
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 11th December, 1962.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade, Industry, Labour and Tourism*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Hon. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., (*Premier*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*) and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

Mr. COWARD and Mr. WALCOTT entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the past four meetings, I am instructed, are in the hands of the printers.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement showing net Customs and Excise receipts for eight months ended 30th November, 1962.

Barbados Statistical Service — 'Crash' Estimates of Gross Domestic Product at Factor Cost for 1962, and Provisional Estimate of Gross Domestic Product at Factor Cost for 1960 and 1961.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1962.

The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1962.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$40,206 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63, Part 1 — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1962-63, No. 30, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$4,697 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63, Part 1 — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1962-63, No. 31, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

At a later stage, I would ask for leave to deal with this resolution in all its stages today.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to authorise the advance of a sum not exceeding \$747 for the purpose of making advances of salary to the staff of the Legislature.

Also, A Bill further to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921.

I would like to give notice of my intention to ask for leave to deal later in today's session with the money resolutions of which notice has been given today, copies of which would be circulated in due course.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I want to raise my objection of the method of which notice was given to deal with these resolutions in all their stages today. It is against the good status of this House. At the moment, members are not afforded copies of these resolutions in advance and I want to make it clear that if a Minister proposes to do a thing like this, Your Honour personally should be notified beforehand and it is for you to give consent and even to have the resolutions circulated beforehand.

It is not good business to deal with these things as the Minister wants. It is true that all hon. members are not present at all times although that is no excuse. I say that, because a paper dealing with an important matter was dealt with in all its stages at the last meeting and that paper dealt with something fundamental so far as this country is concerned. This House is not aware of the contents of the matters in which we are asked to deal with today at a later stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would just like to say this. An assurance was given by the Hon. Leader of the House that copies of these resolutions would be circulated and I gather at an early stage. I would also say that intimation was given at the previous meeting of the House, that today would be probably the last day this House would be meeting before the Christmas recess and certainly as to one of the resolutions which may be dealt with and proceeded today — and that is a matter for which this House would have to grant leave — unless it takes place before Christmas probably it would not be of any interest to the recipients and that resolution is in respect of an advance to the staff of this House.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S BUSINESS

2.45 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

WHEREAS the Barbados Government sent a mission to the United States of America to investigate the causes for the breaches of contract of Farm Workers employed under the Migrant Workers Scheme, and

WHEREAS the Mission submitted a report of the Government, which was approved by the House of Assembly. Notwithstanding the action of the Government and the report of the Mission the recent return of large numbers of workers from the United States of America, justifies an investigation,

BE IT, THEREFORE, RESOLVED that the House of Assembly requests the Government to call upon the West Indian Regional Labour Board, to carry out an investigation into the causes of the recent termination of contracts of Farm Workers in the United States of America,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the House of Assembly requests the Government in collaboration with the other member Governments of the West Indian Regional Labour Board to include a Trade Union Representative from the Caribbean Congress of Labour on the West Indian Regional Labour Board.

QUESTION

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:-

Will the Minister of Social Services state if steps are being taken to expedite the recommendations of the Committee appointed to deal with the payments of pensions to Old Age Pensioners at their homes?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister state when the new system will be introduced?

REPORTS OF SELECT COMMITTEES PRESENTED

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to amend the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials) Act, 1891.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to incorporate the Young Women's Christian Association of Barbados.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee to consider and report on the Bill to incorporate the Young Women's Christian Association of Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that that is the same Report which the Hon. Minister of Social Services has just presented.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to repeal the Public Health Act, 1908, and the Public Health (Amendment) Act, 1945.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill further to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921, be now read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

REPLY TO QUESTION

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 73/1962 asked by the Hon. senior member for St. Thomas on the 21st August, 1962, is now ready.

Mr. SPEAKER: Left over from last time when the hon. junior member for the city of Bridgetown was on leave, is

the Oral Reply to Question No. 53/1962 asked by that hon. member on the 5th June, 1962. I observe that the hon. member is now in his place.

REPAIRS TO TENANTRY ROADS

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, the Question is as follows:-

To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works Housing and Tourism:-

Will Government consider as an urgent priority the repair of the following roads in the parish of St. Michael:-

Spencer's Gap, Baxters Road, Rock Gap, and the Garden Land, Country Road.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the Oral Reply to Question No. 53/1962 asked by the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown on the 5th June, 1962, is as follows:-

No provision has been made for the inclusion of these roads in the 1962-63 Road Works Programme.

Consideration will however be given to the possibility of including provision in the coming financial year for the repair of Spencer's Gap, Rock Gap, and that part of the Garden Land which qualifies for repairs by Government under the Tenantry Road Programme.

Mr. LYNCH: I thank the Hon. Minister for his Reply. 2.55 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next question and the only other question to which the answer has been laid stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and that is No. 73.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware that the Hon. Michael Starr, Canada's Minister of Labour is quoted in Jamaica as saying that there is a growing demand in Canada for skilled labour and skilled workers from the West Indies?

2. Is Government aware that there are 437 vocational schools established in Canada that are graduating, 13,000 students annually and workers from Barbados should find no difficulty in being absorbed amongst the said workers?

3. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, would the Minister immediately set about negotiating with the Government of Canada with a view to recruiting workers from these shores since the Immigration Laws of Canada are non-discriminatory?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"Yes.

The fact that there are 437 vocational schools in Canada that are graduating 13,000 students annually does not necessarily mean that there are skilled workers in Barbados available for Canada. It is not an easy matter for Barbadian workers to emigrate to Canada unless they are skilled.

Persons with skills who wish to emigrate to Canada are free to apply to the Canadian Immigration Authorities and I understand that in recent months a number of such Barbadians have emigrated to Canada.

In July last, two Canadian Officials from the Canadian Department of Immigration visited Barbados to interview persons who had applied for permission to enter Canada. I took the opportunity to discuss with them the possibility of operating a scheme for the supply of selected unskilled workers to Canada on a basis similar to our scheme with

the London Transport Executive and was informed that such a scheme was unlikely to be accepted in view of the high incidence of seasonal unemployment among unskilled labour, a problem which was causing the Canadian Government grave concern.

The Honourable member may however rest assured that I shall continue to explore every means of obtaining work overseas for some of our unemployed labour force."

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no other Replies laid to Questions, and the House may now continue with the Orders of the Day under Private Member's Business.

The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to move the passing of a Resolution re the Hon. Premier's Statement made on the 27th November, 1962 re the reduction of the consumption duty on beer. Is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition ready to proceed with Item No. 1 standing in his name?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed.

RESOLUTION re STATEMENT BY HON. PREMIER

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, as you have intimated, this is the only procedure by which members of this Chamber could have replied to a Statement such as made by the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance. I do not think that anyone listening to the Statement which was made relative to consumption tax in respect of beer will disagree with the Resolution of which I have given notice. The Resolution which I have although it is somewhat late really does not call for much study, because most of us have already given serious consideration to the Budget Speech which had been made by the Minister of Finance when these proposals were made on the first occasion. That is why, despite the fact that it might be said that there are some of us in the Opposition who do not show possibly or indulge in enough criticism which at some times we could, I purposely worded this Resolution to read as follows:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House view with approval the decision of the Government as contained in the Statement of the Hon. Premier laid in this Honourable House on 27th November, 1962, to reduce the consumption duty on beer."

Mr. Speaker, as you will recall, during the Budget Speech of the Hon. Premier, I expressed great apprehension as to the increase in this commodity, and therefore to say today that we approve the decision is not merely saying it lightly because we can say it, because we have taken time out to go carefully into the matter and to keep our ears to the ground. Judging further from the Hon. Premier's speech itself we can view the situation with the feeling that time alone is the greatest healer of all things.

You will recall, Sir, that I said on the occasion of replying to the Budget Speech that while I realised that the Government in power took over a legacy of additional expenditure, and therefore ways and means had to be found to balance that Budget, I did not approve at the time, of the entire method which the Government had adopted in raising taxation to meet this additional expenditure. 3.05 p.m.

I am sane and sober enough to realise that in any community if you must have an increased or improved standard of living such as what this Government which has captured the feeling of the people has promised the people of this country, these improved conditions must of necessity carry taxation, but as I said then, I felt that as far as beer was concerned that the taxation itself was somewhat high.

I gave then my reasons and I made suggestions of what I thought would have been more appropriate taxation at the time but I think everyone would realise that Government must concern itself with the raising of revenue and the policy of Government must be theirs and the method of

raising taxation must also be theirs. Therefore, while it is their policy, it is the duty of the Opposition to oppose, but it does not mean when I accepted the Leader of the Opposition that with a deficit of \$3 million and with the Government's intention to find ways and means of meeting the deficit that I could consider that that was something which they could rake out of the skies or it was something that they could go on the seashore and gather up like sand. I realised then that some form of taxation must be imposed and the suggestion which I made then was while we appreciated that you must bring in some new form of taxation we did not accept your way of doing it by an increase in the consumption tax on beer to the extent which it had been increased.

I think, myself, that a Government like an individual looms high in the estimation of the people, if after trial they find that there is an error and they come right out and say after trial of such a thing, we have found it better to do it in this way instead of the way which we had proposed. I think this Government looms much higher in the estimation of the people by their coming back with this new taxation proposal. That is the view which we of the Opposition take in this reduction of the consumption tax on beer.

Like the Hon. Minister of Finance and other members of the Government I have absolutely no interest, personally or otherwise, in Banks Brewery but I have an interest in Barbados and those of us with any enlightened opinion and responsibility must appreciate that we would hate to see anything at all done that would cause any industry of the magnitude of Banks, regardless of its origin or its owners, which has just started in this community to fold up as a result of what may be termed taxation which can be looked upon as excessive.

Now, Sir, as I have said, the only opportunity given to members not of the Government Party to discuss this matter is the moving of this resolution so that we all can have the opportunity to express our views. Some people who like to suggest that there is a hand glove with my party and the Government Party fail to appreciate the fact that in the Island-wide hook-up when I had to reply to the speech of the Hon. Minister of Finance that I offered criticism then, which I still offer today, and that was the criticism that I thought applied to certain more essential commodities that carried the extra taxation.

Sir, as my resolution says, "we appreciate and view with approval the decision of this Government in this reduction of the consumption tax on beer." Speaking personally, I am unable to partake, but not only people would be able to consume or drink more beer but I am also thinking what it would mean to the economy of the Island and the industrial development of the island and I know that all Barbadians would like to see the Government's programme of industrialisation succeed. All Barbadians would like to see any Government in power in this country with its programme of industrialisation succeed as long as we do not industrialise to such an extent as to the expense of the reduction of your labour force which can be done and as long as it is not industrialised to such an extent as to reduce your revenue to any great or appreciable extent. Therefore, our approval to the Government's stand in this matter is one that, I want to say here and now in this Chamber, has met with unanimous approval to the mass of people in this country and this reduction in the consumption tax on beer is not for persons merely to buy cheaper beer but because they would like to see developed in this country industries and would not like to see anything done for industrialists coming from abroad to say: "Look at what has happened to Banks; this is what can happen in Barbados."

I do feel this reduction of the consumption tax on beer by the Government would do well to enhance their eyes in the face of industrialists and people will appreciate that by trial and error the Government of Barbados is willing to give consideration to the public and say that they are prepared to reduce this and give reasons for so doing.

My resolution does not stop here. It goes on to say: "And Be It Further Resolved that this House urge the Government to consider the immediate removal of the increased duty on other essential commodities, especially rum and chicken parts."

Mr. Speaker, let me make my position abundantly clear. I am not here to suggest to Government to remove all its taxation which it has placed on rum. As a matter of fact, I do not regard the drinking of rum as an absolute necessity as such, but I do feel that the price as passed on to the consumer is too much. I would like to see the Government reduce that by at least 50%. Surely, there must be other avenues along which the revenue of this Island can be raised. I should like to see the Government just as it has given consideration to the reduction of the consumption tax on beer give consideration to the reduction in respect of rum.

3.15 p.m.

I say that for this reason. The average working, labouring man has been accustomed to his rum and not so much to his beer. You might develop Barbados into a beer-drinking country after a while, but up to now, that is not so. Barbadians are accustomed to drinking rum and not beer. I do not say that people should not be able to control themselves in the drinking of rum, but my experience is that the average manual worker is accustomed to our local beverage - by that I mean rum - and if he has to pay 20 cents for a "snap" I think that serious consideration should be given to reducing the amount of tax put on rum. When it comes to the question of chicken parts, I do not agree with anyone who says - I do not care who it is - that there is nothing in chicken parts. You may as well say that there is less in riblets, if that is the term, or in necks and bones which are imported in very large quantities from Canada which have been used in this country for a long time. It is only in recent years that chicken parts, wings, backs, necks and legs have been imported into this country and I think that the average housewife pays greater regard to having the use of chicken necks, backs, wings and legs more so than the riblets, the necks and bones. The legs and thighs of the chicken are out of the reach of the average working man; the average housewife appreciates more if she can buy the backs, necks and wings of chicken than the riblets, necks and bones which are imported from Canada. That is why I set out in this Resolution that additional paragraph which reads as follows:-

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House urge the Government to consider the immediate removal of the increased duty on other essential commodities, especially rum and chicken parts."

I know that the answer by the Government will be that they have to pay Civil Servants, they have to increase the Police and they have to pay Old Age Pensioners. We have agreed with that, and of course, I have never agreed to certain increases in the top brackets. I do not believe that we agreed that these increases in the top brackets were necessary at the time. When you take off the tax from essential commodities like rum and chicken parts where are you going to get the money from? I know that that question will be asked. We suggest to the Government that now they have been in the saddle for a year they will have the opportunity of looking around in other directions where there are not such essential commodities but luxuries and see if they cannot collect taxes in those directions. I am sure that every hon. member of this House would like to have the opportunity of expressing his view on this matter as there was no opportunity when the Hon. Minister of Finance made his statement for any hon. member to speak.

I want to make myself abundantly clear. It was said that when the Budget Speech was made by the Hon. Premier in this House there was no criticism from the Opposition or the Official Opposition. I want to say categorically to those people who have been using this propaganda that if they were only to look back at Hansard they will see the speech which I made, in which I said that while I agree that money must be raised, I did not agree that the tax which was placed on beer - I never said that there should not be a tax placed on beer; I never said that there should not be a tax placed on rum because I believe that there should be a tax placed on rum, but not so much. In fact, what I did say was that I did not agree that there should be any tax in respect of chicken parts at all; I said as to the question of the Package Tax that this tax could be passed

on in one way or the other. It has taken time to prove that I was right and the Government has had to control certain things. I believe that some people have been wickedly overcharging consumers for certain items like tinned stuff, but there are other items as well. I was told by a man on the morning before I came into the House to deal with this matter that he had a quantity of potatoes to be landed; he said that he had worked out the amount and he asked me if I thought that he would pay that amount and would not pass it on to the consumer. He did not know whence the Government got the information that people were so magnanimous that when you take over a large sum of money they would not pass it on to the consumer. Therefore, I say that while we approve of the Government's decision in respect of this reduction, we would urge that the Government not only make this reduction but also that the Government should take immediate steps to reduce the increased duties on other essential commodities. When we speak of essential commodities we set out especially chicken parts and rum which seem to be the two burning subjects for comment among the people of this colony.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, in fact, I have much pleasure in moving that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, it was the responsibility of the Hon. Premier to find an additional \$3 million this year so as to equate our budget and he was wise to call for it.

3.25 p.m.

As he explained to the House he had not long taken up the reins of office and he needed time to look around, but proposed to come to the House later in the year with proposals to satisfy that deficit. Well he came to the House in June, and you will remember that I was on leave at that time, and the Premier brought in these proposals for increased duty on beer, rum and chicken parts. Earlier in the April Budget Speech I can recall him saying that this sum would cause some great concern, but I warned him to go easy and with the development of this Island taking place through the Deep Water Harbour, we might be able to budget for a deficit for a year until things caught on and we could then move on. I warned against too excessive a tax proposal, and I commended the stand he had taken in not increasing income tax at that time, because I recalled that income tax in Barbados was high, one of the highest in the West Indies, and it was bearing very heavily on business and further development. We were courting the investment world from outside and asking that capital be invested in Barbados to create the necessary jobs to boost the economy, and for that reason it was not the time to impose increased income tax charges on this Island. Well he had already come down with that proposal and we commended him; but that \$3 million still faced the Premier and he had to do something and had to come in with some taxation, and he came in with the increased duty on beer. Unfortunately it fell heavily on all, both the import and the local industry that had not long been established. This put the price of Banks beer from, I think 21 cents or 22 cents up to 29¢ or 30¢, and it was definitely beyond the reach of the masses.

Mr. Speaker, any industry established in this Island which must be successful has to get over to the masses of people - the large consuming public - and unless you can capture their imagination and produce something to fit their pocket, you may as well lock, stock because the few wealthy middle-class people who might be able to drink beer during the week and on Sundays are but a fraction, whereas if the masses, the broad wage-earner, can drink his beer, it will create a market for a thriving industry. As a result of the tax the sales on beer dropped very dramatically, and in that five months, they were certainly making a great loss. But that is something that can happen to anyone, though the great thing about it, is to see it in time and to remedy it, and that the Premier did and I commend him for doing it, and being big enough to come to the House and say that it has not had the effect which he had intended, and for that reason he would correct it. He has not taken off all the duty, but he has taken off to the point where the brewers of that beverage have themselves had to cut some of their

profit in trying to arrive at a retail price of 25 cents for a beer which is within the reach of the masses of people. As a result of that, the beer sales have already begun to rise, and it seems that it will create a market where a profit can be made.

Mr. Speaker, that imposition on beer was definitely to raise revenue. The imposition of the tax on rum was also to raise revenue, and like my colleague we think that is a rather high jump we made at one time, and it has slowed up the sales of rum. That is our national drink and with a small reduction on that, I am sure we will catch up from there and go forward. The third item was chicken parts and chickens, and the tax was a twofold move. It was one to encourage the local industry and also to bring in revenue; but what I think the Premier lost sight of was that the industry that had been established here over the past five or six years, although expanding, was not ready to take up the expansion that this flip gave it, and the importation of chickens had to go on and therefore it had to be increased to the public. The day that the Island can produce a sufficient number of chickens, I say stop the others coming in. If they can produce economically and as good, - they must produce as good an item as we are importing from overseas - I am in favour of encouraging local industries wherever possible, but I am not one who will say that you must give the local industrialists 100 percent of the market. You should always allow for some form of comparison, protecting the bulk of the market but allowing some to come in so that we can compare our qualities and our prices, otherwise one morning we will go to sleep and we will find the public paying far too much for what we are producing here.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member said one morning we will go to sleep.

Mr. GODDARD: I meant we will wake up. Now when it comes to chicken parts, backs, necks and wings which are very cheap items, I would advise the Premier to take off the duty entirely on necks, backs and wings, because those are the items which the masses require. They are cheap and they are good food. The other parts with a modest duty can be paid for by the middle income group. Chicken necks, wings and backs cannot yet be produced in the Island. There is no system where people cut up their chickens here in parts as they do in America; they sell the whole chicken, but if you wish to protect that, you should impose the duty on whole chickens. Do not impose the duty on those parts which cannot be produced here, because you would definitely be directly imposing the duty on the people who can least afford to pay for it. That is where our Party stands. 3.35 p.m.

With that difference, I get back to say that it is not for us to say where the money should come from but I am sure that between now and March next year the Hon. Premier would have the opportunity of looking around to see, because the money must be found, where this taxation can be imposed to bring in that large deficit which is facing the Island.

We have over the last ten years been budgeting for surpluses. One year we had a surplus of \$3 million and over the last ten years we have had surpluses of \$1 million, \$2 million. This year, there is likely to be a deficit but do not take panic at it. We can take up the shock. There are other means of equating the budget and you should look around at your expenditure and see if there is any way in which you can reduce that because in doing so you will be also relieving the tax-payer because he is still heavily taxed.

With the touching of those three subjects which caused great controversy in the taxation methods, if they are dealt with in the following manner I am sure the revenue would be increased. More beer will be drunken at the new taxation proposals than the old and as a result at the end of the year the sum which was expected to be raised is more likely to be raised under these new proposals.

