
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Friday, 29th June, 1962.

A Special Meeting of the House of Assembly was held at 2.00 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Hon. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., (*Premier*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism*); Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. J. B. YEARTWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

Mr. WEEKES entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform this Honourable House that this meeting has been summoned under Standing Order 5, Rule 9, it having been represented to me by the Hon. Leader of the House that it is necessary in the public interest.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to lay the Development Plan, 1962-65.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Resolution to place the sum of \$3,216,570 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63 Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1962-63 No. 9 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolved that the sum of \$8,544,483 be advanced from the Public Treasury to be defrayed from Loan Funds and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63 Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1962-63 No. 10 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Resolution to approve the Development Plan 1962-65.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Development Loans (United Kingdom Government) Bill, 1962 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 Rum Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1962 to increase the duty payable on rum distilled in the Island from three dollars and ninety cents per proof gallon to seven dollars and thirty-two cents per proof gallon with effect from 27th June, 1962.

The Revenue in Aid Bill, 1962 to amend the Revenue in Aid Act, 1941.

The Motor Vehicles Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1962 to amend the Motor Vehicles Tax Act, 1960.

The Package Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1962 to amend the Package Tax Act, 1941 to provide for the raising of additional revenue by increasing Package Tax from six pence to twenty-five cents.

The Consumption Tax Bill, 1962 to make provision for the provision of a consumption tax and for matters incidental thereto and connected therewith.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) Bill, to provide for an increase in the duties on certain articles, the imposition of duties on some articles hitherto exempt, and the removal of duties from certain articles.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, with respect to the last six Bills, I shall be asking for permission to proceed with them in all their stages today. As regards the first Bill - The Development Loans (United Kingdom Government) Bill, 1962 - that Bill cannot be dealt with until the Resolution of which notice was given by the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour has been dealt with. This Bill is making provision for Exchequer Loans, and according to a United Kingdom Bill of 1957, under which these Exchequer Loans are established, it is a prerequisite that the Plan be approved; otherwise, the Treasury cannot pay the money out. This is the first time we have this in Barbados; so I shall not be proceeding with that Bill until the Plan has been approved.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, The Development Loans (United Kingdom Government) Bill, 1962, was read a first time.

On motions of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD in each case, the following Bills were read a first time.

The Rum Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1962 to increase the duty payable on rum distilled in the Island from three dol-

lars and ninety cents per proof gallon to seven dollars and thirty-two cents per proof gallon with effect from 27th June, 1962.

The Revenue in Aid Bill, 1962 to amend the Revenue in Aid Act, 1941.

The Motor Vehicles Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1962 to amend the Motor Vehicles Tax Act, 1960.

The Package Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1962 to amend the Package Tax Act, 1941 to provide for the raising of additional revenue by increasing Package Tax from six pence to twenty-five cents.

The Consumption Tax Bill, 1962 to make provision for the provision of a consumption tax and for matters incidental thereto and connected therewith.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) Bill, to provide for an increase in the duties on certain articles, the imposition of duties on some articles hitherto exempt, and the removal of duties from certain articles.

Mr. MOTTLEY entered the House and took his seat.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:— To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the island.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to ask leave to give notice of my intention to discuss the Premier's Budgetary Statement on Tuesday next.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I suggest to the hon. member that the time for giving notices has expired and we have no objection to giving him that leave later on today? There is a motion before the House that the House do now go into Committee of Supply, and I suggest to the hon. member that he should allow this motion to go through and at an appropriate time he can ask leave to give notice of his motion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not asking leave to discuss anything now. I think it was the suggestion made by the Government that after the Premier's Statement had been made, an opportunity would be given to hon. members to discuss the Statement made by the Premier on the Budget. Therefore, I am only trying to interrupt the motion which the hon. member has made in order to give notice of my intention today to discuss the budgetary proposals next Tuesday. It strikes me as somewhat strange that the hon. member should object to my merely giving notice of my intention to ask for leave to discuss these budgetary proposals. If these measures had been in my possession before, I would have taken time to discuss the budgetary proposals on the appropriate motions; but I think it is preferable to take the opportunity to discuss the Premier's speech.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we will concede to what the hon. member has said; but the hon. member will agree, on reflection, that it is hardly appropriate to interpose a motion to ask for leave to give notice of a motion to discuss the budgetary statement when there is a motion before the House that the House go into Committee of Supply. We will agree to grant leave to the hon. member later on today; he can rest assured that at a more appropriate time, the House will be prepared to give him leave to discuss the motion which he wants to discuss. 2.20 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Surely the hon. member will appreciate that I have reasons for making this as an appeal. If

you are late in giving a notice, I think any time is the time; and if you accept me as Leader of the Opposition, I might be out of the House and some other member might ask for an opportunity to do the same. I am now here appealing to the hon. member to give me an opportunity to give notice of this Resolution. I hope the hon. member appreciates the point, because I cannot make it any clearer than I am making it. I am only asking for leave to give notice of the Resolution.

The question that Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER do now leave the Chair was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that before Your Honour leaves the Chair, the motion having been carried, it would be appropriate for the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to ask for the leave that he has indicated that he wants to ask permission for. This would be a convenient time to do it, I think the hon. member has been in this House too long not to know that you can only have one motion before the House at the same time and you can only speak on that motion. The only motion on which you have a certain amount of licence is the motion for the Adjournment. We are not opposed to the hon. member asking for leave to make a motion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I agree with the Hon. Premier, but I came in the House late and summed up the situation, and found myself at the mercy of the Hon. Leader of the House. I know what I am talking about, and therefore I now ask leave to give notice of a Resolution to discuss the Financial Statement and Budgetary proposals by the Premier at the next meeting of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As a result of the motion that I do now leave the Chair which was agreed to, I now do so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1962-63 No. 9.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution to place the sum of \$3,216,570 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63, Part II—Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1962-63 No. 9 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to ask leave to give notice of a Resolution to discuss the Financial Statement and Budgetary proposals made by the Hon. Premier.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to give notice of a Resolution to discuss the Financial Statement and Budgetary proposals made by the Hon. Premier, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to discuss the Financial Statement and Budgetary proposals of the Hon. Premier at the next meeting of the House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I thought the hon. member would tell us what the Resolution was, whether the Resolution is that this House approves or does not approve of the proposals. I think it should be a sub-

stantive Resolution rather than an indication that he wants to discuss the Budget proposals in a general way..... I understand from the Clerk that the hon. member has given him an undertaking that the actual text of the Resolution will be handed in, Sir.

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

2.30 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1962-63, No. 10.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$8,544,483 and it is made up as follows:-

Deep Water Harbour	\$ 223,508
Development Board	1,439,000
Water Supplies	620,000
Health Services	216,500
Education	1,864,440
Agriculture	1,145,221
Communications	2,775,814
Miscellaneous	260,000
	\$8,544,483

Now, Mr. Chairman, the last Resolution which we have just passed — and I hope hon. members will not get confused over these two Resolutions — along with this would bring the capital expenditure under these two Resolutions to \$11,761,053 for the last nine months of the Financial Year — and this has nothing to do with the recurrent expenditure for the payment of salaries. These are entirely new capital commissions which come under the Development Plan.

I did not give hon. members sufficient explanation just now and I do not think hon. members had the time to catch themselves to study these Resolutions as they should; but the proposals under the Resolution which we just passed was \$1,572 million for Health Centres, \$379 million for education, \$8,950 million for Agriculture, \$60 million for Communications, and \$650 million for Miscellaneous expenditure. As regards the Health Services for which the sum of \$1,572 million is to be voted, it is to continue the New Hospital Project and expenditure is met from the following sources: Surplus Balances \$196,578; Colonial Development and Welfare Grant, \$838,730; Labour Welfare Fund, \$537,312. As I have said, this is money required for the next nine months.

Under Education, the sum of \$200,000 is required for the purchase of land for educational projects; then there is the sum of \$179,000 for the construction of an Industrial Arts Wing and it includes furniture for a workshop.

The money for Communications, \$606,000, is for expenditure of tenantry roads for the next nine months, additional road works and additional provisions for salaries, travelling and other expenses of staff.

Now, under this Resolution which we are dealing with, some of these items are overlapping. I only mentioned the expenditure under the first Resolution to show the difference between the requirements under that vote and this one. As I have said before, this Resolution which we are dealing with now is for \$8.5 million and we hope to spend this money in the next nine months. You will remember that we usually put different Heads to Supplementary Estimates, but this is a Capital Vote Resolution and as the Heads are not put separately, I think I should explain to hon. members what the expenditure is being demanded for.

If hon. members turn to Head I, Item 1, for the Deep Water Harbour, they will see that the Note says: "Revote of \$202,159 plus additional provision for \$287,120 to provide for payments of Contractors' fees, Consulting Engineers' fees, Crown Agents' Commission, Claims, salaries, passage and baggage, completion of general harbour works and contingencies."

We hope that this amount will finish off the Harbour, as it were.

Now, as regards to the Development Board, we have asked for the sum of \$1,439,000. It must have been obvious to hon. members that we have already spent \$200,000 this year and we are asking for \$1.439 million to assist with the Industrial Development Programme and to meet the following expenses: administration, promotion, development of industrial estates, erections of factories and loans. That sum is to provide for all of those requirements.

The amount of \$620,000 is for the extension of the Island's water supplies, such as laying additional mains and standposts, replacements of old mains and office accommodation.

Hon. members will remember that a Resolution was passed in this House some time ago to remove the Waterworks Department to St. Cecilia Barracks and to erect a new Police Station at the Deep Water Harbour site. The money has not been spent. We are having a re-evaluation done of this project. As far as the new Police Barracks and the Harbour are concerned, you will be pleased to know that that is out altogether. I believe that was a Resolution for \$80,000 to build new quarters for the Police at the Harbour site. We feel that kind of project is not development. We understand from the Police authorities that they are short of policemen anyhow; they cannot get enough recruits; so I do not think they would need this accommodation down there; that accommodation can be made at the Central Police Station. We really do not see in this day how we can afford to build Police Barracks all over the place because that is not the kind of productive work which we like to see in this Island. Of course, if it is necessary, some extension will be done at the Central Police Station but I do not think it is asking a policeman too much to wake up five minutes earlier for him to do duty at the Harbour.

I mentioned the St. Cecilia Police Barracks in connection with the Waterworks because the proposal was to shift the Police Band up to District "A". That would also involve the expenditure of a considerable amount of money both for the removal and for the additional accommodation. It is true that we have passed that money for Waterworks accommodation, but we are not committed to this expenditure on St. Cecilia Barracks or the expenditure on District "A". I cannot remember the exact figures, but I believe, with the Barracks at the Harbour and the new quarters for the Band at District "A", that it would have involved a total expenditure of \$350,000. We are not anxious to spend that kind of money on buildings which are not going to bring in revenue to the Island but which would put additional maintenance expenditure on the taxpayers.

2.40 p.m.

We still have under consideration the place where the Waterworks Department should be located. We are not committed to put the Waterworks Department in Passage Road. An original vote was moved some time last year and this vote included office accommodation. We are not just going to put up an office for the Waterworks Department until we are satisfied that this building is located in the proper place and that the expenditure is justified. I do not think that any of us would deny that the Building presently occupied by the Waterworks Department is completely uninhabitable for such a Department and it needs pulling down or renovating.

When we come to Health Services, you will see an amount there for these services. Under this Head, the amount which was originally asked for was \$216,500. Under this Head — Head V — there is included an amount for repairs to the road leading from the Mental Hospital com-

pound to the beach. We are going to provide, in respect of item 3 — Medical Staff Quarters — four sets of living quarters for the Medical Staff at the General Hospital. There are twenty-four serving officers who are entitled to living accommodation and there is only provision for 15 of them. We are constructing additional quarters for four of these officers because it is felt that some of these officers may not actually want to live in; they may want to move into their own quarters. It may be necessary to provide in this financial year living accommodation for these officers.

The new Hospital estimate does not provide anything for living quarters; the officers will occupy the houses provided by Government. There is an amount of \$120,000 for these medical staff quarters and then there is an amount of \$75,000 for District Hospitals under this Head as well. This District Hospital as set out here, is for the Northern District area. We are not discriminating against the Southern District Council or the people in the Southern area because you will remember that there is a Maternity Hospital and a Health Service at Oistins in the Southern District already. We have proposals to abolish some of the existing Almshouses and have one Almshouse in the Northern District and one in the Southern District. If it were left to me, although it may be encroaching on the territory of the Mayor of Bridgetown, I would have one Almshouse in the island. The Biblical injunction is that the poor will always be with you; but I do not think that the poor should be with us for ever. As I was saying, this \$75,000 is for provision or establishment of a Health Centre which is the first move towards the construction of a proper District Hospital in each of the District Council areas.

Then you have this amount of \$12,000 for preliminary work on a sewage disposal plan for Bridgetown and its environs. However many plans may have existed in the past in this regard, the fact that there has not been any implementation of those plans means that this Government is not fettered in any way in its discretion to have a proper survey made. We will start this year with the first 500 houses on the outskirts of Bridgetown; we will provide additional accommodation for 25,000 people and we are making a start with funds which would be Loan Funds. We have undertakings from independent sources to deal with these houses. When we put down a scheme like that, we will be putting down a sewage system at the same time. This will be used as a pilot scheme to see about the whole work in Bridgetown. Port of Spain has not only spent the money but has seen how the sewage system works and we intend eventually to do the same thing for Bridgetown. There is a popular belief that you do not need any sewage disposal system in Barbados, but we need it more so than any other country in the world. One Jamaican, a very learned lawyer, who visited these shores a few years ago, referred to the Island as just a large septic tank. That hon. member, who was a member of the Federal Legislature, was not far wrong. We have to rely on under ground sources for our water supply, and we have to be very careful not to pour more pollution in the cesspits. From the health point of view above the ground, I think that we are very fortunate to have the kind of geological formation that the Island is built upon; yet from the point of view of our water supply, we have to be extremely careful that we do not put more pollution into the underground streams and lakes.

We rely on our underground water supply and so we need a sewage system more so than anywhere else. I know it has been said that you can drink water 20 feet away from a sewage disposal pit or cesspit. (*Asides*). Anyhow, you can dig 20 feet away from a cesspit and get water. But this view is not shared by the World Health Organisation Authorities because they have been warning us that the situation in this island is becoming very critical and we are not allowing people to move houses, within districts of a certain radius of our underground sources of water where pumping is being done.

2.50 p.m.

This applies equally to the Belle area, Golden Ridge, Hanson, Bowmanston and other places all over the country, so that this \$12,000 is to carry out the preliminary work on the proposals.

At Erdiston College, we are making provision for building changes and extensions and for the purchase of a station wagon, furniture and equipment. The station wagon is needed, Sir, for teachers who have to do training at different schools. They leave Erdiston and go out to different schools in the St. Michael area chiefly and have to go back to Erdiston three or four times a day at regular hours. The provision of the station wagon, therefore, is to facilitate the movement of teachers between Erdiston and the schools where they have to teach. The station wagon, as far as I can remember, costs under \$3,600.

Under Item 2 there is going to be a new house for the Headmaster at Combermere School, and the old house is being converted into a library. I understand it was not very well designed — without criticising anyone — for living, but we hope to be able to use that for a library for Combermere School. Similarly at the Coleridge-Parry School, there is going to be an extension of the Headmaster's house and roadway to be completed. There is Item 6 under Head 6 — extensions to Primary Schools — \$140,000. Then at the Technical Institute there is provision of \$60,000 for alterations and extensions. Then there is Item 10 — Industrial Arts Wing — \$31,340, Harrison College \$45,000 to provide three Science laboratories and equipment. I may mention here, Sir, that due to the fact that Sherbourne is going to be used by the Pre-Federal Organisation, we intend to use the laboratory facilities at Harrison College, the "Science Labs" as we call them, to do the first degree courses of the Liberal Arts College which will be started in September; so the mere fact that we have taken over Sherbourne does not mean that we have abandoned the idea of the Liberal Arts College. You do not need a building for a College; you need teachers, and for Science you need Science equipment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reason why we have given high priority to \$45,000 to be spent at Harrison College is because we want to expand the scientific facilities there. You will also remember, Sir, that children from other schools as well go to Harrison College to use the facilities which are provided there.

Under Item 14, Sir, you will see an amount of \$440,000 which is for the construction of five new Secondary Modern Schools. I am not unaware that a large section of the community now feels that the Government having given free secondary education should now go and take over the private schools. I do not want to make any pronouncement on that, because the Minister of Education is not here and I think he has already outlined what proposals he envisages for the private secondary schools, but we do feel that it is the duty of the Government to provide secondary education. As far as we can manage, and having given free secondary education to the ten Government-aided schools, we intend to proceed now with the erection of five Secondary Modern Schools, because we feel that the present demand is from the stream of pupils who would benefit best by a secondary modern education.

I might also mention here in answer to a query raised by the hon. senior member for the City that there is no age limit on these secondary schools, as far as we are concerned. If a pupil has the aptitude and ability and has promise and wants to go on, he can go right on as a matter of fact until he is twenty-six, as far as I can see, because we have imposed no legal age limit. Naturally they would begin to get a hardening of the arteries at eighteen and we would like to see them looking for jobs at that stage. Some would look for jobs at fifteen, sixteen or seventeen, but as it is, they would be able to go on and do the same standard of academic work at the Secondary Modern Schools as they do at the First and Second Grade Schools. The reason why we do not call them First and Second Grade Schools is because First and Second Grade schools have been described in the Education Act, and the curricula which we would be instituting in these schools and carrying on would not coincide with the curricula as laid down in the Education Act itself. We therefore do not want to be circumscribed by narrow definitions on education.

