how well they are doing, should point out to this Government that they should not depend on me and others to lend these people this $64. Wherever a boy wants to go, his scholastic attainments should be found out; what is his home life and what chances he has got, should also be found out. So far, thank God, I have not had any failures with the ones whom I have been able to assist; I have only been able to assist about 15 and I have been able to pick out those whom I was able to assist, because I always insist that when they leave this Island, they are carrying our banner wherever they go, I refuse to assist anyone who I do not think would be able to lift the banner of Barbados in the way I think it should be lifted. Do not let hon. members think that I am not getting replies from those who have gone out, and do not let them think that they are not taking their wives and children with them. Surely, these people are worthwhile being encouraged, and they should be assisted in a monetary way or otherwise to go on the other side and make a good name for themselves. So long as we have no where around to which we can expand, we will have to go overseas; and it is desirable that our people should go overseas and be known as Barbadians who work honestly and who are

capable of going to any part of the world and acting as good citizens.

Sir, I have spoken a little longer than I intended to speak. I apologise for keeping hon. members back for so long, but I feel that there has been a certain amount of intelligence in my discussion and I do hope it will be considered.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member takes his seat, I would be glad if he would tell me if specific reasons were given by Mr. Bellamy as to how we were pouring money down the drain. I have heard reasons outside; I have also heard contradictory statements and I am wondering if something has been discovered through which water will always pour, and so on. I am wondering if Mr. Bellamy has said what he considered would be throwing away money. 4.55 p.m.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, when I came into the discussion, it was on the site, the soundings, conditions and so forth. Mr. Bellamy did not give me any specific reason, no more than to say that the site was absolutely and totally unsuitable. I was not in the discussion when they were talking of all the particulars of tides, currents and so on; but that is what I was told, and what is factual.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, it is true, I know, that we are in the middle of an election campaign, and that the temptation therefore to score debating points against each other is very great; but I think that this is probably one occasion when we can forget the heat and bitterness of party strife and bring our minds to bear on the very great problems which beset Barbados at this time.

Two days ago when the Minister of Finance was making the speech which he is reported to have made on the Budget, he must have been conscious that it is very likely that that was the last such speech he might propably be making in this House not only as a member, but as the Leader of the Government. If he were conscious that that was the last time on which he spoke as Minister of Finance introducing the yearly budget, he must also have been conscious of the fact that what he said and what he promised was very inadequate in the situation which now faces us; and he must also have been conscious of the grave contradiction which existed between the tone of his speech as he said it on Tuesday and the tone of speeches of a similar nature delivered in previous years.

Gone from this most recent speech are all the airy boasts about the buoyancy of Barbadian finances; gone too was the complacency which he previously used to express about the mounting and bursting surpluses in the Treasury. For the first time, at any rate in the last three or four years, he had to fore-shadow for us a heavy wave of taxation. Now my opinion is that he had worse news for us than that which he managed to convey and that the situation in Barbados with respect to our finances and our economic development generally is much more frightening than he himself cares to admit; but he admitted sufficient and took us into his confidence to the extent of warning us that whoever succeeded, whether as Premier or as Minister of Finance, is going to meet a very challenging situation in the solution of these problems. I might be forgiven at this stage I say it was very wrong and very unnecessary of the Premier in the years gone by to make the people of this island believe that the piling up of surpluses was the safest guarantee of their prosperity. It was very wrong and very unstatesmanlike of him to make us all believe that the policy which he had up to very recently been following is the only possible policy for the benefit of the people of this island.

The situation in which we now find ourselves is that we are called upon almost at short notice to spend very large sums of money, most of which we have not yet got, at greater disadvantage now than if we had spent them in other directions in the years which have immediately gone. My contention in and out of this House has always been that there was ample opportunity for this Govenment to do quite a lot for the people of this Island in the last five or six years when it appeared and was said that there was money to do anything at all and that the position of this island financially, according to what was then said, was better off than many other Islands. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that, had there been between the years 1951 and say 1955, the unprecedented expenditure in social services - and I just do now refer to a mere increase in Old Age Pensions such as we witnessed in 1956 and if there had been a policy literally of spending these surpluses as quickly as they had accumulated, particularly on education and on health, even if we had reached the situation which we now reach of having little or no money at all, we should still have been in the position of having had some tangible benefits to show for the expenditure. As it is, we can make no such boast. Nearly $1 million has gone down the drain over transport services. How much better would it have been if that kind of money had been spent in building, and not merely in replacing, new schools, and, if any of it was left over, in providing a school meal service and some measure, if not all we had been asking for, of free secondary education in this island? I make this point to emphasise that we are worse off now than we have ever been, not merely because we have not got to build a Harbour or a hospital and have not got the money to do it, but because when we did have money, we did not pursue any of the alternatives which were then before us. Consequently by not having the money at our disposal to do what we want, the community is at the same time much the poorer. That is an indictment on the Government which is in power, and I am deliberately speaking in this strain, because I do not want it to be thought that I have brought the battle of the Federal campaign on to the floor of the House. I think this is too much of an important matter and debate for that type of controversy. Every night from the last two or three nights until 24th March, we shall all of us on both sides of the House have ample opportunity to pursue our battles, but on this matter of the Draft Estimates, while we may disagree very terribly, I think the heat of the campaign ought to be kept away from this debate.

Now it is true that the Premier has often been saying that his own policy in piling up the surpluses and in investing half of them every year was the correct policy, and he claims that had he not done that, there would not have been $6 million or $7 million at his disposal a couple of months ago to advance on the expenditure for the Harbour All that may well be true in a certain light, but the argument given only holds good if you admit that not having spent the money and having had it here, it was as well to spend it at some time or other when the need was most pressing.
5.05 p.m.

But they have saved in the last five or seven years in order to spend $7 million as a stop gap for the Deep Water harbour without seeing the design. In 1952, when this policy was first put up, it was argued inside this House and outside that it was the preparation for what was called a rainy day which necessitated the piling up of these sums. We did get a rainy day of a sort in September 1955 and I think if they wish to justify their policy with the example of the hurricane of 1955, they can do so to a certain extent. I think the hurricane was a blessing in disguise it caused the Government of Barbados to spend money which they would not have spent and the start which was made in housing which was more for rehabilitation than repairing was justified because the money was there: but even so though in the case of the hurricane they foresaw it, they were keeping the money just for those reasons.

I say all of that to come on to the next point. We have been told that the situation in Barbados is not as rosy as we are led to believe. The last crop year and the year immediately preceding last year have been good crop years, but we have been given an inkling of the hard times which are now upon us and an increased amount of taxation has been told to us: but not a word to give us any thought of what is going to happen, and nothing to give us any indication as to why there should be this change.

Last year we knew we would have to build the Harbour at a cost in the vicinity of $25 million to $30 million. We knew that even in the year before. We knew last year and the year before that we would have to build a Hospital.

Only in the case of the Hospital and it is only within recent months that we have heard that it would cost more than it was originally estimated. But even so,if that is true, there is no question that we would not find the money to build the Hospital or to build the Deep Water Harbour; and the yearly boast was that so long as we can find the money to pay the cost of trips for the Premier to the United Kingdom and the cost of trips for the Financial Secretary and for the Governor to go there two or three times, there would be no fear that we would not find the money to build the Harbour. We have been spending so much money for trips for so little purpose that we have before us a situation where the thing has got to be started from the beginning, and in order to get the money which we have not yet got. Whoever succeeds him, whether as Premier or Minister of Finance, has got to wait on the goodwill of the Federal Government before Barbados can be told with any clarity or any assurance what is going to happen to it. That is the situation. Meanwhile, the Hon. Premier, in order to bring home to the people of Barbados the fact that they have been living on false hopes in the years immediately preceding this one, has certainly brought them to their senses by the imposition of new taxes.

With respect to the taxes announced which are already the law of the land for the last two days, I wish to say that I still think that they are unnecessary and will prove to be a burden to the people of this Island. Now, a lot of political capital can be made out of the argument that since poor people do not as a general rule drink whisky, gin and foreign wines and smoke imported English or American tobacco or cigarettes, therefore the increase in customs duty on these two items is not a concern of theirs - and it is possible that you would get some support of a sort politically for the imposition of a tax which poor people feel does not immediately hurt them. You will get that support because the average person does not have the time or the inclination to consider the effects of a new phase of taxation upon the Island. You may gather $140,000 by taxing people who generally drink whisky, brandy, gin and who smoke Trumpeter State Express, Du Maurier and all the brands of tobacco which they may smoke, but you have not considered that you may be seriously damaging the very industry - the tourist industry - which according to a published statement the Government is going to help. Are you going to ask a large number of foreigners from Canada, America, England or anywhere else to come to Barbados in larger and larger numbers only to find that they have to pay the same thing for their luxuries - and with some people their necessities - as they pay at home and with worse justification? This is a point which ought to be considered and I shall argue a little bit later that this $140,000 I understand that the Hon. Premier claims that the report of $140,000 was wrong and that it is $141,000 - which this extra taxation is to bring in is not the only way in which you could have got it; and even if you did not choose to use this other way, there would have been no harm in waiting three or four months before you took that particular plunge.

Mr. Speaker, just reflect. We had a record crop last year. It is this year that the profit tax, the company tax, and all the revenue which stems from our selling and exporting of sugar would flow into the trade, and you do not need to be a prophet to be able to foretell that the Government is going to take in from that source perhaps more than $200,000 extra to what they expected on last year's sugar. That is going to happen. So before they wait to estimate with greater accuracy the intake in revenue from last year's crop, they have plunged this unnecessary hardship on the country which will do harm to a vital industry that, I think, it should be their duty to protect and encourage. It may well be - I do not know what the hon. junior member for Christ Church thinks about this — that they think it is a feather in the cap of the exporters and distillers of rum that taxes should be allowed on the whisky, gin and brandy, and that the rum manufacturers are laughing because it is not their production which is made to bear the brunt of the taxes. I think their laughter is ill-timed, and will be of short duration because I have every reason to believe that soon from now the Government of Barbados will pay attention to rum and we will probably find ourselves in for a rude awakening by an increase in its price.

5 15.p.m.

Therefore, I do not think that there is much need for rejoicing. As I have said, I do not know if the people concerned with rum are aware that it is whiskey at the moment, and not imported spirits, which will bear the tax. If they are glad, I do not think that they will be glad for long; I think that their joy is quite unfounded.

When we proceed to analyse the Premier's Speech, we take it that what he said on Tuesday evening in this House foreshadows the policy of the Barbados Government for the next financial year, and that his successor as Premier or as Minister of Finance will have very little room for manoeuvre or for a change in policy, unless his successor comes from a different party. I cannot imagine that a member of the Government Party, who presumably is at the moment there, should think that the Premier's views would suddenly bring about a radical change in the scope and in the working of the Government's financial policy. Therefore, we can look forward with confidence to the certainty that what the Premier has outlined is the policy of the Government Party this year or for as long as that Party remains in power.

Mr. Speaker, we will have a lot of trouble this year in convincing public opinion that some of the things which you set out to do are really in their interest. In the Speech from the Throne, which was delivered to the joint sitting of this Legislature on the 21st January this year, the Governor was pleased to intimate that Legislation would be introduced sooner or later with a view to amending the Rate of Interest Act. I understand that the Premier himself again foreshadowed its early introduction in this Chamber, because of the present necessity of the Barbados Government to borrow money abroad. I think that you will find a lot of disappointment and a lot of heartburning in the Island as a whole about any measure which seeks to have as its intention the raising of interest rate beyond 6% in this Island. I understand that the Premier has said that the change foreshadowed in the amendment will affect only people outside who are lending money which is to come in, and it will not affect internal borrowing and lending. I venture to say that that piece of legislation, when it comes down here, will have to be very wonderfully and cleverly drafted. I venture to say firther that no drafting however wonderful, or clever, can attain just that design.

It is impossible by a mere Act of Parliament which amends the Usury Act to prevent people from sending money out of the Island and have it brought back at the higher rate of interest. You can talk about threatening them with prosecution, as the Premier has done, but the only way in which you can have that sort of legislation and make it effective, is if you are going to have the co-operation - I would even say the subservience of the Government to the commercial banks, because it is the commercial banks themselves which will have to control and operate much of this lending. It is the banks themselves who will have to please their clients, and it is the pleasing of the clients which makes it profitable to carry on the bank business. A mere amendment to the Usury Act to permit the Government to borrow money outside at 7%, 7 1/2% or 8% will not prevent persons from having persons from having to pay 7% or 7 1/2% in this Island.

If there is money to be loaned to Government or anybody else, the people who are handling the money on behalf of their clients must invest it where their clients will have the benefit of the higher rate of interest, and you cannot legislate against the flow of money based on the prevailing rate of interest. The Government of Barbados is up against this particular difficulty; it wants on the one hand to do its own borrowing at a rate of interest which it knows it has to pay, but on the other hand, it wants to give an assurance to the people within Barbados that they themselves will not be affected by it. That would be impossible. The commercial banks cannot be in a position - however much they may sympathise or wish to help - they will not be in a position to help in the carrying out of this proposal, but they will themselves be a party to it, because of the very operations of the system.

Nobody on that side of the House is required to believe a word I say on this point. You can win favour and say that the proposal will work and the experience of the Government of Barbados will be that whenever you

amend the Usury Act to prevent the people from borrowing money at 8%, you will be bringing about a changed situation; but anybody who wants to get money from a Solicitor or a Bank will have to do the same. The people who carry large overdrafts for short periods - I refer to the sugar producers of this Island who in the crop season have to carry millions of dollars in overdrafts for a short period - may escape it, because the banks, knowing that the crop may only want $1/2 million or $3/4 million for three or four months, may stretch the point and allow an overdraft to be carried at 3% or 3 1/2%.
5.25 p.m.

That is a special category, because the Banks will know that sugar producers are engaged in a business which is a guaranteed business, and that at any time from the month of June or July the returns of the sugar industry will come in and that an overdraft will be wiped off. When they know that, they will make any sort of concession to that kind of business. The rest of the community is not in that happy position. The rest of the community, particularly the business section, are persons who have to get loans of more modest proportions and carry them for much longer, and the man who wants $50,000 to finance his business and who therefore may have to carry his overdraft for a year at most is going to find it very difficult, because with great justice, the Bankers will tell him that the money which they have deposited is money which their clients instructed them to get the most for, and much as they would like to help him, it would not be a safe investment to tie up $50,000 for ten months, when in less time than that they could get 8% somewhere else It is not that they are prejudiced, but it would be contrary to normal banking interest to extend that sort of concession on a small overdraft or small loan when much more can be had in different circumstances.

Now that is bad enough and will create a bad enough situation,but let us go now to the rock of the whole matter. It is not customary in this House to hear a plea for the middle class, and by that I must not be misunderstood to use the the term in any snobbish way or in any scandalising manner. What I mean is this: the Government of Barbados itself has said over and over again that its main object in politics is to raise the standard of living of the people, and that even although large numbers of people may well continue to work in the Governments of their choice, their methods of living and existing will be far above those they formerly enjoyed. In other words, the aim of politics, perhaps on all sides of this House is to create one vast middle class with rising standards of living. It does not mean therefore that we are stratifying Barbados on the grounds of educational qualifications or anything like that, but it means that most of us in politics think the man in the middle is the ideal person on whom to model standards of living: and therefore, when we make a plea for him, it is not that we wish everybody to be like him to the last detail, but we would wish everybody so to enjoy a standard of living with food, clothing and shelter and the possibilities of educating one's children becoming the normal thing, and within the range of a wider group of people. That is what we mean by using the middle class standard. It is the agricultural labourer, the domestic servants and people like that who aspire to raise themselves, so that their children in the generation that is to come should all start off at a level higher than they themselves had started. That is common knowledge; else, Mr. Speaker, why would there be this overpowering drive on the part of working class people to get their children in secondary schools? It is this urge that children should start higher and have more advantages than their parents which is responsible for the fact that the private schools today have more pupils than Government-aided secondary schools, and it is a tribute to the sense of responsibility of our people that they should urge for raised standards and higher levels.

Well now, the amendment to the Rate of Interest Act will affect them in large numbers, and the ownership of homes and property will become very difficult to attain It is all right to say Mr. Speaker, that because people working in the sugar industry can avail themselves of money provided under Labour Welfare so to build or repair their houses, they at any rate will receive the benefits of certain schemes and will not have to worry about these things; that is one way of looking at it. Labour Welfare money, Mr. Speaker, is itself invested somewhere; it is never lying down there until somebody comes from St Thomas to borrow $600. Quite a lot of it, I am sure, must be still somewhere in Barclays Bank, and if it is there, it is treated as an ordinary deposit by the Manager of the Bank and is therefore lent out and used for certain economic and financial purposes. You may possibly find, Mr. Speaker, that when the rates of interest are changed, and the need for borrowing outside by Government is felt by the Banks working inside the country, they may be offering you less on your deposits, and you yourself might be forced to charge more in interest to the people to whom you are lending. All of these are consequential to a change in the rate of interest. We cannot stay here now and follow the whole thing and see around the corner, but Government should be warned very carefully before they tamper with it, because what has enabled the Barbadian of all classes in this island to own and enjoy property was the fact that everybody knew that even before he had enough money to make a down payment, he would be required to pay no more than 6%, no matter from whom he borrowed

When I was living in British Guiana some years ago, I was surprised to see that people cheerfully borrowed money and paid as much as 25% in interest on it and nobody thought it extraordinary; and they did not even believe me when I said that we had had in Barbados an Act on the Statute Book for two centuries which saved Barbadians from that kind of outrage by money lenders. Do you want to tell me, Mr. Speaker, that a Government particularly a Labour Government - would contemplate so easily an amendment to that sort of legislation - which has enabled Barbadians, particularly poor ones, to own houses, land, and operate small businesses at greater rates of interest on drafts and loans - overnight, merely because you have worked yourself into the position of borrowing money outside at 8%? Are you going to put the people in Barbados into such jeopardy in order to get $30 million or $35 million to build the Harbour? If these are alternatives, would it not be better to fight and argue with the British Government to get specific terms more favourable to Barbados at this particular time, and get your rate of interest cut down that way rather than to put the people of Barbados to the jeopardy of not only losing some of what they have, but making it impossible for them to get anything more?