Mr. Speaker, when the budget was introduced, it was rather early but I threw out the hint then that with the oil

revenue from the bulk installation at the Deep Water Harbour we were likely to get in considerable revenue. We now know how that is picking up and many ships are calling here therefore I think the Hon. Premier should give us some indication as to what these revenues are likely to be. I do think that he can pay some attention to that and that would go a long way to reduce that \$3 million deficit which was facing him.

I think in the near future, we should be receiving \$1 million a year in oil royalties from the bunkering of ships in the Harbour. That is something to encourage and to go after because there is no expenditure whatsoever on the part of Government on it; it is a facility that we have as a result of the building of the Deep Water Harbour and it is under the control of a company which is operating it most efficiently. The amount of one million dollars should be coming in from these oil royalties and that should be counted on in assessing our budget in the future.

Sir, I think this is a great opportunity for hon. members after five months of the imposition of this taxation to state their views as to how they find the imposition of this taxation is reflecting on the people and the country. I have great pleasure in seconding the Resolution which was moved by my colleague.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of listening to the debate on the budget but I only had the opportunity of reading the Development Plan of the Government. I cannot say like my other colleagues, or like the members of the Legislature when it comes to Government taxation methods that I oppose or agree with them. Of course, I am unlike many hon. members because I can say that I have no party alignments therefore I can always offer suggestions for the nation, not for the political parties because the political parties are not sacrosanct and are not always blessed with all the wisdom.

Sir, I do not believe in a policy of saying that I told you so because it is so easy for you to say so, but even a fool would have been able to say I knew that would happen. Even a fool would have known that it was a most stupid thing for the Government to have increased the consumption tax on Banks beer after just coming into power for a few months and also taking into consideration the short length of time of the introduction of the industry itself. It was like if you abandoned the Deep Water Harbour because you did not like the idea of what the past Government had done. You cannot run into a new industry like that and impose taxation like that particularly if you say in your own programme that you intend to develop new industries. The Government has said in its Development Programme that a new drive to establish manufacturing industries in the Island will be launched immediately as part of the three-pronged policy designed to reduce poverty and unemployment to the lowest practical level, to increase production and national income and to raise living standards. You cannot say that in one breath at the beginning of your industrial development policy and then come along in another breath and say that you are going to make some rash imposition of consumption tax on something which was in operation for less than 18 months.

I do not know how the Hon. Premier treats his Ministers but I understand that he has said, to my consternation, that he is treating this House with courtesy by making a statement to this House on what this order was and, I am saying if he has said so that he is going out of his head. You are not treating me with any courtesy when you come to this House with statements which are on something that I have the right to know. You are treating me with courtesy when it is something on which I do not have a right to know. If that same attitude is adopted in the Cabinet then I say that I am not going to be one of those people who are going to be easy in these matters, because I want the Hon. Premier to know that any rash behaviour on his part might lead this country into disaster.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say that this consumption tax on beer should never have been imposed at all because there was not enough time which elapsed to give the Hon. Premier the consideration which he should have given be-

fore imposing his tax proposal. If the Hon. Premier thinks himself to be a genius and he can go into these things without giving full consideration and taking some advice on them he is going to find himself in great difficulty. What kind of man he is that can take over a Government in December and find an industry just going along but comes along in June without consultation and do something which before December comes he has to stop what he had done? If it were right then, it would be right now, if it were wrong then, it was always wrong.

I travel outside of the Island, and I heard in New York from people who do not even know Barbados; what has happened to this new man whom you have in power? They were saying that because some investors were staying by and watching what you had done to Banks and their tendency was that what you did with Banks you would in effect do with them. I am telling you an unadulterated fact. The mere fact that you did this sort of thing to a man who has a lot of money and then you are also asking Sheridan Hotels Limited to come here is because you want people with that kind of capital out there to bring in something. Therefore, when you touch one and that person is a man of capital, surely you must create an image outside which will scare people from coming in with capital.

3.45 p.m.

With all the propaganda you make, if a dog bites anyone all the talk you do about dogs do not bite, nobody listens to you. As far as I am concerned, both rum and beer will get people drunk and all drunkards are fools and they are stupid. If it is beer on which you care to get drunk you are foolish; in the final analysis you are foolish just the same. I have my own views about local industries and how they should be operated. I submit today that this question is not a question of the relativity between beer and rum or between chicken parts - backs or legs. Those are matters which will always be questions of opinion. If you say, as the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said, that it is not for you to say how the money can be raised, but that it can be raised, then you will always be in a position to say: "I do not agree with how you raise it." You must always be in a positive position to say how some of these things can be done.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church made some good remarks when he spoke about bunkering. Bunkering will always increase your revenue. What runs through the mind of the Barbadian businessman is the question of taxation from an indirect point of view, but the average businessman cannot complain about taxation from a business point of view because taxation is still at a low ebb. I do not want to bring examples because they will still want to keep the wage level at where it was long ago. I am dealing with this specific matter. I do not agree that you could write something and then come with this imposition on Banks. I have been in this House for 17 years and I have witnessed the fall of an arrogant and inept Government. What I would say to the members of that Government is that arrogance is no substitution for intelligence. Whenever you allow power to get to your head so that you become so arrogant that you arrogate all sense and authority to yourself, the matter of falling is just a question of time. Therefore, I say that you should not follow the example of the last Government. I want to speak quite openly; the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said that he does not want to give the impression that he is there to oppose for the sake of opposition and I quite agree with what he has said. People have taken him to task for exercising his own judgment but that is a common Barbadian habit; people like to take me to task as if my position in here is decided by somebody, as if I were some marionette dancing to the tune which somebody is playing. I do not consider that I owe the Government any obligations; nobody in Barbados owes me any obligation. If I do anything in public life or in politics I do it because I feel like doing it. You cannot promise me anything for doing anything; you cannot promise me anything to make me say: "I agree with you." You cannot do that on the basis of any promise. I do not owe the Government any obligation for supporting me, nor do they owe me any obligation for supporting them. I look on public issues as I study them; it is not that I heard somebody say something and then I

make up my mind; I consider that the best thing which could have been done to this island was the quick reversal of this situation because otherwise it would have done quite a lot of damage to this country. The balance of payment is not always the criterion or it is not always the only criterion for making any determination of your fiscal or economic policy, but it is a very important one for Barbados. Any country in a position in which Barbados is unhappily placed - that is, that you can get sugar from the substances other than sugar cane. You cannot get synthetic coffee; you have to grow coffee; you cannot get synthetic tea, you have to grow tea; but you can get sugar from other substances than sugar cane. If sugar represents 98% of the economic strength of this country and your balance of payment shows a deficit; anything which would reduce any possible removal of that deficit is in the interest of this community.

I heard the Hon. Premier make some wild statement - I do not know what the members of the House or the members of his party were thinking, but he said that beer being an imported commodity, when you make an analysis as to the importation of beer and the revenue which you were receiving from customs duty on beer as compared with the analysis which he carried out at the beer company, it could not pay off. That was moonshine. The general revenue which you get as customs duty is not the criterion by which you make this analysis because you have export capital which exceeds the revenue which you get from beer. Do you realise that your customs duty is only a fraction of the cost which is imported for the commodity by which you get your revenue?

3.55 p.m.

Do you realise that your customs duty is only a fractional part of the cost which is being exported for the commodity by which we get revenue? Do you realise that tomorrow if you could be self-sufficient within the context of the things you import and you remove completely customs duties that you would be better off, because you would not have been exporting capital in the first instance for the commodity for which the duty is only 10% or 20%; so whatever the duty reflects, you have to think in terms of nearly twenty times the amount going out in exporting capital for the products you are purchasing. Bearing in mind that it goes on beer, let us ask what is beer. Beer is one of those beverages which there is no country in the world to which I have been that does not start to manufacture it. You do not export money for people to get drunk. Let them drink bush tea, lime tea and such things. If you go to Trinidad, there is Carib Beer; in Jamaica it is Red Stripe; in British Guiana it is Banks; in Holland it is Amstel or Heinekens and there is German Beer. There is no country in the world that does not endeavour to manufacture the beverage that people use. It is like cigarettes. People like smoking to death; so you put up a tobacco factory and let them smoke out their lives. You do not export all your money for people to smoke out their lives.

When you use that particular statement, remember you have an intelligent audience to which you are talking, more so in the House of Assembly, and you cannot treat us in the House of Assembly as though we were at a mass meeting. The statements we would make at political mass meetings are not statements that we could come in the House of Assembly and expect to get away with them, because nobody questions you at a mass meeting. You make a statement, wish everybody goodnight and go home. You know, Mr. Speaker, sometimes I am not always in the mood to deal with statements that are really not necessarily analytical statements; so when I heard that statement about Banks, it had a very peculiar effect on me, because I said this could not mean what he was now saying in that context, since it would be a very wide and vague statement to make to suggest that the importation of beer is more beneficial to Barbados economy than the manufacture and the production of beer in Barbados.

Now, Mr. Speaker, happily for me I am not a beer drinker as such. I happen to be one of those moderates in the world who can do anything anybody else can do. I can drink beer, rum, vodka or gin or any mixture that people

think would blow you up. Anything that anybody can drink I can drink too. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Even bad rum?) Anybody in politics with the exception of those physically unable to drink it can drink bad rum and bad rum is part of the price you pay for coming here. Anybody who is a member of the House of Assembly, unless he has some physical disability, who has never used bad rum, is not a member of the House. Those members who never use rum as such were still imbibing some, even if they said "boys, let us take this one for the last" and got by the window and it went outside.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is a question of what you are opposing from being in the Opposition; it is what you see as right and what you see as wrong no matter where it comes from. As I said, I have never been to any country where in the country itself there is not the manufacture of any beverage which the people drink. You do not begin by telling people you do not want them to manufacture. As the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said, you do not want people to stop importing stuff at the expense of shoddy stuff, therefore if the quality of any stuff is very bad, it is not a question of not importing or imposing a tax or consumption tax, it is a question of telling them to get out of business because the commodity is not good for people. You cannot have people eating improper food, or if there are drugs, the drugs must be pure. When it comes to making a beverage like rum or beer or making cigarettes, I say these are things which all communities are entitled to do in their own communities. You do not beg that question; you encourage people to do it. There is Red Stripe, Carib, Banks, Heinekens, Amstel and German Beer. You go to the United States of America and drink Pabst Blue Ribbon, and nobody questions the fact that you are going to have beer in the United States of America; it is a must. If you can exchange cleverness for commonsense, you are stupid, but I find there are too many politicians today on all sides who try to be too clever. We would be creating a disservice to this community when those of us who have the right to think on serious matters do not do so, and the community does not get the service they are entitled to from our representation as members.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I had this remarkable experience some days ago. A friend of mine came to me and asked me if I were helping the Leader of the Opposition. I asked him what he meant by that because I am fairly curt when people come to me with this sort of nonsense. I do not suffer fools gladly who believe they are wise. He said he knew I would not like the Premier's Statement debated. I asked him why not. It is a statement dealing with matters belonging to this country, therefore we have a right to debate it. I say that because it is amazing to find that some people would want you to surrender your fundamental rights on the altar of some of them getting a little job or push up, because that is going to help them on this side. They would sacrifice all principle on the basis of how much it is going to affect them.

Mr. Speaker, I have been getting on rough from the time there was the other Party since 1953, and I stood up, and I am pleased today that I can talk on all sides of this House, outside, inside or anywhere at all. I have no fear of speaking outside or inside, because there is nothing they can bring forward subsequently to make me ashamed. I happen to be in a happy position that way because sometimes for the sake of peace and harmony you do not say a lot of things, but sometimes there is provocation, and when the time comes people will know if you are an angel or a devil. I say that because from outside the Chamber if you are not careful at this stage, certain pressures want to be used by people to prevent others from exercising their rights in a democracy, and I want to shake that completely off my shoulders. Nobody at any level or at any stage is going to use me. Some people want to use you at the low level to help them, some at the upper level and some in the middle level.

I am not a member of the Opposition Party, Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the Barbados Labour Party nor a member of the Government Party; so when I speak I do not speak to help anybody to do this. I am saying these are the issues I see so far as this economy is concerned. I am a

Barbadian representing Barbadians and I want the highest return for the Barbadians that I represent.
4.05 p.m.

If I see a low return from any measure - and I say this is a low return - then, it is not giving the highest returns.

I say that the Hon. Premier by force of circumstances had to change this taxation. If you see that people are not consuming, then if you are not raising money from the taxation proposals, you must change it. That is why I said that you cannot be rash, you have to know how much beer is consumed and how much is going to be further consumed and then ask yourself the question, can you get the revenue by low consumption or high consumption. I am glad to say that from all I have heard the reduction of the tax has stimulated the drinking of beer and consequently, the Government is getting more money, and you would not have left any odium in anybody's mouth that it is your intention to stop people from coming here and investing money. I can tell hon. members of the Government and they should know too that it takes a longer time for adverse comments that get abroad to be worn off than it takes to build up your good side. For instance, if you go to another man and tell him your friend is a good man there are few who would say that that man is not good. You do not question it. Similarly if you wish to create an image of good, particularly in this competitive age where so many people are trying to attract capital, you must do the things which are good and you must not create an image of bad although I am not saying that you have to bend over backwards to do that which is good.

Your fiscal survey is the opinion of Government, but I still feel that you have made some error about it. We have spoken about that here. We have spoken about how we intend to finance projects but I do not think your Deep Water Harbour was financed by the best means. The hon. junior member for Christ Church did not bring it out as he should have done. Barbados is now having what you would regard as a superficial deficit but not a real deficit. It is what you should regard as a superficial deficit. It becomes superficial because the financing of the country at the time was that you take up all the money and utilise it on a project that would last for the next 25 years when we are not here. It is just like a man who did not have enough capital and was going to get married. He did not presume that marriage is a thing until death do us part and he goes and buys all the furniture and everything else, all the things that he would need for the next 25 years. He says to himself that he wants all the dinner ware and all the things that life calls for and buys them when he may only use them once or twice a year. The fact is that the Deep Water Harbour was financed out of surplus funds, so it made the surplus funds got in short supply. Therefore, do not come in a hurry and believe that you can make up for something like that in six months.

The Government's policy is in its 3-year Development Plan. One year has passed. I throw this out today. It is a physical impossibility and financial impossibility for this Government to spend \$50 million in three years. It cannot do it unless you get somebody to carry it away. You can only get rid of \$50 million in three years by somebody stealing it. Therefore, your programme must go on after that time. That is where the danger lies in your fiscal policy. You are trying to condense your taxation in your fiscal policy, therefore, you will find that you will have a large surplus at the end at the expense of the work which you had planned to do not being done.

You do not raise the standard of living by having money lying in the Treasury; you raise the standard of living by having the money utilised. The mere fact that the Government says that they are lending their employees money at Christmas time shows that you want to have the money circulated. You are not lending them to go and bank it. If a man takes it and banks it, he has done nothing. When you lend him money, you want him to spend it. You want to prime and pump and, secondly, you hope you would increase the prosperity of the community by doing so.

Sir, I never agreed with this imposition of the consumption tax because of the effect which I know it was going

to have on the industry. I will read a statement in your Development Programme; it is stated:

"The Island's population of 240,000 people and a national income of around \$100 million provide only a limited market for manufactured goods. The Government does not propose to encourage manufacturing self-sufficiency to the extreme point where Barbados loses the benefits of importing goods produced much more cheaply abroad as this will only result in an increase of the cost of living, and may, in fact negative any small gains in employment. In those instances where goods now imported can be produced as cheaply, and of comparable quality, in the island it is proposed to encourage the industry in order to provide jobs for Barbadians."

I have been reading your Three-Year Development Programme and I hope Government would go in for consultation on many of the pronouncements which I see here because there are particular statements which are going to impinge on many of the things which you do not want to take place. You should not make these economic statements and these vague financial statements that you are going to do this and that without anybody sitting down and saying this is the Memorandum which we have on it. See to it that we do not like what the last Government did when they erected the Deep Water Harbour and we pointed out to them the effect which it was going to have on the people and they sat by and did nothing about that. Now, the same idiots are saying that they are going to look after these people. That is the sort of idiotic statements which you get Barbadians nursing. One idiot comes up and says something and nobody says anything about it. It is because some people are not sure where they stand and some people look for the most dishonest men to do things for them. I am not saying that to chide the last Government because it is not within my power to resurrect the dead nor do I have any intention of so doing, therefore you would see that I have not set out to criticise the last Government because that Government is not in power now. 4.15 p.m.

I do not say that as any means of criticising the last Government; I only make that as an analogy to show the type of financial position you get from one Government doing something without studying the impact of it on the community and then you look for scapegoats. I am therefore warning this Government that you will have these things to do and if you do not give a study to them when the full blast of the implications hit you, you will not have an answer for it. This statement does not hold good with the statement which I have read. I know that in another quarter you will be asked to explain some of the statements which have been made. You take the Deep Water Harbour; if you are stopping the importation of flour or lumber you would tell us by a study which you have made of the loss of this and that; you have an answer for it. I do not want to say more than that. At this time of our history we cannot be fooling around with such serious problems and the Finance Minister should not make a statement only for political reasons. I quite agree with him in that, Sir Stafford Cripps, who introduced an austerity budget in the United Kingdom, did not have political reasons for doing so; he was doing something for his country. He was preserving his country as against the narrow bounds of his party. We either stand or fall for the good of our country and by the action which we are prepared to take; if it is for carrying out noble deeds anybody would agree to it. On the lower level, people feel that whatever you do, you must have political overtones. I do not look for political overtones in dealing with this matter. As the hon. Leader of the Opposition has said, I do not have any interest in Banks Beer, but I do not feel that there is anything wrong in people who have money to put into Banks or in any other country, because we have to put an investment in money instead of gambling. If people can invest money in sweepstake in which they have not the least interest, I do not see why you cannot create a climate so that a man can know that if he has \$10 or \$20 for which he has no immediate use — I say that there is nothing wrong in cultivating in the mind of that man that he can put some of this money on one side when he can do so, because surely there will come a time when his money will stand him in good stead.

I do not want people to feel that they are capitalists, that they are rapacious or robbers because they have money to put things, otherwise we will have people coming in on the terms on which they want to come in. If you do not want to be a beggar in your own country then you have to get up and work. Do not look for people to do work for you, if you are not prepared to do work for yourself. The good old statement comes in that: "God helps those who are prepared to help themselves." I will not be led down by any political track that you are doing this or that for political reasons.

Some of my constituents have asked me: "If you were here for the Budget what would you have done about it?" I said that if I had been here I could not agree to a tax on rum which, if it is now \$6, to carry it to \$9. From the time that you have been manufacturing rum and it has now reached six dollars, I would not carry it to \$9.00 at one time. Mr. Dalton could not come here and tell me that; I was born here. What has happened in the community that you have got so prosperous at one time? If you have this behaviour where people like drinking rum — in any industrialist country it is the right of such a community to tax people very heavily because that becomes one of the fringes in life; but with a low standard in a community, a "grog" saves your life. How many people do not have tea? A man may ask you to "fire one"; he might have been on the beach for a long time and he would drink a "grog" even if he goes in bed and tries to sleep. He may be ashamed to ask you for tea but he would take a "grog". When Friday comes it is a question of a half flask; you will tell a fellow "cut the flask in half." (Laughter).

Mr. Speaker, these are things which you have to bear in mind. There is no point in making a snap of rum a luxury; there is no point in giving a fellow four drinks and then that costs a dollar bill. When I was questioned about this matter I said: "No; I would never raise the tax on rum from \$6 to \$9 at one time; I would find some other means of supplementing the rum drinker." To all of my friends with motor cars I do not care who they are; I say that the roads in Barbados are very good. There is no country in the world with 750 miles of road with as good roads as we have in Barbados. If you take mile for mile and size for size, I say that the roads in Barbados are superior to the roads anywhere in the world. You go to British Guiana and you will find that the roads are not as good as ours; therefore I say to the people who use motor cars, it seems to me that they can pay more taxes for the use of these cars; in Barbados a motor car can travel as much as 20,000 miles on the same tyres with which you bought that car. Ask the people in Dominica, for instance, how many miles they can get out of their cars with the same tyres with which they bought them. The life of a motor car in Barbados today is three times as long as it was before. 4.25 p.m.