I can assure the hon. senior member for the City that any child going to a Secondary Modern School under our

Government would not have any disability at all, and as a matter of fact, will have more avenues of learning open to him or to her than the child attending so-called First and Second Grade schools, because they would be able to do the complete curricula for the First and Second Grade schools, read for the General Certificate of Education, or branch off to the technical wings and do any kind of welding or any industrial training they want to go in for. You will see, Sir, that the provision for the five Secondary Schools is not for the period of the Development Programme; these five schools are for the last three months of this financial year; so anyone who accuses this Government of not getting on with the job must be sleeping, with what has been done already this year - old age pensions, free secondary education and the crash programme.

Quite apart from the Ministers' time having to be taken up in going to meetings and Federation conferences, when I look back and see what has been done in the last six months, I wonder how Ministers get any sleep at all. There were no less than three Federation Conferences outside the Island and one inside the Island alone during the past six months, and I do not think that any Government has been under the pressure that this Government has been under. We are pushing ahead with the promises which we made to the people, and I was quite surprised the other day in checking through - we have all our Secretarial Staff as well checking from week to week, and I was surprised that they keep ticks against the manifesto to see how fast and how far we are going ahead with the proposals which we made - and I do not think that any member of the public should be dissatisfied that we are not carrying on the programme which we said we would carry out.

There are certain items which of course are going to take a little longer, because the legislation is rather involved, and all sorts of conferences and consultations have to be made. We have already consulted the Government of Jamaica and the Government of Trinidad on the taking over of plantation tenancies.
3.00 p.m.

I understand that there are some plantations in Christ Church under one of these political gentlemen and they have decided to give notices to quit to their tenants. But they are wasting their time. There is no point in giving notice because this Government has said what its intention is. If they think that they can make some quick money out of dividing up estate tenancies now, they will be in for a big shock.

We have legislation ready for the Landlords' Bill and we have to survey every estate tenancy in the Island, redesign them, lay them out and make provision for all the services - electricity, water and so on. At the same time these real estate agents who were rejected by the people had better be advised that there is a calypso called "You're Wasting Your Time". (Mr. MOTTLEY: I am a real estate agent. I am not wasting my time.) I said that those politicians are not in the House of Assembly.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I rise on a point of order. Up to now, I am still a real estate agent and I have not been rejected up to now by the people. I do not know whom the Hon. Premier means, but members of my Party as far as they are concerned, have made their minds up and they are only too willing to let the Government buy over the tenancies. I do not know which of the Parties are conniving. If any money is to be made out of real estate, do not blame me for trying to make some.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: What I said has no reference to the hon. member, but it was brought to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture just this week that estate tenants in that parish have been served with notices to quit by one of those political gentlemen. The hon. senior member for the City does not belong to the same political Party. I think that they have legal advisers who should tell them that there is no use going on with this conspiracy.

I have discussed this matter with agriculturists in the United Kingdom and they are pleased to see that the Government is prepared to do something for the agricultural

tenants because they feel that the tenants will be happier if you bring in facilities and housing and make the land available to them. I only mentioned that in passing. This is the only item in our Manifesto that we have not gone three-quarters of the way to have finalised because of the work involved in carrying out the survey and so on. However, we hope to have it well established by next year.

We have promised the people to come back in the next three years, and hon. members know that our supporters and even some of our detractors are very well optimistic of what we hope to achieve in three years; but I am sure that at the present rate at which we are going, it looks as if we will have implemented all of our projects before that time. The rate at which we are going these days, it would mean that everything we promised in our Manifesto would be worked on. As a matter of fact, we can set them in motion between now and next Tuesday at the rate at which we are proceeding now, providing we do not have any sabotage; therefore, I think hon. members need not have any fear that these provisions will not be carried out during the next nine months.

Our programme for education amounts to \$1,864,440. That is to be spent within the next nine months. Under Education, Item 10, is an Industrial Arts Wing. The amount to be spent on that is \$31,340. A further indication to show that we were not making wild promises as some uninformed members of the political public would have other people to believe is the provision made for a pilot school-meal service in the Primary Schools. We are starting a pilot scheme at St. Clement's, St. Christopher and Westbury. We took three schools, one from each of three districts because each area has special problems, such as the inavailability of supplies and so on. By this pilot scheme we will be able to expand the scheme as our experience allows us to. We are starting this pilot scheme in September. As hon. members know, there was a Committee set up, and the hon. senior member for the City also happened to be a member of that Committee; and he will agree that there is no point in starting off an exercise in which you have no experience at all in 126 schools. We have to start on a basis on which we can do a little bit of experimenting and see what the problems are; and as soon as we have the problems tackled, then I can assure the parents of children as soon as possible after 31st March, the scheme will be expanded to cover the whole Island. However, at least we are making a start in September.

Under 7 - Agriculture - the amount voted is \$1,145,221. Looking at the Schedule, you will see the amount voted for Soil Conservation alone takes up the sum of \$424,465. That means that from the beginning of next month to the end of March next year, that is the amount of money which will be spent on the work which will be done. The amount of money voted for Livestock Development is \$51,892 and the amount for Grassland Development is \$17,350. Then the amount to be spent on Fisheries Development is \$71,158; Abattoir and Cold Store, \$321,736; Marketing Corporation, \$117,070; Markets Construction and Improvement, \$16,550. A lot of these are things which were not done before but initiated, such as Marketing Corporation.

I want to say something about Market Construction and Improvement. Without in any way encroaching on the province of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, the political philosophy of the last Government was that one should build markets in places where people can see them, so that you will say that the Government built a market there. The standing monument of ignorance is the market at Six Cross Roads.
3.10 p.m.

From the day it has been built, which is nearly four years ago, until this day not one single customer has gone into that market. Some hon. members may say that you build a market in an area in which people live, but they come to town to sell their products. That is a considerable expense to the taxpayers of this island; that market is a monument to the ignorance of the people who advocated and pressed for the construction of such a market in the parish which the Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and

Labour has the honour to represent. I do not think that even that Minister would be in favour of the construction of a market there in the interest of his constituency. People like to migrate in the City on Saturday mornings where they can sell their foodstuffs, where people buy them and go home. Not one single hawker has been into that market which has been erected in St. Philip, except to see what ignorance the last Government was putting up. We have to employ a watchman to watch that market. The Minister seems to think that that market should be turned over to the Princess Margaret School for use as a science block but, of course, there should be a plaque saying that it is a monument to the ignorance of the preceding Ministers. (Laughter) I took the hon. senior member for the City down the Portobello Road in London and I do not think he has walked so much in his life. In London and in other big cities like Brussels and Paris, in Swatham and places like that, in the remote places of the United Kingdom and in the middle of the expensive residential districts you have the hawkers on the roads with their baskets. The definition of a market is where people congregate traditionally, where the customer and vendor meet together. The market place is the meeting place of those who have things to sell and those who want to buy. It is the traditional practice for the people themselves to decide where are the most suitable places for markets. It is the brokers and the millers who decide if it is convenient to meet at a certain place; the shopping fraternity finds it convenient to meet at certain places. You have places like Brussels, New Orleans, Rome and Paris where the housewives like to shop in the street. They do not want to see their vegetables under any fluorescent lighting; they want to see them in the sunlight, in the way that nature provided them. To sum it all up, we have the sum of \$16,550 for Market Construction and Improvement, but do not be afraid that you will spend any money in building markets. We are closing down the Police Station in Speightstown and providing office accommodation and sanitary conveniences for people who want to use the floor court of the Police Station in Speightstown. If they want more facilities, we will provide them. We are giving instructions that a traditional market place like Busby's Alley and other places ought to be re-opened and streets should not only be made available to certain people who have licences, but to everybody who can find room to offer his or her wares. We do not think that people who have been accustomed to sell in congested areas - we do not think that those places are not the best places for them to sell. We feel that we should put in some kind of sanitary convenience for the people who have to be there.

You will remember that Mr. E. C. Hill, who was a sound Barbadian, had his whole business premises as a sort of arcade and you had that opening out into Busby's Alley; you had a sort of right of way into Baxters Road. I think that the Government lost an excellent opportunity when they should have taken over that building because it was a traditional market place. It was the only place in the whole of Barbados that people regarded as a building for this purpose; it was an overflow from Busby's Alley. The tourists like to see the colour they get from the open-air market places and nobody would be driving down those places and saying "Bring me a pound and a half of tomatoes", and then you have somebody walking up to them with this commodity.

We will decide that after certain hours certain streets will be closed to be play streets for children, because we have not got adequate playing grounds. We cannot expect the children of people who live in Vine Street or Lakes Folly to go a considerable distance in order to play games. We will have to have these places earmarked as play streets for children; we will have regular streets for this purpose where it will be an offence for anybody to ride a bicycle down such streets, so that there will not be any possibility of anybody knocking down children and being automatically charged.
3.20 p.m.

A motor car would not be able to get in, because we would have road blocks. We are not going to put up a sign, because a sign does not deter trespassers in Barbados. We will have road blocks, but cyclists would be able to squeeze

through. This is now being done in all the advanced countries in the world, and in Barbados where we are so congested, we are going to do that; so if you have the right kind of approach, you do not have to spend money to provide people with facilities; you use the facilities which you have in the right way. My only reason for spending such a long time on that is because I know some hon. members on the other side would want to get up and say we are only spending \$16,550 on markets. It is not for a single market anywhere; it is for sanitary conveniences and washing facilities and so on for the already existing markets, and for the Speightstown Market which we want to establish also as an open air market which would have these conveniences available too.

I mentioned the other matter because I do not want members to think that we are only thinking of the grown-up people. The police are carrying out a survey right now as to which roads should be closed for play streets for school children after 4.30 p.m. or 5 p.m. and on Sundays and Saturday afternoons. Some of the streets in this metropolis of ours will have to be closed all day and all night, because it is not really necessary to have every street in the Island that a bus can go down or even that a hearse can go down; so we will be closing certain streets permanently to traffic in Bridgetown, and this will include not only streets for hucksters, but streets for school children as well. You can expect that some time this month. When I say this month, I mean in July.

On beach development, we have been in touch through the Ministry of Agriculture with Mr. Makepeace Wood and he hopes to come down here in a couple of months' time to advise the Ministry on the places where we should build our groynes and so on. We are not going to spend a terrific amount of money by dumping a lot of rubble and sand in the sea and then finding out it is just washed away. We are starting off with a few experimental groynes at strategic points where the action of the current and wind will be studied with the assistance of Mr. Makepeace Wood who is an expert on these matters, and that will be started within the next couple of months.

Under "Milk Marketing", the Government has already agreed to the establishment of a Central Dairy and Creamery which eventually will control the complete dairy industry in the Island, and which has been discussed in and out of this Chamber for the past fifteen years. Ever since the Royal Commission came to Barbados and after the hostilities were over, these matters have been discussed. Development and Welfare started out way back about fourteen years ago by allocating \$93,000 or \$98,000 for this scheme; nothing was done. Certain people in the Island were not interested in the establishment of a Central Dairy, because the importation of dried milk is of considerable profit to a few people in the Island.

This Government has undertaken to invest \$100,000 which is only, let us say, \$7,000 more than the 1948 estimate on this scheme, so that Government will have a controlling interest to see that everything is done in the best interest both of the consumer and of the small and large dairy farmer as well, and we hope to expand milk production in this Island under the dairy scheme. Eventually when the thing gets going, and we satisfy the rest of the Island - that is, the other people who did not come into the scheme right away - that it is something they should be interested in, we will dispose of the Government's shares in the concern to the small farmers and I should go so far as to say to the large dairy farmers as well. We cannot discriminate against them, but naturally very strict attention will be paid to the allocation of these shares.

Under Communications and Works, Sir, you will see that we have provided an amount of \$2,775,814. If I may give a breakdown of that figure, we are going to spend \$60,000 on roads other than highway and tenantry roads. We have highways, we have tenantry roads and we have other roads; we are spending \$60,000 on that. We are spending \$220,000 on highway improvement; on rehabilitation of highways, \$205,000; and drainage \$1,155,000. This may appear to some to be a considerable amount of money, but you

will remember, Sir, in the crash programme, I explained that it was not some flash-in-the-pan business in order to be flamboyant at Christmas or give the impression of trying to do something; but the crash programme was an integral part of the Government's Development Plan, and part of the Government's Development Plan is to conserve the water which rushes down the gullies and into the sea by building a series of dams and trenches across the gullies in the Island at strategic points, and force the water underground by carrying out improvements to the areas around the gullies by cutting down unnecessary vegetation and so on, by changing the Constitution Swamp, and building bridges and roads across the Constitution Swamp to relieve traffic congestion. Our original proposal entailed the building of a bridge from the corner of Crumpton Street to the bend in River Road nearest to Rediffusion at a cost of \$600,000, but after seeing the whole area and consulting with experts, the Minister of Communications and the rest of us decided that that bridge should go and save \$600,000, and the proposal now is that after draining the Constitution Swamp and providing the necessary bed for it in certain sections, we will continue the work which is being done in the crash programme which curves around in front of the northern end of the Hospital, and continue the road all the way through to what is known as Gully House and put a short bridge out there with a roundabout for traffic. 3.30 p.m.

In other words, the proposed bridge from the bus stand to Crumpton Street would not relieve the traffic congestion; so we are doing a re-evaluation of the project. As a matter of fact, that bridge would create more confusion around the Nelson Gate which leads you into Queen's Park. But if we take the country buses and let them move in front of the new Hospital along what was known as the "Concrete" and let them carry on along the road on the east of Weymouth, and with our resiting those houses along that way so as to let the country buses come out by the Gully House, by building a short bridge there, that would relieve the congestion. That is what this money is for. In other words, we are throwing the buses which have to go to St. George, St. John off the short streets around the town and by that means the flow of traffic would be diverted from going into Crumpton Street. As hon. members can see we are putting this traffic as far as possible on the outskirts of the town so as to ease the traffic congestion which flows over the Victoria Bridge. That is work to be done this year. It is a considerable amount of work.

Perhaps, this may be a convenient point for me to mention something. A few weeks ago in the Press appeared a notice.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: I rise on a point of order. Just before the hon. member goes to that he referred to highways, parish roads, tenantry roads and other roads. He did not go far enough. I want the hon. member to tell me what he means by that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: We have different types of roads. We have highways which used to be under the old Central Road Board. Then you have parish roads which were described as highways but were termed parish roads because the parishes looked after the repairs, with the exception of three or four parishes which were attached to the Central Road Board. Then you have tenantry roads which are roads in tenancies. You also have some cart tracks which are used by people which are neither tenantry roads or highways and those we describe as other roads. You have the position in which a couple of people may be sharing the same road but those are not tenantry roads; they are roads in a development area. If you go up in Graeme Hall Terrace, you will see what I mean. That is a different thing to tenantry roads. This money is not for those roads. If I give a little further explanation, let us take the roads in Strathclyde and Rendezvous. Those roads have never been done. You go down in St. Andrew and there is a place called Ben Hill or Walkers and you get a winding cart track running into houses. Those are not tenantry roads because the people own their own land.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I hate to interrupt the Hon. Premier. But the particular point I want to get made clear is

this. I do not want the public to get confused because under the Local Government Act, the three Councils called on proprietors of land to repair and provide tenantry roads and I do not want the public to get confused with that and the Government saying that it is repairing other roads. I want to know if other roads mean private roads. I understand the explanation of highways and parish roads. Tenantry roads are those roads where people bought the land and there is a road in common on either side of their land which is conveyed to them. I want the Hon. Premier to make it clear that those roads are not private tenantry roads where somebody went out of the Island and came back and bought the land. I say that because the owners of private tenancies will come to the conclusion that we, of the Councils, are sticking on them to repair their tenantry roads while the Government is undertaking to get them repaired.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member asked for an explanation. It is what we mean when we say 'other roads'. Parish roads are those roads which used to be done by the Parochial authorities. Tenantry roads are roads in tenancies, where you get the people owning the land and you still get some of the people paying rent.

Sir, you will forgive me if I go back a little bit on this matter. A lot of the tenantry roads which have been done are tenantry roads owned by private persons. I can show the hon. senior member for the City now in Bush Hall and Bank Hall several roads owned by private people which have been done by the last Government. Under the new Local Government setup, the local authority has power to call upon private persons to fix their roads. I am making a statement of fact.

Obviously, I have not been through the list of all the roads which are to be done. We got the figures and we have cut them down, and so on. What I would point out to the hon. member is that you get a road like Ben Hill where every person down there owns his own land. That is not a tenantry. King Street up by St. Simons is another road which is not a tenantry road. You also get places like Strathclyde, the Navy Gardens and Rendezvous which are not tenancies, but the people are paying taxes and the Local Government authorities cannot call on the people up there to repair the roads. They are not highways; a lot are cul-de-sacs. 3.40 p.m.

There are lots of roads in relation to which originally the land may have belonged to a plantation and it was sold to individual property owners. The old device is that you cut off one piece of land and you did not have to go to the Board of Health. You will find that the whole area is occupied by individual land owners and they send in a petition and say: "We want this road repaired". The hon. senior member for the City has said that he has passed on this burden to us.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The procedure is that people make application to the Town Council and, as we do not have anything more to do with the roads, we pass on the applications to the Minister. You take the privately-owned tenantry roads; you take Alleyne's Tenantry; where a proprietor owns a whole tenantry and cuts roads in it, such is the tenantry in respect of which we are empowered under the Act to call upon the proprietor to repair those roads. On the other hand, where lands are sold out and a road 12ft. or 14ft. wide is left, and on each side a portion of the land has gone into the road but persons are allowed to go to and fro on the road, that is described as a privately-owned tenantry road. Neither one of the persons on each side of the road can stop it; and such roads are the roads which the Board of Health takes over. We have been having a lot of trouble in getting these roads repaired. I think of Water Hall Land which is owned by one individual. I, personally, think that we should not spend one cent on these roads. Let us take Brandons; the owner has a tremendous area down there, and there is no reason why he could not sell one or two spots and repair the roads. I am at one with the Government on this question of roads. Within recent years land has been sold out in St. Andrew and in other areas; the solicitors convey the land which belongs to the owners on each side and those who own the land are called upon to repair the roads.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think that anybody knows more about tenantry roads and other roads than I know.

