THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17th July, 1962.

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., *(Speaker);* Mr. F. E. MILLER; Hon. C. E. TALMA, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries);* Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., *(Minister of Education);* Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism);* Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P.; *(Deputy Speaker);* Mr. G. V. BATSON, *(Chairman of Committees);* Mr. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, *(Minister of Social Services).*

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to have to inform the House that there is a further delay in respect of the printing of the Minutes of certain previous meetings. I will have the matter throughly investigated with the Government Printer in an effort to ensure that this does not occur again.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, Messrs. LOWE, SMITH, MOTTLEY and LYNCH entered the House and took their seats.

EXPRESSION OF SYMPATHY TO Mr. BATSON

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before we commence the business of the day's meeting, I am sure that hon. members would like us to tender some expression of our profound sympathy with the hon. senior member for St. Thomas on the bereavement suffered by him as a result of the loss of his mother. It is customary for us to pay appropriate attention and on an occasion such as this, and although the lady in question had reached a ripe age and had well passed the alloted span, nevertheless, I am sure that we all share the deep sense of sorrow felt by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas on the passing of his mother. If any expression of sympathy on our part can alleviate the burden of sorrow now shared by himself and his relatives, then we hasten to tender it.

Speaking on behalf of my colleagues in the Government, we should like to assure the hon. member that we deeply regret the passing of his mother and should like our expression of sympathy to be tendered both to himself and to all other members of the family.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the House in expressing our sympathy and condolence to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas on the loss of his mother who has passed to the Great Beyond. It is true that, as has been said, and it is as true today as it has always been, you can get many other things: but there is only one mother that you can get. I am sure that the passing of the hon. member's mother has meant a tremendous loss to him and nothing that we can say here can take her place. However, we should say that we suffer with the hon. member in his sad moment. Speaking for myself, I say that despite the fact that the hon. member is not of my political persuasion, the hon. member's mother was one who worshipped with me at the same Church and her manner made me extremely fond of her son, although I do not share his political persuasion. I do say that we have lost not only a mother but a friend; the lady was always ready and willing to give young people good advice. With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in associating myself with what has been said by the Hon. Leader of the House, that we express our sympathy not only with the hon. senior member for St. Thomas but with the other members of the family.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my expression of sympathy to what has been said by the two hon. members. I think it is unnecessary to state that on behalf of my family we have already written to the hon. member's family expressing our sympathy in their bereavement. The hon. member's mother was a good friend of my parents, and I think the hon. member will highly appreciate the expression of sympathy from this side of the Table, of which he thinks so much. I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything more in this connection inasmuch as the hon. member has already received a letter from our family expressing our sympathy in the loss of his mother who was indeed a good friend of ours.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I must rise in support of the remarks which have been made in the expression of sympathy on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. I know what it means to anybody who has lost his mother; it is a memory which will never be forgotten as long as that individual lives. We know that in the old days our Saviour said: "Son, behold thy mother," "Woman, behold thy son."

2.40 p.m.

We know the grief that is occasioned when a mother is taken away from her beloved son, and I must say, Sir, that in all our sympathy we must bow in submission with him, because we know the loss of a mother. My attention is drawn to your recovery last week, Sir, when the good Master restored you to health; and now, the Chairman has lost his mother. I am in sympathy with him, because I have lost my mother and I know I shall always keep her in remembrance for her good deeds towards me, because without a mother we would not be here. I join in sympathy with anyone who has lost his mother, and I am willing at any time to bow in sympathy, as I know there will be some minutes of silence for the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: I associate myself with the remarks of sympathy expressed by hon. members from all sides of the House, and assure the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, the Chairman of Committees, how deeply I share his sorrow on the occasion of the death of his mother. I will give instructions that a letter of condolence be written, as was implied in the remarks of the hon. Leader of the House that such be done, and I now ask hon. members to stand in silence for two minutes as an indication of our feeling of respect towards the hon. member and *a propos* to the loss which he has sustained. Will hon. members rise?

Hon. members stood for two minutes.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like on behalf of my family and myself to thank hon. members of this Honourable Chamber for the kind sentiments expressed, and shall convey to my relatives the deep sympathy and kind words which have been expressed today by hon. members.

PAPERS LAID

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

Barbados Statistical Service, selected monthly Indicators — January, February and March, 1962.

An Account of the transactions in Rum in the several Districts of the Island for the quarter ended 30th June, 1962.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 30th April, 1962.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of $4,033 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. 13, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

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

A Bill to repeal the Public Wharves (Control) Act, 1954.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

QUESTIONS

Mr. CARMICHAEL: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is there any agreement between Government and the owners of the Sandy Lane Hotel as to an entrance of forty feet more or less between the Sandy Lane Hotel and the land to the South?

2. If the answer to the above query is in the affirmative:-

(a) Does Government know that such entrance is almost completely barred?
(b) Will Government take immediate steps to have that entrance defined in order that the same may be easily seen, and that the public may uninterruptedly pass from the Highway to the beach?

3. If the answer is in the negative, will Government use the power vested in it to provide for a public entrance to the beach between Lower Paynes Bay and Holetown Post Office, a distance of more than one mile.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Whether the practice and policy of the Agricultural Credit Bank since its inception, and particularly during the past year, has been in strict accordance with the Act under which it functions?

2. Is it true that loans have been applied for by members of the staff of the said Bank, and if so, by whom, and for what amounts?

3. Have any such applications been granted? If so, (a) to whom, (b) in what amount or amounts, (c) for what alleged purpose or purposes, (d) on what date or dates?

4. Will the Minister take steps whereby an Inquiry into the running of this Institution be forthwith set up and conducted?

2.50 p.m.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, seconded by Hon. J. C. TUDOR, the Bill to repeal the Public Wharves (Control) Act, 1954, was read a first time.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any replies to questions?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, Yes. There is a reply to Parliamentary Question No. 43/1962, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, on 29th May, 1962.

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that St. Thomas Boys' School is in an acute state of disrepair?

2. Will the Minister take all necessary steps to have this hazard repaired as soon as possible?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, at the time the hon. member asked the question, the St. Thomas Boys' School was considered to be in need of repair but at no time has the state of disrepair been hazardous.

The necessary repairs are in fact now being carried out.

Mr. BATSON: I will like to thank the Hon. Minister for the interest which he took in this question.

BRYAN HIGHWAY, ST. THOMAS

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any more replies?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 21/1962, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, on 20th February, 1962, is now ready.

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that lands abounding on Bryan Highway, adjoining Welchman Hall in the parish of St. Thomas, have been purchased by small landowners, with the agreement that six (6) feet of the said land be left over by each owner to permit Government to construct a road of twelve (12) feet wide?

2. Will the Minister therefore initiate immediate steps to have the road constructed in order that these peasants might be permitted to have the lorries drive up the said

road to load their canes and to ease the inconvenience which they are experiencing this reaping season?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the reply to the Parliamentary Question as asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, is as follows:-

"As this existing tract runs through a cultivated area and serves no house, it is not considered necessary to construct a road for the purpose. Government, however, has under consideration the cutting of an earthen "trace" to enable the small landowners to get out their canes."

Mr. BATSON: Again, Sir, I would like to thank the Hon. Minister of Agriculture for the attention which he has given to this question.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no doubt that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture gave attention to this question, but it is the Hon. Minister of Communications who has given the reply.

DISSATISFACTION OF WASHERS AT MENTAL HOSPITAL

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 45/1962, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph on 29th May, 1962.

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is it a fact that washers at the Mental Hospital wash and clean more than 500 pieces of clothing and linen during a single day?

2. Is it a fact that there is general dissatisfaction at the Mental Hospital over the washing, linen keeping, and clothes making?

3. Is it a fact that washers at that institution are complaining in this respect and their grievances are not being listened to?

4. Will Government investigate these complaints without delay?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The replies to those questions are as follows:-

The answer to No. 1, is "No". The average number of pieces of clothing and linen washed daily at the Institution is 400 and the washing is done by four laundresses with the assistance of about fourteen patients. All clothing is cleansed by boiling before being passed for laundering in the ordinary way.

2. The Government is not aware that there is a general dissatisfaction at the Mental Hospital over the washing, linen keeping and clothes making.

3. No complaints have been received from the washers at the Mental Hospital.

4. This does not arise.

Mr. SMITH: Supplementary to that question.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Actually, I am afraid that the time has expired for questions, but by the indulgence of the House, instead of allowing this question to stand over until the next meeting, I will allow the supplementaries to be put today. I take it that there will be no objection.

Mr. SMITH: Will the Hon. Minister consider the supplying of a washing machine at this institution?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will put a further supplementary to that. Will the Government not think it advisable to erect a boiler and a number of washing machines for the purpose of laundering the inmates' clothes at this institution? I think it is time that there should be a modern laundry there.

Mr. MILLER: Will the Hon. Minister of Social Services permit me to ask a supplementary question on these washing machines?

3.00 p.m.

I do not know that it would be advisable. I have seen so much against this since it is regarded as occupational therapy..... *(ASIDES)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed with his supplementary question.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. member that if he is asking a question I am quite willing to answer or to reply to his question; but I do not need any help from him.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand this. I can very well understand your embarrassment.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am surprised at the hon. member misunderstanding me.

Mr. MILLER: You could accept something before from a Minister, but the folly which has fallen from his lips.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that that is not a supplementary question.

Mr. MILLER: I want to ask a supplementary question. I suppose that you will agree.....

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the hon. member that he should just put his question with Parliamentary brevity and conciseness?

Mr. MILLER: That is the Queen's finest language. It is still of some concern to me to treat these things originating in the minds of the Ministers.....

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the supplementary question? I want to make sure that the Hon. Minister answers it.

Mr. MILLER: There are really two questions. I would like to know whether the Hon. Minister would be in agreement with a washing machine being installed at the institution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that that is quite clear to the Hon. Minister.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the questions asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. senior member for the City, I am saying that, at this stage, neither of our medical officers nor the Government deems fit to erect another boiler or have washing machines installed. You have got to find something to occupy the minds of the ill patients, and the washing which they do becomes a sort of occupational therapy for them. Therefore we do not consider it advisable at this stage to have the use of washing machines. The clothing is boiled and when it comes to these patients, one half of the work is already done. I do hope that that soothes the mind of the hon. junior member for St. George. When the hon. member got on his feet he did not ask any question. I got the impression that he was trying to answer the questions asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. senior member for the City.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is necessary to ask the question now. I am not in a mood.....

Mr. SPEAKER: At the moment I am in a mood only to hear supplementary questions.

Mr. MILLER: I am wondering if we should continue in that atmosphere: and as to the remarks of the Hon. Minister, I am not yet in a mood to engage him in a battle of words; but what originates with the hon. member?

Mr. SPEAKER: Only supplementary questions.

Mr. MILLER: This is a supplementary question. Any question which arises in the mind of an authority and is put into the hands of the Hon. Minister, can only be second hand.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that a supplementary question? I hope that the hon. member would accept my advice.

Mr. MILLER: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister in his reply states quite frankly that there is a boiler there already and that they have been advised that to instal what I consider washing machines together with boilers would prevent — he said the ill patients, but I would say the partly ill patients — from getting the chance of occupational therapy. The hon. member seems to say that the doctors have advised that if they were to instal washing machines, that would prevent these people from having the opportunity of occupational therapy. I should like to point out, however, that occupational therapy does not mean manual labour. After the clothing has been boiled, then there is the question of ironing and hanging them out. I gather from the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that there is the question of the amount of clothing which has to be handled.

I am asking the Hon. Minister this again. Would persons at that Institution be deprived of occupational therapy if you were to instal a boiler? When I refer to a boiler, I am referring to a steam boiler which would provide steam for the actual washing machine and then the patients would have the opportunity of occupational therapy.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is making a speech.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I apologise to Your Honour: but does the hon. member consider that where you have an institution with seven or eight hundred patients you should not allow the people to wash as many as 400 pieces of clothing per day?
3.10 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. senior member for the City will remember that I stated that it was not advisable at present. I think that answers the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any more questions?

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition: to resume debate on a Resolution *re* the Premier's Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals. At the time when the House was adjourned, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was speaking, and that was on the 3rd July of this year. Is it the wish of the hon. member to proceed now with this Item?

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I will begin by quoting part of the Speech of the Hon. Premier when he was presenting these Budget Proposals. It is as follows:-

"I now come to discipline. As I told members of my Cabinet an hour before the House began its sitting, you can now fasten your seat belts and prepare for take-off. I have considered various methods of raising the large amount of revenue required to meet the increased salaries and wages of Government employees and to pay debt charges on the loans which have to be raised to defray capital expenditure."

Now, Sir, I am not in agreement with any Premier allowing his Cabinet one hour to know his proposals. You may quote, Sir, that it is constitutional practice, but I do not feel it is fair to members of any Cabinet who are responsible for the Government. If the Hon. Premier makes a mistake, it means that all his Ministers are responsible, and if it should cause the Government to go down, all the Ministers will go down. The Premier, Sir, is only one man, and there may be things in the Budget Proposals which he had not seen which the members of his Cabinet would be able to show to him. I said some time ago that that attitude represents a small dictator, but in the case with the Budget Proposals where you are levying a tax on the people of the country, that is more than being a small dictator, because here you have one man having all the say; so now he is an overgrown dictator, and if things of this kind continue to exist with the Premier and his Cabinet, we might as well get ready to go to Cuba, because I do not feel one man should have all the say when there are others who are responsible for the Government. I do not know how they take it, but it is not fair to them when they are responsible for the make-up of the Government. When I go further into these proposals, I may be able to prove to you, Sir, where if the Premier had just taken a little time off to hear from the members of his Cabinet, certain things that have been done might not have been done.

Mr. Speaker, I say that because you have to be a rough person to be able to dabble in more than one thing. In other words, you have to be a person who knows more than one thing without reading it out of a book. It is not everything that you can get correctly at some time or other out of a book. For instance, you cannot read commonsense out of a book; you cannot be a real hard-headed businessman by reading books. You have to go into it for yourself and in some cases pay for it, because in order to learn you may throw away a lot of money before you find out you are doing the wrong kind of business. One man therefore should never be responsible for an entire Government, and especially in Budgetary Proposals when you are levying taxes on the people of the country to run the country.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I have listened to the hon. member for the last five or ten minutes, and I really did not intend to interrupt him, but he himself knows that much of what he is saying, to say nothing of all his deductions, is incorrect. What the hon. member is really trying to do is to throw some sprats to see if he can catch a whale; but he is not catching any whales today. He will not even catch a flying fish.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Mr. Speaker, if there are no whales today, I will not be able to catch one. The whale is absent; so I will not worry to throw a sprat; I will throw a fish to catch a fish. Now, Sir, the Hon. Premier said in his speech that there has been.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is referring to the Financial Statement.

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir, The Hon. Premier said: "There has been some complaint this year from the peasant agriculturalists that they are receiving smaller first payments on their canes although a larger sugar crop was expected." That is a fact, Sir. The peasants of this country are meeting it more than hard to get ends to meet so as to continue with the cultivation of their land. What has happened with the peasants is that they are called upon this year to pay an increased wage, and the wherewithal is not there at the same time. In other words, they have to pay more for labour, but have not received more for their canes. They are also meeting it very difficult to get their canes reaped at some times, because the plantations give a back-pay after the crop has ended, and the peasants are not in a position to pay back-pay on their canes; thus the workers prefer to work where they can receive back-pay like other people, and therefore dodge working for the peasants.
3.20 p.m.