If you make an analysis of road costs, an analysis of motor costs and an analysis of the tax costs on motor cars for using the roads, then you take a pyramid of road costs you will find that they go high up while the other costs remain below. What is wrong if you had to increase tax by \$10 or \$15 per year more? Why can't they make a contribution? Here it is a man can go and buy a more expensive motor car. It is true that his operational costs have increased, but when you watch that, you do not hear members quarrelling. With all due respect to the Ministers, I see that they are using motor cars which one cannot say are below the dignity of Ministers, therefore it shows that even the increased cost of purchasing motor cars is not regarded as a barrier to purchasing; so if they had to make a contribution themselves by paying increased costs, it would not be too much.

Mr. Speaker, I have considered to myself quite seriously that there is room for taxation, and the Government could have made other tax impositions on people. For that reason if I had to increase the tax on rum — I do not say I would not increase it, I would not be so stupid — I would not have carried it from \$6 to \$9 one time, because you must leave room for the future. It means that you cannot tax rum for some time. I will say to members and to the public that those are the things that will always be exposed

to taxation, and with Britain's proposed entry in the European Common Market, it is going to present this Island with a problem when it comes to the balance of payments because sugar is going to be exposed to this type of competition and as it happens still to be the bed rock of our economy, we have to think in very broad and serious terms about any fiscal or economic policy of the Government.

Now with chicken parts and chicken backs, I happen not to be an expert on that subject, but I do feel from what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said, if you have commodity prices that are essential, Mr. Speaker,.....

I am sorry, Sir, time is up.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It being 4.30 p.m. the time for Private Members' Business has expired, and the House will commence Government Business.

The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that the first Order of the Day under Government Business be the Statement by the Hon. Premier on the implication of Britain's Entry into the Common Market. Your Honour will recall that at the last meeting of the House, the Premier signified his intention to make such a statement today, and I am asking leave to take that Order now.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier may proceed to make that statement as anticipated by his remarks at the last meeting.

STATEMENT BY HON. PREMIER ON THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On the 3rd August, 1961, Mr. Speaker, the following motion was approved by the House of Commons in the United Kingdom:

"That this House supports the decision of Her Majesty's Government to make formal application under Article 237 of the Treaty of Rome in order to initiate negotiations to see if satisfactory arrangements could be made to meet the special interests of the United Kingdom, of the Commonwealth and of the European Free Trade Association, and further accepts the undertaking of Her Majesty's Government that no agreement affecting these special interests or involving British Sovereignty will be entered into until it has been approved by this House after full consultation with other Commonwealth Countries by whatever procedure they may generally agree."

Mr. Speaker, it is arising out of a motion approved on 3rd August, 1961, by the House of Commons and on the same date by the Learned Members of the House of Lords that I have proposed to make a statement to members of this Honourable House on the state of negotiations between Her Majesty's Government and the six countries of continental Europe which comprise the European Economic Community. Now right at the outset, Mr. Speaker, I should say this: there is no such thing today as the European Common Market. The European Common Market is an objective towards which the six countries of Europe have dedicated themselves to attain. It is not anticipated that the Common Market in Europe in the full sense of the term should be established before the end of the year 1965. What we have witnessed during the past fifteen years from the time that General George Marshall made his speech at Harvard University and so established and laid the foundations for what became known as the Organisation for European Economic Cooperation, in other words, the Marshall Plan. From that time in 1945 until the present moment, we have witnessed in Europe, if not in other parts of the world, a steady drift towards European solidarity both on the political and economic plane. Unfortunately this coming together has not reflected itself in the activities of West

Indian politicians; but all over the world we are getting larger groupings of countries for the purpose of economic survival and for more effective political action.

Between 1947 and 1957 when the Treaty of Rome was signed by the six European countries which now comprise the Economic Community, several attempts were made to bring not only these six countries which comprise France, the Federal Republic of Western Germany, Holland, Belgium, Italy and Luxembourg by Her Majesty's Government both towards the six countries of the Economic Community and when shortly after the Treaty of Rome in 1957 came to nought, Great Britain then set up with the Scandinavian countries, an organisation which came to be known as the European Free Trade Area.
4.35 p.m.

In 1959, the President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Reginald Maudling, in a speech in the House of Commons reported on the state of the negotiations with the Inner Six, as they had come to be known, and he informed the House of Commons that the price which the Inner Six Countries wanted Britain to pay was a price which Great Britain could not and would not afford. The price which the European countries wanted Britain to pay at that stage was the sacrifice of the agricultural interest of Great Britain and, secondly, the rejection of the old idea of imperial preference and the Commonwealth trade arrangements under which we have managed to survive up to now.

In August, 1961, the British Government faced with growing balance of payment problems, faced with a dwindling rate of economic growth, faced with the loss of several Conservative seats in bye-elections, made a renewed assault on the Common Market and agreed to open negotiations at the headquarters of the Economic Community in Brussels. If at any time during the course of my remarks I use the term "Common Market", I am not using it as a term of art or as a statement of fact but because the efforts of the Inner Six countries, which I have mentioned towards a greater economic and political cooperation has been designated by all and sundry as the "Common Market". I shall more strictly use the term "Economic Community". There is no chance of there being a Common Market before 1965.

The Lord Privy Seal was entrusted with the very difficult negotiations at Brussels and I must say that he has earned the admiration of all those who have had the privilege either of working with him or listening to his expositions of Great Britain's attitude on the state of the negotiations.

I do not entirely share the optimism of the British Government as to the feasibility of countries like Barbados reaping untold benefits from European Association on the economic level. However, it is my duty to present to the public of this Island and to the members of this Honourable House in the first instance as graphic and as brief a summary of the current position of this Island in relation to the state of the negotiations which Great Britain is conducting with the European Common Community.

Great Britain has not yet joined the European Economic Community but it is abundantly clear that Great Britain under the leadership of Mr. Harold Macmillan, the Prime Minister intends, and I will go as far as to say, at all costs, although this is a term with which some people may take objection but I certainly say, come what may, Great Britain as long as she is permitted to join the Inner Six countries and become part of the Lucky Seven of Europe.

In September, 1962 after much parleying by the Premier of Mauritius and myself, the Under Secretary of State and the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Affairs, the British Cabinet invited me as Premier of Barbados to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference which was scheduled to commence on 10th September, 1962. I accepted the invitation and with the exception of the very last session when I was unavoidably absent, I took part in all of the Committee's deliberations which had special reference to tropical agricultural products. I also sat and made contribution in committees on citrus and cocoa and

bananas on behalf of the Ministers of Trade of the Eastern Caribbean territories who were not present at the conference, Barbados having been the only place to have been invited. Apart from Barbados, there were the Prime Ministers of Trinidad, Uganda, Jamaica who were attending the conference for the first time. The Premier of British Guiana was also invited so was the Prime Minister of Singapore, and so was the Prime Minister of Sierra Leone, Sir Milton Margai. For myself, personally, I must say that it was a wonderful opportunity to study and discuss at first hand with all the leading statesmen of the Commonwealth our mutual and our peculiar problems which arose out of Great Britain's involved attempt to enter the European Common Market at all costs.

I should also say that there was never a more concerted stand which I have seen in any conference than the stand adopted not only by Barbados and all the independent territories who were invited to the conference but our Commonwealth brethren from the northern territories and the Dominions of Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Nigeria, Tanganyika, Sierra Leone, Ghana, Ceylon, India and Pakistan. There was only one country which appeared to have no reservations at all over the proposed entry of Great Britain into the European Economic Committee and that was the neighbouring territory of Trinidad. Of that I shall say more later. I can only say each man to his own taste.

We in Barbados are confronted with a situation in which we must find markets for our goods and find markets for them where there is no discrimination against our products in relation to products from other industrialised countries and we have the task of raising the standards of living of our people and that is not an impossible task if we put our shoulders to the wheel. I am convinced that we need not be abject in our approach to these problems and we need not make ourselves any economic doormat of any European power or any Asiatic power for that matter and if we approach these problems which are of all-consuming interest to us as much as to the United Kingdom, if we approach them with an atmosphere of realism and plain speaking and of careful assessment, then I am satisfied that no ill can befall the economy of this country.

4.45 p.m.

After the long period of rehabilitation which was initiated by the Marshall Plan round about the middle of the 50's it became apparent to observers that the countries of Europe, over whose future Sir Winston Churchill had shortly before despaired, were making a remarkable recovery in their economic and social and political development. It was a background of confidence in the achievements which they had already made that the six countries on the 25th March, 1957, signed the very historic document which has come to be known as the Treaty of Rome. I wonder myself how many people there are in Barbados who have taken the trouble to read the Treaty of Rome, because after the declaration of War in 1939 by the United Kingdom Government on the forces of Nazism, I certainly consider that the Treaty of Rome is the most significant declaration which has been made in the Twentieth century. From 1957 until the present year, a short span of five years, the economic activity in these European countries who were signatories to the Treaty of Rome has developed at an ever-increasing pace; the gross national products of those countries have increased far out of proportion with the growth in the gross national product of the United Kingdom. Those six countries have captured a substantial proportion of the world markets for manufactured goods and the workers in those countries are moving freely from one country to another with a high degree of mobility which makes for high standards of living so that one has the right to choose the kind of job that one wants in any country that one wants. There has been a remarkable change in Europe. Great Britain, up to now, secured behind the white cliffs of Dover and the 20 narrow miles of sea water which separate her from continental Europe, has at last awakened to the economic threat of European expansion. Great Britain should have, in the early stages, joined with those other countries in every way but now she is making frantic efforts to retrieve the advantage which she has lost by not joining in the early stages. Mr. Speaker, what therefore is the Treaty of Rome? It is a very

lengthy document; there are perhaps over 280 articles in the Treaty of Rome setting out the basis on which the countries of Europe intend to work in cooperation. If I may select at random a couple — one or two in Barbadian parlance — of articles from the Treaty of Rome, you will appreciate that the Treaty of Rome binds the European countries who are signatories to it in an indissoluble economic Union which it is projected will become not only a political union but eventually a federation if not a unitary state. It is therefore ironic that at the same time that countries with different languages, with different cultural heritages, countries which not long ago, less than 17 years ago, were locked in mortal combat at each other's throats, countries which did not enjoy even the facility of being represented in a single cricket team at any time but had always been competing against one another both in the field of sport and on the field of battle. From the time of the Roman Empire right through until 1945, those countries had been antagonistic one towards the other. In the short space of 12 years we witnessed a remarkable metamorphosis in the relationships between those countries for the sake of economic survival. We in the West Indies have taken the other direction; we, with our long history of co-operation, with our full and free interplay of commerce and culture, we elected round about the same time that Great Britain was making the fateful decision — we elected to drift apart, one from the other. It is for this reason that I consider the efforts which are now being made in Europe of more than special significance for us. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I consider it vitally important that every single school child in Barbados should understand that history is not the Battle of Crecy or the Battle of Agincourt; it is not the Norman Conquest or the American Civil War. The history which is now created before our eyes is the unification of Europe, the improvement of living standards of the people who are already rich, and if you do not wake up in time the disimprovement of the standards of those who are already poor.

Article 2 of the Treaty of Rome states:-

"It shall be the task of the Community, by establishing a Common Market and progressively approximating the economic policies of Member States, to promote throughout the Community a harmonious development of economic activities, a continuous and balanced expansion, an increased stability, an accelerated raising of the standard of living and closer relations between its Member States."

Article 3 states:-

4.55 p. m.

"For the purposes set out in the preceding Article, the activities of the Community shall include, under the conditions and in accordance with the time table envisaged in this Treaty:

(a) the elimination, as between Member States, of customs duties and of quantitative restrictions in regard to the import and export of goods, as well as of all other measures having equivalent effect;

(b) the establishment of a common customs tariff and of a common commercial policy towards third countries;

(c) the abolition, as between Member States, of obstacles to the free movement of persons, services and capital;

(d) the inauguration of a common policy in the field of agriculture;

(e) the inauguration of a common policy in the field of transport;

(f) the establishment of a system ensuring that competition in the Common Market is not distorted;

(g) the adoption of procedures permitting the coordination of the economic policies of Member States and the correction of instability in their balances of payments;

(h) the approximation of their respective national laws to the extent required for the Common Market to function in an orderly manner;

(i) the creation of a European Social Fund in order to improve the possibilities of employment for workers and to contribute to the raising of their standard of living.

(j) the establishment of a European Investment Bank to facilitate the economic expansion of the Community by opening up fresh resources; and

(k) the association of overseas countries and territories with a view to increasing trade and to pursuing jointly the task of economic and social development."

Under the Treaty, Mr. Speaker, five institutions have been set up. The first is a Council of Ministers to work out various details and procedures under the Treaty. Secondly, a Commission of nine persons who are internationalised to prepare the work for the Council of Ministers. Thirdly, a Court of Justice; fourthly an Assembly which is non-legislative and gives advice on which decisions are to be taken and fifthly an Economic and Social Committee comprising representatives from various walks of life from each Member State of the Community.

The Common Market to which I referred, Sir, is to be gradually brought into existence during a transitional period of twelve years. There are to be stages of about four years each of reduction on tariffs between Member States and the aligning of tariffs to a common tariff. Export duties between Members were to be abolished at the end of the first stage, and quantitative restrictions were to be removed gradually from 1st January, 1961 or in advance. As a matter of fact, Sir, Member States took the first stage towards the common external tariff. Incidentally there have been negotiations on the general agreement of trade and tariffs this year to keep a common tariff on a wide range of goods below the level it would otherwise have reached.

On the 1st January, 1962, the Community officially moved to the second stage of reduction of tariffs on trade to one another. By that date they had reduced their tariffs faster than the Treaty had called for, and the tariffs within the Community on industrial goods being already 40% below the level of 1957. Member states are required by the Treaty to develop gradually a common agricultural policy during the transitional period and to bring it into force not later than at the end of the period, that is, 1970. Regulations in regard to sugar are due to be made in 1962. Sugar, Sir, is our chief product and I shall refer to the situation in regard to sugar at a later stage.

The Treaty provides that the free movement of labour within the Community shall be secured not later than by the end of the transitional period, which as you know is by 1970. There is also a provision in which we are interested, and I will state how we are likely to be affected by this, that is, the provision of freedom of movement of labour. Of the various other provisions of the Treaty, the most important as far as we are concerned are those relating to the Association of Overseas Countries and Territories, and to this I should like hon. members to pay special attention because this is where we are supposed to come in.

The Treaty provides for association with the Community of non-European countries and territories which have special relations with Belgium, France, Italy and the Netherlands. These territories include what were at the time of the Treaty the main dependencies of these countries, but certain non-European territories with whom Member States have special relations are not included; so that Surinam and the Netherlands, Antilles, Tunisia, Morocco and the Kingdom of Libya are not treated as Overseas territories which may be associated. But provision is made for the negotiation of conventions of economic association with them. Certain Overseas Departments of France such as Martinique and Guadeloupe are fully covered by the Treaty as it applies to the European Community and are not treated as Overseas Territories. The Treaty stipulated that the provision for the gradual abolition of Customs Duties and quotas shall apply to the Overseas Territories

and Member States. Associated Overseas Territories; we can now use the shorthand definition A.O.T. Barbados is likely to be an A.O.T., that is an Associated Overseas Territory under the Treaty. These territories are however permitted to levy such customs duties as are necessitated by their need for development and industrialisation or which are of a fiscal nature and are intended to contribute to their budgets. Such duties are to be progressively reduced to the level of one imposed on imports of the products from Member States with which each country or Territory retains special relations. The details concerning the Association of Overseas Territories are determined by the implementing convention which provides for the elimination of quotas of goods from the A.O.Ts on the same basis as that of the Member States and where quotas exist in the A.O.T. these shall be converted into generalised quotas which do not discriminate between Member States and shall be increased progressively.

No one appreciates, Mr. Speaker, more than I that to try to condense the provisions of the Treaty of Rome 1957 which I hold in my hand and which contains, as I mentioned before, well over 200 Articles. This is a very difficult task, and I would therefore invite hon. members to exercise a little patience, because it must be got on the record of this House what the position of Barbados *vis-a-vis* the European Common Market is at this stage, and not at a stage when it is too late and the horse has already escaped from the stable.

Freedom of movement of workers from the Associated States to Member Countries and from Member countries to the Associated States is governed by Conventions requiring the unanimous agreement of Member States. Members of this House might well take a note of that when they come to evaluate the difficulties which are confronted in making a decision of this kind.
5.05 p.m.

The Convention which implements the terms for the association of overseas territories comes to an end on 31st December, 1962. That is less than three weeks from now. These six associated overseas territories reached a measure of agreement on the terms for the renewal of the Convention of association. The new arrangements are basically the same as the old and the main provisions are (a) free entry of the products of the associated territories into the community; (b) free entry of the products of the country into the associated territories but with the right of the associated territory to encourage development and industrialization; (c) the development fund and (d) the appropriate institutions to implement these conventions and proposals.

After 31st December this year, therefore, there will be some change in the relationship between the overseas territories and the Member States of the Community. Instead of the progressive abolition of Customs Duties on imports and certain products originating in the overseas territories, all tariffs will be immediately removed on 1st January, 1963.

Secondly, the Common External tariff of the community will be applied to the tropical products but this Common External tariff will be reduced by a percentage still to be determined.

Thirdly, the Development Fund will be larger but perhaps not much larger in quantity than those under the provisions.

I can mention now that it was agreed that the Development Fund should be increased to the figure of \$708 million (U.S.). The purposes to which the monies of the Fund may be spent are to be somewhat extended. The institutional arrangements will be revised in view of the Associated Overseas Territories so that the equality of rights is fully recognised.

Provision is also made in the interest of the Associated Overseas Territories that any products competing with similar products should be taken into consideration when determining the common external policy.

In August, 1961, the Minister of State of the British Cabinet, Lord Perth, came to the West Indies and had some discussions with Governments in the West Indies and the then existing Federal Government and the West Indian Ministers indicated to the Minister of State who had stated that the British Government fully understands the importance of the West Indies exports in the United Kingdom markets. These Ministers informed Lord Perth that the West Indies would wish to secure a status of Overseas Associated Territories and that the United Kingdom should ensure that the level of the trade between the West Indies and the European Free Trade area and the European Economic Community should not be less than the average of 1960 and 1961. Exactly how this can be secured is a device which has not been gone into.

They further went on to state that the reality of the Canadian trade must not be given up to the European Economic Community and the Canadian trade must be maintained. This was in August, 1961.

The Minister further stated that existing quota restrictions maintained by many European Community Countries against manufactured goods from under-developed countries, for example, textiles, would have to be dismantled. This of course is a general Commonwealth problem rather than specifically a West Indian problem. This is what was stated to us.

Lord Perth then went on to state that there must be no involvement of West Indians in World politics especially in Africa consequent on an overseas territorial status. They also stipulated that West Indians must have complete freedom in fixing the level of their taxes.

As regards freedom of movement between the West Indies and Europe the normal type of disability which usually faces West Indians should not exist but there should be the right of freedom to seek employment in the community. They further stated that consultation on a bilateral basis was unsatisfactory since a commodity may concern more than one member of the Commonwealth, for example, petroleum and a multilateral basis seemed to be preferable, and after any Commonwealth conference is convened on the question of the United Kingdom's entry in the Common Market any constitutional technicality should not preclude West Indian representation and in particular representation by territorial Governments such as Trinidad and Tobago. You can very well see whom that was inserted by.

If the West Indies were to be given associated status their participation in control and management of the Development Fund should be ensured. The next exemption was that West Indian Governments should be free to negotiate — subject to any international obligations such as GATT — the present West Indian trading arrangement in the sense of the long term contracts which the West Indians now enjoy, for example, the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement; the contracts relating to the prices; these must relate to the existing contracts and must in no way be reflected on, also to the renewal of such contracts from time to time.