In St. Andrew when these roads were given over to the highway authorities.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that the hon. member is speaking on a point of order.

Mr. CORBIN: Yes, Sir. I am speaking on a point of order. When the roads in St. Andrew, St. Joseph and St. Lucy were given over to the Highways and Transport Authorities, there were several roads which were given over; they were roads before any of us was born. People use to work their carts on these roads; nobody could stop them and therefore the roads were their roads. You cannot stop me, neither can I stop you, from using these roads. Those who sold the land left a space there for the carrying out of the produce. That is what I want hon. members to realise.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this debate is getting very involved and I think I have to clear up one or two matters. I have mentioned Ben Hill and other roads. I was using those roads as an illustration of what I mean of other roads. It is not that these roads are to be included in our programme; it should not be said that I said that we were taking over or repairing Ben Hill or any other such roads in this programme.

As far as the hon. senior member for the City is concerned, I do not think that anyone who had been listening to what I have said here today would get the impression that those who own private tenancies should look to the Government to repair those tenantry roads. It is unfortunate that the local authorities did not adopt this attitude long ago. When the land owners first got the authority to sell out this land, there was no inspection to see that these roads were constructed at all, so that such roads were constructed without any proper material and therefore they could not be kept in proper condition. The rents are reasonably low, and if the tenantry owners are called upon to provide proper roads, and so on, that is really no burden to them. You cannot eat your cake and have it too. If you have tenancies and the rents are uneconomic, then you should sub-divide the land and repair the roads. A person who has one hundred housespots can sell about six or eight of them and provide proper roads for the people who occupy the other 94 or 92 housespots. I repeat that these private tenantry owners cannot expect to eat their cake and still have it; they want to have this feudal system whereby they can pass over land from one generation to another in perpetuity. There is no imposition on the owners of these private tenancies if you ask them to repair the roads because, invariably, the people who are paying only 50 cents a week or so are quite willing to have the roads repaired.

Something has appeared in the Press to the effect that I do not like the siting of the houses at the Hospital, but I was talking about the siting of the road there. 3.50 p.m.

I made no pronouncement to any newspaper man or journalist. Indeed I understand that somebody was loitering around when I was discussing matters with the Minister and the Surgeon Specialist at the Hospital, and they all agree with me that I never said anything about the "sight". I said those houses should not be there at all, that they should not be on that site; but with the *Advocate*, "a thousand years in thy s-i-g-h-t" could be translated "s-i-t-e" and vice versa; so they spelt that "site" as "s-i-g-h-t". The *Advocate* did report accurately that they should be resited, but they did not spell the word "r-e-s-i-g-h-t-e-d"; they decided to spell that "r-e-s-i-t-e-d" in the same sentence in which they said I did not like the sight. Not liking the site for houses and not liking the sight of houses are two different things. They did not go on to explain the reasons I gave, but I said it should be a prohibited area, and quite apart from that we are building this road which will go right through to Gully House to relieve traffic congestion.

Mr. Chairman, if I had to reply to some of the nonsense I see in the daily newspapers from day to day, I would not have any time to do the people's work and my energies would be drained away. The rest of my life would be spent writing articles correcting them, and they would say they are sorry, they did not understand, and write editorials that do not read correctly. If they get amusement, I cannot blame them. You will see also, Sir, that I was speaking at one stage on drainage, and if anyone in Barbados has any doubt whatsoever that we mean to carry out the programme which we have in the Manifesto, they will see that the last Government in its Five Year Plan provided a total amount of \$1,000 for investigating the possibility — and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who is interrupting the proceedings should be very glad to hear this because he has been asking nearly as many questions.....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, am I correct in hearing the Hon. Premier say that I am interrupting?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has complimented you.

Mr. SMITH: On what?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On your attention.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, this is no joke. I heard the Hon. Premier say that I am interrupting the proceedings. I do not know that I am interrupting any proceedings.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You did not hear the last sentence which was a compliment to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I do not want any compliment from anybody. I heard the Hon. Premier say that I was interrupting the proceedings and I should like to ask what proceedings I have interrupted.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was about to say that the hon. member has probably asked as many questions as I have asked myself on the East Coast Road; and although he had the doubtful privilege of belonging to the Party of the last Government for nearly twenty years and asking questions about it all the time, he never saw his dream fulfilled. He, like me, being a representative of a constituency, would be glad to see that we do not have any provision for investigating the possibility of constructing the East Coast Road. We have down \$540,000 to be spent between now and 31st March on the actual construction; so I thought the hon. member would abate his exuberance and would not explode because I made passing reference to the number of questions which he had asked. We have \$540,000 for the East Coast Road, and if I could drink, I would even want to "fire" one with the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to know that we are getting something done in the parish. Unfortunately I cannot. There was an original amount of \$6,000, but it is now \$540,000. This is not all the money that will be spent on the road. We are doing it in stages and this stage is going to cost \$540,000 between now and the 31st March.

On Equipment, we have \$288,446. This will be equipment primarily for road construction. One of the neighbouring Islands recently bought equipment from the United States for road surfaces commonly called Barber Green equipment, which will build the nylon road that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said he wanted to see. I hope he does not take it that the crash programme means he must crash his motor car by exceeding the speed limit on these nylon roads.

For Runway improvements and drainage, there is \$150,000. There was a considerable amount of money at first set aside for runway improvements and car park, but we have cut that out because we do not think we can justifiably spend that money for the remainder of the year. We are going to press on with the East Coast Road, and with the \$1,000,000 for the Constitution and gully drainage and so on, it is hardly likely that we would be able to do more than \$150,000 worth of work at Seawell. Let us come now to the question of the car park. It is true that Seawell at

certain peak hours may be congested, but if you are going to spend any money in a development programme to build a car park, I think I should issue a warning right now that such additional work would have to be paid for by a parking fee. There will be no parking fee for Seawell as it stands at present, but if we have to spend half a million dollars, I am not going to allow that money to come out of the Treasury for people to go there and sit down in the bar and drink rum and ginger or rum and soda three or four times a day. (Mr. SMITH: You have got it already in taxes.) Well we want it both ways then. You cannot get that kind of thing in a place like Barbados. It is a very nice car park; it could hold a few more cars, it is true, but out of the 168 hours in every week, for about 160 of these hours the car park is more or less empty. The reason why I mentioned that is because one hon. member in an aside asked whether runway improvements at Seawell included the car park.

Mr. Chairman, there was originally a proposal for car park facilities to be extended, but unless the public wants to pay a car parking fee, we cannot spend that money. I have never seen anybody turn back from Seawell because they could not find somewhere to park; but it is highly probable that in five years' time car parking facilities at Seawell may be too limited for the amount of traffic which we hope to have coming in; but if we have priorities in a development programme we cannot afford to waste money on that kind of project. You have to convince the sources from which you are getting loans and grants both in the United States and outside that we are being realistic, and do not want to see just the biggest car park in the West Indies and no money coming in. What kind of false economy would that be? (A VOICE: What about the other car park?) You mean the Fairchild Street car park! I was talking about Seawell when the hon. member interrupted.
4.00 p.m.

Now, when we come down to Fairchild Street you will have to pay because of what we intend to do down there. I was talking about the runway myself; I was talking about the Seawell car park. We do have the sum of \$125,000 for car parking facilities in Bridgetown. I will tell hon. members that since we have the Deep Water Harbour, we do not need the Inner Careenage Basin to the extent of the present area there. The Inner Careenage is not required for the berthing of liners. Lumber does not come ashore there now; it goes to the Deep Water Harbour. This money is to provide parking space for approximately 1,000 motor cars. The present wharf wall on the Fairchild Street side is in a bad state of repair and needs replacing. Instead of replacing that wharf, a new piling would be driven on a line parallel with the Trafalgar Square and into the middle of the water area; and all the space between the new piling and the old water frontage will be filled in with rubble which we will get from other projects and that will provide us with space for 1,000 motor cars. All this is what is going to be done before the 31st March, next year.

There is no money which I am asking for today which will not be spent. As a matter of fact, I have drastically reduced a lot of the money which was making provision for a lot of other things for which no one could satisfy me that we had the necessary staff and equipment to carry out the projects. The \$12 million of works in this capital expenditure is to be completed in the next nine months. This is work which is going to be done between now and 31st March.

As I have said, we are providing additional parking facilities for 1,000 motor cars and that will pay for itself in a year even if we only charge 25 cents a day for parking a car. These are what we call productive projects. We cannot spend anything more on the one at Seawell unless the people are prepared to pay at Seawell as well.

As regards the rate charged, I may mention that in big countries like London you pay at the rate of a sixpence per hour for parking facilities and you cannot stay longer than two hours unless you pay again. In New York if you park in a private area you pay \$1.00 for the first hour and 35 cents for each hour after that. Therefore, if we charge 25 cents a day, I do not think anyone should grumble.

We now come to Miscellaneous expenditure and in that we have \$10,000 for Minor Handicrafts and \$250,000 for the Natural Gas Corporation. This therefore makes a total of \$260,000 and the grand total for the Resolution, \$8,544,483.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Will the Hon. Premier tell us something more about Item 6 (New) Natural Gas Corporation?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Natural Gas Corporation is asking for a loan to meet capital expenses. As far as I understand — I want to be quite honest about this — the Natural Gas Corporation does not want to expand its services this year. This money will be made available to the Natural Gas Corporation by way of a loan. We still have lots of debt, and this is not a gift; this is a loan. As far as we have been made to understand, there are very few extensions for domestic services and there will be no extension to the mains. They do not want to do it because they are not satisfied about certain factors such as reserves of gas and such things.

However, I am very glad to say that the Hon. Minister of Trade has already drawn up an agreement with a Canadian Oil Company which is prepared to drill thirty new wells during the period of the current financial year. The Directors of this company are looking primarily for gas; they are not doing exploratory work for oil. If they strike oil, they will be delighted; but they are doing this knowing full well that we are not giving them the right to prospect for oil alone. They are not prospecting for natural gas for domestic purposes and industrial purposes alone; they intend to make fertilisers out of the natural gas. As I have said, they want to put down thirty wells this year. This has come about as a result of a Barbadian family living in Canada. He is an oil engineer. He had a case in the Law Courts and apparently he has been impressed by the way I cross-examined him. He said that it is not going to cost us a cent. We are not giving them special concessions except in so far as the development of fertilisers is concerned. This money is not for them; they are doing it out of their own money.
4.10 p.m.

The Natural Gas Corporation will pay interest on any money which we advance them; our policy is that they should pay interest now. As a matter of fact, they still owe some money for royalties. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that this Resolution....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, one would not expect this Resolution to be passed without my saying something on it. It is only a matter of hours that this Resolution was in my possession and after I received it I had to go to bed. This morning I had to go to work and therefore I have had very little time to read this Resolution.

Under Head 4 — Water Supplies — I am very glad to see the amount of money which we are going to vote for development of water resources, additional mains and standposts, replacement of mains and standposts and so on. I am throwing out a hint to the Hon. Minister; first things must come first. There are a lot of districts and villages which are still without the water service and the people have to walk very far in order to fetch water. Those districts should be the ones to have priority immediately at the beginning of this scheme. The people who have to walk for such great distances in order to fetch water, especially the workers — it is those people who are in these districts who are suffering and the Minister should give the water authorities instructions to start in those districts and serve the people there first. There are quite a number of applications which have been made by the various District Councils in respect of water supply; I think that the applications which are already there should be considered first and foremost and then the others should be dealt with.

As to the installations for private individuals, the figure is somewhere in the vicinity of 800 applications for these installations, and at the rate at which water is being installed in these homes, the person who is No. 600 will not be able to get his or her water before the next six years. I would like the Hon. Minister to take up the matter with the Waterworks Department and let them speed up these installations. If it is a question of money, well, we are voting the money now, and the labour is there; if it is a question of material, well then, let us speed up and get the material. I do not know what is the rate of installation, but it may be that some people will not get their water service before 1969. There are those people who have to travel for long distances, especially those people in the country districts, as I have already said, and on this matter I do not speak for the parish of St. Joseph alone. I know that people have to walk from all the tenancies to the main road in order to get their water. It is therefore time that the water should be taken to the tenancies and not that the people have to walk such long distances so as to get water.

Under Head 6 - Education - there is Item 2 - Combermere School. I notice from the note to this item that provision is included to meet the cost of the Headmaster's house, the conversion of the old house, two laboratories and lecture room and enclosure. Sir, I do not know what is the reason why you have to build another house for the Headmaster of Combermere School when not so long ago we have built one. If it is a question that you want other rooms, lavatories and so on, I think it would be much cheaper to build these rooms than to build a house for the Headmaster because then you would have to alter the Headmaster's house into these quarters; in that case you will have to spend more money in order to do that. I know that the Headmaster's quarters are quite habitable and anybody can live there.

The Hon. Premier has mentioned something about this and I would be glad to live in that house because it is a better house than the one in which I live. If you were to change the Headmaster's house in order to provide these rooms, then you will have to spend money to do that, and then you would have to build the Headmaster's house. We have to be very careful with the money which we are spending because this money is coming from everywhere.

As to the School Meals Service, I know that two other schools were mentioned. I am not a Reporter and therefore I could only manage to jot down St. Clement's School.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: St. Christopher and Westbury Schools.

Mr. SMITH: If you are trying out this School Meals Service in every district, I quite agree with you; but you seem to go very far away to make a start, all down to St. Clement's.

As far as Education is concerned, you are trying to do everything to help children to go to these secondary schools. Everybody is paying the piper and everybody should be able to call the tune. Those people who have to pay this increase of four cents for a "snap" are contributing to this expense and they also have children who are going to these private secondary schools. Everything is done for the Government-aided secondary schools, but I am dealing, not with the schools, but with the parents now. Everybody has to pay his taxation in order to help the Government to keep running these schemes. The Hon. Minister of Education is not now in his place, but the Hon. Premier can say what they are doing about the private secondary schools and about assisting the parents of the children who are attending these schools to cope with the expenditure, the high cost of living and so on. Those parents who are paying for the education of their children have to meet the same expenditure as those who are not paying for the education of their children. 4.20 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I would like to correct the hon. member, because I know that certain members of his Party who used to be members of the House are going about on Sunday mornings with one or two Civil

Servants, particularly from Highways and Transport Department - people who should know better - telling the public that the Government has given rich people free secondary education and poor people like them do not have free secondary education. I know the hon. member is fair enough to bear with me for one or two minutes. The first point I want to make is this: the four cents on a snap of rum is to pay for the disloyal Civil Servants who go about preaching propaganda about the Government. It is absolutely nothing to do with the Development Plan. The money for the Development Plan is coming from my blood and my sweat and that of the Hon. Minister of Trade with our advisers who went up to the United Kingdom, to Washington and New York and argued with people, cajoled them and talked to them and convinced them that we knew what we were talking when we asked for these loans to carry out this programme here. It is the first time in the history of Barbados that we have got an Exchequer Loan of \$2.7 million. Do not let us hear this emotional talk - "whoever pays the piper must call the tune" - that we have had bandied about here, and that the people are paying more taxes and are treated unfairly. That is the biggest myth that we have in Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is talking as if there are two classes of people in Barbados, the people who send their children to Government-aided secondary schools, and the people who send their children to private secondary schools. In truth and in fact, including myself and including other hon. members around here, some former Ministers and the Leader of his Party on his right can tell him that he has been in exactly the same position, that all sections of the community have children at both types of schools. A mother or a father may have three children at Government-aided schools and two at private secondary schools; so to go around on Sunday mornings or any other day or to get in the House and say that we are giving the rich people free education - and they have been calling the names of people who do not have children of school age - is being disloyal. There are certain favourite names that they call in Barbados - Mr. Wilkinson and Mr. Bryden, neither of whose children are of school age - and what we hear in St. George, Christ Church and in St. Thomas is that Mr. Bryden and Mr. Wilkinson's children are getting free secondary education. If they get, it is because the last Government allowed them to get in these schools at all, but neither Mr. Bryden nor Mr. Wilkinson or people in that category have children of school age, and they pay more taxes than anybody else.

Mr. Chairman, the system even in my day was that you could take a Scholarship examination, and if you came first you got the Scholarship. The only Scholarships that discriminated on the grounds of means test were the Vestry scholarships, and I never took one because my uncle thought it would be degrading to set out what your mother or your father was working for. The first Scholarship I sat around eight or nine years was right here in this Chamber; that was the only Scholarship that had no kind of means test; but whether you had rich or poor parents, you could take the Primary to First Grade or one of the senior Scholarships. I can name several people who sat the examination. I sat all the examinations because nobody in my family was prepared to go and beg any Vestryman to give me a break, and the hon. member knows that used to happen. It was nothing to do with merit; it depended on how many Vestrymen you knew. Now let us get the records straight, and I hope when I have finished, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is not going to continue with this nonsense.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, does the Hon. Premier refer to my remarks as nonsense?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Some of the remarks.