One cannot be vexed with one for trying to get the most he can. For those peasants to get workers to help them reap their crops, they have to employ what can be considered as the softer worker and not the real hard-working-class people. They have to employ the sort of house servant, and as you know a house servant does not have to go out into the sun nor does she carry heavy loads; therefore,

when you get that type of worker employed in the reaping of the crop, that person does not carry as many canes nor does that person walk as fast as the ordinary working class people who work in the field. As a result, the peasants stand to lose.

You will notice on the Order Paper, Sir, I have a Resolution asking the Government to give assistance to such peasants by payments from the Price Stabilisation Fund.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has drawn this matter to the House and has called attention to the price which peasants get for their canes and the increase in the cost of handling, I think it is only proper that I should give him certain information relative to the price paid to peasants for their canes in order to set his mind at rest to some extent.

The hon. member has said that the price paid for peasants' canes is slightly less this year than last year. I want to give him the reasons why. The reasons why the price paid this year is slightly less than last year are due to two factors: one, the low factory recovery rate. In 1961, the rate was 8.6 while the weighted average for 1962 was 9.99 on the 3rd March 1962.

The fall in the average world price of free market sugar is also one of the factors. In 1961, the market price was $115.08 per ton; now this year it has dropped to $83 per ton. The increase in the negotiated price by $3.18 per ton is too slight to counter-balance the effect in the price by the fall in the world market price calculated to be $32.08 per ton. The larger the crop, the lower will be the average price paid for a ton of sugar.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regard that as a proper point of order made by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture because he directed the attention of the hon. member who was speaking to a point which he desired to bring to the notice of the House. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph may proceed.

Mr. SMITH: I can understand the Hon. Minister of Agriculture on that point, but that still does not solve the problem of the peasants. The point which I want to make is that it is impossible for peasants to get along with the reaping, cultivation and so on of their canes at a profit owing to the extra amount of money which they have to pay and which is more than what plantation owners pay. The owners of plantations pay so much per ton for cutting and so much per ton for heading; but a peasant regardless of whether he reaps a ton or not has to pay out money. There are people who work task work at the plantations: but peasants have to pay day's work instead. Therefore, when they pay $2.00 or $3.00 a day for heading canes, I am sure for that day's work the particular worker has not headed one ton of canes. That is the point which I want to make clear. It is no fault of the peasants; they have the canes and they have to get them reaped. As I have just said, the peasants are not in a position to pay backpay as the plantation owners, and the regular agricultural workers always say to the peasants: "We cannot work with you because we do not get any backpay when we work with you." They go off to the plantations and work where they can get backpay, and the poor peasants have to hire whoever they can get, and it may be sometimes $2.00 or up to $3.00 per day which they have to pay to that type of worker, and along with that they have to give them something else. According to the saying, they have to give them a "burn mouth" along with that.

As a result, the peasants find themselves paying out the same thing as they get at the factory and I feel the Government should go into the question and see to it that they help these peasants at a time like this with a little money from the Price Stabilisation Fund because that Fund is there to help them. I think this is the time when these peasants should be helped from that fund. Sir, that is what I am asking the Hon. Minister to go into. Instead of letting the money stay there while the peasants are suffering, give them some encouragement so as to carry on with the economy of the Island by helping them to work their land and get something from it. Definitely, peasants are losing money now owing to the set up and the price which they are getting for a ton of canes. The Price Stabilisation Fund is there and I am asking the Hon. Minister to help them from that Fund.

Now, Sir, I will carry on by reading another part of the speech as regards rum. The Premier states: "The excise duty on rum in Barbados is very low compared with that in other countries. It is $3.90 per proof wine gallon; and there has been no increase in this duty for ten years. There is also a "licence" duty of eight cents per proof wine gallon on all rum distilled in the island, whether it is exported or consumed in the island. The excise duty is, in effect, $3.98 per proof gallon or about $3.08 per liquid gallon which is under proof.

"The excise duty in Trinidad is $9.66 per proof imperial gallon equivalent to $8.05 per proof wine gallon. I do not propose to increase the local duty to that figure, but to put it at $7.32 plus the eight cents licence duty or $7.40 per proof wine gallon in all. This is equivalent to $5.74 a liquid gallon or an increase of about $2.65 per liquid gallon. This increase will take effect as from tomorrow, and, when existing stocks are exhausted, the price of rum may be increased by four cents a half gill or what we call a "shot", eight cents for a "bishop"."

3.30 p.m.

Now, Sir, the Hon. Premier has termed that as four cents per "shot"; but I am terming it as four cents per "shock" because it is shocking to increase the price of a half gill of rum by four cents. I feel that that is a little too high on the poor man's rum; I know it is too hard on the poor people's rum. I know that the tax will have to be collected, but there are other avenues or sources from which the Premier would be able to get his tax. I am sure that he will be able to make the increase per "shot" at least one cent or a penny. This is all because of his remarks that the price of rum has not been increased for ten years and the Premier has put on a ten year increase at one time. He has done that because in Trinidad the price is much dearer, and he feels that by putting it to four cents per "shot" he would not be doing the army of rum drinkers any harm.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order. The hon. member says that the price of rum has not been increased within ten years. That is not strictly correct. The price of rum has been increased within ten years; it was increased by one penny on one occasion. The hon. member is now insinuating that the price, which normally should have been put up within the last ten years, has now been put up at one time. Speaking from memory, I am saying that the price of rum has been increased on two occasions within the last ten years.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, this is what the Premier said in his speech:-

"The excise duty on rum in Barbados is very low compared with that in other countries. It is $3.90 per proof wine gallon; and there has been no increase in this duty for ten years."

That is what is set out in the Premier's speech. I believe the Premier has seen it because it was printed, and if he had not seen it, he would have said so. Whom are we to believe? The Premier or the Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member reading *verbatim* from the Premier's Financial Statement which was made in this House?

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir. This is the "Financial Statement and Budget proposals laid by the Hon. Premier on 26th June, 1962." I heard what the Hon. Premier said myself because I was in the House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order. The hon. member is not a new member of this House; he is one of the old members who survived the "broom" and the "sinking ship." He was a member of this Chamber in 1952 and

he knew that the former Premier of the West Indies imposed a duty on rum. There was an increase in the price of rum in 1952; there was another increase subsequently and they could not even find any use to which to put the money.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the Minister's point of order on this occasion?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: My point of order is that the hon. member was a sitting member from 1952 and he knows what the position is.

Mr. SPEAKER: I doubt whether that is a point of order. Let the hon. junior member for St. Joseph proceed.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Minister has made my point clearer; he has substantiated all that I have said. Do you think that if the Hon. Premier had taken up this matter with the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and told him that he was going to say that the price of rum had not been increased within the last ten years — do you think that the Hon. Minister would not have been able to bring the matter to the Premier's notice and such a mistake would not have been made? The Hon. Premier has made the island believe that he has everything around him by saying that one hour beforehand he would call upon the Cabinet to tighten their belts and get ready for the "take off".

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I will not sit here and allow the hon. member to be facetious. He said that the Premier should have notified the Ministers about the budget proposals. The hon. member knows as well as anyone else, that if the Premier intended to raise the price of rum or to increase the tax on motor cars, it would be unfair to tell hon. members because they have friends and the Premier would have to keep these things to himself. I am not saying that hon. members would let out secrets, but they are human beings.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member has made his point of order.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, if I were a member of that Party of which the hon. junior member for St. Thomas is a member, I would resign; he is telling the House that the Premier cannot trust his Ministers since they may have friends who will let out secrets. A remark like that could not be worse. Here you have a member of a Party telling the public that the Premier cannot trust his Ministers, because they may have friends whom they may tell about the increases. I am not a member of the Cabinet, but I am ashamed of what the hon. member has said. The Premier might have talked with the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, but the hon. member has no right to say what he has said. Anyhow, Sir, I will return to the point which I was making. The hon. senior member for Christ Church was in the House at the time when the Hon. Premier made these remarks. I will go back and say that if I were the hon. member, I would not defend this particular part of the Premier's speech. I am sure that if the hon. member had the chance of adding his quota in saying how to get taxation with this particular item, he would have said: "Well, let us go to something else."

3.40 p.m.

Nobody can lay blame to them for it, but they are still responsible for it as a collective body. I am saying that it is not fair to have increased half a gill of rum by four cents. I will say, Sir, that there are people in this country who do not drink half a gill of rum in a whole year, but these same people burn thousands of gallons of gasolene in a year. Now you are going to make me pay through my nose for my grogs because I like them and I drink them, but the other fellow who does not drink but burns a lot of gasolene can sit back tax free. As soon as I get a little further, Sir, I will be able to prove to you that if they had put one penny more on a gallon of gasolene, they would have been able to increase the rum by one cent. I do not know the figures, because I am not a Financial Secretary, but that is how I feel and I will say so all the time. The consumers of gasolene may not exceed fifty gallons per month — that is the ordinary type of man who has got to do travelling — and if you had put one penny per gallon on fifty gallons of gasolene per month, that would be $1.00 a month and $12.00 per year; but the poor rum drinker does not know how much is his increase because he does not put it down.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the Premier himself somewhere else in this City say that a man cannot drink a gallon of rum per month; he is making sport or does not know what he is saying. I thought he would have said that a man could not drink a gallon per week, because there are men who consume more than one gallon of rum per month, not because they are bad, but because it is a custom. There are some people who cannot partake of their meals as they should unless they "fire" one to sharpen the appetite. If they do not sharpen the appetite, they leave most of the food; so you cannot blame them for it. It is just like someone else who would take a tonic or a cigarette. I am sure that these people will never forget the Hon. Premier for hitting them so hard on that half a gill of rum. I challenge him to let all the people who drink rum vote for him, and let all those who burn gasolene vote for me, and I am sure to win.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph does not realise when the Government raises the tax on gasolene, whom they are raising it for. He must first understand that there are school children coming from St. Joseph who have already been taxed with a very heavy bus fare and are not able to pay it; so if you raise the tax on gasolene, you are bound to raise bus fares, and that is the reason why he would like gasolene raised.

(CHEERS FROM GALLERY)

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not hesitate to have these precincts cleared if there is any recurrence of that behaviour. Only members of this Chamber may speak or be heard during a Sitting.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I think when you get a chance — I know you are a very busy man — you should take the last speaker who has just sat down into your Chambers and teach him what is a point of order, because he really wants teaching what is the meaning of a point of order. He hears other members get up and say "on a point or order," and he has got up and said it. How on earth could what he has just said be a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not disagree with the hon. member that it was not a point of order. One does not know what an hon. member is going to say when he prefaces his statement by "a point of order". One has to hear what he has said, and as soon as he completes, then one realises that he has not made a point of order at all.

I would counsel hon. members to refer to their Standing Orders, and in particular to page 27, Standing Order No. 28 — Interruptions. I would ask hon. members also to co-operate with the Chair and bear in mind that Standing Order, which is more often than not flouted just through excitement, exuberance and the irresistible desire to rise. One has full opportunity to make one's own speech and contribution in one's time, and should note the difference between a point of order and making a speech, however short. Anyhow, a word to the wise is invariably sufficient. Let the hon. junior member for St. Joseph proceed.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that hon. member is not in the Chair.

Mr. SMITH: I am sorry, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I had an occasion to explain to the hon. member for St. John already to be careful with his speeches. Why should he jump up right away on to the buses and school children? It is because he runs a bus. As soon as he gets up and does that, he is thinking about himself.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, I would ask the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to ignore what was mentioned as a point of order, it not being a point of order, consider it

was never made, and resume his debate on the Premier's Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals.

Mr. SMITH: I will carry on, Sir. That could not cause bus fares to be increased. A gallon is eight pints; so it will be one penny on eight pints. How therefore are you going to work it out? I cannot work it out because I did not go too high in school. I dare suppose the hon. junior member for St. John would be able to work it out and tell us before I finish how much each child would have to pay by way of a fare. I burn gasolene too, but I cannot drink much alcohol owing to my complaint; yet I use both, and would be willing to pay for both.
3.50 p.m.

It is no use thinking of the children only and killing the people by way of too heavy a taxation. As regards the school children, the Hon. Minister of Education will soon tell you that they are well provided for, although I disagree with him.

Sir, I will just go back and say that we cannot follow other countries when it comes to taxation methods because you may find some countries which do not pay tax at all. We are bound to tax the people. Now, Sir, regardless of the price which Trinidadians are paying for their rum, we cannot say that the excise duty in Trinidad is $8.05 per proof wine gallon, and therefore if we make an increase of 100 percent, you still will only be paying $7.40. In other words, the Government should not look at it like that. I feel it is not fair. You are taxing the people in order to raise more revenue. I agree to that.

Now, Sir, this is another point. The Hon. Premier stated further:

"That is a considerable drop in the quantity of beer imported leading to a consequential loss in revenue which could be almost put at half million dollars. That is the price we have to pay and will continue to pay for the construction of one factory."

Now, Sir, they have increased the price of beer and taking it from what I read here, the amount of money which you have lost by the erection of a beer factory here, you are preparing to make it back from the same factory. Here it is, the same Government is telling you that you have to encourage local industry and you must do everything possible to help local industries so as to provide work for the people of this country. Just because you have lost revenue from the imported article, you go and pick this particular locally-made article and, I would say, have taxed it by too heavy an amount. You have lost a certain amount by allowing this factory to come in and you have to meet the same expenses of your budget. But what have you done? You have hit the local product so hard that it will not be able to compete with the imported product.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is misinforming the House. He said that the Government has hit the local product so hard that it cannot compete with the foreign product, even although the consumption tax which has been put on the local beer will be cheaper than the imported beer. That is not a fact.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I do not think the Hon. Minister will expect me to say here plainly what I mean. I will not do it. I will only say — and he will understand me — that the margin between the two is this: the imported fellow has the chance and will always have the chance. I will not go any further than that. The Hon. Minister should not try to make me say something which I should not say on the floor of this House. Mr. Speaker, you know, the Hon. Minister knows, and I know that with the margin between the two — the imported product and the local product — I am sure the local fellow will be underneath. I am not saying anything here because I am not a member of the Government, neither am I criticising or opposing for opposing's sake: I am here to talk facts even if they are only my facts. I am here to show the Government where they have erred and where they have made a mistake; and I am not only saying that they have made a mistake, but I am trying to point out to them where they have made a mistake: and so long as you have made a mistake, I think it is the duty of any of us to point it to the Government.

I am sure if the former Government was in power and they had brought in a budget taxation like this and had put on such a heavy levy on rum and beer, I know how the hon. junior member for St. Lucy would have got on. (A VOICE: Not like you, because you would have remained silent.) Well, I may have remained silent like you and some of the members over there. You ought to be ashamed to say so because you know better. I am sure if it were the former Government which had brought down budget proposals like this and with the same remarks as were made by the Hon. Premier, I would not want anybody to tell me how many hours some of the other hon. members on that side would be speaking. However, I do not have to do that. It could never be fair, and with these two commodities which I have just quoted it is not fair and the same thing is bound to happen.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, again, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is misinforming the House with the inference which he draws. The facts are that if you have two commodities which are differently priced and you lay on people a consumption tax, the differential remains the same. It is not true to say that the outside beer is competing against the one inside.