It is all very well, Mr. Speaker, to talk about the democratic way of life and to enable the worker to have a vote so that he can put Labour in power. I think that is good so far as it goes; but what makes a man a free man is not only the fact that he can vote, but the fact that he can acquire and own property.
5.35 p m.

And I say that the idea of owning property does not mean a man owning sugar estates or operating or controlling three or four of the larger businesses in the City; I mean the idea that every man should have something for himself, if it is not more than a roof over his head, and in most cases the land on which the roof and floor are standing The Barbadian people do not dig money out of the land; they have to work for it; and when they have not enough of their own, they have to borrow it and then pay it back. The safeguarding of the people of Barbados is something which you must always bear in mind. You must make it always possible that they get money easily whenever they want it and at the most reasonable rates. I submit that there would be soon an attempt to prevent that drive which exists in large numbers in Barbados; and it is because of that I draw attention to the fact that the middle classes are going to suffer the most immediately, and everybody else after that. I think that this is the sort of Bill of which the 'pros' and 'cons' should be argued publicly, and that a national debate should be held out of it, so that the people of this island should be able to give a clear mandate whether the Government should proceed or not proceed with it. When the amendment comes before the House, the now Hon. Premier may not be a member of this House; he would not be a Minister of Finance. Whoever takes over that portfolio - and I am sure the successor is present in the House at the moment - had better think carefully and take a second opinion on the efficacy of introducing this particular bit of legislation.

It is fashionable to curse the planters, the old slave owners, the sugar producers and their ancestors; I know that you can score good debating points by appealing to popular prejudice; but anybody who lives in Barbados in 1958 and understands what is happening - if he is an honest politician - cannot withhold a mead of praise to those slave owners who thought fit to put a Usury Act on the Statute Book. They did it, it is true, for a narrow reason to protect themselves from the Jewish people who were in Barbados in that day: but we have come to benefit from their narrow self-protection and self-interest; and this Act has enabled coloured people in this Island, after slavery was abolished, to own and acquire property, and to hand it down to their children at their death. At the present moment it has enabled a large section of the community which is neither rich nor poor to borrow to operate and control business which are of commercial benefit to this island. If you tamper with that Act, you are tampering with something which is very helpful to the people of this island.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Estimates, when this House goes into Committee on them, there is a lot here and there which I would put forward to the Committee. However, I do not think that I would be able to attend many of the debates.

I would just like to say this. It has become a fashion in this House, particularly near the end of a financial year, around the last two months, to come before the House with a whole avalanche of Supplementary Estimates for appeals for sums of money for various services of the island, which the Government says is "unforeseen expenditure." I hope, Sir, that by the end of next financial year we would have less of that, and that the budgeting would be so nearly accurate that we would not have this cascade of Supplementary Resolutions coming to the House towards the end of the Financial Year It not only upsets the whole financial picture, but because there are supplementary Resolutions, hon. members do not see them in their true order and are not able to say whether we are spending less than what we are, because nobody remembers from time to time that a particular Government Department has asked for $100,000 more than what was voted for them; then you hear suddenly that you have spent more and that it is a waste of public funds. That can be avoided if the budgeting is as accurate as possible, of course, it is not always possible to make it out to the finest point: but you should be able to do it with a greater degree of accuracy.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the people of Barbados are up against it now. They have not yet been told in any detail what their immediate future is likely to be, except one part of the future which is foreshadowed of more and more taxes. It is possible that the revenue will increase in the next financial year: and with this particular Government in power there will be ways and means of spending that revenue. I would just like to say that it is not right nor accurate to call this a record budget, because it was foreshadowed some two years ago. I agree with the Hon. Premier for once that when you have a Five-Year Plan, your Revenue and Expenditure in any particular year is just a record of one-fifth of the whole plan. A lot of people, for instance, will not remember that of the $12 million or $13 million which was earmarked for Capital Expenditure last year, about $6 million or $7 million was unspent or not used. It is therefore only fitting that the unspent balance from last year should be added on to what is proposed to be done this year and, therefore, you will get a swelling of the figures to make people believe that a lot is going to be done in excess of what is being done. But if you do not spend it in 1957, you will have to spend it in 1958; therefore if you have to spend it in 1958, do not make people believe that it is an unprecedented sum which you propose to spend this year when you know that you only propose to do this year what you did not do last year.

5.45 p.m.

Therefore, if taxes have to be collected, and if more money has got to be found for the services of the colony, let us hope that the Government, the Premier or the Minister of Finance whose duty it is to find these sources of revenue, will not only find them from sources which will ease the majority of people but will spend them in ways which will benefit.

Mr. GODDARD: I am sorry that the Premier has departed from the usual practice of informing members of the House that he intends to deal with the Budget on a specific day. He did that on the last occasion. As a matter of fact, since I have been a member of this House, he has always told us on the previous occasion that on the next Tuesday, he would be starting the Budget, that he would be making his Budget Speech; then we would have an opportunity of studying it and then come prepared to deal with the Budget. That was not done on this occasion, as I was expecting it would be done, and as a result, I came into the House just when the Premier was finishing his speech. I have only said that, because he may say that I did not hear what he had said; I had to take most of his remarks from the Advocate, and I do hope that he was reported correctly.

I do not wish to go over what other hon. members have debated today; I came into the House early today purposely so that I could hear their comments and that I could make my contribution to the debate. There are certain things with which I agree, others with which I do not agree, and there are certain aspects primarily which might not have been dealt with, or which might have been glossed over by others.

As regards the Deep Water Harbour, the Premier has said that the contract which has been made falls down solidly on the side of the Government. I hope that that is so. When you are dealing with people who are accustomed to making large contracts, I am sure that, on their side, they will have as capable a lawyer or lawyers in the matter of the drawing up of the contract as the Government could hope to have. The lawyers will have as much experience as the Colonial Office, and they would also have had to do with big contracts. I would not go as far as to say that the contract readily falls down heavily on the side of the Government. Contractors today are carrying out big projects which are lasting over a period of years; and when things have been changing so much in such a short time, I cannot see responsible businessmen signing a contract which will tie them in any material way. It is true that we have not had any details of the contract; we do not know what form of contract it is. The Premier may think that it is a watertight contract and it falls down solidly on the side of the Government. However, I still have my doubts, because rumour has it - and we can only repeat that if there is anything in the entire contract - and, in many cases, it is a cost plus - in a project like this, there may be a lot of unforeseen things which may not have been put down.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of Order. There are about 25 to 30 Clauses in the contract from which I propose to read in order to convince hon. members as to how tight this contract is on the side of the Government. I am afraid that I may have to keep back the House when I am replying.

Mr. GODDARD: I thank the Premier for that; that is what we have been waiting for and what the public would like to know. This is a large sum of money which we will be spending over these five years. I am one of those who felt from the beginning that this idea was an excellent one, and I did not hesitate for one moment in supporting the Government in going on with the construction of the Deep Water Harbour.

Last year was a record year. We had a crop of 202,000 tons of sugar and it was sold at a record price. Apart from the agreed price on 132,000 tons, the surplus we had was all sold at a fancy price, higher than the contract price. Therefore, that resulted in the Island having a sum which we have never seen before. It is for that reason that I agree with the last speaker that the revenue from income tax this year should be somewhat enhanced as a result of profits on last year's crop. I would like to remind the Hon. Premier, however, that much of the revenue collected last year was on the P.A.Y.E. system, and on this year's P.A.Y.E. system the revenue will be collected on a crop which is estimated today to be about 160,000 tons. Although the Government in this Budget thinks- or thought two weeks ago - that the crop would be 175,000 tons, I am told that it might go as low as 160,000 tons, because the juice is not so good, the canes are drying rapidly, and these things will take their toll on a once estimated prosperous crop. I feel that the Government must have taken all of these

things into account in relating the revenue to be derived this year to the expenditure and what has been planned to be spent on capital works.

The Budget today has not got the significance it had of former years. To me, the most important feature is the Five Year Plan. When you are embarking on a Five Year Plan, that is where we should be distributing most; but the last Five Year Plan did not have any beginning. The first Five Year Plan was embodied in the next, and it was changed for the reasons of bringing it into 1955-60, so that we could go on from there. The Premier's Five Year Plan should have ended in 1956-57. We did not have the same debate on the second Five Year Plan as we had on the first The Budget have not got the same significance as before, apart.from when you come to the raising of revenue for the particular years.

I am glad to know that the Government I do not know how they could have done it - does not want to embark on any increased direct taxation.

5.55 p.m.

The Government is well aware, and have been told by people who have made surveys, that direct taxation in Barbados is higher than in any other Caribbean territory, and as a matter of fact many of the difficulties that we have in this House throughout the year in trying to satisfy Civil Servants, whether they be in the very top bracket or in the middle one, and trying to keep them here and finding quarters for them even to the extent of giving them furniture - arise from the fact that they are disillusioned people when they arrive in Barbados from overseas. There are many Civil Servants who were told at the Colonial Office that taxation in Barbados is similar to where he is coming from, only to find when he gets here that it is not so; but he has already given up his post to come into this Island and is therefore disgruntled from the beginning. It should be made very clear to them and should be brought home to the Government that not only Government but private industry is having its difficulty in recruiting qualified personel to fill specialised jobs in Barbados. I am not one for filling posts from outside when qualified Barbadians are available , but I am not one for filling specialised with any type of person; it is false economy; and if we have to go out for these reasons we should do so. But Government should be aware that not only they are finding difficulty in recruiting that type of person and keeping him here, but private industry has the same difficulty. This should be brought home to them, because the sooner they can bring our direct taxation into line with outside, the better for all.

Last year we had the benefit of a tax deduction when working wives were given an allowance which they never got before. It is true that we had pressed for it for many years before we got it, but I can assure Government that it was not too late and it brought back into circulation many efficient wives who would otherwise have stayed at home. This year we have no promise of allowances but we have one small tax in revenue on spirits. Like other speakers, I wondered why Government embarked on that. It is an important product, and as one speaker said, it may do the rum industry some good. I do not think the competition with rum is whiskey; it is more with beer. The working man who drinks rum does not switch to whiskey; if he has an extra dollar in his pocket, he is going to drink a beer or a stout; so I cannot think it was to help the rum industry at all. This is to raise the revenue, but I do not know why it is such a small sum of $140,000. The Premier may say that every little bit helps: but from the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure, the surplus is a much larger sum than last year when we budgeted for a surplus of $200,000 or thereabouts; today it is over $1 million. That will be a reflection of the very large sugar crops we have had; but the Hon. Premier knows what the crop will be this year, and he should give us some reason for putting the additional duty on spirits and I must say it is not only on whiskey, but on gin which the masses are drinking, and brandy and liqueurs. Because of the increased standard of living, the masses are drinking more gin than they have been in the past, and I think the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is well aware of that because he is not far away from what is happening around the shops.

I was very pleased to see that the Government has raised the allocation for the Development Board this year to $500,000. Now from the outset let me say this: I look on the use of the Development Board for two purposes; the modest sum of $1 million will assist small industries and small businesses in bringing in bits of machinery and putting them on the right track. It is what every other country is doing, and I only regret that they cannot find more money than $1 million for that purpose. But the larger feature of the Development Board is something else, and what should be encouraged is private capital, whether it is from within or from outside - much larger sums than what Government can afford to put there to expend and create new industries. The Manager of the Development Board is a good man; he is wide awake and goes after business not only internally but outside; but it is no use keeping him in that post with $1 million. You cannot afford to give him any more money, but you can arm him with the best legislation possible or equal to any in the Caribbean for the encouragement of industries in Barbados. We are behind the others, and I am now specifically to the tourist industry.

I know you have promised to amend the Hotel Aids Bill, because what we have on the Statute Book has not attracted one single dollar, although it has been there for two years. Committees have been into Barbados from outside; they have looked around, made surveys and talked with Government. They know that the aid in our Act is so out-dated in relation to Jamaica and Trinidad that they would not think of coming here under the existing conditions. We have had meetings at the Ministry of Trade up to this week, but I am speaking of it primarily for the Premier, because I know that it is his word that goes a long way in the Cabinet, and unless you give every detail which Jamaica and Trinidad are giving, you should not worry to change it at all. In saying that let me say that none of the existing hotel proprietors would benefit one penny; we are only interested in it as an industry.

6 05.p.m.

Those who are in it today have no more money to put in the industry. Those around the coast and in Christ Church have spent all their pennies in putting in all the rooms they can, and they are not benefitting from the existing Hotels Act. It may seem strange coming from me but I do wish to see foreign capital, whether from outside or is locally, put into the building of new hotels. We are interested in it as an industry because we feel confidently that this island is a good spot for tourism, and we are a people who are friendly. They come here and tell us that this is an ideal lace to set up a tourist industry, but they cannot come here with their capital when Trinidad and Jamaica are offering greater advantages than Barbados. Ask Trinidad and Jamaica why the investors go there first. They give them all concessions; they even give them relief from trade tax, and we who are in the industry are prepared to let then have it if you consent to give them. You will be giving concessions up for only a period of five or seven years and if you do not give them up, they are not coming in; the industry will must lie where it is. I repeat: the existing hotels will not benefit from any of these things unless we add a few more rooms. I am only repeating what has been told to me and what I know has been told to you. In re-writing the Act, do not worry to amend it unless it is the same as what Trinidad and Jamaica are doing.

Now, we come to subsidies. The removal of subsidies from pickled pork is what we have been asking for for a long time. We have been telling the Government for the last eight years to stop subsidising the Canadian and to subsidise the Barbadian. If we produce the pigs here, let us subsidise the people here. (A VOICE: We are doing that.) You are now saying that the people are telling you that. Surely it is better to subsidise what you are producing than what has been produced outside. I commend you for saying that now.

You are now going to shift that subsidy on to brown sugar. That is a local product and I agree that that category of sugar should be subsidised, because

what was subsidised before was not enough. It has not been enough from the time you started subsidising it; however, it looks as if there would be a little surplus this year because you are doubling the amount. The amount of subsidy on it goes from $10,000 to $20,000. You will find that the demand for it will not be so great because of the fact that as soon as you give people all that they want, they never seem to relish it.

I am very pleased that you have stopped subsidising pickled pork from outside. If you were subsidising pigs that are produced here, I would say nothing against it; if you were subsidising milk from here, I would say "yes"; but I do not agree with your subsidising "Dutchman" or any sort of condensed milk from Canada or otherwise. That has always been my policy. As I have said, I am very glad that Government has shifted it subsidisation of pickled pork to brown sugar, and at any time Government feels like subsidising foodstuffs grown in Barbados, I will agree with it. Of course, you must subsidise rice because rice is our staple food, and you have to subsidise it to get it for the people at a modest price.

As you know, the Canadian pickled pork is now in short supply because of seasonal conditions and, not only that, they have got the money they want for it. As a matter of fact, it has gone up to astronomical figures. Let me say that if you think you will get it at a lower rate now, it will be bought at double the price. I am telling you before this subsidy is taken off that the price of pickled pork is going up but I do hope that it is not as bad as I think. When the subsidisation of flour was removed, it jumped up, but it has now settled down. That is what competition has done for it now. As you see, a Canadian Flour Mission has come down to Barbados. We should always take advantage of having free competition from overseas. I am one merchant who wants to get goods into Barbados at the cheapest price because high prices do not benefit us. We want to import more for the same money. It is a short-sighted policy to have high prices because it raises the cost of living of our own employees, it will only be a matter of time when greater demands will be made on us and as a result we would have to adjust the whole wage schedule.

Now, we come to the Bank rate which is a very touchy problem. I know the Government (and the Hon. Premier particularly) has been very concerned about it, and pressure from certain quarters has been brought to bear on him that he should amend Our Usury Act. That Act has served us in good stead for very long and we are so accustomed to it that I for one wish to see no tampering with it. The day that we are forced to amend it, well then, we will have to do it: but I am not one who is convinced that the time has arrived.

The bank rate went up suddenly last year just about the time the Hon. Premier was in England. I do not know, if he went then to raise the money, whether he could have raised it at that time: but it is a fact that the bank rate has sky-rocketed to a point above what we hoped in the raising of this fund for the Deep Water Harbour. Of course, the raising of the bank rate has had some effect which it was intended to do. It has strengthened the sterling and you can see it reflected in the exchange. Sterling balances for raising sterling dollar reserves have mounted, and it has been said in high quarters that in a matter of six to nine months, if not before, the bank rate should take a downward turn. 6.15 p.m.

It may go back to a point which would permit our banks to lend money at 6%. If it went down to 5%, well, we would be safe; if it went down to 5 1/2%, that would be on the border line. They cannot lend out the money at such rates and hope to make money; but the finances of the Island and the deposits in the commercial banks are such that they can carry on for another six or nine months. I would advise the Government to shelve this legislation and hold it up, because in tampering with this Usury Act, I do not know how you will make it water tight for outside loans only. I know that the Public Utilities here can only borrow money from certain quarters and they cannot lend; if that can be overcome, that is another matter. We will pay the result in Barbados, whoever borrows the money. If they have to borrow money at 6 1/2% or 7%, that will have to be added to their expenses and it will fall back on the consumer. I do not want to see the development of the Barbados Light and Power Company held up in the expansion for which we have been asking. I say that if it is a matter of six or nine months when that legislation should take place, let them shelve that legislation and see what effect the money market will have on us.

I do know that the Government will have to raise their loan towards the end of the year in order to replenish what they are advancing now towards the Deep Water Harbour. It will take some judgment on their part as to when they will raise that money and for what length of time. I cannot see money staying up there; it must come back down. You must bear in mind what is looming in the United States of America, and it looks to me, although people do not like to use the word, that there will be a recession. We have different schools of thought on that matter; I do not hold myself up to be an expert, but I read the "Financial News." Eisenhower is saying that the recession will begin to right itself from this month, and I have seen where an expert is saying that there is a recession and towards the end of the year, it may straighten itself out. If we get a recession in America, it will react in every country in the free world. It will react in the United Kingdom, and it will react down here; it will not have the same effect in Barbados as it will have in the very highly industrialised countries which are producing machinery. We have a lot of people in England; we are still hoping to send over another few thousand this year; and there is nothing to stop people from going to England to work like a recession or a laying off of work in England. That will be a slow-up in Barbados and all of these factors you have to bear in mind. I am hoping that the Government will be able to tide over these things without having to come here and amend the Usury Act.

