
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 20th March, 1962.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 10 o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism*); Mr. W. A. COWARD; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); and Mr. N. W. BOXILL.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

Hon. A. Da.C. EDWARDS, Messrs. SEALY, WALCOTT, CARMICHAEL, MOTTLEY and Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD entered the House and took their seats.

MESSAGE FROM THE OTHER PLACE

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Other Place a Message returning with amendments the Bill intituled an Act to exempt the Barbados National Trust from the payment of Stamp duties, registration and recording fees and Local Government rates.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

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

Barbados Statistical Service — Quarterly Digest of Statistics, No. 18 and No. 19, June 1961 — September, 1961.

Barbados Statistical Service — Selected Monthly Indicators — October and November, 1961.

Barbados Statistical Service — Quarterly Digest of Statistics — No. 20, December, 1961.

Barbados Savings Bank — Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for the half year ended 30th June, 1961.

The Report of the Committee appointed to review the remuneration of the Members of the Barbados Police Force.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: (*on behalf of the Premier*):-

Resolution to place the sum of \$25,568 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1961-62 Part I - Current as shown in the supplementary Estimate 1961-62 No. 46, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949.

A Bill to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year one thousand nine hundred and sixty-two and to make provisions for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax.

A Bill to continue various expiring laws.

Mr. J. W. CORBIN entered the House and took his seat.

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 has just been given.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

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

BE IT RESOLVED that the Government give priority and take immediate steps to place a 4" main in Thorpes Cottage, St. George whereby the residents of that district will be able to obtain water supply.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Registration of Deaths Act, 1924. 10.15 a.m.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SEALY: To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism:

Is the Minister aware that six tenants of the Waterford Housing Area have been served with Notices to Quit by the Housing Authority?

2. Is the Minister aware that the reason given for the serving of such Notices is that the site at present occupied

by the houses of the said tenants is required for the erection of a workshop?

3. Is the Minister aware that there are alternative sites in the said area upon which the proposed workshop can be erected without detriment to any of the existing tenancies?

4. If the answer to (3) is in the affirmative, will Government issue a directive to the Housing Authority for the erection of the proposed workshop on some alternative site and the cancellation of the said Notices?

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

Will Government consider as an urgent priority the laying of water mains in the following areas in the parish of St. Michael:-

Free Hill; Garden Land, Country Road; Morris Gap, Westbury Road; Pounder's Gap, Westbury Road; School Gap, Westbury Road; Parris Gap, Westbury Road; Rock Land, Spooner's Hill; Woodstock Road, Spooner's Hill; Bow Road, Bush Hall; Syndicate Road, Bush Hall; Paradise Road, Bush Hall; Deane's Village, Hindsbury Road; Goodland Tenantry; Dalkeith Village, Dalkeith Hill; Belle Tenantry; Lico-rish Village; Rollins Gap, Brittons Hill.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to settle the rate of Income Tax for the year one thousand nine hundred and sixty-two and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to continue various expiring laws, was read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. CARMICHAEL, seconded by Mr. YEARWOOD, a Bill to amend the Registration of Deaths Act, 1924, was read a first time.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER No. 5

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that all the Items standing under Government Business be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I would like to suggest to the Hon. Leader of the House that it is not simply a question of exempting the Orders from Standing Order No. 5, but he should have Standing Order No. 5 suspended. The House is meeting at 10 o'clock and not at midday; and unless it is the intention to go from 10 o'clock until 2 o'clock, I think the question of lunch time should be arranged, because I do not think it is necessary in these circumstances to go from 10 o'clock until 2 o'clock. You should have an earlier break, maybe at 1 o'clock; so that if you suspend Standing Order No. 5, you would be able to set your own time today and not merely exempt Government Business. Then there is Standing Order No. 18 dealing with Private Members' Business. Question Time is at 2.30 p.m., then Private Members' Business takes place immediately after that time and cannot go on after 4.30 p.m. All these things should be regularised to fit in with the time you are meeting; otherwise we will have this unnecessary hiatus of saying that we cannot meet within a certain time.

I think the Hon. Leader of the House should look at the Standing Orders and have them suspended in order that we can do today's business in accordance with the time we are meeting.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: To be quite frank, Mr. Speaker, it had not been my intention to have lunch earlier than 2 o'clock, but if members are so desirous, there is no reason why the suggestion of the hon. senior member for St. Peter should not be adopted. Furthermore, with regard to the exclusion from today's sitting of the time normally allotted to Private Members' Business, it was my idea that in view of the recent happenings on the Federal front the hon. senior member for St. Peter would himself have objected most strenuously if we attempted today to deprive hon. members of the time normally allocated to them.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member seems to have mistaken what I said. What I said was that in view of the fact that we are meeting at 10 o'clock, if we stick rigidly to the times that are under the Standing Orders, it would be very difficult. What I am suggesting is that if you remove these Standing Orders, you would be free today to say that lunch time will be from 1 o'clock until 1.45 p.m., then you will resume for Question Time and Private Members' Business. If you stick to these times you would have a hiatus that if you finish before a certain time you could not do anything before 4.30 o'clock; so what I am suggesting to the hon. member is that now that he has the opportunity he should have the Standing Orders suspended and insert terms which the Leader feels are necessary so that we can go until 1 o'clock and resume at 1.45 p.m. and go on from there. It is just a matter of arithmetic.

Mr. SPEAKER: I trust the hon. member for St. Peter has not forgotten that he has risen on a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: No, Sir, but I was trying to clarify something to the hon. member who might not have been listening.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I could not conceive of our having finished Government Business in today's allotted hours in view of the fact that we are going to consider the Estimates.
10.25 a.m.

Naturally, this would take all the time at our disposal and more. As I have said earlier, if hon. members, Sir, speak, want to have the luncheon interval moved forward by an hour, I, personally, have no objection at all. If that be the consensus of opinion, then I would move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14 and 18 be suspended for this day's Session.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's former motion was different. Is the hon. member asking leave to withdraw his former motion?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is what I intimated.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to withdraw his former motion. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the hon. member.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14 and 18 be suspended for today's Session.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1961-62, No. 45

HEAD VIII - LEGAL

Head VIII - Legal - was called.

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

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

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

HEAD XXIII - MEDICAL (1) DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL SERVICES

Head XXIII - Medical (1) Director of Medical Services was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Head XXIII Medical (1) stand part.

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$13,314 do now pass.

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

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee, with leave that the Committee should sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER No. 5

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am now asking for leave to take Order No. 5 as the next Order of the Day under Government Business.

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

THE OLD AGE PENSION BILL, 1962

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: Second reading of a Bill further to amend the Old Age Pension Act, 1937.

Hon. A. DaC. Edwards: Sir, the Bill before us is to amend the Old Age Pension Act, 1937, by increasing the maximum rate of Old Age Pension from \$2.15 to \$2.40 a week, and I am sure you will agree with me that that is long overdue. I hardly think that I would meet with any great opposition to increasing this rate of pay for Old Age Pensioners because I have noticed that since 4th December last, there have been many new converts from the other side over to this side, which is the side interested in the welfare of the poor.

In order to increase such pension, it has become necessary to increase the Means Test. All of this is noted in the various clauses of the amendments to the Act. In this very

Bill, it is also intended to increase the remuneration for the members of the Old Age Pension Claims Committee, some of whom have to travel far distances and, therefore, in this day with travelling expenses being so high, we find it necessary to increase the rate of remuneration for these people from \$2.40 to \$4.80 for the Chairman and \$3.60 for the ordinary members of the Committee.

Sir, it is not necessary for me to make any long speech because this Bill is straightforward and it is what any person who cannot be considered a brute will support.

I, therefore, take great pleasure in asking that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion which has just been moved by my colleague and I do so briefly and with great pleasure. I believe that my colleague asked me to second his motion because he knew that in the last Parliament I had been associated with the agitation for the increase of Old Age Pension to the figure which was suggested by Professor Richardson in his Report on Social Security as long ago as 1954, 10.35 a.m.

If therefore this Bill is now before the House, it can be taken as an indication of an attempt on behalf of this Government to keep faith with the old people of this island by raising their rate of pension at least to the figure which was suggested eight years ago. It must not be taken, however, to mean that this Government is in any way complacent or that it will rest satisfied with this Measure. What we have in mind to do is, in the very near future, to combine similar schemes together in a comprehensive social security plan for which we have received the advice of an expert who came down here, I believe, at the invitation of the last Government. While therefore schemes are being worked out for a comprehensive social security plan, in the meantime, the old people will have a little more spending power. In this connection I would like to draw the attention of the House to this matter. In consequence of a motion made by the hon. junior member for St. Philip, I believe, a committee has been set up to go into an ancillary matter, that of the best method of paying the old age pension. That, plus the fact that we are now asking the House to approve of this Bill, means that the welfare of the old people is of great concern to this Government and their future is safe with us.

I should just like to note that we have done this without any prompting on behalf of the electors because their desires are generally known. We have not waited until we are ready to face the electorate again to do this; we said that we would do it as soon as we have the power to do it, and this is the first opportunity which we have had of keeping faith with a large number of deserving citizens of this island.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that this Bill has come before us. We know that it was long overdue. I remember that during the regime of the last Government when this Bill was brought down, it was ignored and when I see a Bill of this nature having been turned down it often shocks my modesty. The last Government are the people who had been in power and after they got in power they did not remember the poor. These people, to my understanding, are just like when a man is put in honour and understandeth not and therefore he is likened unto the beasts that perish. I know that this amount of \$2.40 a week is a great consolation to the poor people of this island because when they cannot purchase an article for 25 cents, we know how hard it is with them. There are many more people who have lived and who have helped to build up the economy of this island, and at this stage some of them are only depending upon this little mite which is offered to them by the Government. I hope that a system of social security will be set up in this country which will enable the old people to receive more money. I know that in 1957 we made 204,000 tons of sugar - I know how much that was - and at that time the old people were receiving a very small pension. I am very glad to see that my Government is comprised of people of such great ability, knowledge and wisdom that they can look out not

only for themselves but also for the poor people who have suffered and borne the heat of the day; I am very glad that this Government has seen fit to give these people \$2.40 per week. I hope that this amount will not be lessened but that it will be increased and the poor people will be getting something out of that for which they have worked for so many years.

I trust that when an increase is given to the able-bodied man, the poor pensioners will be considered and increased accordingly, because they have to purchase the same food at the same cost as the man who is working for \$12,000 a year. The poor pensioner has to buy his commodities at the same price at which the big man is buying his. Think of a man who is receiving \$12,000 a year and a poor man who is receiving \$36.00 per year having to buy food in the same manner as the one who is working for this great amount of money! I hope that the time will come when the Government will consider the poor people in a better way. Mr. Speaker, there could be no better Measure to come before this House than this Measure in which you are thinking of the poor people who are unable to help themselves. I can say that the Most High God has instilled it into the minds of the Minister to help the poor; if we think of the poor, God will think of us and this Government will be kept in power as long as God sees fit to keep them in power.