Mr. SMITH: I would be glad if the Hon. Minister would take me on as regards quality.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that there is no such thing in this debate for any distinguishing of beer to take place.

Mr. SMITH: Now, Sir, we go on to the next statement by the Hon. Premier. I quote: "There has been no increase on the duty of tobacco since 1952, ten years ago." Now, Sir, the Hon. Premier had assured me that the manufacturers or the merchants here cannot interfere with the price of cigarettes because the Government has put a tax on tobacco only. In other words, he means to say that the manufacturers would have to pay that increased tax. But, Sir, I want to know this and I am sorry that the Hon. Premier is not here. If you put on ten per cent surtax on tobacco which you say that the manufacturers will have to pay, when the manufacturers come to find out that they are losing money as a result of this surtax, what is going to happen? If they do not call for an increase on the price of cigarettes, it will mean a decrease in the income tax which they will be paying to you; so you will not be any wiser because if they cannot make the amount of money which they should be making on each dollar or a thousand dollars by the putting on of this extra ten per cent surtax and they cannot increase the price of cigarettes, what is going to happen is that the Government will still lose money because the Government will lose income tax from it.
4.00 p.m.

When the Hon. Premier tries to make out a case for the cigarette smokers, he is not making out one for his Government because he is bound to lose. There is where I say that if the Premier had taken up the matter with his Ministers, they would have been able to see these things. The Premier is a lawyer but he cannot see everything; when it comes to a point of law, he is there; but when it comes to business, he knows nothing about that. However, he has businessmen. The Good Book says that you should not muzzle the ox which treadeth out the corn. I am sure that he has businessmen who would be able to point out these things to him and he would not have any chance to say one word. You put the tax on the tobacco to save the cigarette smokers, but you will not get the tax. The people who are drinking rum will pay for it, and the Premier will pay for it too. Do not think that the people of this country will take this thing sitting down. They will be quite satisfied if everything was taxed to the hilt, but do not tax my rum and let go the other fellow's gasolene. Any sensible person can see that.

Mr. Speaker, I am still at page six of this Financial Statement and Budget proposals. This is what the Premier says:-

"Incidentally, the annual 'gun' licence is only five dollars. I propose that it be increased to $10 from 16th January, 1963." That is all right. It goes on to say this:-

"It is also intended that the penalty for having an unlicenced gun should be increased to $500."

Because I have broken the law, you are going to break my neck. *(Laughter)*. It is only because I may find myself with a gun which somebody has left on my premises — I may not have seen it — therefore I will be hurled before a Police Magistrate and fined $500. I will not go any further with that matter. The Premier goes on to say this:-

"The 'Orion' Commitee which recommended the tariff for the West Indies fixed the rates on "poultry, killed or dressed" at 10% preferential and 25% general, and on "Eggs in the Shell" and "Eggs not in the Shell, liquid, frozen or dried" at 10% preferential and 15% general. I propose that these rates be charged in Barbados as from tomorrow. In nine months — the additional revenue should be $68,620, and in a full year $91,493.

If I may just explain a point at this stage, Sir, you will notice that duties of this kind which we intend to increase are in directions where we feel there should be no imports of these commodities at all. We eventually expect to see that Barbados will not be importing any eggs, because here in Barbados we are producing all the eggs that we can consume; but there are certain sectors of the community — let me put it that way because you know what I mean — hotels and such like, that seem to think that an egg which is stale from outside is better than an egg which is fresh from Barbados. This is a viewpoint to which I do not subscribe at all, and therefore we are not increasing the cost to the consumer, because in any respect when we impose these duties, we are trying to stimulate local production."

I can see with the Premier in one way, but I disagree with him in another. He is trying to make the tax so prohibitive that the local eggs and poultry etc., will be able to find a good market. But the question is this: are we rearing sufficient poultry to cater to the needs of the entire island? You will have to make sure that the local rearers do not add their own tax, too. When people come to know that very little of these commodities is coming into the island, they may increase the price of their commodity. We have some things coming into this island called chicken backs, wings and necks, and does the Premier expect that by making an increase in the price of this particular item he will raise $91,000? But what is in a fowl's back? — Natural bone, not meat. And what are wings? — Nothing. And the neck bone? — Nothing. Let us remember that it is the poor people who buy these things; the other people will buy the legs. I repeat that it is the poor, small man who will have to buy his backs, wings and necks and let us remember that these things are all at one price. The backs are nothing at all. The small housewife will buy the chicken backs which she will put into the pot and she says that they will season the pot; they will cut off the rawness. They make the thing taste as if it is good fowl stew. My God, the hon. member has taxed them too! If these people were able to buy the legs, they would buy them too. Sometimes these things are very stale; sometimes they are so old that they will turn into all kinds of colours. They will call it fowl soup but, speaking for myself, I call it fowl bone soup.
4.10 p.m.

I call that fowl-bone soup, and that is being taxed so heavily as to bring in $91,493.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member saying that the tax on fowl backs is bringing in $91,000 odd? What I understood the Premier to have said in his Budget Speech was that there will be an increase in the tax on all poultry imported into the Island; not chicken backs. The hon. member is being unfair in his statement when he tries to give the House the impression that from the tax levied on chicken backs which the poor people will be using we are going to realise $91,000. This is a tax on all imported poultry which everybody will be using, not only the poor people, but people like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph himself.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order has been made. I would suggest in future that hon. members make their point of order and not preface it with a question. Certainly the Minister has made a point of order, but he started off with a question which made me doubtful whether he might not have been going astray so far as his having risen on a point of order. Let the hon. junior member for St. Joseph proceed.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I really have to smile at the Ministers on the other side who try to defend their Hon. Premier. The Hon. Minister is saying that this tax is on all poultry and not on backs and necks alone. What would you call the backs and necks? Would you call them "red herrings" or "sea eggs"? The people overseas separate the wings, backs, necks and legs of the chickens, and that is how they are sending them to this Island. That is what is happening, and the Hon. Premier does not know, just as you do not know.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the hon. member says "you do not know," is he addressing the Chair still as indeed he must be?

Mr. SMITH: You know everything in poultry, Sir, and I am sure that if you were in the Cabinet, you would have been able to put them right, particularly when it comes to poultry, because you know poultry when you see it; you are not like the others. I see, Sir, that the Hon. Minister does not want me to stress that anymore, and I will pass on. It seems I am hurting his corns, as he cannot sit quietly in his seat. I have not got to him yet, but I am going down the line. Although I agree with them in trying to protect local industry, I want them to be very careful, because they are protecting one side and not the other. Anyhow, if you take your eyes off the arrears here, it may be a possibility of their carrying up the price if we cannot get it coming really and truly as it was before; so you will have to keep your eyes on that. Still, you cannot get out of the fact that you have taxed these bones and necks too heavily.

I am here, Mr. Speaker, to represent the people and not myself. I am not looking for anything behind my name or any big post. All I am looking for now is the grave. When you see a poor man like myself trying to represent poor people, it is from the heart. I would like to do something good for them while I am representing them. I do not want to be a Prime Minister, Premier or Lord Gort; my portfolio is at the Fix-it-Right Garage. The people of St. Joseph sent me here and expect me to represent them, and I will do it in my humble way. I know that these people have got a hard blow and I am trying to see if I can hit the Government hard enough where they can feel, and get them to cut down the cost or take off a notch.

On page seven of the Financial Statement and Budget Proposals, the Hon. Premier said: "The package tax has been six pence since it was imposed in 1941. I propose that it should be raised to 25 cents with effect as from tomorrow. In the last nine months of the financial year this increase should yield $210,000 additional revenue; in a full year — $280,000."

Now, Sir, this package tas was not interfered with since 1941, twenty-one years ago, and now the Premier has seen fit to put on twenty-one years' increase on it. That means, Sir, more than 100% increase, because from twelve cents to 25 cents would be more than 100% increase. One may say that the increase is so small that you can spread it over and it would not increase the item by anything more, but I will deal with the Post Office. If you have a package coming through the Post Office as low as half an ounce, regardless of what it is, the package tax will be increased to 25 cents. The limit for a parcel is twenty-two pounds; so if you have an article weighing 24 pounds, you will have to divide the parcel into two, because it exceeds twenty-two pounds. Even if you have a parcel weighing 23 pounds, you would have to make two parcels, and you will have to pay two more increases.
4.20 p.m.

That will be two sets of increases; so this package tax is a heavy one; it is not as slight as they may say.

The hon. senior member for St. Philip is not in his place. He tried to tell me on the last occasion that condensed milk comes in packages of 288 tins. He must be the only person who can lift those packages up. That shows me that he does not know anything about it. Condensed milk comes in packages of 48 tins and that means thirteen cents extra package duty. Do not think that package tax is the only tax that item is carrying.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Again the hon. member is misinforming the House. It is true that a box or a carton of condensed milk numbers 48 tins, but for the purpose of Customs Regulations a package of milk is deemed to be 288 tins. That was pointed out two weeks ago by the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is saying the same thing. He is saying that a case of condensed milk contains 48 tins and that is a package. You do not put twelve packages together and call it one package. Each package is one package. The hon. member does not know anything about it either.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is true that I may not know anything about it, but I know a little more than he. I am not misleading the House but he is. For the purpose of Customs Regulations, 288 tins of condensed milk are accounted as a package. It is nothing to do with a carton of milk.

Mr. SMITH: For the purpose of Customs Regulations, 288 tins are called a package, but I know what I am saying. Let him have it that way. But I want him to tell me, if for Customs Regulations a parcel is half ounce or an ounce, whether they wait until that half ounce or ounce amounts to 100 ounces and then call it a package.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It may be half ounce of gold and the amount of twenty-five cents is not too much to pay for a half ounce of gold.

Mr. SMITH: That may be true. But you know that according to Customs Regulations, you have to declare what that package contains. Of course, the Minister may not have to make a declaration.

Now, Sir, anyhow as regards that package tax you must know how sweet it is that they expect it to bring in $288,000. You have these big increases on these things, but you have other things which you have not touched yet.

Now, the Hon. Premier states further:-

"The only other adjustment in taxation which I now propose is an increase of the Motor Vehicles Tax from 10% to 20% of the value of the motor vehicle. The additional revenue will be $159,000 in the remainder of the financial year and $212,000 in a full year. This will take effect as from tomorrow, as will all the other changes which I have mentioned (except that with respect to the gun licence)."

Now, Sir, as regards the Motor Vehicles Tax, I agree with the ten per cent which the Hon. Premier has put on, but, Sir, you have some people with motor cars in this island that if you stepped up on the tax on their cars you would be able to get in more money and they would not feel it. From my way of thinking, $4,000 should be the limit and then you should put on another 10% on these cars priced higher and thus leave out my neckbones and my fowl backs. (A VOICE: And then you will come in and say that we are discriminating.)

Tell me the ordinary type of person who has a car which is worth over $4,000? (A VOICE: All of those who get a lot of free money.) I do not know if it is the type of persons who get a lot of free money at the end of every school term, but I am saying that you should tax again the people who are buying cars for more than $4,000. As soon as a fellow goes and buys one for over $4,000, he is holding a piece of change. If I were able, I would buy one for that money. As soon as you go to buy one for that amount and over, you should help to keep your country. As soon as a fellow buys one for over $4,000, put on a berry on him, and as soon as you put on a berry there, take something off fowl backs. If I had the Government to run, that is how I would do it. I would try to help the ones who are not able.

Well, Sir, if they agree to look at it the other way, that is their business. Let us say then, instead of $4,000, it should be $5,000. You would know as soon as you go and buy one for that price you will have to pay more consumption tax. As a matter of fact, I have been just hearing from an hon. member who knows a lot about cars that the dearer the car, the more mileage you get to a gallon of gasolene; so it will pay to buy one of those cars.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is a convenient point to let the House know that it being after 4.30 o'clock, we now should proceed to Government Business.

RESOLUTION *re* WEST INDIES OLYMPIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. SPEAKER: The First Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: To move the passing of a Resolution to provide that the sum of $3,600 provided in the Estimates 1962-63, Part 1 — Current, under Head 47 — Subsidies and Grants, Item 53, West Indies Olympic Association, be used for the purpose of making a grant to the Barbados Olympic Association.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, in October, 1961, it was agreed by the then Government to contribute a sum of $7,200 to the West Indies Olympic Association for the purpose of assisting in sending a West Indies team of which Barbados would have a representative body to the Central American Caribbean Games.
4.30 p.m.

At that time it was agreed to send one half of this money, three thousand six hundred dollars, and it was provided in last year's Estimates for the West Indies Olympic Association because that requirement was made by that Association; the remaining $3,600 was left over and it was included in the current year's Estimates. When permission was granted to pay this money through the Jamaica Auditor General to the West Indies Olympic Association, the inevitable end of the West Indies Federation was envisaged and therefore there was no more West Indies Olympic Association. However, there was some uncertainty as to whether the games would be held or not and then the air was cleared. Up to that time, however, it was really my opinion that these games would still be taking place in Jamaica this year, but the $3,600 provided in last year's Estimates lapsed by the 31st March this year.

Although this money was provided for making a contribution to the West Indies Olympic Association for the games to be held in Jamaica, it was really voted for the specific purpose of sending a representative or to assist in sending a representative team from Barbados. It is true that now that the West Indies Olympic Association no longer exists, the money will not be sent to the West Indies Olympic Association; but here in Barbados we have the Barbados Olympic Committee. This Committee has made representation to the Government for assistance and the Government has decided that the remainder of the money which did not lapse, that is, the $3,600 provided in this year's Estimates for the assistance of the team to attend the Olympic Games in Jamaica — the Government decided that this amount should be contributed to the Barbados Olympic Association on a dollar for dollar basis, this amount not exceeding $3,600.

This Resolution which is now before us just seeks to transfer the $3,600 which was voted for contribution to the West Indies Olympic Association to the Barbados Olympic Committee for the purpose of assisting in sending a contingent to the games.

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that there is no Barbados Olympic Committee; it is now the Barbados Olympic Association.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, at the time when the representation reached the Ministry of Social

Services, I think it was the Barbados Olympic Committee. That was the name with which we were dealing. However, I am grateful to the hon. junior member for the City who has pointed out that the name has been changed from the Barbados Olympic Committee to the Barbados Olympic Association. It is really one and the same body. Without any further ado, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I was at pains to listen to the Hon. Minister. I remember for the last five or six years what a struggle it was in Parliament to get money for sports or for the assistance of sports. You will remember that we discussed this matter and it took a long time to be dealt with. I remember that we had discussions in Barbados with the world famous Herbert Mc.Donald who was organizing these games in Jamaica. I have listened to the Hon. Minister carefully because I had much to do with these matters. As you will remember, the Federation was changed; Jamaica left us and it could not be fair to refer to Jamaica as a part of the organization. By Resolution No. 84/61 we passed the sum of $3,600. What I am unhappy about is that this is a matter which leaves me in doubt. We have an Olympic Association and I know what it is to collect funds. To suggest that you can pass this Resolution to make this money available with a view to sending a team to the Central American and Caribbean Games, you know, Mr. Minister, that that is not true.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member continue to address the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: I am sorry, Sir; I intended addressing my remarks to you. I believe that the Hon. Minister has had something to do with sport even if it is only from the pavilion. I am sure that the Hon. Minister will find out that for an Olympic Association to raise money on a dollar for dollar basis, that money will never be found. The Minister will only find that this money will again lapse in the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I can say that I have spent quite a lot of time in a year driving as many as 100 miles a week in trying to collect a thousand dollars so as to send a weightlifter to the Olympic Games.
4.40 p.m.