When you look around the West Indies, from British Guiana back to Jamaica, the rates are going up to 8% for small borrowers. When we have been borrowing money in Barbados at the rate of 4% or 5%, the small Islands have had to pay 7%. That is one of the reasons why Barbados is owned by the Barbadians, and you cannot say that of any other of the West Indian Islands, from Jamaica back down. There is more foreign capital and there are more absentees proprietors in the other Islands than there are in Barbados, and that is one of the reasons why money inside the Island. Anyhow, this is a very big subject, but I do hope that we will be able to weather the storm until the bank rate is adjusted and come back down, so that we can carry on and borrow what we need, and hope to have the stability in Barbados to borrow on good interest rates without having to pay anything over 6% That would be another spiral; it would send up the cost of living. There are a few things which we cannot control; but those which we can control, it is the duty of the Government to control.

The Premier made the statement that the Tourist Board is to be set up this year, but I do not see any provision for it in the Estimates. I have looked through them very carefully, and I have seen where the Publicity Committee has been given the same thing as it was given last year. I had thought that if legislation would have been so near to the setting up of a Tourist Board as we were led to believe, the $50,000 which was promised would have been in here. I am asking the Premier to make a note of that point when he is making his reply. Why did he not include in these Estimates under the Head "Tourist Board" the sum which was promised some months ago? That omission gives people to believe that legislation in respect of the setting up of a Tourist Board is not as near as we had hoped.

I am raising this point now because the Premier is a candidate for the Federal Legislation. If I am right, it will not be many weeks during which he will be here and somebody else will be leading the Government.

What is the position of the Church? There has not been any mention made in the Premier's speech about the disendowment and disestablishment of the Anglican Church. This matter has been in abeyance now for the last three years; and since the Church Suspension Act has been amended, I am suggesting to the Pre-

mier that it is not doing the Church of England any good in Barbados. We find that the Church is having to rely entirely on retired people to carry on their services; they are unable to attract into the Church young men, and the effect is such that these people do not know where they stand. I make bold to say that this matter is doing the Church great harm.

6.25 p.m.

If it is not the intention of the Government to disendow the Church, or if they find it for financial reasons difficult to do so, I would suggest to them to reinstate the Church Act so that they can fill the number of vacancies with younger men. Make up your minds and tell us the true position. If for financial reasons you are unable to do it, because it is stated Government policy that it is not the intention to harm the Church or put them in a worse position than they were two years ago, then a statement should come from you before you leave, because you should not allow the Church of England, which is the established Church here, to remain as it is under these conditions and to carry on only with pensioners, and not be able to recruit men to do the work that should be done as a result of not being staffed by young qualified men. Old men cannot be expected to do what the young men can

I do not think I have repeated what I have heard from others, but I hope that notes have been made. I would be very interested in the replies, particularly to the very last subject which I have mentioned.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, in a Parliament like this in which Government backbenchers do not, or perhaps are not allowed to, participate in debates - I do not mean by any Rule of the House; I am not speaking from the standpoint of a ruling from the Chair, but possibly from Party discipline, because their adventures are so rare, that one feels for some reason or other that they are regarded as wiser so not to do therefore, one in speaking at a comparatively late stage of the debate has absolutely nothing to reply to, because the point of view of the first speaker who introduced the budget has been put and his various aspects have been commented on very fully by the speakers who have succeeded. When it comes to the stage that there is practically no one to speak except the Introducer of the Resolution, and so many people have already effectively replied to him and demolished anything that appertained to reasoning in his remarks, one is left with very little that one needs say.

I will make the one comment that it is a truly conservative buget, and the statement which the Hon. Premier made with which I agreed is that he had nothing startling to put before the House; every sentence which he uttered bore out that, and then on the first afternoon after his speech had been made and listened to by one of the hon. members in the Conservative seats who left the Chamber with a smile of quiet satisfaction on his face, today we have heard him as well as his colleague, the Leader of the Conservative Party make their speeches, and you must agree with me, Sir, that they entirely appreciate this indubitably rich man's budget which has been propounded with a smile on his face and yet not without the suspicion of a smile by the Hon. and Learned member for St. Joseph. So far as the poor are concerned, we find that in respect of income tax there are no increased exemptions or allowances for children or dependants. If you examine the allowances in this island and compare them with those in Trinidad, you will find that there is a tremendous difference in Trinidad in favour of the poor or middle class person; but in this rich man's budget, there are no increases at all in the rates of income tax for those in the higher bracket. Of course, that is why the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for St. George were so happy for this budget.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I did not say that there was a raise for those in the higher brackets. There is no increase at all for anybody - waterfront worker or rich man.

Mr. BRANCKER: That is exactly my point; there are no increases for those who are in a position to pay, and for those who are less able to pay there is no decrease proposed. This is true Conservatism. Is Lord Salisbury a member of this Chamber, or is he still at Heron Bay and his voice speaks in this Chamber through the Hon. and Learned member for St. Joseph? That is exactly what would come from his mouth if he were running the Government of Barbados.

Now, Sir, there is to be an increase in tobacco and whiskey. I do not know whether the Hon. and Learned Premier speaks of locally made cigarettes, he speaks as a Barbadian, as a West Indian statesman or as a St. Joseph statesman. Does locally mean West Indian? Does it include "Anchor" from Trinidad or does it merely mean tobacco made in Barbados? Certainly Sir, the tobacco which the poor man smokes in Barbados is predominantly "Trumpeter," but when he is enjoying a Bank Holiday or when Christmas bonus and preference money is paid out, he will buy some American cigarettes - "Lucky Strikes," "Camels" or "Chesterfields." If you increase this you will make it more difficult for him to enjoy something a little better than the everyday thing which he is accustomed to using. Members of the present Government should realise that the poorest man is entitled to occasional luxury. I could understand a tax on cigars and whiskey, but not a tax on all imported cigarettes.

Now, Sir, the cigarettes produced in Trinidad are every bit as good as the majority of American cigarettes. What Government proposes to do with such it was not clear from what the Premier said, because he mentioned "locally" and I do not know whether he spoke in the St. Joseph, West Indian or Barbadian context; but I must say that after his Budget speech he has even poorer hopes of securing election to the Federal Parliament because with this Conservative budget which he has propounded, not a single merchant, firm or factory owner is going to give him a vote to lose him from Barbados. At all costs they must ensure that next year and the year after until, of course, we have a general election here - he remains to propound budgets of this kind.

6.35 p.m.

At all costs, there must ensure that next year and the year after that he remains in this Island. In the most naive tone of voice, with the most innocent expression on his face, he delivered himself of a budget speech which would do credit to Mr. Macmillan, Mr. Thorneycroft or some other Conservative member.

There is one point which he made in regard to the amendment to the Usury Act. He said -

Mr. SPEAKER: I will like to draw the hon. member's attention to Rule 122: "No member may read extracts from newspapers or documents other than the authorised report of the debates" - referring to debates in the House.

Mr. BRANCKER: Yes sir; I intended to ask Your Honour if I may have an authorised copy of the Hon. Premier's speech. One has to rely on something in order to make a quotation and that is why I was referring to what was reported of it in the newspaper. Of course, I made my notes too. In reference to the Usury Act and the Hon. Premier's remarks about that, what is there to prevent the Bank lending money to X at 8% if the Bank assigns the debt to Y? Y is a customer of the bank; he is asking to give him some business and the Bank is out to help him; therefore they assign the debt to Y who thereby gets 8%. Of course, with that hint thrown out, it might well be that Government will ask the Crown Law Officers or whoever drafts this Bill to bear such a thing in mind, but it is obvious that a bank can lend at 8% because there is nothing to prevent that debt being assigned to someone else. I put that forward because it is the sort of thing which one can see easily by which we can get around the proposal which the Government has in mind.

Well then, Sir, the Hon. Premier has announced that there will soon be an increase in bus fares. Who will pay the increase bus fare? The rich man? Of course not. He will not be paying any increase in bus fare nor will his expenditure be increased on account of that because he does not travel by bus; he travels by car, which may be a taxi, Jaguar or Vauxhall.

Sir, it is interesting to hear the Hon. and Learned Premier say that Government has revised their views on bus fares and that they have had buses in bad condition thrown on them. He has forgotten what Government has done. The concessionaires before Government took over the buses from them were asking for an increase in bus fares and made out a case for it if they were required to put in new units as was suggested by the Government A Government committee recommended that their request was reasonable. If you were requiring them to put in Mercedes Benz and Leylands, then you ought to have allowed them to have increased fares.

You refused them the increase and you are saying now that you have found out, now that you have taken the buses over that they were right and bus fares will be increased.

Our views, as have always been put forward, are that it is for Government to run road transport and run it efficiently and for Government to run all the routes. There is no reason at all, if Government runs all the routes why it should not be a success. The running of the routes must not be used for the purpose of gaining political friends; it should not be for the purpose of bringing new disciples into your political party's camp. If you run all the routes yourself and run them efficiently, it is conceivable that on the present bus fares you will lose money. You may not make a profit. You will notice that the other concessionaires are at present running them at a profit, but the reason why you cannot run them at a profit is because the money has to go into so many people's hands that you do not know to whose hands the money may adhere. I will be the last person to blame the conductors because it is far more likely, by my experience, that somebody who is considered above them, somebody who has to dress better than they and live more expensively than they, will have more need for money. Of course, as you know, the usual thing is to blame the man at the bottom. It started with the Conservatives in name, and it has gone on with the Conservatives by nature.

I do not agree with having a uniform stage rate; it would not be justified. Government would only be justified in suggesting that after it has taken over all the routes in the Island and is running the whole show when they will be able to decide to purchase things wholesale from outside

Under Education, we see nothing new. It is indeed absolutely barren, absolutely sterile. There is no new secondary school to be built, no free secondary education, no free hot meals for elementary school children. It is the same old Conservative policy going on and on and that is why the hon. junior member for Christ Church looks so happy and his colleague, the hon. senior member for St. George, except for the information he received about the Deep Water Harbour, having no criticism to make. Of course, as regards the educational policy of this Government, I believe I am looking at the new Minister of Education and he is looking at me. His policy might be more intelligent and drawn out.

Mr. SPEAKER: We have no new Minister of Education.

Mr. BRANCKER: You may recall that we were officially notified that the present Minister of Education would not be carrying on any longer.

Mr. SPEAKER: But the House has not yet been notified of any new Minister of Education.

6.45 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Whoever is the new Minister of Education, I trust he will have a more enlightened policy than his immediate predecessor. There is no use going on in this island with so many children for whom no provision is made in the Government-aided secondary schools, and there are so many private schools which have to start up and work under such difficult and perilous conditions. There is one private school which you may have noticed in Pinfold Street where, as soon as the children step out at the lunch hour, they step right into the traffic on a busy road. That school is doing its very best and is unable to provide any more adequate accommodation. When you have conditions such as that, with 80 children housed together in a small building which is right on the road, the state of affairs is not good enough. We are fortunate that, up to now, there has not been any serious accident having taken place in that area in respect of those children.

The Government should have proper schools adequately equipped and not as inconvenient and as hazardous to the children who attend them as is the case today with certain of the private schools which, through lack of convenience, are unable to provide proper accommodation for the children. The Modern High School is in a different situation; it has a long gap and it has certain grounds. The Regent High School also has a gap with a certain amount of grounds and as to those schools which are hard put to, the proprietors should be offered to rent a site on some grounds; but even that does not take off the responsibility of the Government for building schools. Perhaps as soon as Combermere has been finished the Government will look for those schools which have no room and invite them to go to the Garrison where Combermere School was situated. At least there is more room up there than there is in Pinfold Street and in other areas.

Another matter, Sir, is in regard to the education policy relative to the payment by the Government of the entrance examination fees, even of successful candidates who take the G.C.E. examinations in this island from the private schools. As you know, Sir, those who take these examinations in the Government-aided schools have their fees paid for them by the Government. Those children for whom there is no accommodation at all in the Government aided schools, have to go to private schools and their parents have to pay the fees for the entrance examinations. That is not good enough. If, however, the Government were to undertake to pay the fees for all such pupils, the private schools might enter any number of pupils who have comparatively no chance at all of achieving any success. If the parents of the pupils are required to pay the fees themselves, when the results show that the pupils were up to the required standard and they get through the examination, let the parents be reimbursed by the Government as to the entrance fees for the examination.

It is the duty of the State to provide education for the children of the State. This Government fails in its duty if it maintains the policy of previous Governments which were Conservative not only by nature but also by name --- previous Governments which decided that a certain number of secondary schools were sufficient for Barbados. One doubts even if those people were in power today, they would not realise that the number of Government-aided schools is inadequate to meet the demands of the public. Everybody is insisting on secondary education for his son or daughter, whether he had it or not, and it is the duty of the Government to provide it. This Government has been in power long enough - I would even say much too long - not to see the dire necessity for additional secondary schools in order to cope with the demands. If there were only a few hundred children in private secondary schools in excess of those for whom Government-aided schools have accommodation, I would say that it is the duty of the Government to build schools in order to accommodate the couple of hundred children: but it is correct to say that there are more children being accommodated at the private secondary schools than those who are accommodated at the Government-aided secondary schools. It is a fact that the Government does not provide one half of the secondary education for which there is a demand, and that is not good enough. In view of the pronouncement that irrespective of what may or may not happen, federally speaking, there may be a change in the Ministry of Education. I am looking forward to a liberal, broad minded and intelligent pattern from one who may want all his time to be devoted to matters educational, and not have to treat that subject as if it were the least important of the subjects which will concern him In other words, it is too important a subject not to be paid that attention which it deserves. It is a separate Ministry and it should have its own Minister who is not encumbered or handicapped by having other duties to look after or other duties to perform.

In connection with the Deep Water Harbour, the Hon. and Learned Premier spoke about making a levy on anything which the Contractors have on the spot. You know, Sir, that there are many people against whom you can get a judgement, and when you have that judgement and it is recorded in the books of the Court, you attempt to levy. But on what do you find to levy? Whether Messrs Richard Costain have ten lorries and one or two pieces of machinery on the site, how could they ever amount to anything which is worthwhile on which to levy in order to recover what this Government may have lost or what it may feel is due to it by the Contractors in the event of any failure in the carrying out of the contract?

6.55 p.m.

What is there on the site which they can levy on and, if necessary, sell which would amount to any appreciable sum of money? Have they at anytime more than $50,000 in machinery or equipment which could be levied on and, if necessary, sold to pay someone else to carry on the work? Even if they had as much as that, surely they would realise as shrewd businessmen that something

was about to happen to them and in quick time planes and steamers would come in, and off would go the lorries and the machinery, and that would be the end of the equipment which Government would be seeking to levy on in order to set itself right.

I do not propose making any further comments on the policy of the budget as made in the speech made by the Hon and Learned Premier, but just to close as I began by deprecating the attack on the poor man which this budget certainly has done when it fails to relieve him by increased and adequate exemptions and allowances in respect of income tax, and increases his busfare and even the occasional cigarettes which he would enjoy smoking over the week-end, keeping "Trumpeters" for other days in the week.

I understand the merchants are already dealing with us because they are now charging $6 for a bottle of whiskey which formerly cost $5. This means that the Government is getting 60¢ and the merchants are getting 40c right away. You can see why the merchants, present and past, smile. The Government is saying that they must get 60¢ on whiskey and the merchants are saying that this is their chance to take a little 40¢, so you can see how the merchants benefit and the poor man is deprived, because after all the amount they are going to bring into the island is infinitesimal compared with those in the higher brackets of income tax.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to be very long. Again this appears to be the usual sort of household budget which does not make any new departure as far as Government policy is concerned. There is nothing in it that is really new, but I would still like to make a few comments.

I listened very carefully when I was in the House to some of the remarks of the Hon. Premier and I agree with him that as far as the dry season which we are now experiencing is concerned, there may be some need for revision during the year with regard to Government Expenditure; probably the Estimates would have to be revised. We all regret that the rains have not come in yet and fear as a result of that that this year's crop will be somewhat curtailed. That is how the whole island is feeling about it.

One matter which I would like to draw to the attention of this House is that I was alarmed when I saw the great increase in the expenditure for telephones in Government establishments. I remember looking at these figures and I think that the increase is big enough to alarm members of this Chamber when we realise that in 1957 Government telephone cost somewhere in the region of $32,000 and in this year's budget there is an estimate of $41,000. I think that is a matter that should be looked into. I know that the average man who has a telephone installed at his home has very recently realised an increase in the charge which he has had to pay, but I think when the increase in telephone in one year amount to $10,000 more, there is really some cause for real and serious alarm, and I regret there is that increase in this year's Estimates.

Another matter on which I spoke last year at this same time was this open-air school which is supposed to be built at St. Christopher's Christ Church. Looking over the Estimates for the years past, you will see that since 1955, there has been this proposal to build this school at St. Christopher and the estimate in 1955 for such a school was $18,700. In 1956 and 1957 the same estimate appears and in this year's Estimate, the amount is $30,000. As I said on the last occasion, I do not see the wisdom at this stage in our educational development of building an annex open-air school, especially in a district like St. Christopher where you already have a built up area. I do not see the wisdom of it, I do not see the sense in it, and I really cannot appreciate it.

It is a good thing that since 1955 and up to now nothing has been done - for which I am glad and I hope at this time next year nothing more will be done, because it does not make good sense to me to try anything like this type of school anywhere in Barbados. We have no land where people live in such inaccessible areas that you cannot build, but when it comes to the point that, where there is a school you should have an open annex - I do not see the point.

There is one thing which again I am going to stress this year, and that is a Cadet Corps for Coleridge School. I remember the Premier's attitude to it last year; he said he is a pacifist; but I think when we have three boys' schools already having a Cadet Corps - Harrison College, Combermere School and Lodge School - I do not see why the boys who go to school in the northern part of the island should not have the privilege of getting an early training in military drill, which means really more than military drill; it develops a mental alertness as a result of being a member of a Cadet Corps.

7.05 p.m.

