

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 13th March, 1962

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; (*Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism*); Mr. R. ST. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. E. L. CARMICHAEL; (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of the 6th March, 1962 have been circulated amongst hon. members. If there be any objection, these Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (*A Pause*).

There being apparently no objection, those Minutes are hereby now confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay the following:

An Account of the Transactions in Rum in the several districts of the Island for the quarter ended 31st December, 1961;

Statement showing gross Customs and Excise Receipts for the nine months ended 31st December, 1961;

Statement showing gross Customs and Excise Receipts for the ten months ended 31st January, 1962;

Statement of sums paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police during the quarter ended 30th September, 1961.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay:

Statement showing sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 31st December, 1961.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On behalf of the Hon. Premier:

Resolution to place the sum of \$13,314 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1961-62 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, No. 45, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour:

Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled "Customs (**Petroleum Products Bulk storage**) (Amendment) Regulations, 1961" made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 10th November, 1961, under the provisions of Section 2 of the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of the parcel of land described in the schedule for public purposes; namely, the provision of a road leading to the Deep Water Harbour.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: A Bill further to amend the Old Age Pension Act, 1937.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: A Bill to amend the Casual Employees Pensions Act, 1961.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Question No. 3/1962 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, on the 16th January, 1962, is ready.

Also, the Oral Reply to Question No. 5/1962 asked by the same hon. member on the 16th January, 1962, is ready.

Also, the Oral Reply to Question No. 7/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph on 16th January, 1962, is ready.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Question No. 9/1962 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter on 16th January, is ready.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the Money Resolution of which notice is given today. 12.15 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

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

WHEREAS the people of Carrington's Village and Chapman's Village, St. Thomas have been experiencing difficulties over the years in getting out their canes from the said parts of the parish due to an inadequate road known as Carrington's Village Tenantry Road,

BE IT RESOLVED that this Government immediately undertake steps to have this same road known as Carrington's Village Tenantry Road extended right through to Chapman's Village in order to facilitate the many cane farmers who have been experiencing great difficulties for so long.

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

WHEREAS the public transportation service in the parish of Saint John is irregular and inadequate:

AND WHEREAS there is urgent need to remedy this situation;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to issue directions through the appropriate channels to the private concessionaires plying in the said parish so as to ensure greater efficiency in the routes under their respective controls.

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

BE IT RESOLVED that this House view with dismay the fact that the initial payment by the factories to peasants this year on account of the price per ton of cane produced is less than the corresponding payment last year - \$14.00 as against \$14.50 - whereas the cost of harvesting such cane crop has considerably increased.

QUESTION

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is the Government aware of the dissatisfaction of employees at (a) the Housing Authority; (b) Transport Board; owing to their conditions of service and the treatment meted out to them by their employers?

2. Will Government cause an investigation to be carried out into the workings of the said Boards with special reference to the matters above referred to?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Casual Employees Pensions Act, 1961, be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill further to amend the Old Age Pension Act, 1937, be now read a first time.

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

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

Mr. COWARD entered the House and took his seat.

EXEMPTION FROM STANDING ORDER No. 5

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:- To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the island.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I 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.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1961-62 No. 44

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of \$59,185 under several Heads of the Estimates, and as is customary, these Heads will be taken separately.

HEAD XX - EDUCATION

Head XX - Education - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head XX stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I should like to draw to the attention of the Minister that there is a feeling among stamp vendors that the commission paid on stamps of the denominations, six cents, eight cents, twelve cents and twenty-four cents of two and a half percent.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, on what Resolution is the hon. member speaking? The motion is that Head XX of the Schedule to the Resolution stand part.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry.

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

HEAD XXIX - MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services - stand part.

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

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

HEAD XXXIII - CIVIL AVIATION

Head XXXIII - Civil Aviation - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Head XXXIII - Civil Aviation - stand part.

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

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

ANNEXED ESTIMATES - POST OFFICE

Annexed Estimates - Post Office - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Annexed Estimates - Post Office - stand part.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, under this Item - Post Office, I wish to draw to the attention of the appro-

priate Minister that there is general complaint, not to-day, but for a long time that the commission paid for stamps from 6 cents up is 2 1/2%. They have to carry these stamps which are used by the public, and it is felt that that commission is very inadequate. I do not say that it should be put as high as 5%, but an increase of 2 1/2% today should be made on the large number of shilling stamps which are used for overseas purposes, and if they have to fulfil their duties properly and carry the stamps that are required, and have to spend money in paying for them in advance, it does not warrant the expenditure involved for the service to the public to be paid at 2 1/2%. I think that matter could be gone into with the Postmaster and the appropriate Minister and something done for them in the very near future.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, in supporting the last hon. member who spoke, I would like to point out that very few, if any, stamp vendors now carry shilling stamps for the obvious reason that there is no commission whatever to be gained from selling shilling stamps. These regulations obviously were drawn up at a time when the postage to Canada and to the United States of America was 20 cents which usually was made up of a 12 cent stamp and an 8 cent stamp. That postage has now been changed to one shilling, but you will find that throughout the country and except for this main depot here, the General Post Office, no one will be carrying shilling stamps. When therefore anyone wants to send abroad a heavy packet, it is necessary to stick these six-penny stamps on top of each other because the shilling stamps are unobtainable.

I think the Minister responsible might look into this matter.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I saw the hon. junior member for St. Thomas first.

Mr. SMITH: That is your colleague, Sir.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, whilst adding to what the former members have just said, I would like to make one point clear to the hon. junior member for St. Michael. I do not think it is because the people are not given a percentage on the shilling stamps that they do not carry them; I think there is a law laid down that these people cannot sell a stamp higher than a six-penny stamp, and sometimes people write fairly badly and they have to write very big, and if they had to send a letter to New Zealand which is 3/- and they had to put on twelve three-penny stamps, you would not see to whom the parcel was going.

I am therefore asking the Minister to look into this and allow the vendors to sell any denomination of stamps whether it be six-penny, twelve-penny or two-hundred penny stamps with a commission and not just for the sake of selling stamps. These people facilitate us by selling stamps, and it is really a help because sometimes when one comes to the Post Office, there is such a long line that one has to go away and the letter is held up for a number of days. Therefore by giving an incentive to stamp vendors they would be able to sell bigger denominational stamps, and a person would be able to send to the shop next door, buy a stamp and just drop the letter in the post-box.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the remarks of the various speakers on this Resolution. When you have to buy these stamps, you have to carry something to wrap them in, and the people who sell them in the country have to wrap them for the buyers. Sometimes there are so many that they have to put them in an envelope. That is not provided for and the 2 1/2% commission is not good enough today for one after selling \$1 in stamps. It is not good enough, bearing in mind that these people from the country districts are all business people and have to break a day to come to town, and do business. Each commodity or each item should pay for itself. You will find that these particular vendors are selling stamps for nothing, or maybe at a loss because they have to wrap each penny or four-cent stamp, and may have to tear off a piece of paper which they bought to wrap the stamps for the people, because sometimes the perspiration from your

hands takes off the gum, or they may be soiled, and the 2 1/2% would not even pay for the paper.

It is time, therefore, that the Minister in charge should go into this matter, Mr. Chairman, and see that they are not encouraging the stamp vendors to sell stamps, because here at the General Post Office you have to wait practically half a day to get stamps. Before we had emigration to the United Kingdom, the sales in the country for stamps were small. Now, one may say they are selling more stamps and would get more percentage, but you have to encourage them because it is not every person who comes to town for stamps. Some people may ask someone to buy for them, and most people ask conductors on the buses to buy the stamps for them; so you have to give them something. I hope, therefore, that the Hon. Minister will take it up as soon as he possibly can and see to it that these people benefit by increasing the percentage on the sale of these stamps.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am taking a different line before the Minister attempts to reply. While I agree that the commission on the sale of stamps must be increased, I am suggesting that a survey be made and the number of stamp vendors be increased. Those of us in my line of business would appreciate that if you increase indiscriminately from the point of view of not putting a ceiling somewhere, Government would be at a great disadvantage, and at this stage of our economic position, we cannot afford to be, because stamps used for documents range from 10/- to £1, and the increase on the commission for such stamps could not be such as to deplete or decrease the revenue which Government would receive from it. 12.35 p.m.

While I agree with the last hon. member that you should increase it from 2 1/2% so to speak, you cannot do it indiscriminately. My point is that the Minister should investigate the matter quite thoroughly. I suggest that you change the system and appoint vendors in the necessary districts.

Now, I am speaking to the Hon. Minister in charge. The Marshal must move from in front of the Minister when I am speaking to him. (Mr. WALCOTT: What is the hon. member getting on with? What is the Marshal doing? How is he interrupting you?) The hon. member who spoke *sotto voce* seems to have had a little guinea pepper recently, but the two of us are made up of the same kind of stuff. If I am speaking to the Minister, I do not think that the Clerk or the Marshal should stand before him, whoever he is.

Sir, I am saying that the Hon. Minister has not had the experience which we have here over this matter and that is why I am giving him this suggestion. It has been found out that people have put a lot of denominational stamps on parcels and the money from them was paid in. The parcels were posted and when they arrived at their place of destination it was found out that they did not have on the stamps of the right denomination or the right value. What I speak of is a fact; therefore, I counsel the Hon. Minister that what I have suggested ought to be done and for several reasons. We have had bitter experience in this country, and therefore you have got to be careful in making your recommendations.

I agree that the percentage commission should be increased, but you must have a ceiling, so to speak, because a tremendous number of stamps of the highest denominations are sold in the offices where they are used on documents other than letters. It can be so arranged that the vendors can buy stamps and get a very high commission and we can ill afford that today. I support the idea of the appointment of more stamp vendors and the increase of the commission, but up to a certain ceiling.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the information received from hon. members and as soon as possible I will have a thorough investigation carried out into the commission and all the other aspects in connection with the selling of stamps in the Island.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to deal with that question on stamps. I am going to deal with Item 26 in respect of casual labour. I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister to an extremely scandalous state of affairs which is going on in Barbados and when I come to deal with the Draft Estimates, I will elaborate

more on it. In Barbados, you have a ridiculous spectacle in that men are working for the Government in an indirect way and are receiving the scandalous wage of \$13.64 a week. Those are the men who are called upon to deliver mails and to drive the mail vans throughout the Island. I raised this matter here about two or three years ago. There is a thing known as a "fair wage clause" in all contracts. Here in Barbados it has to be investigated because you have contracts being given out to people, and those people paying whatever wage they like and making a profit on what they are doing. You have men working for those people and getting nothing approximating to proper wages.

Sir, you have a system in relation to this matter of paying a man two cents or three cents for handling a bag of mail and you can very well see how many hundred bags a man would have to handle at that rate to get \$10.00.

You have mail vans leaving St. Lucy, St. Philip, St. John and St. Andrew and the men working on them are paid \$13.64 a week. (VOICE: Is that true?) An hon. member has asked me if that is true. Do you think that I have come in here with jokes? Those men are paid \$1.00 a box a month in addition to that and, as I have said, two cents a bag for handling mail. By that rate of pay, they cannot earn \$20 a week. Some of these van drivers have to go to the Crane, Sam Lord's Castle to clear boxes and they start as early as 5.30 a.m. o'clock. You have the situation in which the Courtesy Garage Ltd., is given the contract for delivering mail and that firm employs four drivers. As I have said, it is those drivers who are paid \$13.64 a week. I want to know of any Government which can draft a contract like that and regard it as a fair wage clause.

Sir, those workers are entitled to the same treatment *vis-à-vis* the people employed by the Government, and the contractor should be called upon to give up the contract because he sends the workers helter-skelter about, telling them to see the Labour Commissioner as if the Labour Commissioner employs those men.

Sir, that must cease. No man working for the Government today in any capacity should be drawing the scandalous wage of \$13.64 a week. Moreover, I am going to draw to the Hon. Minister's attention that the time has come when this practice of giving out this work on contract should cease. No longer should there be any contract given out for the delivery of mails. That should be integrated in the Post Office service where you would be able to utilise the people now employed in that capacity in a more scientific and broad basis. This practice must cease and these haphazard, outdated methods must also cease. When you look at the estimates of expenditure on this item, you will see that what these mail van drivers draw a week does not at all approximate to the amount which you are spending on the item: and when you look at the amount which they pay for the contract, you have to ask yourself why it is that the man who is doing the work is not getting more than \$13.64 a week.

I hope, as I have said, when we come to deal with the Draft Estimates, to deal with this matter more specifically. I have only alerted the Hon. Minister on the matter in order that he would be in a position to deal with this scandalous matter which should be rectified without delay so that the men who are called upon to do this job would get a wage in keeping with other people in the same category in the Public Service.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I must agree with the last speaker concerning this matter. I think it is high time that the Government should have its own Post Office vans and that the giving out of this work on contract should cease so that these van drivers would get conducive salaries. It is not right that a driver of a Post Office van should be receiving \$13.64 a week. That is happening because of your giving out this work on contract. It is known that when a contractor's belly is full, he does not care whose belly is full.
12.45 p.m.

I feel that the Government should undertake this work and pay the drivers a better salary. I would advise the Min-

ister to look into the matter very carefully. I would be very glad if the Government would take the contract out of the hands of the contractors altogether, because as long as you have contractors doing this work people will suffer continually. I say that there are contractors and sub-contractors in this Island of Barbados today, and that is why poor people are suffering so much. These contractors are receiving the greater part of the money and they are giving the workers whatever they feel like giving them, because they know that the workers cannot do better. I wholeheartedly agree that the Government should take the matter into consideration and deal with it in the best way in which they can. All of these poor drivers should be given a better salaries.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that the time has come when consideration should be given to this matter and the Government should take over the control and running of this service. At the present time these employees are under contract, Messrs. Robert Thom Ltd. are under contract with the Government and the Post Office for the delivery of mail. In the performance of this contract they are supposed to have six vans, four of which are in daily use.

As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, these men are paid \$13.64 a week plus \$1.00 a month from each post office box from which they collect mail. The standing postmen who drive their vans at present receive a salary of about \$24.00 per week; these drivers are regarded and are paid as postmen and not as drivers. The drivers of the vans under contract by Messrs. Thom Ltd. work for about six hours per day. The contract commenced in April, 1958; it is a five year term and in that contract there is included a fair wages clause. I repeat that under the contract Messrs. Robert Thom Ltd. are supposed to have six vans, four of which are in daily use and the other two are reserves. I am prepared, Mr. Chairman, to have a thorough investigation carried out into this matter (*Hear! Hear!*)

Mr. WALCOTT: I thank the Hon. Minister for his information. He would see that the point I raised is that although this contract has in it a fair wages clause, no contract is binding on the wages you pay for the period of the contract. In the fair wages clause in the United Kingdom, if wages change in the contract period, you have to change the contract accordingly. In connection with the Deep Water Harbour, Messrs. Costain Ltd. had to pay wages which were changed. The position is that Messrs. Robert Thom Ltd., will not get anything more out of this contract and therefore they are not anxious to draw to the Government's attention that wage changes have taken place. This amount of \$13.64 per week cannot be a proper wage even under this five-year contract. The Government is bound to make a change in the wages if changes are made after the contract has been signed.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of \$59,185 do now pass.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ending on the 31st March, 1963.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, by the provisions of the Executive Committee Act which for the past 70 years has guided the procedure in financial matters in this Chamber, the relationship between the Executive Committee and the Legislature, and the vesting of public properties in the Executive Committee in trust for the people of this island of Barbados, it has been customary before the 31st day of March in each and every year from that date onwards when the instrument become part of the Statute Law of this island, for the person in charge of Government Business - one of the four members of the Executive Committee - to introduce a detailed account of all the revenue which the Government of the colony contemplated for the ensuing year.

This year, 1962, for the first time in the sixty-third year of the operation of the Executive Committee Act, I as Minister of Finance after giving due notice to the members of the Legislature in December, 1961 - some three months ago - that such a post was contemplated, deem it my duty now to move the second reading of the Bill popularly known as the Appropriation Bill for the year, 1962-63.

I do not intend except in very general terms to make reference to the Capital Estimates as they will be the subject of a separate Resolution; but I must at some stage mention the Capital Estimates because it has been customary to present the Estimates for Current Expenditure and Current Revenue along with the Capital Estimates at the same time and within the covers of the same document. I, therefore, with some indulgence, will move on to Order No. 2 which is the second reading of the Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ending on 31st March, 1963.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the Order which is called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am merely pointing out that the Orders have not been set down in proper sequence, and I do not want to be accused of jumping the Order Paper or anything like that; but the second part of Order No. 1 was not dealt with. I understand that we have set aside Order No. 1; so just having explained my position to the Chair, I will proceed now to Order No. 2, and Order No. 1 - Capital Estimates - will be dealt with immediately after the second reading of this Order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the salient points which I want to mention here will be on the Appropriation Bill, and I am deliberately refraining from describing it as the Budget for the year 1962-63, because, as I indicated before, the Financial Department of Government under my guidance intends to introduce a Budget and a Finance Bill some time before the 30th June this year, when a proper evaluation of the finances of the country will have been made; and therefore this motion which I am asking here today does not include any provision for taxation and does not in itself contain any provision for Capital Expenditure; neither is it intended in any more than a cursory manner at this stage to give an economic survey and a study of the state of the nation on the introduction of this Appropriation Bill in its second reading. All that will be done, as I indicated before, some time before 30th June when the full Development Plans of the Government shall have been drawn up and when we have succeeded, I hope, in making provision by way of Loan Funds on different markets for the financing of these Plans.

It is also, of course, our intention to introduce a new provision called a Finance Act in which the changes in duties and the incidence of taxation will be dealt with; but, as I said before, we are now under the operation of the Executive Committee Act of 1891 when it is necessary for us to present a detailed list of expenditure and revenue of the Island for the coming year, but that expenditure and revenue

is of a recurrent nature only and is really an appropriation for the different Departments. I might point out, Sir, that in the United Kingdom the Budget Speech proper is not made until some time during the month of April although the financial year ends on 31st March, as it ends here. The reason why the Chancellor of the Exchequer does not find it convenient to introduce the Budget before the month of April is not because he is inhibited by any statutory prohibition, but because it is not possible to make an accurate evaluation - but only a speculative one - of the true revenue of the country until the majority, if not all, of the receipts are paid into the Treasury of the country. We are in much the same position here in Barbados today.

If I may illustrate the necessity for waiting for the actual figures, the revised Estimates of expenditure which have been printed in the Draft Estimates for the past year are actually in excess of the actual amounts which have been paid out from the Treasury of this Island during the same period. There will be, as far as we can see, no Revised Estimates of expenditure. The Revenue Account is reasonably accurate because most of the receipts are in, and we can calculate at this point of time with reasonable accuracy the amount of revenue which will accrue to the Treasury of this Island during the next three weeks.

Another reason why I find it necessary for that matter to wait before the presentation of the Budget is that the economic position, not only of this Island, but of the world with which we are immediately concerned is in what I may describe as a state of flux, and is undergoing a certain amount of change due to the disequilibrium of interest rates and the economies of the Western democratic countries at the present time.

There are various unsettling factors which are apparent. One of the predominant ones is the fact that the British Government, although it has published its Economic Survey, has not introduced its Finance Bill and has not passed its Budget. The second factor is the possible entry of the United Kingdom into the European Common Market; and the third factor is the instability of the World Sugar Market, which instability is due to causes over which we have little control, due to matters of international politics. Those are the three reasons which I can think of readily; there may be additional reasons. Those are the three reasons which I can think of readily while the general economic situation is in a state of flux or undergoing change; that happens periodically in the economy of countries with which we have to deal.

Sir, to give you an illustration of a possible influence which may be exerted on our situation here in Barbados. Five days ago, the Bank of England reduced its rate to 5 1/2%. We, in this country, for a long time have been suffering from a shortage of capital, and this shortage has been actuated by the high interest rates paid in the outside world. It is therefore very encouraging to see that the bank rate of England, although that is not the mortgage rate, has made a move in what I consider the right direction, because if you are to have any useful development plan set in motion in this Island, other parts of the Caribbean and other parts of the world concerned with our area, then it is absolutely necessary for us to take loans at a reasonable rate of interest.