Mr. SMITH: It is not a question of some of the remarks. The Hon. Premier rose on a point of order and said I would be fair enough to let him talk, but that is not a point of order. The Hon. Premier is making another speech, and it is not fair to other members for you to allow any other member, be he Premier or no, to get up on a point of order and make another speech.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member made some misstatements and I stopped the hon. member for two reasons. The first is that I have to ask for an excuse to go to the Museum to present something which the Premier of Israel sent to the Museum. The second reason is that this has been going on too long, because if he would consult with other members, including the Leader of his Party on his right, I am sure he would be honest enough to tell him that there are not two classes of people in Barbados, people who send their children to Harrison College, Queens College and Combermere, and people who send theirs to the Arlington, Federal and so on. The truth of the matter is that in nearly every family you get some of the children going to private schools and some to Government-aided secondary schools. There has been no selection of children by this Government to go into any one of the ten schools. It has been on a competitive basis, and therefore I take it that the brighter children, the children who are better examined, go to the Government schools — and not necessarily the better children, because a lot of the children at private schools have done remarkably well — but the brighter children who are better examined have managed to get into secondary schools. Even the Venezuelan boys at the Lodge School who do not get free secondary education still have to pay. Some of them are spending \$1,000 a month in this country. We had one family at Lodge School alone spending \$1,000 a term in school fees and boarding fees when I was a member of the Board of that school.

To come back to the point, Mr. Chairman, I must ask the hon. member to disabuse his mind; I am not saying that he is nonsensical, but what he is saying when you consider it, does not make any kind of sense, and I understand that no kind of sense is nonsense. It is only a shorthand term, but it does not mean you are a nonsensical idiot or anything like that necessarily or at all. I am merely demonstrating to the hon. member that Barbadians have a very loose logic when they talk about people sending their children to these schools. The children of lightermen, agricultural labourers, bus drivers and conductors and scavengers are not only going to these secondary schools, but are winning scholarships as well, burning oil lamps at night, and some of them do not have a bed to sleep on until they go to Oxford or Cambridge University; and I am sure the hon. member on his right will tell him that it is consistent with the facts of history, because if he does condemn this, he would have to condemn his Government as discriminating against the poor all these years.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Premier has been reaching for me about four or five times. What are you telling us? That on the grounds of merit the bright children go to Government secondary schools and you are providing free secondary education only for the bright children? Is that not a form of discrimination? Am I to understand from the Premier's speech now that the bright children get through the net and probably go to Government-aided schools? That is probably true in reply to my colleague's remarks and questions, but are we being told for the first time that the Government is now discriminating and only giving free secondary education to the bright children? I would like to hear the Hon. Premier on that. 4.30 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will answer the hon. member. I thought that he would have been honest enough to correct his colleague, but he has not risen to do so.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, the Hon. Premier makes these unkind remarks whenever I say something, and it is because I am not prepared to reduce myself to that level to which he reduces himself. The Hon. Premier does not realise that to pay a little courtesy and politeness is so cheap that we can afford to lavish it. It is free and for nothing. The things which emanate from your lips indicate what hangs on the wall of your mind. This is mean and ugly and the sarcasm which the Hon. Premier brings into his debates.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member seems to completely misunderstand his colleague because the hon. junior member for St.

Joseph was saying that the people who sent their children to Government-aided schools got free education.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, do you not understand the rules of a point of order? That is not a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the Hon. Premier.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I can talk a lot of times because we are in Committee. I ask permission to make a Statement and I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is misrepresenting the true state of affairs. The discrimination is not between parents; if there was discrimination, it was discrimination because we have decided to control the Government Schools and because we made education free to those who are in them. There are more children of poor parents in those schools than children of rich people and I can provide the hon. member with the statistics if he gives me three days. If the hon. junior member for St. George is saying that it is not true that there are more children of poor parents in the ten Government-aided schools, then I say that we have been in office for the last seven months and found them there subsidized to the extent of three-quarters of what it costs to keep them there. We have to straighten our own front yard before we go into somebody else's back yard. It is now the policy to have secondary education free at all levels, but his Government said it was impossible even to have them in Government Schools. In the eight months since we have come into power we did it.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Premier is making another speech. I am on a point of order. He knows it is not true and he is not telling the truth. We never said it was impossible. How would you have the face to stand up in Parliament knowing that these things are going to be recorded forever and say that? We started on a scholarship basis and that is how it was done in Jamaica. The hon. member said it was impossible. He is making about ten different speeches on a point of order. At this stage, I will like to ask the Hon. Leader of the House not to take a vote on this matter today.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. MILLER: I am on a point of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. junior member for St. George does not understand what the House is discussing.

Mr. MILLER: I am on a point of order; so the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour, will have to sit down. I am saying that all of these papers reached me late last night. We heard the Hon. Premier for almost two hours and on top of that he has risen on five or six points of order. I do not think it would be reasonable to conclude discussion on this vote this afternoon and I am only asking the Hon. Leader of this House to give us that assurance.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. George totally misunderstands what the Committee is discussing. The Development Plan is not before the Committee at all. We are discussing the Development Plan next Tuesday and the hon. member has all the time to reply to everything which is here in this Resolution. All that we are doing now is a Resolution for certain capital expenditure; we are not considering the Development Plan.

Mr. MILLER: I do not know why the Hon. Leader of the House should go out of tune. I have always had some respect for him. I saw quite recently some letters coming in from the Leaders of the other colonies describing the Conference as the "Crawford Conference" in London.

I am only asking that we be given full opportunity to discuss this Resolution. I want to discuss it with my Party and I know that my Party would like to discuss it with me. It is for capital works. We are in Committee and we can have a debate on it but do not conclude it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I repeat, this is not the Development Plan at all.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, we are dealing with two Resolutions, one asking for \$8 million which we are considering now and we have passed the other for \$3 million. They are for money to carry out capital works. I am asking that you do not press this for a vote. As I have said, I want to discuss this with my Party and this is something which my Party would want to discuss because it is a major matter. I am simply asking that you do not press for a vote in Committee.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, it hurts me, believe me, to say anything. I was a Chairman and it hurts me to see that I cannot praise the Chair as I should. Imagine that one hon. member rose at a point of order and talked all over the shop and you sat there and allowed him to do so. He was on a point of order; he was not making a speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Premier rose on a point of order and also on a point of explanation.

Mr. SMITH: You put it your way. I am only saying that it does not look good at all.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of privilege. Will the hon. member for St. Joseph sit down? I am not deliberately unkind to him, but every time he gets up, he makes a spectacle of himself. When the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was sitting in the Chair, hon. members had a certain amount of respect for the Chair. He is not the Chairman now and he does not miss an opportunity of accusing the Chair of being partial and biased; but to show his partiality he said that one member was allowed to speak on points of order. I, as a Minister can speak as many times as I like on this matter, but the period of hiatus between his two speeches was taken up by his colleague.

I rose just to ask the hon. member if he legitimately made an error because it is popular currency in Barbados about this matter of poor people's children and rich people's children. I got up to describe to the hon. member that his Government had it in their power to do what we are doing and they told the people that we were trying to do the impossible.

4.40 p.m.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have really taken up too much of your time and I apologize; I am asking for an excuse. However, on a point of privilege, the hon. member cannot accuse the Chair of being partial. I am warning the hon. member now that the next time that he does that, we have the numbers over here and we will deal with him in the proper way. When the hon. senior member for St. Lucy was trying to get things done in a constitutional way in this House, he was suspended by the Party for which the hon. member for St. Joseph is a member and he sat over there smiling all over his face like a Cheshire cat. I am warning the hon. member now; I will have him suspended.....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. The Hon. Premier mentioned that the hon. member for St. Joseph had his face like a Cheshire cat. I am wondering which hon. member he meant.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I meant the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who was Chairman of Committees at the time.

Mr. SMITH: I never had any numbers. I really thought that the Hon. Premier was a harder politician. When he was a member of the Opposition, the way in which he used to get on made me say that he would be a tyrant if he ever became the Premier of this country; but he is really soft; he is like jelly fish. He got up to reply to the remarks that somebody went into the Pine and said this and that, I think that the Hon. Premier should rise higher than that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not care what the hon. member says about me. They have said everything they can about the hon. senior member for St. Philip, the hon. senior member for Christ Church, the hon. senior member for the City

and myself; they have already said everything that can be said and written in the English Language for the next 1,000 years about us; but the hon. member should not now be accusing the Chairman of Committees of partiality. I will allow the hon. member to go on with the debate, but we are not going to allow him to tell the Chair whatever he likes. And this is a threat; I am now threatening the hon. member that if he continues like that we will use our numbers over here to put him outside.

Mr. MILLER: You are making sport.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: We have 14 members over here and we can act constitutionally.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, we have heard the Hon. Premier bragging about his numbers. I know quite well that he would want to put me out of here, but I would suggest to him to let it be a matter of hand to hand, the two of us, not these numbers. I would take off my blouse now and let us go for it. (Laughter). I will not cast any aspersions against the Chair. The next time I will read the Rules of the House and let us see who will be the worst off. When the Hon. Premier says that I am casting aspersions and doing these things, if I see the Chairman making a slip, what must I do? I have the same right as the Hon. Premier. Does he believe that he can do everything and your humble servant cannot do anything? He is making sport. What difference is there between the Premier and myself where membership of this House is concerned? I am not a Minister, but I can talk and do as I like; I do not have to look in his face to see whether he is pleased or not. I say that he should not allow the members of this House to know that he is cherishing something about some Civil Servant going into the Pine and saying something. That has hurt him. I am asking the Hon. Premier not to catch at these straws; I find that he is not a hard politician. He is catching at the newspaper articles, he is hurt if somebody says anything and he raises it in here. A politician has to give and take; he cannot be grumbling at everything. Since I know that, I will write and I will talk too.

I am going back to the Resolution now. The hon. member says that I am trying to mislead.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I do not have to challenge any hon. member of this House to fight or to resort to fisticuffs. What I say, I say and I mean it seriously. The hon. member knows quite well what will happen to him if he decided to engage in a physical battle with me because he will disappear in Sputnik. (Laughter). No matter how he wants to side-track the issue — he must preface every single speech of his by accusing His Honour the Deputy Speaker or the Chairman of doing this and that. I want to say that there is no such thing as freedom of speech in here. You are allowed to talk as long as you do not abuse the privileges of the House; if the hon. member abuses the privileges of this House, I would not have to engage in any fisticuffs with him because I have nothing against any hon. member of this House; but I do not want to take advantage of the hon. member.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Premier who is now leaving the House does not know the Rules as well as I know them. I know my Rules and I can afford to get up when the Rules of the House are broken and say that they are broken. I am quite sure that the Hon. Premier does not know the Rules of the House as I know them. He can talk; he is a lawyer; he has a nice pair of lungs. I am not saying that the poor people's children are not in the Government-aided schools, but you have more poor people's children in the private secondary schools than the ones whose parents can pay for their education. That is a fact. Imagine your having a family including six children, they are poor people and all six children are going to private secondary schools!

4.50 p.m.

I am talking about the parents who have a family of six who may have two children at private schools and others at Government Schools. I may have one child for whom I can pay going to a Government school, but he is going to get education free and now he will get meals free, but a parent

with six children.....(Mr. MOTTLEY: The meals are only for elementary school children.) I do not know that. I have not had any explanation on it; all I have heard about is a School Meals Service. A parent may have six children going to school for whom he has to pay, but I am getting free education for my child though I can pay. Could that be fair? It could not be fair at all, because any man who has one child can pay for it; but I know the troubles, worries and headaches of a parent who has six children. It is not fair to educate one section when the other has to pay through its nose. The hon. junior member for St. Andrew would know according to his receipts that there is not a term.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, first of all I should like to know to which hon. member for St. Andrew the hon. member is referring.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order. I have not misquoted any person.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Secondly, the hon. member for St. Joseph made reference to the school of the member for St. Andrew. I want to make it clear that there is no hon. member from St. Andrew who controls the affairs of a school presently.

Mr. SMITH: Yet the hon. member wants to know which member, though he says there is no member who has a school.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I said there is no hon. member for St. Andrew who is presently controlling the affairs of a school.

Mr. SMITH: Let him try to fool whoever he can. He can say he is not controlling his school, but who is controlling it? The point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that people who pay taxes are contributing to the upkeep of these schools, and even now by buying rum they are contributing to educate children free; yet they have to pay for theirs. If it is free for one, it should be free for all, because you are taxing the people. The people who used to "fire" a grog will "fire" one if it costs \$10.00. It is a little hard to carry a snap from 16 cents to 20 cents, but it is not fair to call on them to contribute to education.

Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Premier said that this is money that he and the hon. senior member for St. Philip tried to get and it is not the four cents on the rum. If you are borrowing money you have to pay interest on it at least, and that interest will come from taxation; and you have to repay the money at some time or other. Where is that money going to come from? Out of his pocket and the hon. member's pocket? Are they going to take money out of their pocket when the time is due for the interest? The Government has to pay for it, and the Government is the people. The Government is the small class man, and he is contributing a lot more than most of us, because I cannot drink much as I am a diabetic subject. When I could do much with it, I drank a lot of it. It is the poor man's food, but you have held on to him and burnt him with this extra four cents on half a gill. You have put 25% on his grog and he still has to pay the school in Collymore Rock or some other private school for his children. It is not fair. I have three children at private schools, because I was not lucky enough to get one at the Government schools, and I have to pay. Now you are calling on people to pay taxes on bedsteads, refrigerators and what not. Every big man in this country has his refrigerator and his bedstead already, but the small man who is trying to get a fridge and a bedstead has to pay more taxes; so this tax is for the poor people.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of order, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph seems to be mixing things up. There is no specific person in the Island of Barbados who cannot send his child to any type of school, and anybody who drinks rum is contributing to the cost of education for these children whether they be at Harrison College, Combermere School or any grant-aided or private schools. There is nothing that denies any person in the Island the right of sending his children to any school. The schools are

open as Government schools, and anybody who can qualify is entitled to go to them. There is nothing to hinder any man's children going to Harrison College, Combermere or any other school; so I would like to draw that to the attention of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. The hon. member also mentioned that the Premier seems to be catching at straws when he referred to members of the Civil Service going about canvassing. I do not know if the Hon. Premier should disregard straws, because a straw is very sensitive, and when I see a straw I know the direction in which the wind is blowing and you can shift your sails to catch the wind.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who has just sat down said that the schools are open to everybody. Why are there so many children on the Waiting List then? What is the point in using the argument that the schools are open to everybody? They are open to everybody, but they cannot take in everybody. Soon you are going to have teach them under the cellar. My point, Mr. Chairman, is that it is not fair that one set of parents have to pay every cent for their children and another set does not. I want the Government to do something for these children, because the money that is being spent comes from these other parents also. When you come to agricultural labourers, these are the backbone of this country, and the majority has to pay for their children at private schools. Something should be done for them. The people who drink the most rum are agricultural labourers, because it keeps them up. They are paying for everything and getting no help as far as education is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, it is this Government that promised free secondary education, and it is on that promise that they won the election, but now they are not distributing it fairly and squarely, and I am going to see to it that it is distributed fairly.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, at no time did any member of this present Government get on any platform and mention free secondary education. It was always stated that there should be free secondary education at the ten Government-aided schools. (Mr. MILLER: Shut up and sit down!)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. junior member for St. George addressing the Chair?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whom the hon. junior member for St. George thinks he is talking to.
5.00 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, I do not intend to mix what I am going to say next Tuesday on the Hon. Premier's statement on the financial policy of this Island with this capital works programme. I shall retain that for next Tuesday. No Government could be so unreasonable as to expect that they can come in here and make a Statement without our replying to it. As a matter of fact, I am going to throw this out as a warning. To expect that would mean that this House is broken up.

I appreciate the fact that the Hon. Leader of this House realises that we have to speak on this matter. This Resolution which has come down today for our consideration, we regret very much that you have not given us time enough to study it. I say that because I received my copy last night from the Clerk of the House. Naturally, I am a very busy person. I left a meeting to come here at a quarter past two today, and that was my second meeting. Last night, I also had to attend a meeting; therefore, you can very well see that I have not had sufficient time to scan this Resolution. However, I do not think that this Resolution is as important as the statement of policy of the financial statement of the Island which we are entitled to discuss and criticise. Let me say that if two people agree all the time on a subject, one of the two is a damned fool.

This Resolution is for \$8,544,483. The Hon. Premier in dealing with this Resolution dealt with the various heads

which come under the various Ministries. I appreciate why he dealt with it in that manner because this is a policy which they have agreed upon; but I thought it strange myself that each Minister did not deal with the subject under his portfolio. (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: This is an omnibus Resolution.) I agree that it is an omnibus Resolution, but I thought each of the Ministers would have dealt with the Heads which come under their different portfolios.

This Resolution is for capital works. I want to make it clear that it is only because today being the 29th of the month and tomorrow being the end of the month, unless we pass this Resolution tonight it seems to me that you cannot begin to do anything next week unless this Resolution is passed. However, it is not right to send this to me at 8.00 o'clock the night before and ask me to come in here the next day and do this. Under the circumstances, however, I will be prepared to vote for this Resolution. It is nothing which this particular Government has initiated because it has happened with the other Government when it was in power. That Government has given us an explanation and has pointed out the difficulty, and the Opposition although they had numbers accommodated them. That has happened before and I have given that Government support.

Now, Sir, let us deal with the Deep Water Harbour which is Head 1. I am not going to be as exhaustive as the Hon. Premier, but it is one of these things with which we should deal in a different way from which we are dealing with it now. To deal with this matter in the correct way we would really and truly have to deal with the Hon. Premier's statement which dealt with the financial policy of the Island. However, if we deal with it in that way now, it will lose all the effect it will have when you come to deal with it in the Premier's speech.

While I am at this point, I want to say that it is tradition and customary for hon. members to have a copy of the Budget Speech made by the Premier in their hands soon after it is made in order that they can study it, and we are asking that we be supplied with a copy of the Hon. Premier's speech on the financial statement of the Island before the end of this week so that we can study it. Later on today, I am going to ask that my Resolution on the matter be made the first item of Private Members' Business on the Order Paper at the next meeting. The public has a right to hear both sides of the question. We are entitled to a copy of that speech before the week ends so that we can make our contribution on it.