Young men in the northern part of the island come to Bridgetown and join the Barbados Regiment which was once called the Barbados Volunteer Force. I do not see any reason why the Coleridge-Parry should not have its own Cadet Corps. Actually for maintaining this Cadet Corps the Government makes a provision of $240 per annum, which is £50 for that matter. Obviously, to begin a Cadet Corps you will have to spend more than this but for maintenance you will not need to spend more than £50 and I feel that for what it means in the overall to the boys that such a corps should be provided for the Coleridge Parry School.

I was very glad to see in the Estimates some provision for the insurance of Public Buildings. The reason why I was especially glad to see it was because I remember on one occasion when the Hon. Premier was out of the Island a member of the Government said that it was an undertaking, if not a real policy, that Government did not intend to insure its buildings. On that occasion I very much regretted what the Hon Minister said; now I feel very much happier. It is not that one e pects a conflagration which would destroy a couple of buildings, but it does seem unbusinesslike to say that the Government is going to take a chance and because of that will not insure its buildings.

Sir, I did not intend to speak on Government's transport, but I will say this much. I was very glad to see that the Housing Authority has published a report of its activities and as a result hon. members now have some opportunity of studying the work of the Housing Department. I hope in the very near future that this House will be favoured since we are called upon to vote sums of money to put in the hands of the Transport Board, with some sort of report of the activities of this Board.

There is one thing which I would like to hear as far as the Development Board is concerned, and I see that half million dollars is allocated to it. I do not know if the Hon. Premier said it when I was not in the House, but I hope he will give this House a statement as regards the policy of the Development Authority. I do not think anywhere in his budget speech he really stressed anything in reference to that. You see a half million dollars which is considerably more than what was allocated before set down for this Board: but it is not good enough to see that amount put there and not to hear some statement of,policy as far as the development programme is concerned.

I do not think there is anything more for me to say at this stage. When the House goes into Committee on these Estimates I would speak on specific Heads. I have only mentioned things of which I disapprove and things of which I approve in my short address.

Mr. F.G. SMITH: Mr Speaker, I am not speaking at all in this debate. Quite unlike the Hon. Premier, I know very little of economics.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr Speaker, I think this matter of the Deep Water Harbour is so important that while I hate to keep the House late tonight, I am afraid it might take me a long time to reply to that particular matter and to set out a reply to the points made, or questions asked concerning the statement read out. It is a matter of great inportance for Barbados to know whether there is any truth in what was written in the Press I can only say that while Mr. Bellamy might have been sober when he had a discussion with those other two gentlemen, I am told that that is not the usual thing with him. The Hon. Minister of Trade has had an interview with the hon. senior member for St. George as regards that instance and the Hon. senior member for St. George was not quite sure of the date that Mr. Bellamy told him those things. We know that Mr. Bellamy was disgruntled at some time because he has been fired by Messrs. Costain's Limited and was fired on the ground that he likes all the wines he can get. What ever was the cause, he was a disgruntled employee and

"The Contractors shall be deemed to have visited and carefully examined the Sites and its surroundings; to have satisfied themselves as to the nature of all existing works and buildings, also to the nature of existing wharves, jetties, landing facilities roads or other means of transport or communication and as to possible interruptions thereto and the access to and egress from Site; to have made enquiries, examined and satisfied themselves as to quarries and sites for obtaining stone, sand and other materials, the sites for the disposal of surplus materials, the available accommodation as to land wherever required, work yard sites and such depots and buildings as may be necessary for executing, completing and maintaining the Works; to have made a local and independent enquiries as to the water levels in the Harbour and subsoil and the variations thereof, strength and direction of currents, discharge of water courses and drains, sea disturbances, storms, prevailing winds, climatic conditions generally and other similar matters; to have investigated and studied the nature of the ground to be excavated, dredged, traversed or demolished and the levels of the surface thereof, the strata therein and possible variation thereof; to have satisfied themselves as to the sources and means of obtaining adequate supplies of skilled and unskilled labour, also all materials required for the Works and the transport thereof; to have considered the possibility of delays or inconvenience that may be caused to their operations by reason of the breakdown of communications, storms, floods, adverse weather conditions, and the navigation of vessels and floating craft passing or being in proximity to the works; to have acquainted themselves as to their liability or payment of Government taxes, harbour dues, customs duties and other charges; to have examined the Contract Documents; generally to have obtained information on all matters whatsoever that might affect the carrying out of the Works and the Schedule Rates; and to have satisfied themselves as to the sufficiency of their tender."

They cannot come back and say they underestimated.

"Any neglect or failure on the part of the Con tractors in obtaining necessary and reliable information upon the foregoing or any other matters affecting the Contract shall not relieve them from any risk or liabilities or from the entire responsibility for the completion of the Works at the Schedule Rates in strict accordance with the Contract Documents."

They have to obtain their own information, and over and over again there are sections setting out that Government is not responsible.

Clause 11 reads as follows:

"The Contractors shall be deemed to have in vestigated and to have formed their own opinion as to the nature of all existing works and buildings on and adjacent to the Site, the ground and materials to be excavated, dredged, traversed or demolished the levels and variation of the strata therein; the requirements as to cofferdams or other means of excluding water from the site of the permanent work; the extent, levels and quantities of water to be dealt with by pumping or otherwise; the variations of the ground levels above and be low water at the Site; and all other matters and things which could in any way influence them in the carrying out of the Works or fixing the Schedule Rates."

Clause 12: "Borings, the positions of which are indicated on the drawings, have been made at the Site. The results of such borings are shown for the information of the Contractors but their accuracy is not in any way guaranteed."

They have to take that risk.

"Further borings or trial pits. Should any further borings or trial pits be required the Contractors shall make all such borings and sink all such trial pits as directed by the Engineer for ascertaining levels of the strata of the ground or the nature thereof or otherwise."

Engineer means either the Resident Engineer or the Consulting Engineer.

The next most relevant section is paragraph 14. This is to show how tight the Contract is on our side.

Ground levels above and below water level. The surface levels in consequence of natural or other causes may have varied since they were taken and their accuracy as shown is not guaranteed. The Contractors, in fixing their Schedule Rates, shall be deemed to have taken into account any such variations and possible variations subsequent to the date hereof."

That is why I specifically asked the member about the rumours he has been hearing about a crack that is appearing somewhere in the sea bed and that water will always be pouring in and spoiling the work already done. They are responsible for taking the risk of flooding, and they are not going to be relieved of that responsibility. They are supposed to take into consideration the fact that there was a hurricane two years ago, and there may be another hurricane.

"Water Levels. - The levels of the tides shown on the drawings are believed to represent such levels fairly, but their accuracy is not guaranteed. The tidal levels are governed to a considerable extent by wind and other causes and the Contractors shall not be entitled to any payment, compensation or allowance should the said tide levels prove to be incorrect."

Do you want anything tighter than that? Government is taking no responsibility for the fact that there may be some variations. The only thing we are going to do is to increase or decrease according to the cost of material and labour.

"Accuracy of particulars not guaranteed. - The accuracy of any particulars given or records referred to in the Contract Documents or supplied to the Contractors for their information is not in any way guaranteed. The Contractors in fixing their Schedule Rates shall be deemed to have examined all available records in regard to tidal levels and to water levels, discharges and velocities of water courses and drains and all other physical features and data obtainable in connection with the Site and to have taken into account any variations therein."

On this we have been approached over and over again by people saying that Government does not know what it is doing. You will be surprised to hear that Costain is taking that responsibility, and would not be getting paid for the job unless it is done to the satisfaction of the Consulting Engineers. We have given them records from the Department of Agriculture on tides, currents and so on We knew what the people in Fontabelle were saying. One of the precautions against that, I understand, would be the special island breakwater which is now being made, which would partly be the answer to what might call high waves.

"No compensation for inaccuracies in particulars.- No payment, compensation or allowance will be made to the Contractors nor will the Contractors be entitled thereto by reason of any extra expense or loss which may be caused or arise during the execution of the Contract from (1) any inaccuracies, mis statements or omissions in the Contract Documents or any of them in reference to the surface, water or other levels, or to the water in foundations or otherwise; (ii) any other error, misstatement or omission whatsoever in the Contract Documents or any of them or in any other information supplied to the Contractors. The Schedule Rates shall be deemed to cover and provide for all such risks unless the Consulting Engineers shall deem otherwise." They have to take that risk.

"Materials on the site to remain the property of the Government .- The Contractors shall not sell or otherwise dispose of or remove, except for the purposes of the Contract, any sand, stone, ballast, clay, earth, rock, trees, crops or other substances or things which may be obtained from any demolition or excavation made for the purposes of the Contract, nor shall they dispose of any buildings or produce upon the Site at the time of the de livery to them of the possession of the Site, but all such substances, materials, buildings, produce and other things shall remain the property of the Government."

I will have to skip some of these, because there are many sections to which I must make reference.

"Commencement of Works.- The Contractors shall commence the Works immediately upon the receipt of an official order to commence the Works, and shall carry on the Works with all due diligence and in regular progression to the satifaction of the Engineer so that the permanent work shall be completed in all respects on or before the date for completion." Then there is the section dealing with the general scheme of procedure.

it is conceivable that he was fired before that time. It is hardly likely that he would have said what he did if he were still employed by Messrs Costain because he would know that two minutes afterwards he would be fired from thr job. It is reasonable to assume that he was already fired.

As regards his statement, it is not true; it could not possibly be true. In the first place it is ignorance. If you call on people to tender for a $4 million job - $6 million in one instance - do you think that they are going to tender on merely the report of Barbados as to the site? Commonsense would tell you that that is not so. Several people sent engineers out here to look at it, not Messrs Costain, Ltd. alone. Dutch people sent people out here and we inspected the tender from the Dutch people. As a matter of fact, I happened to be in London the very day that the tenders were opened. I telephoned the Crown Agents to ask them what stage had been reached and they said to me: "you are lucky; we are opening the tenders today.' I went over and saw the tenders and I had an advance copy of the contract. Although I was speaking from memory when I spoke of the levy, I have not made a mistake about it. I do not know what may have given some hon. members the impression that we have no hold on the contractors. Let me say that there is more teeth in the contract than they think. I have spent more than an hour looking at it. I have gone through it page by page and it is a thick document consisting of nearly 140 foolscap pages, much of it being fine print. I have gone through it and have made a note of the most important sections which I will read to this House. 7.15 p.m.

The hon. senior member for St. George has said that conditions were not anything in comparison with the reports they had obtained from Barbados and the impression would be given that some stranger had sent them these reports. Messrs. Costain have sent out a competent man and all these other people who thought of tendering for the contract also sent out their people. I will read the actual tender. Messrs. Costain went on the spot and it is incorporated in the contract that they would have to visit the site; and when I read out some of these Clauses, hon. members will see that the contract is strongly in favour of the Government. I know that businessmen will say that people will not sign a contract out of which they could not slip. From my experience of what has happened in other parts of the world, we have had to tighten up many of these old contracts, and the one which we are signing with Messrs Costain has stopped all the loopholes. I think I will read, first of all, the actual tender, because that will give some indication as to the exact position. You do not tender, unless you know what you are tendering about, and so on.

I repeat that the matter is not just like that. The contractors have to give a bond, they are going to be paid only by the month and be certified by the Consulting Engineers that they have done a month's work. If they work for a month, they will get paid for a month In addition to that, the sum of £100,000 is retained to be paid them when everything is over. This contract is a tight contract; I am almost inclined to say that the hon. junior member for Christ Church would be surprised to think that anybody allowed himself to be tied up so tightly. Messrs. Costain is a reputable firm; they have done a lot of work in other parts of the world. It pays to give a guarantee to the Government, because when the work is finished, they will know that we contracted for this and that, barring a war or some other emergency.

This is how the contract reads: "Gentleman, - Having examined Drawings, Form of Contract, Specification, Schedule of Prices, Form of Bond, and Instructions to Persons Tendering relating to the proposed construction of a Breakwater, Wharf Wall and other works in connection therewith at Bridgetown, Barbados, and also having visited and examined the Site of the proposed Works or caused it to be revised on our behalf by a competent and reliable person and having acquired all requisite information relating thereto and affecting this Tender, we, the undersigned, hereby offer to construct, execute, complete and maintain the proposed Works, with such alterations, additions or curtailments of such Works as may from dme to time hereafter be determined and ordered in writing, in strict accordance with the Contract Documents at the rates entered by us against respective items in the Schedule of Prices."

After they set out to tell you that they have been on the site and they have a competent man there, they go on to say this:

"We undertake to complete and deliver up the whole of the work within the period of" - now 50 months - "reckoned from the date of the receipt by us of an intimation from you that this Tender has been accepted

We undertake in the event of this Tender being accepted to execute, when called upon by you to do so, a Contract for the due construction, execution, completion and maintenance of the said Works in the terms of the Contract Documents hereto annexed which may be altered and added to in such a manner as you may require for the purpose of adapting it to the circumstances of this Tender.

We propose the Northern Assurance Company Limited for your approval as Surety for the due performance of the said Contract for the sum of £50,000 and undertake to execute and procure the execution by such Surety, or other approved Surety, of a Bond for this sum in the form hereto annexed when required by you to do so

In the event of any of the conditions upon which you accept this Tender not being complied with or in the event of our failing to procure the execution as aforesaid of either such Contract or Bond for one month after the same respectively shall have been left with or posted to us at the address given below for that purpose, we hereby authorise you to rescind the acceptance of this Tender, but this provision is to be without prejudice to any other rights or remedies you may have in respect of such failure.

In consideration of the trouble and expense incurred by you in preparing the Contract Documents and in examining and considering this Tender we undertake that the same shall not be withdrawn by us before the expiration of three months from the date hereof, but shall remain binding upon us and may be accepted at any time before the expiration of such three months."

That is the actual tender which we have accepted. Their actual figures were £3,681,453. 5s. 3d., working at so much per cubit foot, for this, that and the other. They have, Watchman by the hour 2/6 boy by the hour, 2/-, and so on. The unit is by the hour, and they say they will work by Trade Union rates and so on. The rates of pay and every single thing is set out in absolute detail It is not a question of cost plus; they are working by actual rates.

There is a Variation Clause if prices should go up and then come down, agreed to by us. The Variation Clause says this:

"The Contractors' remuneration shall be increased or decreased should there be an increase or decrease of cost to the Contractors in carrying out the Works due to any increase or decrease during the progress of the Works in the basic market cost of permanent materials forming the permanent work delivered f.o.b. prevailing at the First day of October, One thousand nine hundred and fifty six, as compared with the current market prices at the date of actual delivery f o.b."

There is a variation Clause in respect of the cost of materials and similarly, there is a variation Clause in the cost of labour, the Clause states this:

"Contractors' remuneration shall be increased or decreased should there be any increase or decrease in the official rates of wages per hour paid to labour of any kind employed at the Site by the Contractors in connection with the Works, due to any labour laws, orders or regulations, made from time to time by the Government, the municipality or any association causing a variation in the rates of wages prevailing at the First day of October, One thousand nine hundred and fifty six.' 7.25 p.m.

Cement has gone up and labour has gone up, and that is what I meant the other day when I said we had to watch our money carefully. We have to watch for the right time to borrow money; we have to finance from local revenue and wait and hope that the Bank rate will come down soon

Now as regards this stupid illusion that this contract is not tight, I will read from the Contract how tight it is as regards the site.

Clause 10 of the contract reads as follows:-

"General scheme of procedure.- The Contractors shall with all possible despatch and at their own cost prepare and submit to the Consulting Engineers for their approval a general scheme with approximate dates for the execution of the Works with all necessary drawings, diagrams and specifications indicating the methods and plant they propose to adopt in carrying out the Works, also the general nature and size of the temporary works they propose to construct and erect, and they shall obtain the approval of the Consulting Engineers thereto in writing before commencing work at the Site If the Consulting Engineers shall consider any alteration in or additions to such a scheme to be desirable the Contractors shall be bound to conform thereto without additional payment to them. The Consulting Engineers' approval of such scheme and any alterations or additions thereto shall not affect the sole and absolute responsibility of the Contractors for the execution, completion and maintenance of the Works in strict accordance with the provisions of the Contract Documents Three fully figured copies of all such approved drawings and diagrams, Similar in quality to those to be supplied under Clause 19 (F) hereof, shall be supplied to the Consulting Engineers as soon as possible after approval."

7.35 p.m.

As if to rope it in the next Clause makes it clear; It states:

"The Contractors shall be absolutely and solely responsible for the methods employed in carrying out the Works."

Then the other Clause is this:

"The Contractors shall be responsible that the Works throughout are executed in the most substantial, proper and workmanlike manner with the best quality materials and workmanship, all to the entire satisfaction of the Engineer and in such order of time as he may direct, nothwithstanding that certain portions of the works may be executed by subcontract."

Clause 25: (A) "No part of the permanent work (except work absolutely necessary for saving life and property) shall be carried out during the night or on Sunday or on any other day in the week set apart for rest without the written sanction of the Resident Engineer."

Perhaps I better read the next sub-Clause:-

"Not withstanding the provisions of sub-clause (A) of this Clause the Works or portions thereof shall, without entitling the Contractors to any extra payment or allowance, be carried on by day and night without intermission should the Engineer, owing to the default, negligence or omission of the Contractors or their slow progress in carrying out the Works, consider such a course necessary and so direct in writing."

The next and most important Clause is this one - Clause 35. Instead of reading it through, I will just give the substance. The Engineer must satisfy himself as to the quality of the firm's work If he is not satisfied with it, he may say "pull it down and do it again.' That is the work of the Engineer as regards workmanship or materials and if he says to pull it down and do it again, the whole expenses in regard to such work shall be borne by the contractor.

As regards the removal of imperfect work, the Engineer can say that it is not done to his satisfaction, pull it down. Then the Contractors must provide to the satisfaction of the Engineer sufficient staff and he can direct the Contractor to fire a man either through misconduct or for any reason because of which he thinks he should not be employed.

There are one or two more which I am not going to read at all.

I must read Clause 74, which shows that everything is at the Contractor's risk. It says: -

"Except as regards war, invasion, civil war, rebellion, revolution, insurrection, military or usurped power the Contractors shall undertake all risks and liabilities of whatever kind arising out of or incidental to or connected with the construction, completion and maintenance of the Works including, but not by way of limitation, all risks attendant on the nature of the Site (save the depths at which suitable foundations can be obtained), the tides , the soil, the subsoil, the levels and consistency of the strata in or on which the Works are to be formed or constructed; also all risks of fire, landslips, floods, gales of wind, hurricanes, variations of water levels in subsoil, quantities of water to be pumped, discharges of existing watercourses and drains, failure and collapse of temporary works and banks, traffic delays and other causes whether in or beyond the Contractor's control which may affect the Works during construction or during the period of the Contractor's liability; and all damage that may happen in any way howsoever to the Works during their progress or (except as provided for therein) during the period of maintenance shall be made good by the Contractors at their own expense.'