I am not predicting, Sir, that because the bank rate has gone down 5 1/2%, we necessarily will be able to obtain loans at a cheaper rate than we could obtain them two or three months ago. There are other factors which influence the market rate of interest, on all common interest on money markets, which usually are 1/2% higher than the prevailing rate of interest. And we know that the bank rate does not move up day by day. Therefore, when it is brought down to 5 1/2% we know that it is done after due consideration has been given to the export trade, the balance of trade and the currency situation and matters of that kind. That is why I say that it is very encouraging to know that the bank rate has come down to 5 1/2% after going as high as 7 1/2% during the past two years. Because of that great pressure was exerted on the Financial Department and me by a foreign agency. Without saying anything disparaging about this agency which supplies advice to Colonial terri-

tories, although this pressure was exerted from as early as December to take up loans in order to finance the Deep Water Harbour, I decided to wait and see what would happen because the trends did not seem to me to be unfavourable for the purpose of raising capital.

The position then, Sir, is not only would it be possibly easier for us to obtain the money which we need for re-financing of the Harbour project, which I said is about \$13 million for the Contractor constructing the Harbour, but the money was taken from various Reserve Funds pending the raising of loans. Permission for the raising of loans, approximately \$21 million, dates as far back as July, 1957. We have not been able to raise that loan, and as a result the reserves of this country were depleted in order to pay for the Harbour construction. I do not think anyone of us would dispute, when we establish a capital work of the magnitude of the Deep Water Harbour from which generations to come — probably three or four if not more, if the Harbour is not previously destroyed by an Act of God — will be enjoying amenities created by this generation, that it is equally right that the reserves should be built up out of the extra burdens imposed on the people of Barbados. During the past ten years the people of Barbados were overtaxed, and an amount of \$5 1/2 million of the money which the Government amassed during that time was sent outside. If I make any reference to the past Government, I want to make it clear that I make it as a Minister of Finance, and not as a politician. I do not see how I could operate the finances of this country in the vacuum of 1962-63. I think it is only right that I should acquaint members of the Legislature of the situation then, and the situation which obtains at the present juncture.

In the year 1955, the people of Barbados were over-taxed. Even after the raids which were made by supplementary appropriations by different Government Departments during the course of the year, you collected a revenue of \$5 1/2 million in excess over expenditure. The sum of \$5 1/2 million in an economy like this is taking a lot of money out of circulation. That money was not reinvested in the Island of Barbados; that money was taken out of the purchasing power of the taxpayers of this country. During the years from 1951 onwards the Government of Barbados collected a minimum of \$2 million in excess of expenditure by way of taxation and this was put in to the General Reserve Fund; and then, by a stroke of genius, it was decided, so large was the amount accruing to the Fund, to split that Fund in half, and to put half of it in what was called the Revenue Equalisation Fund, the other half, therefore, going to the General Revenue Balance.

Now, Sir, if I give you some indication of what went on, in the financial year, 1951-52, \$1.2 million was put into the Fund. That meant that the gross amount collected in that year amounted to \$2.5 million. In the financial year 1952-53 \$1.16 million was put into that Fund which meant that a surplus of \$2.3 million was collected.

In 1953-54, 1.34 was collected — a surplus of over \$2 million. In 1954-55, 1.8 million, a surplus of \$3.6 million; in 1955-56, 1.5 million, which on paper looks like a surplus of \$3 million approximately; and in 1956-57, 1.45 million, a surplus of approximately \$3 million again. You will see that the surpluses between 1951 and 1957 were of the order of some \$15 million during that period of time. That was fifteen million dollars of the purchasing power taken out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this island. As I said before, sometime around there, the Revenue Equalisation Fund Act was changed in order to change the percentage from 50% of the surplus balance to an amount to be decided on by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. From the year 1957 until the year 1960 no money was paid into the Revenue Equalisation Fund at all because all the money was being dedicated to the construction of the Deep Water Harbour, and therefore no balances were paid in at all; but there were balances during those years.

It was the first time in history — and when I say that, I mean from 1950 — that we have ever had a deficit in the island's finances; that was in the year 1961-62. It is true that in the year before that the Government budgeted for a

deficit, but they actually achieved a surplus in that year. Therefore there has been, in my opinion, a systematic over taxation of the people of this island during the past ten years. In this year 1961-62, in this present financial year, the figures would give the impression that the Government's estimate of a deficit is accurate, but that is not so because there would have been a surplus if the Government had not permitted themselves to be inveigled into salary increases to the Civil Servants to the tune of over \$3 million in an Election year, and in a year when they actually budgeted for a deficit. As far as I am concerned, and as far as my Government is concerned, we will have to make good this deficit in some way. I do not begrudge any Civil Servant a higher salary. We have already indicated that the Ministers cannot expect any increases and that we are a way below the first two tiers of the hierarchy of the Civil Service. It is time that members of the Civil Service realise that they are very privileged people in this community; I hope that they will return to the community something commensurate with the amount of salaries and other fringe benefits which they are obtaining from the Government. When I say fringe benefits, I mean loans for purchasing motor cars to which the Ministers are not entitled, leave passages to the United Kingdom, pensions and things of that sort. I know that there are some politicians who feel that they are entitled to pensions too. I want to say that the present position in Barbados is that the people who accept ministerial office — this is not an appeal for any increase in pay for the Ministers — the people who have ultimate responsibility are now being paid less than perhaps the first five or six people in their respective Departments. If, therefore, we are in this year calling upon all sections of the community not only to affect economies in their respective patterns, but also to invest money so that the community may expand at a rate which is at least commensurate with the rate of population growth, if we call upon people to tighten their belts, it is because we are prepared to tighten our belts as well and to set an example.

Perhaps another highlight of the Bill is that Your Honour has decided to set an example to the Legislature by tightening your belt, if it can be tightened any more (*Laughter*) by accepting a reduction of \$1,200 a year in your personal emoluments. The Government has also decided that the Legislature should make a gesture in order to emphasize the true economic position of the country by taking out the vote for \$14,000 which was formerly included for the provision of meals for the members of this House. We have not interfered in any way with the provision of the meals which the Other Place obtains by making any reduction of the amount for the food there. It is just over \$500 — a small amount for the total food bill of the Other Place, and we did not think it competent for us to reduce that amount because the Members of the Other Place do not receive any salary. I thought that it would be undignified for us to sit down here and cut down such a bill; but if we are asking people to be aware and to be alive to the economic hazards which beset us, if we are asking people to make this great lift, if we are calling for a higher level of productivity and a higher increase in the standard of living which will increase the productivity of the island by schemes which we have to introduce in the next financial year, it was necessary for us and the Legislature to set an example to the community. It may be only a token; one may say that this sum of \$14,000 is not much, but every little bit helps. I have had to spend many days and nights seeking ways and means of pruning, not slashing, the overall expenditure for the ensuing year, and I have tried to do so in places where it would hurt least and I have had to make an overall reduction in the original Draft Estimates of nearly \$3 million; so that on the Draft Estimates as envisaged before the 4th December, 1961 we would have had a deficit this year of \$5 million.

I have already had to take out certain items — and I will give hon. members the details — by very judicious pruning and calling upon Government Departments to forego certain, I would not call them luxuries, but sometimes necessities especially when these necessities have had to be imported from abroad. We have had to take out \$3 million from the Estimates in addition to the deficit which we can see of \$1,978,791 which we are at present contemplating. In other

words, Sir, the estimated revenue for the year 1962-63 is \$25,835,200; the estimated expenditure for the same period will be \$27,813,991. To put these in round figures, Sir, it is roughly \$26 million as against \$28 million, leaving an excess of expenditure over revenue of some \$2 million. Those are the crude figures which I can give to the House at this stage. I hope that in the process of time I will be able to reduce the gap between expenditure and revenue, perhaps, to nil, and I would be very over-optimistic, I think, to hope that I will be able to convert this into a surplus by the 31st March, next year. I am going to have a very good try at it, and therefore I am not going to go any more into the question of how this is going to be achieved. It can only be achieved in view of the fact that we have effected all the economies that we are effecting or have effected in the Draft Estimates obviously by investigating the sources of raising additional revenue.

I think, Sir, that although it is not customary at all for the Chancellor of the Exchequer or Minister of Finance to tell the public or members of the Legislature what he is not going to do, I think it is only fair to say I do not contemplate any increases in the rate of income tax during the next financial year. It is not, of course, in order politically, legally, constitutionally or advisable to say what I am going to do, but I think, since I am calling on you personally, members of the Legislature and everyone who has the interest of Barbados at heart, to make some sacrifices, that I should at least allow them to go to their beds tonight with light hearts by telling them that no increase in the current rates of income tax are contemplated during the financial year, 1962-63. I do not think, Sir, that the Island can afford it, and by the "Island" I mean not only the people taxed higher than in all the surrounding territories in so far as income tax is concerned, and I say "income tax" advisedly, and I think I can also include companies tax. When I say "income tax" I see the hon. junior member for Christ Church relax in his seat. I am sorry I did not indicate to him before that by income tax I refer also to companies tax. We do not contemplate increasing our company rates from 40% to 45% as was recently done in British Guiana. We do not contemplate anything like that: because when I said that it is not a good thing for the country at this juncture to increase the rates of companies tax, I do not only mean that the wage earners or people living on annuities and pensions are already paying as much income tax as they can be reasonably expected to pay, but I seriously entertain the belief that if we attempted to increase the rates of companies tax, it will cause a falling off in the level of investment in this Island during the next three years, and that is something I want to avoid at all costs.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have any control over the psychological influence which activates the human breast, and therefore although we may consider it unpatriotic for people to take up money and invest in companies outside this Island to which I consider they owe the first duty, yet in view of the fact that as recently as last week I felt myself constrained to make a Statement that we did not intend to impose any restrictions on the free conversion of sterling or any restrictions on capital export, I do not think that at the same time or in the very next breath we should come and do something which would encourage people to take their money and invest it elsewhere.

We have been making a comparative study of the level of taxation in all the West Indian territories and of the inducements which are being offered to countries not only within the British Commonwealth but outside of it which may immediately affect the level of investment in Barbados. We have been making a thorough study of this, and it is my conclusion, opinion and decision that this year there should be no increase in the rates of companies tax or income tax. It will therefore be necessary for us to investigate other sources of raising revenue and so of diminishing the gap between the Estimates of expenditure and the Estimates of public revenue for this year. When I say this year, I mean the financial year, 1962-63, and I hope that hon. members will observe the proprieties and not press me to disclose any more than I have disclosed, because it is not my intention to yield on this point. It must remain a Budget secret until the Budget is actually declared, and I thought that the greatest concession that I could make at this stage is to tell hon. members what I do not intend to do.

If I may therefore pass on, Sir, certain innovations have been introduced. I know that some hon. members do not like innovations; they do not like streamlining, but I could not deal with the Estimates in the traditional form. I think the form in which they have now been presented not only makes them more readable, but it certainly makes them easier for the layman to follow the Government's pattern of expenditure from one Department to another. I have tried along with the financial staff, to simplify the layout of the Estimates as much as possible and as may be compatible with accuracy and commonsense. Various other innovations have been introduced with the co-operation of the economic staff, and as I indicated before in December, at my request we have deleted from the Estimates of revenue and expenditure certain items which, in my opinion, were only serving to inflate the Estimates unnecessarily.

If I may give you an indication — strictly from memory — because I cannot find the figures, in income tax, for instance, you will find that a sum of about \$500,000 has been deleted from income tax which was a refund of income tax. The reason for that is that under the P.A.Y.E. system taxes are collected throughout the year and then at the end of the year certain persons are still required to make out income tax returns: and when those returns are made up, it is discovered that those persons were overtaxed because proper deductions have not been made out. When this money is paid in, the figure then has to be paid back to the taxpayer. The figure is known to fluctuate around \$500,000; and this, I think, should be a matter of internal accounting and not re-duplicating the work which has to be done by the Audit Department and the Income Tax Department. Similarly, in the Customs Department, the amount of \$500,000; therefore, that is \$1 million which we have taken out of the Estimates. You have added in \$1 million under Customs and Excise and income tax, and you then have to take it out on the other side in Drawbacks and payments to income tax payers.

We have also taken out of the Current Estimates \$510,000 for the expansion of the road building programme by the Department of Highways and Transport. That money is transferred to Capital Estimates.

Quite apart from all of that, quite apart from the deletion of these Heads of Customs Drawbacks and Refund of Income Tax — and of course, reimbursement for the reinstatement of highways which is another item which has been taken out because the Public Utility companies usually pay the Department of Highways and Transport for the reinstatement of highways after they have laid down pipes and so on for them, I have made the request that the money should be deposited by these utility companies in advance. We used to be asked here to vote the money for the reinstatement of Highways: and after the highways had been reinstated by the Department, then the Barbados Light and Power Company or whichever utility company it was that dug up the highways would reimburse the Department on presentation of the bill for the amount. That has been deleted as well because that is a self balancing project. Those items will also occur on both sides of the Balance Sheet because anyone who is familiar with the proper estimating of the national economy and being acquainted with Estimates of revenue and expenditure would know that if you go up to an International Agency for assistance, that agency would look at your revenue and expenditure over a period of years and begin to break it down; and if they see that you are inflating your revenue and expenditure unnecessarily, that is the kind of thing which does not tend to inspire confidence or respect in these quarters. I do not intend this criticism to anyone, but in my opinion it is not a proper system of accounting and therefore, if the Estimates for revenue and expenditure are lower or does not compare with the Estimates of revenue for last year, it is because we have taken out over \$1 million in these self-balancing things. In addition to the reductions which have been made, the judicious pruning to which I have referred, we have certain inevitable increases in the Estimates of expenditure, quite apart from the question of nearly \$3 million for those Civil Servants' increases.

If I may give an illustration of that, we have a provision for the first time under the Pensions Acts of 1962-47 and

1961-44 - and I think there is an amendment to one of those Acts now to include brothers and sisters of the deceased employee of the Government in the workers' section - to include provision for the pensions for the public employees and casual employees under these two Acts; and therefore, that will be an increase which would not have occurred in last year's Estimates of expenditure.

Sir, I am very happy to state that there is another increase which I do not think any member of the House will quarrel with, and that is that the Government has decided as from 1st April, 1962 to increase the rate of pension of old people from \$2.15 to \$2.40 a week. *(Cheers)* I think that these people have been waiting for that increase from 1958 and it is not the intention of the Government to drag its foot on matters of that kind where there is no disagreement. I think that even the past Hon. Minister of Social Services may be sounding his praises when he rises on his feet to speak on this matter, although his Government resisted the idea that these pensioners should be paid more than \$2.15 a week and although that was the amount given to them in an election year.

The other aspect of increased expenditure which is not yet known is due to the fact that the Police Service Commission Report has not yet been received by the Government although I understand that it is nearing completion or has been completed. The members of the Barbados Police Force are drawing the same emoluments which they were drawing during the year 1961-62. The situation is not that they got the increase recommended by the Salaries' Commissioner and are now looking forward to an increase of that; the situation is that they have drawn no increase at all. Therefore, this is a quantum of increase which is inevitable. There is bound to be an increase for that. What it is I cannot say; but I cannot see that it can be less than \$300,000 a year. The Estimates of expenditure would therefore have to be increased in this respect when the Government comes down with a Resolution for an increase to the people in this Department.

There are several other features, some of which may be described as novel or innovations; but there are other new features of the Estimates on which the Appropriation Bill is based. You will notice that the Departments have been set out under the several Ministries.

It is proposed that the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries is to be fully integrated by the 1st April, 1962, that is, some three weeks from today's date. It is also proposed that the Ministry of Education would be fully integrated sometime this year, so that you will not have a Department of Agriculture and a Ministry of Agriculture, but a Ministry of Agriculture with a Chief Technical Officer, as he is already designated; and you will have a Ministry of Education for whom we are making provision in new quarters quite close to the Government Buildings in Bay Street. You will have a Minister of Education with technical advisers under him. At the present moment we have a kind of hybrid set up in this Ministry whereby you have a Minister and a Permanent Secretary, an Assistant Secretary superimposed on top of a Department with a Director, an Assistant Director, and so on. When we integrate these Ministries it is hoped that there will be not only a much greater co-ordination in the work of the two Departments, but in this intra-Departmental set up, we will no longer have this situation of the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing; you in your small corner and I in mine. The Minister will sit in the same building with the Chief Officer and the Permanent Secretary and all the rest of his technical administrative staff. We have contemplated the integration of these Ministries by setting out the Estimates in the form in which we have done.

Mr. Speaker, under Head XXVII you will also notice that all the votes for repairs have been amalgamated in a block vote. Before this, a certain amount would be voted for the upkeep of the Prisons, the Schools and that sort of thing; but all this money is spent by the Public Works Department and therefore it is the Public Works vote. Of course, different avenues of expenditure have still got to be itemised and detailed, but there is no point in splitting up

nonrecurrent expenditure, in my opinion. Of course, this is a matter which all hon. members are entitled to discuss, but the form in which the Estimates are presented is a matter for the Minister of Finance and it would be surprising if they were not presented in any other form than the traditional one, because we have never had a Minister of Finance before. I want to exercise certain economies not only of expenditure, but economies of space, stationery and vouchers passing from one Department to another and Minutes passing from a man who has to requisition something from the Director of Public Works. The Director of Public Works and all other money-spending Departments will not only be subject to the supervision of the Legislature, but as you are aware, Mr. Speaker, we have prepared - and we will be inviting the House to move an amendment to the Standing Orders of this Place - a new Finance Accounts Bill whereby every single individual Department in this island will be responsible to the Legislature in the first and in the last analysis, and subject to the supervision of a Public Accounts Committee. I think that this Committee will be set up sometime in April this year. Perhaps I should mention at this stage that although we have taken out votes from certain Departments and put them in other Departments, it does not mean that these Departments will do what they like, because the Legislature will have greater control over the expenditure of public funds than they have ever had in the past.

Under Head XXX the staff of the Waterworks Department has been strengthened by twenty additional officers as against what they had in 1961-62. Under Head XXXII we have not included any subsidy for the Transport Board, although they have put in an estimate of \$160,000. This may sound rather harsh, but I feel this way about it, and hon. members will agree with me. If you had a person running a business for you and at the beginning of the year he told you that he anticipated making a loss for the next twelve months of \$150,000, not only would you ask him to have his head examined but you might ask him to go and look for another job. I am not saying that we are asking the Head of the Transport Board to look for another job, although it may come to that very soon. *(Laughter)* I think it is pure, unadulterated effrontery on the part of a statutory body which last year claimed in their financial statement which they presented that they have only lost \$19,000 - and I know hon. members will have their tongues in their cheeks when they hear that; and they have sort of lulled the members of the House and the public into a sense of false security, and now they served notice on the Government that they intend to lose \$150,000. You cannot blame me if I have deleted that item. If they intend to lose money, they will have to know where to get it from. I am not asking the Legislature to vote any money to subsidise the transport services on these premises. I absolutely refuse to do so; they have full powers under the Act to satisfy the banks that they are operating in the proper way; they cannot have all the freedom of a Government Department and all the immunities and freedom of action which private business enjoys. I do not regard the Transport Board as an organisation of Government; they are a statutory body and if they want to assert their independence, we want them to operate independently for a short time, and in the next report they submit there will be nothing like the loss which they anticipate now. If we encourage them to budget for a loss, they will never set their house in order. I am not coming back for this subsidy of \$150,000. That is out from now until the 31st March 1963. What I have done with the \$150,000 is a matter of great interest. I know that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, like myself, is a representative of a Northern and an Eastern parish and he is very anxious to know what is going to be done about the construction of the East Coast Road.

We have discovered that a road-surfacing machine which will complete this job in a very short space of time, to hon. members' delight, will cost about \$150,000. It was estimated some seven years ago that a machine of this type could re-surface all the roads in Barbados in a space of time between four and six months, and such a type of equipment - I think it is only a trade name - is a Barber Green equipment; and far from cutting down on the number of rollers as has been the practice and the amount granted to

the Highways Department, we are undertaking a serious programme of road construction, and the type of road which we envisage is a dual lane carriage way, because we are not building for 1962 but for 1992 as well, and a dual lane carriage way will be built on the East Coast Road. I am glad to say that I think the \$150,000 which the Cabinet has agreed to include in the Estimates under Head XXXII - Highways and Transport - for road finishing equipment is a much better expenditure than the deficit of \$150,000 for the Transport Board.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I remind certain hon. members of Standing Order No. 29 (6) which reads as follows:-

"While a member is speaking all other Members shall be silent or shall confer only in undertones, and shall not make unseemly interruptions."