Mr. MILLER: I feel some necessity to speak on this matter and I may say that I am unhappy about a number of things which have been said today on this question of the payment of old age pensions. It is more or less for the sake of the record that I want to straighten what has been said. I want to express my thanks to the Minister who stated that the Report of Mr. Stockman is in the Ministry.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I never said that the Report of Mr. Stockman was with my Ministry; I said that the last Government had invited Mr. Stockman here and we have continued to have the benefit of their request.
10.45 a.m.

Mr. MILLER: I do not know, Sir, if it is necessary at this stage to ask to check the debate, but he did say something about the Report. I have been waiting to read that for a long time, but as I said earlier, for the sake of the record, it will be remembered that we discussed the increase to \$2.15 as against the recommendations of Mr. Richardson eight years ago of \$2.40. We had the assistance of the United Nations. They sent us on request an expert, Mr. Stockman, on matters of social security. It was felt after a discussion or two with Mr. Stockman with the Ministry that we should include old age pensions operating on a level of social security. The idea of the Government then was more or less to bridge the spiralling cost of living, and it was hoped that at this time with the new Estimates you should have his Report, and hence the business of social security would have been started.

I have no doubt that all members of this Parliament, and for that matter all souls in this Island, are aware that the past Government has just constructed and completed the building in Country Road, and staff is there to administer public assistance. What I am anxious about are the special recommendations and to see something specific about the distribution of public assistance. Now with all this talk and, maybe, provocative remarks by the Minister of Social Services which are utterly unnecessary, and after Richardson was asked to review and made recommendations eight years ago, surely with the changing cost of living it could not be \$2.40 a day; it looks more like \$3.80. The Minister of Social Services with his chest like an orang-outang is treating this matter as if he has achieved something. What does this actually mean to old age pensions? Actually in figures this represents 3 cents a day - less than would buy the cheapest loaf of bread.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, the Minister of Education, usually on occasions like this would have arrived with a basket and all the goods indicating the cost. It is pitiable today he did not think it necessary to bring in what 3 cents would mean to old age pen-

sioners, even expressed in biscuits. The Minister talked about converts and of his interest in the poor and what not, but with all the lip service and the tears which could be regarded as a shocking modesty, when you think of the debate and what it would cost to print this debate as against the contribution to old age pensioners, it adds up to exactly 3.5 cents per day based on the differential of \$2.15 to \$2.40. I thought it necessary at this stage to say this, and I am glad to know that the Report of Mr. Stockman is in and the Government will be in a better position to give the Old Age Pensioners what the country can really afford. We were really concerned about it at the time, and you will forgive me when I repeat that when we were taking the figure to \$2.15, the idea was to bridge the cost of living until such time that we were in possession of the Report from Mr. Stockman; but the hon. member with his chest like an orang-outang on a mountain is giving 3.5 cents a day to the Old Age Pensioners, less than what would buy the cheapest loaf of bread. As you look over the top of your spectacles, it takes us back to the Court scene in the "Merchant of Venice."

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, like the last speaker, I do not suppose any of us could afford, even if we wanted to, to offer opposition to this, but I regret very much that I had to do research and search for myself as apparently the Objects and Reasons are not very clear. The Hon. Minister should see to it that these things are made clear; but the first thing that struck me in the Objects and Reasons was that he did not mention that he had also amended the Means Test. I notice it has not been amended, and like the hon. member.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I did say that we amended the Means Test.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not remember the hon. member saying it and I must apologise. I usually look at my Bill with the Objects and Reasons, and if you look at the Objects and Reasons all you will see is that you are amending the amount for the prospective pensioners and the amount to be paid to the members serving on the Board. I would ask the Minister to be a little more careful on the next occasion to have the Objects and Reasons made abundantly clear, so that even if hon. members get in late they would know that their desires have been carried out.

I must offer my commendations to the Hon. Minister and his Cabinet for coming down with this increase, but I am among those who still feel that the time should not be far distant when this Government should consider what is necessary in this country, what I consider is really necessary, what I believe the Minister thinks is necessary, and what I believe I have heard from the mouths of the members who form the Government today is necessary - the necessity of reducing the age from 68 to 65. I am still not compromising on that, because I have not forgotten whence I came. As I go through the country and watch people, and after 22 years' experience interviewing people day after day, I find that the overwhelming majority of people who work as agricultural labourers in the sun and fields of this country - from my experience and that which I have gained from sitting with medical practitioners - are not much more good for hard work, and I think the time should soon be ripe when we should find money from somewhere or other to reduce the age to 65.

I commend the Government for keeping its promise. This is one of the promises it made and I believe the public was looking forward to it. There is nobody in this country, rich or poor except those who, as the Minister said, have the heart of brutes, who would grudge this pittance which you are giving. We do not believe that from \$2.15 to \$2.40 is an amount which a person can live on, but I have seen so many people in this country who are - as I have seen in the Minister's speech - starving who take this little pittance and have grand-children to help and so on. There is one point, however, which is worrying me and I hope the Minister will forgive me if I draw it to his attention at this time, and it is this: side by side in the Hon. Premier's speech which I hope to deal with later, I do not agree with you in increasing the remuneration of members serving on these Boards. Are we so bankrupt of people with hearts in this

country who would be willing to give their services on these Boards? The reason why I say that is because there are a lot of members on other Boards who are taking it as a means of living. I do not suggest that is the case with members on the Old Age Pensions Claims Committee; but I do not see the necessity for raising this to \$4.80 and \$3.60

Before you had a change of political philosophy and outlook in this country, there were still people serving on these Boards and I am going to give an instance, and there are members of the Government probably who will agree with me; there are members who sit on Public Assistance Committees day after day without receiving one cent. There are members of the same Government Party who sit on these Committees all over this Island and they do not receive one cent. Is it not therefore possible for this Government to have a number of its supporters and admirers to serve on these Boards? It is not a day or half-day. There are members here like the members for St. Joseph, the members for St. James and the members for St. Philip who have had Local Government experience; it is not the same as dealing with cases for an entire day. They take an hour or two in investigating the cases of a couple of people which come up.
10.55 p.m.

If you look at the statistics, you will see that the numbers which go on the roll year after year are few. I, personally, regret that the Government has seen fit to increase this amount of travelling to members of these Committees. I do not know what the Committees in the rural parishes have recently been told. I know that on these Committees you have Rectors of parishes and other clergymen. No one is suggesting, I hope, that these clergymen would not sit on these Committees unless you increase this rate of travelling. I am absolutely certain that there are people still left in the country who would be willing to sit and serve on these Committees. I am going to use the Premier's own words when he said: "every little bit helps". I have been honoured by the Ministry to be a member on one of these Committees to go around at my own expense, it does not matter, because if I say I am going to serve I will serve. If I am not going to serve, I would have said that I cannot serve.

Sir, I do not think it is really necessary to increase this rate and I regret that the Government has seen fit to do so. I do not know if any representation has been made to the Minister to say what is actually the reason for increasing this amount. You are not reducing the age limit to 65 years as the qualifying age for a pension which would mean that automatically there would be an increase in the number of persons qualified. This is a sort of social and voluntary service which is performed by members of these Committees and in all countries you will get people who are willing to serve on such Committees. I am sure that you can still find in this country 36 people who would be willing to sit on these Committees without asking for this \$4.80. I thought that the Government instead of increasing it would have reduced it and would have said that we have members who would serve without further recompense. I see members of the Government Party who sit on these Boards and who, I know, are willing to give up of their time to serve on those Committees.

The work of these Committees is very straight laced. As regards assessing a person to be an Old Age Pensioner, according to the assessment, you must be worth less than \$4.00 a week, that is in property, pension or whatever the case may be. That assessment is easily done by the officer who investigates the matter; therefore, all that members of these Committees have to do is to sit down and receive the baptismal certificate which shows that the person is over 68 years and therefore; from the information you get, is qualified to receive old age pension.

Sir, in the Government Party, there are members who perform this social work for nothing. I regret that the Government did not see fit to bring this Bill down without increasing the allowance to those persons who sit on these Committees. I commend the Government for increasing the old age pension and I hope that in the near future Government would so look after them that they reduce the qualify-

ing age to 65 years. I am told that in America where the conditions even of the climate are different from that here, the qualifying age is 65 years.

In conclusion, I would say that I am sure you can find 36 people in Barbados from among housewives, retired gentlemen and retired Civil Servants who would be willing to give up an hour or two to serve on one of these Committees without remuneration. I hope on another occasion that you would look around and find such people. I am sure that the greatest honour which can be bestowed on anyone is either to represent the people or to have the honour of sitting on these Committees.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out that this Bill is only for the purpose of increasing the remuneration. It does not mean that these people should take it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I quite appreciate your position, but I have been in here long enough to know that if a Government which has an overwhelming majority brings in here such a Bill, it is as good as passed.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this amendment to an Act which is a quarter century old would always give rise to debate, but I think the hon. junior member for St. George, the former Minister of Social Services, failed to realise that the Government in power stated specifically in the last election campaign that they were going to increase the old age pension. Are you going to advise me how to speak?

Mr. SPEAKER: Surely the hon. member is not making that remark towards me.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not mean you; I meant the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. I cannot find the appropriate adjective to use in reply to what the hon. member on my left was telling me.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think hon. members realise that the present Government, that is, the Democratic Labour Party, made it clear in their manifesto that they were going to increase the old age pension to a minimum of \$2.40 a week. The reason for that is that those of us who sat on the side opposite to the last Government in power of which the hon. junior member for St. George was a Minister, when the Bill came down, we said then that the minimum which the Government should have brought down was to adhere to the recommendation which was made by Professor Richardson and which was to increase it from \$1.80 to \$2.40 a week. Professor Richardson said that that could have been done since 1958.

The hon. junior member for St. George was a member of the then Government and there is no point of the member saying that if you take an analysis of the cost of living as it is today, it is justified to raise it to that figure. What the hon. member said is a complete condemnation of him and his Party because if you look at the cost of living between 4th December last and today you will see that there is no appreciable difference; therefore what the hon. member is saying of this increase today is only due to his being a multiple hypocrite. If what the hon. member said has any weight in it today, then it had weight in it three months ago. It only shows that the consciences of the member and his Party were so leprous that they could not have any feeling whatsoever.

The hon. junior member for St. George had the effrontery to get up and tell us today that it is quite in order. There was no point in his telling us that today. Members of his Party went to the country after they had raised this pension to \$2.15 and lost the election. I therefore think that the hon. member should keep quiet now. The argument which he has used today is a condemnation of the whole Party to which he belongs. Of course, the members of his Party condemned themselves. It is a matter of evolution.

Sir, I cannot see how the hon. member can lay any claim to this. The Government in here today is proposing that old age pensions at the figure of \$2.40 is the ideal thing. On top of that, the Government is saying that it is putting it at

\$2.40 because that was its view. The Party in power said in its manifesto:-

"The Party is of the opinion that in addition to the obligation of the State to provide its citizens with maintenance in old age and also in case of sickness or loss of capacity to work, that the comparatively prosperous position of the colony, the high level of taxation and generally burdensome cost of living entitle the community to a comprehensive system of Social Security with a minimum delay."