Can you want a tighter thing than "whether it is in your own control or not" that you take the risk? That is why, I repeat, I never saw a contract which so helps the Government and not the Contractor. It goes on to say that the Contractors shall be responsible for accidents and as regards Workmen's Compensation Insurance, it says:-

"The Contractors shall effect a policy of insurance against liability to pay damages or compensation to their workmen or other persons employed on the Works and shall continue such insurance during the period of the contract. Similarly, subcontractors shall effect a policy of insurance and for the same purpose and the Contractors shall require a subcontractor to produce such policy for the inspection of the Consulting Engineers."

There are some other sections which in effect show that the only thing specifically for which we will pay them is an earthquake but the Contractors take the risk as regards all other things.

Then there are other things as to what happens in the time of war. The Clause says that they must continue work for twenty-eight days and then put an end to the work.

Listen to what this Clause says as regards Permanent Work:-

"The Contractors shall provide ample and efficient pumping plant and shall do all necessary pumping to keep the Works and the foundations thereof dry as referred to in Clause 66. All temporary pumps shall be placed outside the limits of the permanent work but should a temporary sump be allowed, with the written consent of the Engineer, to be placed within the limits of the permanent work it shall, upon the removal of the pumps, be filled solid with 4 to 1 concrete - in-mass at the expense of the Contractors."

"All springs appearing in the foundations of the permanent work must be dealt with by the Cmntractors at their own cost and as directed by the Engineer. Water from springs shall be led clear of the permanent work in drain pipes in the most expedient manner determinable at the Site. The drain pipes shall be subsequently grouted up solidly under pressure with neat cement grout forced through mild steel pipes built into the permanent work for this purpose The costs and charges for all pipes, grout, grouting, etc., or for any other labour or for materials for dealing with springs shall be deemed to be included in and covered by the Schedule Rates."

It could not have been possible to make it tighter. I do not blame the hon. senior member for St. George a moment.

I have not mentioned, although I have really hinted at it - I have not made it quite full - that there is a section that the Contractors can only get pay after they com plete the work and only by the month. They draw money in England but they may ask for some here.

Perhaps I should refer to one other thing. There are several reasons why we can say that you break the contract. If you are going slowly; if you are not doing it according to the specifications; and so on.

Then, if the Contractors shall not commence the Works in the manner previously described in the contract, or if they shall at any time in the opinion of the Engineer -

(i) fail to carry on the works in conformity with with the Contract Documents, or

(ii) fail to carry on the Works with due despatch, or

(iii) substantially suspend work on the Works for a period of fourteen days without authority from the Engineer, or

(iv) fail to carry on and execute the Works to the satisfaction of the Engineer, or

(v) fail to supply sufficient or suitable plant, temporary works, labour, materials or things, or

(vi) commit, or suffer, or permit any other breach of any of the provisions of the Contract on their part to be performed or observed and shall in the like opinion persist in any of the above-mentioned breaches of the Contract for fourteen days after notice in writing shall have been given to the Contractors by the Engineer requiring such breach to be remedied, or

(vii) if the Contractors shall abandon the Works, or

(viii) if the Contractors during the continuance of the Contract shall become bankrupt, make any arrangement or composition with their creditors, or permit any execution to be levied, or enter into any liquidation, whether compulsory or voluntary (not being merely a voluntary liquidation for the purpose of amalgamation or reconstruction), then in any such case the Government through the Resident Engineer shall have the power to enter upon the Works and take possession thereof, and the materials, temporary works, plant and steel thereon, and to revoke the Contractor's licence to use the same, or if any money is owed to them or if any extra money is due to them over and above what they have in their tender which you have to pay somebody else in order to carry out the Contract, you can sue them for it.

7.45 p.m

I think I must have satisfied the greatest doubting Thomas on earth that this Contract is completely on the Government side and except for the reason of an earthquake or a war, the Contractors have to do this work within 50 months, and so on.

As regards this gentleman, Mr Bellamy, whatever is his reason for saying these things, they are demonstrably untrue. We have known that people have been telling us not to go to the Fontabelle site; all that was sent to the Crown Agents, Sir Eric Millbourn and Mr. Coode. Mr. Coode's grandfather was the first man who, eighty years ago, came down here and made a survey and preferred the Northern site. I have told the House already that on one day in coming down from Mr. Coode's office, I said; "You must be very glad to have brought to completion the plan which your father brought down." He said; "Not my father, my grandfather." There are engineers who have said that this is the proper site and how could we turn our back on it?

The hon. senior member for St. George has given me the opportunity of erasing any fears which might be in the minds of Barbadians that there is anything wrong with the construction of the Deep Water Harbour. I do not blame Mr. Johnson for raising the matter, although he might have gone to the appropriate Minister before writing; but still if he heard these things, it was a good thing to try and make them public. If he and the hon. senior member for St. George had had a discussion with the Minister, and Messrs. Costain had written a denial and any of the staff had agreed that this man (ASIDES) The Minister says that the dismissal had taken place before he said these things. Hon. members having heard what I have read out, will understand that there is no human reason for believing that this Government is going to suffer.

Messrs Costain have done a lot of work about the world. While in the Gold Coast, I saw a huge project. Some of the stones in the project weighed as much as ten tons. An English firm started to carry out that project and then decided that the cost of the transport of these heavy stones had come to far more than what they had expected and they could finish it. We have been told that the matter has not yet been decided as to whether the contractors would be made to stick to their contract or not.

The hon. senior member for St. George has not read the contract. We have made provision in here that in some cases, the word of the Consulting Engineer is to be final, and the case of any dispute, you appoint an arbitrator who is agreed upon by the two parties. The Dutch people enquired of this project from the Dutch Foreign Office, thinking that they would get the Contract. Hon. members might remember Mr. Gregory who told us that the dredging appartus was in Jamaica, and it was cheaper to bring that apparatus here from Jamaica, than from their headquarters. However, in a number of things like disputes, the contractors have to abide by what the Consulting Engineer has said. On that score, the hon. senior member for St. George can feel relieved.

As regards the disendowment and disestablishment of the Anglican Church, I should like to tell the hon. junior member for Christ Church this: the Church in effect is asking us to give them the same sum as they are getting now. We cannot promise them that. They have asked for $3 million. The hon. member is a member of the original Committee, and I hope that he will continue to serve on that Committee. I think that he is closer to the Anglican Church than any other member of the Opposition We have to continue to give money to the Church until we have reached an agreement which is satisfactory to both sides. We have not abandoned the principle of disendowment. We will write into the Act that you will not be cutting off yourself from religion; we will acknowledge that, in spite of disestablishment, the vast majority of people are members of the Anglican Church. There is no reason why the Bishop should not continue to enjoy priority over other denominations. About 90% of Barbadians are Anglicans, and about 18% go to Church regularly. I do not see the hon. senior member for St. Andrew smiling; perhaps, she does not go to Church regularly. (Laughter) It is the claim of the Church that they can produce figures to show that there are more Anglicans than the members of any other denomination. We do not want to hurt the Church; we do not want to say in one breath; "We disendow you," and to say in the same breath; "We endow you." If you can give them $3 million as a gift - we can amend the Act and they will get nothing; but if we give them $3 million, we have endowed them to the tune of $3 million. We have to watch that.

7 55 p.m.

At any time you can amend the Act and give them anything, but the day we give them $3 million in order that they can pay the same income to the Clergy, we have for the rest of time endowed them to the tune of $3 million; so we have to watch that carefully. I hope that hon. members would not think me offensive for mentioning this, because Clergymen are good businessmen too; they want to sell us the Deanery as part of the Hospital site for what I consider ... I see the Hon Minister of Social Services will feel hurt if I finish that sentence, so I will not continue; but I consider they are asking too much for it.

I hope I have answered all the questions, but I do promise to reply to any points which hon. members will make, or perhaps each Minister will answer for his particular Department as he will know more about it than I would.

Mr. GODDARD: What about the Tourist Board?

Hon Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The Tourist Board has been notified that we are going to give them this money, but it is only because it has not yet been established that it has not been given already. Of course, we would have put it in pending the establishment of the Tourist Board; but we are not backing down; as a matter of fact we could not even if we wanted to, because we have notified them that we are going to give them this money We think it necessary to establish a Tourist Board.

Mr. Speaker, I apologise for keeping members back so long, but they will agree that the Deep Water Harbour was so important that it was necessary to make the position clear.

The question that Mr. SPEAKER do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

APPOINTMENT OF TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN

On the motion of Hon. M.E.COX seconded by Hon. D.D. GARNER, the hon. senior member for St. John was appointed to act as temporary Chairman during the absence of the Chairman, Mr. L.E. SMITH.

At this stage, Mr. L.E. SMITH entered the chamber and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. L.E. SMITH being in the Chair.

Head 1 - Governor was called.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $20,872 be voted under Head I - Governor.

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

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

HEAD 11 - SECRETARIAT was called.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $16,681 be voted under Head II - Secretariat.

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

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

HEAD 111 - ACCOUNTANT GENERAL was called.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $4,030 be voted under Head III - Accountant General.

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

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

HEAD V - HARBOUR AND SHIPPING was called.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $127,754 be voted under Head V - Harbour and Shipping.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I see that Item 12 is for the provision of a Port Manager. Will the Premier give us some information on that? Would that be on contract? I saw and heard that you succeeded in getting someone who has now taken ill and will not be coming. How soon will a Port Manager be required?

Mr. F.G.SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on this matter of the Port Manager, I take it that due to the fact that the Deep Water Harbour is being built this post will be of importance. I want to say here with your permission that in connection with what the Premier was saying earlier tonight, I met a man on board the 'Golfito' travelling to Jamaica, and he told me that the legal advisers and the engineers of Costain must have been sleeping to let Barbados get away with what they did get away with in the contract, and that his firm would not sign a contract like that knowing it was in favour of the Barbados Government. He was an engineer working in a Harbour Company, and he said his firm would not sign that type of contract with everything against them, so the Premier is certainly right.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: I do not know if the hon. junior member fo Christ Church was present when the Premier was making the Budget Speech, but he mentioned that we had not yet succeeded in getting a Port Manager. It is on contract in the first instance. There was a high-powered gentleman, a retired Admiral who was interested - he had previous experience in Penang and did very well in Port administration. We had hoped to get him, but he suddenly fell ill and did not worry to come. Of course the hon. member will be made aware of any further information.

The question that $127,754 be voted under Head V &Harbour and Shipping, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD VI – CUSTOMS was called.

Hon Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $177,235 be voted under Head VI - Customs.

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

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am asking the Minister in charge of Customs to go seriously into the matter of reviewing the allowance paid to Customs Guards and their hours of work. Some work for over seventy hours and get 23¢ an hour. It is not satisfactory at the moment and as a Socialist Government they should consider it at an early opportunity.

8.05 p.m.

Hon. M.E. COX: I promise the hon. member that I will do that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Sometime ago, I raised a similar matter and got a similar reply. Surely they must realise that in the absence of the weapon of a strike, they should at all costs give cognizance to such things. Because such people do not threaten to strike, year after year, you get a promise to do something and you get nothing happening. Those people work for a record number of hours in a week. It is a matter which the Government should do something about.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, as regards, Item 24, Rent of Warehouses, which is to provide storage accommodation for rum, I thought it was the intention of the Government that all persons should provide their own bonds. Is Government still running bonds or keeping bonds for private individuals? I thought that had ceased and that everyone was called on to provide their own bonds.

Hon. M.E.COX: I must apologise to the hon. member for not paying all attention I should to what he was asking, but as he knows, so far as the Regulations are concerned, private people can build or have their own bond for their use and these bonds can also be provided by the Comptroller of Customs. I cannot say offhand if the Government will cease to provide these bonds but, as he knows, we rent these bonds from the various firms and then rent them out to the person concerned. I would enquire into this question and inform the hon. member before the consideration of the Estimates is concluded. I do not see any reason why private individuals cannot go ahead and use their own bonds.

As regards the point raised by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, I must apologise to this Committee because on the last occasion when he raised this matter I promised the Committee that we would bring down regulations amending these fees as soon as the Committee which was appointed to go into the matter had reported. Unfortunatley, the Committee has not yet reported and I can only promise that I will get behind the Committee to speed up in its work.

The question that the sum of $177,235 be voted under Head VI, Customs was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD VII. PRINTING OFFICE

Head VII, Printing Office was called.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of $68,392 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr F.G.SMITH: Mr. Chairman, again I note that this is ----

Mr CHAIRMAN: Kindly call the item with which you are dealing.

Mr. F.G. SMITH: I am dealing with the whole Head.

Mr CHAIRMAN: Oh no; let me hear the item.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Item 16, Materials. Sir, I think it is high time that we set about to establish this Printing Office on a proper footing. The Opposition is fully conscious that the work which the Librarian is doing keeps him running all the time, but this is a technical office and it should have at its head some one who knows all about it even if it means paying a proper wage to a proper man. I think the Government should see about it and although the Librarian knows something about it, I think it should have direction from a head who knows about printing.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Let me assure the hon. member that this Printing Office has been established on a good footing. We have advertised for a Government Printer and we may have him pretty soon. I may say that we are fortunate that through the establishing of this office,

printing is costing us $28,000 less than it would have cost, were the printing done outside.

Mr. GODDARD: I have heard people who came to me state that the work they have there is held up and they cannot get the books they want to do their work. One of the village lawyers has come to me and has said that some Departments in the Courts cannot get their records kept properly as a result of the holding up of work which they have at the Government Printing Office. I do not know how well established it is and whether it is able to cope with the work.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, what the people cannot get is execution and judgement forms. As you ought to know, if you get a judgment in the Courts against somebody else and there are no forms for you to fill out, you risk yourself to somebody else coming after you and getting execution before you because that person may have a form which he can fill out. Some attorneys and some district courts have some of these forms stored away. If, say, you get a judgment against X and subsequently somebody else gets a judgment against the same person, his attorney who may be living in St. James may have one of these forms which he is able to fill out rightaway, and as a result his claim will be in before yours. I wish that the Hon. Minister in charge will see that these forms are printed

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I think that the most scandalous position is to be found in the matter of the publication and printing of the debates of this House. No debate of the House has been published since March last year and that represents a very scandalous state of affairs. It means that publication of the Official Debates of the Legislature is entirely behind hand.

Now, the Hon. Minister has told the House that they are actually saving money by the operation of this printing plant. I do not know by what method of accounting he has been able to arrive at the fact that they are saving money because the plant has not been in operation for very long; and one does not know whether in calculating this handsome profit, all the factors in connection with the operation of the plant have been taken into account. The staff is pensionable and what not and, therefore, in arriving at a profit and loss with a Government Department like that, all these factors have to be taken into account: and they are different from those which would apply in the normal operation of other businesses.

If you are saving money, well then you can make a larger capital investment because, obviously, the plant is too small to cope with the amount of work which they have to do. I would say that the staff is doing a good job with the equipment at their disposal. It is a Department with a type of printing which is entirely original or new to Barbados; therefore, it reflects the greatest credit on those responsible that they are doing what they are doing As far as I know, nobody has been trained in that type of printing except the Plant Superintendent (or whatever he is) who had some sort of a course; therefore, they literally had to start from scrap.

8.15 p.m.

When you consider for whom the Government is printing - the Legislature, the Government Departments and Subsidiary Departments and what not obviously, more equipment is needed: and the fact that they are making some kind of saving by the printing of Government work gives them money with which to play for the extension of the equipment up there. There cannot be any justification for the scandal that the printing of the debates is a year behindhand. One wonders how long they will take to catch up with them and print them. I doubt whether there is any Legislature in the world, except the Legislature of some South American republic, in which the matter is allowed to lag behind in the manner in which we are treating the publication of the official debates. It is true that much value may be placed upon what is said, but at the rate at which we are going, I can see a few members of this House being dead before the debates are printed and they, therefore, would not have any chance of correcting them.

A Member like the hon. junior member for St. James might actually cross the Great Beyond before he sees in print the voluminous ---

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should not refer to the hon. junior member for St. James like that; why does he refer to that hon. member and to nobody else? That is not fair.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not being unfair at all; all I am saying is that by virtue of his maturity - a point at which we would all feel proud to reach he may be a little nearer to the unwished-for, even than the majority of hon. members; and it would be very unfair to him to allow that event to take place without his having seen in print the report of the voluminous and lengthy speeches which he has made on the floor of the House. (Laughter). I do hope that some attempt will be made to expedite the work of the Department, especially - the firms to which reference has been made by members of the Opposition, and in this matter of the publication of the reports of the very important speeches which have been made by hon. members of this House.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I am very interested to know if the post of Government Printer has been filled. I was pleased to receive a report from the Housing Authority and I understand that that report was printed by the Government Printery; it was a very fine job indeed. I wonder if the Government Printery can can produce such an excellent report, how soon will they be bringing the publication of the debates up to date? If they can be so efficient as to produce that document, I think that the time is now that the debates of the House should be drawn up. I am wondering if the appointment of the Government Printer and that of the Plant Superintendent have been made; if these posts are filled in the near future, then this Printery should be able to do more work.

Another point to which I would like to refer - is the composition of the Printing Committee. As you know, Sir, it is composed of some members of the House of Assembly and one from the Other place, a composition which I do not well appreciate I think that the time has come when there should be some change in the composition of that Committee. To have members of the House being still responsible for the publications which have to be done to serve the various Government Departments - well, I think that things have now reached the stage where that composition is absurd, and the Government should consider an amendment to the law to change the constitution of the Printing Committee.