The last stipulation was that in the event of the United Kingdom joining the European Common Market without being able to achieve a status for the Associated Overseas Territories with the safeguards suggested, the United Kingdom would undertake to have discussions with the Commonwealth territories and the West Indians on the question of compensation for any loss of preference which might ensue if Britain joined the Common Market.

As I have said before, since this date in August, 1961, the negotiations for Great Britain's entry into the Common Market have continued and — if I may say so — have been intensified. Consultations did take place at the conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers with members of the Commonwealth and it was this end that I attended and took part in the discussions at Marlborough House.

Western Europe has a population of 330 million souls, the Soviet Union 250 million souls and the population of the U.S.A. has a community in the region of 180 million peo-

ple. I have included Greece in the figures of 330 million souls because it is an associated territory of the European Economic Community.
5.15 p.m.

It would take up too much time if this statement went into any details of the importance of the market afforded by the Community. It is already comparable in size with the markets of the United States of America, and the Soviet Union even without Great Britain's entry. I will not at this stage, or at any stage for that matter, tell the people of Barbados that Great Britain cannot afford to stay out of the Common Market or the European Economic Community. At the present moment, at the time when our discussions were being held at Marlborough House every other news item was crowded off the front and centre pages of all the national papers in the United Kingdom and the sole topic of discussion was Great Britain's entry into the Common Market. I do not share the fatalism of the Prime Minister of Trinidad neither do I share the pessimism of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom when he states that Britain's entry is inevitable. It is inevitable only in the sense that, as long as the Conservative Party in Great Britain is in harness in that country, they have made up their minds to go in. It is not therefore incumbent on me to say that Great Britain cannot afford to stay out. What we are confronted with in Barbados is the fact that Great Britain is going in and we have to consider what we will do after Great Britain has entered the European Common Market. We have seriously right now to start thinking about our economic fate in these islands; we must realise that the world is shrinking so rapidly that the economic problems of Europe are of vital importance to the man who lives in Chalky Mount or in Chimborazo in Barbados. This Government is not satisfied to be buffeted by the actions of countries in Europe without having some kind of say or intelligence of what is going on and making appraisals of our situation and making decisions after such intelligent appraisals of our economic situation. It means that Ministers of this Government therefore, have to work not only on the problems of economic stagnation in the island of Barbados; but the Ministers of the Cabinet, over which I have the honour to preside, have also to give active consideration to the economic and political future of the Eastern Caribbean. I will go so far as to say that the members of this House along with the Ministers have got to address their minds very seriously to the problem of association with an economic community in Europe. I should like to make it clear that despite the fact that we do not enjoy the status of independence within the British Commonwealth of Nations, despite the fact that we are still constitutionally to be regarded as a country which has not attained its political freedom and which is not independent, the British Government could never have any intention, and even if the British Government had any such intention, would it be competent for the British Government to drag the people of Barbados into a European Economic Community on the basis of associated overseas territorial status or any other status for that matter. The British Government is not attempting to drag Barbados into any such vortex; but Her Majesty's Government has kept me, as Minister of Finance, informed daily of all the negotiations which, protracted as they are have been taking place in Brussels day by day and night by night. I will not sit down and allow these despatches to pile up in filing cabinets and on the floor of the Ministerial Buildings without a proper and careful study being made both by the Ministers and myself of the implications and the negotiations as they progress from day to day. I am issuing a very solemn invitation to members of this House, to recognise that the economic destiny of the West Indies is very very closely bound up with these negotiations which are going on in Brussels. The Government of Trinidad and the Government of Jamaica have both elected to place permanent representatives in Brussels; we, in Barbados, cannot afford to place a staff of trained experts in Brussels to hold a watching brief on behalf of the Government of this island and therefore every member of this House has to make his contribution and study the situation intelligently and help the people of this island to arrive at the right decision when the time comes, and the time is not very far away. The decision which we will be called upon to make may substantially alter not only our economic institution but it may also alter our legal in-

stitutions. It may substantially alter the relationships which we enjoy with countries like the Dominion of Canada; it may destroy some of the goodwill which we may have established with Commonwealth countries which are closer to us geographically and economically than Europe. It may establish new friendships which we may find it difficult to entertain; it may establish associations which may — and I use the word "may" in the problematical sense — be to our ultimate advantage. I do not want to be a prophet in these things but it will take on the part of Barbados, setting the lead to these other islands, the greatest amount of intelligent concentration on the problems of the European situation, and it is for this reason that I have elected, on the eve of the Christmas recess of this House, to make this appraisal of the problems with which we are confronted.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to conclude this Statement in a few moments. I have outlined the short historical background of the European co-operation. I have demonstrated that it is remarkable that countries, which have been snarling at each other for a long time, have suddenly come together to their mutual advantage and that we, who have been belonging for so long and for such a period to the confraternity of the underprivileged and the confraternity of international suffering, that we who have so much in common, are still thinking in terms of whether there should be a federation of the Eastern Caribbean with Customs Union and freedom of Movement and all the other benefits which the antagonistic Europeans have themselves discovered will flow from such association, should now be carrying out practices contrary to the general trends which are taking place in the field of international politics. 5.25 p.m.

What we have to consider, therefore, Mr. Speaker, is how will Great Britain's entry affect us. We are not a Department of Britain in the way that Martinique and Guadeloupe are Departments of Metropolitan France. *France outre-mer, le pays sous-développé*, as they describe them now the same way they describe us as pre-technological and emerging countries. The question therefore arises as to whether we should seek association with the Community. These are the hard facts. There are several Commonwealth countries and territories which will not be eligible for association under the Treaty, but there is no doubt that in the case of Barbados it is a matter for us to decide. As I mentioned before, the United Kingdom cannot tell Barbados you belong to the Common Market; it is a matter for us to decide. It is likely that if Britain joins the Community, the terms on which association will be offered to us will be those which I have described as having been recently agreed on for the existing Associated Overseas Countries and Territories.

Let us consider the future of sugar, Sir, as this is our main export and is likely to remain so for years. In all the discussions that have taken place, little has been decided on the question of sugar. I was somewhat, may I say, flabbergasted during the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference to be told by the United Kingdom Delegation to Brussels that they had not got around to discussing sugar in Brussels. We convened a special meeting to discuss sugar with all the territories concerned including Australia, Mauritius, British Guiana, Jamaica, Trinidad and Barbados, — these were the chief countries — and the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations informed us that the British Government would do everything possible to see that our interests were safeguarded. If members of this House regard a statement of that nature as one which re-assures them over the economic future of Barbados, I certainly cannot share their equanimity on a subject like this. It has been one of those difficult problems which apparently have been deferred from time to time in the hope that in time there would be a solution. This is not satisfactory. I understand from the British team that sometimes they debated for fourteen hours in Brussels and then they adjourned when they could reach no conclusion on the question of sugar. Up to now, as far as I know, Sir, no firm decision has been taken as to the future of the sugar interest in the West Indies and until such time as some formula having been arrived at in the interim period, I would not recommend to the Government of Barbados or to the members of the House of Assembly that we

should buy the European pig in the proverbial bag or in a poke as it is sometimes called; but we do know that sugar has been included in the list of temperate foodstuffs which might be considered from time to time by Commonwealth Members. At the present moment production of sugar in Britain and in at least some countries in the Community, — and I mean the Inner Six and their Associated Territories as well — is controlled by limiting the area of sugar beet. If such controls were to be removed, there could be serious over-production at present price levels. The price at which sugar is produced in Britain is comparable with the price paid for sugar purchased from Commonwealth countries as well as being in the range of prices now ruling among members of the Community. It is important that there should be no reduction in the average price level within the community at the Common Market state. We must try by every means to ensure that Barbados particularly has outlets for sugar comparable to that which we now enjoy.

In considering this matter, Mr. Speaker, we have most seriously to bear in mind our close relationship with Canadian preference and the markets which we have enjoyed for upwards of 40 years. It is certainly hard to be faced with the problem of a choice between Britain and Canada in this dilemma. Somehow or other there must be a way in which the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement can be incorporated into any International Sugar Agreement and in which we can maintain a close relationship with the Dominion with whom we have enjoyed these trade ties for such a long time. When I said just now, Sir, that the price of European sugar is the same as the price of Commonwealth sugar, I should have explained that the cost of production of subsidised beet sugar in the United Kingdom and in Europe is now within an alarming 10% of the cost of production landed cost in the United Kingdom of cane sugar from the West Indies. This is a very alarming situation and that is why I said that when the Hon. Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations made the statement to us that Great Britain would do everything possible to safeguard the interests of West Indies Trade primary products, particularly sugar, I derived no immediate consolation from a statement of that nature, because if European sugar is now becoming competitive with West Indian sugar, the fact that we will have the benefit of a preference into the European countries comparable to that which we enjoy with England, still does not put us in a position where we may be able to compete effectively with the locally produced product in Europe. There is a common external tariff of 80% on sugar in the Community, so that if a ton of sugar costs \$200, for us to sell sugar now in Germany or France, we will have to pay \$160 in duty on sugar which is only worth \$200. If we therefore stay out, you can see that we will be confronted with this high tariff barrier against the expansion of our sugar production in the West Indies.

Barbados really has never had any great problem in exporting all the sugar which we do not need for our domestic consumption and for the Windward and Leeward Islands, the Windward Islands particularly. We have really never had much difficulty, but we must remember that out of our total production, only some 130,000 tons are guaranteed the special price under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. Now it is clear, Mr. Speaker, that by 1970, and we have to think far ahead, the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement must go by the board like all the other transitional arrangements which now exist between the countries of the Inner Six. 5.35 p.m.

The problems of overseas supplies of cane sugar exist whether or not the United Kingdom joins the European Economic Community because of the position of the associates and overseas departments of France and it is expected that the community would wish to treat sugar from present and new associates alike so we have not only to compete with the Beet Sugar Producers, the Sugar Producers in Continental Europe and in England but we have also to compete with countries like Martinique and Guadeloupe some of which have a production far in excess of the peak production of the Island of Barbados.

There was at one stage, right up to the time that the conference came to an end in September, 1962, considerable

doubt that the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement would be extended for another year. It is always eight years in advance and every year it is extended for another year. As a matter of fact, I think it was Mr. Heath or Mr. Duncan Sandys who informed us at one meeting that it was extremely doubtful that the members of the European Club would agree to the extension of the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement for another year and we made strong protest about this. I think we have reasonable good cause to believe that all the representations that have been made have borne some fruit and the Agreement has been extended to 1970. I think it can be assumed if we are associated with the community, a comparable degree of protection for our Sugar Industry would be given to that which exists now under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. If such protection were not given, then, Sir, our position would be indeed untenable.

It is therefore vital that we press for this. There are two things which we have to watch, prices and markets under any new arrangement which may be adopted. The Common Market external tariff on rum is approximately 20/6 per proof gallon to 24/9 per proof gallon compared with the British preference of 29/6 per proof gallon. If Barbados were associated with the European Economic Community it would get duty free entry but would face direct competition from Martinique and Guadeloupe. We are losing our market for rum in Canada because that country is now importing molasses and producing their own rum and there is no reason why our producers of rum should not try to face up to competition especially now that the distillery tax has been removed.

Lest there be any misunderstanding I should say that any imports from countries which are not members would have to pay full external tariff which would be imposed on top of the British basic duty on rum and that is very high but this basic duty would still be left on imports from all sources. The scale of British basic duty is approximately ten guineas per proof gallon but varies a little according to the number of years it has been in the warehouse. To fill in the picture I should mention that the General Agreement on Trades and Tariffs Conference which commenced in September, 1960 concluded its work in July, 1962. The first phase of this conference had the object of securing appropriate compensation to certain GATT Member Countries to offset any increase by Common Market status to the Common External Tariff. But the outcome of these negotiations was that in addition to agreeing to binding certain weights in the Common External Tariff, the community undertake to reduce duties on a variety of products. The duty on copper, for instance, which now externally is free, is bound to be free in the future. Raw coconut oil for industrial purposes is bound at 5% and other raw coconut oil at 10%. Grape fruit at 10% and oranges at 15% for the period 1st April to 15th October.

It will be appreciated that the U.S.A., Ceylon and Indonesia play an important part in these negotiations.

Now, Sir, I want to dilate here on the economy of tariff goods. I have given only one illustration of the effect on tariff import duties on the cost of commodities inside the imported country. There is no point in an industry in Barbados or the U.S.A. or in England being able to produce goods on a large or small scale at competitive ex-factory prices if by the time the commodity reaches the consumer the tariff and duties which have been imposed in addition to the insurance and freight charges make the commodity unpurchaseable by the people who would want to enjoy it. I gave you an illustration, Mr. Speaker, in which I demonstrated that the Common External Tariff on sugar, including Barbados sugar, in Europe is 80%. That is 80% *ad valorem* duty. Countries impose tariffs for the purpose primarily of raising revenue but most European countries in their agricultural policy impose tariffs for the purpose of protecting their domestic product from the product imported from Associated Countries and Territories and one of the difficulties which I always recognise in the whole exercise of association with the European Economic Community that up to now because I have been given no clear undertaking — and I have spoken probably to every possible

expert representing Great Britain at Brussels and the Secretary of State himself and the Lord Privy Seal, Mr. Heath, on this matter — that despite the reduction and the lowering of the tariff walls, that West Indian products would not be confronted after they got in the countries and before the goods reached the consumer with internal high consumption taxes. This is one of the difficulties. 5.45 p.m.

That is one of the difficulties. If one accepts a Statement made by a Minister of the British Government that it is all take and no give, which was a statement actually made to me to this effect "What you are worrying about? It is all take and no give," only the simple-minded would accept a formula of that kind; because when you examine the whole rationale of the European Economic Community, which is to widen markets in Europe for European manufacturers, you will see, Sir, that the existing preferences and consumption taxes in Europe will, between now and 1970 — which is the end of the transitional period — make it extremely difficult for our products to compete in the first instance with the locally-manufactured products in those European countries and, secondly, with the highly-protected products of their associated markets with Martinique, Guadeloupe, Tunisia, Somaliland, and so on. The entry of Great Britain into the European Common Market from the point of view of Barbados, is certainly beset by a lot of surrounding circumstances which need extremely careful examination. I cannot too seriously stress that it is essential to the future well-being of the world that developed countries should fully recognize and put into practice the principle that every bit of assistance must be given by the countries which are already developed, both by the provision of capital and by a flexible attitude, on tariffs to undeveloped countries. The Development Fund provided for overseas countries under the Convention of the Treaty of Rome was, or would seem to be, large. It was \$580 million U.S. and this year they have agreed to increase it to \$730 million U.S.

The difficulty is this; the associated territories which have been in the Plan from 1957, this year have found that \$580 million U.S. was not enough to carry out the sort of programmes in those developing countries which would make that kind of impact on their standard of living. I have had an opportunity to talk with them. What I put to the British Team when I was in the United Kingdom was this; if the countries which are already inside find that \$580 million is insufficient to scratch the problem of underdevelopment and low standards of living, how can you stand there and dangle a Development Fund in front of the noses of people like myself and say that if you join you will be able to take part in the Development Fund? The people who are inside now do not have sufficient and if you extend the membership to countries like Trinidad, Barbados, Jamaica and Mauritius and the eight islands of the Windward Group, you will have a larger number of suppliants knocking at the door of the Development Fund. I have not received any answer to this yet, but, it is a matter of commonsense. Not only that, but anybody reading about the Development Fund would get the impression that people send down a team like the Lord Roote's Mission and say that Barbados has a development programme of \$50.2 million and they can raise \$10 million themselves. They are on the London Money Market for \$6 million by Thursday morning which they are likely to get, and therefore we must bridge the gap between what they require and what they are actually able to raise by their own efforts; they would probably make a loan of some \$34 million available to the Government and the people of Barbados for the purposes of development.

That is the impression which we would get if we read the abridged nonsense that appears in the columns of the Daily Press. The European Economic Community itself is a most involved legal institution and economic set-up and it is not as simple as that. What happens now is that they allow you to purchase equipment on a long-term basis to the extent of the amount of development funds which the community makes available to undeveloped countries. Therefore, when you examine this gift horse, which some hon. members may think that I am looking in the mouth at the present moment, you will find that this is another de-

vice for the manufacturing countries of Europe — and I make absolutely no apology for saying it — to sell their manufactured goods to the primary producers which are chiefly the countries of Africa and the non-independent or dependent countries of the British Commonwealth. The development fund is not a pump-priming operation at all; the only pump which is being primed right now with the \$580 million of the Development Fund, is the European Economic pump. They will sell you manufactured goods and you will pay for them; they will give long-term credit but they will not put \$580 million into the hands of the lesser breeds without the law and tell you to buy your equipment goods and machinery from wherever you can obtain it. Nothing like that at all. That is another reason why I have spent such a long time on elaborating on the different inducements which have been extended to territories like ourselves that we have nothing to fear; leave it to the United Kingdom and they will do the best for us. I made myself understood in no uncertain terms when I went to Downing Street and spoke with the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Affairs. Before the Conference opened, I told him — he is coming down here within a matter of weeks and Your Honour can ask him, although I know your name is not Didymus, nor is it Thomas. You are not among the doubtful. I told him that I happen to know that there are members of the West Indies Sugar Producers who are associated with the West Indies Sugar Association, who had the ear of the British Government and whatever they may have told him, I did not want the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Affairs for one moment to entertain the illusion that any private group, whether it be the Trade Union, the Sugar Producers' Association or whether it be a Council of religious Ministers, I did not want him to entertain the illusion that any single group had the right to speak on behalf of the Government and the people of Barbados, because the decision to join the European Economic Community as an associated overseas territory, was a decision which this Legislature and this Legislature alone would have to make. Perhaps it was after I disclosed to the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Affairs not only my personal attitude on the matter but the fact that I knew he had received the assurance from the sugar moguls in the West Indies that it was all right for Britain to go in — it was only after that, that I received an invitation within a matter of hours from the British Cabinet to attend a meeting of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers. That is why I said earlier that we must be very careful not to allow ourselves to be buffeted about by all decisions made at remote distances from our own shores. If we do not want to be buffeted about on the economic seas of the 20th century, it is incumbent on us to take an intelligent interest in what is going on so that we can make a contribution when the occasion arises, and we assess and determine what is the best procedure and what are the best steps for us to follow.

There is only time for me to mention one other point with regard to the Treaty.
5.55 p.m.

This is most important because it affects our people directly. As I have mentioned, there is to be free movement of labour within the Community not later than the end of the transitional period. I can mention to the House right now something which most of the members around the horseshoe table here know already; that there is the fullest freedom of movement now between the people in Europe and Great Britain although Britain is not in the Common Market or European Economic Community. I want to repeat that. There is the fullest possible freedom of movement now between Europeans and Great Britain. They possess the passport which is known to all Barbadians. This is their club. Great Britain does not need to join the Community for there to be freedom of movement, but this year, in 1962, in direct opposition to the terms of the British Nationalities Act, 1948, the Conservative Government in Great Britain elected to introduce a most retrograde bit of legislation in the form of the Commonwealth Immigrants Act, 1962 which was passed in May this year, which discriminates against West Indians and people from other parts of the Commonwealth who are not of European descent, and has placed in the hands of Magistrates who are not necessarily the best people to evaluate national

circumstances and international relations, because they are unpaid. They are voluntary Magistrates in the United Kingdom; they have no legal training, and they are deporting West Indians at the rate of 120 per month; but they are opening the flood gates to Italians who were fighting them 15 years ago and to Germans and to other Europeans.

These are the realities that we have to face. Now I am not joining any club and I am not prepared to advise the people of Barbados to join a bloc on sufferance, because if one of the cornerstones of the Treaty of Rome is that there should be the fullest possible freedom of movement of labour within the Community, and if the burdens of Association are going to be extended to the Overseas Territories, therefore we should have the benefits of that Association as well. I think, Sir, at this stage I rejoin company with the Prime Minister of Trinidad. We parted company early in the Conference on some of his rulings, but we joined company at a later stage when he pointed out that there is no point in having a club in which you have a dual system of membership, and one of the first things we must insist on would be a repeal of the Commonwealth Immigrants Act, 1962, in Great Britain. There is a large body of opinion, Sir, that the passage of this Bill through the United Kingdom Parliament was done out of deference to the Inner Six to the President of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Konrad Adenauer and General Charles De Gaulle, the President of France. There is very strong feeling that this iniquitous bit of legislation was imposed at their behest as one of the conditions of entry which Great Britain was called upon to pay, part of the ante; and so, Sir, if for this and other good reasons I do not appear to be enthusiastic over the unqualified committal of the Island of Barbados to association with Great Britain in their Common Market exercise, it is because we must look at the advantages and the disadvantages as well. And although it is perfectly true that we do have a lot to lose if we stay out, let no one leave this Chamber here tonight with the impression that if we go in that we are not going to lose something, if that something is only our self-respect.