Let the Hon. Premier proceed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: You will notice, Sir, that there is a net increase in the cost of education of \$1.4 million. This \$1.4 million is chiefly due to the increased salaries of teachers. The amount for free secondary education which was introduced earlier this year is a very small proportion of this, certainly less than \$200,000, but I want to make it clear that this \$1.4 million is not at all due to free secondary education, but to the salary increases which have been granted to members of the teaching service.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 p.m. o'clock, this Sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 p.m. o'clock.

(On resumption.)

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

Mr. SPEAKER: My attention has been drawn to the fact that there is no quorum. Let the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Question Time was called.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are four questions for Oral Answer. The first Question for Oral Answer is No. 3 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, a question in connection with the construction of the East Coast Road.

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

"To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Will Government state when will the construction of the East Coast Road commence?"

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the commencement of the construction of the East Coast Road awaits the completion of the preliminary survey at present being carried out by the Department of Highways and Transport with a view to the preparation of an estimate of the cost.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister state about what time he expects the survey by the Highways and Transport to be completed?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to say exactly when that survey will be finished, but it is being carried out at present.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member asked not "exactly" but "about what time?"

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I cannot say, Sir.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister is in a position to state when it was started.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the commencement of the survey was in the latter part of last year; it is still in progress now.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether I can assist the hon. member, because this is an aspect of the matter with which the Minister of Communications may not be intimately concerned. There are certain Bills which have already been drafted, one of which was turned down by the Other Place in the last session of the House, and that concerned development charges and betterment charges. I also indicated to the House some time previously that in order to speed up the survey of the East Coast Road that I had applied for assistance in the form of surveyors and engineers.
2.35 p.m.

At this stage, I can assure the hon. member that it is proposed to start construction of the road itself as soon as possible after the introduction of the Capital Budget in May or June, that is perhaps, sometime in July. Of course, that is subject to our getting the necessary assistance in time. We are saying that the construction of the road is one of our major projects in our plan.

PROVISION OF WATER SERVICE IN EACH HOME

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Reply which has been laid is to Question No. 5, which is also in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. L. E. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, Question No. 5, reads as follows:

"To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Will Government, as soon as possible, provide a water service in each home in this island?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is in the negative, will Government in the alternative, provide stand posts at distances of not more than 100 yards apart in each village throughout the Island?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the answer is as follows:-

"The provision of a water service in a private residence is a matter for the owner but the Government will continue to make services as easily available as resources will allow."

"2. Standposts will continue to be erected in villages on the recommendation and with the co-operation of the Councils for the three Local Government areas."

CHANGE OF DAY FOR THE PAYING OF OLD AGE PENSIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next reply which has been laid is to Question No. 7, which stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, but the hon. member happens not to be in his place.

The next Question for oral answer is a question put by the hon. junior member for St. Peter in connection with the date of payment of Old Age Pensioners in St. Peter.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the Minister of Social Services:-

Will the Government consider changing the day of paying the Old Age Pensioners in St. Peter from Saturday to Friday owing to traffic conditions in Speightstown on Saturday mornings?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question, I am pleased to report that the matter has been considered and instructions have been given for the change in paying days to be made immediately.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, may I enquire of the Hon. Minister if that will happen throughout the Island?

Mr. SPEAKER: The question only applies to St. Peter.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I would like to say that this question was asked concerning the people in St. Peter and this answer concerns only the people of St. Peter.

Mr. GODDARD: Will the Hon. Minister consider making this an islandwide procedure owing to the fact that payment of wages on Friday is an island-wide practice and it would be an advantage for these people to have their pension on a Friday too instead of a Saturday?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I have no objection if the hon. member or any other hon. member would make out a proper case.

Mr. GODDARD: I thought I had made out a proper case in my few remarks.

TURNING IN OF WATER ON PAY LATER BASIS

Mr. SPEAKER: I observe that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is now in his place and I wonder if he would like to put his question No. 7 now, since the answer is ready.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, to enquire from the Appropriate Minister:-

Will Government consider the advisability of turning in water on an entire pay-later basis to a limited number of houses annually, until every house in the Island has water installed?

2. If the answer is in the negative, will Government state why?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: In reply to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, there is already available to householders who require domestic water services installed in their residences an instalment plan with a period of 24 months for the completion of payment.

Question 2, does not arise.

Mr. SMITH: Supplementary to the question asked, I wonder if the Hon. Minister can state what is the down payment for the first instalment under this plan.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: While the Hon. Minister of Works is looking through his file, I seem to remember that the down payment is in the vicinity of 25% of the total cost.

RESOLUTION re PAYMENT OF GRATUITIES TO MEMBERS OF FEDERAL LEGISLATURE

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no other answers ready to questions; therefore, the House will now proceed with Private Members' Business.

The First Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter and that is a Resolution which reads as follows:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that the House of Assembly view with alarm and disgust the decision of the Federal Legislature to pay gratuities to Ministers and Members of the Federal Legislature consequent upon the dissolution of the West Indian Federation."

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, you were so kind to read the full text of the Resolution that I consider it is not now necessary for me to repeat that. I will only state that may be in my closing remarks, I may be forced to amend the

text by deleting the words "consequent upon" and inserting the word "pending" which would be more appropriate because the dissolution of the West Indian Federation is not a legal fact yet.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will it give the desired effect just by the mere insertion of the word "pending"?

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, Sir, it would read instead "pending the dissolution of the West Indian Federation".

Mr. Speaker, if there is anything in my view that would undermine the stature and quality of politicians of the West Indies, it is this outrageous and rapacious act by members of the Federal Legislature in agreeing to vote gratuities to Ministers and members of the Federal Legislature. 2.45 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to state at the beginning that I believe I am one who stood up early in my political life and stated that legislators should be rewarded for their services. Today I do not retract anything which I said early in my political career, that is to say, that people who enter public service in modern times are entitled to be remunerated for their services. At the same time, I do not believe in feather-bedding politicians; I feel that if a man enters political life, then he must be prepared to take all of the consequences which are involved. The Federal Legislators in my opinion, were handsomely paid; the payment they received was not only in keeping with the dignity of their office, but the salaries paid to Federal Ministers and members of Parliament were out of proportion to the economy of the territory which they represented.

In the main, the West Indies is a poor area; and today when you hear so much about the viability of the area, it is more than outrageous for those who hold positions of responsibility to expect to receive this type of treatment when nothing takes place within the Legislature in their own colony. I heard one of the Legislators make a statement that it is prevalent in the West Indies for people to regard politicians in the light that they should be born poor, they should live poor, and they should die poor. I do not subscribe to the view that a politician should die poor because when he has served the people I do not see why he should end up in the gutter. At the same time, I do not subscribe to the view that because a man is a politician, because he is in public life, he must be so treated that he should become a millionaire as soon as possible. For that reason, I feel that the sentiments I express are sentiments I echo from the community as a whole on this last phase of the Federal Parliament and the Federal Legislators' conduct.

Mr. Speaker, it is very revealing if we should look at the situation boldly, logically and brutally. Today people in the West Indies are fast becoming fanatics in their party politics; they subscribe wholly to the philosophy that party politics is a good thing and that it determines the method by which you should conduct public affairs. If this is accepted by people, then they must pay the consequences. Any examination of the Federal Structure will show that the West Indian Federal Labour Party claimed that they won an Election and the members who started the West Indian Federal Labour Party were entitled to form the Government. They did so. Now if members belong to a Party and they can no longer get along with each other, and their party machinery becomes so brittle and fragile that it can no longer hold together, why should the public be taken for a ride on the back of party discipline, party rowing and party quarrels? The Federal Labour Party has Mr. Norman Manley in Jamaica as President, the Prime Minister, Sir Granville Adams, is a Vice-President, and Dr. Eric Williams is one of the other Vice-Presidents along with Mr. Bird and the like. Now the three high priests cannot live together in the same cathedral because the cathedral can no longer hold them; and why should the inhabitants of the community be called upon to pay this ransom? Why should we be called upon to pay this? Mr. Manley said that he was not going to the Federation. On the 30th December, 1957, the present Prime Minister said that at the present time he had no intention of going to the Federation. Dr. Williams said that he was not going to the Federation either and Mr.

Bird made a similar statement. The newspaper said that these people were leaving up the Federation and the leading statesmen should have taken the responsibility of going there. It was sometime in January that Mr. Manley said that he had made the irrevocable decision, that he was not a young man and therefore although the glitter of the prize of the first Prime Minister of the West Indies loomed high, he made up his mind that it was essential for him to remain in Jamaica and strengthen the Jamaican situation in order that they might help the situation in the Federal Government. Therefore he declined to go to the Federal Government and made a statement to the effect that he and Dr. Williams were quite prepared to support Sir Grantley Adams for the position of Prime Minister.

Later in January, after that statement was made, about the 15th, after a meeting called by Sir Grantley Adams in Barbados, he was persuaded by his Party colleagues that he should run for the Federal Parliament. He was quite prepared to run for that Parliament after he had the support of these people. That is a brief idea of the composition of the present Federal Government. The high priests at the time decided to form a party; it is the same party in which the Leaders of the Party cannot live together in the same Cathedral, and the Leaders said that they would take their respective territories out of the Federation. One said that he was going for a Referendum. The Prime Minister said, when the Referendum was being conducted, that he had no doubt that Mr. Manley would win the Referendum; he said that in an interview in Trinidad, in Queen's Park, at the beginning of the campaign for the Local Government Election in Barbados, the same Prime Minister who said that he had no doubt that Mr. Manley would win the Referendum, said that Mr. Manley was the most intellectually dishonest politician that he has ever come across in the 30 years of his political life. I am dealing with the sequence of this statement; the Vice-President of the Party said that the President of the Party was the most intellectually dishonest politician he had met for the last 30 years in politics. On the other hand, the other high priest in Trinidad after the Referendum had been taken, said that if Jamaica comes out of the Federation he would not continue in it.

2.55 p.m.

You have the situation, Mr. Speaker, where the Party in power which controlled the Federal Legislature, was solely responsible for the breaking up of the Federation. Those were the people in power and the people behind them in their respective territories were the ones that formed the Government. The Federal Democratic Labour Party was in the Opposition. It is known that in Trinidad the Democratic Labour Party had the greater number of seats, and that was the situation also in Jamaica. Well, with that picture, Mr. Speaker, I was very confident that the Federation was heading for the rocks, not based on anything the people in the various territories had done. The electorate was not called upon to say whether they were satisfied or dissatisfied; so the leaders themselves were the ones who brought the Federation to this sorry state.

I am not here, Mr. Speaker, making this a platform of saying who is responsible for the break-up. Now we hear who is responsible for the break-up; but I say, Mr. Speaker, that those responsible for the break-up were the leaders of the Federal Labour Party who were in control. Those were the ones to keep it; but it is just like in the local context with a political Party like the last Government which was in power. I do not see now that because some of the members of the last Government are out we should compensate them unless we had an Enabling Bill. If for some given reasons of sympathy we had to do that, and in some other cases they had done it, maybe we would do so; but I feel the political Party that runs the Government must pay the consequence for losing.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how much hon. members pay attention to Federal politics, but you will remember that when these expensive delegations went up to London in June, 1961, it was stated that with the coming into being of Independence, it was the intention of Federal Government to hold elections in May, 1962. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the intention of the Federal Government

was to hold elections in 1962, then on what grounds can any of the Ministers and members say that they had a right to go back to the House of Representatives as if they had been returned? Are they saying before hand that they are going back and it does not matter? How do they know that? Even here in Barbados we had an election before 1962 and changes have taken place. There are five members representing Barbados. One is ill and we would not want to speak harshly of the sick and incapacitated, but this is not a Bill for compensating the infirm and incapacitated; it is a Bill passed ostensibly to compensate the well and hearty, and ones that live very well too.

What guarantee have we, Mr. Speaker, that the same forty-five members who adorn the West Indian Parliament will be there after May, 1962? So what claims do they have on the Treasury? Now this is March and part of the Federal Government is now in the United Kingdom. We do not know how long they have to spin out before May, but in any case it looks to me that May will come and they may still be there holding on until the Bill passes, and when the Bill passes it will begin to operate. Now you do not back-date this Bill. You cannot pass a Bill saying the Federal Parliament is not in existence on 1st January, 1962; so you have to pass a Bill, if this is March, saying that the Federal Government will come to an end on 31st May. In any case they would have earned what they would have earned anyhow, because that is the date on which they were going to have a new election.

Let us have a look at what is taking place with these members. Some of them never had it so good. The principle on which MacMillan won his election would apply to all the Federal members; they never had it so good. I do not begrudge them what they got. I always say that Ministers should be well paid for their services. I have no envy of members drawing their salaries, but let us examine what the members earn; we know some of them because some of them live in our midst.

Some of those members who adorn the Federal Parliament earned \$24,000 in the last four years, and that is only a conservative figure. They started off at \$480 a month and ended at \$600; and I am not taking the full period at \$600; I am taking the full period at the lower figure of \$480. If they had been drawing \$480 a month, you will find that at the end of this month which is March, they would have drawn each out of the taxpayers in the West Indies an amount of \$24,000. These are men who go down there about two or three times a year, and I make bold to say that a member of the Barbados House of Assembly performs more services to the people of Barbados than a member of the Federal Legislature going there once or twice a year, and that is not taking into account the \$30 a day that they get when attending Parliament — or \$45 a day as I have been told. The net amount paid to each ordinary member was \$24,000, and they came back here and did their work like any of us in Barbados. I understand that they paid a lower rate of income tax through some arrangement, and I do not know if that applied to the Ministers. However the Federal members paid a lower income tax than those of us in Barbados.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe you had the good fortune of going to the Opening of the Federal Parliament; so you have enjoyed some of the hospitality of the Federal Parliament. I understand that the hospitality was not parsimonious; it was very lavish indeed. Not that I felt you should not have been entertained in that manner, because I know you can enjoy and appreciate entertainment in its proper form.

Mr. SPEAKER: A distinction was made between the Leader of the Opposition and members of the Government Party.

Mr. WALCOTT: When you went to the Opening, you will very well remember the thunder and all the paraphernalia that was used. Now we know that the Ministers blew a comb for four years. If you go into the Ministerial Build-

ing in Trinidad, the hardest thing you will find a Minister doing is looking for the right newspaper; he is either looking for the "*Barbados Advocate*", the "*Daily Gleaner*" or the "*Trinidad Guardian*". The majority of work they had to do was to read the newspapers published in the various islands, and each member sends his paper to the other fellow. That is the sort of exercise that they had in the Federal Parliament, because they had no Departments to run in a local context, as Ministers do here. The Minister of Finance said that he was Minister of Finance without finance, 3.05 p.m.

Now, this is how the Finance Minister has treated the people in the end.

Sir, the Federal Ministers themselves have drawn \$50,000 in four years' time. Are you going to tell me that a Minister drawing \$50,000 in four years' time at the end of that time, can still be poor? I do not have to say this but, as hon. members know, some of the members of the Federal Legislature will go back to their various territories and will be elected to their local Parliament; but even if that will not be the case, the average businessman in the West Indies, if you give him \$50,000 in four years' time, would not work for anybody for the balance of his life.

I am not dealing with free trips which have been thrown in to Ministers, but you also get them drawing money for visiting their constituencies. You get some of them living in a place called Federal Park. You get this lavish living by them which they did not pay for and in the end the Ministers would have received \$50,000 in four years.

Now, Sir, Barbadians are very sentimental and the more money you have, the poorer they say you are. If you talk about the Prime Minister, you have so many idiots in Barbados who feel that you should say nothing about him. As a matter of fact, whenever you speak of an individual like him the idiots in Barbados say: "Oh, what you have got against that person?" You do not have anything against the person but you just cannot agree with what he does. Some people say: "Oh, yes, you should give the Prime Minister a pension." It is true that he has got to the age which is pensionable because if a man has reached an age which is near to 65 years, he is getting to the age where he should be pensioned. However, if you examine this matter in the circumstances that you must give a politician who rises to the high position of a Prime Minister a pension, then you have to examine the circumstances surrounding this matter. In the last four years, the Prime Minister received around \$96,000. You do not have to go into the personal circumstances of the Prime Minister, but he has received more than \$60,000 from 1954 to 1958. As a matter of fact, during that time he has received \$50,000; therefore, in the last seven years he has earned over \$1¼ million from the public. Are you telling me that a person like that is in impecunious circumstances?

You have these outrageous and exorbitant salaries being paid in a community which is poor and has less than three million people. In India which is a community of 450 million where you have a Prime Minister Nehru, you do not get that. India is a sub-continent. When you realise the size of those places and what they are paying their Ministers, and compare them with what the West Indian Ministers were paid, you can very well see that the West Indian Ministers were some of the highest paid Ministers in the world. As I have said, the Prime Minister of the West Indies received \$96,000 from the Federal Government. Along with that, his Hospital bills are not subject to payment by himself. I repeat, if anything has undermined the prestige of West Indian politicians outside, it is this payment of gratuities to Ministers of the Federal Legislature. People outside can only look at West Indians as a bunch of irresponsible, rapacious people who want to line their pockets with money when they get in public life. That is the sort of advertisement which we have got from the Federal Legislators.

The consciences of some of them have shown up and they have made public the suggestion that if they receive this gratuity, they are going to give it to charity. (A VOICE:

Say the Conservative said so.) Well, the Conservatives realise that if they got it, they will have more heart affliction by it, putting them possibly in a higher income tax bracket. I say so because I often heard Conservatives say that they look disdainfully on money when it reaches a certain point because they say: "What is the use of having money when it means nothing to me because of what I pay on it." They say earning more money does not mean anything to them. I am saying, therefore, that the Conservatives may have decided to give it to charity for one of these reasons. However, I am not reducing it to the narrow basis of what it means to them in income tax, but I am putting it to the fact of their conscience. Even the conscience of a Conservative would speak to him; and if it is more than advertisement that they will give up money which is given to them, then I say that one of them who has said that he is going to give it to charity does not label himself as a Conservative.

I would not like anyone to regard this as a move against the Ministers or against people getting a reward for their services. I will say this. If the circumstances which have brought the Federation to an end had been circumstances other than political, that is to say, if it had been something like an earthquake or something that made it impossible for Parliament to sit anymore - say, that somebody had blown up the Parliament and some of the Ministers had been killed - you could very well say under those circumstances that you grant them a gratuity. But you did not enter politics with that in view. I entered politics cognisant of all the consequences which result from it. If that be the case, why then should I be rewarded for what I have to face? And if that be the case, why should they be rewarded? They are not removed from office because of anything done to them. They, the politicians themselves, broke it up. It was a result of the doings of members of their own Party - Dr. Williams and Mr. Norman Manley. Do you want then the community to take over from the organ blowers? I do not think anyone should regard this as something against any one person.

No one who would agree to pay these Legislators should single out the Prime Minister and say that he agrees because the Prime Minister has made a contribution to public life. We are not now discussing that he has made a contribution to public life and, who says that this is his end? He entered public life and has risen to the height of Prime Minister. It was within his hands to hold on to the power which was given him, and I say that the quality of leadership must be exercised when you reach high places; therefore, the Prime Minister had the opportunity of reaching that height if all the qualities of leadership had resided in his brain. He was given an opportunity greater than any other West Indian because he had the first opportunity among all West Indians to weld together the people from the scattered territories and to give them the inspiration which they longed for; but far from doing that, he went abroad and had the guts to tell the people in New York that Barbadians went to Jamaica and taught the Jamaicans how to read and write, 3.15 p.m.

When you reach a position of responsibility and can go on and do that, it is just like the foolish slurs that are made in this Chamber about whether members think that there is a pond side club. He told a man that he had no right being on the Governing Body of a School; when he was put in a position in which he should have been like a magnet, instead of drawing people to him, he made a statement which made people run away from him. He has acted more to discredit the West Indian unity which we have, and now today he wants to see Dr. Bunche. The same people who are spending this money passed New York and went to London; it is just like you want to meet a fellow in Bridgetown, but you go all the way down to St. Lucy first! They passed New York and went to London and now they want to go back to New York! Whose money would you spend like that? For a distance of 3,600 miles away, the plane passage would cost anything like \$500 or \$600 American and that is the sort of thing which you read in the newspapers this morning. They are going to New York and come back, and they are in London already. They are going first class. Who is paying for all this? I hope that we will be able to deal more with this matter when we come to the appropriate Head of the Estimates dealing with Federation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that those of us in Barbados would shelter at trying to unify what now remains of the Federation. I think that the members of this Legislature should be bold enough to say what they think of a matter of this sort because, at this stage, I am not one of those Legislators who believe in putting Barbados to be in front of everybody; but I believe in having my own equals. I say that in this Assembly hon. members must have the courage to allow the West Indian public to know how we feel about how Legislators should be rewarded, that is, in the context of their political life; and because we are Legislators ourselves we will not say that the sky is the limit. I say that there is absolutely no justification for paying any Federal Minister or member of the Federal Parliament one cent by way of compensation in the circumstances which have caused the Federation to be broken up. Mr. Speaker, with those remarks, I have much pleasure in moving the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. BOXILL rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Thomas caught my eye first.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this Resolution I want to make my position explicitly clear.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution?