Now , you have the Government Printery and the Government Printer, I do not see why the present Printing Committee should continue to function as it did years ago. I think that the sooner the Government looks into that matter, the more efficiently will be obtained out of this Printery.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, so far as the Printing of the debates is concerned, the Committee will appreciate that there was a backlog of work from the Advocate Printery which had to come in. The Printery obtained a special machine in December, I think it was, and that machine was to be devoted entirely to bringing the debates up to date. I have not spoken to the Clerk of this House about this position, but, as I have already said, we hope, now that the machine is there, the position will be altered very considerably; however, we have this backlog which has come in from the Advocate. Generally , I welcome very much the remarks which have been made by hon. members as to the Printery. I know that some hon. members have visited the Printery and have seen the conditions there. As they have said, I think that the staff is doing a very good job with the new type of machinery. Some of the staff is still in the process of training, but, as time goes on, they will become more efficeint and we will not have these delays of which hon members have complained.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I thought the hon. member would have made some reply to the remarks which I made about the composition of the Printing Committee. I know that His Honour the Speaker will appreciate the remarks which I have made. I think that the time has come when the Act should be amended. I knew the position when I was the head of the Printing Committee and I never appreciated the position where the Legislature was responsible for considering the printing for the various Government Departments.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order. We have taken that decision. In the present circumstances, we ought to have changed that position; I think we ought to change it.

Mr HUSBANDS: I am sorry I did not hear the Premier before, otherwise, I would not have said what I said.

The question that the sum of $68,392 be voted under this Head, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

8.25 p.m.

LEGAL

HEAD VIII – LEGAL was called.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $8,424 be voted under Head VIII Legal

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, there are two Items, Nos. 12 and 16, under which I am seeking some enlightenment.

Under Item 12, there is an increase of $1,000 for Fees to Counsel authorised to appear by Crown. What is intended, Mr. Chairman, to be done in this financial year about that, now that the office of the Attorney General has been filled? Last year it was not filled and it was necessary to employ senior Counsel - one of Her Majesty's Counsel - and junior Counsel. Is it proposed to continue with that same practice? As you know, in England it is regarded as the duty of Her Majesty's Attorney General to go down to the Old Bailey or wherever it is to prosecute on behalf of the Crown in a murder trial where human life is involved. We would expect the Attorney General to go down to the Town Hall and prosecute a murder case, and if he decided not so to do, he would let the Solicitor General do it; but it does not seem fair to the taxpayers, if you have an Attorney General, for private Counsel to be engaged, although I trust my colleagues will forgive me for reminding Government of what is the correct practice and procedure. We should not be paying private Counsel so long as we have an Attorney General.

I am going to tell you of cases in Trinidad where Mr. Malcolm Butt was to appear. The senior Crown Law Officer is never regarded as someone to appear in Court; he is the chief adviser of the Government and has so many problems to advise on in his Chambers that he is never expected to appear in Court, particularly in those two cases in which Mr. Butt was engaged which were expected to occupy weeks as they turned out; then there was further argument and more time was spent in Court by the senior Crown Law Officer. I should like to know what is the intention of Government, because it is a matter of Government sanctioning it by asking us to vote this money. What is the intention for prosecuting cases at Assizes now that the post of Attorney General has been filled?

Now, as to Item 16, Law Books, may I enquire into this $2,600 which we are asked to revote? Of course, the amount has increased. What is the intention of Government in respect of this set of Law Reports? Does Government propose to have this set of Law Reports in the Attorney General's Chamber, in the Law Library or where? I should like that settled so that when it comes it would not go somewhere where it was not intended. I should also like to inform Government that as from this year a circular has gone out from the Registrar to practitioners in both branches of the professional saying that in order to use the Law Library you must pay an annual subscription of $5; otherwise you could not use the books. I would like to know if Government knows that the books are made available free - it is a question of principle -- or if they know that they are made available only for people who pay a certain amount. Of course the poor Barristers suffer because whereas a Barrister is required to pay $5 a year, a big firm with big partners like Haynes and Griffith or Yearwood and Boyce is required to pay the same $5 for the use of the books by one of those firms with so many professional men in them. I am only pointing out how unfair it is, and Government should be informed of these things. The question is whether you are starting a principle and charging for the use of the Library The amount is immaterial, because if the amount is small it is even worse than if it were large, because so long as we are paying we will insist that every possible book be made available in that Library. You should either charge nothing at all and nobody would make complaints, or charge $100 or so a year and have the Library kept up to date with the best books, and let Government insist that every member of the profession, Barrister or Solicitor, be required to pay the same amount. Do not let Solicitors get away through four or five joining a firm and paying one $5 bill. Do you imagine Haynes & Griffith or Yearwood & Boyce being the same as some other poor member of the Bar?

Mr. F.G.SMITH: Mr Chairman, under Item 12, Fees to Counsel authorised to appear by Crown, I see inserted here a figure of $4,000. I am wondering if Government would not think it more economical to add another $800 making it £1,000 a year and paying Crown Counsel who would not only be there to prosecute during the Assizes, but would be in the office of the Attorney General to assist with any drafting that may arise from time to time. If you are spending $4,000 on Counsel to prosecute for the Crown, why not put another $800 a year more with that, because you might get a good young lawyer who prefers the security of the Civil Service to the roughness of open practice, and who would be there to advise Government Departments? I am not asking for a job for myself because you would have to add another £2,000 or double it! I think the Premier will agree with the suggestion: if you are spending as much as that you can get a full time officer who would be there all the time instead of being at the Assizes alone.

I take it that the amount is fairly high because for a long time the island has been without a Solicitor General. I have often heard it said in this Chamber that lawyers are all a penny, like flying fish in the glut season. It is peculiar that we cannot get a Solicitor General as we had hoped in the West Indies or from outside. We have experienced great difficulty in getting an Attorney General, but fortunately we did get one and we are well in the position now of not having a Solicitor General appointed.

Of course, it is vital in offices like the Attorney General and Solicitor General that you should have men who are secure in the tenure of their office, and therefore who can discharge these very important legal functions without fear, favour or affection. I am throwing it out to Government that instead of voting this $4,000 they should appoint one Crown Counsel for a start - and if the volume of Assizes increases you would have to get two, and get a full time lawyer. Of course, only certain conservative lawyers would benefit from this $4,000; this $4,000 in the past would have been paid to conservative lawyers or those whose allegiance was to the Political Party. (A VOICE: That is the same as the Government.) I would not say that is the same as the Government. Whatever you say about the Government, I know two gentlemen who, are worse than the Government. I think you should consider that suggestion seriously, because you would be doing much better than voting the money which you are voting.

8.35 p.m.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I do not know what the hon. member has just said. The only person who would come here for $4,800 as a full time job will only be a parrot lawyer. You might have to make it more substantial. I think it would be better to staff the Attorney General's office than to pay a chance lawyer. It would be better to do that than to rely on private practitioners. However, I will pass the information on to the Attorney General. Hon. members must remember that it is a matter between the Chief Justice and the Attorney General.

Mr. F.G.SMITH: Sir, I have also noticed in my travel throughout the Caribbean that vacancies of legal appointments in the other colonies are advertised but those here are not advertised. If you take the post of Solicitor General which was vacant in this island, as far

as I know, I have never seen an advertisement to fill the vacancy. You find advertisements for the post of Legal Draughtsman, Leeward Islands, coming here from the Leeward Islands, but you never see it from Barbados. If you really want to get good men, you should advertise in all the colonies and then pick the man you want. You have some barristers and Magistrates in the smaller islands with some experience who would be willing to come to Barbados. I know it is always a matter for the Chief Justice to decide, but I just want to say that you never see in the usual way an advertisement for vacancies in the Legal Departments of this island.

Mr. BRANCKER: Would the Hon Premier give the information I asked? I would like a definite answer if he can supply it as regards the books for the Law Office.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: My recollection, Sir, is that it was intended for the Law Library. The vote was intended to purchase English Reports. The Attorney General already has English Reports although he may not have a full set. My recollection is that it is for the purchase of English Reports which are not full in the Attorney General's office. I take it that Law Reports mean Law Reports: so it seems to me that the Law Reports will be for the Attorney General and the English Reports for the Law Library. I will enquire and let the hon member know. I am only guessing.

Mr. BRANCKER: We have Item 9 for purchase of law boks for which the sum of $650 is to be voted. Then you have Item 16 which is a vote of $2,600 for the same books. You would not separate them and bring them under two separate items if they were for the same purpose; so I come to the conclusion that Item 16 is for the Law Library

Inasmuch as it comes under this Head which is a head for the Attorney General's office, we do not want to take any risk that these reports for the Law Library has been kept for some other place.

The question that the sum of $8,424 be voted under Head VIII, Legal, was resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. M.E.COX: I beg to move that Your Honour do report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

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

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

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

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting 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 left the Chair.

8.45 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE

On re-assembling,

Mr. Speaker: When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply on the Estimates.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House resumed Committee, Mr. L. E. Smith being in the Chair.

HEAD IX - MARKETS

HEAD IX – MARKETS was called.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $60,724 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. F.G.SMITH: Before the question is put, I should like to ask the Hon. Minister to get the Regulations fixed, so that we can have the market opened early.

Hon. M.E.COX: We are going to have the Regulations ready pretty soon.

The question that the sum of $60,724 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD X- FIRE BRIGADE

HEAD X - FIRE BRIGADE - was called.

Hon Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of $30,343 be voted under this Head.

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

The question that the sum of $30,343 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XI – LIGHTHOUSES

Head XI – LIGHTHOUSES – was called.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of $3,108 be voted under this Head.

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

The question that the sum of $3,108 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XII – REGISTRATION

Head XII – REGISTRATION – was called.

Hon Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of $16,347 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that on the last occasion when we met, we did not discuss the Civil Establishment Order, dealing with the Established posts; therefore, any criticisms which I have to make I will reserve until we are discussing that Order, which is now on the Order Paper

Mr. BRANCKER: In respect of Item 7, "Clerical Assistance, $12,000," I should like to say that there is a tremendous backlog in the Registration Office. The law says that a Deed has to be ready within a maximum period of si weeks, but now, you have to go back for it in six months. It is not the fault of the Department, because it is very hard pressed; the trouble is that there is a great shortage of competent help. I understand that application has been made to the proper quarter for clerical assistance, but it has not been granted; a deaf ear has been turned to it. It is not good enough for people to have to wait for six months in order to have their Deeds recorded, particularly, if the Head of the Department is not at fault, and if application has been made in the pro per quarter. If application has been made for this Clerical Assistance, what is the reason for the delay in granting it? The public should not have to submit to this inconvenience when the matter is one which can be easily cured. It is not a question of getting an expert who is hard to find; any bright boy from Harrison College could go to the Registry and copy Deeds and this important work could be brought up to date.

Mr. F.G.SMITH: Following upon what the hon. member has said, I should like to point out that these copyists do not get any holiday; they only get paid when they work. I would like to know what is the attitude of the Government towards these people? I think the Government should provide some funds - the Government should consider bringing these people into the Establishment as such or give them some holiday during the year. There are certainly doing a good job and they should be given a holiday. The Registrar's attitude towards these people is a very sympathetic one and I wonder if this matter has been drawn to the attention of the Government. It is a matter which deserves the Government's consideration- granting these people holidays and permanence of employment.

The question that the sum of $16,347 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XIII - LEGISLATURE

Head XIII – LEGISLATURE – was called.

Hon . Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to increase by $3,600, Item 25 "Travelling

Allowance for Ministers." As hon. members will see from the cyclostyled copies, there are certain Items which have to be moved in. It is not a matter of an afterthought; what has happened is that instead of dealing with a single Minister, we considered it better to have the Cabinet Ministers and let them all agree to these Items. I do not attend, ordinarily, when the Medical Services are being dealt with, but some of these things are not just afterthoughts the particular Minister has said that instead of his agreeing to these things now, let them all remain for consideration by the full Cabinet. We had to do this at this time in order not to hold up the Government Printery.

This particular Item will be increased from $2,880 to $6,480, so as to provide for an increase in the Travelling Allowance payable to each Minister from $50 per month to $90 per month. Inasmuch as we will soon be having seven Ministers, we are putting in this amount now so that it will be in the Estimates. I am therefore asking that this Item be increased by $3,960, so that the total amount will now be $38,668 to be voted under this Head. Hon members will remember that when we first started the Ministerial system, we did not know what would be the appropriate sum for Travelling Allowance or for entertainment and we warned the House then. We have now discovered that our original 1954 Estimates for travelling allowance was too conservative in view of the amount of travelling which we have to do. It was recommended to us that the amount for Travelling Allowance should be increased, but we did not think so. We now feel that this amount is necessary.

I am going to move that the sum of $38,668 be now voted under this Head.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I have objection to this matter being brought in at this stage, with these amendments having been circulated to hon. members long after they have come into the House. I suggest to the hon. member in charge of the matter that the consideration of this particular Head be deferred, so that hon.members would have the opportunity of perusing this Item of which they have had no copies until after they had perused their copies of the Estimates.

Secondly, this amendment has been circulated at this time, at a time when we should be actually concerned with retrenchment, and it is not reasonable to ask for an increase which nearly amounts to an increase from 50% to 90% they did not increase it to 100%. They perhaps, suspected that some criticism would have been made. This proposal is just like when you see something costing 99 cents, the idea being that it is less than $1.00. I see no justification for this increase and therefore, I must oppose it.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that there is a subtle attempt for them to increase their emoluments without having to pay any income tax on them. I would not propose an increase in our salaries, because the Income Tax Commissioner would get something out of it. As this copy of these amendments has been cyclostyled, I do not see why we could not have had it sent to our homes, so that we could have the opportunity of studying it.

9.45 p.m.

Anyhow, Sir, apart from the fact that it is brought to us at this late stage, I am passing no such increase in principle. If there is nothing else, he must remember what the crop is likely to be this year. It was thought that it might be 175,000 tons and one hon. member said it might be 160,000 tons This amount is an actual bagatelle, but it does not go down well with the public; they realise this is for the Ministers for travel and you have no check. This is the time that we should be retrenching, not increasing, unless there is a cast-iron case for increasing.

Mr. F.G.SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I too am opposed to dealing with this item which was circulated this afternoon. The Estimates have been going through and I have been facilitating the Government as far as it is humanly possible; but I should be failing in my duty if I sat and voted for travelling allowance to be increased in this 18x9 place from $50 to $90

The Premier in opening the Estimates showed that the position of Barbados is not as rosy as it had been. How can anybody with a socialist conviction or who makes any preference to socialism, sit down and vote for this increase with a clear conscience? You can get from Bridgetown to St Lucy in half an hour, and you can drive around the whole island in three hours. The Deep Water Harbour is being built in Bridgetown; they are getting stones from Bagatelle, and the only man who would have to go there to see if the project is going well is the Minister of Communications and Works. This country is not as vast as Jamaica or Trinidad; can the Ministers tell this Hon. Committee that the $50 they have been getting is too little? Can they give us an idea of how many miles per month they travel? How can we sit here at this time in our development, when people are called upon to tighten their belts, and when we cannot get money for economic development, and vote an increase in travelling allowance from $50 to $90? Are you going to give the Minister without Portfolio too? What is his job? Is he going to get money for driving around the country, when people cannot get the minimum of $15 a week and there is so much suffering, starvation and bad housing in this country? Do you think I would vote for this? I would lose my seat for this. And the same Government voted $4 a month for the cleaner at the Belleplaine Courts. I would lose my life for something like this (A VOICE: Your life is not worth much.) Do not give people the impression that you are feathering your own nests This would give the impression that you are trying to get as much out of politics in as short a time as possible. There are so many things that can be done with the money you are voting here. Why not give more scholarships to poor children, or pay for examinations for people from private schools? How can I in the name of God sit and vote for this? I am prepared to go with you when you are reasonable, but this is terribly unfair to the people who have put you in power. This is scandalous. You have increased the salaries of members, and you have also increased the Ministers: my God! are you going to increase travelling too? Be fair to people and do not do this to them all the time. And they will vote for you for the Federal Parliament!

I do not know what to say for them. The only way for them to learn is for some of them to die in the road with bad feels, starve or die with Tuberculosis. How can they vote for people who increase travelling in this 18x9 place? Where do you have to go; to Montego Bay?

Mr. Chairman, I say without any fear of contradiction that this is a positive scandal and unfair to the masses of this country. I will not say anymore on this; let it pass. Some people will never learn, and the people in this country will have to suffer.

Mr. Chairman, dealing with Item 20, an increase to provide for the Speaker's entertainment expenses, I feel, Sir, that the Speaker of this Hon. Chamber deserves the amount of money being voted under this Head. This Item of expenses to entertain other visiting Parliamentarians is a matter which should have been dealt with not only during the tenure of office of the present Speaker, but it should have been dealt with and had been raised in this Hon. House during the tenure of office of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. This can only give the impression that the hon. junior member for St. Peter for one reason or another was not persona grata with the Government in power, because immediately he is demoted from the high office which the present officer occupies, the salary goes up from $240 to $400, and in addition he is getting $600 to entertain guests and people whom he should entertain. I am not quarrelling with the principle, but I should personally like to know why it was not done when the hon. senior member for the City raised it during the tenure of office of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. You would make people feel that he could not spend $600. They probably feel so because he was demoted from $240 to $160; but now the office has been increased, and there is still a vast difference between $400 and $240. I am very glad to see that Government has accepted the principle, but if I vote alone in this House and the people never give me a vote again, I

cannot vote for $90 travelling allowance except the Saviour tells me to vote for it; and I feel very strongly on it. Honest to heaven, I feel strongly on this; and I was surprised to see it heading the list of amendments coming around. Sometimes I wonder how people spell socialism, because socialism for them means getting as much as you can in as short a time as you can out of the people who put you in power. You are getting $720 a month; the Premier gets $1,000; do you mean you are still going to do this to them? (Hon. M.E. COX: That is cheap.) I know it is cheap, especially when the people in this country do not know where the next meal is coming from. You fellows make sport! The Trinidad Ministers get about $300; so you should make yours $300 too! You are not getting any money in comparison with the Trinidad Ministers!

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I will deal first with Item 20, to provide for the Speaker's entertainment expenses. I think that is fair, and the only comment anyone would have to make is that one would have expected Government at least to give some explanation as to why they have now brought it down.

I think I was singing a solo in this House when I said that immediately after what we considered the new dispensation, we found occupying the high and dignified office of Speaker, persons whose economic position could not afford them to live up to the standard of entertaining people, and I said five years ago, a little after the hon. junior member for St. Peter became Speaker, that just as Ministers could have an entertainment allowance, His Honour the Speaker should be given an entertainment allowance

9.55 p.m.