"The D.L.P. will increase Old Age Pension to a minimum of \$2.40 per week to assist in easing the burden of the aged."

I do not think you can use the criticism that this Government only wants to give people 3 1/2 cents more. This is underwriting what the last Government should have done. 11.05 a.m.

Normally, what I would say in these circumstances is that it may be that the Government's statement should have been made in the full context of its Manifesto; I feel that the Old Age Pensioners should have been entitled to this amount of \$2.40 per week as from the 1st April, 1961, instead of the 1st April, 1962. That is the only criticism I have to make, that is that this \$2.40 should have been the amount paid to these Old Age Pensioners and that taxation should have been called for to meet it. As soon as you talk about Old Age Pensioners, you are talking about people who have already worked, those who have made their contribution to the country during the time they were working. Now that Mr. Stockman is here, I can say from the point of view of the Trade Union that we have stimulated this matter in the minds of the old people. If people want to enjoy a better way of life, they have to make a contribution to it. I am not in agreement with any burdensome taxation being placed on people, but I am satisfied that the employers are not making their maximum contribution to the island by way of social security. By law, anybody who employs people in any industrial sector must be called upon to make a positive contribution towards the workers' social security. This idea of pussy-footing, that you can employ a man and then when he gets old it is somebody else's business, cannot work. I know the profits which these people have made, the amount of bonuses they pay and the salaries for which they work. I know that there are those who are getting \$400, \$600 and \$800 a month and their responsibility in their work cannot measure up to what other people have to do. This idea of asking people to make this contribution on a voluntary basis cannot last any longer; it must be done by law. There is a waste of money on Public Assistance Boards and Committees and all of these things should be scrapped and allow these things to be administered by intelligent people.

You are wasting a lot of money for the payment of Old Age Pensioners at \$2.40 a week; you are spending as much money in administering pauperism as you are spending in an industry. I am totally opposed to multiplying employment so as to give people 75 cents a week. What kind of big administration you want in order to give anybody 75 cents a week? You must get rid of this nonsense. Administration costs money and it is not a sensible thing to have administration which will cost too much money. Do you want an administration to give a man a penny or ten cents? Are you going to employ somebody to sit at home at a desk so that when anybody comes there and you give him ten cents that amount is put down in a book? I asked the Government to scrap these Public Assistance Committees and Boards and have a proper central organization to deal with this matter. I want to say that as to some of the things which people do in Barbados, I could do those same things and have half day in order to do other jobs; one half of these people do not work as hard as I work. When you have people making a contribution to the island, you have other people having nothing to do; there is no point in asking for higher productivity at the bottom when the people at the top are not giving it.

This Bill is a matter of a pledge which has been made to the community and the Government is now honouring this pledge. My criticism is that this \$2.40 per week should have

been given to these people at the time when the amount was made \$2.15. But, I repeat that the employers must make a positive contribution to social security in the island in which they live.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in supporting a Bill of this sort for the increase in the amount for the Old Age Pensioners from \$2.15 per week to \$2.40. If I did not support this Bill here today, I feel that I would be lacking in my duty to the old people of this island for whom I have the greatest love and respect. I am wondering why this Bill has been delayed for so long when I heard the Minister said that such a Bill was recommended eight years ago by a Socialist Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member clarify what he means by "the Minister"?

Mr. COWARD: I mean the Minister who introduced the Bill. Knowing the poor people of this island as I do, I am wondering why this Bill has been delayed for so long, I have been associated with these people for many years as a member of the Board of Poor Law Guardians. I know the needs of these people and that is why I am very glad to see that the amount has been increased. I am very sorry that it cannot be increased from \$2.15 to \$10.00. I know that that cannot be done, however, and I appreciate that one is willing to give a little time, or that the time will come when these people will be given more. My thanks now go to this Government for the consideration which they have given to the poor people of this island.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have very little to say on this Bill because so much has been said about it already that very little remains for me to say on it. This amount of \$2.40 per week represents an increase of 25 cents, but every little counts. Twenty-five cents is a lot of money for anybody who does not have anything at all. I would prefer to have 25 cents in my pocket than not to have anything at all. 11.15 a.m.

Sir, with the Government considering the increase for the Old Age Pensioners, it is no sense monkeying around and trying to cheese-pare. You have to make them happy, and if you do not make them happy today, you have to try and make them happy tomorrow. You are going to give them \$2.40 this week, maybe next Saturday, but then next Saturday night they are still going back in an open-air house. It is no good, as I said not too long ago, trying to make them feel good by way of eating, and making them miserable by way of sleeping; both have to go together. I know that it is better to have somewhere comfortable to sleep at night than to fill your belly, because there is a possibility that if one comes at my home or goes at any other member in this House or at his neighbours, and says he does not have anything to eat tonight, they are going to share with him; but they cannot share somewhere to sleep. In other words, they would have to inconvenience some of their family to make them happy.

Now what is there, Mr. Speaker, to prevent the present Government from going into the matter more seriously? The Minister said he could not give it priority. He gave the increase priority because he made that promise, and I believe that if the question had been raised when they were making the promises to increase the old age pensions, they would have made a promise to repair their homes also. They would never have said that they could not repair their homes or give it priority. I am sure they would willingly have made the promise and would have carried it out as they are carrying out this twenty-five cent increase today. There are people who are suffering and need help; they know that there are people in the City of Bridgetown whose homes are made habitable for them - I would not say all - and therefore these people in the country expect it too; so the Minister will have to shake up himself, pull himself together and start to think about it. He cannot go to sleep on it; he cannot tell them that he has increased their weekly pension and cannot do the houses. I think he would be losing time in increasing their pension by 25 cents and not trying to make their houses more habitable, because as long as life is in this body of mine, I am going to talk it far and wide and hard and ask them to call on the present Govern-

ment to come to their assistance by way of repairing their homes. Their homes will never be repaired by them as they are not in a position to do them.

What I am asking, Mr. Speaker, is not impossible; it can be done. Ways and means can be found to have it done, and if they are going to say that the last Government did not see fit to give them \$2.40 but they are giving \$2.40, it is not going to stop there. It is more than food alone; they even want clothes, far less somewhere to sleep. So shake up, Mr. Minister, and get ready to come down here with a Bill or Resolution for the repairs of the homes of Old Age Pensioners.

We have seen people who, owing to working hard and not getting the necessary treatment, food and so on to keep them, break down before they are even 50 years old. There are others who at the age of 68 are much stronger than some at 50 years. These people want help also, but they will have to wait until they are 68 years old to receive a pension to help them. I know how hard these people work, and on mornings they have to get up, drink tea without milk, - and coffee has a bad taste without milk - or some resort to bush tea and there is nothing nutritious in that; they get one meal a day and have to work very hard. Those are the people who are broken down today through working to build up the wealth of this country, and they have succeeded in doing so. Now is the time for this Government or any employer, and quoting my own words, even a brute to look and see that these are the people who want help also. It is not those at 68 years alone who want this help. Some people, as I have said, have broken down earlier than others and some assistance should be given to them regardless of the cost. I expect another member to get up and try to cut off my head if I talk foolishness by saying that it was not happening before; but nothing happens before the time. The time has come for something to be done. I preached this on my platform and on other platforms. I made promises to people about the repairs to old people's homes. I made a promise that regardless of which Government was successful in returning to power, your humble servant intended raising the question. No Government can stop my mouth from now onwards from saying anything at all. *(Cheers)*

If my Party had been returned to power, Mr. Speaker, I may not have had to say anything here as I would have drawn it to their attention privately, and if they did not have it done, I intended to speak on it. Anyone who listened to any of my speeches in the bye-election in St. Joseph would not talk any foolishness today. I spoke my mind as a man and intended carrying it out regardless of which Government was in power; so you are only wasting time telling me something now, because my mind was made up from the time of the bye-election to strike, regardless of who was in power.
11.25 a.m.

Well, now, if the present Government has to come in for some "licks" from me, it would have to be satisfied. I only want something done for the people of this country, especially those poor people whose homes I had to visit and which I visited more regularly this last election than at any other election in order to see conditions for myself. As a matter of fact, I have to contribute to the upkeep of some of them. I have to pay for certain things for some of these poor people; therefore I am not going to sit back and allow the people of this country who are able to pay, to fail to contribute. However, I do not think for one moment that any employer or any businessman, who is making a comfortable dollar would say one word against the Government wanting to take away one penny from that dollar thus leaving him with 98 cents when that employer knew that that penny was going into a fund to help these poor old people. He would be satisfied with his 98 cents, but he would cry for murder when you take it away from him without his knowing on whom it is to be spent. If I might give an instance, let us suppose that every time you go into your home you see something new. You would not have anything to say because you see how your money is spent; but when you eat it out and do not see how it is spent, it is bound to turn you back.

I am appealing to this Government to find ways and means to implement my suggestion. It can be done now. You

do not have to wait until the next three years to make right these poor old people's homes; you can do it right away. You can help these poor pensioners with repairs to their homes right now.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say anything whatsoever on this Bill, but since some of the members have had the effrontery to get up and make some sesquipedalian speeches, I am bound to say something. (A MEMBER: What sort of word is that?) You will find it in the dictionary. It means very long-winded speeches.

I do not want to repeat anything, but the hon. junior member for St. Joseph talked about the Government must stand and take his "licks". I happen to be a member of the Government Party. I do not want the hon. member or anybody to get it in his head that we are going to allow him to fly on the backs of the people. The hon. member spoke in like manner as when you know that you are getting the influenza and you start drinking coffee and rum so as to ward it off. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is anticipating that these lashes are coming, no matter how much rum and coffee you drink, but I will only tell him that for the last eighteen years as a member of the former Government, he sat down in here and was in concert with that Government which said that anybody who asked for a raise in the old age pension would not have any conscience. Yet still he has known, because he has heard the financial statement of the Island read out, that the mismanagement of his Government has caused us to be in the position which we are in today. The hon. member knows all of that; yet he has come in here today just playing to the gallery. He has come in here today with his fancy talk about giving pensioners \$3.00. This Government was elected for a matter of only four months and it has brought down this Bill to increase the old age pension to \$2.40. Compare that time with the 18 years which his Government was in power; yet during all that time the hon. member did not know how to voice his opinion that these pensioners should get something more.

Sir, any time I see my Government going wrong, I intend to voice my opinion against it. I do not want the hon. member to tell us anything. What I would like this Government to do is to appoint some sort of commission to go into the question of what some people pay their workers, because I know that some of them pay their workers next to nothing. I would like the Government to go into that question so as to find out what can be done for pensioners when they become old.

The hon. member got up in here as a member of the former Government and has talked a bunch of tripe on this Bill. His Government raised the old age pension from \$1.80 to \$2.15 a week at a time when the blindest person could have seen that it was only an election gimmick. This is about five or six sittings which we have had since this Government came into power, yet we have seen fit to raise the old age pension to \$2.40; and if this Government had been in power before, we would have done it long ago because according to the recommendation of Professor Richardson, this pension should have been raised since 1958. The former Government used to bring down a lot of experts, and yet when those experts recommended things which should be done, that Government would not see fit to implement them. That Government would pay sometimes \$25 a day for the rental of a car to take these experts around, yet it would reject what the experts recommended.