For him to ask the Barbados Olympic Association to find $3,600 to match the Government grant of $3,600 is purely farcical. This is bound to lapse in the Treasury. I would like the member who has had a lot to do with this Olympic Organization to tell us today if it is true that they requested the money on this condition, that is, on the dollar for dollar basis. If you were doing anything, you are foiling the hopes of the athletes of this Island that this contribution of $3,600 meant something to the team going to the Olympics because there is no organization of this kind that is known as the Olympic Organization that could find $3,600 on a dollar for dollar basis. The Rifle Association, where you have attached to it all the wealth of this country, must come to you every year when it comes to the question of going overseas, because sport is not supported here as in other territories. I am advancing this, because I know how vital and important sport is in this territory; but for the Minister to tell us that this money will be given on a dollar for dollar basis, I would have to ask the representative of the Olympic Association in here to say whether they requested this money from Government on that basis, because I know they cannot find $3,600, and that means they will not be able to avail themselves of the use of the $3,600 we are voting in this Resolution; and it further means that no team would leave from Barbados. There are hundreds of boys and girls hoping to have a chance to attend these Olympic Games.

Mr. Speaker, that is how it is done in other countries, and that is what it means to England, to the United States of America and more recently to Russia who is going to take all the tops all over the world, because they are now spending money sending people overseas. We can ill afford to deny Barbados an opportunity to come into the white light of publicity if sport is a means of bringing the masses together. I appeal to the Hon. Minister to check this, and see if it is possible to defer a decision on this and get a further Cabinet decision on this money by making an outright grant to the Association; otherwise you are going to further hurt sport. It is all right to have an Association and see it function. I am warning the Minister that if this is in his innocence — and I would hate to think it is otherwise — and if this Resolution is passed today, and no doubt it will, it will mean exactly nothing to the Association, because they would be unable to find the money to match the $3,600 made available in this Resolution. I would like to hear something on it because I cannot understand that the Olympic Association would appeal to Government for a grant to send a team overseas to the Ninth Central American and Caribbean Games on these conditions. This is a tip-top opportunity for our men. Look what has happened! We have had a "Mr. London", something you would never have believed in Barbados, in a Body Beautiful contest in the United Kingdom, a chap who would never have had an opportunity to put on a pair of boots. In the United States we have had a top boy in the Olympics; we got a Gold Medal and a Bronze Medal, and the money for this was collected from variety concerts, dances and shows and in the streets, and we asked the Government seven years ago for the first grant of money.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to miss an opportunity like this with a tiny sum of $3,600. I should like to hear something more on this and to be told whether this money will be made available to this organization as an outright gift or grant, or whether it will lapse in the Treasury and the community would be so much poorer off.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might be able to throw a little light on this matter as I have had something to do with it. We of the Barbados Olympic Association, of which I have the honour to be President, were hoping that the present Government would not take shelter behind a technicality because $3,600 of the $7,200 originally voted by the previous Government had lapsed, because, believe me, Mr. Speaker, every cent of that money would be needed to send any kind of effective team from Barbados to Jamaica. I am almost sure that the Secretary could not have been so misguided as to ask for a grant on a dollar for dollar basis, because that would have been most unwise on his part. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether, as a member of many organizations, you have collected money in Bridgetown. If you have, you would be only too well aware of the point we are trying to make. What we were asking for was an outright grant.

I may mention in passing, not that I am taking this for the purpose of comparison because comparisons are always odious, that the Government of Trinidad has given $30,000 to the Trinidad team to the same games. I would never suggest that this Government could do the same, but certainly, Mr. Speaker, they can do a great deal better than giving this $3,600 which was given by the previous Government. This Government in power having captured the imagination of the young people of the colony, we were hoping that they would try to live up to what was expected of them by the young people by giving some worthwhile contribution which would help these young people to carry out their hopes and aspirations in the athletic field, and I use the word "athletic" in its wider connotation. These are the various Associations which hope to be represented in Jamaica; athletics, basketball, shooting, lawn tennis, swimming, water polo, boxing, weight lifting and cycling. We are making no plea for any particular organization; we are asking for an outright grant to cover all of these sports which are being indulged in by the young people of the colony. We are making an appeal to the Minister — we are not quarrelling with him — that a further Resolution be brought in for $3,600 — it can be done next Tuesday — as the amount of money which had lapsed, and that the Government does not shelter behind this technicality. The Government should not dodge behind a dateline when so many young people are looking forward to be able to make this trip and to place Barbados on the map in so many different sports.

It will be known to you, Mr. Speaker, that even in West Africa who are very single-minded in so far as their economic advancement is concerned, they are paying tribute to sport. A few days ago at the White City in London, on Saturday afternoon to be exact, one Seraphino Antao from Kenya beat the best athlete that Great Britain could produce. That news went around the world a few minutes after it happened, and it must have meant a lot to the people in Kenya. Think what it would be like if one of these young sportsmen whom we are sending to Jamaica should succeed in gaining a Bronze, Silver or even a Gold Medal. I am told, Mr. Speaker, that there is more than one member of the contingent capable of so doing in comparison with the efforts of other athletes from other countries. There are eighteen countries being represented at these games. Some are sending contingents of over 300 to show how important this is considered. It might be well for the Minister to know that the team from Cuba is at the moment being trained in Soviet Russia, so important they consider a victory at these games. Mexico is sending a team of over 300. Jamaica itself got down a coach from Brazil to coach their team in football.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of national prestige is bound up in games of this sort. As I said, Mr. Speaker, even West Africa which is so singleminded in its advance realises that there is no point in having economic or constitutional advancement unless the people who are going to enjoy the benefits have healthy bodies. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to implore the Government, not on my own behalf, but on behalf of the young people of this colony who would be represented by the members of this contingent, to think a second time and see whether they cannot bring forward another Resolution on Tuesday next with a further contribution from this Government to add to the $3,600 which did not lapse from the last Government.
4.50 p.m.

I say that because in truth and in fact no contribution has been made by this Government which is in power. I would like that to be clearly pointed out. All that they are doing is permitting us to spend $3,600 which did not lapse from the last Government's account. There will be no precedent created if money is given to young people to represent us at these games. In 1956, money was voted to send an athlete to Finland. In 1959, the hon. junior member for St. George, who was then a Minister of the Government gave us some money to go to Chicago in which games one of our weightlifters brought back a Bronze Medal. They also voted some money to send a West Indian team to the Olympics in Rome in 1960 and so, Mr. Speaker, there will be no precedent established if this Government were to find it possible to vote some money to send this team of 40-odd athletes to Jamaica.

We had hoped to raise this money by public subscription, but several eventualities, perhaps unlooked for, have hampered us in our efforts. Last year was a very bad year in Bridgetown, and many of the more generous merchants did not find it possible to give the contribution which was expected from them. We have tried to help ourselves by various forms of entertainments and some have been rained out. Who are we then to look to? When I say we, I refer to the young people of the colony. The example of their brethren in Trinidad who have given $30,000 for a similar purpose must appear before their eyes. Then they have the example of the Government of Jamaica which has voted $7 1/2 million to build a stadium, sensible to the necessity for people to have healthy minds and healthy bodies. I am not advocating that this Government should give $7 1/2 million; I am asking that they give a contribution of the $3,600 which lapsed. It is not dignified of this Government and it is not expected that they would shelter behind a technicality and therefore prevent so many young people from realising their hopes and aspirations. Charity begins at home.

They say that $3,600 was sent to the Jamaica Auditor General. That was not sent to pay the Barbados team there. It is clear what we are asking is that a contribution be given to the Barbados Olympic Association over and above the Government allowing us to have this $3,600, which contribution would meet, by half, the expenses which are necessary to send the team.

Some hon. member has asked for a breakdown. The reduced passages are at $210 return per man. Then, uniforms will cost $54 each. It is essential that the team appears in uniform. You cannot have the Barbadian team travelling on the field to be laughed at and derided by the thousands of spectators there. They all should wear the same blazers, trousers, the same insignia on their blazers and so on. I think every member would agree with that.

What has happened, Mr. Speaker, which has caused us a certain amount of dismay and which made one of the more viable associations with which you are not entirely unconnected withdraw was the announcement that each member of the team would have to pay board and lodging while in Jamaica at the rate of $7.20 a day. For fifteen days, that is a sizeable sum, and so the Barbados Amateur Football Association which we had hoped would have provided the money which would make the dollar for dollar allocation a tenable one withdrew: and by their withdrawing all the other associations which are comparatively impecunious associations were not able to meet this dollar for dollar allocation. We have to depend on this Government and a few private subscribers like Your Honour to contribute this money which will make it possible for the sending of this team abroad.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I was a bit taken back when I sat and listened to the hon. junior member for the City, when he referred to the meagre contribution of $3,600. Here on my file I have a letter written on 28th March, 1962 by the same hon. member who was then Secretary of the Association and this is what was stated in that letter:- - I will only read a part of it.

"Dear Sir,

In the Revised Estimates for 1961-62, the sum of $3,600 has been allocated to assist the West Indies Olympic Association in its promotion of sport in the Caribbean Area.

Inasmuch as this organization has now been dissolved, my Committee has instructed me to make respectful application that this vote be transferred for the use of the Barbados Olympic Committee which is in dire need of financial assistance if it is properly to fulfil its function."

On 29th May, when the Barbados Olympic Committee had changed its name to the Barbados Olympic Association another letter was received by my Ministry from the Secretary. As a matter of fact, at this time, Mr. Speaker, the present Secretary was not the Secretary on the 28th March, which was the hon. junior member for the City. There had been a change in the person. We received a letter from the Secretary of the Barbados Olympic Association stating that it would take them a matter of $9,600 which is comprised of $8,400 for passages and $510 for affiliation fees for the sending of a contingent to the Olympic games and the Secretary asked in this letter to subsidise the sending of this contingent to the Central American Caribbean Games in Jamaica.
5.00 p.m.

He asked for a subsidy. Taking the letter which was sent by the hon. junior member for the City, he asked for the sum of $3,600. The Barbados Olympic Association....

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of order. This $3,600 of which the hon. Minister is speaking, would have gone a-begging after the end of March. There was no such organization in existence as the Olympic Association so that rather than have this money going a-begging, we begged for it in order to help sport in the territory; otherwise it would have lapsed. At that time I happened to be the Secretary of the Committee but I am now President of the Association; hence the change in nomenclature. The Committee was granted Association status.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, what was asked for by the Association was a subsidy. The Government was asked to subsidise the sending of a team to the South American Games, which would cost them

$9,600. I know something about this matter; it is true that after this Resolution was before the Cabinet, or after the Cabinet prepared for this money, we heard that the contingent would have to find their own board and lodging and so on. I had sympathy for them to the extent that even when the members of the team were to have anti-yellow fever vaccinations, I gave instructions to waive the fee for them. I want hon. members to know that I pay just as much interest to sport as, or more than, any other person in this island. I would do anything to permit a Barbadian campaign in the field of sport anywhere at all. What I can promise hon. members is that I will see what more I can get for the Barbados Olympic Association, but I cannot guarantee that I can get more. However, I will try.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am in trouble to understand the Minister. He is saying that they have sympathy for this Association; he was requested to give a subsidy and they are attaching ties and conditions to it. You have this suggestion of a dollar for dollar basis. I cannot understand that at all. The President has said that this money would have lapsed last March and now you have a request for a subsidy. You can request 20% of whatever you like; you may find that you need $9,000 in order to carry the team, but this is not the case with the Resolution as it stands now. The Hon. Minister says that he cannot promise he will get anything more.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member has completely missed the point I was trying to make. The point which I was trying to make is that the Secretary of the Barbados Olympic Association, at the time when he made application for a subsidy, stated that the amount of money required to send a team to Jamaica was $9,600. I know that some of the Associations were contributing to send representatives to the same games; I took into consideration the fact that the hon. junior member for the City has asked for the sum of $3,600 for the purpose of assisting in sending this team to Jamaica because he spoke with me before he decided to deal with this matter.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order. What point is the hon. member making? He said that the Committee asked for a subsidy. The first $3,600 was requested by the President of the Association in order to save that money from lapsing, but it does not mean that they will be collecting $7,200. The organization could decide to send a team for $40,000, but all they will find is that they would be in trouble to find money to send the team. The organization will have to satisfy the Treasury that they have $3,600.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Is that a point of order?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, will you ask that stupid man to sit down? Is he going to tell me when I am on a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot refer to the Hon. Minister as a stupid man. The point of order was made and, I believe, fully complemented.

Mr. MILLER: If you think that the point of order has been made, then you draw my attention to it and I will sit down; but we will not have two Speakers.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Only a swollen headed idiot....

Mr. SPEAKER: To whom the Hon. Minister could not be referring in Parliament.....

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order. Ask the Hon. Minister to sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Automatically one takes his seat when a point of order is being made in Parliament.

Mr. MILLER: What is happening, Mr. Speaker? His head cannot be swollen; his head has a flat top. His head had to be flat because when he was a boy he carried bread fruits on it to Fruitful Hill. We can understand an idiot.

5.10 p.m.

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

Mr. MILLER: If you tell me it is not, I will accept that. I do not know what he could be referring to when he talks about being swollen headed. One could hardly imagine.....

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, you can see an example of ignorance personified.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us proceed with the Resolution; it would help a lot.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I was saying that the hon. junior member for St. George did not permit me to make the point I was making which he missed as though he were missing a bus or a car going to St. George. If he would listen, he would really see the point I was trying to make. The point I was trying to make is that the hon. junior member for the City.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I will draw to the attention of hon. members on my left Standing Order No. 29 — Behaviour of Members not Speaking. While they are studying or restudying that Standing Order, let the Hon. Minister proceed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am one of the members on your left. I have been keeping very quiet, and I do not know why you should draw attention to that Rule because I see a lot of bad behaviour going on, and if I have to get into it, there will be real trouble. I do not want to be rude at all, but you have drawn attention to a Rule, and I do not know why you should draw it to the attention of hon. members over here, because it may appear to the public that the Opposition is behaving badly.

Mr. SPEAKER: I never said all members or individual members. It was only on my left that, at the particular moment when I spoke, Standing Order No. 29 was being contravened.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, we can always excuse the hon. junior member for St. George, because if you dress up a pig in a suit of white, he would still jump in the mud and dirty it up.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, you have heard the remarks of the hon. member. The man is utterly incompetent. There was a grave mistake when he was sent to the Ministry, and thinking people in this country and the *hoi polloi* in the streets know this. He was not two months in the Ministry before he had fallen from grace, and he is talking about somebody's ignorance.

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not constitute a point of order. May I appeal to hon. members to let this discussion proceed in a proper parliamentary atmosphere and not let hon. members shout across or swing remarks unparliamentary, unproper or unkind, or ungentlemanly words at each other? It does not help the debate, nor does it in any way tend to assist us in doing the business of this Chamber. I appeal to all hon. members to see that the Standing Orders are observed. Now on my right, I would draw to the attention of hon. members — I do not say all — Standing Order No. 29 — Behaviour of Members not Speaking.

I will ask the Hon. Minister to resume, and I will ask him to confine himself to the subject matter, the meat and the pith of the Resolution.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I will resume, Mr. Speaker, but I still maintain that if you dress a pig in a suit of white, he will go into the mud, with all due respect to the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the point of order in reference to? Because a vague remark was made?