Mr. BOXILL: Yes, Sir. I am not going to make any apology for what I am saying except Your Honour demands it. It would have taken a John Dillinger, Al Capone, Pretty Boy Floyd, Kidnappers of Bobby Greenley or a Frank Costello - only a man with the most diabolical machinations could make a proposal of this sort. This is what I would call robbery with violence; it is just the same thing as if a man were to attack you with a stick or a gun and ask you to empty your pockets. It is only a mad man who would have thought that these Parliamentary members should have been compensated because he has broken up something which they had started. For that matter, I should try to break up the House of Assembly and then try to get a pension. These people are like a lot of people walking around with the pretence that Sir Grantley Adams should have been compensated; but compensated for doing what? If he had come back to Barbados and had run for a seat in St. Thomas he would have lost. Would you have compensated him then? I say that there is absolutely no justification for giving any Parliamentarian a pension other than what my colleague has mentioned, that is if something over which he had no control had happened - and there again it would be if we felt that he had deserved something. It is not right for any Parliamentarian to feel that he is entitled to a pension after he had dissolved something which he had started. We must let the general public know how we feel about these people; I have always advocated that this is high class robbery. They did not merely ask for \$200,000; they asked for \$152,000 more. Now they are in England asking the Colonial Office to stop something to which he has already given sanction. Do they expect the Colonial Secretary to retract the statement which he has made to Jamaica about independence? I was in Jamaica during the time when the referendum was being taken and I felt, from talking to various people, that Mr. Manley would have lost the referendum. Why didn't these people go to Jamaica and try to explain something and save the Federation? But they seem to have had something made up. This is just like a few little boys playing cricket. As soon as one fellow gets out, he takes up the ball, the bat and the stumps and says that there is no more play. They intended to break up the Federation because they knew that there would have been no place for them, and they wanted to put themselves as being the first and only people who were able to start the Federation. They deliberately broke up this thing because they were afraid that some of the dynamism of the D.L.P. might have reached over there.

3.25 p.m.

They were afraid of themselves because they had no place to go. Look at the sorry bunch up in England. Of course you cannot do anything about it, Mr. Speaker; neither

can I; but I would like to send somebody up there to knock them back down here. They look so stupid, and they are making Barbados and the rest of the West Indies look foolish to the rest of the world. It is just like a man who marries a woman and does not want to live with her anymore. No Judge can make him live with her, but he can make him support her. These people after deliberately going all out to break up the Federation, are going all out to see how much of the \$7 million they can confiscate for themselves. Only a man with the most diabolical machinations could have thought up something like this. Anybody who has any self-respect for himself would be ashamed to take this money, as my colleague has said.

Mr. Speaker, there are three gentlemen who have said that they are not going to accept anything, but are going to put it into charity. These gentlemen must be commended for doing such a thing, because this is a sort of ransom money.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think there is also a lady too.

Mr. BOXILL: If by accident I did not mention her, there is no slight intended. She should also be mentioned and commended for such an act. This is something reminiscent of the kidnappers of Bobby Greenley, because when this little child was kidnapped and the parents were asked to subscribe \$600,000, yet the perpetrators of the act still killed the boy. They dissolved the Federation and are asking us to pay them this money. If they had any decency and know that they are now forming a new Federation, they would give that money over to the new Federation. Certainly if they had the West Indies at heart, they would give the money to start the new Federation since theirs has failed, and let us try ours. It is the survival of the fittest who can get the most for the least. As Dr. Williams said, these members were the best paid men for doing the least amount of work. These jobs were sinecures. There is not one bit of legislation you can point to and say the Federal Government did this, although they sat periodically and drew a lot of money; and now they are expecting us, the people of Barbados, to support them in this. I saw something in one of the newspapers that they will come for something for the Federation. I believe that somebody has gone mad. When this comes up, it will really be Federation, because I am not going to sit here and allow that money to be squandered.

Mr. Speaker, \$45 a day for board and lodging plus entertainment is a lot of money, and as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, they now propose to take a trip to go and see Dr. Ralph Bunche. Since when has he the authority to tell us what to do? Dr. Ralph Bunche cannot even tell the people in the Congo what to do; so he has no jurisdiction in the West Indies.

The dissolving of the Federation was caused by the leaders, because the people in Jamaica and the people in Trinidad decided to come out. There is no law that binds us to remain in the Federation, and only lunatics would trek up to England because they do not have to pay the money; and it is our money they are trying to get rid of as quickly as possible. It is ransom money, money that has been marked by the police and they are trying to get rid of it before the police catch up with them. These people intend to go on; and if we do not put a stop to it, later on somebody may come asking for a pension for his wife for the time she cooked for him while he was in politics, or a pension for a mule. We have to stop this nonsense here and now, and let people not only in the West Indies but in the world see that at least there are some responsible people who call themselves politicians even if they are not.

In supporting this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I am right in asking that a strong letter be drafted to Mr. Maudling asking that these people be completely ignored since they are not representing us anymore. They are only up in England and probably going to America on their own behalf. They are only trying to keep the Federation alive for what they can get out of it. I see where the Prime Minister is drawing \$96,000. That is something that would make Frank Costello see that the West Indies is a lucrative place to come to and try his game. He could al-

ways come down here and start something like the one-armed bandits, slot machines or some other scheme, because if we are going to allow \$96,000 to the Prime Minister and \$50,000 to the other members just like that without making some sort of noise about it, it would encourage men like Dillinger and others of the same mentality to come to Barbados feeling that here is a lucrative spot for them to start a new scheme. The next thing that will happen will be that you will find Bookies here, and when you open your rum-shop you will have to stock a certain rum or beer. We must therefore let these people know in no uncertain terms how we feel about this robbery, I might say, with violence.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am really speaking on this matter with a sad and heavy heart, heavy for many reasons. You know my political points of view, Sir, and in my campaigning in this Island I did say to the people that although in my political ideology I did not agree with Sir Grantley, I felt at the time four years ago because of the influence it appeared he had with the Colonial Office that he would have been the most suitable person to be Prime Minister of the West Indies. When I said that, I believe every living man in Barbados who knew me knew that I meant it, because I happened to have been political enemy No. 1 of Sir Grantley Adams, with the exception of the Minister of Trade in the last Government. I believe I would be written down in his breast as his greatest enemy, but nothing I say here today must be considered personal as far as Sir Grantley is concerned.

There are quite a few hon. members on this side and on the other side who know that there are places where politicians meet people who follow politics in the West Indies and express public opinion, and sometimes you are cross-examined from about 10 o'clock at night until 3 o'clock or 4 o'clock in the morning as to what is the position in the West Indies. I remember when I was in New York, and even there I had the courage despite the fact that I was in great opposition at the time because there were a lot of Jamaicans there that night as well as other West Indians, to say that I felt he was the most suitable person at the time for leading the Federation to victory; so you will see that I was not saying it just to get a vote for somebody. That is why I said I was speaking with a very sad heart to think of a man who could reach that age, a man who could have gone out in a blaze of glory, and a man who could have gone out a year ago as a great West Indian, whatever I personally may think about him.
3.35 p.m.

Although lots of people differed with Sir Grantley there were still a lot of people in Barbados who were very proud that Sir Grantley became the Prime Minister of the West Indies. You can dislike him for this or that, there was still that pride that he was a Barbadian.

It is pathetic and I urge hon. members to sympathise and say that this man must be sick. He is sick. No sane man can act this way. This is a man who has had the opportunity of appreciating what is honesty from what is dishonesty. This is a man who has won the highest educational reward, the Blue Riband of Barbados. He is a sick man; do not let us be too hard on him. Personally, I am sorry for him because he could have gone out with a blaze of glory. It is sad when we reach a certain age and we do not go out. I have not reached that age yet. Look how he is going out now! He is going out as one of the most dishonest West Indians ever born from a woman in the West Indies. That is how he is going out.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am not attempting to ask the hon. member to withdraw any statement, but I certainly believe that we want to be careful and say the things which we know to be true and especially when speaking of a famous West Indian as Sir Grantley Adams. We are too close to his period to be able to see in real perspective.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what point of order is that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was waiting to hear.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I wonder why the hon. member stopped me. I am speaking with a sad heart. I said that I am sorry. I see people start to drink rum and they get dotish and I really feel sorry for them. I say but for the grace of God I could be like them too. I am sorry for Sir Grantley. If he had gone out a year ago, he would have gone out amidst a blaze of glory and with a lot of prestige around him. If that were the case, look how much West Indians would have felt about him! I am a man who walk and keep my ears to the ground. I have listened to West Indians who feel today that this man is going out as one of the most dishonest persons who have ever been born of a West Indian woman. Why did you stop me from saying that?

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not stop the hon. member from saying that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Of course, you would have known better.

This Resolution reads as follows:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that the House of Assembly view with alarm and disgust the decision of the Federal Legislature to pay gratuities to Ministers and members of the Federal Legislature consequent upon the dissolution of the West Indian Federation."

When I say that there are people who have come to the conclusion that you are dishonest, to give you an illustration: if the present Premier of this country came in here as Leader of his Party, meaning that he has the influence over the members of his Party and he is responsible for formulating policies, and said: "Well, as far as I am concerned, members should get so much money more", I would say that he is the most dishonest person ever born from a woman in Barbados.

We view with disgust this matter. Let us say here and now that if the Prime Minister of the West Indies had put his foot down on this \$150,000 handshake, you would never have got it considered by the Federal Legislature. This is a raid on the Federal Treasury; this is taking advantage of the common men whose money you have collected. This thing would never have passed if Sir Grantley had put his foot down on it. Let no man fool you about that. Therefore, that is dishonest. Who can say it is honest?

One hon. member of this House said, "do you think that an organ blower could have got this thing through?" I say that if Sir Grantley Adams did not feel like letting this thing go through, it could not go through; it could never be passed.

Some people have said that we in Barbados have given a member of this Legislature a pension, therefore, why not give one to Sir Grantley Adams too. I am going to answer that now and give my reasons for not supporting this. When Sir Frederick Clarke was a member of this House of Assembly, he sat here for 50 years without receiving one cent. When he retired from this Assembly as Speaker after 50 years without drawing a cent, it was discovered that he had devoted his life to politics thereby neglecting what Barbadians chose to call the Planters Profession. Because of that, members of the House then passed a Bill giving him \$100 a month. You must remember that for 50 years he got nothing for his services. If the situation was on all fours, enemy or no enemy, Government or no Government, I would vote \$400 a month for Sir Grantley Adams and say that he deserves it.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter was very mild. When you tell me that a man is drawing \$2,000 a month, that is a lot of money anywhere in the world. In addition to that, he is getting a free Daimler. The Queen drives in a Daimler. He is also getting a free chauffeur, a free house, free servants and entertainment allowance. Are you listening to me?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member need not repeat it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I cannot help repeating it. The Prime Minister got \$96,000 during his term of office. Along with

that he was given a free house with a swimming pool, although I understand somebody said that he was afraid to bathe in it. He was given a free house with a swimming pool, a Daimler, a chauffeur and entertainment allowance. Besides that, four years previous to that, he worked for \$50,000 in Barbados.

3.45 p.m.

A man with a wife and one child — \$50,000 in four years, \$96,000 in the next four years, and all of that with a house and an entertainment allowance! The other morning I went to a gasoline station in order to put gas in my car and I saw a strong barefooted man looking for work. The man came up to me and said, "Skipper, give me a raise". He had a paper reading and he said "My God, \$55.00 a day for Adams in England?". The irony of it is that this man is a Socialist; he is not Mr. Cuke or Mr. Bryden; he is in charge of a Socialist Government. I say that this is highway robbery with a vengeance. Let Adams, Bradshaw or any of them know this. I agree with little Dominica; the Leader of that country had the guts to say what he had to say and he went back to Dominica and said it. Do you think that the people in the street are satisfied about this? I could become nasty on this matter. You draw all of this money, you pass a law awarding five Barbados Scholarships and you get one out of the five. I have not been given any Scholarship and I am not asking for any work for my children either. You work for \$50,000, \$96,000; you are given a house, a car, a chauffeur, a butler and everything else, and besides all that you are given entertainment allowance. Then you come along and the island is paying for the education of your child.

I am going further now; the yard fowls in power on top got every cent of the £600. Let Ronald Mapp deny this in the *Beacon*; after a boy got a pass degree from Oxford, they assumed to put that in the newspapers, but they could not give Walrond's son more than £450, although he had a First Class degree to teach at Guy's Hospital! But you have barefooted people in Bridgetown and when the rain falls and the drops come down like breadfruits, they go into the houses. These people have to buy their rice and their sugar, and do you want to give this man a pension? Pension, hell!

Mr. SPEAKER knocked the gavel.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps I have discouraged the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is really pathetic. It all reminds us that Capt. Raison was among the few people who came to this country and who gave more than they took away. Capt. Raison was one of the few Englishmen who did that. I have had the opportunity of meeting well-placed Canadians; I have had the opportunity of having discussions with the wealthy people in the U.S.A. I have had the opportunity of having discussions with West Indian advisers, and they all think that this proposal on the part of the Federal Ministers is a shame. This is a golden-shake hand-out. What is the position? Sir, I have a friend who is a member of the Federal Cabinet. Did any of you believe that Mr. Victor Vaughan would get back a seat? (A MEMBER: Leave him alone; he is ill.) He is my friend. Did it appear to you that Mr. Rocheford would get back a seat too?

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has made it clear that he is not resigning for Sir Grantley Adams to get a seat in here. I am quite sure that he could not get a seat in Bridgetown at all. As to the parish of St. Peter, there is one thing; he may have a chance of a seat but out of St. Peter! When you give this hand-out, how can you assure me of this? Some of the members of the Federal Legislature have never even tried to work for the salary which they are drawing as members of the Federal Legislature, never mind the salary as members of the Federal Cabinet. They could not get that salary in Barbados at all; they could not work for a living at all. I see that the hon. member for St. James is looking at me.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two members for St. James.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I mean the member of the Long Robe, the hon. member who belongs to your fraternity. Mr. Speaker, I want to sound this as a warning: it is an outrageous thing — I mean this representation which these civil servants are making. As far as the civil servants are concerned, if they cannot find jobs then I say, yes, they should be given pensions; but if they can get jobs, I do not see why you should take up this money and give it to them. West Indians have one thing in common, and that is poverty. Poverty anywhere is a challenge and a blot to prosperity. I want to say that that Party was born in corruption; any member of a Party who says that he is a Socialist and he wants power and therefore he will amend the constitution so that he will have power to do things, he is a member of a Party which was born in corruption. He could not succeed. Dr. Eric Williams says that he is not a Socialist. Adams says: "I know that you are not a Socialist." And he says, "I have one chance, that is, if you come in and amend our Constitution."

3.55 p.m.

Anybody could see from the beginning what was happening. I do not want to take you on any excursion, but any fool can claim that all three of them broke up the Federation. I went to Queen's Park the night Sir Grantley spoke here. According to what I have been reading, Mr. Norman Manley is head of the West Indian Federal Labour Party — or was. It is not unusual and it has happened in England where the President or Leader of the Party is not always the Prime Minister. Now I have been told by a friend of mine who keeps me posted with West Indian affairs about certain things. Let us imagine that the Minister of Education goes into the Market Square and said that the Premier who is the leader of his Party is the most dishonest man intellectually he has ever met. What do you expect if you smite the shepherd? Naturally the sheep will scatter. Immediately Sir Grantley accused Manley that happened, and people talked about wanting a Referendum.

Mr. Speaker, I consider Sir Alexander Bustamante as good as or a better politician than any in the West Indies; so what else could he do then but to point out to the people of Jamaica that Adams said that Manley was dishonest intellectually? It was the only thing to try and win the election with. Adams did not finish there. He went to Jamaica and made bold statements about Jamaica's industrialisation and said that the Federal Government must have power to impose retrospective taxation. That meant that after Manley and Bustamante had given these companies tax holidays on their business, he was going there to smash them up. I got a letter saying that he had to be escorted by police. I also got letters telling me about the West Indian Army and of the differentiation he made between English officials and West Indian soldiers; so I have evidence to produce here if the time comes, and Mr. Bradshaw has a document which he refused to sign which would differentiate between an English sergeant and West Indian officials. As a matter of fact, I would go further and say that the upkeep of the dog of an English officer was more than that allowed for a West Indian corporal. Those are facts.

I understand that Bradshaw made out a case that these gentlemen should not be allowed to go back home broke, but should have a smooth passage home. We all wish them a smooth passage home, and if they cannot get the Britannia, they can get Pan American. I started to canvass in politics in this country and took a plunge against several Conservatives. I decided to run people like the now Trade Union leader who is a Socialist, and I went home and woke him up one night and registered him. I have been in politics now for twenty-three years; where is my pension? You, Sir, have been in here for twenty-five years, and the Hon. Minister of Trade for twenty-two years; where are your pensions? Nobody in Barbados could deny that the Minister of Trade has made a contribution in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I have not changed my political ideology; I have remained the same, but I render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's. I can remember the day when the Minister of Trade came to town and asked for \$1 a hundred for cutting canes and I listened to his speech which was very well made. Some of those yard fowls who have hopped on

the hand wagon do not know anything about this. People came to town with sticks, hoes, bills and wampas asking for \$1 a hundred for cutting canes, and I heard it was impossible to get that. Where is that member's pension? It is not a good example, Mr. Speaker, to be the leader of a West Indian people who can handle nearly \$200,000 in eight years and say you are broke. That is a warning to people like West Indians if a man can handle that kind of money and paid for every possible thing that the Island has to offer. Probably I made a slip and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would contradict me, because I said that the man paid for everything, and I would bow to him.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot see any member of this House voting against this Resolution. To vote against this Resolution is really asking me to join in giving notice and warning with the last two speakers to let us have real federation when it comes to the mandatory levy in the Estimates. It could be mandatory or rudimentary. I am really now addressing my remarks to anybody who thinks he can vote against this Resolution, and I am telling him that he is looking for federation in truth, because, Mr. Speaker, you will have to name a lot of us if you tell us you are going to vote for this handout.

I listened carefully to the Premier's budget speech, and to me it was the first that was not written by Civil Servants. I do not see how anybody could very well say that they agree with these handouts. Some people say it is not of interest to Barbados, but part of that money belongs to Barbados. We are not merely saying that Adams should not have it; we are saying that none of them should have it, but if perchance we must mention Adams, we are mentioning the man who is leader of the Party. It would seem strange to all of us who understand Party politics that the Prime Minister should have set himself a free vote. You must have a conscience. There is such a thing as public morality, but this is such a thing as public immorality. If perchance we mention Sir Grantley on this occasion, the reason is that he is leader of the Party and no one knows better than Sir Grantley the poverty that exists in these islands.

Now I am going to tell you one of the reasons why the Federation got broken up. A lot of you hon. members have not been watching; but we made Sir Grantley Prime Minister of the West Indies.
4.05 p.m.

Sir Grantley Adams was here in Barbados and I am saying now that intellectual snobbery or social snobbery by a lot of black people is the worst thing in the world. Here he was forming a Government and the only man, whom he would go to the Airport to see off was an Oxford graduate, Mr. Manley. What did he say of Mr. Gairy? He said he was a little wild boy. He said so because the others had no University education. It was no surprise when Sir Grantley was in Jamaica and they talked about bringing the Federal Capital here that they laughed at him. You saw in the newspapers at the time that Sir Grantley Adams met Mr. Norman Manley at the Airport. The Prime Minister of Barbados was then looked upon by all West Indians as a good leader. I am no social man and it does not matter to me; but what do you find about Sir Grantley Adams? At any social functions which he had you will see Mr. Manley and Mrs. Manley; you find that he had no use for the common man. Do you think you would see Mr. Joshua and his wife at his house? And yet you say that he is the leader. He was only leading people down a drain. All he wanted is Mr. and Mrs. Manley and he had no use for the common man. He would not know how to bring a lot of waterfront workers on his lawn. Do what I did; I brought people of all shades together at my home. What else do you expect of him?