I do not think, Sir, that I would be telling any tales out of school if I mentioned that the African territories like Nigeria, Tanganyika and Ghana were very sceptical about this exercise, and indicated quite clearly that they had no intention of making application for Associated Overseas Territorial status, and the Secretary of State at one stage told the African delegations that he thought that this is what they would want, because they had always been talking about Pan African and African unity, and here they had a splendid opportunity not only to unite under the banner of the European Community, the former Colonies of Great Britain, but here they now were confronted with a wonderful opportunity to unite with those French and Italian colonies in Africa as well. The Nigerian Minister for External Affairs, Mr. Wachuku, stopped the Secretary of State in the middle of his pronouncement and said: "I just want you to understand Mr. Secretary that we in Africa do not consider that African unity is to be achieved as a by-product of European Association." There are some people in the West Indies today, Mr. Speaker, who hope to achieve West Indian unity as a by-product of European Association, and that is why they appear to be so enthusiastic, because without having any of the headaches of the Federal or pre-Federal exercise of bringing people together and getting some measure of agreement amongst them as to the form and shape which our new nation should take, you do have these people who hope they can sit on the sidelines and become associated with Europe, and then at one fell swoop accomplish the Leadership of a West Indian Economic Community as a by-product of European association.

I say, Sir, that if you want to join this Club down here, you have to buy your entrance ticket early, and we are not looking forward to achieving our national unity here in the Eastern Caribbean by any other device than by our own efforts. It therefore is incumbent on us, Sir, to study these problems with a great deal of care. If anyone were to ask me now what is going to happen to Barbados, I would say off-hand that Barbados, whether there is a Federation or not, may find herself manoeuvred into the position where the Island would have to make applications for Associated

Overseas Territorial status to the Common Market.
6.05 p.m.

It is not that we are going to gain a lot by going outside but unless something radical is done between now and 1970 and unless they are able to change the outlook on the part of members of the European Club by 1970 we are going to suffer. That is not the point. But the point is that we have been depending on this kind of imperialistic colonial relationship for such a long time; we have not hitherto had the Governments with the visions to break or sever these bonds of economic dependence which tie us so tightly to the metropolitan countries that we are going to be in a bad position if we stay out. It is not a question of better off or well off; we are going to be badly off by going in but if we go in, we may have the opportunity to make reason prevail and alter the present outlook of the people who now belong to the Club. We are confronted with this problem of freedom of labour on the one hand, Great Britain is opening her doors to Europeans, and Englishmen going to the Continent and on the other hand she is shutting her doors to West Indians. If this is the price that Great Britain has elected to pay, then I think Great Britain has really sunk to a level which I never thought of in the glorious days of 1940 when she sat alone against all the world with only the colonies and Commonwealth countries alongside of her. We were fighting the Germans then. We were fighting the Italians then. Now, we are on the outside, and the Italians and the Germans are fighting us for our living standards. We, on our side, once we achieve this freedom of movement of labour need not to fear any large influx of workers from Europe and therefore, we must press on to see that if we are associated with the European Economic Community, our workers have the freest possible movement within the community by the end of the transitional period, which is 1970.

Unless I get some firm undertaking I would not be in a position to accept that kind of association. I would say like the Africans. "We know that we would suffer by staying out and we may find it difficult to survive by our own efforts, but we must survive and we intend to survive by our own efforts," but I am not going to accept any dual standards of morality which by their economic strength they are able to call the terms to the rest. Our Association with Great Britain is certainly as close as Martinique and Guadeloupe with France and it is inconceivable for their workers to be allowed to move freely in Great Britain where we cannot. We are certainly not afraid of the people of Martinique and Guadeloupe coming to Barbados as long as our people can move to these Islands.

Sir, I trust in the process of making this statement that I have managed to clear up some of the doubt and the ambiguities which may have existed in the minds of hon. members. At this stage I do not propose to make any motion because the position is still very much in the state of flux. I have used this opportunity to bring members of this Honourable House into the picture and to let them know what is going on and to focus attention on the problems with which we are surrounded today. I hope at some future time to keep hon. members abreast with the developments and negotiations going on in Brussels and when the time does come, long in advance I certainly will initiate debate on the position of Barbados with Great Britain's entry in the European Common Community.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, to continue with Government Business, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the Hon. Minister also want to consider the other resolution of which notice was given earlier today?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am grateful for Your Honour's reminder. I should also ask that it be an instruction

to the House when in Committee of Supply to deal with the Money Resolutions of which notice was given today.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am objecting to that for many reasons. Do you think it is fair to have us subjected to listening to a statement for nearly two hours as the first item of Government Business? (Hon. E. W. BARROW: (*sotto voce*) You did not have to sit and listen.)

I have been elected inside here. I have as much right to sit in here as you so when you get there with your unnecessary foolish remarks, you must reserve those remarks for people who do not have a right in here. Do you think this House is some private domain of yours? I have as much right in here as anybody else.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the hon. member referring to? Is the hon. member referring to the Chair?

Mr. WALCOTT: I am referring to where the remarks came from.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will you please refer your remarks to the Chair?

Mr. WALCOTT: I am going to stay out when the people put me out of in here. Where have you got the idea from? And you are looking in the gallery. Instead of looking in the gallery, you have to look where the votes come from. You are getting on with the same nonsense which the other ones used to speak some time ago.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: It is all right for Your Honour to let the *sotto voce* remarks from the Hon. Premier go unheard. He said that I should stay out if I did not want to listen to him. How dare him to tell me to stay out of this House? The people of St. Peter returned me to the House when he was under the greatest pressure. You get this kind of rude, unkind remarks being made. This is not 1940. I am a man who was in here for 17 years and you are telling me to stay out. Are you crazy?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet.

Mr. WALCOTT sat down.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I have just made a statement although the hon. member for St. Peter does not acknowledge the courtesy of the House. He said that he was subjected to listening to a statement and I said that he did not have to sit and listen. As a matter of fact, he left at one stage and found his curiosity overwhelmed and he came back. Nobody subjected him to sitting in his seat; he was free to walk in or out.

Mr. WALCOTT: My curiosity did not bring me in here. I came in here 17 years ago and I came in because I have a contribution to make. I am not going to be subjected to this sort of nonsense, to these sarcastic remarks. These remarks are the same that the former Premier made and you can see where he is today. If the Hon. Premier has the idea that this House of Assembly is his home, give us notice to leave. He is telling me of my curiosity. It might have been my curiosity that helped him to be in here and now he is telling someone about my curiosity. All he has to do is to wait until there is election again and see how curious it is going to be. I have not come in here by the help of any other member.
6.15 p.m.

I am not here by the help of any person or by begging for any situation. The same nonsense which you are talking now is what Sir Grantley Adams talked and where is he today? The people have put me in here and if you want to have a showdown let the showdown come now and you will see where it lies. I stood here for two hours when a statement was being made, a statement which has been made the

subject of debate in another country. You cannot tell us that we are little children and that when something else comes up you will let us have it; Macmillan does not tell Great Britain that, but the hon. member is telling this Legislature: "This is what I have now and when I get something more I will let you know". The Nigerian Premier does not tell Parliament that.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House is that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply. The hon. member's remarks should be confined to that motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member was recently reminded of that.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member says that I should stay outside. On the last occasion when I objected, he made some stupid, uncouth remark like that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member said that he was subjected to something. I told him that he did not have to stay; he does not have to undergo any torture. Why does the hon. member not get on with the subject matter? As the Jamaicans say: "The higher a monkey climbs, the more he shows his tail".

Mr. WALCOTT: This is the same monkey that climbed and helped to push you up. These are the same kind of monkeys whom you want to ride on their backs. It is the monkeys in Barbados who have to keep people like you up.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member confine himself to giving his reason why the House should not go into Committee of Supply?

Mr. WALCOTT: Every time that the hon. member rises on a point of order I will rise again. If I have to stand alone I will stand against this type of middle-class snobbery which these lawyers and doctors want to dish out. I will not stand for it. As soon as they get an opportunity, they try to deride people who are not professional men. The Premier is talking about the higher a monkey climbs the more he shows his tail; that is what you get when you are talking about independence. The monkeys who are in the cane-fields have to work; therefore when you utter these remarks to them you will see what you will be sooner or later — sooner rather than later. I say that you should never arrogate too much to yourself. The Hon. Leader of the House wants to deal with the Resolutions of which he gave notice earlier today and we are subjected to a speech which lasted for two hours, which turns out to be a statement which we cannot debate and it was dealing with a very important matter — the matter of Great Britain's entry into the European Common Market. The Premier of Trinidad has decided that that is a subject for debate. I want to say that if this House is to be respected it must be respected in what it stands for. If it is a matter for debate then let the matter be put on the Order Paper for debate.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The hon. member well knows the procedure which he has to adopt if he wants to debate the statement, but his remarks have nothing at all to do with what is now before the House. We will never get through the business tonight if the hon. member goes on like that. If he is objecting to the House going into Committee of Supply let him voice his objection and give his reason for it.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not want to challenge Your Honour. The Deputy Clerk came around to me and the hon. member was reminded that he had to make a motion. I am not objecting to the matter; I am objecting to the principle of it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, we announced last Tuesday that the House would be going into recess today. Look at the Resolutions! One Resolution is to authorise the advance of a sum of money for the staff of the House in the same way as we are extending this facility to members of the Civil Establishment Staff. We want them to have the money to spend at Christmas time and therefore we could not wait until next year to deal with these Resolutions. An-

other of these Resolutions is to make provision for additional postmen to deal with the delivery of Christmas mail. If we are not coming back here next week, obviously the only time in which we can deal with these matters is tonight. We are not cutting across any procedure; we are simply asking permission to deal with these matters before Christmas.

Mr. WALCOTT: Does the Hon. Minister think that I cannot read? Is the 25th day of December something new now? Have the Post Office Authorities now found that they want more postmen? I am saying that this is a perennial thing. I will say that if you talk about productivity in this island you have to set a lead. Everybody knows that the 25th day of December is Christmas Day; that is nothing which the Government has to proclaim. Everybody knows that you have to take on more postmen at Christmas time; even on Christmas Day you have postmen delivering mail. Do you mean to say that you did not know that Christmas Day was coming again this year? Do you mean to say that you did not know that you would want postmen to deliver mail even on Christmas Day again?
6.25 p.m.

Now the only time you know you need postmen is at the last minute and you come on the last day and tell me I must do this. The other matter is that of the members of the House. Do not play up to them with a bonus, because they are paid here all the time. The staff gets no food; nobody worries about providing meals for them; so do not play you are magnanimous by looking out for them. How come you are giving them a Christmas bonus?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is just extending the facilities which are extended to the other members of the Service.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: As Your Honour could remind the hon. member, we only got the application yesterday, and we could not have dealt with it before. It is no bonus; we are merely advancing a sum on the next year's salary on the same basis as we are advancing a sum to Civil Servants.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, we are not dealing with the principle of giving them the same facility. What I am objecting to is that we have come here today and sat down for two hours and you have not begun to deal with any of these things. We come in here Tuesday after Tuesday consecutively and listen to long statements being made, and now you suddenly want to put pressure on us to finish business before 7 o'clock to accommodate somebody. I am not going to accommodate anything or anybody other than my conscience. You had the whole of December; did you not know that you had postmen to pay? If the Postmaster had waited until yesterday or the day before yesterday to send in something for postmen, you would want to jump in his neck and ask how dare him to expect you to come to the Legislature at such a late date. This is the beginning of trying to pressurize people, but the others who tried to pressurize people paid for it. They laughed at us. You have shifted sides and they are laughing now on the outside. If you knew you had postmen to pay, you should have come and done this Resolution in an orderly way. What example are you setting in the community?

Mr. Speaker, other people have given their employees Christmas allowances or loans, but they have taken them in their confidence and given them in time; but you want to reduce Parliament to a pub, where so long as you can stand a drink the others must shut up. You feel that because you are Government everybody else must shut up, but you are not a Government to shut any person up. You are a Government to do things properly in Parliament and to set the lead in public behaviour and conduct. You must tell people in your Departments that they are not dealing with little boys, and that they cannot push a request in somebody's hand and tell him it is to be done tomorrow. I do not want to be fussy about these things, but the members of the staff are employed by the Debates Committee, and if they made a request, to whom did they make it? (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: They asked the Speaker.) Should they make a request on Monday and expect it to be dealt with on Tuesday? Sometimes you go to the Bank for a loan and do not get it so quickly. I want to say to them as servants of the House that

I treat them with respect, and the servants must treat the organisation to which they belong with respect; and I do not accept that the servants of the House have treated the Speaker of the House with respect if they pushed a request at him on Monday and expect it to be dealt with today.

Mr. Speaker, if they wanted a request like this, they should have been prepared to process their request to the House or to the Speaker in advance rather than put it in somebody's hand at the last moment. Why should I be subject to that? Is it because I have no right to be here? I say to the members of the House and to the staff that they have a right to act in accordance with the highest principles of behaviour, and if they want a request, try and put it forward early. Last Tuesday you passed a Bill like this in which you gave the Executive authority to do something. It was brought down and put through the same day and those members who were not present would not have known about it. A Bill came to me and when I asked the Clerk about it, he told me that it was already passed. Members do not know what legislation would have been passed when the Orders come so late. It is not a matter of the money; it is a matter of business. And then you have these unnecessary remarks which create disrespect. Nobody disrespects any Minister of the Government; nobody disrespects the Premier, but every time the Premier opens his mouth there is some positive disrespect or sarcastic remark to people which is uncalled for.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that I do now leave the Chair that the House may go into Committee.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I object to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am putting it to the vote.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, when a single objection has been raised, it is not a question of putting anything to the vote. You only announce that objection has been made.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion is that this House do now go into Committee of Supply, and it has been seconded.

Mr. HUSBANDS: After that nothing may be done, I am afraid, because a single objector objected to what purports to happen consequent upon that motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion has been made and seconded and I am now about to put the motion that this House go into Committee.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1962-63 No. 29

Head 5 - Judiciary - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 5 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, this is for Travelling Allowance, and the Hon. Minister should tell us something more about it, because I think it is a new departure. The note says that it has been decided to pay to each person performing the duties of Magistrate at any District Court other than District "A" a Station allowance at the following rates."

6.35 p.m.

"It has been decided to pay to each person performing the duties of Magistrate at any District Court, other than District "A" a Station allowance at the following rates: (a) District "B", \$300 per annum which is \$25 per month; (b) Other rural districts, \$480 per annum which is \$40 per month. The amount of \$725 is to meet expenditure on these allowances for the period 1st November, 1962 to 31st March, 1963."

Is this a new departure from the traditional custom of having these Magistrates travelling? Will the Hon. Minister tell us what prompted the Government to decide on travelling allowance for Magistrates? Heretofore, I do not recall your having travelling allowance for Magistrates. Would you explain for me? If I am wrong, then my memory does not serve me right but I do not think that we ever had travelling allowance for Magistrates.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I cannot remember hearing the Hon. Minister putting this Head at all to the vote.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister of Trade moved Head 5.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The position is this. A Magistrate is not now required by law to reside in the district in which he holds Court; he is more or less subject to periodic travels. He therefore cannot plan a district in which he would live permanently and therefore it is considered that he should be given some Station allowance as compensation.

This allowance is non-pensionable and payable to the person performing the duties of Magistrate in the particular district. It does not apply to District "A", it applies to District "B" and the other rural districts. It is regarded more or less as a Station allowance to permit him to get to and from the local station.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I think that I am in sympathy with what the Government is seeking to do but I think the way in which the Resolution is being prepared is misleading.

The note to the Resolution says that it has been decided to pay to each person performing the duties of Magistrate at any District Court other than District "A" a Station Allowance and then we find the Resolution headed: "Head 5 - Judiciary - Item 34 - Travelling Allowance. As I said, I am in sympathy with the resolution but this is confusing. Somebody must be responsible for getting these resolutions printed and when they come here they should mean what they say.

Personally I feel that some sort of allowance is intended and the Hon. Minister gave us some sort of cue when he said that Magistrates are no longer required to live in the districts. In that case, what they require is a House Allowance.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If the hon. member would give way, I would be able to explain what appears to be confusing. This supplementary provision would offset for the saving anticipated in the item estimated from which Magistrates' Travelling Allowance is paid. In other words, acting Magistrates who are now paid in respect of travelling would be paid an allowance instead. This is really a Station allowance.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not want to let it appear that I have any objection to this Resolution. I am in sympathy with it but if you look correctly at the Resolution itself you will see: Head 5 - Judiciary - Item 34 - Travelling Allowance and under the column "Voted" is the sum of \$4,250, and under the column "To be voted" \$725. Then over in the Note which explains the position, you see: "It has been decided to pay to each person performing the duties of Magistrate at any District Court other than District "A" a Station allowance at the following rates;" What I am saying and asking the Hon. Minister is, in the first place, it has been decided to do something, and in the second place, I am asking the Hon. Minister to refresh my memory if in the laws of this country you pay a Travelling Allowance to Magistrates. I am almost sure that the answer is bound to be 'no'.

On the other hand, while I am on my feet, I must say that it is a tremendous decision to make that no longer a Magistrate would be allowed to live in the area.

Now, I want to say this. You are dealing with the majesty of the law and you are in charge. You want to do things not merely to satisfy Magistrates but the people from whom

you collect money. What happens to the person who is arrested in the parish of St. Philip and is taken to District C and the people there do not know where the Magistrate is living because, as you have put it, if the Magistrate cares to live at the bottom of St. Lucy, he can do so but by the laws of the country a person arrested must be brought before the Magistrate at the earliest opportunity. Let us say the person was arrested on Friday night then Saturday goes by without his seeing a Magistrate and then Sunday goes by. Surely, it affects all our constituents. What happens with him? A Magistrate is not required to live there but he is paid a Station allowance. I do not understand what that means. Nobody can find where he resides. That person arrested may have committed the offence of just breaking a sugar-cane from somebody's land and for that offence he must remain in the cell from Friday night until Monday morning. I think this is a retrograde step. That is my honest opinion. I ask the Hon. Minister to think of his own area although it can also happen in St. Joseph and all the rural parishes.

Sir, I really would like a further explanation on this. I am not imposing if the Government's policy is to give a travelling allowance. It might be a good thing rather than to have one Magistrate doing traffic cases all the time and another bastardy cases and another petty debts and so on. It might be a good thing to let Magistrates see something of what is done in the districts. Surely there must be something further to explain this to me. I see the Hon. Minister of Agriculture attempting to rise. I do not pretend to know. I am not satisfied with this measure as it stands.

Mr. WALCOTT: As it stands now, Mr. Chairman, travelling allowance is paid to Magistrates.
6.45 p.m.

Travelling Allowance is paid to magistrates but they are not under the Act in relation to which I think persons are entitled to loans for the purchase of motor cars and so on. This item is Item 34 in the Estimates and if you look at Item 34 in the Estimates you will see that the note says that this amount of \$4,250 is for the purpose of paying travelling allowance to magistrates in accordance with the Travelling allowance regulations. What the hon. member is saying and what we want an explanation of, is that this is not a simple question of paying travelling allowance to a magistrate. The magistrate is already entitled to travelling allowance if he has to travel. There is a decision which changes the present position as regards the employment of magistrates and that is what the hon. member would like to know. There is a decision which changes the structural arrangement for magistrates and the hon. member would like to know what the position is.