Mr. MILLER: You said, Sir, that you wanted to have gentlemanlike behaviour in this Chamber, and you only

looked in the direction of the Opposition. Who would know more about pigs than the hon. member, when he was like a parasite on a pig? The man is stupid enough and does not know what he is handling.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, and reference may not be made to an hon. member by the use of the word "man". Please let us maintain order and decorum and the highest level of parliamentary debate. I will not hesitate to suspend this Sitting if that behaviour goes any further.

Mr. MILLER: I am sure I should not have to interrupt the House on this, but the Minister must come to the realisation that we of the Opposition are at least entitled to examine what is going on in Parliament. For him to attempt to make stupid statements shows that the man is an utter failure. Is that unparliamentary? You refer to the woman, the mother of Jesus. You never called her a lady. Is there anything in calling him a man? Is there a denial of masculinity?

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. Members know that under the Rules of this House, reference may only be made to each other as hon. members.

Mr. MILLER: All I want to say, Sir, is that it is unfortunate, because this was prepared for him by his Permanent Secretary, and now the Minister is unable to present it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now making a speech. I take it his point of order is made.

Mr. MILLER: It depends on which point.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder if the hon. junior member for St. George is aware of which point, or whether there is any point of order.

Mr. MILLER: At least a point was made, but I have the right to get up again.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will appeal to the Hon. Minister to let us proceed and let the Minister continue to set the high example he has always set in expounding the matter which is before us.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, in the second letter which was sent by the Secretary of the Barbados Olympic Association, it was stated that they wanted to raise the sum of $9,600. When the Barbados Olympic Association was a Committee, the then Secretary made a request that the $3,600 provided in this year's Estimates be given to the Barbados Olympic Committee — at that time for the purpose of assisting in sending this team. In both the first and second letters, we were told that they needed a subsidy. We happened to know that there were certain sports organisations in Barbados that were contributing to sending a team. For example, I happened to know that the Barbados Amateur Basketball Association was contributing or had planned to contribute a reasonable sum to send a team to Jamaica.
5.20 p.m.

As I have said before, it was only after the Cabinet paper was prepared.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the Hon. Minister also knows that the money which the Barbados Basketball Association of which I also happen to be President loaned to the Y.M.C.A. was loaned especially for the purpose of building their stadium. Otherwise hon. members will feel that this money is available to the Basketball Association and they are not using it.

I also would like to point out on a point of order, that at the time the £2,000 was needed, we were not told then that each and every member of the contingent would have to pay $7.20 for board and lodging for fifteen days which would come to $108 for each of the 40 odd people that we are sending. That is the reason for the increase of $4,000 odd in our request.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: That is the point which I was trying to make. I said that after this Cabinet paper was prepared, we understood that it was necessary for the association to raise more money because they would have to pay for the board and lodging of the members of their team. The Cabinet paper was already before the Cabinet. On the question of the Basketball Association, I would just like to point out that I understood from sources very close to the Association of which I happen to be a member that setting aside the money which they had loaned to the Y.M.C.A., there would still be money left and, secondly, there was the possibility of having some of the money refunded by the Y.M.C.A.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am still awaiting to hear the point made by the Hon. Minister as he promised.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not understand the reason why the hon. junior member for St. George has just arisen.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am not afraid of him.

Mr. MILLER: So long as he is not afraid, but has respect for the Chair.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. junior member for St. George referred to the fact that my Permanent Secretary and Assistant Secretary prepared this for me. This is not the hon. junior member for St. George sitting in the chair or in the Ministry of Social Services. The present Minister of Social Services does not have to depend on them to prepare everything for him, as was the case in the past. The hon. junior member for St. George is speaking from experience.

Sir, I was saying when we decided on this figure of $3,600, we decided on it in the light that they wanted to raise $9,600 and secondly, in the light that some of the organizations at the time, which were the B.A.F.A. and various other organisations, were supposed to contribute money to this fund; therefore, we said that we would agree to contributing $3,600 on a dollar for dollar basis. We decided on that because we knew that other organizations were contributing also.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have been waiting all along for this point. If we are interested in sport, you would not make a speech like this at all. The least the Hon. Minister could tell us is that the Basketball Association in order to assist the Y.M.C.A. had to cringe the last dollar to loan the Y.M.C.A. He is going to come in here, this feeble-minded simpleton and talk about somebody reading something as prepared by a Permanent Secretary.

Hon. A.DaC. EDWARDS: What has the hon. member risen on?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister was making his final speech on the resolution. The hon. junior member for St. George could have only risen on a point of order.

Mr. MILLER: I rise on a point of order. I am yet to understand. The Hon. Minister said that he wanted to listen to the particular point. I did not interrupt him. The fact remains that this Association would be denied this money. It is not a question of whether the Permanent Secretary prepared this for him. It was back in 1961 that we agreed to the sum of $7,200 for the purpose of sending a Barbados team to represent the West Indies in the Central American Caribbean Games and in that year, half of the amount was voted. The second half was put in the Estimates of this financial year. The amount which was voted has lapsed. All that I am saying is that the Association up to now has not got anything but hollow, empty promises.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. George has directed our attention to the point which he made with the hope that the Hon. Minister will direct his attention towards it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I said that the hon. junior member for St. George missed the point which I made. I

cannot cut open the skull of anybody and give him understanding.

Mr. MILLER: Let the fool make his point.

Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the Hon. Minister ended his speech?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: No, Sir.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking on a point of order; I am asking leave, Your Honour, to make my contribution on the Resolution as I was not in the Chamber before now. I know that it is against the Rules of the House that a member should speak after a Minister has replied and I say so because I take it that the speech by the Hon. Minister which I have listened to was one in reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister was making his reply. As I have it here, after the Hon. Minister introduced the resolution, the hon. junior member for St. Michael seconded the motion, then the hon. junior member for St. George spoke followed by the hon. junior member for the City and the hon. junior member for St. Andrew was making his reply.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Therefore, I have no right to speak on the motion unless with the indulgence of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House will determine that as soon as the Hon. Minister has completed his reply.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Personally, I got the impression that the Hon. Minister had finished making his reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry; I did not get that impression.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to allay the fear of any hon. member who seems to think that the efforts made by the Barbados Olympic Association to raise enough money to send part of the contingent to the C. A. C. games in Jamaica were in vain. I would like to inform the hon. junior member for the City that inasmuch as this Cabinet Paper was prepared before he had received information from Jamaica that the team would have to look after their own board and lodging, I will raise the matter again with the Cabinet and see what further contribution can be made to the Barbados Olympic Association.
5.30 p.m.

This Resolution seeks to transfer a vote that was already made for one purpose to another purpose, or to transfer the vote from one Association to another. That is the purpose of this Resolution – to transfer the vote from the West Indies Association to the Barbados Olympic Association. I will promise the hon. junior member for the City to go into the matter further and see whether anything more can be done for the Barbados Olympic Association in the light of the fact that the expenses of the Association to send a team to the Central American and Caribbean Games will be greater.

Mr. LYNCH: I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister that when the first letter was received, no mention was made about sending a contingent to these Games. We asked for a transfer of this vote for the furtherance of sport. We are now asking that we be given a transfer, just as was done by the Government of Trinidad, to assist in sending the team to the Ninth Central American and Caribbean Games. I thank the hon. member, if I may at this stage, for the promise which he has made and hope that it will be carried out expeditiously, so much so that the matter will be before us on Tuesday next.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was above a point of order. However, it was brief, the language was parliamentary and therefore I allowed it.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, you will find me brief at all times.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister has already completed his second speech.

Mr. MILLER: I thank you, but I rose immediately after the hon. junior member for the City took his seat. I did not know that the Hon. Minister had finished his speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: An intimation has been given to this House by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who was absent – unavoidably, I take it – earlier this afternoon, that he would crave the indulgence of the House to be allowed to speak after the Hon. Minister has made his second speech. If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would formally ask for leave to speak at this stage, I will put the matter to the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to make my little contribution to the debate on this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member could not possibly have been present earlier. The hon. member is asking leave to speak on this Resolution at this stage. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the hon. member. *(After a pause.)* There being apparently no objection, leave is granted the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, nothing that I could say could add to the decision of the Government in this matter, because the Minister in charge has already intimated that he will do his best to see what he can get his Cabinet to do by way of increasing this grant. In supporting the remarks of my colleague, the hon. junior member for the City, I would like to say that it is universally known that Barbados is not very generous in making contributions to sport of this nature. I do not take back one single word of that; Barbadians are more generous in making contributions in matters of health but not so much in respect of sport. I hope that what I say will not cause any offence to the Hon. Minister. Some people think that I am apologetic, but I am as apologetic and peaceful or as hard as anybody else when I want to be. If you take into consideration that the Association will try to raise this money, and the Association, through its President and member of this House, has made its position clear that it will be a decision for them to send this team, I am just supporting my colleague and making this approach.

In doing so, however, I would counsel the Hon. Minister of Social Services not to be afraid of his age. You will appreciate that it is not a matter of criticism. You are still 5,000% better than any of them who came in here at your age. Let the hon. member not be bullied or be afraid. Instead of talking about a pig in a white suit, talk about a purse in an old sow's ear. *(ASIDES)* Use the right language, and get up with your boxing gloves on. I believe that the Minister of Social Services has had to do with sport in schools and with children from all walks of life. The 41 people whom you will send to Jamaica... *(ASIDES)* Do you want me to swear to anything that I cannot prove?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has only got permission to speak on this Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I can stand asides from all hon. members and I can reply to all of them at the same time too. I said that Barbadians are not very generous when it comes to making contributions to sport, and I would appeal to the Hon. Minister of Social Services to try and convince his Cabinet to make this contribution and to make it as expeditiously as possible, because it is necessary to have this contribution.
5.40 p.m.

It is necessary to have this $3,600 which would come from what was promised by the last Government, and the hon. member made it quite clear that only now they have come to find out what it would cost to keep these people in Jamaica. I am absolutely sure that the Minister will do his best to help this Association. I am not only thinking now of the Minister of Social Services, but of the Minister of Edu-

cation. Think what it would mean to the thousands of children coming out of school. I would bet that not five of the forty-one people whom you are sending out of Barbados can pay one week's board and lodging in Jamaica. You have accepted children coming from slum areas, and if they can become athletes, you should help in sending them. Trinidad has given $30,000.

You will remember, Sir, when Schmeling won the fight from Joe Louis, what national pride the Germans had in Schmeling. That is why I associate myself with the hon. junior member for the City in asking the Minister to convince his Cabinet. I realise that the Minister cannot himself say that he will bring it down, but I believe he is conscientious when he says he will impress his Cabinet to do something further. My remarks are not directed to the Minister of Social Services alone, but to the Minister of Education as well in this matter, and the Minister of Education should back up the Minister of Social Services in a matter of this kind, because children are drawn from all these schools, and they are young people who could not afford to pay their way in Jamaica. I myself know that two underprivileged girls are being selected to go. They are taking people from the slum areas in this Island who cannot afford to pay, but I know it would mean a lot to Barbados if we send this team. We have frittered away money in things of lesser importance than this, and I think that the Minister of Education must know that human beings are entitled to a certain amount of play and healthy sport. I am therefore appealing to him not to see it as $3,600 as a gift, but as $7,200 which we would be contributing out of the $15,000 to send these forty-one people to Jamaica.

After all, Mr. Speaker, we should not let it be said as some West Indian Islands have said, that Barbados is the cess-pool of the West Indies. Do not let it be said that we do not want to encourage athletes. I am therefore appealing to the Government - and I have no reason to doubt that the Minister of Social Services will do his best, and knowing the Minister of Education as I do, I believe he will realise that this is a part of the education of this colony to encourage athletes from these schools by sending them to Jamaica to take part in these games which would create some sort of national pride.

That is the contribution which I want to make, Mr. Speaker. (Mr. MILLER: You are making a milk-and-water half-baked speech.) Now I want to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that if you sit in that Chair and listen to the hon. junior member for St. George making a lot of nasty, stinking, worthless, depraved remarks, and I am not taking back one word, you will have to adjourn the House now. I am prepared to say that you have been allowing the hon. member all afternoon to persist in that behaviour in reply to the Minister of Social Services. If I have heard the remarks, you have heard them too, but you are allowing him to use nasty, stinking, depraved remarks....

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: As there is disorder in the House, I suspend this sitting for thirty minutes.
5.45 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the hon. senior member for the City, the Leader of the Opposition, was addressing the Chair. He may continue.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, before I proceed, I should like to take this opportunity to apologise to you for any loss of temper which might have occurred during the debate just before the sitting was suspended, and I hope you will accept it in good faith.

I was suggesting at the time, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Education should give full support to a matter of this sort in Cabinet, because it was a matter of the young people of this country finding an outlet by indulging in such healthy sports as Olympic Games. As I said, the majority of these people were taken from a walk in life which could ill afford to pay what my colleague, the hon. junior member for the City, and the now President of the Barbados Olympic Association, said it was drawn to his attention they will have to pay. I make my appeal also because it is a matter of coming here for this $3,600 which lapsed with the last Government and I support the contention of those who asked that it be made $3,600 more, which would amount to half of the $15,000 which I understand from the hon. junior member for the City will be the actual figure for boarding in Jamaica.

We have to look at this with some sort of national pride, especially in these days when Jamaica and Trinidad are singling themselves out, and Barbados which has enjoyed a certain amount of prestige in these West Indian Islands is slowly slipping. Those of us who mix with the leaders of the West Indian Islands realise that Barbados is losing that place which she held one time. I read recently where someone from Kenya beat an English athlete, and I feel that the Government would do well, seeing that the Opposition itself is combined, to give all the support that would be absolutely necessary in a matter of this sort. Barbados has been known to spend money in a less worthy cause than this, and although this is something in which you are spending money from which you are deriving no immediate dividends, yet it would be of great benefit to the Island. I know that two of the girls who are being selected are from humble walks of life, and the Minister of Social Services knows from his own experience, having been associated with a school, that persons are drawn from walks of life who have attended that school, who were very good athletes and can ill afford to pay their way in Jamaica. I therefore associate myself with the remarks of my colleague and those who have asked that this matter be given further consideration. It is not one of those things into which you can bully the Government by saying they must do it; it is not one of those things in which you can appeal to the populace. The average man in the street might ask why we are spending money like this; but the United States, England and even Russia pay great attention to this when they think of competing against people in other countries, and feel it is a great feat for them to carry off prizes.
6.20 p.m.

If you vote this $3,600 today which is a revote, I am goint to support you. You ask the Minister to reconsider giving you the balance, but you should not really ask him alone; you should have the combined voices of the Ministers. If you get the assurance of the Minister of Social Services, he will do his best: but that is not all. Other Ministers will also be sitting down and I have not heard that assurance given by the most powerful Minister who is Minister of Education. Having heard from the Minister of Social Services that he has made a promise to reconsider the balance, I would just like to hear the Minister of Education give us and the public the assurance of how he feels about the question of sending a Barbados team to the C.A.C. Games in Jamaica and the spending of another $3,600 on the venture by the Government. The Hon. Minister of Education is aware, having himself taught in secondary schools, that people are not very generous in making gifts to this venture.