On the question of water development, we have a lot to say. Every hon. member around this Table is eager to see this ambitious programme which the Government is now carrying out in its social reform. There is some change between their approach and the last Government's approach and, I suppose, the approach of my Party, but the ultimate aim of all of us is to work for a better Barbados.

There are one or two things which I would like to point out and I will deal with education first. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph raised the question of private secondary schools. Now, Sir, one of my colleagues in the City is the headmaster of the largest private secondary school not only in Barbados, but in the West Indies. I therefore consulted him on this matter. When the present Government was in the Opposition, I raised this matter both in here and on public platforms and I want the Hon. Leader of the House to know this. You have been given the power to run the Government and therefore, it is your duty to carry out your policy. We have no row about that; we are the watchmen, so to speak now. We do say that all is not well in this country if more children have to go into private secondary schools than go into government-aided schools. The figures are very remarkable. The desire of parents to give their children a proper secondary education is so strong today that I venture to say now that the Government should have some control over every private secondary school in the Island, and if that were to happen I believe some will have to close down because they are not properly staffed. Government has made up its mind that something will have to be done in private secondary schools. You cannot deny the fact that we are

sending children now to the University of Calcutta and down to the U.C.W.I. You have students today who were educated at these private secondary schools in Barbados and therefore, not all of these schools are opening their doors to make money. Some of these children were those who could not get entry into government-aided schools; therefore it is the Government's duty to give careful consideration to what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is saying. 5.10 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but in order to avoid a more protracted discussion on this matter, especially in view of the fact that the hon. senior member for the City now seems to be endorsing, at least to some extent, the proposals made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, I should like to say this:

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of explanation, Mr. Chairman, I have never endorsed any proposals made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Well, let us put it in this way; the hon. member quoted what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Oh, No! I said that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is now saying what I had been saying when his Government was in power.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Oh, I see. You have heard today that we are making proposals to extend the accommodation at the Government-aided Secondary Schools. In other words, our policy is to increase the accommodation at these schools and therefore the more secondary education you provide at Government-aided schools the more.....

Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the Hon. Minister.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You do not do that with me. I have risen on a point of explanation and the hon. member has to sit down. I am drawing to the hon. member's attention exactly what the Premier has said. He has misquoted something. Another thing is this: never, as long as I live, will I have any hon. member shouting at me. I came in here just as any other hon. member came in here. I am trying to remind hon. members of what the Hon. Premier has said.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the Hon. Minister.

Mr. MILLER: You have two members on the floor now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is a matter for the Minister. I rose on a point of explanation.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Let him listen to my point of order and if I am wrong he can correct me. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph knows that his Government, less than seven months ago, refused to do anything for these secondary schools. I am saying that this Government is proposing to provide free secondary education at the Government-aided schools and we are now providing more accommodation at these schools.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not know the reason for which the hon. member has risen. I am telling him or his Government this; first of all, he does not seem to be paying any attention to what I am saying. I agree with the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that in the not distant future you will have to do something for these private secondary schools.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Like what?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not know; I am not a Minister. I am saying that when the last Government was in power I harassed them and I am glad today to note that the hon.

junior member for St. Joseph is now agreeing with me that something should be done for these private secondary schools.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The Government under which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was a member, refused to do anything at all for these schools. We even asked them to refund the examination fees. They refused to do that and we are now doing it. All of these things that Government refused to do last year.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I ask: on what has the hon. member risen? He has risen because what he is saying was not explained by the Hon. Premier (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The Premier might not have explained everything.) I am surprised that the Hon. Premier took charge of the entire Resolution and did not allow certain members to handle certain things. I am glad that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is converted because I said that it was frightfully unfair for me to have my child going at Harrison College and have his fees paid whereas at the private secondary schools the parents have to pay for the examination of their children. I said that I am glad that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has been converted to that, and I am happy to know that the Minister will do something about it. I stood over there and asked the other Government to do these things and nothing was done about it. I am happy to hear that the Government is refunding the examination fees of the children who get through the examinations. What the Minister was saying is what the Premier had forgotten to tell hon. members.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. May I just remind the hon. senior member for the City that the Premier has not yet replied and in the course of his reply he will deal with these matters?

Mr. MOTTLEY: But you do not expect to sit down there and not have hon. members make these criticisms. I am quite happy that you are doing these things, but I believe myself that not only should arrangements be made to pay these fees and retain teachers but regulations should be provided where schools should be inspected, and only those schools which come up to the required standard should be given any particular aid or whatever the Government proposes to do about these schools. That is my personal view; that is the view which I have always expressed. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph knows that I have always taken that stand, and if he takes that view, why can't I agree with him?

I want to go a little further. This other matter was raised by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph; but because he has raised it and I had it in mind to raise it too, do you think that I will not raise it? You have built a house for the Headmaster of Combermere School who was then Major Noott, and he occupied that house for sometime. I understand that the Solicitor General, Mr. Jacobs, is using that house. Hence, Mr. Chairman, that house could not be so dilapidated and it could not be in such a state of disrepair that it could not be habitable.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I can help the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But you do not know what I am going to say.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Yes, I do.

Mr. MOTTLEY: No, you don't.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: It is not a dilapidated house; it is a new house. Both the family of Major Noott and that of the Solicitor General are smaller than the family of the new Headmaster.

5.20 p.m.
When we came into office, Sir, we found that the outgoing Government had decided to spend \$24,000 to repair this house for the present Headmaster to make it larger, whereas a new building would cost \$30,000; so which is

better? To do as they proposed to do and spend \$24,000 merely to enlarge the House, or spend \$30,000 and get an entirely new house, and then convert the old house into a library?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the hon. member for his explanation. When I start to speak, members come to their feet very often, and I appreciate it. That is an explanation which I knew a lot about, but this is what I am thinking of. I am not mincing any matters, but Major Noott had a wife and a child and lived in a house which cost \$16,000. I challenge you to say it is not true, and I accept every word you said just now because I knew before you mentioned it that there were arrangements to remodel that house at a cost of \$24,000; but I was waiting to see it come here for me to pitch into it. You built a house for \$16,000 for a man, his wife and child to live in. I am not a socialite or one of those men whom a clap on the back can handle; I am a businessman. I understand that an estimate was given — I do not know by whom, whether it was by the last man who left the Public Works, because there are some people at the Public Works who have five, six or eight houses, and if they were in America, the Senate Committee would investigate to see how they got the money to get the houses — of \$24,000 to remodel this house. I was waiting for you to bring it here and let me jump into you. I am going to ask these questions.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, the hon. member says he was waiting on us to bring it in here, but, Mr. Chairman, it was not an estimate given to us. We found it there. It was an estimate made at the time when Major Noott was living in the house, and it was proposed to enlarge the house when Major Noott was there and to spend \$24,000 on it then.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would still have been waiting if you had brought it or if the last Government had brought it, because you cannot hide these things from me. You cannot build a house for a man to live in and then spend \$24,000 to enlarge it after it is five years old; therefore the Hon. Minister has got to explain this to me. The Hon. Minister said that it has been discovered that the house which was built for Major Noott is being occupied by the Solicitor General whose family is smaller than the family of the present Headmaster. What I really want to know is this: can the hon. member tell me how many bedrooms this house has? It cost \$16,000 without the land, and I know about building houses. It is not a 12' x 8' or 16' x 9'.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: My recollection is that the house has one room that could be called a bedroom and another small room which was converted for use as a bedroom; but it has not got two full bedrooms, no study, no anything.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, the statement made by the Leader of the House is not correct, and it would be good for him to get information on this instead of making these loose statements and not talking the truth.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, before I replied to the hon. senior member for the City, I checked with the Minister of Communications and Works.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation, about three months ago it was drawn to my attention that \$24,000 were required for enlarging the house. It is not an old house; it is a new house which costs \$16,000 or \$18,000, but the amount of money estimated for repairs was around \$24,000. I spoke to the Hon. Minister of Education to discover if there was any land in the vicinity suitable for building a house and what it would cost, because I could not see the Government spending \$24,000 on alterations of a house when a new house would cost \$30,000. He enquired and the Government got the specifications of a house that would be suitable for the Headmaster of Combermere School, and it was estimated at around \$30,000. I suggested at that time that it would be more economical for the Government to let Mr. Jacobs live in that house and build one for \$30,000 rather than spend \$24,000 in altering the house; then we would have two houses, and instead of renting a

house for Mr. Jacobs, it would have been better for him to live in that house.

Mr. Chairman, the size of the present house was not suitable. I have not actually inspected the house myself, but apparently it is just suitable for a husband, wife and one small child. That was the report I actually got on it. There was no study or proper accommodation. Actually it was never suitable for a Headmaster. This is the first time that I have heard it cost \$16,000, and from the reports which I have heard, the house was never suitable for the purpose for which it was built, if there was one member of the Government who would stick out that the Headmaster should remain in it, it would be me. I would say if it was good for Major Noott and his family to live in, surely the present Headmaster should be able to live in it. It was not suitable when Major Noott lived in it, and arrangements were being made at the time for extending the house and making it suitable for the Headmaster of a school like Combermere.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the Hon. Minister who has just sat down because he has displayed so much sense in my opinion. It is just what I would have done if I were told that \$24,000 were needed to repair a house which I knew cost \$16,000. I want the Minister to get this clear in his head. 5.30 p.m.

I am no friend of the present headmaster, Major Noott or anybody else. What is worrying me is that it is a new house. I have not been into the house, but it does not matter if it is Mr. Gittens, Major Noott or Mr. Jacobs; what matters is that it is a new house and it costs \$16,000 and you now come for one for \$24,000. You must have some investigation; all is not well with the Public Works Department. You have to admit that. Let me put it this way. Let us say that it has two bedrooms, one of which might be small; surely it does not seem suitable. You must ask yourself this question: "How much did it cost to build this house?" All is not well with the Public Works Department. It is not strange for me to hear that somebody from a Government Department offered to sell somebody 150 bags of cement at \$1.00 a bag. Do you think I am nice? I have not stated which Department, but the Hon. Minister of Works can start and judge for himself. The man is a responsible man and he came to me and I said: "No, man; I do not deal with anything so."

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I rise on a point of order. For the benefit of the hon. senior member for the City, I just want to say that all of these things are the straws which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph says that we pay too much attention to. Those are the things which we want to know about because we trim the sails to suit the wind.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Anyone nautically inclined as the hon. junior member for St. Michael will always watch the latitude in which the ship is sailing.

Let us accept what you said that the house is most unsuitable. I am going to agree with you that a house which has only two bedrooms — a big and a small one — would not be suitable. Certainly I would not give \$16,000 for that building and the land; but when you come and tell us that you come for \$24,000 to build a new house for the Headmaster at Combermere School, it is enough for me to ask why are you asking for it.

It is time for you to investigate the cost of the building of that house as regards how much was spent and where the money has gone. I accept all that you have said. You said that the present building does not suit a Headmaster for a school with 700 children. How can you give him a house with one bedroom and a little nooky one?

I agree with you when you say that the house is not suitable; but if you say that it is not suitable, that it cannot hold the man's family, therefore if you appoint a man as Headmaster and it is part of the conditions that you give him a house to occupy and you get an estimate saying that it will take \$24,000 to make this house suitable for his family — I do not know if he has 11, 12, or 14 children — then if you tell us here.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is apparently under the impression that the \$24,000 is to be spent to suit the new Headmaster's family. Even in the time of Major Noott, the house was found unsuitable and an estimate was given in his time to extend the house.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sorry that the Minister of Education is not here. You must find out how much was spent on the present house. It is the duty of the Minister to find out how much money was spent and where it has gone.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: The file came to my Ministry to spend \$24,000 to enlarge the house. I got in touch with the Minister of Education and I told him that I could not in any way approve of any Government spending \$24,000 to extend the house, and that it would be better to build a brand new house. I got in touch immediately with the Public Works Department and was told what it would cost to build a new house. I got an estimate of \$30,000. I told the Minister of Education that it would be a crazy thing to spend \$24,000 on extending that building when you could build one for \$30,000 and it would pay us better to let Mr. Jacobs, the Solicitor General, remain in this house rather than rent one for him. We would then pay \$24,000 to build a new one for the Headmaster.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Even now, I am still questioning this. While I agree with the action of the Hon. Minister not to spend \$24,000 to repair a house which costs \$16,000, I am sure that with your owning the land at Waterford you can build a suitable house to hold a Headmaster — I am not talking of repairing that building — for \$24,000. (A VOICE: That is not true.) The hon. member is saying that you cannot build a suitable house with a study and office for that money. As I have said, I agree with the Hon. Minister when he was asked to spend \$24,000 in extending the present building that he was absolutely right in saying that he could not spend it in that way.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The whole truth with respect to the question of a suitable house for the Headmaster of Combermere School is that the last Government approved of the plan. There is a regular standard for that type of house, such as what you have at Enmore for the doctors. 5.40 p.m.

That is the position with the house. The modern trend is that you should have a house for the Headmaster, a study and what not. Major Noott approved of the plans for the erection of that house. I do not now remember the figures, but later on Major Noott discovered that he could do with an office and a library and we agreed with that. When the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works said that he came to him to spend twenty-four thousand dollars, that was a joke; all that was submitted was an estimate. We are now quibbling about the size of the house. Suppose Major Noott had forty-two thousand children and he was a bachelor! He only wanted a study. As to what the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works said about this \$24,000, he could only have submitted an estimate; he could not make you accept it. I know that the house was too small, but the drawings and the plans were accepted by the then Headmaster of Combermere School, Major Noott, who gave up his house at Roebuck Street in order to move into the new premises at Waterford. Captain Tomlin, the Director of Public Works, is a man whom everybody would respect and in whom everybody would have faith.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I think that this matter should be straightened out. The mere fact that Major Noott happens to be an intelligent Headmaster does not impress this Government. He is not an architect. The truth of this matter is that the last Government or the last Premier spent \$48,000 out of Labour Welfare funds and came here *ex post facto* after the money had been spent and it is pretty clear that something had to suffer. It appears that the Headmaster's house had to suffer. A lot of things were going on up there of which we would not have approved. I am not criticizing the hon.

member who has just sat down; I am only getting the record straight. Major Noott also approved of the expenditure of \$10,000 for Science equipment which was not supplied. The hon. junior member for St. George knows that as well; therefore you should not quote him as any kind of authority. It is not for Major Noott to approve of this expenditure.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the Premier is talking about; it is a pity that the hon. member did not remain in here and hear the debate. You are building a house for the Headmaster of a school, and here you have the Premier making this ugly, mean insinuation.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: What I have said is true.

Mr. MILLER: It is not true; you spent \$50,000 on something nasty and dirty.....

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

Mr. MILLER: I am speaking through you, Mr. Chairman. You did not see either the Premier or the senior member for the City.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman,....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, are you going to allow misbehaviour in this Committee and then we will have to adjourn the House after a big row? It is the duty of the hon. senior member for the City to take his seat.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member is not on a point of order because the Premier has sat down.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I am addressing you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will bow to Your Honour's ruling, but I want to say this; the Premier had finished speaking and the hon. member got up.

Mr. MILLER: I was on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Premier sat down and the hon. member got up to speak.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, will you please rule in this matter?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. junior member for St. George must know that you cannot rise on a point of order after an hon. member has resumed his chair. If an hon. member rises on a point of order, he must do that during the course of another hon. member's speech. Therefore, the hon. junior member for St. George did not rise on a point of order.

Mr. MILLER: The Premier was not making any speech; he said that he wanted to get the record straight. That is on record.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not rise on a point of order at all. I rose and made my contribution to the debate and I also said that I am going to speak as many times as I like because we are in Committee. Furthermore, if the hon. member would listen, he would not give so much trouble. The hon. member asked me if I was speaking on a point of order and I said that I was speaking. I rose just as you, Mr. Chairman, were about to put the question. I finished my speech and then the hon. member rose and he was interrupted by the hon. senior member for the City. Therefore, the hon. junior member for St. George was not speaking on any point of order.

Mr. MILLER: These serious insinuations go down in history. When the hon. member talks about \$48,000, that

figure was not correct; the figure was actually \$60,000 and that was for the purpose of building a hall and a theatre for Combermere School. I was on the Governing Body of the School when the construction was going on. The figure was \$60,000 from Colonial Development and Welfare funds and it was for the purpose of building a new hall and a theatre. I can remember the speech of the hon. member on this matter. It was a question of the need of the community for a concert hall for local celebrities and it was a question as to whether you would build a hall and a theatre. The question was whether we would change the Queen's Park Hall. The hon. member is now coming out with all these insinuations about something nasty, about some corruption and that an investigation is going to take place. We had pressure from all over the island that we would need a theatre and a concert hall in keeping with the growth and development of our community. When I say that Major Noott approved of the plan, that does not mean that he was an architect or an engineer.
5.50 p.m.

If you ask a man to vacate his home in Roebuck Street, at least you would want to let him look at the plan of a new home to see whether it is all right. Whether he said "yes" or "no" would not change Government's decision; but that is the sort of courtesy which you would expect a Minister or a Government to pay to someone who would be expected to live in the house, maybe, for the best years of his life. I am not saying that the house was suitable for Major Noott with a small family, but he accepted and approved it, not as an engineer or as any Englishman; but we thought it elementary courtesy to submit the plan to the Headmaster, and whether it cost \$16,000 or \$60,000 does not mean there was something corrupt about it. You have an engineer in whom you place confidence and respect, and, if anything, he has saved this Island millions of dollars.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy to criticise him here because he cannot defend himself, but you cannot think of a living soul his equal; and then you would want to claim honesty in a democratic community such as ours. The man built that Airport at Seawell for \$400,000, under half a million dollars, and people from up and down the whole West Indies and America and Canada asked how in the name of Heaven it was done. It is there as a show piece to the West Indies. They come and criticise and you hear all the cynical laughing by the hon. member about the Harbour, and now he folds his lips when the whole world is praising the Government for the money we spent which will be repaid in less than 30 years. That is the attitude of one who claims to have responsibility.