Now, Sir, the other night at a dinner in honour of the Hon. Minister of Trade who was celebrating his 25th anniversary as a member of this House, present was the leader of the delegation from St. Kitts - Nevis - Anguilla. He said that there was still a chance for us because there was still around us a Minister of Education in Barbados and we still had the Federal Speaker with us. Barbadians have never studied this thing carefully. It does not worry me; I smile at it because as it seems to me, you only want to use people.

Sir, I have a lot of experience. I will expose something here now. I have never yet said anything about it. You saw Dr. Jagan when he passed through here during the time of the Adams' Government. I speak *ex cathedra* on this. The Adams' Government would not budge when Mr. Jagan said that he wanted an audience with the Governor. We had a number of Conservatives in this Chamber and I got up and said that as far as I am concerned about Dr. Jagan, you could let him pass through. He should pass through without any hindrance; but if he did anything wrong, you should lock him up. I had the shock of my life when Mr. Jagan phoned me. I have never exposed this. He said that he would like to go to Government House to have a chat with the Governor. Let me say that Dr. Jagan was a most charming personality and he said to me that Sir Grantley had told him to see me. Sir Grantley had told him to see a little pigmy like me. He told him that I could make it so right with the big White people in the country that the Governor would receive him. I told him that if he wanted to see the Governor, Mr. Adams had the right to carry him and let him see the Governor; therefore, I am not surprised at these things.

If we are, perchance, mentioning anything about Sir Grantley Adams, it is because he is the Leader of the Party. Do you realise that the Resolution for the golden handshakes for the Federal Ministers was amended on the 12th? I hear someone say: "John Dillinger, Al Capone." The Ministers associated with this said: "Give us some of this hand-out or you would not get it through". Therefore, you had another \$150,000 added to that Resolution. This is money which was paid in for the running of the Federal Government and if they had said that there are certain essential services, therefore, this money which we have here, after paying off bills the balance can go towards those schools of higher learning, whether it be the University College of the West Indies or any other institution which would be of a benefit to the territories, every one of us would be satisfied because it is difficult for poor people to get their children in schools of higher learning. I do not think that there would be one voice raised against their saying: let us pay off our debts and let this money go towards a school for higher education whether it be the U.C.W.I. or a Grammar School in St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla and Tortola.

Sir, I have already said that I speak with a heavy heart on this matter because as things have turned out, I am sorry for Sir Grantley Adams. This man is a sick man. Some people have enforced sickness on themselves. Some people are afflicted by God Almighty but a lot of people go about and drink rum and then get dotish. Those people are not afflicted by God Almighty. I am saying that Sir Grantley Adams is like one of those people and I am sorry for him. Too much money in some people's hands is a bad thing. I am asking you, Mr. Speaker, any man getting \$2,000 a month, can he be broke?
4.15 p.m.

A young man with \$2,000 a month! When you can hear that a man is getting \$2,000 a year in the U.S.A., I will tell you that the Borough President of New York State with the biggest budget after the Federal Government gets only \$24,000 a year. That is a lot of money. He had to rent a house. This man is getting \$24,000 a year, a uniformed chauffeur; he has an entertainment allowance, and all the free drinks he can have; and not only that, but warm clothing. (ASIDES) Some hon. member said, "and long drawers!" (LAUGHTER). I sent my son to England and I had to buy warm clothing for him. Look at this thing; Lord have mercy! Mr. Speaker, I do not want to mention a lot of things. I am supporting the Resolution moved by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, and I throw all this out as a warning: If you really want to see Federation — well, we have had our relationship for the past years, and when we come to this matter, I hold you in high esteem; but if this Resolution does not get through this House, you will have to bring out the Police Force, because it will be real federation. Instead of threatening me with a battleship, you will have to threaten me with men-of-war.

This matter concerns Barbados as much as it concerns Trinidad. Even today we are budgeting for a deficit. I say for the last time that right now in Bridgetown there are

members of my Party who say to me, "Mr. Mottley, there is precedent for it. You pensioned Sir Frederick Clarke who was a member of this House for fifty years." But I say that for fifty years Sir Frederick Clarke never drew one brass cent. If I am wrong, then the Clerk or Your Honour can stop me. When Sir Frederick Clarke lost his seat, the Legislature decided to give him a pension, which he drew for a few years, of one hundred dollars a month. When you come to this situation, the position is different. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, if you were to open Sir Grantley's heart when he is dead, you will find "M.C." written on it, which means, "Mottley and Crawford" (LAUGHTER) If Sir Grantley had been in this House and had become ill, if he had made his contribution and had not been drawing all of this money, then I would come in here and sit back and say: "This man has been giving this service to the country, he has not been drawing any money and therefore he is entitled to a pension." With all of these things, however, I do not think he will want to take any pension, because he has said that he is coming back here to practise with his son. I feel that the fervent prayer of the righteous availeth much. I want him to come back here side by side with my son to practise. You may not be one of those people who, when you go down in the Lower Green, people pull at them. If Sir Grantley Adams is coming back here to practise, then let him come back to practise. The hon. senior member for St. James and Your Honour will have to occupy seats beside him because when you get youngsters like mine together they will give a lot of trouble. You know that this thing is wrong. I refer now to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and even those who have given both feet to Sir Grantley in St. Joseph. You are a fledgling and what I admire about you is that you always stand your ground. I want to say that Mr. Fields Lowe cannot be given \$20.00 a month for canvassing for you, but this man is getting \$2,000 a month. You cannot do anything for this man now. You can take the law from the Premier but it is going to be one big row in here when it comes to voting any mandatory levy in respect of Federation. It is dead, buried, gone and everything. I have never heard a man going into the Hospital for so many things — butting his knee, falling down in the bath, and I may say that there are a lot of men who, when their wives cut them, say that they fell down in the bath. (LAUGHTER) The hon. senior member for St. Joseph is so dignified....

Mr. COWARD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder why the hon. senior member for the City is referring to me so much; I think I have made it clear to the hon. member that I am not dishonest and I will never be dishonest.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am aware of that fact. The fact that you stood up so graciously in 1958, you and the Prime Minister, and you did not bow your knee; that is what we call being dishonest. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I have said enough on this Resolution and I will now give other hon. members the opportunity to speak on it. There is one thing; we do not deal with letters in Parliament. We pass Resolutions and have them cabled.
4.25 p.m.

As the Federal Parliament is still in existence today, I am wondering if the Premier could set us right, as we cannot write a letter, as to whether the text of the Resolution could be sent to the Federal Parliament, because it has not been dissolved, and let Sir Grantley himself see that he is coming back to land in Barbados in a blaze of fire as far as we are concerned; and if he comes back here doing this thing, he will have the whole population of the Island against him. I think the Premier will give his guidance as to whether it can be recorded that way.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Andrew caught my eye, and a second after the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, and that is why the hon. member for Bridgetown was allowed to speak before him. He may now speak unless he prefers to give way.

Mr. CORBIN: I will give way, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MILLER: I think you know, Mr. Speaker, that I signified my intention to speak on this matter, but you were

obviously looking in the other direction or probably you need magnifying glasses. Anyhow, what I regarded as the trend of the Resolution as started by the hon. senior member for St. Peter drifted in the last half hour of debate completely from pensions, gratuities and hand-shakes and was devoted entirely more or less to an individual. This is understandable because there has been a long period, probably going into two decades and almost more of this kind of thing. What I am more or less concerned about and what moves me most is to catch up the threads of the speech of the hon. senior member for St. Peter. We want to consider what has taken place in the recent few years. If for any reason you wanted to send home your domestic help, there is such a thing as severance pay, and I would not like to be in trouble with the Union in having to pay two weeks' pay to which she is entitled and other things which sometimes are referred to as perquisites. I do not know that that is the decision today. You take a man out of his estate home, he is a politician, we know, and there will be elections in the near future, probably in three or five years, and if you bring to an abrupt end a man's career in the Federal Parliament and send him home, what is he going to do?

It is now 4.30 p.m., Sir, and with your kind permission I should like to continue on Tuesday next.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid we will have to forego the continuation of this until the next meeting of this House.

HOUSE REVERTS TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 p.m., the House will now revert to Government Business.
4.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Earlier this afternoon the Hon. Premier was addressing the House on the Appropriation Bill.

HOUSE RESUMES DEBATE ON APPROPRIATION BILL

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, before the Suspension, I was dealing with the question of the increases under several Departments, and I had reached the stage where there was an increase in the Education vote by a figure of \$1.4 million, chiefly due to the increased salaries as a result of the Jacobs Report.

When we come to the Ministry of Social Services, you will see there, Sir, that there has been an increase by \$364,875. Again this increase is not attributable to any expansion of the medical services, but to the increases in salaries and wages also arising out of the Jacobs Report.

Under Old Age Pensions, you will see that there has been an increase of \$1/4 million and this is to meet the anticipated expenditure due to the amendment which will be introduced some time within the next few days to the Old Age Pensions Act to give a minimum pension of \$2.40 to Old Age Pensioners.

There is one other significant item under the Ministry of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour, and that is the sum of \$293,400 for displaced workers. I believe that is the final amount which was allocated for the displaced workers consequent on the construction of the bulk sugar installation at the Deep Water Harbour. I think I can disclose at this stage that the Government has given permission, on the request of the Committee of which the hon. senior member for St. Peter is a member, to allow an amendment to the Regulations, so that the Deep Water Harbour displaced workers may be given a lump-sum instead of weekly or periodical payments. This is thought advisable in the circumstances, and this sum of \$293,400 is to meet the final payment for the displaced workers under that Head.

Those, Sir, are the main increases which I have just dealt with, and as I have said, despite the retrenchment which has been undertaken in various Heads of expenditure, the salaries increases have accounted to a large degree for the increase in Government expenditure during the period 1962-63 and also incidentally during the financial year 1961-62.

I should like at this stage, although it is no part of the Appropriation Bill, to give an indication to members of the directions in which retrenchment has been made. The reason why I deem it expedient to do so, Mr. Speaker, is to give members the reassurance that the retrenchment should not in any way affect the level of employment. I know Sir, that it has not been fashionable in Barbados to mention the term "unemployment" at all. We have had expressions bandied about in here like "the economy is buoyant". I always associate a state of buoyancy with a state of stagnation, because my impression of buoyancy is something bobbing up and down on the sea like flotsam and jetsam and not getting anywhere in particular. We want to substitute the word "dynamism" into the economic thinking and financial vocabulary of this House and of the people of this Island. For years we have had this word "buoyancy" bandied around. The taxation level has been higher than the Island can tolerably support, and we still have the unemployment figures rising steadily from year to year.

I venture to say that if approximately 17,000 people had not taken it upon themselves and exercised their initiative to escape from the severe conditions which confront the majority of the working classes of this Island during the past five years - the emigration figure from Barbados up to the middle of 1961 was somewhere in the region of 16,800 for the four years antecedent to that date - we would have had very distressing conditions here in Barbados.

I make bold to say again that if these people had not taken upon themselves the initiative to escape from the economy of this Island which so often has been described as buoyant, we would have had very distressing conditions in the Island and possibly a certain degree of civil commotion. Fortunately, for us, a Barbadian does not wait until his back breaks; he always relieves the pressure by escaping from the country which owes him a livelihood and to which he has a duty to perform as a citizen of the Island.

I have always held the view that emigration is not an objective towards which a people who want to take their destiny in their hands should strive. It is, as I have said, something which any Government under pressure would utilise and which under stress and strain it would welcome. But the main object of this Government in managing the resources of this country would be to stimulate business and industrial activity and so create job opportunities for the people so that, Immigration Bill or no Immigration Bill, Conservative Government in England, Labour Government in England or whatever form of Government it may be operating in England, we would not have to be beating a drum in order to provide employment for our people. We should try and provide employment right in this country for them. Of course, Sir, this may sound quite ambitious, but it is not over ambitious.

The other popular jargon which has been bandied around is that this Island is over-populated. This Island has to face the reality, whether we like it or not, whether we deport or export 5,000 Barbadians who should be coming back into the economy which has been involved in their upbringing, that in the next 25 years we have to support a population of 400,000 people; therefore, there is no point of our talking of over-population because we have an unemployment problem right now: and unless we tackle the things which we can control such as the expansion of the economy by industrialisation, by research, by intensification and planning of agriculture in the country and by all the avenues which sensible people in similar position would pursue, we would be resigning ourselves to a state of more unemployment.

This Government does not intend to have a steady increase of unemployment. For the first time since I have had the honour in this House to be associated in the running of the country, for the past three months, I have witnessed some indications that we are reaching the marginal level of unemployment in this Island. By that, I mean this. From the beginning of the present crop season, some difficulty was experienced in getting agricultural workers to cut the canes. We have asked for a census to be taken so that we can present to the House what the actual figures are. It

was felt in some quarters that this Government had stimulated industrial activity to such a level that people were orientating their outlook about gainful employment, and, if you take one illustration, you will see that under the Government's crash programme people prefer to work for a steady wage than for an inflated wage during the crop time.

Partly as a result of the representations made to us, partly as a result of our financial resources and partly as a result of our coming pretty close to the end of the moneys which have been voted by the Legislature, we have had a steady dropping off of the numbers employed by Government in the different projects undertaken under the crash programme in order to make labour available for the present harvest which must be reaped expeditiously.

Now, Sir, this is the kind of economy which I wish to have some say in forming: because, when you can readjust your employment opportunities in the light of one sector of the economy, then you are beginning to have a healthy sign that the people who want to be gainfully employed are achieving their objective and are getting a reasonable wage. As I have said, we do not believe in buoyancy because that means getting nowhere in particular. It is better to have a state of disequilibrium because when matters are in a state of equilibrium they are in a state of rest. That is one of the elementary laws of physics, and that is the elementary canon of economic thinking.

The following reductions were made in order to bring the volume of expenditure within reasonable limits. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to go through all these items here. These reductions do not form part of the Appropriation Bill: but I wish to give hon. members the reassurance that the reduction by the sum of \$2,374,285 is not going to be any diminution in the volume of employment in this Island. Under Head 2 we took off \$24,000 from the Training Fund and \$25,000 from Leave Passages, and \$140 from furniture and equipment. From the Judiciary, we took \$250 off Travelling Allowance and \$1,300 off Furniture and Office Equipment. I have already mentioned that we took off Drawbacks to the magnitude of \$420,000 from Customs. We have also taken off \$35,000 from Treasury Bills because we have examined the position since Treasury Bills have been issued, and have discovered that the amount contributed to Treasury Bills for servicing the issue is not justified; the market conditions are such that the public are not taking up Treasury Bills and, as a matter of fact, the biggest purchaser of Treasury Bills is the Barbados Government Savings Banks.

Those are the items which we have deducted from the Estimates. Now, from the office of Home Affairs, I have cut my stationery down by \$200, Incidentals by \$300 and from the Information Service, we have taken off \$1,850. We have also cut down on equipment for the Information Office, \$1,050; and other office equipment \$75. The overall saving is \$3,475, and no labour is involved. When we come to the Police I have asked that these animals which perform very creditably when the tourists come here but which otherwise have not earned their keep - we have asked that they be disposed of by giving them to some lover of animals or selling them. We have taken out \$360 which is a one-third reduction and which leaves two dogs, and we hope that there will be no dogs by the end of the year.

I do not think that an expenditure of over \$2,000 is justified. We have not advocated that they be shot, but it is not easy to keep up hungry and thirsty dogs who can consume so much. There is an upkeep for the dogs, but it has been a one-third reduction. There is \$1,300 for Band Cadets. As to newspapers, we have been able to cut nearly \$1,200 off the Police without in any way affecting efficiency, Passports \$1,000. There are passports available and the emigration figures are not as high as they were during the past few years. Motor Vehicles, \$8,600; and we have saved \$18,790 for wireless equipment and most of this money would have gone outside of Barbados. Fire Service, \$47,000, which was for the purchase of a ladder. Local Government, Registration of voters, \$500. As to the Ministry of Agriculture, the sum of \$5,000 has been saved. There is \$4,000 for upkeep of Government lands; furniture and equipment,

\$2,300; installation of electricity at Agricultural Stations, \$6,000, making a total of \$17,300. In the Public Works Department, we have saved \$85 under the Ministry of Communications and Works. That Department appears to be a Works Department; so that there is no extravagance. In respect of plant and equipment, there is \$5,000. The sum of \$10,450 was allocated for the washing and painting of the old Hospital buildings. There is no point in painting the outside, and therefore we have left the washing for the inside because the patients like to have a cheery appearance. In connection with Police Stations, there is \$6,800, Printing Office \$16,700. There is a new building.....

Mr. GODDARD: On a point of order, I should like to enquire from the Hon. Premier whether these are savings from the Draft Estimates.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: These are savings from Estimates which were already approved. In connection with the Waterworks, purchase of lorries, \$5,000. Installation of meters, \$21,000 is the amount which we have saved there. (Cheers).

As to the transport service, there is a deficiency projected for this service. I am afraid that I misled the House a little while ago when I said that the projected deficiency was \$150,000. Actually, for the purpose of keeping the item in the book we had to leave in a dollar so that the projected deficiency is \$149,999. (Laughter). Highways and Transport Department, \$150,500. This is not really a saving; this is an item which appears on both sides. We have probably saved a little more because when we pay out wages and buy materials for the Telephone Company, the Electric Company and the Natural Gas Corporation, we are losing interest on that money. We intend to make these public utility companies pay in the money in advance before we reinstate the roads and send in a bill which was collected within a reasonable time and sometimes within an unreasonable time. We have tightened up on that and \$150,500 will be involved there. A large factor of labour will be involved here, but it does not mean any falling off in the level of employment. We are demanding that this work be paid for in advance before the public roads are dug up by these companies. Additional road works \$511,140 is now under the Capital Estimates and there is \$22,480 for plant tools and spares.

Teacher Training, \$32,700; equipment, \$1,365, we have merely transferred to the Training Fund. We have not effected a saving there because that would affect the teacher training. Erdiston: water bill \$255; Technical Institute, \$830 without any anticipated loss of efficiency in that Department. Leave Passages under secondary schools, \$5,000 will be saved. As to public libraries, we have postponed the purchase of reference books, \$1,500 and furniture and fittings, \$4,000. As to the General Hospital, on refrigerators the sum of \$2,780 has been saved because a lot of equipment has been ordered for the new Hospital. Furniture and equipment, \$1,288 plus \$472, badges for nurses, \$540, Mental Hospital; \$1,000 for furniture, \$1,500 for refrigerators; furniture, \$4,233. At the Mental Hospital a charitable bequest has been made by a lady; otherwise the money would have been paid out of public funds. We have drawn on this particular fund for the provision of furniture for certain Wards of the Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, we do not anticipate any increase in crime so that the Prisoners Earnings Scheme has been reduced by \$626. For emigration there was an amount of over \$1 million under the Labour Department, Head 45, Item 22 and therefore we have reduced the item by \$282,925 and later on in the year if we see that a supplementary vote is necessary, of course it would be forthcoming.

I really do not anticipate that this year in view of the present circumstances all over, both in England and in Barbados it will be necessary for us to increase this vote at all.

Under Subsidies and Grants — The Barbados Museum and Historical Society, \$4,300; for the Family Planning Association I think the figure I have here is \$10,000, but, as far as I know, it was reduced by a further \$5,000. The

reason for that is that it is no part of the policy of this Government to promote family planning. The Government was approached to provide an extra \$10,000 for the mass distribution of contraceptives. This would bring Barbados very close to Mr. Aldous Huxley's "Brave New World" when we would be walking about with Malthusian belts. I feel that the emphasis in any country like Barbados should be on the increase in productivity and increase in the number of job opportunities rather than to go about accusing people of the taint of original sin — that they are having too many children. It does not mean that we are going to discourage any private or charitable organisation from promoting Family Planning in the way that the *Stopes Clinics* do in the United Kingdom very effectively, but we do not believe that the Government should shelter behind the excuse of over-population to avoid meeting its responsibilities to provide jobs for the people who are already born, in being and under the Queen's peace in this community. We have reduced the vote for Family Planning by \$5,000 not in any way to hurt or restrict a scheme which employs a certain number of people, but we have definitely refused the offer of some big American concern to spend an additional \$10,000 in the mass distribution of contraceptives, and we are not apologising for it at all.