Finally, I would say that while I give my hearty support to this Resolution, you should ask that this sum be increased and I would like to hear other members, including the Hon. Minister of Education, who holds one of the most important portfolios dealing with the young people and not only those of school age but also those interested in athletics. I am thinking of weightlifting and cycling. They must come under the portfolio of the Minister of Education. I would like to hear him give the assurance that he would back the Hon. Minister of Social Services and then we would know that it would get the assurance of the Cabinet.

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

THE DEVELOPMENT LOANS (UNITED KINGDOM) BILL, 1962.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the second reading of the Development Loans (United Kingdom Government) Bill, 1962.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to take charge of this Order in the absence of the Minister of Finance who is not now in his place.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I must crave the indulgence of the House for what would certainly appear to be my inability to furnish the House with the entire background of this Bill. I believe also that hon. members having read the text of the Bill will themselves have understood what it is all about and how important it is. Two things I would like to say, first of all. One is that this Bill takes its place in a certain order of priority because of its very nature it would have been impossible to have it dealt with by this House before certain other things had been done. Two things were therefore necessary before the House could dispose of this matter. One was that the complete Development Plan of this Government should have received the approval of this country's Legislature, and the second is that the attempt should have been made to put the colony's finances on a reasonable and assured basis. These were two conditions without which the effects of this Bill could not be experienced. The Development Plan has now passed both Houses of the Legislature and in consequence of that, one of the two prerequisistes has been met. The Premier's statement of finances and budgetary proposals have already been laid in this Chamber and have taken their effect physically and, therefore, the second prerequisite has also been met.

It therefore falls to the duty of this Chamber to consider now the passing of this Bill. The House will want quite rightly some information as to the reasons for the introduction of this Bill and allowing for the fact that I, myself, have only the last two hours become familiar with all the details although I was familiar with the general principles of it when the Cabinet discussed it — I may say that I am only doing it myself because the Hon. Minister of Development to whom it has fallen is about to leave the colony shortly for British Guiana to take part in the Rice Conference there — despite that, I think I am in a position to give the House now some background to the matter.

Before 1939, there was only one general way in which Colonial Governments could raise money in the United Kingdom and that way was by having recourse to the London money market for their external loans. They would take their chance, having regard to the state of the market at a given time, and if conditions were favourable they would raise their money. There was of course another way in which money came into British colonies, but that method need not to be mentioned here because it only concerns rare occasions — such as acts of God — when the British Government with the consent of the British Parliament makes *ex gratia* grants for the relief of suffering from earthquakes, hurricanes and floods. We therefore need not concern ourselves with that because that does not happen under normal conditions and the occasions for that are more or less all too rare; therefore, generally for Colonial countries wanting to raise money, one had to do it on the London money market and take one's chance according to the prevailing conditions of the market.

However, in 1959 there was a Conference of Commonwealth Finance Ministers held in Montreal, Canada, and one of the proposals put to that Conference by the British Government was that as from that time, subject to the concurrence of the British Parliament, the British Government would say the amount the Colonial Development and Welfare Company had to make finance available to Colonial Governments who wanted money to proceed with their developments, without necessarily having to wait on the vagaries of the London money market. And so said, so done.

6.30 p.m.

Early in 1959 the British Parliament passed the Colonial Development and Welfare Act of that year in which provision was made for loans to be granted to Colonial Governments upon certain specified conditions; and so it has come about that Exchequer loans, as they are called, are loans made directly to Colonial Governments on the authorisation of the Secretary of State for the Colonies with the concurrence of the British Treasury. These Exchequer loans have been granted from time to time. One of the stipulations attached to the granting of these Exchequer loans to the Colonial Governments is that these loans must be regarded as loans of last resort. They are not an alternative to raising money on the London money market; that is to say, that the grant of an Exchequer loan would not necessarily prevent a colony or a group of colonies from approaching the London money market for the raising of a loan; but the effective advantage of an Exchequer loan over a loan which is raised in the ordinary circumstances, is that so long as the British Treasury is satisfied that the finances of the particular colony are in perfect order, that there is genuine, political stability in the colony — so long as these conditions are met, no attempt is made to hold up the development of the particular colony for want of finance although, on the other hand, it is emphasized that these loans are loans of last resort. The point is that it is not thought desirable that Colonial Governments should by-pass the ordinary, private enterprise loan channels in order to reach the Exchequer loans, but that Exchequer loans should be made available in addition to others, or in cases where waiting upon the London money market loans would, as a result, hold up the development of a particular colony.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the terms of these Exchequer loans are not normally to exceed thirty years and, in some cases, they are expected to be repaid within between 20 and 25 years. In addition to that, what should prove to be the most interesting part of the matter is that a novel feature of this form of loan is that principal and interest are repaid in equal annual instalments. Therefore, that provision enables the borrowing Government to make the loan a charge on its revenue with ease and with fairly accurate calculation as to what it costs from year to year to service the loan.

When we turn to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, we will notice, and I draw hon. members' attention to it, that the provisions, or rather, the Clauses of the Bill set out with great clarity the main aspects of the loan. Clause 2 deals with the amount which this Government expects to raise from that source of Loan Funds — sums of money not exceeding in the aggregate one million five hundred thousand pounds sterling. Clause 2 (2) goes a bit further and says that any such loans should be made on such terms as may be fixed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies with the approval of Her Majesty's Treasury. As I mentioned to the House earlier in my preliminary remarks, there are one or two prerequisites — the passing of our own Development Plan so that the Secretary of State for the Colonies will see that the money asked to be loaned to this Government would be spent for a purpose for which he could grant his approval and, secondly, the budgetary proposals which have already received fiscal effect. The Secretary of State for the Colonies will know that a reasonable attempt has been made to put the finances of the colony on a more healthy footing. Clause 3 of the Bill is the stipulation of the Act itself. This is what it says:- "Any loan raised under the provisions of this Act together with the interest payable on any such loan shall be repaid by equal annual instalments of capital and interest so that such loans shall be repaid within the period for which the sum is granted." Clause 4 makes it clear that the repayment of the loan as well as the interest charges payable thereon shall be charged on and paid out of the general revenues and assets of this island.

Mr. Speaker, I must dwell for a little time on that. This is, I would imagine, an acceptable feature to the House. I think that Clause 4 makes that clear stipulation because the point which hon. members and the public at large must grasp is that an Exchequer loan is, in all its essentials, a loan from the British taxpayers to the taxpayers of the colony. That is what it is in effect; it is a device which enables the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with the concurrence of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, bodily to lift money out of the United Kingdom, money which has been contributed by the United Kingdom taxpayers, for the use and service under certain terms of the taxpayers of the colony. The safeguards in Clause 4, as it were, follow from that. It links the responsibility of the United Kingdom taxpayer in lending to the greater responsibility of the Barbadian taxpayer in borrowing; that is why both principal and interest are charged and are to be charged out of the assets of this island. When we come to Clause 5 of the Bill, that need not detain us because it exemplifies in legal form the consideration to which I drew the attention of the House;

that is, that any money borrowed under the provisions of this Act shall be appropriated and applied to any of those purposes of the Island's Development Programme for the period 1962-65 and to no other purpose whatever. Of course, the Development Plan will be scrutinised very carefully by the Secretary of State for the Colonies and his advisers, but he will know that as soon as that Plan has passed the Legislature and gained the approval of the Governor, it represents the policy of the island of Barbados. Therefore nothing remains now but to have the approval of both Houses of the Legislature, and this House will certainly give its approval to the Government for the raising of this Exchequer loan in the terms as set out in the Bill.
6.40 p.m.

I should like to say finally that this poses a very heavy responsibility on the people of this Island, and I would like them as a favour to this Government to scrutinize what we do with great care and attention to see that we are held — if ever there was a temptation to stray, which I do not think there is — to this great responsibility which we have undertaken, because what this Government has done in effect, Mr. Speaker, is to pledge the taxpayers of this Island, their assets and the revenue which they put into the Treasury as repayment for this loan, in view of the great and serious need which we have for the money.

Although it may appear as if it is a routine measure we are proposing, Mr. Speaker, it has a great seriousness behind it, because for the first time in this Island we are, as it were, coming face to face with the British taxpayer. The British Government who will make this loan available to us shortly is directly answerable to the people of Great Britain for the use or misuse of these funds, and we would therefore like to be held equally answerable to the people of this Island for the way in which we apply them, and we have safeguarded ourselves by putting it to the law of the land that this money is to be used for developmental purposes and for no other.

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

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it is rather unfortunate for the country that the Minister of Finance, the Premier, is not here to answer this Bill. From our point of view, it is rather unusual and this has occurred in Barbados for the first time in 300 years. We have been told repeatedly that it is the first time the colony has had a Minister of Finance. I suppose you will appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that you can dub yourself with a few things. You can call yourself the Lord High Chief of the Exchequer and what not. At this stage I must pay tribute where it is due, because this is going to be a rather unhappy incident in the history of this country, and is apt to place a burden on the country. If you make an Exchequer loan for $7.2 million, the equivalent of £1.5 million, and it is tied for a period of twenty or thirty years, you can very well understand, Mr. Speaker, what this country is going to be subjected to. If for any reason by industrial development we had a wind slide or we could pay this $7.2 million back in a period of five or seven years, we could be saved from paying interest on equal instalments over a period of twenty to thirty years.

Mr. Speaker, let us examine what could happen behind all this. We can look at the other territories who are anxious at the moment to affiliate into an organisation known as a Federation of the West Indies; I am thinking of the seven coming together with Barbados. Whatever we say today or whatever is left, I do not think there is anything called the remnants of the Conservative Organisation in Barbados. You do not know what it is to be outside budgetary assistance from the Colonial Office. Whatever has happened in this country for 300 years, the planter type in this country has always saved Barbados from this. They would have asked for more money on sugar or to be given a cess or a loan, but would never have asked to be tied to the apron strings of the British Government. For that reason Barbados has been able to weather many storms, and it is for that reason that Jamaica and Trinidad continue to pay tribute to Barbados and its independence. Whether or not this is the first time, the moment we come together in a Federation of the Eight, if this takes place in another six months, we could not apply for Colonial Development Welfare Funds or for assistance by a loan, because we would have ceased to be called a colony. If you study this, you can see the tragedy that is likely to fall on this country as a result of this decision.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the Minister had in mind. He did apologise for his lack of knowledge of matters financial in attempting to handle this Bill. Hitherto, I think, the Minister knows that Barbados has always been in that very strong position to borrow money on the open English money markets. This is an improvement on all of this. It is true that you offer your assets, that is, you get the acceptance from the Colonial Office or from the money lenders in the United Kingdom; but you have here £1 1/2 million, our assets are examined and we are told that they have three or four times that amount in Kenya by Government loans and you are satisfied. As a matter of fact, you will remember that when we applied for a loan, just to show the position of Barbados in relation to money markets in the United Kingdom, our request was oversubscribed in less than five minutes. That is now history. Why do you want today to make a loan from the British Treasury, knowing the strings that will be tied, to pay back in twenty years? You will remember what happened to the World Bank, and it is for that reason that Barbados should shy away from this responsibility. When they decided on expansion immediately after the war and it was necessary to put Germany and the other countries back on their feet, they decided to go to the World Bank, but 80% of the money on that Bank was owned by the United States. England was in a very awkward position, but to save the Colonies and her prestige England developed what is known as Colonial Development Corporations to save us from borrowing U.S. dollars through the World Bank, and it was then at 6%. You are pretty well aware of what the premium would mean to us, a differential in U.S. currency of 171.5 or 171.6 as it was this morning. That is what we would have to pay our interest on.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we are doing the right thing. You know, Sir, that when the British Government realised that the whole of the British Empire continued to borrow money from C.D.C., a branch of which was established here in Barbados, they laid the conditions and tied you with all the wire ropes in this world, but that was a consistent policy as settled by British Parliament. Today, Sir, $7 million is nothing for Barbados to borrow; we have got a good name in the world's money market. We could go to London and borrow this $7.2 million and probably pay it back in three years. Something will happen .... it has always happened where you could pay this money back and save yourself from having to pay interest over a period of twenty or thirty years, and be in a position in another three or five years to borrow another $7 million for another Development Plan. Imagine at this stage and this period of the country's development that the United Kingdom would request a colony like Barbados to pass in both Houses of the Legislature a Bill to borrow money from the British Treasury when we belong to the British Treasury, to Parliament and to the Secretary of State lock, stock and barrel. Whatever has come to us by self-Government and internal Government in our Constitution, finance will forever remain with the British Treasury, even when we become an independent territory like Trinidad and Jamaica. You can become independent and find yourself more dependent on foreign territories than you have ever been in history.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to press the Minister on this. I can pretty well understand and appreciate that it was not expected that he would handle this, but I am not satisfied why he should elect to handle this today. Why could this not have been left to the Minister of Finance who would have been in a better position to say what he has to say?
6.50 p.m.

Hitherto, we have never had to borrow money this way. Our country is still in a good position although we hear the stupid things which are taking place in Parliament by a responsible person, the Premier of Barbados. There was a run on our banks some weeks ago, all because of those stupid remarks. I do not know what it is — unless the Government is afraid of going to the London money market to borrow this £1 1/2 million — unless some thing has happened which we know nothing about — but they can go

on the London money market and borrow it and pay it back in seven years rather than saddle this country with a loan of this kind for twenty years. It is all right to go and do a lot of fancy things just because the unthinking masses of our country are not aware of what is happening. However, the fact is that after 300 years we are today passing a bill to sanction a loan. Imagine this! Three years ago the last Government got permission from the Colonial Office to raise a loan on the London money market and in less than five minutes it was oversubscribed. Nothing has happened to the country since then to prevent that taking place again. Does the Hon. Minister know what it is to saddle this country with interest for 20 years on a loan of £1 1/2 million? You will have to budget for this. Why do that when you can borrow this money and repay it in three years, after paying interest on a short term?

For your three-year programme you are thinking of this £1 1/2 million. The very Hospital which you are constructing now is being built out of loans from C.D.C. and over £2 million was given by that Corporation. Now you must come to Parliament with this Bill for an Exchequer Loan, which is something rather unusual. I am warning you about this because I am unhappy about it. Whenever there was a stage in the history of this Island where we ran into difficulty of financing a project, we always made an appeal to the Colonial Office and our appeal was always heard.

You are asking for budgetary assistance over this period which you call your Development period. I am not going to deal with what may be only a Public Works Programme. What I am going to say is that you know you cannot spend any $50 million in two and a half years as you are saying; you know that. We must face facts. It is not even a matter of whether you can bring in your skilled workers. You know that you cannot spend $50 million as you have set out in your Development Programme in the next two and a half years. Anyhow, I have no concern with that side of it at the moment. What I am worried about is if it is at all necessary for you to borrow money this way.

This is an awkward position which you have put us in this evening. It is not under the portfolio of the Hon. Minister who is handling it and I do not know whether there is any urgency that we should deal with it tonight. I would be happy if the Hon. Minister can tell me why this cannot be deferred until next Tuesday. We must be told why Barbados on this occasion must effect a loan from the British Government which must be sanctioned by Her Majesty the Queen and the British Treasury, when hitherto all that we needed to do was to get permission from the Colonial Office and we could raise it on the London money market. Hon. members of that Government know that was so.