We did not bring in an expert to recommend that pensioners should get \$2.40 a week; therefore, I do not agree with the hon. member getting up and talking the bunch of hog wash which he talked about.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let it be a more eloquent expression than that.

Mr. BOXILL: I withdraw it for the word "stupidity".

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not take any note of the hon. member talking about "hog wash", because Your Honour knows a hog when you see one.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that you do know a hog when you see one, especially a fat one.

Getting back to the point, the hon. member's Government raised the old age pension from \$1.80 to \$2.15 a week which is a matter of 35 cents. When they did it, they were playing to the old people's votes. We are not playing to anybody's vote. We have a Resolution which we passed to decrease the voting age from 21 years to 18 years; so we do not have to play up to the old people's vote. Now that we have increased old age pension to \$2.40 a week, instead of the hon. member's getting up and commending the Government for doing such a thing in the short period in which it has been in power, he has got up probably on the instigation of another member to prolong the talk on this Bill. He is just playing to the gallery. I want to serve notice on the hon. member and other hon. members that as long as I am a member of this Chamber, I am not going to sit still and allow them to get away with murder. It is high time that they realise that we are sent here to represent the people.

I remember some time ago that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was on a Board - I think it was some Board of Guardians - and there was a woman in St. Joseph whose husband had taken ill with T.B. They made representations to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph for some sort of aid and, believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph could not see fit to give that woman who had three children anything more than 75 cents for two weeks.
11.35 a.m.

Yet he is coming in here to criticise. I am bringing this home to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. That has never happened during my time. The hon. member is straying all the time; in other words, he is lying to this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member might say that the junior member for St. Thomas is guilty of a complete inaccuracy.

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I may be wrong about the 75 cents. I have just been told that the amount is really 25 cents. (Laughter) However, I want to draw to the attention of the hon. member that at that time he could not see fit to give this poor lady, who was in dire necessity, more than 25 cents for herself and three children.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. That is not so. It is not good enough for the hon. member to be getting up and trying to lie on another hon. member. Why does the hon. member not call the names of these people if he wants to prove his case? He has just mentioned 75 cents, and now he says that it is 25 cents. Who told the hon. member that the amount was 25 cents? Let him call the name.

Mr. BOXILL: It is a matter of opinion; for me it is a fact. If the hon. member wants to object to what I say, that is a matter for him; but there is some sort of truth in this matter, if the hon. member is objecting so strenuously. It does not serve any useful purpose to lie on anybody. However, to get back to this matter of the old age pension, we have seen fit to give these Old Age Pensioners \$2.40 per week.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are seeking to do that.

Mr. BOXILL: I beg Your Honour's pardon, we are seeking to do that. I am ashamed of the way in which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is trying to conduct himself in this House today.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to the Standing Orders of this House and to the Chair, I thought that after the Hon. Minister, followed by the hon. senior member for the City and the hon. senior member for St. Peter, had spoken on this Bill, that was enough; but what has exhausted my patience is that I heard the hon. junior

member for St. Joseph call on the Minister to "pull up his socks". That is unbearable and if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph understands what he means by calling on a Minister to "pull up his socks", then I would be glad if he could explain that to this House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, my only purpose in rising is to clear up one or two points made by the hon. junior member for St. George and by the hon. senior member for the City. The hon. junior member for St. George was the Minister of Social Services in the former Government. By his speeches and actions since the last Election, he appears to have completely repudiated the policies of the Party of which he now claims to be the Parliamentary Leader in this House. I would like to inform him that the honourable junior member for St. Lucy is not the Minister of Social Services. Mr. Stockman has not given this Government any Report whatsoever of any kind or description, and the amount of the old age pension was not increased as the result of any Report given by the United Nations Expert on Social Security; the amount was increased because there was a longstanding outcry against the callousness of the last Government in even refusing to discuss the Report of Professor J. H. Richardson of Leeds University which was submitted to that Government, of which the Ex-Minister was a member since 1954. Mr. Stockman has made no recommendation as to any old age pension. If the hon. member were to read the document which was presented by this Government during the Election of 1961, he would see that direct reference is made not only to the necessity for reviewing the old age pension, but also the minimum amount which we feel it was desirable for the Old Age Pensioners to have, which would provide even a low level of subsistence.

No one is pretending that \$2.40 a week could keep the bodies and souls of these old people together in a community such as the one in which we live. Every time the hon. junior member for St. George rises to his feet he should do so with a great sense of shame. The Greeks used to call it *Aidos* and the Romans used to call it *Pudor*. These are two things which the Minister has never possessed either in large quantities or in small ones.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, I did not make the statement I am accused of making by the Premier. The Minister of Education said that they had a Report and I just complimented the Minister and said that I was anxious to read that Report because I happen to be the one who, in the past Government, had got Mr. Stockman down here. I did so because I wanted to know what to do about the Old Age Pension and about social security generally. Mr. Stockman was released to us by the United Nations. The Minister in passing said that this Report was in and I said that I was anxious to read it. I have nothing to be ashamed of, least of all the last Government.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Because he repudiated it. The Minister of Education is not now in his place but he has already denied that he made any statement to the effect that the Stockman Report was in. The hon. member just now unwittingly said what the hon. junior member for St. Lucy did say; that is, that the Richardson Report was available all the time. It was available since 1954. The hon. senior member for St. Peter for the past seven years, at least three times a year, has got on the floor of this House and has invited the last Government and the last Minister of Social Services to discuss the Report and they have point-blank refused to do so. The question was raised sometime in October last year by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and myself that any hon. member of the House could have initiated a debate on this Report although it was an unofficial Report.
11.45 a.m.

When we talked about the Hospital Report, he said that any hon. member could have initiated a debate on the Report that had not even seen the light of day. Now it has been the practice of the Government which he represented and which he now repudiates.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You mean the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have no reason to repudiate the last Government.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: They have been repudiated by the electorate. I see that the necessity no longer arises for the hon. member to repudiate the Government, because the electorate has repudiated the Government. I stand corrected. Now the position is this: when I say "he", it is not because I am treating the hon. member with any lack of respect. When Cicero spoke in the Senate, he always used the pronoun "he" when he referred to Lucius Sergius Catilina - and Roman history is well known; he never referred to him as the Hon. Senator.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yet Cicero never spoke in this Chamber. (Laughter)

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am only showing you, Sir, that there is good precedent for using the personal pronoun when a person is well known, and the word "he" is sufficient designation to indicate to all and sundry whom you are talking about. As far as the hon. senior member for the City is concerned, he made a plea that there should be not only the extension of the quantum of pension which should be paid, but there should be an extension in the age group, and by that I mean bringing it up to the present level, - a reduction, in other words, of the age of persons eligible for the receipt of pensions by reducing it to the age of 65.

Now, Sir, I know that the Report has not been discussed and members of the general public may not be aware of the recommendations. We do not feel ourselves constrained or inhibited in any way by a Report made by experts, and perhaps if I might just go back a bit to one of the interruptions by the hon. junior member for St. George, he said he could not do anything because he did not have the Stockman Report. Neither do we; but no one in Barbados needs the Report of an expert to indicate that \$2.40 is an irreducible minimum for the payment of a pension to people over the age of 68 years. You do not need an expert to tell you that. An expert advises you on a comprehensive scheme of social security which is a little more involved than a simple issue like the increase of old age pensions. The same member who could not act without the advice of an expert - and he had a Financial Secretary to tell him what the implications would be financially - still increased the pensions shortly before the election from \$1.80 to \$2.15. A quotation from a document which is a document of the House already and for which I make no apology would answer the strictures of both the hon. junior member for St. George and the hon. senior member for the City. Under the heading of "Old Age Pensions" Sir, if I may turn to page 8 of Professor Richardson's Report in 1954, this is what he said:-

"The main changes are recommended in this system of old age pensions. The first is that both the amount of the means test and the amount of the pension should be raised substantially. The present rates do not allow for the considerable rise in the cost of living since they were last increased in 1949;" - that was in 1954, Sir, - "nor do they take into account the rise in wages and standards of living in Barbados during the last five years.

"Since the old age pension was last raised in April, 1949 to one dollar and twenty (\$1.20) cents, the cost of living has increased by about one-third, therefore to give a purchasing power equal to that in 1949, the present rate of pension should be one dollar and sixty (\$1.60) cents. But old age pensions and other social security benefits in any community must be related to wages and standards of living, and in Barbados these have risen appreciably during recent years. The present pension rate is the equivalent of only 15 or 20 percent of the wages paid to many unskilled workers, excluding domestic servants whose wages are substantially below those in other occupations, whereas the practice of countries with considerable experience of social security is that the rate should be not less than 30 percent of such wages.

"It is therefore recommended that the pension rate be raised immediately by 50 percent to one dollar and eighty

(\$1.80) cents a week, and that, provided the economic conditions in the Island and the financial position of the Government remain favourable, the rate be raised at the beginning of 1958 to two dollars and forty (\$2.40) cents, that is to double the present rate."

Now the only condition which Professor Richardson imposed was not that there should be a substantial rise in Government revenue and substantial services, but a mere retention of the fairly viable economic condition of the Government finances between 1954 and 1958. In 1955 the Government had a surplus of \$5 million, and from 1956 to 1958, they never had a budgetary surplus of less than \$2.8 million, \$2.7 million, and \$2.8 million; so, far from the situation remaining as it was in 1954, the situation as far as Government finances were concerned considerably improved.

For a considerable period the hon. junior member for St. George was a member of the Government; he was actually at one stage Minister of Social Services. The Government's budgetary position only began to decline some time late in 1960 as a result of the squandermania which was indulged in by putting up monuments and mausoleums and things like that, increasing the recurrent expenditure which the taxpayers would have to bear. There was no investment in income-bearing projects or anything like that carried on, but a lot of promises given to the people. That was the old regime. In 1961 in the month of March, just twelve months ago, the then Premier of Barbados, whom God preserve in his old age, said in his budget speech that the motto was "steady as we go", whatever that means. I said it was a landship term, being one step forward, and two steps backward; landship economics; so it was a steady-as-you-go budget and the Government was budgeting for a deficit of \$1.2 million, and they could not afford to increase old age pensions. The ex-Minister sat down there in the same chair he is sitting in now - the hon. junior member for St. George - and did not raise a howl, protest or even a whimper; he never said a word. He justified the statement made by the hon. member.

Later in the year the same Government that could not afford an increase which would involve an expenditure of approximately \$300,000, if they had followed our advice, made a promise to the Civil Service Association that they would play ball with them. Now I am speaking facts. 11.55 a.m.