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

Mr. MILLER: You know I cannot do otherwise. I mentioned the Airport and you did not object, Mr. Chairman, but now that I have mentioned the Deep Water Harbour, you are objecting. The Deep Water Harbour is in the Resolution. Are we going to separate it? I do not want to jostle you, but I do want to remind you that the Deep Water Harbour is in the Resolution. I am addressing the Chair, and you know my undying respect for the Chair. I always accept the authority of the Chair, but you will forgive me.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Even though you offend the Chair so often?

Mr. MILLER: You know how I feel when I incur your wrath and contempt. When you ask me to address the Chair, you make me unhappy, because that is my only concern.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will in future pay no attention to your demonstrations.

Mr. MILLER: Thank you very much. Since this is such a wide document, I do not know that there is any need to press this. We are coming here again on Tuesday, and we would not want you to feel guilty that you denied this Parliament an opportunity to debate this. It is most unusual that in replying to the Premier's speech on taxation policy you should come with a Resolution to the House when all pri-

vate organisations and individuals in this City are discussing it, and we are told that we have to come with a motion to get permission to discuss it. Today all private and even public organisations are discussing the taxation, and you say you are running this Government. We know that you are running it to ruin. Why don't you want us to be heard? Why deny us an opportunity to debate and discuss what you have said?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the hon. member knows it is not true to say we have denied the Opposition a chance to discuss this. Only today...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister is on a point of order and the hon. member should sit.

Mr. MILLER: I just wanted to be sure.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, before the hon. member arrived here today, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition gave notice of a motion to discuss the Budget proposals; so it is not true to say that we have denied the Opposition any opportunity to discuss them.

Mr. MILLER: Are you saying that it is not true that the Speaker himself said that we would have by Resolution to ask permission to discuss the proposals, because they were contained in a Statement? In no Parliament has that happened.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I always rise on a point of order when it is a point of order. When it is not necessary, I rise and say what I want to say. When I introduced the Budget and the Financial Statement, I said that hon. members would have no less than two opportunities — and this was in answer to the hon. senior member for the City. On each Bill that was introduced, they have full freedom to discuss all the Budget proposals, and also they could move a substantive motion on the Budget Speech itself and give notice of it. After giving notice they could speak on a substantive motion, and both of these measures require that there should be some interval of time during which even the slow-witted — and I am not thinking of the hon. junior member for St. George when I say that — would have an abundance of time to consider the proposals. I said on Tuesday that there would be no debate then because that would not give the time, but today the hon. member has several opportunities to debate the Budget, and he can also discuss it when the hon. senior member for the City brings in his motion next week or whenever he wants to bring it. I pointed out to hon. members then that even if the Government was slow in bringing the financial bills which have to come in to support the Budget proposals, they could always precipitate discussion if we are keeping it back too long by moving a substantive motion that the House approve or disapprove the Budget proposals. How could the hon. member with any sense of truthfulness say that we are trying to deprive him an opportunity when he is holding up discussion on the seven Bills in which it is competent for members to range over the whole Budget? I say that subject to the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: That is the type of political dishonesty we are exposed to from time to time. If you say you accept British standards and policy, it is true that we have only got a Committee of Supply, but in the United Kingdom there is a Committee of Ways and Means and what have you. In the British Parliament no one has to make any substantive motion to discuss Budget proposals. This is the attitude of a political dictator. You are telling me that we have to wait to get around to this when the other people in this country and associations are discussing your Budget proposals today and tonight, while we have to get permission to discuss it, and you talk of your threat of numbers. Why should we not discuss this? You have made a long speech on you proposals and taxation.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Again on a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I do not have a lot of time to waste, but the hon. member talks about political dishonesty. The matter to which he is referring is that a statement made by a Minister cannot be discussed. What I pointed out to the hon.

member is that he is always asking for time, and I told him on Tuesday that he had plenty of time, and if they thought we were taking too much time, they would precipitate discussion by introducing a substantive motion to discuss them. That is the proper Parliamentary procedure. The hon. member cannot tell me about British Parliamentary procedure, because I can read it out for him right now. They move the Financial Bill, and then they have discussion in the Committee of Ways and Means. This House has no Committee of Ways and Means, and I indicated eight different ways to the hon. member in which he could debate these Budget proposals and he talks about numbers. When he talked about political dishonesty, I deliberately would not interrupt him because he really could not mean me. When he talks about political dishonesty, he must be sleeping because I told the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that if he insisted in making reflections on the Chair, we would not hesitate to use our numbers. I have never said that we would use our numbers to prevent them from debating the Budget proposals. So let the hon. member get down to earth instead of indulging in these flights of fancy.

Mr. MILLER: You think you are in Court talking to a prisoner when he cannot talk back, but this is a free Parliament. You know we would have to make a motion because you know the Rules of the House. Today I was told by the Clerk that we would have to introduce a Resolution to discuss the Premier's Speech and Budget proposals.
6.00 p.m.

He would resort to the Rules of the House and he knows that. The first thing which he is telling this Parliament is about the British Parliament. We have to make a substantive motion to discuss taxation policy. The Premier is making dates with business firms today to discuss this matter and we, today, cannot discuss it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I do not know where the hon. member gets his information from. He talks of making dates with business firms. If I want to make a date, that is my business and the people's because they pay taxes. I do not know where he gets his information from. I have made no dates or appointments with businessmen. When I was approached by the Directors of Bank Breweries, I said that they better wait for two years to see whether they will be making more or less money. The hon. junior member for St. George or anybody else can come to me between now and the 31st March next year, he has got to stand down. These taxes are not coming off until the finances of this country are on a sounder basis.

The hon. junior member for St. George made a statement about making dates with business firms. He said that we have to make a substantive motion to discuss a statement made in this House and talks of it being undemocratic. For the 247 years in the history of this House, that has always been the procedure and it only gets undemocratic overnight. I do not know if he is suffering from a defect of memory.

He has several opportunities to discuss the Budget. He resents making a substantive motion and still approaches the Clerk to make a substantive motion. There is no Finance Bill in Barbados. There is no provision in the Rules of this House for a Finance Bill and that is a position which I intend to rectify. His Government had 10 years to make a Budget Speech and not one word we have ever had of it.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, that is the demonstration which we get in here. I did not say that he is wrong; I am just saying in public that we would have to make a motion to deal with it and we have been threatened earlier today. All day long this is what we have to listen to. You sat and listened to the speech of three and a half hours by the Premier and he continues to rise and remind us that this is the first time that you have a Minister of Finance. You can name him Lord Chancellor or Chancellor; all this means today is that we are not free to discuss the Budget proposals while everybody in the street can talk about them. The Hon. Premier is telling me about a substantive motion. He knows me and he cannot "cafuffle" or reduce me. You have to call Mr. Speaker and leave the two of us locked in a form

to do battle. You cannot subjugate this indomitable spirit of mine. You cannot do that with me; you can never reduce me to servility. I will throw all your Ministers overboard. He told us that he showed the copy of his speech to the other Ministers an hour before. "I say this; I do that;" that was throughout his whole speech. Nothing else but "I".

I happen to be in the Opposition. Why I am unhappy is because we are denied the opportunity of discussing it. If a prisoner opens his mouth, of course he will go to prison; but you are dealing with Parliament and dealing with a free soul. Imagine the Hon. Premier.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is that part of the Resolution?

Mr. MILLER: Yes, Sir. It is a pity. Just like Your Honour, I did not have the chance to read all of it and that is why I am asking the Hon. Leader of the House not to press it to the vote. The Hon. Premier is wringing the last drop of blood out of the people of this country.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, of the points raised in the House and to you, one remark the hon. junior member for St. Joseph made was with reference to the taxation on rum and he was almost on the verge of tears when he was making it. As a matter of fact, I do not know if he did not cry. This four cents increase on a rum snap tugged at his heart strings to the point where I am sure he nearly collapsed.

I want to remind him that in 1952 he sat there and his Government increased the taxation on rum in order to finance their so-called Five Year Plan and he never said a word. In 1957, they came back in and doubled the rate of taxation per proof wine gallon of rum, distilled or re-distilled, which was four cents. They made it eight cents in one swoop. They doubled it and not one squeak was heard from the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. Now, today, when we are faced with the position that we have no money to pay Civil Servants; when we are faced with a deficit of nearly \$3 million and we cannot conduct the public administration without funds, the hon. member is shedding crocodile tears because we resorted to the same policy to which his Government resorted when we increased the taxation on a thing that is a luxury, not a necessity. There is not one item of a necessity which has been increased in this Budget. Not one effort was made to increase the cost of living on the main necessities of the people.

Mr. MILLER: That is not true; do not make those statements.
6.10 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I certainly could not sit here and allow this demonstration on the part of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph about this increase in the cost of a rum snap. He knows that his Party had always resorted to the same means in order to raise increased revenue for the services of the colony.

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

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

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

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

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

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

RUM DUTY AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the

second reading of a Bill to increase the duty payable on rum distilled in the Island from three dollars and ninety cents per proof gallon to seven dollars and thirty-two cents per proof gallon with effect from 27th June, 1962.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the object of this Bill is explained and hon. members will appreciate that this is one of the proposals arising out of the Financial Statement and Budgetary proposals which were made on Tuesday. The rum duty is being increased from \$3.90 per proof gallon to \$7.32 per proof gallon with effect from 27th June, 1962. There is just one further remark which I would like to make and it is this: anyone who has the problem of finding revenue has to look for avenues of taxation which would not impose any burden on necessary things which are indispensable to everyday comfort and to the existence of mankind. That is a problem which everyone who has to deal with matters of this kind will appreciate. In the United Kingdom, the duty on liquor and tobacco accounts for 58% of revenue; the tax on a pint and a half of rum is of the order of something between \$7.00 and \$8.00 for a single bottle.

I want hon. members to bear this in mind because what I have to say now is very important. In Trinidad, the tax is not as high as it is proposed to make it here in Barbados. Trinidad is a country which is progressing fairly rapidly but they, too, have their budgetary problems. The cost of a bottle of rum in Barbados is less than \$2.00 and in the United Kingdom it is \$9.00. They put a tax of \$8.00 on rum exported to the United Kingdom. We are asking the United Kingdom to pay a guaranteed price for our sugar; we want to get an Exchequer loan because I told the Finance Department in the United Kingdom that I would not scramble in the London money market with big monolithic concerns like the Unilever Brothers, Imperial Chemical Industries and people like them who are in the position to outbid any small overseas territories in getting loans on the London money market. I made certain proposals to set up special funds to know what we could do as of right. I told them in London that this idea of Exchequer loans, which are used in the last resort, is not an idea to which I was subscribing, but I thought it was right in Barbados in view of the fact that the new Income Tax rates were low. We had not been given the authority to raise this loan; for this and other good considerations I managed to impress on the Colonial Office and the Treasury the need for this loan of \$7.2 million.

Quite honestly, we have to do quite a lot of thinking of a lot of things. I do not like to talk about people who ask: "Why you do not tax people in the same way they do it in other places?" I like to say that Barbadians are fully aware of their responsibility and they are doing everything possible today. How can you ask the Barbadian to pay the English rate of taxation, to pay \$9.80 for a pint of rum - how can we ask Englishmen to pay \$9.80 for a pint-and-a-half bottle of rum when in Barbados you can drink rum at a price which is less than \$2.00 a bottle? You cannot pay less for whisky and less for rum and then stretch out your hand and get gifts from the English people. We said that we were providing the people of this island with free secondary education, and so on. I say without any fear at all that if we were not saddled with an empty Treasury, with a deficit of over three million dollars by way of salary increases - I feel that in a country like Barbados - never mind that people say that I do not like the Civil Servants; I say that I like them to do their jobs for the money which they are being paid.
6.20 p.m.

I said that the salary increases were unjustified in the context of West Indian living standards. They get low interest car loans or free of interest car loans, I am not sure which. Anyhow, they get low interest housing, and when everybody else is paying 8%, they pay 3% or 4%; they get holidays overseas which employees of business firms do not get, and because it was an election year and because the last Government believed that the Civil Service was dedicated to them, they came along and gave them a 38% increase in salaries, and in some cases, it went as high as 43% when the cost of living had only risen a couple of

points in a few years, and nobody advanced why these increases should have been given, while the rest of the community was left to fend for itself. I would like any hon. member on that side to tell me what he would put taxation on. Would he put it on food, on shirts or on cane-bills? You have to make up your mind.

The Customs Tariff list I went through was thirty-two feet long of code numbers that I and I alone - and I make no apology for it - had to work on. I make no apology for telling the Ministers an hour before, except, I think, that in the light of my experience I did not get through telling them when the House actually commenced that it should have been an hour and ten minutes. What are the hon. members who talked about the Budget today trying to say? Are they saying that the United Kingdom including the Barbadian migrants up there - 25,000 of them - must pay \$8.00 duty on a bottle of rum, and down here because we ask you to pay something like a little over \$2.00 for 1 1/2 pints of the best rum - when in England alone it is \$9 for the same bottle of Barbados rum or Trinidad rum - that that is too much? If you go up there you cannot get it any cheaper; you have to pay the same price for it. Are we going to tell these people that we are not tightening our belts and doing everything possible? On what grounds have we got a right to talk to them unless we are prepared to show that we are prepared to pull our weight as well?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a very simple matter and if hon. members on the other side would just indicate to me how they were going to raise the \$3 million, I would be very glad. There has not been a single year from 1951 - when I entered this Chamber - until 1961, when fortunately for this country we took over the Government, that they did not have a Budget surplus of between \$1 1/2 million and \$5 million. In the very year that they put an increased duty on rum, they already had a surplus of something like \$19 million in reserves; but they put a tax on rum because Professor Beasley told them that our rum duties were low, not because they needed money.

Now we have a programme of \$12 million to be spent in nine months in the two Resolutions which we have just finished, and now that we are getting an Exchequer loan for the first time in history, they are talking in a lacrimose manner about four cents on a snap of rum. Experience has taught that every time a tax goes on rum, consumption goes up, and the sale of rum in Barbados alone in the last two days must exceed the sales in the first three months of the year. It is absolutely fantastic. There are something like three million gallons of rum in the bonds, and you cannot get a gill of rum anywhere to buy from any of the wholesalers in Roebuck Street. Are the people really so hard done by that they are laying up stocks of rum all the time? The way they talk about poor people's rum, you would believe that the poor classes in Barbados roam about the streets reeling all the time and stopping to eat a sprig of salt fish, with an advertisement saying "You are not living unless you have got a bottle of rum in your hip pocket", while they are reeking with fumes all day long, and that every time the working man feels a loss of energy he has to take up a bottle of Macaw and have a swig, as if the working man does not regard rum drinking as something you can curtail. You can expand dependent on your ability to pay for it at the time, and when you cannot pay you catch a drink with your friends or stay away from singings and dances.

Mr. Chairman, we make no apology because we know that the last Government misled Mr. Jacobs by telling him that there was plenty of money. I cannot blame him because he said he had been assured that there were substantial reserves, and that the Budget surplus was an average of \$3 million a year, when the truth of the matter was that they had no surplus and no reserves. As far as I am concerned, Sir, we are making no apologies for putting a duty on rum, and anyone who wants to can talk about taxing the poor man's rum, as if all a poor man does is walk about reeling drunk on Sunday mornings reeking with fumes of alcohol. If that is their idea of how a working man in Barbados should live, it is not mine. We said we would give hot meals

to school children and increased pensions to old people. In January we instituted free secondary education; I think in February or March we raised old age pensions when they on the other side said it was impossible and we were misleading the people. We started out by retrenchment right here in this House, to show that we meant business, by cutting out \$14,000 for meals. Members of the Government Party who come all the way from the country sometimes have to sit in here eleven or twelve hours and do not have time to go and get a meal sometimes; and this is what we are prepared to do.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, they are talking rum talk. It does not matter how much discussion takes place on it, a tax is a tax. You can talk and say what you would have done if you had been in the position of the Minister of Finance, but I am responsible for it and I am not apologising to anybody because I think it is far better to feed 40,000 children and let a few drunkards bellyache about rum, than let the drunkards be happy and let school children starve. That is my philosophy and I am not apologising for it, and if I thought I could have put it up twice as much and got away with it, I would have done it. I felt this is what I could have got away with, because we felt we would produce results in the country when we start our development programme in a couple of weeks' time. The same people who complained about rum got 38% increases in salary and they were not buying more rum. They could never drink \$300 in rum in a year.

This is the predicament in which we find ourselves, and there was no proposal for raising any kind of taxation for financing the Deep Water Harbour properly either from our finances or otherwise. We are sure that when we took the Government over there was a deficit of \$3 million or \$4 million, and at the end of the financial year we hope to reduce it to \$300,000. I had to pay \$10 for a bottle of rum in Trinidad two weeks ago; not that I was drinking it, because I cannot drink for now. I am not saying that this is the average price, but that is the price you pay in hotels. There were people there who were valuable to the Government and to Barbados, and that is what I had to pay for it. You only pay money for rum when you want it, and when you don't want it, you can leave it out. There are some people who take the slogan "You are not living without Macaw" too literally, and there are some politicians who feel that unless you have rum, you are not living at all. 6.30 p.m.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as you well know, this Bill was only circulated late yesterday. I do not know what time you received yours, but I received mine just as I was going to bed. As I have said already today, a Bill of this nature, regardless of whatever the Hon. Premier may say, is one which we should have time to study because we are responsible people. The Premier might have been dealing with this Bill for the last three or four months, but I only saw it for the first time this morning. I had to go to work; so I did not have much time to read this Bill.