I think that hon. members ought to know that this Family Planning Association has money in the Bank which I think they ought to spend before they come to Government. They have more than \$5,000 in the Bank; so if we reduce them by \$5,000 this year, it does not mean that they have to lay off any of the trained nurses or workers which they have now for instructing people in the rural districts and metropolitan area in the intricacies, whatever they are, of Family Planning. To me this sounds like birth control, but they called it Family Planning. We do not think that in the present state of the economy of Barbados any private or public organisation should be encouraged to build up reserves at the expense of the taxpayers, and I just want to make the policy of this Government abundantly clear on that, because unfortunately Family Planning has during the past four or five years in Barbados by the activities of the last Government been elevated into an economic principle of managing the resources of the country. To that we do not subscribe.

We had to reduce the Barbados Museum and Historical Society by \$2,143 because we think that some of this expenditure could very well be postponed.

The gross reduction in order to bring our expenditure down to a reasonable level, and I have now come to the end of the reductions, is to the order of \$2,374,285; but when one makes the necessary adjustments to avoid double counting in the Budget, you will see, Sir, that the Customs Drawbacks \$420,000, Inland Revenue Fund \$500,000 and Public Utilities Companies \$150,500 — a total of \$1,070,500 — is deducted from the gross which would leave approximately \$1,300,000 which would be the net amount. Then I think it is right, Sir, that we should take into consideration the Heads which we have transferred over to Capital Estimates, and that is to the order of \$511,140; so the net retrenchment in the projected Estimates of Expenditure after we take out the \$1,070,500 and \$511,140 is \$782,645 in the Estimates of this year.

Without in any way wanting to be tedious with a long recital of figures, I wanted only to reassure members more than once that the retrenchment which we have undertaken was done with a view to maintaining the level of employment that would be generated by the normal expenditure, and not to affect the level of employment in any way that we could help. I think from the figures and the Heads I have disclosed to hon. members, they will see that most of these reductions will not affect the level of employment in any way whatsoever, either directly or indirectly, as far as I myself can see.

I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to keep hon. members any longer with a recital of the statistics which are available. As I said, we are primarily concerned at this juncture with the Departmental votes rather than with the Development and Capital votes; but I think, perhaps, before I close

I might give an over-all picture of the background against which we have taken over as a Government, and the background against which we will be preparing our Development Plan which will be brought to the House at the time of the Finance Bill and Budget Speech sometime in the month of May or early in June.

The estimated population of the Island at the 31st December, 1961 was 241,706 compared with 242,274 at the end of the year 1960. The natural increase of 4,395 was offset by migration of 4,963. The natural increase was therefore, 1,311 less than in the previous year, due to the decrease of 1,025 in the number of births and an increase of 283 in deaths. Those are figures to me which are symbolic of movement outwards of the persons in the younger age groups, and the women of child-bearing age from this country. When you lose something like 5,000 by emigration, - the exact figure is 4,963, 37 short of 5,000 - naturally if anything like 50% of those persons are women of child-bearing age, this will lead to a falling off in the number of live births in the country, because you are moving out the age group both on the male and female side which would be responsible for the procreation of the species, and leaving therefore a higher percentage of people who are no longer fit for work in the community.

Now, that is one of the trends which a country which wants to expand industrially, has to watch very carefully. We do not want to wake up one morning to find that we have only old age pensioners to mind the industries which we have here. However, we need not be alarmed over the increased number of deaths. There is no epidemic which I know about that has caused it. But these trends are the result of the migration to the United Kingdom and elsewhere which are now making themselves felt and are now having an impact on the population statistics of the Island.

The Commonwealth Sugar Agreement has been extended to the year 1969, and there has been an increase in the negotiated price of sugar from £45.2s. which is \$216.48 to £45.15s. 3d. which is \$219.66 which is a net increase of \$3.18 per ton. At the same time, the free market price has fallen to \$105.60. This fall in the free market price should not, in my opinion - and I say "in my opinion" because mine is not always the same as other persons in this country - affect the amount of income from the sale of sugar in Barbados. Our experience, although our quota is in the vicinity of 134,000 tons and the anticipated yield this year is 180,000 tons, is that we usually have no difficulty in getting rid of the additional 35,000 or 38,000 tons of sugar at the negotiated price due to short falls in other Islands. The other islands, in other words, do not come up to their quota; so we are usually able to take up all the shortfalls in those islands. Therefore, from the point of view of the price of sugar, the situation in Barbados should be slightly better than last year because not only have we got an increase in tonnage - and that is from 116,000 to 118,000 tons - but we also have an increase in the negotiated price by the amount of \$3.18 a ton.

Rum on which duty was paid for local consumption showed a decrease from 411,154 wine gallons in 1960 to 397,115 in 1961; while exports of rum fell from 790,000 proof wine gallons to 712,606 proof wine gallons.

Perhaps a word of warning would be advisable at this stage. It is felt that the rum industry in Barbados has got to pull its socks up. Jamaica rum producers - without casting any aspersions on the products of another country - produce an inferior article to that which is produced in Barbados, but they spend a tremendous amount of money on advertising it and to the extent that there is no such word in everyday parlance as rum; it is Jamaica rum, whether it is special Jamaica rum or not. The Barbados producers appear to be competing both among themselves and the products of the other countries, and I think the time has come when they should pool their advertising and their resources and advertise Barbados rum as a product; if we sell more Barbados rum, all the producers would benefit. As a matter of fact, we only have about three of them in the export market; and I think the hon. junior member for Christ Church, whether he agrees with my prognosis or not, would say that

my prognosis is very helpful at the present moment. I think the rum producers in Barbados should do something about putting Barbados rum on the market as a special product; they should not advertise rum as somebody's rum. We also have to consider whether it is profitable to ship our rum to places like Canada where it is sold at a special price. As a matter of fact, I understand from a large Canadian importer that great damage is done to our rum by selling it more cheaply than the price at which Jamaica sells her rum. He said that when the people realise that Barbados rum is cheaper than that of Jamaica, they say that Jamaica rum is better because it is more expensive.

Now, this is a very vital sector in our economy. It is closely associated with the production of sugar in this Island, and it is one of the commodities in the world market where we feel we have a very special advantage. I am afraid and regret that that advantage is not exploited to the fullest; and if I give a word of warning to the wise, perhaps, we may witness some stimulation in the export market of rum.

Now, Sir, the value of the exports of soap, margarine and lard rose from \$1,109,638 in 1960 to \$1,157,143 in 1961.

The total value of domestic exports in 1961 was \$37 million as compared with \$34.9 million in 1960, and the total value of re-exports was \$6.2 million as compared with \$5.9 million in the previous year; while the total value of imports last year was \$80.3 million as compared with \$83.3 million in 1960. The visible trade gap was therefore reduced from \$42.4 million to \$37.1 million.

In other words, there was a visible trade deficiency of \$37.1 million. We imported \$37.1 million in goods more than we exported and, as hon. members know, our chief exports are sugar, rum, fancy molasses, vacuum pan molasses and edible oils and soaps.

Those are our chief exports, quite apart from our export of population which has developed to be a major export in this colony. Twenty-three and a half million worth of food was imported in 1961, an increase of almost \$1 1/3 million; while imports of manufactured goods and articles fell by \$1 million to a little over \$25 million, and imports of machinery and transport equipment fell by \$3 million to \$12.2 million. The trade gap on visible trade account was made largely by receipts from the tourist industry and by remittances from abroad, from emigrants who had gone overseas and who had sent back money for their families, and the repayment of Government loans which has been fairly steady. In addition to that, there were the normal remittances from places like the U.S.A., not only from the farm workers, but from relatives who had emigrated long ago and who still continue to assist their families in Barbados.

In 1961, 37,060 tourists arrived in the Island as against 35,535 in 1960 - an increase of 1,525 - as compared with 5,286 in the previous year. Approximately, half the number of tourists came from North America and Venezuela. Total expenditure by these tourists was approximately \$15.9 million in B.W.L. currency as compared with \$13 million in 1960. This increase was due largely to a marked increase in the number of tourists staying at the more luxurious and expensive hotels.

Emigration to the United Kingdom rose from 4,194 in 1960 to 6,031 in 1961, and emigration to the U.S.A. under the Farm Labour programme rose from 1,275 in 1960 to 1,310 in 1961. Remittances from persons abroad through the General Post Office and certain other channels which we can trace totalled \$7.5 million in 1961 as against the comparable figure of \$6 million in 1960.

Finally, I come to what perhaps is one of the more unfavourable features of the economy, and that is the total standing to the credit of depositors in the Government Savings Bank. The total fell by \$1.8 million as compared with a fall of \$262,000 in 1960. At the same time savings in the commercial banks rose by \$2.3 million as compared with \$0.97 million in the previous year. Time deposits in the

commercial banks rose by \$606,000 despite a reduction from \$2.7 million to \$400,000 in Treasury time deposits. Loans and advances by commercial banks rose from \$39.7 million to \$41.3 million at the end of 1961.

You will see, therefore, that there appears to have been a transfer of a substantial amount of money in the vicinity of \$2 million. Although you cannot trace it accurately, it is reasonable to assume that people transferred money from the Government Savings Bank to the commercial banks. There was no diminution in the level of savings, but the alarming feature is that people no longer want to leave their money in the Government Savings Bank. Recently a decision has been taken to allow the Governors of the Savings Bank to vary the rate of interest from time to time without any legislation being fixed, because if you want to encourage people to leave their money in the Government Savings Bank, we have to offer rates of interest competitive with those offered in the commercial banks. I am quite sure that hon. members will be glad to know that the rates which are offered — the decision was taken a couple of weeks ago — will be competitive with those offered by the commercial banks so that I hope that there will be not only a re-transfer of money to the Government Savings Bank, but that the people will be induced to take some of the money from their puzzling-boxes and old stockings and from under the bed and put that money into the Government Savings Bank so that they can acquire savings which are invested, because the Government will be investing that money in Treasury bills, deposit receipts and matters of that kind. That Sir, is the financial picture which I would like to put before hon. members.

If I may end up by coming back to the point at which I started, after the various adjustments have been made, we will be asking the House to make certain amendments to the Estimates as they have been circulated. Hon. members should, by now, have copies of the amendments to the current Estimates, because I believe that in those amendments were circulated today. I do not think it is necessary for me to go through these amendments item by item, except, perhaps, to highlight one or two important aspects in which the amendments have been made. I have already mentioned that as far as the Legislature is concerned, Your Honour's personal emoluments have been reduced by \$1,200 thus setting an example not only to the Legislature but to the rest of the community in this year of emergency with which we are faced. The necessary legislative enactment has been prepared; the item "refreshments" has been reduced by \$14,000 and that note will be deleted. On page 1 of the amendments there is a mistake which I would like to correct. There is to be substituted a note to read as follows:—

"Act 1891 - 7 as amended by Act 1946 - 13".

The Act 1891 - 7 is nothing to do with the Legislature, not in that respect anyhow. It should have been the "Act 1891-24". The Speaker's travelling allowance has been increased to the same amount authorised to a Minister of the Government, that is, \$90.00 a month. There is therefore a net reduction on the Speaker's amount which will be \$70 a month. The Government Hospitality Vote has been increased by \$4,000 for the simple reason that we have been coming for supplementary estimates all the time and we estimate that the figure there is much more realistic in view of the projected Federation, and the number of conferences which we will be holding from time to time. There are various other Heads, Mr. Speaker, but I do not think that it is necessary for me to repeat what I have already said under different headings, because some of them are merely repetitions of what I have said before. I am therefore moving that the Bill comprising the Estimates as amended by these proposals, be now read a second time.

In conclusion, I would like to say that we in Barbados should always be aware of what is going on in the country, because it is the only way in which we can inspire confidence amongst the taxpayers and other citizens of the Island if we keep them informed of the true position and not treat them like children all the time, or assume that they do not understand financial matters. That is not only

necessary for the taxpayers, but for the business community and for prospective investors and people who want to put some capital into different projects in this country. It is therefore our intention to lay the facts, no matter how depressing these facts may be, from time to time before the citizens of this Island, so that they will work along with us in order to raise the standard of living and the gross national product in this country, and so that we can achieve the things which have been achieved by other areas, not only in the West Indies, but outside of it.

I do not think that members need necessarily be alarmed because there is a deficit of nearly \$2 million. It is the best that we can do in the rather peculiar circumstances of being confronted with a *fait accompli* in the wages and salaries for the public service to the order of \$3 million. Even without that increase last year the Government had budgeted for a deficit of \$1 1/4 million. That deficit was translated into a surplus of nearly \$2 million, but then the \$3 million increase in the salaries and wages of the public service took care of the revised Estimate of Revenue which would have left Government with a surplus, as I said, of about \$2 million. There is a deficit of \$2 million and we are going to take very active steps to reduce the size of that deficit. Having a deficit is not necessarily a bad thing if the people who work in the Public Service would be willing to put in a full day's work or full month's work for the full month's pay which they have asked for and which they are now getting, if they discharge their duties with courtesy and with good humour as the members of the public expect them to discharge them, and if the Heads of Departments and other people concerned do not carry out systematic raids on the Treasury which will not be looked upon with approval by my Cabinet anyhow. The only way that you could justify an increase in Departmental spending is to show that the cost of the commodities which you wanted to purchase have risen due to extraordinary circumstances beyond the control of the Department; but I do not subscribe to the view that an Estimate should be put in and something deleted, and later on in the year when the financial picture begins to look a little rosier that a systematic raid should be made on the Treasury for the very items which had been deleted. When these items have been deleted, I have deleted them until 31st March, 1963. These items have not been postponed pending a better picture; they have been deleted, and I want to make that abundantly clear, and they would have to get along without them. They would have to get along without the elaborate cabinets and desks and that kind of thing, because there are a lot of businesses in this country running with inadequate equipment and managing quite well, and there are a lot of people sleeping on the floor when Civil Servants are swinging around in swivel chairs in Barbados. There are children going to sleep hungry in this community every night; and although our deficit is only now to the order of \$2 million, we have to remember that there are increases for the Police to come, and the cost of the School Meals Programme also to be added on to deficit; so that is not going to cost a little bit of money.

Although I may sound like a prophet of gloom, I want everyone to understand that this is a country with a very serious problem, and we should not immediately aspire to have all the creature comforts that we see on the screen — the cabin cruiser, two cars in the garage and that kind of thing. I am not going to say anything about luxury spending because the time has not come for that yet. The public will be called upon to make certain sacrifices, but I do not think there are sacrifices which are going to be intolerable for this community to bear. We have to see that the principle of the maximum social advantage is applied in every respect of Government financing, and therefore it will call for a redistribution of the wealth of the country via taxation from those who have a little more to those who do not have so much by way of social services and so on. We do not intend to curtail the social services just because there is a deficit.

Mr. Speaker, the immediate demands for expenditure will be met from such reserves as may be still left. When I say "may be still left", I have already told the House that the General Revenue Balance and the Revenue Equalisation

Fund have been almost entirely depleted; but we do have certain unproductive investments with the Crown Agents and through the Crown Agents, and from time to time we have to ask the Crown Agents to sell some of these investments in order to meet our expenditure, as the year goes on. That is an ordinary practice. If you do not have any money on call or at short notice liquid cash, we have to call in some of our investments. I do not necessarily think this is a bad thing, because if you look at the list of investments, you will see we have been systematically losing on these investments due to the rise of interest rates.

I do not like to be pedagogic, but it is necessary for me to explain matters which I normally would take for granted if I were only addressing Your Honour. If the Government of Barbados buys, let us say, \$100,000 in bonds at 4% and the interest rate rises to 8%, the Government of Barbados cannot then cash in these bonds for \$100,000. The Government would normally have to wait until 1980 or whenever the bonds or stocks matured to cash them in, in order to get back the amount of money that was invested, and by this time, of course, the purchasing power of money has fallen. If the interest rate goes from 4% to 8%, it is only natural to expect that depending on the length of time towards maturity the value of the investment will fall, and you can see illustrations of that by looking at the Estimates where you will see the value of Government investments have been set out. The value does not fall to \$50,000 because the interest rate has doubled. As I said before, that depends on the length of time there is to maturity and redemption of the investment, but certainly, as has happened to a lot of Government investments over the past ten years, it may drop to 68% or 69% of the amount that you originally invested. Now that has been happening, I started warning the Government of this country from 1952 that they should have floating conversion loans at a time when the rates of interest were low and get rid of some of the securities at times when the interest rates were tending to rise.

My warning, as you are aware, because you were in the House, fell on deaf ears and I have now inherited this lack of vision; therefore, we would have to do the best we can about it. Some of the investments in the past few days have risen because of the reduction in the bank rate and therefore, we have to watch the trend very carefully to see whether there is a likelihood of a further reduction so that we can cash in on some of these investments. Therefore, it can be seen that although we do not have liquid cash floating, we do have some investments and we have to consider very seriously disposing of some of these investments before the market value falls much below what it is. However, quite apart from that, we hope to be coming to the House with our plans for greater production and expansion of our economy and we also will be bringing in the necessary legislation to authorise the raising of loans in whatever markets we can get them.

I am very happy to say that as a result of much corresponding and travelling by the Hon. Minister of Trade and myself, we have high hopes of raising \$7 million (U.S.) between now and the end of the month. It is possible that I can only ask the investment house to send \$6.3 million because we only have authorisation for the raising of \$6.3 million by the Loan Act of 1957; however, that is \$6.3 million which I have every reason to believe we can get and which would be useful in tiding us over the period from 31st March, 1962 to 30th June, 1962.

We also have to consider the introduction of legislation for the entire re-financing of the Deep Water Harbour project. I think that in the course of my remarks today I left the Deep Water Harbour project somewhat in mid-air. The position with the Deep Water Harbour which has made terrific inroads in the financial resources of this Island is as follows:-

"Harbour construction was \$17,840,190 together with engineering, consulting and advisory rose to \$18,477,399. The approach roads cost \$1,296,000; tug \$666,869; ancillary works \$762,000; drainage, \$421,000; capitalisation charges \$1.9 million. Now, the bulk sugar installation came to \$4,643 million thus making a total of \$28 million expended to date on the Deep Water Harbour."

Now, Sir, most of that expenditure has been made from Reserve funds. The amount of money raised in 1957 was \$12.5 million and that is the only way in which the Harbour, in my opinion, has been properly financed. That left a deficit of roughly \$15 million to date and I would like to say that when all the ancillary works have been completed, the ultimate cost would be likely to be in the vicinity of \$31 million.

I would also warn hon. members that the figure now for the construction of the new Hospital is \$2.6 million in excess of the figure which was presented to the Legislature. I have not investigated that matter yet, but, as hon. members know, the Hospital is not yet finished. That is not a satisfactory state of affairs; but, as I have said, those are the conditions which we have inherited. We have inherited an estate with very heavy mortgages on it.

I would like to say that we are not deterred nor have we deflected from our original intention to carry out the programme with which we went to the country, and by very judicious handling of our limited resources I am still very optimistic. I feel now that we are on a platform and from here on Barbados is going to make a leap forward although the platform on which we stand, if we stand on it too long, is likely to break. We cannot stand on it too long; we have to leap forward; and I want to assure hon. members that it is our intention to view the situation realistically and not to stick our heads in the sand and mislead the public that this is the greatest place in the world and that the Government is going to be a fairy godfather. We are asking the public to join in the uphill effort so as to bring us to the position on the top of the hill and to enjoy the view to which we are looking forward. (Cheers)

I beg to move that this Bill with the amendments which I have made be now read a second time.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member seconding the motion now with a view of speaking on the Bill at a later stage.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Yes, Sir, in case the necessity arises, I would like to reserve the right to speak at a later stage.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, it has been the practice of this House, after listening to the Budget Speech given by the Premier, that hon. members are given a copy of the speech and a little time in order to study it so as to come back here more prepared to contribute to the debate. Of course, I realise that there has been a departure from that today and everything has been quite different from the presentation of former budgets. I appreciate very much the points of change, but that, again, necessitates the study of his speech which we would like to have in our hands before we continue at this stage.

In recent years the Clerk of the House has very kindly provided a copy of the Budget Speech within two days so that we can really study it and thus would be able to contribute more forcibly to the debate. If I may use the Hon. Premier's words, he said that he would be putting some of the salient points. Some of the things which the Hon. Premier said may not be remembered; so I am asking the Government at this stage if they would be grateful enough to continue the practice which was adopted in this House, ever since I have been here.