I believe that what the hon. member is thinking of, and what is worrying some of us in the rural districts, is that it is not so easy to get magistrates when something occurs, and it is felt that if a magistrate is not living in the particular area, that imposes a strain on people. If, for instance, a magistrate does not live in St. Peter or in St. Lucy but he lives in Bridgetown, there is a difficulty in that you cannot get hold of the magistrate. That is an additional problem for poor people and that is what I think the hon. member is referring to.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, my colleague has looked at his Estimates and he has discovered that magistrates get travelling allowance. Travelling allowance is always given with the understanding that you are paid for travelling from the office out, not travelling to your office. This is a new type of travelling allowance. As I say, you never pay a man for travelling to his office.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I said that it is a station allowance.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The Hon. Minister is obviously in difficulty. It is convenient to put this matter under the Head of Travelling Allowance, but can the Hon. Minister enlighten us further as to this matter?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, our point is that we are not objecting to what you are paying a man; suppose you call

it a New Year or a Christmas allowance! What we want to say is that the magistrate is already entitled to his travelling allowance but the hon. member wants to know why you want to put in this allowance in the way in which you put it in, that you are only giving travelling allowance to the man. I would like to know if any new arrangements have been made in the Judiciary by which you want to employ magistrates in the rural areas on a different basis, and therefore you are giving them a station allowance. As set out in the note to this item, the station allowance for Dist. "B" is \$300 per annum and the station allowance for other rural districts is \$480. It does not matter if he travels because this is a station allowance. What hon. members are confused about is this: Do you really mean that this should be put under the Head "Travelling". Item 34 in the Estimates is "Travelling Allowance" and this is a new item in relation to which we would like to have some more information. Let us put this under a new Head.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, there might have been a slight error in the Resolution itself because this is not travelling allowance specifically. There should be a new Item under this Head dealing with a station allowance. A magistrate is no longer required by law to reside within the district to which he is appointed; he can be transferred from one station to another. He is therefore unable to plan in which district he will live so as to be near his office and it is considered that this station allowance should be regarded as compensation for this inconvenience. This is a station allowance and not a travelling allowance because an appointed magistrate does not get any travelling allowance except for a special purpose. These slight typographical errors are such as appear from time to time in these Resolutions.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Rather than cause any controversy about this matter Mr. Chairman, if what the Hon. Minister has said is true, the Auditor General dare not pay out one cent. I think that the hon. member should withdraw this Resolution or this item of the Schedule to the Resolution and go on with the other items. I am suggesting that the Minister should postpone this item in the Resolution and go on with the others. This is not a slight error as the Minister has said. You have "Travelling Allowance" and then you have "Station allowance." I say that the Auditor General dare not pay out this money. As to whoever is responsible for preparing these things the Minister should just tell them that we do our work in this House. I quite agree with the principle which the Government has decided upon in changing around the magistrates. With that I have no objection at all, but when this item is presented to us in this way and we pass it in this way, then when it is presented in the Other Place an amendment is made and we will look foolish. I say that you should not do that to us.
6.55 p.m.

I suggest that you do not press us with this, and go on with the other one.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown agreed to the change around, but I am not agreeing to it. Now, Sir, the hon. member says that Magistrates are now living in the parish.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I said I agreed with the principle that if you want to change around Magistrates from doing one type of work all their lives, it is a good thing for them. If you have a Magistrate doing traffic cases all his life and having to do with nothing else, he becomes stale and knows nothing about other matters. I agree with that part; but I do not agree that the Magistrate of District "C" should be allowed to live in the bottom of St. Lucy so that if anything happens in St. Philip you cannot get him.

Mr. SMITH: Now, Mr. Chairman, I was born and bred in St. Joseph.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I am going to move.....

Mr. SMITH: I am going to shed a little more light on this Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: At this stage, I beg to move that we do now Report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER No. 5

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, at this stage, I beg to move that Standing Order No. 5 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I hope that does not mean that we have to stay in here all the time and the Sitting is not going to be suspended at 7 o'clock p.m. The motion is quite in order but not for us to have this marathon Sitting. Members have to eat and the Sitting will have to be suspended. If we are going to suspend, let us do that and come back at 7.45 p.m. and continue the debate. I was in here from 2.30 p.m. and it is now 7 o'clock, which is four and a half hours being here, and nobody serves you with food. If we are going to suspend, that is all right, but on the basis of not having anything to eat, we must suspend the Sitting.

The question that Standing Order No. 5 be suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House resume Committee of Supply.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister said that this will be a Station allowance and Magistrates are no longer required to live in the district. No Magistrate lives in the parish of St. Joseph at all. The last Magistrate whom I know lived in St. Joseph was Magistrate Reece, and at that time I was a boy, but not since then; so I want to know how this Station allowance comes in. Are you turning a Magistrate into a Sergeant? It is true that a magistrate should be living in the district, because at night policemen find great difficulty in getting certain writs signed, and sometimes they have to wait until I come in at night or wake me up to get this done.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If the hon. member will give way, I will explain that there is a slight error in reference to the item in the Resolution itself, and I am quite willing to delete this item from the Resolution and go on to Head 17.

I am therefore asking leave, Mr. Chairman, to delete Head 5 of this Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to delete Head 5 from this Resolution and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Head 17 - Premier - Home Affairs - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 17 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Head 30 - Waterworks - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 30 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I should like to draw to the attention of the Minister some problems arising out of this question of plumbing expenses. It does not only apply to the Waterworks but to Public Works generally. There are people at the Hospital and the Government finds itself in a peculiar situation in which plumbing rates are paid to workmen in the Government Service which are recoverable; but you would get the problem at the Hospital where you may have dislocation. If you have a contractor and he has plumbers, he cannot pay them the plumbing rates which the Government pays to a man who is going to get a pension, twenty-one days leave and other conditions of service, yet there is refusal to deal with this matter.
7.05 p.m.

I am sure that the Minister responsible for this sort of thing should go into this matter because I can tell him if something is not done, you may get a strike at the Hospital. Where you have specialist jobs such as plumbing to be done, you cannot pin a man down to the rate of pay at which you are giving a similar man holidays with pay and pension allowance. Pension allowance is equal to 22% of a man's pay. If you are paying your man one dollar an hour, do not expect a man to come from outside and work for one dollar an hour. It is a problem because we have been faced with that problem. I would like to say to the Hon. Minister that we are having the same problem with the Waterworks Department.

I am not a man who believes in standpipe politics but as regards the Waterworks Department, we have some standpipes sited at places which do not serve any useful purpose. I do not know who was responsible for putting down standpipes in the old days but you had people living in sort of back districts and the standpipes for their use was put at the side of the road by canes. I would like to see the Government set up a Committee to give study to where standpipes are located in the rural areas. I promise the Minister to take him in one of the districts to show him what I mean. Anyone who knows Portland and Benny Hill and who goes into Indian Ground would find a standpipe up by Cherry Tree Hill where you do not meet anybody at all but when you go into Prospect you see people who have to make a long pilgrimage before they get to a standpipe. This is purely in my own parish. You have a standpipe at the bottom of Mile-and-a-Quarter when the people live up Benn Hill. I would like to see the Government make an investigation into this matter. I am not dealing with the Local Government aspect but you should make standpipes more accessible to people in their own homes.

I feel the time has come when just as in the City of Bridgetown where water mains are easily available to people that the same thing should apply all over the Island. We should encourage the people with the installation of water and you should treat it as social costs which they cannot afford to pay for on a cash basis but you put a pipe in a man's house and then give him an easy method to pay for the installation. I feel that is one of these social advances which we should aim at. Whatever policy you have, look at it and see if it is a possibility. Make it possible that in the next ten or fifteen years, going to a standpipe in areas where the water main runs alongside the road would be a memory.

The amount of five shillings a quarter is not too much money for anybody to pay for water considering the time saved in bringing it to your home. I think the time has come when we should stop this old vicious system where people waste a lot of their productive time drawing water at standpipes and it would also stop a lot of them paying money to the Court. We can do this by giving them the facility of having it in their homes and I feel the Government should aim at these things.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I merely want to say that the hon. member has tread on ground which has

already been treaded by the Government. The Government has been considering that installation costs for putting in electricity and water should be paid for on the instalment plan. As a matter of fact, we have already taken this matter up with the Barbados Light and Power Company, Limited and arrangements have been made for them to instal services in a few trial areas on the instalment plan. I agree with the hon. member that people may find it difficult to be able to provide at the same time the total cost of the instalment plan, like water and electricity, and especially in the case of electricity the instalment plan is usually very high.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter must have been told or he must have read that the entire backlog of applications for water services at the Waterworks Department is scheduled to be concluded by the 31st March, next year. We have given more staff, more equipment and materials to the Waterworks Department for this purpose.

I merely want to say that in so far as Government's policy is concerned with the installation of Waterworks services and making water available to the community, nobody is more anxious than we are. We found a backlog of 2,000 applications which in the normal course of events would have taken two years to instal and we are doing it in less than six months. The Hon. Minister of Communications has given the overall policy for making water available throughout the Island.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister of Trade has just said that by 31st March, next year he hopes to implement all of those outstanding water services. I think I have a plan which can even expedite that. I have suggested already to the Waterworks Department that instead of waiting until somebody comes up and their looking back to find out when your application was sent in, they can instead of installing that one service in that particular district of road, instal six or seven who have sent in applications for installation and are living on that same road. Five people made applications for water services in a particular district by me and two weeks ago the Waterworks Department sent a man to put in one installation. He was sent up by a lorry. The man got on the job somewhere around eight o'clock and when half past nine, he was finished but the truck did not come back for him until about two o'clock.

What I am suggesting is this. You should instal at the same time not only those whose applications have been in for a long time but applications which you have received since. When you send a man to couple up one service in a district, let him couple up the three or four other services at the same time because it would take no more time. You should not just instal the service of the applicant who had applied first. Instead of waiting to look back at who had sent in applications two or three years ago, when the man drops in to tap one service let him tap four or five at one time. It would save a lot of time and when the truck gets back at two o'clock he would have already installed the five services. They came and dug up a road near where I live two weeks ago to put in one service and they came back last week and dugged it up again to put in another and I am sure they would have to come back this week. Surely we can have five or six tappings on the same pipe done at the same time. 7.15 p.m.

Mr. SMITH and Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: My eyes caught the hon. junior member for St. Joseph first.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, this is something which I am throwing out to the Minister. I notice that approximately 2,000 applications for water have been outstanding for almost two years and by the 31st March, 1963, the Government wants to close them. These installations are to be made from mains which have already been laid, but you have just as many people living in the country areas where no mains have been laid at all, and these people have to walk for considerable distances out to the front road, so as to fetch water. I would be very glad if the Minister would see to it that the Department keep a check on the reports which have been sent in from the various District Councils

asking for the erection of these water mains in these back areas. I would be very glad if that is done.

I can remember that in the Airy Hill District I was trying to get water up there. I telephoned the Clerk of the District Council up to last week and nothing has been done relative to the laying of a main in order to get water in that area. These people are suffering just as much or probably more than those who are living on the front road and we are now asking for these installations. I would be very glad if the Minister would keep a check on these applications. There are some cases in which the use of ordinary galvanise pipe would do the job. There was a time when it was said that they did not have the four-inch mains but now they can use the ordinary galvanise pipe so as to relieve the suffering of these people. These people have to work all during the day, they have to do the necessary cooking in the evening and in the morning they have to do washing and still they have to make a long pilgrimage in order to reach their work. I think that priority should be given to those people who live in the agricultural areas; especially in this particular district things were hanging fire for over four years. I am sure that the applications were in the Waterworks Office for the installation of these mains long ago.

Mr. CORBIN and Mr. WEEKES rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. Philip caught my eyes first.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I must commend the Government for bringing this Resolution down to this House. You will remember that only a week ago I tabled a question in connection with this matter. It is true that Rome was not built in a day, but water is an amenity which should be taken to the homes of the people. During our campaign we promised to provide the people with roads, water and light and I am very pleased to see that new consumers will be getting water installed in their homes. On this question of water, it is my opinion that we should be dealing with a comprehensive plan. Owing to the fact there are certain districts which have no mains, I would suggest to the Government that we must have a comprehensive plan whereby mains should be laid in every district throughout this island. I realise that that is a colossal task for this Government but it must be done regardless of the cost owing to the pledge which we made to the electors during our last campaign. This is not a big liability to this Government because the people have to pay for the installations.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be very frank in making this statement now; I feel that water in Barbados is very cheap. The statement which I will make now will not be a very popular one I know but I feel that the time has come when we should allow people to know that if the Government must help them they must also help the Government. I would suggest to the Government that they should go into the matter and the people would be satisfied to pay a little more per quarter for their water. In conclusion, I am asking the Government to concentrate on the provision of water, roads and light, more especially water and roads, in their 1963-64 Estimates. I feel quite sure that we will be able to face the electors again when the time comes for that and it will be quite possible that we will be able to sit at ease in our seats again. I am therefore advising the Government to work very hard and include a big sum of money in the Estimates next year to be spent on the water and roads.

Mr. CORBIN and Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for the City caught my eyes first.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have risen principally lest it be thought that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas was singing a solo. 7.25 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I rose because I see the Hon. Minister is paying attention to what the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has said. One thing which must be borne in mind with our limited resources in doing work is that every man hour means money. What the hon. junior member for St. Thomas said should be taken seriously and it must be taken

seriously if I know the Hon. Minister correctly. What he is saying is that it does not matter whether somebody applies in 1962 and another in 1963. While you should give preference to persons whose applications were in first, what the hon. member is saying is that if you have ten applicants from Harts Gap or six applicants from Westbury Road or from any other area, why send a man to put in one connection and when he is finished send him all the way to Jackmans when he can make other connections in the same area? I say it is a waste of manpower; and a waste of manpower is a waste of money. The hon. member has given you such a suggestion which should be put into operation within twenty-four hours or the Government is not mindful of what they are about. Why send a man to Harts Gap to put in one service when there are five other applicants on the same main for the same service?

There are some people in this country who say, as soon as something comes from somebody who is not a professional in that line, he does not know what he is talking about. I rose to support the hon. member very strongly in his suggestion. As far as Bridgetown is concerned, while I am on my feet, I will say that the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works lives in my constituency and I should like to remind him that in that area mains are needed. I want to remind him too that home drums sometimes beat first and not always last or all the time. I have always said that we are not ambassadors, and if you turn to your immediate left, you will get an example of what I mean. To be in here you must do something for the people who sent you here and not for the others alone. I support the hon. junior member for St. Thomas very strongly, but you must remember that there is still a necessity for more mains in St. Michael, and as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said, mains are very important. I commend the Government and I wholeheartedly agree with the item in this Resolution under the Head Waterworks, because this is a very important matter.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I have always given thought to this serious situation of water. In St. Andrew there are pipe stands which have been there for two years and we are waiting on the Government to run water to these pipes. The boys use these pipe stands as stumps in playing cricket. This Government has taken over from the last Government and I want them to be very serious about this situation. Wherever I turn the people are saying to me, "Homie you mean you built pipe-stands and promised water for two years and yet there is no water? What is your Government doing? Are they sleeping?" I tell them I will try and wake them up. If the Government does not get up and face its responsibility and do things for the people, I will pass sentence on them as I did on the last Government. The Minister is there at the Ministerial Buildings, but we who are outside are searched for all the time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I should like to draw to the attention of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew that these are applications which have been in for a period of over two years. There are over 2,000 such applications which have piled up and which we are now dealing with; there are no new applications as such. We are remedying an old situation; so when he talks about sleeping, he is entirely out of place.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, it is all right for the Hon. Minister to say I am out of place, but the Minister is at Ministerial Buildings and does not have the worries of the people as "Homie" Corbin has in St. Andrew.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, if the hon. member happened to occupy my role and had to face 80 or 90 people every day, he would not be talking as he is talking now, because within five minutes of getting to my office, I have to interview people, and in order to do my work, I have to do it at home in the morning; so when he talks about seeing people, he is not really faced with any problem.

Mr. CORBIN: I live at Lakes, and night and day people leave St. Simons and come to my home to get water and this has been going on for the last six months. I wrote the Waterworks Department three or four times asking them to send water lorries but to no avail. People come from a

mile away every morning to my home to get water and I continue to call upon Government to instal water in the parish.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but if he reads the Addendum here, he will see that \$65,000 are for plumbing \$5,000 for refunds and \$65,000 for reinstatement of highways, consequent on the Government's decision to accelerate the rate of new connections.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should like to hear the Hon. Minister alone.
7.35 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The money is to accelerate the rate of new connections in order to complete by the 31st March next year approximately 2,000 applications which have been outstanding for almost two years.

Now, the hon. member could not have read that and therefore I am really drawing it to his attention. We have these applications which have been outstanding for about two years. In May this year our Government decided to have all the outstanding work done and we enquired from the Waterworks Department what they wanted to do this. They wanted four lorries and more equipment and the Hon. Minister of Education has been assisting in getting new plumbers trained to supplement the staff and now that the equipment is here we are working on installing these outstanding applications.

I am merely drawing to the hon. senior member for St. Andrew that if he had read the note to the resolution itself he would realise that it was not our fault but the fault of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and his party.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member said that there were 2,000 applications which had been outstanding for two years, therefore, 1,000 would go to the period when my party was in power and the other 1,000 would go the period of their party, therefore, it will be 1,000 to each of us.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am saying that we found 2,000 applications outstanding and by the end of March there will be more outstanding.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, I do not matter whose party had been responsible; I know that we are responsible today. I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that no Government would feel good to hear their people crying for water when they can have it. Every year the Waterworks Department send out to each parish — and that was the case when they were Vestries to each parish — and ask where they were going to site a new stand pipe and the Department would instal the water after the stand posts were built. For two years, they have made us build the stand they have refused to turn on the water.

Since this Government has come into power, there are certain places which need water and I am asking this Government to speed up as fast as they can and give the people water. It seems as if Jesus would come and they would not have the reservoir in St. Andrew. We want water mains run in St. Andrew. We want water and I must have water for my people; I do not matter what you may say. Do not get up and talk a whole day. We want work done and unless I get water for my people I will not keep quiet. The people of St. Andrew have elected me and told me to come in here and air their grievances. If they have earth selling or giving away I must get some for my people. I want to get at the earliest opportunity a water main in Lakes, St. Simons, another in Corbin's Village and until that is done, we will not be satisfied.

The people are walking in this day a mile and a half in order to get a bucket of water and they have to bring it on their heads. We have been told by Government today that they are doing their best but they have failed and I want them to do their best. I knew what overthrew the last Government. It was false promises. If we go around and promise the people things, we must see to it that we give them those things. Two years ago, we have taken up money

and built standposts and the standposts are still without the water installed. Let us get the things which you have promised the people. Get up out of the Ministerial Buildings and go around and see what the people want. Get up and go out in the fields and see what they want. I am going to tell them all that I want to tell them when I am right. I am wholeheartedly supporting this resolution with the understanding that the people who have applied for water will get it.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Chairman, I always feel that it is unwise to spur a willing horse and it is clear that within the last month every attempt has been made to improve the water system in this island but there is much to be done. There is no doubt about that.

This is not the first time that I have heard as far as the equipment is concerned that the Government has brought in more lorries to make things more satisfactory but I am going to issue a word of warning. The evil is not with the Ministers who sit up all night and do everything in their power; it lies in the persons who are to carry out their policy. That is where the evil lies.

The Hon. Minister of Education would do everything in his power to have young men taught in the technical class rooms so as to swell the persons with the technical skill. The Minister of Communications would do everything in his power to get the necessary trucks to transport the workers on the project and it is even expected that they must go around and see that the work is done but there is one thing which the Minister cannot do. He cannot go around and see that his policy is carried out and do the work in the office too. This is the word of warning which I am issuing. I have been watching it for a long time. I know of particular individuals in St. James who have paid big sums of money to get water installed in their homes and I have seen other persons who have erected homes and have got water installed in them. I will not blame the Minister for this; I am more responsible than that but I would say that it is those who attempt to sabotage this Government or the Government's Ministers who are only human beings. I am telling or advising those who are attempting to overthrow or sabotage this Government that any time that they get in their Department and try to do that or to give any excuses, we know how to deal with those persons.