The Premier of Barbados told the President of the Civil Service Association that he would give him cost of living allowance in 1958 but he was going to hold back the demand for an increase in Civil Servants' salaries until 1961. I am making statements of fact. I have already challenged the hon. junior member for St. Thomas who was the then Premier on that issue and his Government which had budgeted for a deficit and which had depleted every single fund of the financial resources of this Island and which during my tenure of office I said was \$19 million invested in New Zealand, Kenya and Rhodesia and various other associated outposts of the British Empire. Because there was an election coming around, that same Government came in here with a lot of ill-considered legislation like the Domestic Servants Bill and that kind of thing which had not neither a minimum age nor a minimum wage but said that you must work for eight hours, which was something not of benefit to the same class of workers whom they wanted to protect.

Mr. Speaker, you know the alacrity with which that Government implemented the report of Mr. Jacobs, the Salaries Commissioner, but in the period 1954 to 1958 they did not elect to even discuss the proposals of Professor Richardson. Mr. Jacobs came here knowing nothing of Barbados - I would not like to say that he came here descending from a cloud - but after he got in close contact with certain top officials and was kept at arm's length from other people, after all the injudicious lobbying done by people who should know better, he brought down recommendations which involved the Government into an expenditure of \$3 million and probably it would be in the vicinity of \$4 million.

There is perhaps another thing which I should make clear at this moment. The increase for Old Age Pensioners

is going to take place from 1st April next. There is no backpay and there is no election coming up this year; so I think it is most disgusting that people who get motor car allowances and who get money to build houses, although I do not grudge them for them because I partially own the house in which I am living, and some of them who also get trips every three and a half years at the expense of the taxpayers of this country and who are stepping about this country like a motorised army of occupation because, so far as they are concerned, they feel that they have been removed from the rest of lives of the people of this country, believe that they have a God-given right to come to this country and to hold people up to ransom in an election year.

There are people in the Civil Service who deserve more money than they are getting, but there is a lot who should be getting less. The yard of the Government Headquarters has the resemblance of a Brooklyn racing track in the afternoon because of the roar of motor cars at thirty seconds after four o'clock. That roar would make you believe that it is the start of the Grand Prix. You cannot get Civil Servants to stay in office after four o'clock, unless you had given someone previous notice, to put in a little extra for all this money which they are getting. All that the hon. senior member for St. Peter said last week is absolutely true. We must get away from this idea that we have to pick up this person from school and somebody else from Broad Street and take them home. There is also the delusion that you must start to put away your files shortly after you have got back in from lunch.

That is the atmosphere which generated from the lack of knowledge, lack of sincerity and inefficiency of the last Government. If I speak of it today, I am speaking of it as a taxpayer. I get no benefits at all; I get all the headaches.

I am not asking for any fringes, but I think that people who are being supported by this community should make a contribution commensurate with the support which they get from the taxpayers of this Island. It is almost immoral to pay \$4 million in increase to Civil Servants and to get up and make harping speeches about the increase of 25 cents a week to about 8,000 or 9,000 old age pensioners. The hon. junior member for St. George just now said that it was only three and a half cents a day. He was the Minister of Social Services in the last Government. If it is 3.5 cents a day more, why did he not give them? In the Budget Speech last year by the former Premier, he said that they could not afford to give an increase to what they did later, far less to give this 3.5 cents a day increase. Now we have budgeted for a deficit in the Estimates twice the size of that by the then hon. junior member for St. Thomas, who is fortunately no longer to be a member of this House, and we are not unduly alarmed at paying 25 cents a week more to these Old Age Pensioners because you must have a principle when it comes to the question of distributing money for social purposes.

The money collected in this Island is collected not only to provide Ministers with the education which they did not get before they came in here and when they became Ministers by sending them on trips; it is not collected only to be appropriated for the use and benefit of the members of the Barbados Civil Service with whom I have the good fortune to work for the past four months and for those who appear in front of the public, that is to say, where the public has to appear before them for any service, and then for these Civil Servants who have this good fortune to treat those people who come before them without any respect or with little respect.

Anybody with any iota of intelligence coming into the Ministerial Buildings would know that they canvassed bitterly against members of the Party which I have the honour to lead. Of course, that means nothing to me because I knew I could have won the elections without them; therefore, I do not want them to think I am saying this only because I am aware of that.

This is just a little indication of the way in which I am going to address them at their Association meeting. I am not going to tell them what a fine body of men they are: I

am going to tell them what a lazy bunch of people they are and what I think them to be. It is hard that the Ministers should be working in their offices until eight o'clock and nine o'clock at night four and five days a week.

The other morning I picked up the daily newspaper and saw an article in which it was stated that the Hon. John O'Halloran, a Minister in the Trinidad Government, said that not a single Minister of this Government was present at their cocktail party which was held at the Trinidad Booth at the Trade Fair. Let me say that we have been attending certain social functions because we deem it a gesture of goodwill on the various sections of the community to invite us, but this is not a cocktail-party Government. On the day in question when this cocktail party was being held and when we were accused of staying away, every single member of this Government had previously visited the Trinidad Booth at the Trade Fair and complimented them on it. I had personally spoken with the Hon. John O'Halloran and spent over an hour in their booth with other Ministers of the Government, including the Minister without Portfolio, who is in the Other Place, and the Officer administering this Colony. 12.05 p.m.

We had expressed a great interest in the high quality and standard of the exhibits; but on the very night when he accused us of discrediting his party, we had not stopped work until a quarter to ten and the Minister of Trade asked me whether he could be excused. In view of the fact that the Estimates were coming up, we decided that we would go to the Trinidad Party and offer our apologies. We could not get in because it was something approximating a stampede down there because the Premier of Trinidad had made the decision that there was to be a free show.

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the proposed increase for the Old Age Pensioners, there is no cocktail party that they can have.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I want to show the difference in approach with this Government. I telephoned the authorities down there explaining that some Ministers would like to get in, because we wanted to put in an appearance. I think it is the height of bad manners to accuse this Government of boycotting a cocktail party; but if it had been left to me alone, I would boycott all cocktail parties.

Mr. SPEAKER: The great responsibility now is to the Old Age Pensioners.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not mince any matters and I think that if a few cocktail parties were to be boycotted, we would be making more progress. Having digressed thus far I will, if I may, just in conclusion answer the point raised by the hon. senior member for the City. In his Report, going straight or from where I left off, Professor Richardson said this:

"No change is recommended in the age at which old age pensions should be paid. To reduce the age to 65 would result in an increase of more than 2,000 in the number of pensioners, while to reduce the age to 60 would involve an increase of about 6,000 in the number of pensioners. In view of the limited financial resources available it seems preferable to pay somewhat larger pensions to persons over 68 years of age than to pay smaller pensions to the large number of people involved if the pensionable age were lowered. It is, however, recommended that pensions for the totally blind be paid to persons, if destitute, who are 20 years of age and over, instead of at the present age of 40 years. The number of the totally blind between these ages is small. It is also recommended that the few deaf mutes in the Island be granted pensions at 20 years of age; usually they have been able to learn little at school and are often unable to earn a living".

Then Professor Richardson went on and made certain recommendations about the "means test". We have followed substantially all the recommendations made by Professor Richardson. The age for the blind was already lowered and we have increased the "means test" to \$4.00. I would like

to see the situation where you would not have to make any "means test" at all; but when you have slender resources you have to allocate them in the manner in which the greatest help is given to the greatest number. When you come to the question of the repair of old people's houses, we have had a debate on this matter. The City Council, when they see cases of necessity, - and they have been doing this for a long time - would make a grant of money for carpenters to repair old people's houses; but the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is advocating that everybody who is over the age of 68 years, owns a house or lives in a house which is leaking. The truth is that most of these people who draw old age pensions, live in the houses of their sisters-in-law and so on. When we ask the hon. member to mention cases relative to the repair of the houses of these Old Age Pensioners, he said that we would have to give him time so as to answer that question. I have no doubt that there may be people at sixty-eight years who are living in fairly deplorable circumstances; but that is not an indictment of this Government except in so far as it has not set about to make an effective, over-all plan for the relief of want, distress and infirmity. When you come to the question of the repair of these houses, that can be done by Local Government Committees because these Committees are in a far better position to examine this kind of payment and to make provision for it than somebody else in Bridgetown, for instance, who draws a big salary and gets an allowance to drive to somebody's house. Your sanitary authorities, your assessors or your Poor Law Guardians are the people who are in day-to-day contact with these people. We do not have to declare a general policy to help people who are destitute; we will direct or encourage or suggest to the competent authorities, whether it is the Housing Authority or the Local Government Authority, to do something in order to deal with these cases of necessity.

12.15 p.m.

I do not think the hon. member need go on beating that drum very much longer, because the drum is beginning to sound a bit muffled at the present moment. I do not think, Sir, that I can usefully add anything more to this debate. Of course it is going to cost money, but we will have to find the money when we increase the Old Age Pensioners by 35 cents.

There is just one other point which I understand the hon. member asked me to mention. I am very glad when I am reminded of these things. I do not want to be accused of not answering a question when what I should be accused of is having a notoriously bad memory. I should be accused of that instead of dictatorship and things like that for forgetting to answer questions. The hon. senior member for the City raised the question about increases to members of the different Boards. It is true that I would like to see voluntary service; but I find it difficult sometimes to get people who are interested in politics even to come to a political meeting or a meeting of any other Association or Club. As you know, Sir, from being President of one of the Association dealing with sport, the Football Association - and I think the hon. senior member for St. Peter also belongs to that Association and the Cricket Association to which I belong - if you get one-tenth of the membership to turn out where they pay a very high subscription in my opinion, about \$10 a year, to meet in a country like Barbados, you have done remarkably well. I think the hon. junior member for Christ Church can bear me out as well as the hon. junior member for the City. Anyone who has to work with Committees knows that if a man is normally engaged and is not a retired Civil Servant or person of independent means, it is very difficult sometimes to get him out to the things that he says he is interested in. The \$4.80 which is paid, I believe, to the Chairman for attending these meetings is not by way of compensation or payment or anything like that; it is not supposed to be an emolument, remuneration or reward; it is merely to take care of certain contingencies like travelling expenses in going to meetings. Some of these men have cars and some may have to rent cars, and that is all it is regarded as.

Mr. Speaker, this demand really came from the Postmaster General, and if I may read the note it is as follows:-

"Members and Chairmen of the Claims Committee have from time to time intimated that the remuneration paid" - they call it remuneration but we do not call it that - "for attending meetings is inadequate. Some of them have to travel long distances but do not own cars and are more often than not out of pocket. The opinion has also been expressed that since the Chairmen must attach their signatures to each and every card in authorisation of payment they should receive more than the other members. Both propositions are reasonable and merit consideration. The present amount payable is \$2.40 and this has remained unchanged since 1951. It is suggested that the Chairmen be paid \$4.80 and other members \$3.60 per meeting."