I have reason to be worried and there must be something operating in the mind of the Hon. Minister. We have struggled for 300 years to stave off inroads by the Colonial Office. You do not know what it is to be a grant-aided colony. I do not know why we have to be faced with this aid of £1 1/2 million which is to be paid in twenty years. If, say, in another five years we need another £1 1/2 million, do you know what that would mean? If your revenue cannot settle this in twenty years, it means that you will leave this country in a very awkward position. We have never had a loan, apart from borrowing money from the Colonial Office. Colonial Development Corporation has made grants to all these territories from time to time and they have left us free to go and borrow money from outside from time to time. Is the Hon. Premier afraid by seeing what is taking place with the industrialists? Today, they are all backing out. We are probably driving this country into a dangerous position and this Bill speaks of something which can be probably unfortunate for those of us who are unaware of the consequences. I repeat, we have never had to approach the British taxpayer and the British Treasury for a loan and now we hear all of this nonsense that you are tied to repayment of all this money over a period of twenty years. Do you understand how much you are going to pay for the additional interest? Five years from now you may want $5 million, and if you are tied by agreement for twenty years to repay this you cannot go and get it. What is wrong with your continuing as we have done in the past? Do you mean to say that all those who have gone before have acted unwisely and all that they had done was folly and we must have this new fangled idea? Why do it this way when you know that this $7 million can be borrowed on the London money market, leaving you free to borrow some amount again? Why should we be tied to the purse strings of the British Treasury?

Sir, I am speaking to you very strongly because I am unhappy of the consequences. I am unhappy because the Minister of Finance who is to answer this is not in his place. I think I should warn you that this is a signal that our country is in danger. This is something which has never happened before. Today, we are accepting Colonial Office terms and they are not always so happy and sweet. I am asking the Government to examine this. I must leave it on record that by doing this you can possibly be driving this country into danger and into things which we have never thought of before. We have always got loans through other means. All these things happen to tie the Barbados Treasury to the Colonial Office and to the British Treasury. 7.00 p.m.

This is the quality of mercy; it is not strained. They are so careful that this money will be returned at the agreed period. They are not satisfied with your revenue balances, or what you can afford to pay; they have asked for your assets as well. That is the sort of thing you will find in one of these uncouth mortgages where you tie the old lady's slippers and the little goat as well. Mr. Speaker, I must record my views and I am sure that I am recording the attitude of my colleague's as well. You can repay this money and you will need the interest for development; you are taking this colony and its population into danger.

Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

At this stage, it now being 7p.m., of the clock,

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7 p.m. of the clock, in accordance with the Standing Order No. 5 of this House, this sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. of the clock.

This sitting now stands suspended.

On re-assembling,

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum present and I ask that the bell be rung.

On the bell having been rung, a quorum was obtained.

THE DEVELOPMENT LOANS (UNITED KINGDOM GOVERNMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the suspension of the sitting, the House was debating the second reading of a Bill to provide for the raising of loans from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom for the purpose of development, and for matters incidental thereto. The hon. junior member for St. George had been addressing the Chair and I gather that he had concluded his address. I saw the Hon. Leader of the Opposition rise to speak and the hon. member may speak now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. junior member for St. George, who was the last speaker on this Bill, has said, this is the first time during our time in the Legislature that such a procedure has been adopted for the borrowing of money for the island of Barbados. With that I agree, but I do not agree with the hon. member when he says that, as the Bill now stands, the actual borrowing of money, which is being done by legislation, from the United Kingdom with the consent of the Secretary of State for the Colonies through the Chancellor of the Exchequer, puts us in the same position as the neighbouring colonies which are grant-aided. From reading the Bill carefully, it specifically deals with such moneys as are borrowed for the purpose as set out in the Development Plan which has been passed by the Legislature and which will be approved by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. While I agree with the hon. junior member for St. George that this is the first time that we are adopting this policy of borrowing money, I do not agree with the hon. member that this is something which will put us in the same position as the neighbouring colonies. As far as I am concerned, I must agree with him also that it has been said, and said with some justification and proof, that during the regime of the last Government, Barbados enjoyed such a reputation in England and abroad that a loan was raised within five minutes or it was over-subscribed within five minutes on the London money market.

The London money market, just as any other money market, is a business. It is not a market to lend us money because they have a paternal or any other feeling towards us, but it is a market to make a profit. What I would like to find out first of all is this: I may say that I will give the Bill my support because it is bringing $7 million into this country and I agreed with the Development Plan. This Bill seeks to bring in this money for the purpose of the Development Plan. If you have no cash money, then you will have to borrow money and you will have to borrow it in what the Government considers to be the best market. I have given credit to this Government and I have given credit to another Government for borrowing in the best market and under the best terms. The hon. junior member for St. George has referred to the fact that not only are they taking our security, but they are also taking our assets. I want to say that the only person who can ensure the revenue of Barbados over a period of five years, two years or twenty years would be God Almighty Himself — the Omnipotent.
7.50 p.m.

The revenue of Barbados is primarily derived from the sugar produced in this country, and depends on the rain which we get; therefore, just as in business, anybody lending money would have to include not only your revenue but your assets, which do not necessarily mean only your buildings or properties, but your other investments or anything you may have abroad. As an individual, it may even cover your insurance policy after death. I therefore see nothing wrong with that part of it. If you are borrowing money, you have got to agree to the terms of the people who lend the money. I am sorry the Minister is out now that we are dealing with this matter, and I think the Minister of Agriculture and the other Ministers should take notes of what I am saying.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I want to assure the Leader of the Opposition that notes are being taken in the absence of the appropriate Minister.

Mr. MOTTLEY: While we may not differ in the Opposition on certain points, I think it is the duty of Government to take notes because they must answer us. The last Government when in power secured loans on the London market. I should like to repeat here what was told to me by a leading capitalist in this country who, while in England, was invited to a dinner given by the Barclays Bank people. I am thinking of the name of Barbados and not the individual. It would be well to let you know that Barclays Bank Limited rank among the leading banks of England. This man was put to sit next to the President of this universal establishment, and during the after dinner speeches the President referred to the fact that he had by the side of him a man from a far-flung unit of the British Empire called Barbados, a country whose credit and integrity stood only second to that of Finland, because during the period of 300 years in which Barbados had done business with them, no Barbados businessman had ever gone bankrupt — I mean the manufacturers' representatives, so to speak — owing any amount of money to Barclays Bank or any of the overseas Banks, and therefore it spoke well for Barbados.

I want to make it clear that I am at one with the hon. junior member for St. George when he said that the business people of this country, the plantocracy, the old diehards, always kept in mind that the good name of Barbados should always be kept on the money market or in the financing of this country, and we, the other set of people of the colony followed suit.

Only a few days ago, Sir, an Englishman who is here on exploratory business said to my colleague and myself at the City Council that Barbadians have such a good name in London, that if they went on strike they could hold the entire London Transport system up. We felt very proud about that, but that is only by the way. However, Sir, the last Government of which the hon. junior member for St. George spoke, thought that they should borrow money on the London money market. I am going to put it this way because I want the most humble mind to understand. (A VOICE: In the House?) Not in the House, but in the Island; I do not speak only for members of this House. I challenge any man to say that this Island, not being independent, can go to the United States or any place else and borrow one farthing without the consent of the Colonial Office. Anybody who tells you differently would be fooling you. If the Minister in charge wants to contradict me on that, I am prepared to sit down. In the absence of independence, Barbados cannot go to the World Bank, to the United States or to any foreign power to borrow one cent without the consent of the Colonial Office; and whatever you hear about our self-Government, that is an established fact.

Mr. Speaker, I support this Bill because we have a Development Plan and we must have money. What I want to know is why the Government has gone to the British Government. The British Government cannot take money out of the Treasury without an Act of Parliament giving authority to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and we could not get it without the approval of the Secretary of State. Did the present Government in Barbados which came into power on 4th December go to the Secretary of State and say they did not want to go on the London money market, or that the London money market refused to lend them and that they wanted to borrow from the British Government? I am suspicious that it is not so, and I would like an answer to it. The London money market means the people who control the business and have the money to lend. It is the people who have money to invest for some widows or orphans, or who are trustees and what not, and in London there is what is known as a Capital Issues Committee which controls the money going into foreign countries or other countries where they do not think it is safe. I believe that the Minister will agree with me that the Capital Issues Committee controls the London money market; therefore it is a matter of choice. Do you think that the London money market would lend the Colonies money at a cheaper rate than the British Treasury? That is a thing I want answered. I am going to ask more pertinent questions on this.

Now you have the Northern and Southern District Councils; suppose they wanted $200,000 or half a million for that matter to carry on social services in the area; do you think that the Banks in Bridgetown or the money magnets in the City, the people who are trustees for money from solicitors, would lend the Northern District Council money as cheaply or as reasonably as the Government of Barbados would lend it to them for the social improvement of that district?
8.00 p.m.

I support this Bill. There is nothing in this Bill which tells us the length of time of the loan or the interest rate which we are going to pay. You have asked me to pass this Bill and I must say that I am at one with what the hon. junior member for St. George has said. Let us compare as to whether the British Government is taking us for a ride. I do not mean to be offensive when I say that. Let me say here at once that I would not be one to think that the British Government would adopt the attitude of taking this colony for a ride. When I say that, I mean making you pay a higher rate of interest than the London money market will make you pay.

However, I see nothing wrong when this Bill talks about assets, but it does not say how long are we borrowing the money for. Therefore, I would like the Hon. Minister to tell us how long and at what interest we are borrowing this money, and if I use a legal word, I will also like to know if there is some sort of defeasance, that is to say, if we had some prosperity or some lovely crops, if we can pay it back in ten years and be free of it. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that such particulars should either be put in the Bill or should be made known to us and not merely be known by the Government. Just as it says here in Section 5 that any money borrowed under the provisions of this Act shall be appropriated and applied to any of those purposes of the Island's Development Programme for the period 1962-65 which may, in accordance with the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act, 1959, be approved by the Secretary of State and the Legislature of the Island from time to time and to no other purpose, those other particulars should be set out in another section.

That is why I say that we are not in the same position as St. Lucia, Grenada and the other colonies. They get grants-in-aid to pay Civil Servants. This money which we are getting is for a specific purpose. It is for the Development Programme which was passed and approved by both Houses of the Legislature for the period of 1962-65. This particular section in itself tells us that we are not in a similar position as Grenada and St. Lucia. You can only use this money as the Legislature of this Colony approves and you know that the Legislature of this Colony does not only apply to the House of Assembly.

Sir, all I want the Hon. Mnister to do is to answer me these questions: What is going to be the interest rate? How long is this money to be borrowed for? Is there going to be a defeasance? Would the hon. member say if after this Bill is passed, the Government will come back to the Legislature for us to be able to say that instead of lending us money from the point of view of the interest rate which we could get it at from the London money market, we can say to the mother Country that you are now exploiting us and you are lending us money dearer than we could get it if we had raised it on the London money market, or the World market or the money market of Canada or Australia for that matter. I repeat, I doubt myself whether that would be the British attitude.

However, Sir, I am going to support the Bill. I, myself, have a suspicion some where along the line that this Bill was in existence and the other Government did not use it. If that were so, I would like to know why. Mr. Speaker, I would like to get an answer to those questions.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, as I see it, undoubtedly, a Bill of this sort coming before us is bound to provoke some great measure of discomfort because undoubtedly, it brings into effect a new approach to the custom of borrowing money from what we have known in the past.

The Hon. Minister in charge of this Bill has, I must say, gone out of his way to make ample explanations and he has given us a full statement as to the methods by which Colonial Governments in the past have borrowed money. He made mention of the London money market and the transactions between the colonies. There must be some peculiar reasons why the Barbados Government at this particular time is borrowing money in this peculiar method. There must be something; there must be some definite reason, and the Hon. Minister has not yet explained that, and I have no doubt that when he comes to reply he will try his best to satisfy the House that they need not be some worry or any undue worry as to the course of action which the Government has now taken by introducing a Bill of this nature.

I, to some extent, share very strongly the concern expressed by the hon. junior member for St. George, a former Minister of the Government, who undoubtedly knows something about the mechanics of Government borrowing. He has been experienced in that sort of thing: and like every Barbadian — and, I suppose, like every citizen of a colony in the West Indies — I become very, very concerned if I just suspect that my country, Barbados, is being subjected to any extra strains by the Colonial Office. I become very, very worried indeed. Like the hon. senior member for the City, I, too see that the Bill says that this money which is to be borrowed is to be used for an expressed purpose, that is, for assisting the country in its Development Plan. The hon. junior member for St. George expressed the view that there would be some sort of reduction to grant-aided status. Well, the Bill does not say that.
8.10 p.m.

The Bill does not say that, but there is a lot that the Minister has to explain in this Bill. All that the hon. senior member for the City has said relative to the rate of interest, the terms of repayment and the period of repayment I am entirely in agreement with. The hon. senior member for the City is a businessman and he knows the way of business much better than I know, and I really regard what he has expressed to this House as statements and expressions that have got to be answered. Whenever there is any sort of departure from a normal method, it is expected that questions will be asked and, like the hon. senior member for the City, I do not know if some difficulty has been experienced by this Government in getting money abroad. I do not know if the Colonial Office has brought certain pressures to bear and certain stringencies or if they, at this particular time in our history, are rather doubtful as to the viability financially of this colony. If that is so, I suppose the Government would have to introduce a Bill of this sort. If Barbados undertakes projects like the construction of the Deep Water Harbour or the erection of the new Hospital — and I may say that some of the funds for the erection of that institution which is still going up were provided locally by way of a certain cess or taxation, some of which has been foregone by the agricultural workers of this country; yet when we remember the magnitude of certain big Government projects that have been undertaken in Barbados by way of loan, we really become chary and doubtful as to why this particular method of borrowing is now taking effect.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to anticipate any matter which is not yet before the House, but we have been hearing that there are other loans in the offing. If, at this particular time, we must have recourse to a method of this sort, a method which is novel and new, we must wonder what has been actually operating in the minds of the Hon. Premier and his Cabinet that, at this particular time, they are now thinking of raising money in this manner. Like any other Barbadian, I am interested in the development of Barbados and in the stability of its economy. I am not condemnatory of this matter; I am just wanting to know if this particular course is safe, if there is any worry, if the Government is not very sure as to what is the next step which they have to pursue when they have to make other loans.

The mechanics of borrowing in the Colonial territory have been outlined by the hon. senior member for the City. Sometimes the Hon. Premier, who is also the Minister of Finance, makes certain utterances which temporarily alarm the populace and then, on re-examination, he gives us certain assurances. The Government is now faced with a three-year Plan and, in a very general way, I believe the whole country approves of it. It is proposed to execute and finalise this Plan in three years. I am not in the habit of making extra long speeches and I need not; but I must say that I appreciate very much the approach which has been made by the hon. introducer of this Bill. Although the Hon. Minister of Finance is not now in his place, as I see it, the hon. introducer has made a very good job of presenting this Bill although he attempted to be apologetic in that he was not as knowledgeable as he should have been of this Bill. However, if the Hon. Premier had been in his place, I do not think that my doubts would have been in any way lessened until he rose to reply. We have to be very jealous. The hon. junior member for St. George referred to the days of the plantocracy of this island — the days when the plantocracy ruled this country — and the hon. senior member for the City made some reference to the high regard in which we have been held in the United Kingdom and Barclays Bank which is operating all over the world. Still, for all that, I am not at all very, very happy at the bringing down of this Bill, nothwithstanding the fact that, in the very Bill itself, we are told that it will only be operating in reference to the three-year Development Plan which has just been passed by both Houses of the Legislature. The Government has already budgeted for a deficit and by the recent budgetary proposals, they hope to offset that deficit; but with development about to be done in a period of three years — a rather considerable amount or quantity of development — I do not feel very, very sanguine about that.
8.20 p.m.