Mr. COWARD: Sir,

Mr. SEALEY: Sir,

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Sir,

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I see three hon. members on their feet. My eyes caught the hon. senior member for St. Michael first.

Mr. SEALEY: Sir, it is my duty to go around St. Michael and I can say that we have got more pipes in St. Michael within the last six months than we have got in two years under the previous Government. It is part of my business to see to this but what I really feel is happening to this Government is that it is being sabotaged and I say so for the simple reason that I saw about three months ago the Waterworks Department carrying out some work in Free Hill where they fixed two or three standpipes and then they went to Brittons Hill and did something else. I wholeheartedly agree with the hon. senior member for St. James that the Government is being sabotaged. As I have said, we have got more pipes put in in St. Michael in the last six months than we have got in two years when the previous Government was in power.
7.45 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the remarks which have been made by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and that is why I wanted to rise before the Minister replied. Fortunately for us the Minister of Communications and Works is one of those persons who are quite willing and ready to listen to reason and I am sure that no hon. member of this House would chide the Hon. Minister of Communications because temperamentally his heart has its sympathy. Nothing we say about the water

services is to be taken as a criticism against him and he is blessed with the possession of a temperament that any criticism which we make is not directed against him. The Hon. Leader of the Government knows too much and he can know as much as he knows when he is not there to know; whenever you know, you have to come back to us to support you. I would say that nobody knows anything better than what we would know. We know that you are being sabotaged by any kind of "tage". I do not have to cover up anything; I am not a lawyer; it is now a year that the Government has been in power and a lot of the people who are keeping you there are not working in any department. The ones who are working in Departments are those who give you all the blows at the ankles. The Minister is getting blows all around. I think that you must set up a committee to deal with these matters. As a representative of the workers, I do not go around pussy-footing with workers and tell them: "Do not work and get money;" if a man is not prepared to do work in a reasonable manner then what you are doing will cost you more money. I am a politician plus a Trade Unionist. I say that if a man is not prepared to do any work then you should fire that man and let somebody else do the work.
(ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot hear the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am sorry to interrupt the Clerk; I do not know that he should be in conversation with hon. members so as to interrupt an hon. member who is speaking.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, any member of this House has a right when he wants to speak with the Clerk, to ask him anything, to call him. The Clerk is the Clerk of this House; he is not the Clerk of the Government. I am saying that at any time I call the Clerk and he does not come to me, I will break up the House. I repeat; the Clerk is the Clerk of this House and not the Clerk of the Government. He has to go to each hon. member when he is called and show the same respect for all hon. members.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member has missed the point. We were saying that we had to interrupt the Clerk with the loud conversation which was being carried on. I did not want to interrupt the conversation. However, I would like the Hon. Minister to bear what I am saying in mind. I would like to see either a Committee set up by the Government or a Departmental Committee set up to make a study of working methods in Government Departments. I am satisfied that you are having a lot of wasteful expenditure which we cannot afford. I do not think it is good for us to have work methods introduced and carried out whereby thousands of dollars have to go down the drain. You are having a poor working standard which is costing the community a lot of money. I am satisfied in my mind that, with the present work methods, the Government can spend a lot of money but you are not getting enough work for the money which you are spending because somebody somewhere is afraid to tell somebody that he is not doing sufficient work. I do not want to indict anybody today; nobody is out to accuse people but we are watching these things and we want to see better work standards.

You have people who are just going in the road, just making a peck and then somebody comes along and they carry on a conversation with him. I do not think I would have to speak for very long to the Hon. Minister for him to realise the point because he is not a man who is given to not listening to what one is saying. The Government has not got any sort of secret service agency which will inform them where they can find a man spying. I am not saying what I am saying from the point of view of witchhunting; I am not like the man Mc. Carthy in the United States who is accusing people of Communism. I say that we want to set up a Committee to make a study of the working methods in Government Departments; we want people to realise that they who are the workers should do their best for the national effort.

I am saying that every member of this House owes it to the people that he should, as a matter of public duty, impress it upon public servants that it is in their interest in the national effort to give the maximum contribution to the work

which they have to do. I am not at all satisfied with the effort which I see manual workers put forward. The Government supervision is poor; they should have a training for supervisors. You have the Department of Highways and Transport, for instance, and you ought to see to it that they have the sort of industrial acceleration which is required. 7.55 p.m.

We have got to do it because we have come at a time when, if we want to accelerate the pace, we have to make the men realise that merely going to work and clocking in their name is not good enough. Before I sit, I should like to say that some people came to me quarreling because they were not included in this gratuitous offer which the Government gave. A man told me that though he got holidays for the last three years, his name was not on the list. You have an Information Office, but I think the time has come when you want a Public Relations Officer, as from the number of people I hear who want to see the Minister, this has become obvious. People have the idea in Barbados that it is a Minister's duty to give them a job. I will not call the Minister's name, but a man told me that he had been to a Minister and could not find him because he was too busy. I do not like this because the Minister has to do his job and not a yard-fowl job. They have the idea that every yard-fowl that supports you should expect a job, and if he is the chief yard-fowl, you must give him a giant job, otherwise he is planning not to support you at the next elections. The Ministers must be relieved from that sort of pressure. Some of them cannot do the job they want, because they want a Clerk's job but cannot spell. They want you to chase away all the good typists saying that they did not support you in the election and therefore you must bring in somebody's daughter or grand-daughter whether or not she can spell.

Mr. Chairman, I feel the time has come when you can relieve people from that so as to get good work done, and the Government should set up a Committee to study all the work methods in the public service to see that you get the maximum effort from cantoniers, and men riding rollers or pecking the road, if not it would look at the end of the year as though you are spending all your money and not getting enough work.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Chairman, I have very much pleasure in supporting this Resolution. I am very happy to see the Government accelerating.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should like to hear the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, but I am afraid hon. members on my left are interrupting.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Chairman, I will begin again by saying that I have much pleasure in supporting this Resolution. I strongly agree with the Government on their decision in accelerating the water supply to these outstanding applicants. You heard my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, say that it is over four years that he has been trying to get a water supply in the parish of St. Joseph in the Airy Hill district. You will recall that since I have been in this House I myself brought to the notice of this Government the lack of water supply in the tenantry roads. I sat here not long ago, Mr. Chairman, and heard the hon. senior member for Bridgetown telling the Minister who represents the parish of St. Michael that home drums beat first, but I am now appealing to the Hon. Minister who is in charge of this department to let justice be done, because there is quite a number of sufferers in the parish of St. Joseph who have been waiting patiently for a long time for water. They have been promised but up to now they have not received it. I know that each and every member in this Chamber would try to get water in his constituency because water is a necessity and we must have it, but I will end my short address by appealing to the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works to remember the poor sufferers in the parish of St. Joseph and give them their due and quarter as would be given to the other parts of the Island.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, water is one of the most essential things in any Island, and everyone here will realise it is very expensive to run water over the entire Island; that is the first question we have got to consider. As the Premier said, he would like to see water in everybody's house and not standpipes all over the road, and

there is no member in this Government or in this House who would not rather see one and all with water than having standpipes, but at the same time we have got to consider the financial position. Water is one of the things that we should be able to get financial help from outside on. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, we have just contacted UNICEF and U.S. Aid and we have had a hydro-geologist; so the problem of water is directly under study in a big way. I made a statement in this House last Tuesday to the effect that the actual water supply in the Island is to be connected up with the general development of water in the Island. This survey has recently been completed, about the last two months, and negotiations are underway for help and funds to borrow to carry out our development programme on water, and I can assure one and all in this House that I am doing everything in my power to help with the water situation.

The hon. senior member for Bridgetown, Mr. Chairman, mentioned that home drums beat first, but while I agree with him, I was appointed by this Government as Minister of Communications and Works not of St. Michael but for the Island of Barbados, and I look forward to the good work I can do for Barbados at any time and not only for St. Michael. My duty is to Barbados, and although I have great respect for the people of St. Michael, I would like to carry out my good work so that it can glorify the whole of the Island and not St. Michael alone, and that is what I am working towards. I contribute in my Ministry part of the finance to every member's parish. 8.05 p.m.

We had diagrams drawn and each week there are certain areas in which we are making roads and putting in mains at right angles which we consider branches for houses on the other side. That is so. You can therefore see that I am not sleeping on it. We had the Director of Waterworks coming in and I consulted him on it.

I hate to say this, but the hon. senior member for St. Andrew made some comments about Ministers getting out of their offices and going out in the field. I strictly object to that remark. If he feels that Ministers sit down in the Ministerial Building and sleep, I will tell him that if he would like my job, he can have it. I go to work at 9.00 o'clock and some times I leave at 9.00 o'clock at night and that goes even for some Sundays and Bank holidays. If he thinks that we skylark up there he is mistaken and I object to his making those remarks in here.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I said in my remarks that Ministers get in the Ministerial Buildings and they have a right to come out and speed up the work.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: You cannot be in and out. I have to concentrate inside now. I have been an outside man all the time but I am concentrating inside now. You cannot be inside and outside at the same time.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What are you speaking on?

Mr. CORBIN: I am speaking on a point of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am moving that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I rose on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will listen to the hon. member's point of order.

Mr. CORBIN: What I was saying to the Hon. Minister is this: he looks like he is getting cranky. I do not want the Minister's job. He said that if I want his job, I can have it. I am appealing to him to get the things which my people and the people in the Island want.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: 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. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the sitting of this House be suspended now for half an hour.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am objecting to that motion because the Hon. Leader of the House must not be so stubborn. When he asked for leave a while ago to suspend the Standing Orders, a reasonable proposition was made by me then to let us adjourn for half an hour. The Hon. Premier has gone home and he is eating by now. He does not have to wait but we have to wait. The hon. member is now asking that the sitting be adjourned for half an hour.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. That is not correct. I am not a prophet. Nobody could have foreseen this protracted debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I appeal to the Hon. Leader of the House. If there is the intimation from one hon. member that the discussion would not be so protracted, and that there will be non-partisan, I am suggesting that you carry on in Committee.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I want to point out that the Government has more business to be done. The Hon. Premier has gone home because he is sick. He has the influenza.

(A VOICE: Do you mean he was so sick and yet could speak for two hours?)

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That shows his stamina.

Mr. WALCOTT: I appealed to the Hon. Leader of the House earlier in the evening when it was 7.00 o'clock to let us adjourn then and come back.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am no prophet.

Mr. WALCOTT: You do not have to be a prophet, I thought the Hon. Leader of the House would have accepted then what was a reasonable proposition that we adjourn at 7.00 o'clock for a short time to take supper and then come back.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House resume Committee of Supply.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, just for the benefit of the records, I am going to say this. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew made mention of the water shortage in St. Simons district and he has given this House the impression that the Government was doing nothing about the water question in that area. 8.15 p.m.

I am sure that the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works did miss this point. He did intend to explain it to the hon. member but I will do that inasmuch as the Hon. Minister is not now in his place. Representation was made to me as a representative of the parish of St. Andrew in connection with the water shortage in that St. Simons area and I would like the hon. senior member for St. Andrew to understand what the position is. Because of

soil erosion in the Turner's Hall area whence water was brought to the St. Simons District, the water mains were pushed away and that area had to be supplied by water coming from Belleplaine. The position is that the amount of water which the people in St. Simons are using depends on the amount of water supplied from the Belleplaine area. There are plans afoot.....

Mr. CORBIN: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken concerning the pipes in the flat. That is what I was speaking about; I was not speaking about those in the hills. I have asked the Waterworks Department to send a van with water down there continually and they have refused to do that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: This is the position, Mr. Chairman, there are plans afoot that after the road has been repaired, which will soon be done, the water mains will be coming from the Hillaby area down to St. Simons and the people in that area will get their water. That will be done within a short time from now.

The question that Head 30 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 38 — MEDICAL (1) DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL SERVICES

Head 38 — Medical (1) Director of Medical Services — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 38 stand part of the Schedule. The item under this Head is "Board of Health" and the amount required is \$150 to meet the cost of travelling on duty of the Clerk to the Board.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question that Head 38 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ANNEXED ESTIMATES — POST OFFICE

Annexed Estimates — Post Office — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Annexed Estimates — Post Office — stand part of the Schedule. As hon. members will see, the items which need to be supplemented are item 28 — Uniform — and item 35 — Bicycle allowance for postmen.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question that Annexed Estimates — Post Office — stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I now beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of \$144,525 do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1962-63 No. 31 Ex Gratia PAYMENT FOR COMPENSATION

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution to place the sum of \$4,967 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1962-63 No. 31 which forms the Schedule to this Resolution. As the Addendum sets out, Mr. Chairman, the provision of this \$4,697 is being sought to meet the cost of settling claims for damages sustained by four vendors in the Cheapside Market in respect of

losses suffered by them as a result of the removal of their property from the Market by the Market Authorities. The break-down of this amount is set out and the names of the parties who are claiming damages are also set out. I might say that this is an old matter; it is a legacy of the last Government. It is a question of compensating those owners of stalls who dealt with pickled meat and whose goods were removed without their knowledge and they have sustained certain losses as result of the removal of these goods during the last Administration. We are now attempting to settle those claims which are now outstanding.

The matters have been investigated by the Crown Law Officers and by the Crown Solicitors. These claims have been filed against the Government and after a close scrutiny of them, the Government has decided to settle the claims outside. We are therefore asking for this amount of money for settling these claims out of Court. The names of these claimants are as follows:

Hutson Inniss	...	720.00
Robert Broomes	...	520.00
Clyde Brancker	...	3,200.00
Edward Linton	...	257.00
Total:	...	\$4,697.00

Each of these claims has been closely investigated and we are satisfied that this amount of money should be paid out. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for the City rose to speak.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will listen to the point of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Peter knows better than that. A point of order must refer to a remark made by the speaker at first.

Mr. WALCOTT: This point of order arises out of what the Government has done.
8.25 p.m.

I am going to rise constantly on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the Minister keeps out of this, we will get through. The Minister has moved the passing of a Resolution which has been seconded.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for Bridgetown was standing first.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rose on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect, Mr. Chairman, do not get in it.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I say you cannot rise on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will hear the hon. senior member for Bridgetown first.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member opened his remarks by saying that the Minister had made a motion which was seconded; so I rose on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I say you cannot rise on a point of order because I have not made a sentence.

Mr. WALCOTT: You said the motion was moved and seconded and I rose on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister moved the passing of a Resolution which was seconded and sat down.

The two of us rose together, but if he caught your eye first, I am prepared to sit down. If I caught your eye first, then I am entitled to speak. How therefore can the hon. member rise on a point of order after the Minister has sat down? He cannot rise on a point of order as soon as I start to talk. I know the hon. senior member for St. Peter well enough, and he knows I am right. What he is trying to trick me with now is to rise on a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Chairman does not know the rules of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am willing to bet you anything that I am right.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the hon. senior member for Bridgetown to address the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I thought the Hon. Minister who is very meticulous about his job.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am rising on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will now listen to the point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I only want to point out that when people try to be difficult, I will be more difficult. This Committee has no authority to deal with this Resolution, but I was sitting quietly to let you realise that I would not object too strongly, but if you insist with this, I will point out to you that the Committee has no instructions to deal with any of these Resolutions that were passed today because they were given notice of today and I objected to them being done. I did not want to make it difficult, but I want to point out that the hon. member moved that the House go into Committee to deal with the Resolutions and I made objection; so leave was not granted. (To the Marshal:) What are you bringing the Minutes to me for? Do you not know that some of you want locking up for the Minutes? The motion was that the House go into Committee of Supply, and the Speaker did not say further that it be an instruction to deal with these Resolutions.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: He did.

Mr. WALCOTT: He did not, and if that is in the Minutes, I will say you will have a serious challenge.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I made the motion that His Honour leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the Committee to deal with the money Resolutions of which notice was given today, and then I gave notice that I would ask for leave to deal with them later in this Sitting. His Honour the Speaker put the question and there was no negative vote at all. That is my recollection and the Clerk can bear me out.

Mr. WALCOTT: Objection was made to dealing with the Resolutions today. The motion was for the House to go into Committee of Supply, and the hon. member asked subsequently that it be an instruction to deal with other things. I objected and therefore it was not a question of putting the motion. If you know the Rules of this House, as long as objection is taken, you cannot put the question; therefore you had to put the original motion which was made that the House go into Committee of Supply. I was not at this stage going to object, but if the Clerk tells me he has that written in the Minutes, I will get rough, because you cannot have Minutes written for what did not take place.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If you have twelve votes against the motion for leave.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am not objecting at this stage since I felt the matter had been settled and I am not going through with it any more, but the hon. member cannot tell me that the question was put to get twelve votes. I was not really objecting at this stage, but I was only getting a little fun.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, knowing the Hon. Minister of Agriculture as I do, he is usually very painstaking

and I thought he would have given us more information. He said that this Resolution for \$4,607 was for the purpose of compensating those people whose goods at the Cheapside Market were actually removed and thrown away, and he gave us a breakdown. I want him to answer me one or two questions which this Committee would like to know. Who is the person responsible for doing this? Is he still in the Service, and if he is in the Service, are we called upon to pay this \$4,697? If he did this as a result of usurping authority or without the knowledge and consent of the Government and we are paying this, is he still in the Government Service? You have said here that "provision of \$4,697 is sought to meet the cost of settling claims for damages submitted by four vendors in the Cheapside Market." — I take it that these vendors at the Cheapside Market were there legally and paying their rents and so on — "in respect of losses suffered by them as a result of the removal of their property from the market by the market authorities." The words "removal" and "market authorities" are nice words, but they are not working with me. Is this claim as a result of some "Kiaki King" throwing away these people's goods, thus making the Government responsible?

8.35 p.m.

What I want to know is this. Is this man still in the Government Service? Is he retired? Is he drawing money? Is he drawing gratuity? Are we to pay this money and he has gone scotch free? Do not tell us that the authorities went and removed those things. If I just remove your barrels and put them outside, that is not anything. It is a question of taking the people's pickled meat which they had bought and dumping it.

Sir, if I stand alone, I will not be voting for this resolution unless you give this Committee a proper reason why you are not making this officer pay for this damage, and I want to know here and now the reason. I know the Hon. Minister of Trade is very meticulous and takes great pains with his work. I want to know whether this Officer is still in the Government Service.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown knows all about this matter already. He is talking about the man and if he is still in the service and he is also talking about salt meat. This is what is put in front of me and what I see from the Addendum:

"Provision of \$4,697 is sought to meet the cost of settling claims for damages submitted by four vendors in the Cheapside Market in respect of losses suffered by them as a result of the removal of their property from the market by the market authorities."

I want to know what is their property. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown talked about salt meat. The Hon. Minister is not bound to tell him anything because he knows about it already. I also want to know who are the Market Authorities.

"A breakdown of the claims is as follows:—Hutson Inniss, \$720.00; Robert Broomes, \$520.00; Clyde Brancker, \$3,200.00; Edward Linton, \$257.00."

From this breakdown it appears to me that Clyde Brancker had the whole market. His amount seems very big. I do not know what it is made up of so I would like to know what it is and what the property consists of. As I have said, his amount seems very big.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I think I can give the details which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph requested. In respect of claim No. 1, that consists of one barrel scalps, \$152; one barrel ribs, \$76; one barrel snouts, \$82; one barrel tails, \$80; one barrel bones, \$43; one barrel tails and snouts, \$82; one barrel bones, ribs, bones and beef, snouts, tails and scalps, \$60; which totals \$536. Then one tierce ribs \$143; one tierce snouts, \$145, one tierce tails \$145, one tierce bones, \$78; making a grand total of \$1,044.00.

I think it is claim No. 2 which the hon. member wants to know something about. That consists of four tierces

neck bones @ \$75 a tierce, \$300.00; four tierces snout @ \$140 per tierce, \$560.00; three tierces flat ribs @ \$152 a tierce, \$456; three barrels flat ribs @ \$98 per barrel, \$284; three tierces fins @ \$152.50 per tierce, \$457.50; four tierces tails at \$140 per tierce, \$560; two barrels tails @ \$86 per barrel, \$172; four barrels scalps @ \$54 per barrel, \$216; one tierce scalps, \$94; three tierces hips @ \$98 a tierce, \$294; three and a half tierces beef @ \$147 a tierce, \$514.50; three barrels mixed meat @ \$48 a barrel \$144; making a total of \$4,102.50.