Now if I may give the hon. member some indication, the actual expenditure in connection with Pensions Claims Committees during the past few years is as follows and it is very small: in 1957-58 the amount was \$461; in 1959 it was \$545; in 1960 it was \$473 and in 1960-61 it was \$504; the Postmaster General estimated that an amount of \$960 would be an adequate estimate for the payment of Pensions Claims Committees during the financial year, 1962-63. It would be very churlish of us, if these people are performing a voluntary service, to deny them a small increase in the out-of-pocket expenses - which, I think, I would prefer to call it - which would only involve the Treasury of this Island in perhaps \$360 a year more when they are distributing perhaps over \$1 million. Once the principle of compensating them for out-of-pocket expenses was established, I do not think that the quantum is something, unless it rises to astronomical heights, which we should worry about at all. Members of other Boards are paid \$15 for members and \$30 for the Chairmen of the Boards, and in some cases the Chairman is paid a flat salary of \$200 a month; and the maximum which a member is supposed to draw is \$60 a month and the Chairman \$120 a month. These Pensions Claims Committees are the parochial beasts of burden; I would not say the parochial donkeys. They, like the Justices of the Peace in the United Kingdom who are frequently described as judicial donkeys or beasts of burden, carry the brunt of the administration to see that the money is not spent in directions for which it was not intended.

I can only say, Sir, that although the principle is a sound one, - though voluntary service should be voluntary service, - one would have expected that they are entitled to some kind of compensation for out-of-pocket expenses, and I do not think we can justify a quarrel with the quantum or the amount which they should get, provided it is kept within reasonable bounds.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any hon. member who has not spoken who desires to speak?

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to profess myself as being in complete agreement with this Bill, except for the fact that I do not know if the Minister has taken into account the fact that there has been a recent increase in valuation figures. Having regard therefore to that increase, I feel that the means test should be staged at \$5 rather than the \$4 suggested because there is a large number of people between the \$4 and \$5 brackets who have therefore been disqualified. I am minded in this situation of the position of Tantalus who is supposed to be suffering eternal torment, hunger and thirst, with a bunch of luscious grapes suspended above his head; and whenever he held up to grasp one, they were withdrawn and when he held his head down to drink of the waters which surrounded him, they receded. That is the position of those people who have been disqualified by the rising valuation figures.

As to the point whether there are enough voluntary workers in Barbados who would be willing to serve on these Boards, we feel on this side of the Table that there could be found 36 people public-spirited enough to give of their services on such a Committee especially when it is considered that the chief instrument used in such a Committee is a rubber-stamp and there is a staff to do the greater part of the donkey work. We find that there are people who will come forward and serve voluntarily on Committees in the municipality. I had an example of it only

yesterday when we had a meeting of the Public Health Committee and there were several people present who are remunerated in no way whatever for their services. This community would have arrived at a sad pass, when there are not voluntary people who are willing to come forward and give service to the community in which they live.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, after listening to such eloquent speeches and such nonsensical ones by some hon. members in this Chamber, I have come to the conclusion that the sensible speeches have outweighed the nonsensical ones.
12.25 p.m.

I hardly think after listening to the defence made by the Premier of the sensible speeches, after listening to the defence by him of the nonsensical speeches that there is much which I can add, I would only just like to refer to a very loose statement made by the hon. junior member for St. George and I am craving your indulgence to use a local metaphorical expression and that expression is that I can only refer to the hon. junior member for St. George as a dog returning to its own vomit.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I am placed in a rather unfortunate position because having already spoken, I am not expected to reply although when this Bill goes into Committee, I will have something to say. However, I would like the Hon. Minister to explain what it is which he has in mind that caused him to use that remark.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Sir, the hon. junior member for St. George sat here in this Chamber and refused when asked to do so to even entertain the idea of increasing old age pensions to \$2.40 and still the hon. member comes in here today saying that it is only three and a half cents a day more and you should be thinking of it in the light of social security. He comes in with this lot of nonsensical ignorance.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, I am not accustomed to doing this filibustering. I was at pains to explain that. My whole idea was if the Government was satisfied then that Old Age Pensioners should be paid \$2.40 a week, the question was whether or not the \$2.40 meant the same today as what it meant at that time. If the Hon. Minister wants to take me for a ride, let him give me the opportunity where I can speak again.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I wonder how much difference there is today in the cost of living from what it was four months ago or even six months ago. The hon. junior member for St. George and his Government felt it was unreasonable for anyone to suggest increasing the old age pensions to \$2.40 a week.

Now, you get this statement made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. Apparently, he did not want to hear my reply and therefore, he has vacated his seat.

The question asked by the hon. senior member for the City has been well answered by the Hon. Premier; therefore, I consider it redundant to go over it.

I hardly think that there is anything more which is expected by me therefore, I will close by stating that Mr. Stockman who was made available to us or to the last Government not to consider an increase in old age pensions, as the hon. junior member for St. George should know, because he was then Minister of Social Services, but Mr. Stockman was made available to us to advise as to how best the existing resources of the colony including old age pensions could be channelled in the official scheme for social security.

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

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and

the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

12.35 p.m.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—

"Section three of the Old Age Pension Act, 1937, which Act is hereinafter referred to as the principal Act, is amended by substituting the words "four dollars" for the words "three dollars and sixty cents" in paragraph (c) of subsection (1)."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, this may be a good opportunity for me to make a suggestion. I am fully aware that what I am going to suggest now cannot be done by this side of the House because it would be creating a charge on the Treasury. However, it would have been an opportune time to amend the Act in the way I mentioned when the Act was last amended. What the Premier has read out about the last Report is absolutely true, but I think he will agree with me that I was the one member who was courageous enough to say that I disagreed with the Richardson Report as to the age of 68 years and suggested that 65 years should apply to old people receiving this pension. Since then, in the United States of America and in England, they have amended the Act and reduced the age. I am the last person to make any recommendation without bearing in mind the slender resources of the island, but I have never been able to compromise on Civil Servants going home at the age of 65 and the old people not being able to receive their pension at 65. I am willing to pay my quota of taxation in that respect; I have always taken that stand as you will see from the debates in Hansard.

The Act says that blind people should not receive an old age pension until they are 20. I am asking the Premier to give this matter some consideration. The child of some poor persons may be born blind. Under the law of this country a man has to support his child until it attains the age of 16 and if a child is blind and the father is dead that child is not in a position to draw a pension until he is 20 years of age. I know that none of us from this side can make this amendment, but if the Premier will look at the English Act he will see what I am suggesting is correct. This is the opportune time for the Government, instead of making these piecemeal amendments, to make one amendment reducing the age to a minimum. If somebody gets blind at the age of 12, 16 or 18 years, he must reach the age of 20 years before he can get this pension. I would say that we should reduce the age in keeping with the Bastardy Act; it would do well to reduce the age for a blind person to 12 years at which he could draw this old age pension and not allow him to wait until he reaches the age of 20.

Mr. WALCOTT: I quite agree with the hon. member but I do not agree that we should use the term "old age pension" in respect of a blind person; we want something modern in relation to these blind persons. Anybody with any sense would know that when a person is blind, whether he is six months old or sixty-eight years old, you have to treat him in a different way from an Old Age pensioner. My advice to the Premier is that he should not fall into the same method of having piecemeal legislation because when he falls for the blind he will also fall for the maimed and the halt. There are cases of destitution as distinct from Old Age Pensioners and therefore my advice to the Government is that they should not look upon these social security measures in a piecemeal manner but to regard them in the light of the Government's own statement that there is somebody who is looking into the matter of social security, that the Government is considering its policy on this matter and that anything we deal with here should be taken in the light of a comprehensive scheme.

On the question of age, you cannot look at this matter except you look at it in a broad way. You must understand the mentality of the people today. There are those who feel

that as long as they are alive and they are 68 years of age, they will draw this pension. I know a man who draws \$2,000, he is 68 years of age and he still expects to draw the old age pension. I told him "No" and he cannot understand why I told him "No." He says: "I am 68 years of age". I would be prepared to give this pension to persons who reach the age of 65 years but it must be on a contributory basis and you should have your "means test" even then. If you have people making a contribution at the beginning you will still want to have a "means test" because if people contribute, then they will have to draw. I have had some discussion with Mr. Stockman who knows what he is saying.

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of order, Did I understand the hon. member to say that I said that the "means test" should be abolished? I said that the means test should be raised to \$5.00. I just want to get that clear.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what happens with hon. members. They have the habit of not listening to the debate and then they rise on a point of order and say something which you did not say. I said that the hon. junior member for the City said, and I agreed with him, that the question of the "means test" should be examined; but the hon. member seems to think that he must get into the debate whenever I speak. If he wants to get in a debate like this, I am saying that the employers should be called upon to make a contribution to social security in Barbados. One of the hardest jobs you have to do is to get one penny out of an employer for anybody who has been working with him for the last 20 years. We have men earning large salaries and making profits and you cannot get them to give a worker the equivalent of two weeks' pay as a contribution for any years of service which the worker has rendered. I have been to one employer and there was a man who has been with that employer for 12 or 15 years. I asked that man to make a contribution on the basis of two weeks' pay to that employee and he refused to do so. I want to say that employers must be made by law to make this contribution; these employers are not making any contribution towards the people whom they employ and then they talk about these old people. I am going at the source from which the contributions should be made; you must make the contributions when the employee is alive.
12.45 p.m.

These employers are getting away with too much. If I had to deal with all of them, from the 1st April I would make it as a condition of employment what these employers should do, and put into an Act as a condition of employment that every employer employing people over a certain point should make some contribution, and then you would not have all these people stringing up saying they want old age pensions, because the employers would be making a contribution towards them. It is time that it stopped.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has generated some heat, but I would like him to understand that the members of my Party totally agree that there should be a contribution on both sides on this whole question of social security. Any thinking employer or capitalist in this modern day knows that public relationship and capital and labour demands that if you want to run a business successfully, there must be social security on a contributory basis. I wanted to say to the hon. member that employers and those who pay taxes still make that contribution, but I agree with him and we have all agreed. I have said that it is a universal policy and it must be accepted; Barbados cannot be unique in this respect. It is only that we had a Government which did not bring it before. I think I can quote from Dr. Hugh Springer that everybody knows that the strides which the Union has made in Barbados were purely because you had employers here who were always reasonable enough to see the demands which were made; they were more reasonable than other people in the Caribbean area. I quote Dr. Springer, Mr. Chairman; and I believe that it is because so many people in the country hold the Trade Unionist member in very high esteem because of the forthright manner of his approach.

As far as we are concerned, we recognise that today any type of businessman or any capitalist, whether small

or large, realises that employers must make a contribution, and therefore that is how it should be. I do not see however how he can suggest to the Premier that he should not fall for these piecemeal amendments, because whether you are blind at one year or at two years, you are blind. You are amending the Old Age Pensions Act. You are not dealing with social security which must be a comprehensive Act to come before this House. As a matter of fact, you have got to scrap a lot of things when you come to this. I have had a whole lot of Regulations and Acts sent to me from Chicago, and in my humble way I have studied them as best I could; but while we are dealing with this now I would like to say this: the law says that you must be in Barbados at least twelve years. You are amending the Act with which we all agree, but I never compromise and I am entitled to have an opinion like anybody else. I do not compromise with Richardson. The greatest man living on old age pensions was the Reverend Godson of blessed memory who called me to his house, but I did not compromise. I realise that my grandmother was a labourer, and I have seen in my twenty years of work people at 65, and I have never compromised with the hon. member on my left.