What does this Bill call for? It calls for an increase in taxation. The taxes are already in operation because the Hon. Premier said that these taxes would be in operation from the next day which was Wednesday. He made his Financial Statement on Tuesday.

I do not see the good of rushing through with it today because it is not holding up anything. Regardless of what the Hon. Leader of the House has said that I may shed crocodile tears, regardless of what the Hon. Premier has said, the increase of four cents on 16 cents for a snap of rum is too much at this time. They ought to have gone about it in another way and they would have raised the same amount. I am not here to tell you how to do it.

The Hon. Leader of the House asked if they should have put the increase on food, clothes and shoes; but when it

comes to shoes, there are some people who keep a pair of shoes for six or eight years, but those same people fire two or three snaps a day. I know some people who do not wear shoes, but they fire their grogs; and I say that the increase of four cents is too much. If the Hon. Premier is going to lock me up for saying that, let him lock me up. I doubt he went to St. John since he did it, but I live in my constituency all the time. Only this morning a man told me: "Of course, you know that I like my grogs."

I will say it all over again that a 25% increase on a man's rum snap is too much. There are some people who drink more than they smoke. Do not think that because you have put the increase on tobacco it is not going to increase the price of cigarettes. Do not think that the manufacturers are going to manufacture cigarettes at a loss. It is no sense your saying that you have not taxed cigarettes but you have taxed tobacco. I do not understand that at all.

I am not saying that taxes would not have to be raised. By all means you must get money to run the country; but it is the way how it is done that matters. You could have raised the same amount of money if you had gone about it in a different way. You say that people are not supposed to drink rum. That is true. But they drink it and if they drink it, they will have to pay for it. If they do not drink it, you would not be any wiser; I am sure that they are going to drink it. They may be a little hard to buy it at first, or they may feel the pinch at first but the next two or three months they will forget all about the price.

I would be very glad if they keep this taste in their mouth until the next election. If I get them feeling the same way as they felt yesterday and today at the next elections, I know what would be the result. But they are typical Barbadians. I am sure that if the elections were next week, you could preach "tootle-nilly": you would not be the next Premier. It is not going to happen because the taste will be out of their mouth. It is those rum drinkers who have caused you to be in here.

You have taxed refrigerators, but everybody who is able to buy a refrigerator has bought one already. It is the persons who see their next door neighbour owning a refrigerator and are in such circumstances that they have to raise a little pig and sell it in order to get one that will be hit by this new taxation. Do not mistake the idea that it is not the very poor who are being hit. Those are the persons who have been hit because everybody nowadays would like to have a little fridge and stove in his home. When I used the word "poor", I mean the people who are not in a position to have a thousand dollars in the bank. It is those people who when the rain falls regularly starve because their money is already exhausted. As a matter of fact, it is exhausted before they get it. In the past, there was no Housing Authority and no "coolie" man. These people have to pay in instalments for their houses, they have to pay the Indians for cloth and when they trust a little stove, they have to pay for it; therefore, when the weekends, they do not have anything to put by. This may sound new to the Hon. Premier because he does not know that way of living; he would have to go down to the country districts to know. He feels that I am telling lies. They also have to send their children to school and they do not think of the ordinary elementary school as the place to send them. You have agricultural workers with two and three children going to secondary schools. They have to pay bus fare and the father when he gives out all this money to his wife still has to "fire" a rum snap.
6.40 p.m.

What have you done? You hit him with a 25% increase. I am saying that that is too much because you could get the taxation otherwise. I am not here to tell you where you can get it from. As far as the matter of economics is concerned, I am an idiot and therefore I would be insulting the Hon. Premier to tell him where to get this money. I have mentioned shoes, but the Premier does not know that there are some people whom a pair of shoes will last for about ten years; on the other hand, there are those who will drink a "snap" two or three times a day.

The hon. senior member for St. Philip says that I was in the last Government. I cannot understand why some of the members of this House say that I was in the last Government. If that is so, I was not there to direct any policy. If the Cabinet of the present Premier does not know certain things until about an hour before he is ready to lay them on the Table of this House, what was I in the last Government? If the Hon. Premier were to lose power and his backbenchers were returned here, must I say that they were in the last Government? The backbenchers are only here to say "Yes" and if you do not say "Yes" then your head will be cut off. (Laughter) I would not blame the backbenchers for anything because I know that they do not agree with everything that has been done. If the backbenchers do not agree, in fact, they cannot disagree; but the Finance Minister can do just as he likes and he is forgetting that I will be saying that he has taken it upon himself to do whatever he has done. But if what he has done were to cause the Government to fall, the backbenchers or the other members of the Cabinet will still have to take their share of responsibility in the matter although they did not know anything about it.

I cannot even attack the Ministers because the Premier is doing things and he is only enlightening the Ministers about those things an hour before he comes into the House. The only thing for the backbenchers to do, the only thing which they will do now, is not to come in here. I am directing these remarks now to the hon. senior member for St. Philip. He should not use such remarks to a backbencher. I would not know, when I was in the Government, what the Government was doing and I do not think that the Premier would expect that one of his backbenchers would get up in here and attack him on his Development Programme; that would not be in keeping with Party Rules. That particular backbencher, if he were not in agreement with what is being done, would have to keep his mouth closed or do not attend any particular meeting of the House. That is what a backbencher has to do when he wants to maintain Party allegiance; that is what he has to do when he has two bosses. You cannot talk as you like on certain measures because at the Party headquarters they will call a meeting and start to lash that backbencher. Of course, that backbencher would be wrong if he did not agree with, or if he spoke against certain measures brought down by the Party. I am speaking for the people of Barbados; I am saying that this article has been taxed and the tax is too much. I know that the Hon. Premier has his country to run and he has to raise money by way of taxation. The Premier is not wrong in raising taxation, but he may be doubly wrong in taxing too much.

Sir, you will forgive me for making the comparison which I was making at the last meeting or two of this House as to the actions of certain people. They do not do any wrong because the law is there and you can apply it; but in the *Daily News* the matter was put in the way in which they wanted to put it. Now the *Advocate* has taken up the matter. I do not say that the people were doing anything out of the law, but at the same time why should you impose a fine of \$100 when you could impose a fine of \$10.00? When you impose a fine of \$100 on a man and you also take away what would enable that man to raise that fine, that is something very serious. If that man goes to prison for three months you would have to feed him, whereas if a fine of \$10 had been imposed on him, that fine would be paid. That is sense.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am asking the hon. member not to go too far into that matter.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I will not go too far in it. We are not going to stand in this House, however, and allow Civil Servants to make things look ridiculous. We are the masters of the Civil Servants and therefore I do not take it that we are the employees, because we are the employers. In the case of any Civil Servant who wants to make us look ridiculous, I will be there to put him in his place. We make the laws and if we tell an employee to do a certain thing - if we say that the fine for such and such an offence is a fine not exceeding \$100, it is your business to interpret the law;

we will have ourselves to blame for making the gap too wide.

6.50 p.m.

Sir, I would not go any further because it is time that anyone should have a break, but I am saying that I am not in favour with - and the Hon. Premier does not like me to use these words - increasing the poor man's rum. There are some people as I said whom a pair of shoes lasts for ten years, while a bottle of rum only lasts them for two hours or a day. They must "fire" one; so you are hitting them too hard. If you put the tax on shoes, it would not ask them to trot, because it would take ten years to hold them; but when you put the tax on their grog, they still have their other commitments, plus having to send to school their children and paying every cent for them, because they are not likely to get their children in public schools where they can get free education; so the small man is getting lashed all around.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I hope other hon. members have said what they wanted to say. Now I am going to draw two things to the attention of the hon. member. The first is that I am making no apologies for the incidence of taxation, because I have considered the matter very carefully, and you have to have the courage of your convictions in these matters. There is no point in a Chancellor of the Exchequer or Finance Minister being apologetic, because he would give the general public the impression that the taxation is neither justified nor can it be supported. To neither one of these points of view can I possibly subscribe. What I want to say is this: objections against taxation usually come either from people who are supposed to be representatives of the masses of the country who just feel it is a good drum to beat, or from the Press which is looking for something sensational. I will give hon. members an illustration. There are possibly 242,000 people in Barbados. Eighteen months ago the bakers got together and decided to increase the price of what we used to call a cent chick, then a three cent loaf, by 33 1/3%. Neither the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the hon. junior member for St. George nor anyone else raised a question at all, and the hon. senior member for the City and myself were the only two members who said anything about it, and we could not even get the Press in Barbados to publish what we said on the floor of the House of Assembly, because about six weeks before that, the price of Canadian Spring Wheat flour had gone down.

I am not blaming the hon. junior member for St. Joseph because he was a backbencher as he said; but when I was a backbencher and I did not agree with what they did, I got up and said so. Furthermore I criticised the first Development Plan and called it a Development Plot; it was a Five Year Plot and not a Five Year Plan. The three people who criticised it were the hon. senior member for Christ Church the hon. junior member for Bridgetown and myself, and we were backbenchers along with the hon. junior member for St. Joseph at that time, as he now is. I said then that the rate of interest was down to about 4 1/2% and that they should have started the Deep Water Harbour, and they could have built it for half the money, and I made other criticisms; so do not let us get this absolution that the hon. member is asking for on the ground that he was a backbencher. He makes me almost feel like a Father Confessor when he comes and asks for absolution when he says he was a backbencher.

Mr. SMITH: I am not asking for any absolution, I do not have to ask him for anything. I live at Sugar Hill.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER NO. 5

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

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

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the debate on the Rum Duty Amendment Act, 1962, be now resumed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the purpose, as you know, of the suspension of the Standing Order was purely to facilitate the debate on the Bills which we have, so that we would not be interrupted by the statutory hour.

I think it ought to be published throughout the length and breadth of this Island that the bakers in Barbados increased the price of bread by 33 1/3% without the Government doing anything about it whatsoever, and the only protest came from two members of this House. The newspapers refused to publish any debate on the matter. The hon. junior member for Christ Church who has interest in a bakery got up and informed me that the price of flour had gone up, and I asked him to go and check it very carefully. Although he had a bakery, he himself thought that the price of flour had gone up. Bread is the staff of life. They are protesting about four cents on a snap of rum, but when the price of bread went up they did not protest. I know that because I personally pay my bread bills every week. I go and do the shopping. I go into the market. When the hon. member says I do not know these things, I do things that he is not accustomed to doing. Nobody has ever left my house to go and buy a flying fish, unless I went and bought it. When the servants come in and hang up their hats, they do not have to go out again until in the evening.

As you know, Sir, when we had to fend for ourselves in the United Kingdom, we had to scale the fish as well and cook them, and then we had to go out on Saturday mornings and clean off the front steps to make the place look respectable if we were having somebody in. There are a lot of things I know about that the hon. member would not know when it comes to the day-to-day facts of life. Sometimes you get a howl of protest about the poor man's this and the poor man's that as though you have an army of the proletariat reeling about the street all the time and cannot do without "Macaw" or Eclipse" or "Pretty Girl". When the price of bread was increased by 33 1/3% and I tried to get public opinion to bear on this unjustifiable increase, I criticised the Government by bringing it to their attention that the three cent chick went up to four cents. The hon. junior member for Christ Church said that it was because the price of flour had gone up and I challenged him. I said I did not make statements or ask questions to which I did not know the answers and that it was not true to say that flour had gone up. Members did not take it up because the people who were accustomed to ruling Barbados had done it, and it was good enough for them; but I will tell the hon. member that if he wants to educate his constituents now, I am going to tell him what to do. If they want to watch the cost of living, they had better make sure they stop giving fourteen ounces for a pound and teach the people that on the scale, sixteen ounces make a pound, because a lot of unjust profits which amount to more than 25% profit, are being made sometimes by people getting wrong weights in Barbados. That is what you have to look at, and not the four cents on a snap of rum. There are people who when they go to get a pound of rice right here in Barbados only get twelve or thirteen ounces and sometimes fourteen ounces. That is what is happening in Barbados day in and day out.

7.00 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Premier is saying now that the shopkeepers are robbing the people and giving them fourteen ounces for a pound. If he knows that so well, certainly we have a Police Force. If the shopkeepers are robbing people by giving them four-

teen ounces for a pound, he is encouraging it too because I think Police comes under his portfolio.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is pure unadulterated nonsense. What I am telling hon. members is that these people should not watch newspaper headlines; they should watch their own interest. One cannot send a policeman to follow everyone of them to the shop. I am not saying that all the shopkeepers do that; I am saying that they are getting crucified without their knowing it. They should have protested against the rise in bread. What they should protest against, they do not. You see yourself being given wrong weight. I say so if every person in St. John votes against me - and I am not saying that any shopkeeper in St. John does it but it would not surprise me if some did it. My colleague has a business place and I am sure that he does not do it. (A VOICE: Why?) I know because I despatch in it sometimes.

I challenge even the hon. member to say that he is not aware of that and of people in this Island getting short weight all down the line. If sixteen ounces make a pound and you take off three or four ounces, you are sending up the price of that commodity by 25%. When some of these shopkeepers go to weigh salt butter, some of them throw the butter from such a height so that if it weighs one-tenth dram, the scales will go down. The hon. member knows that if you pour sugar from a height above the scales, the way it comes down, the scale is bound to go down. You do it all in one motion and as you know, the quickness of the hand deceives the eye. Customers go into a shop and watch everything except the scale.

Sir, I am not saying that all do it, but these are the reasons why we need a Consumers' Co-operative or some kind of co-operative to make sure that people do not get unjustified mark-ups or people do not give them short weight. I would like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to name me one person in his constituency, even the gentleman who complained, who is going to suffer in his standard of living because he has to pay four cents more for his snap of rum.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, I would like the Hon. Premier to give way on a point of order. It is all right to tell shopkeepers that. You call them thieves, but let us look away from the item which we are dealing with. His last discussion was on bread and flour. I want to hear him get out of this corner and state the Government's interest in increasing the cost of poultry.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you on a point of order?

Mr. MILLER: Yes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Were you speaking on some objection?

Mr. MILLER: Yes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, stick to that.

Mr. MILLER: We are discussing the increase on flour as against a luxury item.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, use your discretion; do not go too far.

Mr. MILLER: No.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In other words, when the opening is wide, I hope you will not try to make it wider.

Mr. MILLER: All right, Sir. We are encouraging the poultry industry. The Hon. Premier talked about short weight at a shop. You are talking about one little item. Let us take chicken necks. Even at Christmas time when the people do not have a chicken, the price may jump from 36 cents to 46 cents per pound but the people will still be able to get a piece of chicken. We will never see the poultry industry here develop to the point where you can get it sold at this price.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Hon. members should not rise on a point of order to make another speech. If I started to talk on a Consumers' Society any time, the merchants would not want to talk to me; but I have all my statistics. Let us take the hon. member up. This is the Rum Duty Act.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I rise to make an appeal to hon. members. I have given notice of a motion to discuss the Hon. Premier's speech on this whole thing. In my opinion, I do not think that we should discuss these things. I do not agree with it. The right way for us to discuss these things is by a discussion of the whole of your speech. That seems a fair thing to do; but if you take the whole night to discuss rum and now you are turning to discuss chicken, we are going to discuss all of these things which are raised in your speech.

I have been told by the Hon. Leader of this House that the passing of these Bills tonight is absolutely necessary. Let us have a full dress debate on this matter later, but let us pass these things now. All these things are noted and they are going to be discussed. I am appealing to both sides.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, I have not yet finished my reply. I agree with the hon. senior member for the City that it would save time. I was trying to impress on the hon. junior member for St. George that he could talk on all of these things. I do not go back on my word. He went into something about chicken parts. I am not going to allow a statement to be made without my replying to it.
7.10 p.m.

I think I may make a statement about what shopkeepers are charging for cigarettes and so forth. I could start and give statistics as to what the hon. member is talking. The chicken which is brought down here is rejected in Florida; the chicken which is imported into this Island, the nice form of chicken wrapped up in cellophane paper like the hon. member over there.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER knocked the gavel.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Your Honour cannot stop me. I have a right to reply to anything that is said; I cannot reply to what was not said.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: While I am speaking, you will listen to me.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: You will ask me to listen to you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In making your comparisons you went from one thing to the other; you went from rum to other things. The hon. member made his comparisons and he went to chicken. I am ruling now that there is no further debate on this Bill; everybody has spoken on it and I will now put the question to the vote.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: You allowed the hon. senior member for the City to mislead you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You cannot impute that the hon. member is misleading me. I will not have any hon. member, including yourself, saying that any hon. member is misleading me. I object to your saying that you or any other member are misleading me. I ask you not to repeat that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I did not say that Your Honour should conclude the consideration of this Bill. I am speaking on a point of order. Your Honour cannot conclude discussion on the Bill; I said that Your Honour should make both members stick to rum.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member stick to rum.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am the Minister of Finance and I am not concealing anything from the public. I have been accused of being a dictator in replying to the point made by the hon. junior member for St. George. It is dangerous for

this statement to go on record and I do not reply to the hon. member. I know my rights and privileges.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I know your rights and privileges. Let the hon. member proceed with the reply on the question of rum.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will proceed with the reply on the debate. It is unfortunate that the hon. senior member for the City should have adopted the attitude which he has adopted. The statement made by the hon. junior member for St. George is misleading when he talks about the price of chicken backs going from 36 cents a pound to 46 cents a pound. If that is done, then it is illegal. Far from that, the duty imposed was 10% on chickens coming from certain sources and that would mean an average increase of 10 cents per pound. There is no reason why the price of fully-dressed chickens should go up because the people import them at 50 cents a pound now. If they put on 10 cents they make a profit of 40 cents a pound. There is no duty which I have imposed except the duty on Rum, and that can be borne out by the duties. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if they provoke me I will give the price of every mark up; these chickens are sold at \$1.20 and \$1.30 per pound and because the Government is asking for five cents are they going to put up the price of chicken backs which are rejected in Florida?