I am very obviously chary whether or not, if we commit ourselves to this sort of method of borrowing money from the United Kingdom Government through the backing of the agency known as the Colonial Office, we are not beginning in Barbados to lose some sort of confidence in ourselves. Quite apart from the outside business world, the moment we begin to lose that, I think we are going on a retrograde step. I have been told by somebody who is very knowledgeable indeed that great risks have been taken by the former Government relative to borrowing large sums of money, not just about $7.2 million B.W.I., but sums far in excess

of that, without our having apparently to tie ourselves down in a manner of this sort. If that is a new trend, we have got to watch and observe it very closely indeed.

There have been insinuations that I should cut my speech a bit short because the Minister is anxious to reply, and I do not think there are many other hon. members who are desirous of speaking; but I should make this crystal clear. I am very sorry indeed that I did not come here prepared to speak on this Bill. I read it some weeks ago, and I have not had time to read it today, though I remember the underlying principles; and I would like certain assurances indeed to be given to me, as of course to the hon. junior member for St. George and the hon. senior member for the City, that we are not losing confidence in ourselves, and that our finances are not so gloomy and our borrowing power is not becoming too lean; because the moment that is so and the moment we initiate a Bill of this sort, there may be not so long from now a similar Bill coming down that may not refer to something specific, but may be so general in terms that we could not hope to accept it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be an obstructionist and I am going to sit, because I really see the anxiety on the face of the Hon. Introducer of this Bill, and I think I should stop now in order that he may be able to wind up in his reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any hon. member who would care to speak on this matter before the Hon. Mover has his last word? Apparently there is none.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in the short time at my disposal, the House will forgive me if I answer all the questions briefly. First of all, I should like to say, Mr. Speaker, that an Exchequer loan is a loan on more favourable terms than can be got on the London money market. *(Hear! hear!)* I think in this respect this Bill is only an enabling Bill and therefore its terms are no different in this respect from the Acts of 1933 and 1935. The Government is not in a position now to say what the rate of interest will be or the nature of the defeasance, that is, the length of time. That is currently being negotiated. In order to meet the reservations and anxieties of the hon. member who has just sat down, I should like to tell him that the colony — you can still call it a colony — of Jamaica which is soon to be independent has just raised a similar loan of $1 1/4 million in aid of current revenue, and no one is suggesting that Jamaica is becoming grant-aided because it has raised an Exchequer loan of $1 1/4 million.

I should like to say finally that when you ask why we go this way, and not on the London money market, the answer is this. On the London money market you have to compete not only with other colonial territories wanting the same kind of money at the same time and possibly for the same purpose, but you have to compete in England with public corporations, municipal authorities and other borrowing agencies who at the same time are converging on the London money market. English investors therefore, generally speaking, prefer, if they have a choice, to lend their money to agencies better known to them than to distant territories, and that, sometimes, occasions a delay and a disappointment; but I would like to give the assurance to the House that this country is not being sold down the river. It is a perfectly legitimate enterprise upon which the Government is embarking and hon. members can have no fear that in raising this loan the interests of this colony are in any way being set aside.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, before the Minister sits, I know I cannot speak again, and I should like to put the other question to him. He assures us that the terms are being considered now, but I should like to ask whether the Legislature will be acquainted before an agreement is made on the terms and conditions of the loan.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think I can tell the hon. member that the Minister of Finance will, as in all similar cases, acquaint the Legislature with matters of this sort and in greater detail. It will not be necessary for the Government to seek the approval of the Legislature for the terms of the loan. They will be negotiated because they come as a consequence of the enabling Bill which the Legislature is passing. As I said before, it is not different from enabling Acts which the Legislature have passed in the past. But this remains true of an Exchequer loan, Mr. Speaker; that it is an accommodation loan received on more favourable terms than would be received on the money market.

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

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

8.30 p.m.

Clauses 1, 2, 3 and 4, were called separately and passed.

Clause 5 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Clause 5 stand part.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, this is the Section under which this money is going to be borrowed and, as I have said, it is to be borrowed against the collateral assets of this country. It is specifically stated in this Clause that you can only use it for items which are stated here. You must forgive me for repeating this, but I say that if you borrow on your collaterals and under control of the British Government, you are free to do what you like; but there are strings tied to this. You cannot go outside of the Development Plan to use any of that money. Let me say, for instance, that something happened within another year such as made it necessary to expand your airport; even with this money in the Treasury, you cannot use it for that purpose. This money is tied against the Development Plan and these are the things which I am worried about, and for the future I think that my protest should be recorded in Parliament.

If you were borrowing this through Colonial Office, you would have easy access of getting it because after the Colonial Office has approved of your getting the loan, they would get it for you on the London money market. It is no pressure when you get it on the London money market.

As I have said, this money which you are borrowing is tied to the Development Plan only and it is set out very clearly in this Clause. After you have borrowed this and, say, something happens and you want a quick $1 million to spend on a new project, you would have to go to Colonial Office. You will have to do that although you hear all these happy and classical platitudes by the Hon. Minister that the conditions under which we are getting this are better than before. That is not true because where you could fetch a loan on the London money market at 5 1/2% without any conditions attached to it, you are now tied to conditions by the British Government. Do you fool yourself about it.

When we embarked on the new Hospital project, we did not have $1/2 million. Colonial Development Corporation gave us $2 million and in addition to that we got permission from the other organizations to use $2 million of what is really a grant from the Colonial Office. When we attempted to build the $30 million project, the Bridgetown Deep Water Harbour, the Barbados Government did not know where it was going to find the money from, but we knew that the Colonial Office was willing to finance it for us because they had enough faith in little Barbados. Today, you come for $7 million, and you come for it tied by conditions set down by the British Government. It is all right to make classical speeches in here, but three weeks or three months from now and you have to discuss the terms, you will know what the answer will be. You know very well if something unexpectedly turns up, you cannot go back and fetch a loan. What we are doing now has never happened in the history of this Island. I would hate to say: "I told you so". It is a

mean thing for a man to say that. I am worried about my Barbados, and let me say now, it does not matter which Government it is. I am worrying about the fate of this country. It is a question of what next, what will happen in the next two years or so.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. George should not really generate more heat than he conveniently can absorb. It surprised me to hear him speak in the strain he has. I did not answer him earlier, but certainly I will not let him pass this time with what he has just said. He tried to discover some new principle in Clause 5 of this Bill. For your benefit, Mr. Chairman, and for the benefit of other hon. members, let me remind you what Clause 5 says. It reads:

"Any money borrowed under the provisions of this Act shall be appropriated and applied to any of those purposes of the Island's Development Programme for the period 1962-65 which may, in accordance with the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act, 1959, be approved by the Secretary of State and the Legislature of the Island from time to time and to no other purpose."

That is what the hon. member says is worrying him. He says further, if next year there is some occasion for extraordinary expenditure — and he uses the phrase, "if, say, you want a quick million" — what are you going to do if you are bound down to the conditions of this. The hon. member is suffering from a bad memory. In 1957, a Loan Act was passed by the last House specifically for the 1955-60 Development Plan. His memory surely cannot be so bad that he cannot remember this. A similar Act was passed for the 1960-65 Plan last year and that was their Plan. It was laid down under those Acts that loans raised under those Acts could be used for no other purpose but what was contained in those Development Plans. Both of those Acts enable loans to be raised for the Development Plans and nothing else. That was in 1957 and again in 1960. Do you want to tell me that this Government merely because it puts into an Act of Parliament that the money raised shall be used for this purpose is doing something criminal or something wrong?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, will the Hon. Minister be kind enough to give way for a moment? Are you telling this House that in 1957 and 1960 the last Government used this bit of machinery through the Colonial Office to borrow money from the Exchequer? Do you say this?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I have never heard anything more ridiculous.
8.40 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. junior member for St. George give way to the Minister?

Mr. MILLER: I have given way to the Minister already. The Minister is not making a point of order but a point of distortion. I will distort this House if that comes from the Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not think I will allow the hon. member to distort this House.

Mr. MILLER: You sat there and allowed the Minister to stray and I will stray too. The Minister said that in 1957 we passed a similar Act to facilitate the Plan.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It was specifically for the Development Plan for that year.

Mr. MILLER: Did we borrow money for the programme or not? Did we borrow money from the Colonial Office or the British Government?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: You could not have borrowed the money unless prior approval had been given by the Legislature for it. What the hon. member is complaining about is the provision of this Act; the provision that any loan raised under certain terms should be applied for this specific purpose and for no other is nothing new. The 1957 and the 1960 Acts have provisions for the same purpose.

Mr. MILLER: How can the hon. member compare this with loans raised by the last Government? If you borrow money how does it differ from what you are doing here? They are borrowing money from the British Government and the British Government is laying it down that it can be borrowed only for the Development Plan and for a specific period. If the money lapses you cannot use one cent of it. We had to come to the conclusion that we were satisfied that we had an Airport which could only cater to certain passenger-carrying aircraft coming into the area, and when it was known that Jets could be used in the area and the Airport could not accommodate such Jets, we had to hurry and get money. But you cannot do that under this Bill; this is something which is fixed. You borrow money from the British Government and if you were to go over the period you cannot use it. You can only use it for the Development Programme as set out in the Plan.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not agree with the hon. member. This is what the Act says:- "Any money borrowed under the provisions of this Act shall be appropriated and applied to any of those purposes of the Island's Development Programme for the period 1962 -65 which may, in accordance with the provisions of the Colonial Development Welfare Act 1959, be approved by the Secretary of State and the Legislature of the Island from time to time and to no other purpose." That could not mean one thing.

Mr. MILLER: Let the hon. member read Clause 5 it says:- "Any money borrowed under the provisions of this Act shall be appropriated and applied to any of those purposes of the Island's Development Programme for the period 1962-65....."

You cannot spend one cent until next year. That is the kind of democracy that we have; that is the price which we are paying for democracy. You hear that there is an official Leader of the Opposition, but how can he oppose when he is supporting you on all your platforms and asking people to vote for your Party?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is that any part of this Bill?

Mr. MILLER: The Manifesto talked about the Development Plan. Are you now going to rewrite it and change history in less than six months? You have two Governments and now you talk about supporting the Government. How can the hon. senior member for the City honestly oppose? Fancy all of this tragedy or whatever you may call it! The hon. senior member for the City knows finance. You know that you cannot spend $50 million in any two years, unless, of course, you bring the population and equipment from Trinidad. We were spending $30 million in less than four years. Whom are you trying to fool? You know that this money will lapse and you cannot use one dollar after 1965. The Minister of Education is trying to falter his way out of this matter with a lot of little boy's argument. If the Labour Party were in power, this would have the same force; you talk all this half-baked stupidness. I do not agree with you; I have nothing to fear.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member saying that he does not fear the Chair?

Mr. MILLER: The only thing I should fear is fear itself.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair has authority.

Mr. MILLER: Which I respect. You come in here and you talk about democracy.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, Clause 5 of this Bill specifically sets out that this money is being borrowed and it can be utilised for purposes as set out in the Development Plan. It goes further and says that the Plan is subject to development or change provided that it has received the approval of the Legislature and the approval of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Therefore, what is the hon. junior member for

St. George worried about? If the sum of $7.2 million is devoted to the Development Plan which is itself subject to change, what about the other $25 million or so which will be utilised for the purposes for which the hon. member is very disturbed about? We are committed to this Plan. I say that if any emergency should set in and we have need of the money it will be available. Therefore what is this fuss all about?
8.50 p.m.

I am saying that if any emergency steps up and we need money for a specific purpose, there would be money available. You are acting as though it is only $7.2 million that we will have for these purposes. This $7.2 million is devoted to the Development Plan, but we need very much more money because the Development Plan entails an expenditure to the tune of $50.2 million; so I do not understand the argument adduced. It is just a small part of the money which is being loaned, and there would be ample money available for what is disturbing his mind.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member who just spoke made it abundantly clear about the time. I am not going to make speeches in this House to suit the whims and fancies of the hon. junior member for St. George, neither am I going to be a hypocrite. If the hon. member wants to hear me say again, I will tell him that I went about this Island telling people not to support the Labour Party, and I will do that as long as I live, and my son could not stay in my house if he went about supporting that Party.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the hon. senior member for the City.

Mr. MILLER: If I rise on a point of order, you have to ask the hon. member to sit down.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Every time the hon. member opens his mouth, he talks about me as being Leader of the Opposition. Let it be made clear that I asked nobody to be made Leader of the Opposition, and if you had a Party half of which was pulling one side and the other half was pulling the other side, and you could not keep the Party together from running hither and thither.....

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, you can make all the concessions in St. Lucy.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the hon. senior member for the City.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, with all the decency that is left in this fibre of mine, all I want you to do and all I will have you accept is the Rules of this House. If I am on a point of order, do not tell me whom you are listening to. I will sit down and let the hon. member continue, because we will have our little circus parade here and a lot of sport.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Not with me in the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I am saying is that I am not going to make speeches to suit the hon. junior member for St. George. I am pleasing the people who put me in the House. As far as I am concerned, it is a waste of time getting up and saying what kind of oppositionist I am. The evening I feel like opposing the Premier or anybody else, you will see what opposition I have; but if I agree with something, I must say so. I was in here before the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, when the whole force of his Party was against me and I cursed them. I got in here with my good friend, his brother.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, it would take two Parties to beat $2 million in poor relief.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It would also take a lot of beating when you can go with a lot of stripped-up bloomers giving them away in St. George.

The question that Clause 5 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. J.C.TUDOR: That, I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, concludes Government business for the day.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. J.C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 24th July, at 2.30 p.m.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the adjournment, if I am in order, I should like to draw something to the attention of the House. A few weeks ago I drew the attention of the Minister of Communications and Works to the fact that the Y.M.P.C. Club had recently been railed around with galvanised sheets, and he gave the House the assurance that it was without his permission. Since then I have received complaints from the people in the area firstly that the Town and Country Planning Act has been observed in the breach, secondly that it is creating a tremendous nuisance to the people in the Beckles Road area, and thirdly that the property is Government owned on which they have erected this galvanise without the permission of the Government.

Quite recently the Acting Town and Country Planning Officer actually told me when I asked him to come and see me about it that he had got permission from the Minister of Communications and Works, but the Minister on the telephone denied he had given permission. The officer then said that he had permission from Mr. Odle, and since then there has been some bamboozling and saying that he got permission from the Housing Authority. I want to say that we deprecate this attitude of the Government if they have given this permission, because we feel that the land of which I am speaking was bought with the money of the people of this country, and if Y.M.P.C. or anybody at all want to have a private club to rail in with galvanise so as to keep out little children from looking at games, I have no objection to that, but they should buy their own property. If the Government can perpetuate such a state of affairs in allowing them to rail in the property with galvanised sheets, if they put up any in front of the T.B. Ward at the Infirmary, I am going to bring a gang to pull it down. The people in the adjoining roads are complaining that they cannot stay in their houses.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I inform the hon. member that the hour of 9.00 o'clock has struck, and if I do not put the motion made by the Hon. Acting Leader of the House, the House will automatically stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I hope the Hon. Minister will be allowed to reply to me next week.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 24th July, 1962 at 2.30 p.m. o'clock, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

9.00 p.m.