Mr. Chairman, in a cold country people are entitled to a pension at 65 years. I know Barbados better than Professor Richardson; he may know figures better than I do, but I know when a woman starts to weed a farm ground at 65 years she is only doing it to get assistance. I am not a Socialist and cannot pretend to be, but a lot of Civil Servants go home at 65; so are you telling me that the people who produced the wealth of the country cannot receive a pension at 65 years? I accept 68 years now because of the slender resources which the hon. member has told me he has inherited. In the United Kingdom the age is 68 years and in the United States of America it is 65 years. The hon. member for St. Peter has travelled more extensively than I ever hope to travel and he has seen it, and I argue that in the tropics people who work as agricultural labourers, hawkers and domestic servants should receive a pension at 65 years. Look around this Chamber and see which of you would employ a person over 65 years of age. Nobody is looking for a person at that age unless he has inherited her from his parents and wants to give her something. I make no apology to anyone when I say that I believe people should draw old age pension at 65 years and not at 68 in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I am voting for this today because I think it is a wonderful gesture; it is a promise they are keeping, but what I am saying is that it is not a matter of falling for my piecemeal legislation. I saw the figures which Professor Richardson recommended, and after sitting down for twenty-two years and seeing thousands of people, I am in a position to say that rather than wait until a person becomes 20 years if he is blind to be given a pension, you should give him now. You have two Acts to guide you: one is the Bastardy Act and the other is the Married Women's Act. One of the Acts says that if a man is married he is responsible for finding his children up to sixteen years, and the other says if he is not married he is responsible for him up to twelve years. Professor Richardson must have been brought face to face with these two Acts. I know my way around, and even if it is not amended here, it is a charge on the Treasury and I ask members to reconsider it at some time in the not distant future and make that amendment.

There is also this question with which we have been confronted, and when I raised the question here and the Hon. Premier replied, it is for the benefit of the Minister of Social Services to take with a grain of salt the recommendations Civil Servants make to you. I would like to gamble now that the Postmaster General could not find six out of the 36 people who told him that they were not willing to serve unless they got the fee carried up. I challenge the Minister though he has read the note from the Postmaster General that there are people in this country who would not be so worthless as not to be willing to give one hour a week. You have to be very careful that some of the Civil Servants do not lead you into a well. Do you believe that the taxpayers who contribute to the upkeep of the churches and people like the Reverend Pestaina in St. Peter would tell the

Postmaster or the taxpayers who contribute to the upkeep of his church that he would not sit on a Board unless we gave him \$480 as Chairman? I can only say that is a lie, and I challenge the Postmaster to say that Reverend Pestaina told him so. I challenge him to say that the Reverend Woodroffe in St. Joseph told him so. When the hon. member read out the letter to me from the Postmaster General and said that the increase was small, of course I agree that the amount of \$960 is small.
12.55 p.m.

If you take his own speech and read it, you will find that he has retrenched sometimes \$100, \$50 or \$60 and you are telling me that you cannot find people because you are increasing old age pensions. I do not want to be personal but I can call names of wives of hon. members of this House who now serve on Committees and Boards without asking for a cent. I, personally, do not like the idea. They are complaining of our reading out something. What the Postmaster is telling you is that you are increasing the stipend.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I rise on a point of order. What the Minister had read out was an observation from the Postmaster-General merely stating that the members and Chairmen of these committees had asked for an increase in this remuneration. We did not start it. The hon. member's speech may convey the information that we started the remuneration.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I am saying is this. When you got the Minute Paper, you should have taken it as worth no more than a grain of salt. Let everyone of them ask themselves if because you increase old age pension you must increase their rate of remuneration. Is it that you cannot find people to serve on these Boards? They had a rubberstamp and they put the rubberstamp on it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Sir, I would just like to point out to the hon. senior member for the City that the increase in the remuneration for members of the Old Age Pension Claims Committee was not occasioned by the fact that the old age pension was increased. This was a proposal put forward to my Ministry long before we took over and the proposal says that on the grounds that the cost of transportation has increased, the people had asked for an increase to meet the cost of their transportation.

Mr. WEEKES: Sir, there is one point which I would like to draw to the attention of the appropriate Minister. In case a person leaves the Island and he returns as a pauper, that person has difficulty in getting a pension. I feel that something should be done to help a person who returns to this Island a pauper. A person who returns to this Island as a pauper and does not receive a pension applies to the Board of Guardians for help and that creates an additional expense on the Local Government. I feel that the time has come that those paragraphs on the forms which a pensioner must fill out before he gets a pension should be deleted. I therefore implore the Hon. Minister to do his utmost to have those paragraphs deleted from the forms so that a person who returns to the Island as a pauper can receive a pension.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, the point which I was making all along is that we are satisfied that you need an overall scheme for social security and what I said this morning was that instead of the Government coming now to increase the pension by three and a quarter cents a day that you would have looked into the question of the overall security scheme first. The argument of this House was that members of the Government Party speaking on platforms in the election campaign said that it should be \$2.40 a week and that it should have been \$2.40 a week from last year. If it should be \$2.40 a week from last year, what is wrong with making it retrospective from 1st April last year? There is nothing wrong with that. When you come with a comprehensive scheme with respect to the plan, you can call it old age pension or whatever you like and that point was made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

All that I am saying is that we are spending so much time in debating this measure. We were speaking on this

measure for the whole morning. Instead of spending our time on this alone, we could have been considering a comprehensive scheme of social security. We have had the experts to deal with it here. Why should we be considering this when you could have come with the recommendations of the experts on the cost of a comprehensive scheme.

The Hon. Minister of Social Services said in the House that I could not reply to him and he just talked of one returning to one's vomit. I think I should say this to him. Your Party has the Government in hand. This matter was thrown out to the electorate. Because the Government to which I belonged failed to do one of a million things, you are saying that it has failed. Well, then, if any one Government can do everything that is required in a country, you can as well abolish the Government of Great Britain or for that matter the Government of the United States of America because those countries have been running Governments for so long. Where we have failed, there is a number of other things of a changing nature which we have put forward. The hon. member is continually talking about the Government to which I belonged. If that Government had done everything, there would be no need for any other Government. All that I am saying is, why come and debate something which is only just wasting the time of this Place? You have all the plans before you, and at this moment it is costing the people something which you need not have spent when there is a Report on it. Suppose the former Government in its planning had given only or said that it could not afford to give an old age pension of \$2.15 a week and you have come now and say that you are going to give everything, even the food. To talk of the increase which you are giving which is three and a half cents a day more, are you going to tell me that the pensioners are going to die if you had not given this? I am sure that the present Report which you have before you, if considered, would give them probably \$3.00 or \$4.00 a week. The intention of the Government to which I belonged when it gave that increase was only to bridge the gap until such time as this Report was considered. If the present Government had it in mind to give \$2.40, certainly make it \$2.40 but certainly make it \$2.40 from the time we made it \$2.15. By now we could have been a fair way in our discussion on the second reading of the Appropriation Bill.

Are you doing this now because this is a nice political horse on which you can ride or because it is a horse which would not kick and therefore, you can ride on its back all the time? This three and a half cents a day increase is not enough to buy one loaf of bread.
1.05 p.m.

If we want to discuss the old age pension, well, let us go on until nine o'clock; but you have brought us here away from our business at ten o'clock to deal with the Budget and now after one o'clock we are discussing this increase in the old age pension. I took this matter to the Cabinet because the amount was not sufficient and we had an expert from the United Nations to come out here. Now the Minister is talking about nonsensical argument. This is about the third time.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the hon. junior member for St. George is referring to the Gillette Report, but the Report of Mr. Stockman is not in the Ministry. The hon. member was told that already today.

Mr. MILLER: That is a feeble-minded Minister. Every opportunity he gets at me he takes because he has found that I am his opposite number; he is a political imbecile and every time he is discussing something in here he relies on the senior members to help him. Why does he hold this Ministry? You examine the hon. member and see if he is not a physical casualty. He has the shock of being a Minister. Every time he has a debate somebody has to come to his rescue because he reduces it to the point of abuse.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, are we still debating Clause 2 of this Bill?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes, we are still debating Clause 2.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Well, Sir, we are now in Committee and when we are in Committee we are considering the details of the Bill; but it seems to me that some hon. members are taking advantage of your latitude.

Mr. MILLER: That is no point of order.

Mr. HUSBANDS: We are now making second reading speeches and not actually dealing with Clause 2 of the Bill which I would like to debate and would like to have the opportunity of debating. The hon. junior member for St. George in debating Clause 2 of the Bill should desist from making the comments which he should have made early in the day.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Leader of the House has risen on a point of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: To what depths of stupidity can this House descend? The Hon. Minister has already made it quite clear that the Stockman Report has not yet been published. A child can understand that. What is the point of going on to say that?

Mr. CORBIN: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I think that this is a waste of precious daylight saving time today. *(Laughter)* Both sides of the House are agreed that the old age pension should be increased to \$2.40 per week, and therefore why should we waste time with this argument? This debate should have been finished long ago; why should sensible men prolong this argument? The more time we waste the longer it will take for these people to receive this money.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. senior member for St. Andrew should probably be the Minister. These people cannot get this money before the 1st April anyhow. What I am saying is that I would like to read this Report; I am anxious to read it. I would like to know why are we wasting time with this matter when we need a comprehensive scheme of social security. It is on that point that we have had all the argument. Why should the hon. member opposite tell me a lot of personal things which are not always the best?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, even at the risk of prolonging unduly a debate in this Chamber, I will say that there are one or two points made by the hon. junior member for St. George to which a reply must be made. First and foremost he wants to know why this \$2.40 per week is not made retroactive as from April last year.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, my colleague has pointed out something to you and you must make a ruling on it. Section 2 is now being debated. Some of us have to reply to the hon. junior member for St. George about what he has said, but we need not deal with that in Clause 2. It is Clause 3 which deals with the amount which you are going to pay to these people. Clause 2 is where you are increasing the amount for the people who serve on these Boards. I think that Clause 2 should be put to the vote and let us go on to Clause 3.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on Clause 2. This Clause reads as follows:-

'Section three of the Old Age Pension Act, 1937, which Act is hereinafter referred to as the principal Act, is amended by substituting the words "four dollars" for the words "three dollars and sixty cents" in paragraph (c) of subsection (1)'.

I want to know the reason for this addition for those who serve on the Pension Claims Committee. I left my seat during which time the Minister may possibly have made some explanation. When I returned to my seat in the Committee I heard (Mr. MOTTLEY: This is Section 2) I am dealing with Clause 2. I was made to understand that some Minute came from the Postmaster General referring to this matter and giving information to the effect that there were people who were not willing to serve gratuitously on this Board. Hence the reason for this increase.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We have not yet got to Clause 4.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
1.15 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I was saying just now that the hon. junior member for St. George has been protesting that this increase to \$2.40 has not been made retroactive to April last year; in other words, that the \$2.40 should apply as from April last year. Nobody can understand that but he. It was he, Mr. Chairman, who in September last year, just before the election, increased the rate to \$2.15 and now he is protesting that we did not go back to \$2.40 from April last year. It does not make sense. Furthermore, Sir, he is saying that this is a waste of time and that what we should now be doing is introducing a comprehensive social security scheme.