I think it is the feeling on this side of the House that that should be done. It seems as if some other hon. members desire to continue with this Bill and for that reason if I were to sit down now, I would lose my right to speak.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I think that the hon. member should reserve his right to speak if some other hon. member would like to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I would say about that is that the hon. member may move that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed and if his motion is not seconded

other hon. members may speak. At a later stage the motion of the hon. member may be seconded, and then he would be entitled to speak on another occasion.

Mr. GODDARD: In that case, I would move that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

Mr. MILLER rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have noted that the motion of the hon. junior member for Christ Church was not seconded. I take it that the hon. junior member for St. George rose on a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there is a lot of things for which the Standing Orders do not provide, but the hon. member who rose to make a speech and who was not prepared to speak is being accommodated. However, I would not like the hon. member to lose that opportunity. Some hon. members feel that they have the right to rise first on the novel idea of this reservation of the right to speak which is only the right of a member who seconds a motion. If that idea gets around then everybody will rise and say that he wants to speak on a matter tomorrow. I feel that hon. members should have come armed to speak as I came armed to speak. The hon. member is not as great a cricket enthusiast as I am and I said that we were spinning out the days before the cricket started. What has been done on the former occasion, what the hon. junior member for Christ Church has mentioned, has been done because the then Premier came in with a prepared speech. I am trying to save the Clerk on this occasion. If you ask the Clerk to have a report prepared of the Premier's Speech then you will be in for a very long time; you will have to get the type script from the Official Reporters and that will mean that you will have to go through a very long process.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, although it has been the tradition - I would not say of previous Ministers of Finance because there has been none - of previous people who introduced the Budget to read out the Memoranda prepared for them - and it is against the Rules of the House to read your speech - I prepared my notes from statistics and made my speech from them. I would never read out a speech in this House. I make my own speech as I study my background, data and material.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am repeating what the hon. member has said; it has been said that in England a Minister can read his speeches. I am not asking the hon. member for a prepared speech; I am saying what the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said, that is, that it is not being done. Last Tuesday it was said that we would be dealing with the Budget and I did not want any postponement. If the Government want to go through as late as they are prepared to go through - I did not want to come here on Tuesday and then they ask me to come back here on Thursday or Friday. I am prepared to deal with the Second Reading of this Bill and to deal with it as it has been set out by the Hon. Minister of Finance. I have made my notes of what the Minister has said and I hope that the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. junior member for St. George would be given some opportunity to deal with this matter.

The Hon. Premier is presenting the Budget to us - it is not a gloomy Budget; it is not a Budget at all - but in this Bill, the Premier has mentioned the things which they propose to do. I think that we should state our views now so that if the Government has not got down to these things, they should get down to them now. I consider that there must be a brutal and ruthless reappraisal of this country's whole finances from the point of view even of the structure of the Civil Service. There cannot be any excuse for putting the picture to us, as has been put to us today, and allow the structure of this Island to remain in the same way. I see for myself at a glance a complete pulling down of some of the structures which you have, if those are the problems which you have. I am sorry that the hon. senior member for the City is not now in his place.

5.55 p.m.

Now I am a believer in complete democracy, and with my analysis of this budget I cannot see this country continuing with this type of bureaucracy that we have in Barbados, where we are continually employing more bureaucrats and we are not improving in efficiency. I am going to give an example. For the life of me I cannot see how in an Island of 166 square miles and 200,000 people you can have a Central Government, and on top of this you have a Public Assistance Board on which you are spending thousands of dollars, and at a lower level you have a Local Government Commissioner. I see he has been appointed to a post in the Civil Service as an Establishment officer. It is about time that the Government abolish the whole idea of a Local Government Commissioner and look at the whole scheme of Local Government.

Now the Local Government members in here would excuse me if what I say seems harsh. Local Government politicians in the main in Barbados have not yet come to grips with what is required, and the Act under which Local Government is administered is an expensive experiment which we cannot afford with these deficits. You have a deficit of \$2 million, and I am sure that if a financial analysis is made of the things with which I am dealing, you will find that you are spending more than \$2 million to keep up an administration which should be kept up by ten people.

I want the Ministers, Mr. Speaker, to do a little more work. I have been looking through the Heads of the Estimates, and the amount of work that has been allocated to the Premier is too much. He would have to be a magician to do all of that. I do not fool people. If you look in the Estimates you will get some idea of the things that come under the Head of the Premier. Under the Premier is the Ministry of Finance, Accountant General, Pensions, Charges of Debt, Customs, Inland Revenue, Statistical Service and Federation which is a memory. Then he is Minister of Home Affairs, Fire Service, Local Government, Ecclesiastical, Cabinet and General and Barbados Regiment. When you add these to the Ministry of Finance, you will see that there is not a Department that he would not have to deal with.

When I come to the Minister of Labour, I find that he can well undertake some other tasks. The Minister of Labour has the Ministry of Labour, Production and Development, but these are names and not Departments and I see that the only Department that comes under that Head is the Labour Department. There is no Trade Department nor Development Department; so all is done from the administrative level.

Now there is something which the last Government did which the new Government must change. I heard the Minister say that he is not making any recommendations for Ministers to get any more money. My thinking is a little different on that. I feel that a Ministerial system should be a Ministerial system. Now Ministers in the past in Barbados would not take more money for themselves to do a whole time job. All of them wanted to do part-time Ministerial jobs and run their businesses. My view is that if a Minister cannot give whole-time service to functions of public life, he should not be a Minister. You cannot have a Minister working half-time and therefore pick up all these other bits of Departments. That creates in the Civil Service the feeling that a Minister does not do his work fully and that the Civil Servants do the work, because he cannot pay full attention to these things as all his income is not coming from it and he has to look towards other things in order to keep the pot boiling.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to that method. I feel that one of the reasons why we have these deficits in Barbados is that under the old system of Government it was a part-time Government - one person catching some fees on mornings at his office before he can go to his office, and another catching something here on the other hand; so it meant that the public business was left to Civil Servants. I do not say that well paid Civil Servants should not be called upon to do good jobs, because I see in these Estimates that you are paying some of them \$9,400 a year; not that I regard that as too much money to pay a top Civil Servant.

I feel that a top Civil Servant, somebody like the Director of Medical Services, the financial people, the Director of Agriculture or the top Permanent Secretary are worth anything like \$800 a month. I do not begrudge or regard \$800 a month as too much money for a top Civil Servant; but I do not believe in having a man drawing \$800 and you must have 18 people under him. I feel if you are going to draw \$800 a month you must be high-powered like a high-powered machine. You cannot be a low-powered machine and draw that money. If you want that money you must be like a high-powered machine, so that as soon as you open your mouth one can see you are high-powered, like when you press the accelerator of a high-powered motor car and you feel it move under you. That is my idea of bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, the Government spends too much money in Local Government and it is time for a complete reappraisal of this stupidity in Barbados. As I said, there are Local Government members in the House, and personally I would pass a law that you could not be in the Local Government and in the House too because you have to split loyalties. If you want to be in Local Government, you should be there, and if you want to be in the House, be here. The whole concept of Local Government is that it was parish pump politics where a person was looking about for roads or doing some little nonsense job. If you had a road to repair, the concept was finding employment for a man. You put a little marl down, and as soon as lorries and trucks run over the road during the crop they create pot holes and you have to repair them for the next crop.

The Premier raised the question about cane cutters. There is a lot of unscientific thinking of people doing jobs. The plantation people want men to come and cut canes during the crop, but after the crop they do not know anything about offering something to keep cane cutters. It serves those who do not have cane cutters right, because when the crop is over, they do not know how to treat the men but offer them two days' work; so now that this has come about they say it is a crisis that they do not have cane cutters. I have absolutely no sympathy for that type of thinking among businessmen. There are some businessmen in Barbados who are lucky because they have inherited businesses from their fathers. I do not believe in that. I do not believe in any idiot because he is the son of any person having the right to preside over my economic destiny. Some people have their sons and grand-sons in businesses, and it is a matter of inheritance. They are seeing about the lives of too many people, and that is where we get too much low productivity from the management.
6.05 p.m.

I would say at the beginning that there must be a complete re-appraisal of these Government Departments and the work Government is doing. There is too much public wastage. Why should there be a Department for the Crown Solicitor and he cannot be integrated in your Legal Department? Why must you duplicate your Messenger and Typist when one of each would do? When you look through your Estimates, you see every now and then a new Department created. You have now a Department for your Probation Service and your Social Welfare Service and every time you create a new Department, you must have a Head of Department, a Clerk; and by so doing you are multiplying Government servants.

Sir, the size of these Estimates has been growing year after year because you are increasing your Departments. There is a big concept among white-collared workers that if you give a man a top post and give him some more money, automatically, he requires somebody near him to give him assistance. You therefore call him an assistant. They think it adds status. Here in Barbados, wages paid by Government are not so low. In the days gone by, the Chief Justice was getting £1,000 and that was when I first came into this House. Now, today, his salary is twice as much. The Chief Secretary's salary was twice as much and salaries are still going up. On the last occasion when you dealt with salaries of Civil Servants and wages of people in the Public Service, you dealt with them behind a political background, not an economic background; and you can see very well what it has left this country in. You have now to set up Anomalies

Committees to deal with some of the recommendations and when those Committees make their recommendations, the time will soon be at hand again for you to set up another Salaries Commission.

The Hon. Premier has said that he would be coming back around May or June with a Budget and I hope at that time he will say that there is no need for all these Departments and he is having an integration of people in the Service; and it must not only be an integration with a view to retaining all the servants you need but an integration with a view to streamlining it and putting it on a proper basis.

Why say that you want a Local Government Commissioner? The Local Government Commissioner has to send something to the Permanent Secretary, then the Permanent Secretary sends it to the Minister. What is it that the Local Government Commissioner has to do? He has to go and sit down at meetings of the various Councils. Who comes in here and sits down with us? The old Government left some sort of watchdog in creating this Department to watch the hon. senior member for the City. They have left us with the Public Assistance Board just to say that he was spending too much in the City Council. However, it is a matter for the Government to decide whether there is the necessity for a Local Government Commissioner. Taking into consideration the economy which you have, do you want all these people? Sir, I am a believer in democracy. I believe all the men in Local Government can do good jobs. Make them District Commissioners. Give them some measure of importance in the community. The Northern and Southern District Councils are coming to you begging for money to help them to carry on. The only one of these Councils which is not begging is the City Council; therefore, what is the use of having an expensive trapping when everybody is begging?

I do not know the real rate which you give for travelling allowance. What is the average amount of money paid out to Local Government Officers for travelling? I know the Island well and no Local Government Officer travels as much as I do. My average travelling is 1,000 miles a month. You have this question of wasting money. Let us get to the stage of streamlining our economy and get away from the frills if Barbados is to have the structure of keeping in step with its economy. As I have said, I believe in giving people in their district some measure of authority; but from what has been revealed in this Appropriation Bill and in these Estimates, it looks as if we did not go in for a complete re-appraisal of our situation, instead of the Hon. Premier coming back here on the 31st March, 1963 and hoping to redress this balance, he may well find that Parkinson's Law has prevailed among the people.

I am glad to hear him say that these Estimates are complete Estimates and that he will not be coming back later in the year with Supplementary Resolutions. However, I am going to tell him that the Departments are going to make him come back with supplementary Resolutions. If you do not come back, they are going to tell the workers that the money is gone; go and ask the people in the House about the money.

Civil Servants are entitled to know that a politician must look upon the Island as a whole and regard them as part of the whole and not as persons to be singled out for special treatment. I deal with all types of people. If I may put it this way, the mental approach of the white-collared workers is such that they think their *status quo* is something to be preserved at all stages; therefore, when any change takes place quickly, sometimes they take very long to adjust themselves to that change. Sometimes when a change takes place, it calls for a right about turn in your thinking. I am telling the Hon. Premier that the work of some Civil Servants is something which he must be very firm with. I go into many Departments of Government; and although I do not make it my business to interfere with the people because I am a member of the House of Assembly, yet it is appalling the way which white-collared workers are adopting on the job. Sometimes, you feel that you are a positive nuisance when you go into some of those places. The people behind the counters look upon you as if you are

somebody coming from outer space and therefore they should not have anything to do with you. That sort of attitude and approach I view with disgust.
6.15 p.m.

Moreover, there is this idea of looking at the clock. I am not against people knocking off at the proper time, but Civil Servants, whether senior or junior, must be told that their job must come first and their family arrangements and their personal arrangements must take second place. Civil Servants have the idea that they must carry their children to school and go back for them at lunch time. As to the Elementary Schools, it seems to me that some parents would think that if they send their children to an Elementary School, they are sending them to a lunatic asylum. I want to say that I am a very observant man; I watch things in the community and I say that too many Civil Servants have the idea that taking a child to school is a part of their work, not realising that the children can get to school by means of the buses. Then again they say that they must go for their wives; this idea that you cannot keep your wife waiting is all foolishness; if your wife is employed then she should not keep waiting on you. Let us get the Civil Servants with the idea that they must learn to settle these problems. Do you think that in the United States of America any man could be so crazy as to be talking about how his wife is going to get to work? They get to work by train and they do not see each other until they get back to their homes; and it may be that it is better for the child to remain at school and get into a fight. I say all that because I think we have too much of this idea of softness and this mental attitude towards work.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear the Premier speak about displaced workers. I was getting worried about the action of many of these workers. When that Bill was framed, it was framed against a background of giving these workers money on a week to week basis. As the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union, I was responsible for the decision being taken because, as has been pointed out here today, it was done with a view to prevent the island from releasing \$ 1 3/4 million one morning and so inflate the economy of the island and leave 1,200 people out of employment. But circumstances have changed: and in the light of these circumstances, if we had said that some man, who was entitled to draw \$1,000, should be given weekly amounts such as \$6.00, we would feel that that was a waste of time from the point of view of the administration. Moreover, it may seem that if a man is drawing \$1,000 and you give him this money in \$6.00 parcels on Fridays, he would walk about the streets and get drunk until the time comes for him to receive the next amount. In that case he would not know what he did with the money. I hope that now that this statement has been made by the Premier it will give some relief because I like to work. My office is inundated weekly with people who ask me: "Skipper, when will I get the thing? I have my passport ready and I want to get up there before the door is closed." I have never been confronted with so many hills as I have been confronted with on this occasion; in every two weeks I have very gloomy stories brought to me.

Mr. Speaker, my other bugbear which I have been riding for some time is the question of Leave Passages. All Civil Servants can use pressure and I do not know what kind of pressure the Civil Servants have been using on members of the Government; but, Mr. Speaker, for the life of me I cannot see that there is any man in Barbados who is drawing money as a salary and he is looking to me to send him to England. That has absolutely no meaning. Moreover, I think that this idea of giving people six months' holiday must come to an end. That period is too long a period during which a man must leave his work and create unnecessary expense. I say, let him go away for three months. Some of these people have nothing to do for this period of six months and that space of time only causes them to get into trouble. If you are accustomed to doing work, how can you remain idle for six months? Let us begin to cut down this period. A considerable amount of money is paid out for people who go on leave and sometimes you are paying two Heads of Departments. That is not like any business; in any business, if the boss goes on holiday, a man holds on for him; but he has not got to pay all the bosses. He may give a man a little

grog at another time. I am against this prolonged absence from work.

These Colonial Office Regulations were made against the background that if Englishmen came to the West Indies to perform tasks for natives, because they have been working in these areas, this dictum was laid down that they must go back home for this time. In those days of the "V" boats like the "Vestris" and the "Vandyke", these employees used to take about two months before they could get back home. Now we are giving people the same amount of leave as it used to take a man to get back to his home in those days. Why should we tax people to make up for a deficit of \$2 million and at the same time you are sending a man to England? Why should I pay income tax to send a man to England?
6.25 p.m.

The only time I can go on holiday is when I go to a Conference. I could not save enough money to go from here to Pelican Island which no longer exists. If I go away I have to get a freeness. Yet I have to pay taxes. I cannot see how it could be reasonable to continue this, and I hope I will be hearing from the Premier in the Budget Speech that he proposes to remove Leave Passages completely from the Estimates.

If you talk about a mandate, Mr. Speaker, you know that I have a mandate to say so. I have told my constituents that if they sent me back to the House of Assembly I would be knocking off these leave passages. The Civil Servants know it and I believe they agree with it. Some of them so realise that it will happen that some of them seem to catch the boat before it stops, because they realise there is no justification for it; but perhaps the Ministers may be a little bit scared to come down with the heavy hammer. I hope that this will not be prolonged.

Now the Premier made a statement in giving a background of these finances, and mentioned the fiscal policy of the Government in compiling these Estimates. He stated some of the things he has taken out, but though he has taken things out of the Estimates, the deficit is still going to be there. There is one thing I would like to draw to the Premier's attention, and it is that he cannot be too quick to make a decision in relation to the Transport Board and its subsidy. I will tell the Premier that he is subsidising things now which within the context of this country's economy are not as important as public transport. I hear some people say that you should give the buses back to the private people. You know the buses were taken from the private concessionaires because they wanted increases and no increases were granted. I have been in close contact with this matter, and to me it is just like the Trinidad affair with B.W.I.A.

Mr. Speaker, there are about 500 people working for their living in the integrated bus service, and you cannot take these 500 people and throw them to the winds in Barbados to be at the mercies of private employers, because I have the experience that in the public sectors workers can get attention through members of the Legislature, but in the private sector people get away with these things. Before these bus services were taken over, drivers and conductors in Barbados were paid in 1957 the ridiculous wage of \$15 a week, and it is no wonder that you were recruiting people ostensibly to steal and not to work, because if you put a man on a bus and give him \$2 a day and he is collecting a lot of money and taking in to you, he has to be more than an angel for one of the dollars not to drop into his pocket. Moreover, I think the members of the Government and the Premier must understand the way that private people work. They employ their wives, themselves, son and grand-son and they do not get any over-time nor holiday with pay or wages. They eat food in the same house; so those are some of the administrative arrangements of the private concessionaires that you do not find in co-ordinated services. Their administration is done on a loose basis between themselves and relatives which does not happen in a public service where you have to pay a man to do a job.

I feel that this is a very important matter, Sir, which deals with the economy of this Island, and you may run

into difficulties with a group of people who are organised in a Trade Union, which is not going to look lightly upon a system which throws them on to private people, who are not in a position to give them the protection security they deserve. What I think is necessary in transport is that the Government needs to make a brutal appraisal of the Transport Board. I met the Transport Board people last week, and I am going to meet them again maybe tomorrow. I have it on good authority that the Transport Board has increased its operational returns; that is to say, they have over the last year brought in more money from the operational side than they did in the previous year. The conductors have had a very rough time with everybody blaming them. A new contract has now been signed in a Wage Bill for these people, and I do not think anybody would regard a man getting \$30 a week for driving one of those buses in 1962 as too much. The wages should have been more before and it is only now that they are catching up, because in no part of the industrial world would you find any organised worker within our context getting less than \$30 a week for driving one of those 47 or 50 passenger buses. These drivers have to bring people to work, and lots of people in this community do not realise that conductors and drivers have to scramble to get home at 11 o'clock or midnight. I was going to a meeting at Mayers Corner one night when a conductor working at the hon. senior member for St. Joseph had to hitch-hike with me in order to get home. It was not his fault that he had to do that, and it was only good luck that I happened to see this man in his cap and took him up, because I do not risk taking up a man at night.

Mr. COWARD: On a point of order, I think the hon. member would understand that in any work you do, you have to find a way to get home. We are not responsible for a person's getting home.

Mr. WALCOTT: Is that a point of order? But that is only an indication of the mentality of private people with whom you have to deal. The hon. member has put his foot into it. If you took 400 people and left their destiny to be presided over by employers with that mentality, you will see their difficulty. You have to deal with people of the mentality that a man must get home. The hon. member does not know that in London the people who work on the last trip always have a bus or something to take them home.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give way, I think the hon. member and myself have availed ourselves of these services very often in the wee hours of the morning in London and we did not have to pay any fares because the bus drivers and conductors let us ride free on the buses. But the other point I would just like to mention to the hon. senior member for St. Peter is that I do not know if any individual has said that we are going to give the buses back to private people or any nonsense like that.
6.35 p.m.

The Government intends to make the Transport Board pay. That is a different thing altogether and perhaps the private concessionaires would want to surrender their buses at that stage.