That amount was subsequently gone into and it was reduced to \$3,200.00. That gives an idea of the claims of Clyde Brancker.

I want to bring this to the attention of the Committee. Owing to the passing of the Markets and Slaughter Houses Act, 1958, vendors were requested to sell in the market and certain instructions were issued by the then Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries and the instructions were not carried out. In order to maintain the operation of markets at a satisfactory level, the Minister has from time to time instructed the Superintendent not to permit the sale of pickled meat to continue inside of the market except where such meat is sold in an enclosed cubicle and where it does not constitute a nuisance.

No action was taken and on 22nd April, 1960 at the Minister's direction written instructions were given to the Superintendent. The Acting Superintendent ejected salt meat vendors on 8th August, 1960. Let me say that all this happened during the administration of the previous Government. This is a question of clearing up a lot of mess of the previous Government. The Acting Superintendent acted on the instructions of the Minister and he was subsequently transferred to another Department of Government. He was then carrying out the lawful instructions of the Minister at that time.

Mr. SMITH: Now, Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture called out an itemised account of the articles belonging to Clyde Brancker. He was a bit fast but I heard him say four cases neck bones and four cases snout. Well now, the particular vendor, Clyde Brancker would not have to open up all these cases at the same time; he would be only opening up one at a time and the other cases should be all sealed up. Salt meat is something which can be rolled out and stay out in the air for quite a long time. I want to know what caused this salt meat to spoil.

8.45 p.m.

I could understand if something went wrong with the ones which were opened. I do not know what happens at the Port, but when the ships used to come into the Careenage you used to see all of this salt meat lined up on the Wharf by Messrs. Mussons & Co. and Manning & Co. for days. The explanation which is in the Minister's file is very vague. What has caused these things to spoil? Were they stolen or what? These tierces should be intact. If the Minister of Agriculture had given instructions to get these people out of this place, when the person who is responsible for getting them out goes there and sees the salt meat not sealed up, did he pour it out on the ground? Even in that case, what about those tierces which had been already sealed up. What has happened to them? I do not feel happy about this matter at all. I want to know if these tierces were opened by somebody and following the opening their contents were valued and the assessment was turned down by somebody. What about the Inspector who carried out the inspection of this meat? He would have to inspect it and turn it down as being unsuitable for human consumption. I am saying that this amount of \$3,200, in meat is quite a lot. I believe that this meat must have been in connection with more than one stall, because one stall could not accommodate so many barrels of meat and also have so many people to dispatch it.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot vote for this Resolution as it stands; I cannot vote for it unless the Hon. Minister can give me some more information on it. I would like to hear something more about this matter.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, let me explain this to the hon. member. Happily for me, it all happened in April, 1960, and if the hon. member wants to attack anybody then he will have to attack his own Government.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. I am not attacking anybody, Mr. Chairman; I am doing the people's business. If the Minister did not want this matter attacked why did he bring it in here? I want to know about the barrels of meat and who turned them down. I do not care which Government it is. Suppose it was myself; I am here to attack myself. My doubt is that this man or these men may have had one half of the Market in order to have all of these barrels. This man could not turn around in one stall; four tierces would have taken up all the room in the stall. If the Hon. Minister cannot give me the information which I am asking now he will have to postpone this Resolution. This man would only be selling out of one tierce at a time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I will quote a few excerpts from the note supplied by the Acting Superintendent of the Market. This is dated 22nd August, 1960. This is what the Acting Superintendent of the Market states:-

"This morning 8th August, 1960, these meat vendors in the Cheapside Market were ejected. These vendors were given notices to quit the market in the month of May and again in the month of June. All of these vendors were daily paid sellers and therefore a day's notice is all that is necessary for them....."

The Acting Superintendent of the Market goes on to say this:

"On Friday, the 5th August, I spoke over the public address system and gave these vendors notices to quit. On Monday morning about 6.30 a.m., the Police came to the Market on patrol. The Market was opened at 7 a.m., and the meat vendors were given an opportunity to go into the Market and collect their barrels etc., if they were desirous of removing them. Up to 7.30 a.m., no one came in to remove the barrels and at about 7.45 a.m., orders were given to the cleaners to remove the barrels etc., and other appendages out of the Market. About 10.30 a.m., the Market was clear of all barrels etc., and the floors were flushed and made sanitary. All that was done under the supervision of the Police and the Market staff."

Mr. Chairman, that is the report of the Acting Superintendent of the Market. As you know, Sir, the Market was opened to business on 1st February, 1960, and all persons who were selling on the pavements and on the streets in the area which was prohibited by notice published in December, 1959, were required to sell their wares in the Public Market. These sellers of salt meat had been issued daily tickets to sell their meat within the Market; some of these sellers erected their structures within the market but the brine from the meat was a nuisance to others. 8.55 p.m.

Some of them, Mr. Chairman, erected structures within the market, and the brine and so on became a nuisance to others. The Minister gave instructions that they must be ejected and as a result and because of the manner in which it was gone about, certain damage was caused to the tierces of salt meat. This matter has been pending since 8th August, 1960, in other words, roughly 2 1/2 years, and it is a matter in which these vendors have lodged cases in Court seeking damages against the Attorney General on behalf of the Government. After lengthy investigation and enquiries both by the Attorney General, the Crown Law Officers, the Market Superintendent and the Ministry, we have decided to pay these claims and make a settlement out of Court. If there is anything further that the hon. member wants to know, I shall be glad to answer. I can tell him, however, that we have lists from the various firms with which they dealt, and we are satisfied that this amount of money is owing. I am afraid I can give no more information.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I want the Minister to understand that if the outgoing Minister gave instructions

to eject these people with this meat, he should have to pay this money or the Superintendent or whoever it is, because no sane person would go to a market stall or stalls and see so much meat there and throw it out. Up to now I have not been told how these people were ejected, whether the barrels were rolled out or whether a cold chisel and hammer were used to let out the brine causing the meat to spoil; therefore I am saying that these people are taking this Government for a ride. If I were in the Government I would not agree to pay it. They would have to come to Ministerial Buildings and drag me out and lock me up. If the Minister took it upon himself to eject people with so much meat there, causing it to spoil, he should have to pay this claim. I want to know if these tierces were looked into to see that meat was in them.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, this thing happened in 1960 and I was not Minister at the time; so I was not there to see how it happened. If the hon. member wants to know how it happened, let him ask the former Minister.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am not accusing the present Minister of this, but if he is vex and does not want me to talk, let him come across with something and tie up this mouth of mine. If you are hungry and sleepy that is your business, but I was elected here. I am hungry too but I still have to do the people's business. Would you pay this money if you had to take it out of your own pocket if a servant of yours caused you to be responsible for losses? No; you would kick like a mule; so I am telling you it is not good enough. I now see why the hon. senior member for Bridgetown wanted to know whether a particular person was still in the Service, whether he got a gratuity and whether he was made to pay. He knew what was happening. I was a fish and pork man myself, and are you telling me there could be \$3,200 in pickle meat in a little stall at the market? Where was it stored? I am not voting for this because I do not believe it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I asked a question and quite frankly got the answer I wanted. In 1960 when I was Mayor of Bridgetown, I was called to the market to see this business. I think there is evidence in this Chamber to substantiate what I say, and that is the reason why I asked the question. At the time I did not know that there was any communication which the Minister has now read which passed between the then Minister and the Superintendent of the market. I myself became very annoyed when I saw the authority being usurped at the time by the market Superintendent or Assistant. There grew up over a period of years a habit of people taking salted meat of every type from commission agents and carrying it to the market for sale. I did not know it was against the Regulations or that any letter had been written to the Superintendent. When I was asked to go to the market, I saw there quite a number of casks which were opened and put outside. I do not think the Minister would be able to say this because he did not witness it. These casks remained outside and a controversy went on for some time with some of these persons refusing to carry them back on the grounds that they were tenants and were entitled to sell these things there. If the hon. member knows anything about pickled meat, it was not actually thrown in the gutter, but it was left in the rain.

Mr. Chairman, I took the matter up with the Ministry and I did not know, as I know now, that communication had passed between the Ministry and the market authorities prohibiting this. I felt that they were entitled to sell these things in the market and took the side of these people. I raised the question which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph raised about having \$3,200 in stuff, and I understood that one man was responsible to the commission agents and he himself distributed meat to other people. I can give the name of a man called Thomas who keeps a store at Peterkins Road and Eagle Hall, and if you pass there you will see 20 or 30 barrels of meat which he distributes to people at different points. If you go up Hutson Alley, you will see people taking this stuff and selling it. I cannot say whether or not it was \$3,200 worth of meat, but I can say that one man is responsible and have people selling for him at a number of points. All this was put outside.

Naturally, Sir, being an old politician, I took the side of these people, because the Superintendent did not explain to anybody that he had any written document authorising him; all he said was that it was against the market rules and they must get out. The reason why I asked for the name was because I felt that if the officer had done this on his own without the Minister's authority, he should have been made to pay for it and not the Government. If what the Minister has read is correct, that is where the Government would be responsible for the liabilities.

9.05 p.m.

Just as you take over the assets of another Government, you are responsible for their liabilities. If those people went to Court and the Attorney General said that he had nothing to go by, "long live the Queen!" The Crown Proceedings Act gives citizens the right to sue the Government. Citizens could not do that before. The reason why I ask if there had been no authority in writing to the Superintendent or the officials was this: if there were no authority in writing, I would not vote for it. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture read a letter. The Ministers collectively are responsible and individually they are responsible. Since the Minister wrote to say: "I say do so and so", and the officer did so and so, you cannot make the officer responsible for it.

I can tell you that there are people who buy and give to other people to sell. You can verify this for yourself. There were several people who were selling this salt meat, more than the four people whom you have here and this is where my suspicion goes, Mr. Brancker must have covered the other people who were selling for him.

I did not intend to vote for this Resolution because I felt, if the Superintendent had taken it upon himself to act in this way, he should be made to pay for it. We can assume that the Hon. Minister is reading a letter which contained the instructions from a Minister, therefore, they are responsible. Just as they have taken over the assets, they are responsible for the liabilities.

I say this from my experience as Chairman of the Public Health Committee. Salt meat that is exposed to the elements and getting rain and weather which will interfere with the brine, is the easiest thing to spoil. As soon as the bones start to get tainted, no longer can you offer the meat for sale. That is the position. I do not think that the Government came in so easily in their granting this *ex-gratia* payment for compensation of the loss to these people. As I have said, I did not intend to vote one cent of this resolution but since the Minister has read that letter, all I can say is that the book is closed.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I do not want to tarry too long but I want to know if the Minister went right away, as soon as he gave the instructions, and tumbled those goods outside without giving the parties time to get them out of the market. Those people would have to get a notice to quit in either five, six or seven days. The Superintendent could not go right away and tumble their goods outside. They must have had notice.

The hon. senior member for Bridgetown said that salt meat in barrels in the open air outside would get tainted. Yes, but that is so long as water gets into the brine. That would ruin it. I used to have it at my place for weeks. I am only saying this. I am not going to vote for this resolution but I am wondering if it was that the Superintendent and the Market Authorities went straight away and dumped those people's goods outside. I repeat, those people must have been given notice to quit; they must have been given some time to quit.

This thing happened in the constituency of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown. Suppose, if it had happened in my own constituency I might be in his frame of mind. I am saying that something is wrong and when it comes to the hon. member telling me that one of these men went to a Commission Agent and took up these goods and the Commission Agent gave him all those goods, that is untrue.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is not true. You are making fun. Are you telling me that a man in town cannot take up

\$5,000 in goods from a Commission Agent? Go outside and ask. There is a man named Thomas at the corner of Peterkins Road. If you say that a Commission Agent will not give a man all that stuff, go and ask him.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, to satisfy the hon. junior member from St. Joseph, I wish to tell him that this Government did not accept these damages blindly. To begin with, these people's things were ejected and the market officials did not even make a list of what they had ejected. The Market Superintendent claimed that no list was taken of the things on removal; we had to take the word of the owners of the articles.

I want the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to realise that the claim by Clyde Brancker was higher than the money which we are asking for today. He actually was claiming \$4,102.50, but the Government went so far as to have a check made of his creditors in order to find out what he owed them and we have written statements from the merchants who were supplying him with these articles and from the stuff which they had supplied him and the money which he owed them, at least 95% of his additional claim he should have had in stock. But the main thing is this. When this claim was presented to us, we were advised by the legal advisers of the Government that the Government did not have a leg to stand upon. The Government was told not to go to Court to contest this claim because the market people nor the Minister of Agriculture had consulted the Government's legal advisers before taking this action. As a matter of fact, as I said earlier, there was actually no record of the individual sellers or their goods; furthermore, the people's stuff was thrown out in the open and left there. Some was stolen and some was allowed to spoil in the open. What is important is, the Government could not claim with any justification that the plaintiffs had received notices to quit before the removal of their goods and they were not told that their goods would be removed. While it is true that the Superintendent went on the air and broadcasted that this action would be taken, we cannot claim that the individuals had heard this broadcast. We cannot claim that they were served with notices to quit. As a matter of fact, we cannot prove it. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph must understand that no member of the Government would view lightly the possibility of taking up large Government funds and throwing them away like this.

9.15 p.m.

We went into the matter thoroughly and if, Mr. Chairman, we now find ourselves in this position through the irresponsibility, stupidity and lack of confidence in the previous Minister and we have not got a leg to stand upon in Court, what can we do? I am submitting, Sir, that all we can do is to check to the best of our ability on the genuineness of the claims submitted as to the stock which has been lost.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Question!

Mr. SMITH: The hon. senior member for the City can shout out "Question" as much as he likes. I can more understand the Hon. Minister who has just spoken. These goods were stolen and the amount increased because if a man had turned over three tierces one might say that he had tumbled down one hundred. I can quite see what is happening and that is why I say that the person responsible should be made to pay these claims and not the Government. Be that as it may, the people of this country will be able to see how the business of the Government or of some Governments is conducted. (ASIDE: It is your Government.) Mr. Chairman, whether it is my Government or not, I do not care; I am saying that it is not fair to the taxpayers for us to have to vote this money and I will vote against this Resolution still.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, in so far as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is concerned, I should like to say that his decision to vote against this Resolution is no reflection on this Government at all; it is the previous Government who has put us in this position. We cannot prove that the people whose stuff was thrown out had, in fact, had that stuff thrown out. No check was made and

I may say that as to the claims which we have had — the amount of those claims — is even higher than what we have come to this House for. I want to get the record straight. We have a list from the suppliers to these people of this type of goods showing what they owed at the time and we have written statements to show that the amount of goods they had in stock or what they claimed to have in stock corresponded with the amount of money which these people owed to those who supplied them with the goods.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

AYES: Hon'bles J. C. TUDOR, W. A. CRAWFORD, C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSSON, Messrs. CARMICHAEL, BOXILL, YEARWOOD, SEALEY, LYNCH and MOTTLEY

NOES: Mr. SMITH — 1.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, ten hon. members voting "Aye" and one hon. member voting "No". I now declare that the "Ayes" have it.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1962-63 No. 30

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for the sum of \$40,206 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63 Part I — Current, as shown in the supplementary Estimate 1962-63 No. 30, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution. As hon. members will see, this money is required under three Heads of the Estimates as follows:— Head 10, Accountant General, relative to the salaries revision; Head 17 — Premier, Home Affairs, in connection with the Caribbean Exhibition and the Annexed Estimates — Post Office dealing with over time pay, auxiliary postmen, payment of substitutes and extra clerical assistance and inland mail. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agreed to.

9.25 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the following Resolution is for the sum of \$747 for the purpose of making advances of salary to officers of the General Assembly, the members of the Staff of the Debates Committee and the Chaplain of both Houses of the Legislature. The Addendum says it is considered that the Officers of the General Assembly, the members of the Staff of the Debates Committee and the Chaplains of both Houses of the Legislature should be granted the facility recently granted to government employees of receiving advances of salaries during the month of December, 1962, in addition to the salaries normally receivable by them for that month. The advances will be made on the same basis applicable to the Government employees and will be recovered in equal monthly instalments by 31st March, 1963. The basis as set out in the Resolution will be an advance of 25% of the net salary of people receiving monthly salaries, and we are going to deduct them from the salary of each person in equal monthly instalments between the pay day following the next pay day and 31st March.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to disappoint you, but I think that brings Government Business to an end.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 15th January, 1963.

In doing so, I should like of course on behalf, I think, of the members of this House to extend to Your Honour the seasons warmest greetings. We profoundly appreciate the impartial and strict manner in which you have presided over the deliberations of this Chamber in the past year, and we look forward to your return after the Christmas recess fortified by the holiday and no less eager and efficient in the execution of your duties during the ensuing year. I need hardly say that we look forward to the traditional enjoyment of your hospitality during the recess, Sir.

I should say, Sir, that the time of the meeting of January 15th, 1963 will be 2.30 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion for the adjournment and also beg to add to the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the House in wishing you the compliments of the season, and I do hope that you will come back with the best of health and vigour to preside over the destinies of this Chamber. I heard mentioned that we are looking forward to the acceptance of your hospitality during the Christmas Season, but I was really hoping that among the Resolutions we received today would have been one for an increase in the Speaker's Hospitality Vote so that hon. members of this Chamber could not only be wined but dined as the Christmas Season went by, this being the first season which you have had in presiding as Speaker over this House. I do not think we should allow this opportunity to pass without getting together, especially with your twenty-five unbroken years' service as a member of this Chamber, because it would have been a great opportunity for us to meet. We hope that Your Honour will be back with us in the New Year refreshed, and we do wish you the compliments of the Season and a very prosperous New Year.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the question, I thank the Hon. Leaders of the House and of the Opposition for their good wishes to me and their extending the compliments of the season which I heartily reciprocate. I hope that my limited hospitality may not be ignored by hon. members of this Chamber, and if they for one moment thought of reciprocating, I would not fail to accept on behalf of all hon. members.

This is the end of the calendar year. We have had a strenuous but at all times interesting time, and I am more than grateful to the members of this House for their unflinching devotion to duty, bearing in mind that at all times certain members of the staff had not been in the very best of health, but they have conscientiously done all that they could in the interest and the smooth running of this branch of the Local Parliament. I trust that after the recess, hon. members will return with renewed vigour, even more familiar with Standing Orders than they were before and bearing in mind that only where and when Standing Orders are silent do we have to refer to May's other than for purely academic purposes.

I thank the Hon. Leader of the House and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition for their good wishes which I heartily reciprocate, and I trust that informally we will meet many times between now and today fortnight. I am led to

understand that at least one other member—I am not suggesting that the House will be adjourning until today fortnight unless His Honour the Deputy Speaker can come because I am not available for that date—but it has been intimated to me that my colleague, the Hon. Minister of Education craves leave to say something before I formally adjourn this House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It was this, Your Honour: you almost anticipated me in the reference which you have made to the staff. All I had risen to do was to ask whether Your Honour would be good enough to convey through the Clerk to the members of the Staff this House's felicitations for the approaching Season and its thanks for their service.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the Hon. Minister of Education for that, because the members of the staff would realise that it comes from a member of the Cabinet. 9.35 p.m.

Of course, the Deputy Speaker, the Chairman of Committees and myself have a very tangible way of indicating to the members of the staff our appreciation of their services and unless the motion for the adjournment until the 15th January, next year, is not carried and we have to

meet today week, that expression in a tangible form would be shown to members of the staff.

There being no further business, the question is that this House now stands adjourned until Tuesday, 15th January, 1963 at 2.30 o'clock p.m. And having conveyed the expression of appreciation of the services of the Staff by the Hon. Minister of Education, may I also say that I am sure the Cabinet and the Opposition appreciate the good assistance and co-operation rendered to this Chamber and the smooth running of this House by those members of the Constabulary who have been on duty here Tuesday after Tuesday.

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

His Honour the Speaker then sat at the Clerk's Table and each member present gathered around the Table, shook hands and exchanged with him the Season's greetings.

9.40 p.m.