I take it that it can only be spent or paid out of the Treasury when it is wanted for entertainment. I am glad to see that the Government has brought it down but they cannot escape the criticism that it seems purely malicious that they have not brought it down before now. I have no more comment than that to make on it.

Now , let us reason together about Travelling Allowance for Ministers. The hon. junior member for St. Andrew is not singing a solo in what he had to say on it. I hope my remarks will reach the ears of the Income Tax Commissioner and let him question it. A person drawing travelling allowance in the Government Service cannot draw it when he is not in office or has gone out of the country, nor can he get it exempted from income tax when he is out of the island. I have taken that up with the Income Tax Commissioner. When $50 a month is given to a Minister for travelling allowance, I take it that it is Travelling Allowance. A Minister should not be in any different position from Government Servants and other people who get Travelling Allowance. You pay a Minister a salary and if he has to travel you give him Travelling Allowance.

Why have you raised it from $50 to $90? I would have thought that under normal conditions you would have raised it from $50 to $60. Let us take Mr. Gollop who has to do a lot of travelling. I can give an instance of quite a number of such people. You pay 23 cents per mile for the first 200 miles and 7 cents per mile thereafter. I would suggest this to the Hon. Premier and I do not think he should resent it. On the face of it, it does not seem right. If you are paying officers in your Service who must travel by the mile and you are giving the maximum of $60 per month for travelling to an officer of the Social Welfare Department as well as some at the Department of Agriculture, where is the justification of giving a Minister $90 a month for travelling? A Minister, does not do one third of the travelling of these officers in the Service. I take it that you are not paying for travelling for a Minister from his home to his office; you are paying for travelling from his office to the work which he has to do. If you submit that it is 'infradig' to ask a Minister to give you the mileage he has done, then you should take the instance of the officer whose duty it is to travel, and work it out even at the highest average of what you pay your general run of Civil Servants. I can tell you that $60 a month is the highest that they draw for travelling allowance. A Minister does not have to travel three days a week.

Let me ask you this question. Included in this vote for travelling is Travelling Allowance for your Minister without portfolio. I am elected in my line to take the hardest role in politics I do not grudge anybody for what they are getting as salary or for travelling; I am only saying that it is not equitable on the basis of what Government Servants get as travelling allowance for you to put that for a Minister at $90 a month. The Minister of Communications has to travel around to look at works and things like that. The records of the Treasury show that every Minister draws every cent of his travelling allowance. I wonder if the Income Tax Commissioner is aware of that! I contend that if the Government came in here and said that they were going to raise it to $60 per month, reasonable as we are, we would agree. You worked it out on a basis and you said that your Government servants should not get more than $60 a month. You have directed your Income Tax Commissioner to that effect and I think there is a law of the country that you cannot claim for travelling any amount above that figure. Another thing is this. Any officer in the Service who is entitled to travelling allowance will tell you that if he goes to England he is not entitled to any claim for travelling allowance during these months. You propose to pay a Minister $90 a month for travelling allowance. It appears to me that this is more than travelling allowance. This is really $90 a month extra. That is not right, You may think that I say so for political reasons but I am sure that there are hon. members over there who in their saner moments would come to the conclusion that the point raised is a point which would attract the minds of those who would think of what is fair and what is not fair It would even attract the attention of the legal minds.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, I would be reasonable enough, if you increase it by $10 a month, to say that that is reasonable. I am not binding a Minister down to his doing travelling merely when he leaves his office at the Ministerial Building. He may have to go out on some tour with some official and I do know that if a Minister is interested in his job, he would go out on his own and he may have to do it at night. He may be busy in the day at his office and he would say: "let me take a run out to St Andrew now." That would have nothing at all to do with his personal business and that is what I feel he should be allowed travelling allowance for. Sir, I am very reasonable, but I cannot see you giving yourself more travelling allowance than you give your officers in the Service. Can you tell me if any of your officers get more than $60 a month for travelling?

10.05 p.m.

It was Euripides who said in the "Hecuba" that the mighty should not use their might on things unfit. That is putting it mildly; you cannot justify this Now, you are going to get a big question raised. Some of this money is bound to lapse; you can only have travelling or no travelling to do. Officers of the Agricultural Department and the Department of Highways and Transport, Officers of the Housing Authority and of the Public Works Department have to do travelling, The Officers of the Public Works Department who are building houses all over the place get Travelling Allowance, but they also get long leave I want to say here that every cent which has been voted for the Travelling Allowance of the Ministers was drawn and that is improper; it is indecent. They should set an example. The Income Tax Commissioner is bound to take notice of this matter.

I quite agree with the hon. junior member for St. Andrew that they should not increase this Travelling Allowance to $90 a month. If they were reasonable to say that the Ministers should be put on the maximum basis of what you pay members of the General Service, that would be a different matter. There are people who travel all over this Island and they get 23 cents a mile for the first 200 miles; even if the Ministers were travelling every day of the week, even if each Minister was doing 300 miles a month in travelling - I hear a remark made about our being cheap; well, it may be cheap, because it is my opinion that when you have to face facts, you must face them. Travelling allowance is not paid to a man who has to get from his home to his office.

Let me ask them not to be nasty; which of them does 800 miles in travelling a month? They would not do 800 miles a month in travelling at the Government rate or the rate at which they pay all the Officers. You have the Inspectors at the Public Works Department; would the Premier really tell us who has put forward this proposal? I repeat, that you cannot use your might on things unfit. You should not sit there and think that your prosperity will last forever. How can you be Socialists? Hon. members talk about socialism, but how can you pretend to be Socialists, when, even in a small matter like Travelling Allowance, you want to be set apart from the general run of people whom you employ and say; "While we will pay you 23 cents a mile, we, as Ministers, must be paid more; we are on a higher basis"? I would like to know in whose brains this matter was hatched. We could not offer this type of criticism if you had taken the Waterworks Department with their Inspectors, found out how many miles in travelling they do, and then arrived at something for the Ministers. We could not have used that argument if you had done that. How could any decent, honest minded Minister say that he had any right to go to the Treasury and draw every cent which was voted for Travelling Allowance? How could he do it? There are those of us who have to pay our income tax; you have not got to pay Income Tax, but you have travelling allowance. How can you, as Socialists, set apart yourself and say; "We must have $90 a month despite what other people get?"

I find no fault with the Entertainment Allowance for His Honour the Speaker. I do not quarrel with the Entertainment Allowance for the Ministers, because they are entitled to entertain people who come here from foreign colonies. I think it is right and fitting, having regard to the dignity of the office which they occupy, that they should have this Entertainment Allowance. Of course, a man like the Hon. Minister of Social Services can afford to entertain people; as a matter of fact, he used to entertain people before he got an Entertainment Allowance, and so it was with the Hon Minister of Agriculture. However, it is not right to talk about giving the Ministers $90 a month for Travelling Allowance.
10 15 p.m.

How can the Ministers of this country want to pay their travelling allowance at that, draw it, and not want to pay the Inspector at the Public Works Department or any other person? What would the Auditor General say? And included in this is travelling for the Minister who is not yet appointed. I have always said that a travelling allowance for the Minister of Education is absolutely necessary; but even so, how do you work this out? Do you realise that whatever may have been the legal technicalities for saving the car loans scandal in Trinidad, this is just as scandalous? The scandal in Trinidad is that the Ministers got travelling allowance and borrowed money to get cars; somebody said they got $300 in travelling allowance. The Premier has always said that we should never take Trinidad for an example. Some day somebody is going to write "What price Socialism in the West Indies." If indeed this is not as scandalous as the car loan business in Trinidad with Ministers here getting an increase from $50 to $90 a month and drawing it whether or not they are in the island, I do not know what is.

Now, Sir, is it not scandalous for them to ask us to give them $90 a month for travelling and no one has told us how they work it out? Am I making a mis-statement when I say that their own rates are 23¢ a mile for the first 200 miles and 7¢ for each mile after that? Do you think it is right? I would not vote for this at all.

I am going to move that we reduce the vote by $2,880 to show that there is no ill feeling, if Government is prepared to accept on the maximum basis of $60 a month. You might say that we are parsimonious and mean, but I read the speech of the Premier over and over again, and though I am not going to reply to that speech since my colleague, the hon. junior member for Christ Church spoke in reply to it, I must say it was quite sane. In effect it said that we must husband all our resources and be careful with expenditure, because the various schemes, works and social improvements, when added together amounts to quite a lot.

When we were dealing with the van for Lodge School, the Premier told us that though Government was not parsimonious, it was these small amounts when added together that amounted to a lot, and the amount wanted then was only $3,400.

Looking through the Estimates we realise that you have been using the pruning knife for cutting down expenses; how then can you do this for yourselves? If as a matter of fact this was justifiable, I would ask whether it was expected that Ministers would raise everybody else in their standard of living and get an increase themselves. But I would say that this is most unreasonable. You do not even increase this on the basis of what you pay your employees. You have formulated a policy for them but you must take yourselves apart and get $90 a month. The Premier himself speaks about things being vulgar, but this is more than vulgar. There should be a show-down in this House over this. Somebody is going to say it is a small amount, but I am using the Premier's own words. I am not talking about scholarships now; I am taking the trend of the Premier's speech that we must husband our resources and not spend extra money in things unnecessary. There is no justification for this. You cannot say that as far as you are concerned you are not even going to sacrifice travelling, but will take more than you are paying to the people in the general service. You cannot justify that you do this amount of miles, and $60 would be a most reasonable travelling allowance for Hon Ministers of the State to draw under the circumstances.

That is how I feel about it, Sir, and I beg to move that the amount be reduced by $2,880.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, it is not that anybody wants to be personal, but it is the principle which we are fighting. $90 a month is a large sum for anyone in Barbados to use for travelling, and it has been worked out at 800 miles per month. I am not going into personalities or into details, but this another means of getting an allowance other than a salary. Nobody denies them the fact that they should have an allowance for travelling and an entertainment allowance; nobody would want a Minister to entertain people whom they should entertain out of their pockets, and as a matter of fact, if at any time they had extraordinary expenses beyond the $3,000, as has happened on previous occasions with Government, they could come down to the House with a Resolution and we would vote it. What is the public going to say to this increased allowance? We are not allowing this to the Income Tax Commissioner, and I doubt whether any person in the island, whether it be doctor, businessman or anyone else would be allowed more than $80 by the Income Tax Commissioner. It is true it is a matter of principle, and they must set the example. If they do it for themselves, there are many Civil Servants who will hold us up and say if you are doing it for yourself, why should they not be given? The Income Tax Commissioner will be under pressure, and the public will not be satisfied. It has always been said that in the past the Conservative Government did this, that and the other; I would like to see a Conservative Government giving themselves $90 a month for travelling expenses in Barbados. I think things are on the reverse now; you can justify almost anything today.
10.25 p.m.

When it comes to the entertainment allowance for the Speaker, we have asked for that ever since the last Speaker was in the Chair. We knew that he should be given an allowance so as not to depend on anyone to help him with entertainment when dignitaries came here I knew of people who he should have been entertaining when they arrived and he always had to do a little hiding. That was not in keeping with the dignity of the Chair. I know that from experience and I also know that on an occasion the then Deputy Speaker, Mr. Lewis, had to undertake some entertainment. The then Speaker took some people up to Mr. Lewis and Mr. Lewis was somewhat embarrased because he did not know how the entertainment allowance would be met. That is a fact. Therefore, the giving of this Entertainment Allowance for the Speaker meets with our approval because it met with it three years ago, and at that time the then Speaker was drawing about half of what the Speaker is getting today

I say that the Speaker should be put in a position to entertain certain people when they arrive in Barbados and for that reason, we are willing to vote the amount set down; but when it comes to the travelling allowance for Ministers, I certainly cannot justify it, and I will second the motion of the hon. senior member for the City for the reduction he has moved.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I am in favour of the increase for travelling allowance from $50 to $90 and for this reason. The Head of the Administration is allowed two state cars and he is also allowed $1,080 a year which works out to $90 a month. When I was looking in that column dealing with that Item, I did some calculations. I have travelled about this island a great deal and I had to do it in order to do my substantive duties as a trade unionist. It is more travelling than the Head of the Administration has to do and I never yet had anything approaching $90 a month for travelling. I am sure no Head of the Administration of this ancient and loyal colony would ever have to travel as much as I have to do. I feel that Ministers must do more travelling than the Head of the Administration and if you passed that amount of money for the Head of the Administration, you should pass it for them. I mean it quite sincerely.

Now, I think I have sounded a note of warning when it comes to these allowances - these open votes - that as long as they are there, they are going to be used. The Ministerial System of Government has been on operation for a number of years and I am going to credit the Ministers with ordinary working class common-sense and having the ability to calculate over a period of time how much expense they entail in travelling in order to carry out the functions of a Minister.

Mr. Chairman, I will never be a Minister; I have not the ability to become one; I can therefore speak freely. The Head of the Administration is given two state cars They cannot be used so often: so it does not matter. The Head of the Administration with his two cars does not do as much work as one Minister with one car in a month. I would say that. If they have asked that this vote be increased to $90 a month now, I take it that they should have very, very good reasons to ask this Committee to vote this amount of money, and that is the reason why I am quite willing to vote for it. They cannot be such dunderheads as to hope by some sort of arbitrary or fantastic method they are going to get an increase of $40 a month for travelling. (A VOICE: What are they getting it for?) I presume that they are getting it for travelling. I presume that they know since the introduction of Ministerial form of Government why $50 is not sufficient. I may not be able to prove it but I am putting them on the spot. If they say now that after they have reviewed the amount of money formerly allocated to them for travelling allowance which was $50 a month, that they now want $40 more, then their calculation must have been based on experience.

They are the Hon. Premier, the Hon. Minister of Trade Industry and Labour, the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, and the Hon. Minister of Social Services as well as the Minister without Portfolio who will get this $40 increase in travelling. I do not see how it can be justified for the Minister without portfolio unless some other Minister takes him around to let him get that amount. They cannot say that he has as much travelling to do as they. He has just been in the job last week, relatively speaking. As far as the other Ministers are concerned, they must have worked it out and I suppose that they have to present vouchers. They must of necessity have more travelling to do than the Head of the Administration. He can never travel so much in Barbados. The Ministers are busy bodies in comparison with him They should be able to tell this Committee that they can show that they are likely to travel so much in a month.

Now, Sir, I turn to the Entertainment Allowance for the Speaker. It is gratifying to me, it is reassuring to me, that His Honour the Speaker is now going to get a Hospitality Vote of $60 a year. I am going to vote for this money too. It is befitting the dignity of His Honour the Speaker of this ancient House of Assembly that he should have been enjoying this for a long time and I am glad that it has come now.

10.35 p m.

I remember sometime ago when I was very embarrassed, when certain dignitaries came to this Island and I had to remain at home. I gave more than an open hint to the Premier that it would not bother me no matter who came - no vote, no appearance. However, I am glad to see that in this day of grace, we have sen fit to treat the Speaker of this House along the lines on which he should be treated and in the manner befitting his office. That note has been sounded by the leader of the Opposition and the hon. junior member for Christ Church. I am proud to back this vote; I am voting for both the Entertainment Allowance for His Honour the Speaker, and the increase in the Travelling Allowance for the Ministers, because bit by bit certain of the responsibilities which used to devolve on the shoulders of the Cabinet. I appreciate that, but still I think the Premier should be the person who ought to be in a position to know, because he has had experience in this business and he knows how much travelling has to be incurred during the period of a year.

As a Trade Union Official, I have done 100 miles in a day, but I have never got anything approaching $90 a month. As a matter of fact, I never got it. If I incurred that expenditure, it will have to come out of my pocket. Any Minister can use this vote if the Head is given that amount. I will vote for this Item.

.... I should like the Premier to know this. I do not know why the Government Hospitality Vote should appear under the Head "Legislature;" I think that vote should appear somewhere else. Probably, next year, that might be changed, but it ought to be changed. There is nothing legislative in it. As to the indexing of the Debates and the Minutes of Other Place, there was a suggestion once made, that as far as the staff is concerned, it is the staff of the Legislature, and it might even come under one common control. In some Parliaments, the Clerk of the Lower House is the Clerk of the Legislature, but here, the Clerk of our House is a Servant of the House, and the Clerk of the Other Place is a Civil Servant! That state of affairs should be changed too. I do not believe in a Civil Servant being the Servant of politicians; I cannot appreciate that. The former President of the Other Place was the stop gap in bringing about a more efficient administration of the staff of the Legislature; he did not see with me or with other members of the Debates Committee that there would be a smooth running of the business of the Legislature if there was one common control of the Staff, and the Other Place did not keep an independent Reporter. We could have exchanged and we could have had Reporters of the Legislature, but the President of the Other Place did not see with me. Being a gentleman of high prestige, he won. That happens in Barbados; it happened before my time, and during my time. I feel that the time has come when we should control that matter.

The indexing of the Debates of the House is long overdue, and there was an error in the Minutes of the Other Place. Now, we have a Government Printery and with the staff which we have we can effect a great improvement not only in the publication of the Debates, but also in the indexing of the Debates of the Legislature.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I have only risen at this stage to refer to Item 16. "Allowance to Messenger, $48;" that represents a mere $4 a month. The Note explains that this allowance is for the Deputy Marshal, Messenger and Library Attendant, in respect of late sittings of the House of Assembly. Look how parsimonious and econimical we are when it comes to this Officer, as compared with the increase in Travelling Allowance for Ministers for $90 a month! This amount represents taxi fare or something like that for the Messenger every time. The hon. junior member for St. Peter is an authority on what is overtime; when it comes to the Messenger, he gets $4 a month for over time, but when it comes to the Ministers, they get $90 a month for Travelling Allowance! 10.45 p.m.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On the last point, I promise the hon. member to look into it. It may be one of those things that was never complained about and nobody looked at it.