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order. What does he know about statistics more than I know? Whatever statistics are available to the hon. member I would have on my desk. There are no special statistics provided for any Premier; I will get those statistics at the same time as the Premier gets them. You can talk flannel and fuzz; the price of 36 cents has been increased to 46 cents. I am telling you that that is a food item.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member was suggesting that our Government had increased the price of chicken backs. We have increased the price of imported chicken because we know that that can be increased from the demands in Barbados.

Mr. MILLER: It is not correct to say that the industry in Barbados supplies the country's requirements. You have no idea of the tens of thousands of pounds which come to this port and it will reach a stage where you would criticise the rejects. Even the low grade of salted fish comes into Barbados at a lower price than that at which the chicken backs come in. You enquire and you will find that these chicken backs are costing more than the cheapest grade of cod fish imported from Newfoundland and Canada. I am telling the Premier that this cod fish costs much less than these chicken backs.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: A lot of people have exploited this situation but there is no point in having empty laws. We have a statement which I cannot deliver here since the House was not convened for this purpose. I will get tough on these matters. The newspaper comes out and there is an increase in lumber of .26 cents per square foot. That is something infinitesimal; you cannot even work it out. The only purchase tax we have in this whole matter is the purchase tax on motor cars, but the other taxes are infinitesimal. These mark-ups which we impose cannot impose any burden on the community. If people want to exploit the consumers in Barbados, we will have Price Control Orders; and in these Orders we will make sure that in respect of the price of all these commodities which they want to put up, there is a penalty which I recommend; that is, that we remove all fines and impose plain gaol sentences. There will be no fine for selling sardines or lumber above the price.
7.20 p.m.

If they are so crazy as to add one cent on lumber, the minimum period in gaol would be something between three and six months, no fine at all, no \$1,000 or \$2,000 fines, because I am not going to let people sit down when I know the facts and sabotage this Government with the assistance of the Barbados Labour Party who go about spreading despondency and alarm and misleading people. There will also be gaol sentences for aiding and abetting.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, if somebody is going to charge something more, it gives the fellow in legitimate business an opportunity to charge something more also. What sort of dictatorship is that? You have no price controls on the items we are talking about, and the consumer need not purchase from the individual. Now you are going to change the law and send everybody to prison. You sound like Mussolini who died upside down. You said we are not free to discuss the Budget proposals, and now you have gone in the lumber yard. I want to know where we are going from here.

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. T. A. CRAWFORD seconded by Hon. G. E. TALMA, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. E. W. BARROW seconded by Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. E. W. BARROW seconded in each case by Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

REVENUE IN AID (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1962.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Item No. 4 on the Agenda stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Revenue in Aid Act, 1941.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Act is one of the consequential Bills to the Financial Statement which I made on Tuesday, and it seeks to provide for the raising of additional revenue by amending the Revenue in Aid Act, 1941 to make it applicable to certain articles to which it was hitherto not applied. These articles will now be subject to an additional duty of 10% of the rates of duty to which they are now subject under the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Now, Sir, if you will bear with me, under the Act of 1941, two Schedules were contained setting out a surtax on articles in the First Schedule of the Act, and exempting from the imposition of duty the articles in the Second Schedule of the Act. Section 3 of the Act of 1941 said that "notwithstanding the provisions of section two hereof, this Act shall not apply in respect of the Articles set out in the Second Schedule to this Act." It therefore meant that tobacco of all kinds, snuff, brandy, whisky, gin, rum, cordials and liqueurs including bitters, wines and malt liquors, motor cars, trucks and omnibuses, parts and accessories to motor cars, trucks and omnibuses including tyres and tubes, electrical apparatus and appliances, wood and timber unmanufactured such as pitch pine, undressed and dressed, other kinds of unmanufactured wood and timber (except greenheart, purple heart, bullet wood, fustic and locust) undressed and dressed, shooks and staves, glass bottles, and animal lard were not subject to the 10% surtax.

Because of the exploitation by certain sections of the business community of the consuming public, I would like to make the position clear and give a couple of illustrations. Let us say that you paid an import duty of \$5 on a gallon of brandy; and suppose you paid an import duty of \$10.00 on a certain quantity of hardware; according to this Act you would pay 10% on that \$10.00, which would be \$11.00 duty, that is, \$10 duty plus a surtax of \$1.00, whereas on brandy and whisky and so on you would continue to pay only \$5, and there was no surtax during the war on these commodities. You will remember, Sir, that I said in my Budget proposals that for some obscure reason a surtax was not put on these commodities. I say "obscure" for the reason that the articles were really of the luxury class such as brandy,

whisky and gin. Imported rum is a luxury in Barbados, as well as cordials and liqueurs including bitters, wines and so on, and the only things which you could say were not luxury articles were perhaps wood unmanufactured.

Now the position, Sir, is this: we have taken those articles in this Bill and said you must pay a surtax. The surtax is not the 10% *ad valorem* tax, but 10% on 10%, which is only 1% in some cases. Ten percent on 10% or 10% on non-preferential; let us say, 20% in one case, 10% in other cases, moves the tax from 10% to 11% and from 20% to 22%, if you see what I mean, of the *ad valorem* value. 7.30 p.m.

Now, lumber is subject to a tax; but what have we done? We have taken off the tax from all of the West Indian lumber which was subject to tax, such as green heart, cedar undressed, cedar dressed, purple heart, bullet wood, fustic and locust and those words which are not subject to termites. We want to encourage people to import that kind of material and forget about this imported wood from Canada. We have removed the tax on that sort of wood and we have also removed the tax on spruce and deal.

The fact of the matter is that you pay \$2.60 per thousand feet. You have to be a very good mathematician to know what this increase is going to be because it is so infinitesimal. This is for Douglas Fir, pitch-pine, and so on. That lumber is selling something like \$3.60 per one thousand feet. We have had all these years a tax of \$360; so it moved from \$360 to \$362 per thousand feet. We say that you must pay surtax on it; so they moved the price from \$362 per thousand feet to \$362.76 1/2 per thousand feet. We are saying that kind of taxation in responsible communities is not passed on to the community. You will not be surprised in some instances if the Government puts on a tax of that kind that the dealer generally lowers the price so as to get a bigger volume of purchasers and because the people think that it is a worthy thing, they rush and buy a lot of lumber. This is the sort of increase that we have on lumber and they want to tell the people that on account of it, the price of lumber must go up. If you wish to pass on a tax like that to the consumer, you would have to get a machine which would put it at eight decimal places to get the correct increase. The same people who complain that they had to pass on this tax, if you are wealthy and you can pay for the lumber at the same time, they give you a five per cent discount. Now, five per cent on lumber \$360 per thousand feet is something like \$18.00. They can give you back that but they must pass on the \$2.60 per thousand feet to the consumer! Therefore, when you get these politicians and would-be politicians talking about lumber and you are increasing the poor man's lumber, do you not think that we should have price controls?

I am not going to let the business community crucify the masses. They talk of package tax. They want people to believe that when you increase the package tax, you have got to pay more on a tin of sardines. The thirteen cents increase on package tax would increase the price of a tin of sardines to four decimal places of a cent. You get the newspaper coming down with an article about your increasing the price of lumber. As I have said, we have removed the duty altogether from things like non-conifer undressed, other conifer dressed which would stimulate the economy of the West Indies. As regards that increase of \$2.60 per thousand on Douglas Fir, pitch pine, deal and spruce, tell me what sort of increase is that? If they make any great increase in the price on lumber, tell me why I should not send them to gaol for that. The purpose of this Bill is to put on a surtax which is one per cent on things like brandy, whisky, gin and imported rum. There are three million gallons of Barbados rum stocked up in the warehouses. Two of the refineries are not working at all. Should we not put on a tax on imported rum? We have moved up taxation on all of these things, but we have taken off taxation on Caribbean cedar undressed, Caribbean cedar dressed, green heart, purple heart, bullet wood, fustic and locust, non-conifer undressed, other conifer dressed.

I am concealing nothing from the public. I am telling them that it is possible that they may have to pay four cents

on a rum snap and I feel that the margin which shopkeepers make on rum, on the average standard rum, is a great one. As a matter of fact, some of them put the hose on it. They all break it down to their requirements and nobody complains. I have never seen a rum drinker going in a shop with a hydrometer to test the rum he drinks, but the rum shopkeepers want to pull off more because we put on this increase. That is why I say that the consumer has to watch the quantity and the quality of the product, and unless they are prepared to go to the extent that consumers go to in other countries, only when you eliminate that kind of fraud, can you criticise the Government. Why should we let a shopkeeper get away with murder? Sir, we are going to carry on our programme and nothing is going to stop us.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time. 7.40 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. RATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive were called and passed.

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

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

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

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

On motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

MOTOR VEHICLES TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles Tax Act, 1960.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill is a Bill to increase the purchase tax on motor vehicles from 10% to 20%. I may say that in considering this tax, the question of increasing the tax progressively on the more expensive brands of motor cars did appeal to me, but when I examined the volume of expensive cars coming into the island and the fact that this is an *ad valorem* tax, I feel that the present rate is sufficiently progressive. We do not want to exclude certain cars altogether and we do not want to make the tax prohibitive. It may be uneconomical to buy certain types of motor cars and there is not a sufficiently large volume of cars coming in, in order to justify a progressive tax. We also have to consider the elasticity of demand and we have to make sure that the net effect of the imposition of the new tax does not bring about a fall in the total volume of the tax which we receive. That is a very important consideration. I intend to make a full statement, but it has been reported that the increased prices have been asked by certain garages for motor cars imported into this island before last Wednesday. This increased tax is payable

on motor cars which were landed in this island after the 27th June, 1962. Some garages have cars on which they are charging this increase, but if the purchaser is in any doubt, he can take off the engine number of the car and go to the Comptroller of Customs and find out on what date the car was landed in the island. The increased tax should only be paid on cars which are landed in the island after the 27th June, 1962.

I want to make that abundantly clear. The 10% purchase tax has already been paid on those cars which were landed before that date and there is no obligation to pay any increased tax; in order to get a car out of the Customs, the purchase tax would have been paid by the garages. They have absolutely no right to ask any prospective purchaser to pay any 20% tax if the car was taken out of the Customs before the 27th June, 1962.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to ask for enlightenment on this matter. The Hon. Premier has said that if a car was landed in Barbados at 4 o'clock on the afternoon of the 27th June, only on that car the increased tax would be payable. If the practice has been for certain garages — I am not now making any speech on this Bill; I am speaking on the entire question of policy. I am asking that if certain garages had cars which were landed on the 23rd or 24th June and they were in the habit of putting on that tax when they sell these cars, what is the position? This matter was brought to my notice and I think that if a car was brought into the island before the 27th June then the new tax does not apply; or it was a matter of arrangement between the Comptroller of Customs and the particular garage. You may have sixty cars landed before the 27th June and they are in the garages; what is the true position?

My contention has been that if the garage owner is allowed to pay a tax of 10% and now a tax of 20%, then he should only pass on the 10% tax to the purchaser. I suspect that certain things are taking place and if you have not got the facts, I would like you to call up the Comptroller of Customs and get the position abundantly clear. I know some garages who handle cars; some people pay the tax at once and others pay only when they sell these cars. I appreciate that the Hon. Premier may not be able to give me the answer to my question now, but I think he should call up the Comptroller of Customs and enquire of him as to what is the true position.
7.50 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member looks at section 3 of the Bill he will see these words. This is not a pronouncement by me; this is the Act. "Nothing contained in Section 2 of this Act shall affect the motor vehicle tax payable in respect of any motor vehicle landed in the Island before the commencement of this Act." It does not matter really when the duty is actually paid. That is a matter of arrangement and accommodation with the Comptroller of Customs. I do not want to make any comment, because if he realises that people will pay within a few days, I suppose it is quite legal for him to say: "Move them off the Wharf", but the excise is clearly payable once the motor vehicle is landed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Therefore any garage which attempts to charge that is really defrauding a man.

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. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

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

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

THE PACKAGE TAX (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1962.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Item No. 6 on the Agenda stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Package Tax Act, 1941, to provide for the raising of additional revenue by increasing package tax from six pence to twenty-five cents.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

I think that the Bill is a very short one merely to increase package tax which was instituted in 1941 from six pence to twenty-five cents. There is some criticism of this tax, but it has been there from 1941 and nobody has sought to remove it, because it is not really very burdensome. If the suggestion that the tax should be progressive by size or weight or value was implemented, it would be a new import duty altogether. It is not correct to say that Barbados is the only country which has a package tax. What we do not have in Barbados which exists in a lot of other countries, is an export duty on a large number of commodities which of course affects the export trade; but this tax is a specific tax. It is not an *ad valorem* duty; and no matter what size the package is, it is like a handling charge or something like that. It is not really intended to be a duty at all, but it is a small tax which was imposed twenty-one years ago in 1941, and we feel that an increase from twelve cents to twenty-five cents in a period of twenty-one years is not really a burdensome increase. It means if you import a motor car you pay the same twenty-five cent package tax, because something happens here in the Customs of Barbados that is not usual. You can go there and get any number of forms and warrants and the Government has to pay for those. The consignee of goods does not pay for all these warrants that they complain about. That is a situation that really needs examining. You can consider that this package tax helps us to defray the cost of printing these warrants, forms and so on. The cost is probably in excess of the amount of package tax we actually collect, but it could not be regarded in that light. I believe that was one of the motives behind the passing of the Bill in 1941, because there was considerable agitation that consignees and importers should be made to pay for all these forms and warrants and matters of that kind which you have to write up when you go to get things out of the Customs.

I have great pleasure in moving that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

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

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

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE CONSUMPTION TAX ACT, 1962.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Item No. 7 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to make provision for the provision of a Consumption Tax and for matters incidental thereto and connected therewith.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to explain very briefly that this Bill is not exclusive to the Budget proposals. This is a general Bill relating to consumption taxes, and there are certain amendments to which I will have to ask the House to agree.
8.00 p.m.

I would like to read out the amendments. Section 6 reads as follows:-

"If any chargeable goods can reasonably be classified under two or more names, headings or descriptions in the Schedule to this Act, and different rates of tax are chargeable on the goods described under those names, headings or descriptions, the highest rate so chargeable shall be charged and collected on the article."

The words "item of" should come between the words "any" and "chargeable" in the first line. Then in the fourth line, insert "item of" between the words "the" and "goods". In the last line, delete the words "the article" and substitute "such items of goods." The Clause will now read:

"If any item of chargeable goods can reasonably be classified under two or more names, headings or descriptions in the Schedule to this Act, and different rates of tax are chargeable on the item of goods described under those names, headings or descriptions, the highest rate so chargeable shall be charged and collected on such item of goods."

If you turn to Clause 12, subsection 2(b) there are one or two amendments. If you look at the fourth line from the end, it reads "from the date when he begins to carry on business". The word "so" should come between the words "begins" and "to", therefore it would read now "from the date when he begins so to carry on business or when the circumstances of his business becomes such as aforesaid, as the case may be."

Now, we come to page eight, Clause 18(1). In the first line it reads: "The Minister may make regulations". The "r" in "regulations" should be capitalised. It should also be capitalised in the marginal note. If you turn to page nine, Clause 18(2) in the third line, the "r" in "regulations" should be capitalised.

Turning to page ten, Section 19(1) and (2) the words "regulations" and "order" appear regularly with common "r" and "o" respectively. Wherever they occur, they should be in capitals. That is also the case with respect to the marginal note.

In the second line of Section 20 (1) the "r" in the word "regulations" should again be changed to a capital "R".

Now, Clause 21 reads as follows:-

"This Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on the twenty-sixth day of June, 1962."

Delete the word "sixth" and put the word "seventh".

Then, Sir, under Section 21, you will see "SCHEDULE" and under that Heading, you will see, "Section 2, 3(1)". Delete that line and insert "Sections 2, 3(1)."
8.10 p.m.

If we can go back to the arrangement of sections at the very beginning, there should be a capital "r" in Section 18, and if you turn over the first page of what was circularised to hon. members, on page 3 we should have a capital "r" in the arrangement of sections, line 18. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 6 as amended was called and passed.

Clauses 7 to 11 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 12 as amended was called and passed.

Clauses 13 to 17 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 18 as amended was called and passed.

Clause 19 as amended was called and passed.

Clause 20 as amended was called and passed.

Clause 21 as amended was called and passed.

The Schedule as amended was called and passed.

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

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

The question that the Chairman do now report the passing of the Bill in Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

On motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

CUSTOMS TARIFF (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to provide for an increase in the duties on certain articles, the imposition of duties on some articles hitherto exempt, and the removal of duties from certain articles.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the last Order of the day is the consideration of this Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, in order to provide for an increase in the duties on certain articles, the imposition of duties on some articles hitherto exempt, and the removal of duties from certain articles. I do not think it is necessary for me, at this stage, to enlarge on the statements which have been already made concerning the amendments to the Customs Tariff Act in this island.
8.20 p.m.

The purpose of this Bill of course is to assist in the raising of revenue and bridging the gap between our current

expenditure and the current revenue which is some \$2.3 million below the estimated revenue. This Bill really has nothing to do with the Development Plan except in so far as duties might have been imposed on certain commodities wherein we feel that the local market is capable of supplying local demands for these commodities.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee, Mr. RATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That concludes Government's Business for the day, and accordingly this House now stands adjourned.
8.25 p.m.