Mr. WALCOTT: It shows the sort of difficulty which we have when thinking in modern terms and I am sure the Hon. Premier will agree with me when I say that with a Government with a Socialist philosophy, you cannot be tempted even on the basis of the pressure which you may get from certain sectors of the community to give up something just by saying that it is not paying as well as it should be. From the point of view of the workers themselves, you have to ask yourself: are those workers treated well? What the Hon. Premier has to understand, provided the Transport Board is run efficiently, is that if you have to run a proper service even if you have to give a subsidy to it in order to maintain it. That is something which the public must do. These people are getting a bus service to drop their cooks and their maids at their place of residence. These cooks and maids have to get to these peoples' places early on mornings and sometimes they leave late at night. That is why I say that it is against that background that you have to look at the matter. I took the matter up with that person and

he told me that he lived in Clifton Hall. Do you think I am telling a lie?

Mr. SPEAKER: Not when you are addressing the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: I asked him, "How would you get home?" He said, "I would have to sleep in the garage." Everybody knows my motor car, so he hailed me. It was a night when I was going out to a meeting.

Mr. Speaker, I want the hon. member to know that it is not a system which is employed by the hon. member; it is a question which is employed by all the bus people; therefore, I was only drawing it to the Government's attention that one of the dangers of giving buses to the people is that you have to assess this situation.

The other matter which I would like to deal with is the Deep Water Harbour. I do not think the Hon. Premier and his Government would be acting too late now if they did this. You will remember that during the last hurricane, the members of the last Government went up to the United Kingdom to get a loan and not knowing how to present things to people, the people of the Government up there sent them back and told them that they had money. That was in 1955 and the then Government had already decided to build the Deep Water Harbour. I hope the Hon. Premier will tell Mr. Fraser when he comes here tomorrow — and it is not too late — that this Deep Water Harbour project should never be a project which you call upon the people of Barbados to carry alone. You have been made into a sugar plantation by them. You used to ship sugar in bags and now they say that they are not going to take sugar from you in bags. In an economy like this which we have, you have built a Deep Water Harbour. The cost of the project is equivalent to your total income for one year. Go to the U.S.A. and ask the authorities there this question. If they had a project like this to do, do you think that they would want to do it out of their own economy only? You have done something which is equivalent to your whole income for a year. I feel it is not too late to let the British people know that we should not be called upon to build the Deep Water Harbour out of our Redemption Fund and we are not getting any grant from them.

Barbadians have the idea that you cannot beg a man for money and be independent too. Where they have got that idea from, I do not know. The Marshall Plan was an organisation set up to help countries. It was changed to the O.E.C.U. and now they call it the European Common Community. That was done with money which nations put up. That was how West Germany was able to come back. The United States of America had a recession, but Mr. Speaker, do you know the place which did not have a recession? It is the same place which they turned around and gave money so that their economy could become more pulsating. The United States gave Marshall Aid to all of those countries and the only place which fell below was Italy. They went in and bombed their places, knocked them down and then turned around and gave them money. Now, their economy has reached the stage that the U.S.A. and the United Kingdom Governments have been forced to recognise them. That is why I tell the Premier that he should not worry about what people say. Do you realise that there is no territory that had to undertake a project of this nature that did not undertake it without assistance from somebody? Here it is: you want to play that you are so big that you can undertake a \$28 million project without anybody giving you money. The Deep Water Harbour project is one which spells towards development and therefore, you should tell the British Government to get money and lend you. If Great Britain had to undertake after the war a project whose cost was equivalent to her revenue, she would ask for aid. Britain borrowed something like £1,500 million from the International Monetary Fund and it is still a sovereign state and independent; therefore, this idea of your losing your sovereignty if you have to ask for aid is all bosh. It is not too late for the Hon. Premier to tell Mr. Fraser and all those people that are coming here that we are not beggars from the point of view that we cannot be economically viable, but we have sufficient commonsense to know that you could have offered people money who were not in the British Commonwealth. Britain gave Lybia aid to the extent of £27 million and that

country is not part of the British Commonwealth. That is an independent country. They gave them so much aid and they have even sent Civil Servants there to do certain services for that country.
6.45 p.m.

You are not in the position of walking about and asking for food in a calabash. In this day and age you can beg a man and want independence too. There is nothing in the political context for which you are asking. I am telling the Premier this; he must sing one song and sing it long and often; become an economic nuisance to a man in respect of a project and he has to do it. You do not want ten projects; you hold on to one big project. You do not care who is bowling; if you duck, the ball will go over your head. I am asking the Premier to bear that in mind.

As to the programme for the school meals, I am not as worried about that as much as the appropriate Minister would be worried about it. The Government has already set up a Committee to study this programme, but the Government must insist in a community like this on making the programme as broad and as co-operative as they possibly can. You must draw from the community on a voluntary basis. There must be individual women, indeed there are individual wives in this community, who can be organized into a work force; that can be done if we give them assistance in some way without having to pay one penny for that kind of labour. The labour in connection with the school meals programme and any other manual labour like that, is labour for which you can ask on a voluntary basis. I know that in every district of this island the heart of the Barbadian woman is there; the Barbadian women know that you are not selling food to the school children. You do not even have to call upon a man for this service. You want wives who will go in to share the food — not those who want to carry home the food. (Laughter). I want to say that every five pints of rice that are carried away you have lost, and you do not want that kind of wife who is going to help herself but who is not stealing. We want people who will give of their services on a voluntary basis and that is the only way in which we can succeed. It is the only way in which we have succeeded up to now. How can you expect, with the economy which we have, people to exist if somebody did not come in and eat at your home? A boy is going to school in town, but he is living in the country; that is how we live and develop; but if we had to develop on the basis that everybody had to pay for everything he received, then we could not develop. We have to encourage people in the public sector to do the same thing. I cannot see why the Hon. Premier and the Hon. Minister of Education cannot broaden their scheme and ask people to give voluntary help in a service in which the Government is not making any money. Somebody asked me about a driver's job with the food which is going around and I said that I did not know about this kind of work. One man told me that if I did not get one of these jobs for him I know how it would be with him and me. I am not on the basis of looking for jobs for people; I am on the basis of allowing this work to be done on a voluntary basis.

The Premier says that he wants the community to be so dynamic that he does not want to have any problem. Right now there is a shortage of cane cutters. One of the things which we have entered upon is the crash programme which the Government is carrying on. Those of us who represent labour have to tell people that they must work and not "blow a comb". When you work you make the crash programme effective. The work on the Constitution River is coming on nicely and this is something which it was thought could not be done. I do not subscribe to the idea of a man being unemployable because he has been unemployed for so long that he has lost the zest for working. He has got into a new gear; he cannot even get into the reverse gear. (LAUGHTER). We want to try to attract able-bodied men, and when somebody comes along with something he can attract such people. Why should a man be inconvenienced for the convenience of the planter who did not care anything about the man's position before? Why should something be stopped? You are called upon to foster a change. As soon as you have somebody in the sector where he can make a living, somebody who cannot measure up to that has to drop out. All along I have been warning the people; the next people whom you will hear belly-aching is the hotel people,

because as soon as you want to press down people with wages which are not fair, you will not get these people to work. Very soon the hotel people will be crying out that they cannot get skilled people to work too. It is not every strong man who can cut canes. I had a problem on a plantation already. The manager wanted a girl to work with a man who was cutting canes and she said that she could not work with him and make money because he would cut one cane today and another tomorrow.
6.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, nobody is going to head canes behind a man who cannot cut them because her wages are conditioned on how much he can cut. If he can only cut 2 tons a day, she would not work with him; but a man who can knock down 5 tons a day makes a difference to the person. The hon. junior member for St. James would understand the language which I am speaking. That is why, Sir, there is this problem with cane-cutters. I do not see how you can stop any programme with 30,000 people unemployed in Barbados. The sugar industry at its peak only carries 20,000 to 22,000 people; so you perpetually have an army of unemployed people being left there. The sugar industry has been based too much on the army of people from whom you can draw. We cannot go on with that stupidity; so I warn the Minister to look at that carefully.

What I would like to warn the Premier about is that I do not think the sugar situation is as rosy even within the Barbadian context as it should be. The Premier said that we can sell all the sugar that we make. That is not so easy. Barbados can only sell 130,000 tons on what is known as the negotiated price quota. That is what the British Government is going to buy at the negotiated price. Apart from that, we sell local sugars and that can only come up to 10,000 or 12,000 tons. What you send down the Islands would be another 10,000 tons, and you would still have another 25,000 tons or 30,000 tons to be sold on the free market, and you will catch as catch can. The situation today is very precarious. I have a letter in my pocket setting out the sugar situation, and I would like the hon. member to know that my job keeps me in touch with these people. I was looking for a letter which I received today from one of our Internationals and in it it is stated that the American Government is going to pass a Bill in June or at least President Kennedy is going to give an Order in June which is going to restrict the price. They are not going to buy any more sugar since the Cuban situation; and they have been paying premium prices for sugar.

The American Government has become very chary, and that is maybe why Sir Robert Kirkwood was down there. This premium price is done on an *ad hoc* basis, and sometimes it does not get down to the worker; so what they propose to do is to put a limit on the world market price for sugar and pay into a Welfare Assistance Pool the difference between the price they would have paid at a fixed price and the world market price.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member feels he may conclude — I am not attempting to hurry him — before 7.10 p.m., I can allow him to carry on until that time. If on the other hand, the hon. member has much more to say, we will adjourn for dinner and then resume.

Mr. WALCOTT: I think I may go over 10 minutes; so I think you had better suspend the Sitting.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It being after 7 o'clock, this Sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. o'clock.

On resumption.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank you. Let the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended for dinner, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair. He may resume.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I was speaking on the presentation of this Bill by the Premier, and in relation to the point on education, I think I had reached the stage where I had said that there are enough people in Barbados through whom a scheme like this could be implemented without undue difficulty on a voluntary basis, and I feel that a broad appeal should be made to the community to assist in these matters.

The Premier in introducing this Bill mentioned some of the things that he would not do, but he indicated that it would be improper for him to mention the things he intended to do. That is quite understandable, and he stated to the House that it is not his intention to increase income tax this year. He also made a previous statement that it is his intention to deal with the finances of the Island in so far as investment is concerned and that people need not be afraid. I was very pleased to hear that, because we have reached the stage in which not only the public statement made by the Premier in so far as income tax is concerned but the policy of the Government is such that it would make investors feel comfortable in coming here.

I would like to say that to acquire the confidence of the community as a whole, I think the Government should embrace the goodwill of the community in looking upon the development of the community in a broader aspect than the last Government. I pleaded with the last Government for many months, and this Government has come at a stage where there are these broad international points of view. President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress called a Conference in Uruguay last August in a place known as Punte Del Este, and that Conference has been of great significance to the Western Hemisphere.
7.50 p.m.

They are going to give aid to Latin America and the 21 Republics which lie south of us and that is something which we cannot ignore.

I am taking this opportunity to throw out to the Government that on the last occasion, I mentioned in this Chamber when we had a debate in the old House that the time has come when you have to think in terms of a Development Council. When you come to deal with the development programme which the Hon. Premier intends to introduce, I am going to elaborate more on that. At present there is an alliance of Latin American countries and there is a European Common Market for six countries in Europe. There is a South-east organisation. Wherever there is any under-developed sector in the world, people are thinking in new terms; therefore, I hope that what the Premier said would develop into a bigger thing than this.

Sir, I am going to develop my points more fully when we come to deal with the development programme. I think that it is right that we get people in the community to come together and give us their brains. In the United Kingdom, the British Government has set up a Development Council to study broad economic plans for Britain in view of Britain's entry in the European Common Market. We are going to have some problems to face when Britain enters the European Common Market, and for that reason I think that we are too far behind in our planning. I think if you have elements in the community coming together it will be of great value to this country, and you should not entertain the idea of the last Government of stultifying progress by planning at Government level alone. They felt that they could do all of the thinking in Barbados and for that reason they have dissipated the knowledge of people in the community by not utilising them. The Government retains the ultimate responsibility for policy, but in planning for this community you have to make people work and feel they have a contribution to make; therefore, I think the Government would be well advised to bear this in mind now and not to allow people in the community to go idly by and do nothing to help. This Chamber represents the masses; therefore, utilise the brains which you have in the community.

The Hon. Premier has made a notable change in his presentation of the Appropriation Bill as distinct from the last Government. Even in its approach towards the national issues of Federation, the approach which the Government has made in that sphere has more or less embraced the support of the community as a whole. You get more unanimous support for anything which you do when you do it on a broad basis than in the narrow basis when people want to work in a self-contained vacuum. Therefore, I think that is something which the Government will be well advised to do.

I am a believer in people having patience, but if you work on their patience too long, it is bound to run out. I am drawing this to the Hon. Premier's attention. I believe that the patience of the whole Police Force has been tested to the core and I want to say to the Government: do not test their patience too long. It is not fair to any section of the community to wait as long as the members of the Police Force have waited before they get a decision in a matter which vitally affects them. We are very fortunate that we have a very intelligent section of the people in the Police Force although sometimes some policemen may act irresponsibly. I must say that policemen here have acted in the very highest traditions in which a Trade Union would have acted, and I hope that the Government would not test their patience any longer and would get ahead with the salary revision for them, so as to let them get what they justly deserve. It is not fair to ask them to be continually waiting for what they should have already got.

I will also like to compliment the Hon. Premier for the manner in which he has presented this Budget. It is very refreshing indeed to have a measure like this presented in an intelligent manner and so spare us the infliction that we used to have when we had to listen to a very weary, prolonged recitation from the former Minister of Finance and one which was not well punctuated. (*Cheers*). I want to compliment the Hon. Premier for a very excellent presentation of a most exhaustive document, and I would say that by and large he has my support with the underlying things which I have mentioned. If I may just recall a few of them, I do not think this Government has any right a day longer to allow money for Leave Passages to remain in the Estimates. They have a mandate from the people to stop it. This matter was canvassed up and down the country and the people wanted to know when you were going to stop it; therefore, the Hon. Premier should serve notice on members of the Civil Service that it will be stopped from such and such a time. Let everybody know that by the end of the year you are going to stop paying out leave passage. The reason why I say that is because you give a man \$800 a month as salary and then you give him leave passage for himself and wife, you are giving him another \$100 per month free of income tax. I say that because if you give him a first-class passage to England, that costs about \$400 or \$800 for himself and his wife. It is nearly \$100 a month. Is that the amount which you give him? Along with your giving him leave passage for himself and his wife, you also drop in a bit of money for a child. I think you give leave passage for himself, his wife and up to two children. Is that not so?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that Ministers would not talk across the floor.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I consider that this is one of the things on which the Government should make its policy known. The Hon. Premier covered an extremely wide range of subjects in his Budget Speech, some of which we will deal with more closely when we go into Committee stage on the Estimates. He mentioned the displaced workers and I am very pleased indeed to see that we have reached a stage where a decision has been reached in respect of them. He also mentioned some aspects of finance, especially the financing of the Deep Water Harbour and I am sure that we will have to go closer into these things.
8.00 p.m.

I would like to see set up in Barbados very soon a Development Council similar to what they did in Puerto Rico with Mr. Moscoso, and I would say that the Hon. Minister of Trade and Industry is familiar with him. He has been appointed by President Kennedy to administer the

Alliance for Progress in South America. I think that he has been assigned to Brazil.

Mr. Speaker, with the notes and comments I have made on this Budget, I hope that when we come to deal with the Development Programme, we will hear something more. I do not want to say anything about the prognostications; that is the business of the Cabinet. I would like the Cabinet to examine the position and see that in Barbados we have some excellent roads and I think that I have reached the stage in my thinking that road users and everybody are afraid of taxation. As long as taxation is well distributed, however, it is a wise and sensible thing. I cannot see how in this island we can continue this road programme in the way in which it is being continued, when the users of the road are not prepared to contribute more than they have contributed in the past for what they have been getting in this island. My idea is that whereas all users of the road have been getting better service now than before for what they have been paying, more money has been paid out in other sectors. A lot of night clubs have come up here; it is not that you do not want to have this relaxation; but when a community can pay money in order to see a woman strip and the community has not yet been emancipated from the idea of seeing what a naked woman looks like and they will pay a lot of money for that, we are saying that if they have money in abundance for that sort of activity or that type of entertainment, then they must be able to contribute more to the economy of the island which must go on and embrace these things. People who have motor cars are getting more out of their cars today than people got out of theirs ten or fifteen years ago. When I see all of these big motor cars coming in — nobody is quarrelling about the increased cost — and you are getting more life out of the types of these cars than you got out of them ten or fifteen years ago, I would impose more taxes on people who make use of the roads. In whichever way you get the most money, I would put the taxes there; if you were to put two sets of tyres on a car before you got rid of that car, you would have put on enough. I do not talk about people who want to use a motor car until they do not know what was the original make of the car. I have done 16,000 miles with a motor car and if you would look at the tyres you will see that they will give you quite a lot more service. I say that people are getting more life out of their cars than before because we have good roads. I have passed over Wilcox Hill and I saw most of what was going on there; you will soon have a decent drive from the Airport down Wilcox Hill and on to Chancery Lane. That is something to which the Government should give consideration by way of getting money.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Whether it is in the form of a gasoline tax.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the Hon. Minister of Trade rise on a point of order?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: All right, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has made the point.

Mr. WALCOTT: As a member of the public I feel that it is incumbent always to let the public know that in a state such as this where you have been gradually advancing, there comes a stage at which you have to be prepared to pay for some of these things. I am not a believer in people having excellent services, excellent conditions and yet they do not pay anything for them. I have been watching this community very much; I have been watching these entertainment houses; I see that these night clubs are increasing and I say that they should be only for the idle rich; but with the number of cars which we now have, I think that we have to get in some money in order to keep the road system as excellent as it is. I would like to say to the Barbadian public that I have not travelled in any country — Barbados is small — but I have not travelled in a small country which has roads like those which we have in Barbados. If you go to some places in the United States you get as much dust on the roads as if you are going through the Sahara Desert. Grenada is mountainous, but in St. Lucia and in the other small islands, the roads there cannot come up to those of Barbados. In Trinidad you can run into some inferior roads, and when you come to Maracas Bay you get scared;

you really cannot believe that you are on a road. I have not come across a place like Barbados in which there are such excellent roads. This question of roads has always been a political subject in Barbados and you could never hold your peace.

I have not got around to the Minister of Communications yet; I have approached other Ministers, but I want to take the Minister of Communications down to some roads in St. Peter and let him see what the position is there. I think that the time is fast approaching when the nonsense of the Local Government fixing roads should be a memory. In the parishes of St. Lucy, St. Andrew and in St. Michael, they are no worse off by having the Central Government repairing the roads. I think that the time has come when the road policy should be changed.

8.10 p.m.

There are some roads that the Parishes are still doing which are not up to scratch. It is true they get guidance, but it is not good enough; and I think the road system in Barbados should now be a central road system, because in any case you are subsidising the Local Government bodies. Not only that. It has been drawn to my attention that in the Local Government Councils some man who is employed to do a road — and he is a housebuilder — whilst he is supposed to be building the road, is building a house in between; so you do not know if he is a road builder or a house builder. A lot of smart practices go on in the Local Government. They do not have the organisation, unless a Local Government member is going to get into a pair of short-pants and go around and watch the men, and if he starts that, somebody is going to put something in the road to blow up his car.

I think the time has come when the Central Government should take over the roads in Barbados and put them on a proper basis.

I would like therefore to compliment the Premier very much in this Budget that has been produced. It has been produced in better form than the last one, and when we come to the Estimates and are dealing with them in Committee, Mr. Speaker, as you cannot be taking part in these debates down on the floor any longer, I can assure you that some of the things that I know were dear to your heart, if they have not been remedied, I will act as your mouth-piece from this side of the Table. I would like to say that it has been really good listening to a Budget which, although it is a deficit Budget, yet from the prognostications of the Premier, will hold good for the future. (Cheers).

I will not be here next Tuesday, Mr. Speaker, and I beg to second the motion made by the hon. junior member for Christ Church that further consideration be now postponed.

The question that further consideration of this Bill be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ADJOURNMENT

The Government's Order Paper having been fixed.

Mr. SPEAKER: As to Private Members' Business, Order No. 1 will remain the matter which was under discussion on which the hon. junior member for St. George was speaking.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 20th March at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 20th March, 1962 at 10 o'clock in the forenoon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
8.17 p.m.