Before I attempt to answer what some hon. members said, I hope the Committee will pardon me if I say that no human being with the slightest bit of decency

can accuse me of running after money or making money out of politics; it is just the reverse. I never leave this country (except when I go to Geneva) without having to borrow money, because the allowances are not quite enough. As a matter of fact, we pay more in travelling, for bed and breakfast - and it happened twice quite recently - than we are allowed for all meals. You cannot go on indefinitely giving your time and energy and pulling your pocket. I do not think it is fair of any country to expect that of its politicians We have sat down and calculated this, and some months I put off travelling until the next month's allowances are paid in, and I think it perfectly justified. I know in my own instance it is perfectly justified, although I am not likely to be here enjoying it for more than a month

The principle attached to travelling allowance which has been raised for public officers brings in added insurance, dearer tyres and so on; the same thing applies to Ministers and I have acted in this manner.

Before I sit down I should like to say that in the case of the Minister without Portfolio, just as other Ministers find their funds are too little, therefore when another sum is fixed it should be paid to all the Ministers. We have hesitated somewhat with regard to the Minister without Portfolio, but we have, acting on the principle of treating everybody alike, made the suggestion that he should get it too. I am willing to modify that by saying that the Minister without Portfolio, like in the old days with the Colonial Secretary, has to run around and see things in order to explain them to the Other Place. He will still have travelling to do although he is not in charge of running a Department. I am willing to modify his allowance by making it $60 instead of $90, although when one Minister is absent he will have to act for that Minister and still do his specific job in the Other Place, because he will still be in charge of Government Business in the Other Place We find it impossible not to have a Minister out of the country at some time or other, because of the Conferences taking place.

I started off by reminding the Committee that when we started we were only guessing; we though that $3,000 would be enough for entertainment and for conferences, but all this has proved to be underestimated I repeat, who could honestly accuse me of trying to take money out of the Treasury?

We are thankful for the support of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. The hon. senior member for the City speaks of being out of the island. It is a matter for the Minister's conscience; if he knows that for a particular month he was away for two or three weeks, he will doubtless make up for the visits he could not have paid during the period he was away; but to treat the Minister in the same was as a Waterworks employee who has to run off and see a burst pipe and charge by the mile, is wrong. The basis of my contention is that we have discovered. ....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of explanation, Nobody said that the Ministers should be put on the basis of being paid by the mile, but you should arrive at the figure by what you pay to officers who do the maximum-amount of travelling.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I say that by experience we have discovered that the amount is insufficient. I do not know what the mathematics of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew is like, but he worked out the amount at 28¢ a mile. We are paying 23¢ for the first 200 miles and the balance at 7¢.

I repeat that Ministers must be given the credit for not having any desire to raid the Treasury. Look how easily we could have said: "Treat us like people on the travelling list, because those people can get loans for motor cars." We would not dream of doing it. It is obvious that a Minister has to travel and therefore must have a motorcar, because he must travel if he is to keep his eye on the Department and the working of it. I claim that none of us on this side of the House could justly be accused for something merely to put money in our pockets. I think it is regrettable that sometimes because some persons are in the position and find it necessary to disagree with Government that they should enviably make use of offensive remarks. What is true of me with conference is true of all of us. It is a fact that some people who go abroad to conference may be in receipt of a reasonably good salary or earning a reasonably good income and we do not worry to say that we do not get enough; even in St. Lucia it did not come to as much as we had to pay for the hotel bill; it is the same with Trinidad and with England You cannot go on indefinitely giving your time and energy and pulling your pocket too for any Government. I again put it on the basis that members of the House are all Barbadians; you know us and you can ask yourself whether there is any "bu ball" in this Government or could ever be with our dispositions. It took us great time, thought and calculation to come down for what at one time we thought we would have to ask for. Look at the figures of even St.Kitts, Antigua and Grenada and see what the travelling allowance is, if you say we are after money. Of course we are not as big as Jamaica or Trinidad; but from the point of view of size, you can see what it is in relation to St. Kitts, Antigua or St. Vincent.

I do not intend to say anything more, but I will say that although we acted on the principle that all the Ministers should be treated alike, it may be urged that the Minister without portfolio in normal times would have to run around and see things for himself in order to speak in the Other Place with direct knowledge. Obviously he would have to be in touch every day with the particular Departments and therefore I am going to ask leave to withdraw my original motion so as to amend it by making a fresh motion in which the sum of $360 will be deducted from the total of the vote.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Premier is asking leave to withdraw his original motion for the purpose of reducing the vote by $360, and unless any hon. member objects, leave will be granted.

10.55 p.m.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of $38,308 be voted under Head XIII - Legislature, and that the Clerk be asked to change the figures and note appropriately.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is peculiar that the Hon. Premier attempted to draw a red herring across the trail. I have said in season and out of season that whatever you may think of other West Indian Premiers you cannot accuse the Hon. Premier of any bu-ball with any Government. I go further and say you cannot accuse him of being a person who is only after money. I have said that behind his back and I will say it anywhere; but I am not going to socialise with him. I said on the floor of the House that the Premier or any representative of Barbados should not be allowed to go abroad and to travel in any tube or subway or to be embarrassed when other Ministers from other colonies are entertaining people. You talk of £2 being a proper allowance in keeping with the dignity of their office. The Hon. Premier knows well enough that the whole Opposition feels if you were going to represent Barbados that the person should not be asked to pull his pockets; therefore, I am saying this first of all, if you know that your Conference Vote is not enough, you should come here and ask for more. I remember when Mr. Wilkinson was a member of this Chamber, I discussed that with him and asked that it be raised.

Let me draw this to the attention of the Hon. Premier. There is nothing that can get me to vote the way he expects. I will not do it Take your Estimates up and look at it Can you not see that this Travelling Allowance for a Minister is over the Travelling Allowance given to other people who are entitled to it? I am a real estate broker; therefore, you might find me in St. Andrew and St. Joseph on account of my having something to sell; therefore, whenever I make my return to the Income Tax Commissioner I must make a return giving the maximum travelling allowance. It is part of my duty whenever I make a return to the Income Tax Commissioner to claim the maximum for travelling. Would it surprise you to know that the maximum the Income Tax Commissioner would give for travelling allowance even to a medical practitioner is $80 a month? That is public property. In other words, whenever you make out your return, whatever your income is they will only allow you $80 a month for travelling. I did some travelling

during the election time and because of that I put down the maximum I got for travelling. The Income Tax Commissioner called me in and I pointed out to him that I had to do more travelling because it was election year and he said to me: "Oh no; the maximum is only $80 a month." Are you saying in spite of all that, that you are going to vote $90 a month for travelling for Ministers? Let me tell the hon. junior member for St. Peter that the $1,080 which is set out here for the Governor is for gasolene and oil allowance. Not one of us over here will say anything about bu-ball when it comes to the Premier. As a matter of fact, I doubt very much whether he knows anything about it. I will not say that of him: but I am going to ask him according to the principles of travelling granted to officers of this country he would say that it is right to bring in a travelling allowance for Ministers at $90 a month. Let me again remind the Hon. Premier that if I go to the United States of America through illness, I will not be allowed anything off for travelling during the time I am away. You cannot make fish of one fowl of another. You cannot say in the Estimates that you should pay $90 for travelling to a Minister whether he travels or not when that figure is over and above what you pay to any of your officers who have to do travelling. I say, you do whatever you like. If the Income Tax Commissioner acts differently with a Minister, he is guilty of not carrying out his duties efficiently. (Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: He knows his job extremely well.) Therefore, you mean to say that a Minister can get $1,080 a year whether he travels or not but a private individual cannot get it. You say that the Income Tax Commissioner knows his job extremely well. Of course, he knows it extremely well.

Now, you say you leave it to a Minister's conscience if he knows he is away for a month or two; therefore, he must make that travelling up when he comes back.

11.05 p.m.

You cannot justify it. In the Government Service of this country where any Officer has a flat allowance and he is on holiday, you cannot pay him; you have to pay the person who is acting for him. If you increase this allowance from $50 a month to $90 a month, what the hon. member says is justified. This matter has been discussed, but you cannot take the Ministers and set them apart from the general run of people. Do you really think that you are going to convince anybody that a Minister would travel anything like 800 miles a month? If this Government had come down for an increase of $10 a month, making a maximum of $60 a month, that would have been a different matter By virtue of their job, the Ministers must travel; nobody wants to say that a Minister must put down what travelling he has done, but if a Minister goes abroad for two months and he will drive twice as much (Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: He will pay visits which he did not pay originally.) What nonsense is this? A Minister might travel tonight and he might have to travel tomorrow; the Minister of Communications and Works might go down to St. Lucy tonight. I am not being personal in this matter at all; this is a matter of principle. Instead of coming here and saying that the Travelling Allowance for Ministers would be increased from $50 a month to $90 a month — if you are going to say that Ministers must travel outside the general working hours, how is that sum to be given? You pay Travelling Allowance for a month, and if an officer of the Waterworks Department or the Highways Department is ill and he goes out in the third month — the Premier says that he will do double travelling for the third month. If you are not in office and you are putting this down as a monthly allowance for travelling - you come here and say that this allowance is at a monthly rate and working it out on an average, the amount will be $90 a month. I say that that is too much

My conscience tells me so. You have said that you want to increase this allowance from $50 a month to $90 a month when some Officers have to do twice as much travelling as the Ministers have to do and they do not get that allowance. I do not want to be personal as I have already said, but you would expect more travelling to be done by the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing than the Others; but these are certain Ministers who cannot do as much travelling as somebody else has to do. Do not let anybody fool you; you are increasing this Travelling Allowance from $50 a month to $90 a month and you cannot justify it. The Minister without portfolio gets $60 a month; although he is in the Other Place, he has to go around and acquaint himself with all the matters. I am not at all in favour of the Minister without portfolio getting this Travelling Allowance.

11.15 p.m.

The Minister without portfolio would be as much entitled to travelling because he has to deal with the work of all the other Ministers in the Other Place, and for that reason he would have to travel; therefore there is nothing wrong with giving him. But if you are going to give him $60, why raise the others to $90, because your argument is that that Minister would have to do in some instances what all the other Ministers have to do.

In his conscience the Premier must do the right things. It is not a question of somebody saying that he wants to raid the Treasury. I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, the maximum amount of travelling which your officers at the Public Works and Waterworks Department do and what they get. This is something which you avoid when paying income tax and therefore you have to show if you can be allowed $80 for travelling because even at Government rates that is a lot of travelling to do. If you claim that you do 800 miles per month, that is roughly 10,000 miles per year, and I would like to bet anyone of you that if you take your speedometer in a new car and include all your goings around, you could not do 10,000 miles a year. His Honour the Speaker was not allowed more than $80 a month for travelling when he was a doctor, and a lot of people would not get that because the Income Tax Commissioner works on the basis of Government rates. The hon. member said that they have come to the conclusion that after reviewing it this cannot pay and is not enough, and therefore they are raising it from $50 to $90.

I submit that there is no sense worrying. I feel very strongly on this. Personally I feel that if the Government felt that the increase was necessary on the basis of what you pay Government officers, it should not be by the month. I am going to grant you the privilege and right of saying that under the circumstances surrounding the case, a Minister should not report to you at 7c a mile. The hon. junior member for St. Peter was making fun at you when he said that you must have worked it out, but you got up and thanked him. You justified yourself for doing this, but he was listening to hear you say that you have taken the general service and worked out the maximum, and that a Minister has to do this amount of travelling. I do not want the Ministers to come and account to anybody, but you should take the basis of what you are paying people in your service, and you should not pay it by the month either, because there would be justification for anybody to say that as long as the Ministers are not in office and they can draw their allowance every month, they too can draw theirs. You should make it a flat allowance. It does not matter what happens in January if he is away or is ill. Actually when the first Resolution came here, you asked for $50 per month but the Treasury had no right paying it. According to you, it does not matter what happens in January, but if he does ten times as much travelling in February the rate is the same, and I cannot agree with you. I do not know who put this into your head, but it should be reduced to $60 per month. Do you think that the hon. gentlemen sitting over there who will vote for this tonight can say that the Ministers of this country do 800 miles a month, which is roughly 10,000 miles a year? I am prepared to bet you a thousand to one that if you take a new car and include travelling from home and social visits, you could not do 10,000 miles a year. You tried to make a comparison with Trinidad, but the Premier has always told us not to compare ourselves with Trinidad. He said that in Jamaica people like Gairy would go into a $48 a day hotel, but he would never tie Barbados down to that. We never felt he would and we have said so publicly and openly and I regret that anything like this has cropped up tonight.

You might object strongly to my attitude in here tonight, because I call a spade a spade and tell you in front of your face what my position is in this matter. I

feel you could reduce this to $60 a month Let me tell you that while I associate with nearly all of the members in the Opposition, I will express the view that you would never find me associated with any "bu-ball." The easiest thing to do is to twist this.You are socialists and you should not do it. You are increasing your allowance from $50 to $90 when you employ people and pay nothing like that; and you cannot do 10,000 miles a year in travelling. For your own good, although you will say that nobody over here advised you, I do not think that this should be brought here.

The Hon. Premier has thanked the hon. junior member for St. Peter for his help; that is no help; you should wait for the repercussions from that because he said that you must have worked it out. You should give the reason and the next step would be for you to show that your employees do a maximum of X miles and strike an average for the Ministers. You have attempted to reduce the vote by $360, but all the Ministers should be paid at the rate of $720 a year.

11.25 p.m.

Do not talk of being paid by the month. That cannot be any argument by anybody when a Minister is paid at a rate 25% higher than the highest paid Officer who does travelling in the Service and when it is more than what the Income Tax Commissioner allows to people who do travelling. An officer can only get travelling allowance when he travels: but a Minister of the State, if he goes away can still get it; therefore, you are a selected and privi leged class. I agree with the hon. junior member for St. Andrew that you are a privileged class; you are now saying that you must be allowed $90 for travelling.

I do not know if what I have said here tonight would cause you to set your house in order. I am not a fool. I counsel you just as you are cutting off that amount for the Minister without portfolio that you should also reduce this amount for yourself. My mind is that the entire amount should be reduced. I know that force of numbers and strength will cause you to get that amount passed but might has been proven to be not always right. In the battle with Hitler against the Allies it has been proven that might may prevail for a time and may seem to be right, but might is not always right. You might use that force which you have now to vote for this and get it passed but you cannot justify it here tonight, tomorrow, hereafter or any other time that Ministers must be a privileged class and they are not to be compared with all sections of people in the island when it comes to Travelling Allowance, and that therefore they must be given $90 a month for travelling. I would vote for this if it were $60 a month; but in the absence of that I am going to record my vote against this amount because my conscience makes me think that I would be doing wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Item be reduced by $2,160.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

The question that the Item be reduced by $2,160 was put and resolved in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows:–

Ayes: Mr. Mottley, Mr. Goddard, Mr. Smith, and Mr Brancker - 4.

Noes: Mr. Speaker, Hon. Sir Grantley Adams, Hon. M.E.Cox, Hon. D.D.Garner, Hon. R.G.Mapp, Hon. F.E. Miller, Mr. Holder, Mr. Thorne, Mr. Searles and Mr. Bryan - 10

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, may I draw to your attention that no member is entitled to record his vote on any matter of pecuniary interest?

Hon. M.E. COX: I do not want to take up the matter with him, Mr. Chairman, but surely the hon. member sat down in here and voted for salaries for himself.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr Chairman, I am always accused. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy ought to know he has been in this House long enough - that that does not apply to a matter of this sort.

Mr. BRANCKER: In reply to the hon. senior member for St. Michael, I have never voted for money for myself, and in reply to the hon senior member for St. Joseph he has kept so far away from the law and is so absolutely out of touch with it that he does not know what it is. We see that day by day. I am saying that it is a matter for Your Honour to rule and we know that whatever is your ruling we would abide by it. They do not realise that they have the majority without their votes.

The question that the sum of $38,308 be voted under Head XIII – Legislature, was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:–

AYES: Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS, Hon. M.E COX, Hon. D.D.GARNER, Hon. R.G. MAPP, Hon. F.E. MILLER, Messrs. HOLDER, THORNE, SEARLES and BRYAN 9.

NOES: Messrs MOTTLEY, GODDARD, SMITH and BRANCKER - 4.

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, next 11th March, 1958, at 3 o'clock p.m.

In making that motion, I should like to inform the House that as regards the Liquor Licence Bill, when the Regulations were drafted and made, an error crept into those Regulations whereby every person who applies for a permanent licence has to pay the sum of $5 for that application. That applies with equal force to an occasional licence, which was never intended , and it also applies to transfers and renewals, which also was never intended. The Government has taken up the matter and we have decided to have those Regulations amended; it may be that by next Tuesday they will be ready for amendment. Persons who apply for an occasional licence will have to pay nothing as far as the application is concerned. They will pay $5 for the licence and for renewals and transfers they will pay $1 20. That is to say, that those who apply for a permanent licence to sell liquor will have to pay $5.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Speaking on that motion, I want to say this: I am not at all surprised that the Hon. Leader of the House has made that statement now. We drew that matter to their attention. (Hon. M.E.COX: When and where? That is not true.) What is not true? This is a boomerang as far as the Government is concerned, but we want them to know that the matter was drawn to their attention by us.

Mr. BRYAN: Speaking on the motion for the adjournment, I would like to enquire from the Hon. Leader of the House what will happen in the case of those people who have already paid their $5 for their occasional licences. Is it the Government's intention to refund these persons their money?

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am told that these Regulations were never debated and therefore I cannot see that anybody on the other side of the House could have drawn this matter to the attention of the Government. If a period of forty days has passed, then the Regulations have the force of law; if anything is done while they are valid, then it has been lawfully done. It would be extremely difficult for the Government- well, we have not discussed that aspect of the matter and therefore I shall not express any personal opinion. Matters of that nature would have to be dealt with by way of a petition to the Government.

Hon. M.E.COX: The hon. senior member for the City has said that the matter was drawn to the attention of the Government. I should like to say that I have not heard anything like it from any hon. member on that side of the House. The Hon. Minister of Communications and Works informed me that someone who had applied for an occasional licence had to pay $5.00 for the application and $5.00 for the licence and I argued with him that that could not have been right. However, when I looked up the Regulations I discovered that the Hon. Minister was right, and I decided there and then to deal with the matter. I had it dealt with in two weeks' time and obtained agreement to amend the Regulations. The matter was not raised by anybody on the other side of the House. The Regulations were laid on the Table of the House but they were never discussed.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, the Regulations were so late in coming out that applications for licences were being made and the Regulations were not out yet.