Now the Report of the Social Security expert has not even yet been completed, and as former Minister of Social Services he should know that even if it had been completed it would have been absolutely impossible to set up the machinery to implement it in less than a year; but that is not the point. The point is that since 1954 he had a Report by a Social Security expert, Mr. Richardson, setting up a joint contributory Provident Fund immediately, and he did nothing about it under three years. Page 10 of the Richardson Report given to his Government in 1954 proposed a Provident Fund for Old Age Pensioners on a contributory basis ranging from 50 cents to 20 cents a week, depending on the category of employment and what not. The entire basis for operating the scheme was in his hands in 1954. In 1961 when he brought in an amendment to the Old Age Pensions Act to increase the rate by 35 cents a week, it was then in his power to introduce a Social Security scheme based on the Richardson Report. Now he expects us even if we had gotten Mr. Stockman's Report to come in here with a cut and dried scheme with all the mechanics established and with all the administration arranged within a few days after getting the Report which we have not got yet to provide this colony with a Social Security scheme. It is stupid. These things take time and the hon. member knows better than to come in here and beat the air claiming it is a waste of time to amend the Old Age Pensions Act now to provide this increase, when what we should be doing today is introducing a comprehensive social security scheme. Things are not done like that and he knows it. From 1954 he did nothing about it and expects us to do it in two weeks.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I too make no apology for wasting time. I am going to answer the hon. junior member for St. George. When people are down you have to beat them to a pulp, and if the hon. member's skin is too tough to be beaten, we will have to stand on it. The hon. member comes in here parading. Can he be serious? Does he understand legislation and how Government runs? One Government in England said they were going to nationalise steel; another said they were going to denationalise steel, and the one that said they were going to denationalise won the election and set about immediately to denationalise steel. This Government said they were going to increase old age pensions to \$2.40; they did not tell the people \$5; so how can you come today and say they are wasting time? They won an election by telling the people they would increase the rate to \$2.40. The hon. member's Government increased the rate to \$2.15 and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph sat down in here during that debate which drove the last nails in their coffin. Who is wasting time?

Mr. Chairman, if anybody wasted time it was the last Government. Not only did they waste time, but they had no ideas. Mine is not a criticism; mine is only to show that if they wanted to do more they could have gone back from 1st April, but that is one of the things that caused their Party to lose, and their loss was multiple. When it comes to the question of the hon. member saying this is a waste of time,

he spoke as long on this measure as any other hon. member who had anything to do with it previously; but if the hon. member wants to attack the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, the Minister of Social Services, he had better choose a debate. I do not think it is fair for the hon. member to say that this cannot even buy a bread. The hon. member should not talk about a bread because he did not even give them a stone. We asked the Government to increase the amount by 60 cents but they brought down 35 cents, and now the hon. junior member for St. George is talking about a bread. The present Government told the electorate that they would increase the rate to \$2.40 and they are carrying out that pledge. If they did not do that, you would be able to go around and say that they were fooling the people. That is what you want to do; you want to have a platform and say they have not carried out their pledge to the community, and I will say that the Party to which the hon. member belongs is a bunch of shameless, eccentric maniacs. They have the brass to come in here after being associated with an atrocious Party for the last seven years as Ministers to try to behead everybody inside this chamber, and now the hon. member has the brass to talk about freedom and helping the under-privileged. The half has not yet been told about the atrocious acts of the Party to which you belong. You are lucky to have four members here.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member said he wants to make no apology for taking time off. As a matter of fact, if he remembers all he said on the last occasion, I do not think he looked at the Bill at all. What he wants to do is to criticise the last Government who lost the election; he takes pride in doing that, but we accept that. If the hon. member says that because we did not change the old age pensions from \$2.15 to \$2.40 that caused us to lose the election, that is a matter for him; but if he has reason to feel he must continue to criticise me and beat me to pulp, he will never beat me to pulp; he is making a big mistake in his life.

Mr. WALCOTT: I did not mean physically, I meant politically, because after all you are sitting down over there with the ones who have been beaten to pulp.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member is taking a dig at the last Government and takes the opportunity to prod at me, but I can take some fun, I more or less frolic in his idea. Whether we were talking about Old Age Pensioners or flying a kite, the hon. member would have to beat the last Government: It has become a phobia with him. As a matter of fact, he is sick. He becomes dull and loses his direction if he is not beating the last Government. It is psychological and we understand that is his nature. However, I do not know that we need go any further.
1.25 p.m.

All I said was that we were waiting for this so long and the idea of this was just to bridge the gap. At every opportunity, because it keeps him alive, the Hon. Minister is talking about the past Government but that is the only way in which he can handle his portfolio.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the verbiage which the hon. junior member for St. George is indulging in has come only because of the shock which he received. He has a phobia for the last Government. It would be a phobia if I still regard them as something important. This is the most positive work we have to do and the hon. junior member for St. George is only shameless in his getting up today and making protestations. He has absolutely no foundation for making any criticism about what is stated because in the manifesto of the present Party in power, it was stated that they intended to have a wide social programme and as an immediate measure they intended to increase the old age pension to \$2.40. What more do you want? Do you expect anybody to agree with you that they should bring down today a social security scheme after only four months in power? All this has come about because the hon. junior member for St. George and the Party to which he belonged were incompetent. I have not said so because I have a phobia but because I have a phobia for dishonest people. You must have a phobia for criminals. The hon. member is telling this Chamber that the Government should be bringing down a

measure like social security when it has been in power for only three months.

The hon. member is saying that you should be doing something for the blind, I agree with him, but I do not agree to your paying any person who is blind an old age pension. What I said before, I will again repeat. Giving the blind something is idealistic: but the problem is that you have to watch what it means in the community in which we live. One of the criticisms which the hon. senior member for the City has to face is that he feeds able-bodied men. Do not mind that a man may be able-bodied; he may be unemployed. You cannot go too quickly for a scheme unless you have given a full examination of the whole scheme. Sir, who can have more phobia than the group to which the hon. member belonged?

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

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

Mr. HUSBANDS: This is the Clause on which I want to make a few remarks. I listened to a former speech made by the hon. senior member for the City and I got the impression that the hon. member was a bit puzzled because he thought that a Minute which had come from the Postmaster General informing the Government that there were people on the Pension Claims Committees who wanted an increase in remuneration - that such a claim was extraordinary and unexpected. I am not surprised that the hon. senior member for the City did associate the timing of that claim with the bringing into effect of the main amendment of this Bill, the increase of \$2.40 a week where old age pension is concerned. But as the Hon. Minister of Social Services pointed out, there was no connection whatsoever in that increase and the request by members of the Pension Claims Committee for increase in remuneration.

I can tell this Chamber, Sir, that I am well aware although there may be found in this Island many people who are quite ready and willing to serve on these Committees without asking for any form of remuneration, yet there is a growing spirit in Barbados that people who serve on these Committees should be paid.

I am not going to bring any tales out of school but on a certain School Board a certain motion has been resisted where members of that Board wanted to have their services remunerated; therefore, I was very sorry after the hon. senior member for the City sought to single out names and, as a matter of fact, he mentioned the names of two clergymen and said nobody would want to associate claims from members of that Body with that Minute. Maybe, he is right and may be, he is absolutely wrong.

I repeat, there is a growing feeling - and my sympathy goes with the Government - that people who serve on these Committees should be paid. I believe the Postmaster General gave the correct information and I was very sorry to hear that criticism of this officer and the Government being warned to go very slowly in listening to the information which that responsible Civil Servant has to give.

The Government would be well advised to take such advice because there is a growing spirit in this Island of Barbados that people who serve on these Committees want to be paid for it and, I repeat, a motion such as that had to be resisted on a School Board by members. That is a fact, not fancy. I am a member of the School Board. I do not want to bring tales out of school.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that I should say anything more.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I would not like that to be taken in the way in which

it has been taken by my colleague. So far as what the hon. member has said in relation to this Bill, I accept the suggestion given by the Hon. Premier that cases have been made out that you put it at \$3,60 so as to compensate for motor car allowances or bus fares. You accept the recommendation because the quantum of this allowance is not what it should be when you take into consideration the increased cost of travelling. I agree with the hon. senior member for the City; but what my colleague has now said, if that is getting into the Government's head, let us say right here and now, you can chase away all of the people on these Boards who are getting money and put people of confidence in their places. I have served on a number of these Boards and I have told Government Bodies that if you put me on the Committee, you will have to pay me. We can find sufficient people to put on these Boards without paying them; but when you want to put efficient people and they feel that they are independent, then they can come and tell you that if you want them there, you will have to pay them. We know why we pay members of these Boards. It is because we do not want people to be out of pocket.

1.35 p.m.

Therefore you give him a little berry and you can look smart; but you have to train that man and let him know that this is an element of democracy; if a man is put on a high-way Committee his contribution is getting to know how to run his country and you are not asking him to serve the community at the risk of losing his own personal business. If the Mayor can serve the Municipality for \$200 a month that is all right, but when you come to these little "hay-nay" Boards, what do you mean? The Office of the Mayor must be of greater importance than when one serves on these little Boards. You do not want the people who are serving on the Old Age Pension Board to be pensioners too. In our era we have to stress the co-operative aspect in all the phases of our Government activities and that applies to the people who serve on Committees and Boards.

Mr. Chairman, I have served on many Committees and Boards which have nothing to do with my work as such. I have served on Boards and there is one Board I have in mind in respect of which money is paid and that is the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank Board on which hon. members are serving. Many of us came into public life because we were willing to serve freely. Do not let us get the idea that the only way in which you can set up new Boards and Committees is that people must be paid for serving on such Boards and Committees. On all of these School Boards you put people who are interested in these things.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member has said has really shocked me although it may be true. I have been in politics for some time and changes have been brought about and you have a lot of people serving on these Boards. I have served on the Harrison College School Board for many years and I have found that on that Board there have been many people of intelligence, people who have been able to guide the destiny of the School. I have been serving on the Housing Authority and I was paid no money; I am shocked from what the hon. member has said that he resisted the idea. The last Government particularly said that they were not going to put any politicians on Boards and by that they meant that they were not putting politicians whom they did not like, because I saw politicians and super-politicians not only placed on Boards but I saw that the hon. member for St. Peter was kicked off a Board.

Mr. WALCOTT: Which member for St. Peter? I am speaking on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I mean the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I am wondering if you had made a request that you be paid. (ASIDES) I said that the hon. senior member for St. Peter was kicked off a Board and the Speaker was also kicked off a Board. I am wondering.....

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order. A motion to have members remunerated was turned down.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was wondering if that is why the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member

for St. Lucy were kicked off the Board. Really and truly what I am concerned about is that I am shocked to hear what the hon. junior member for St. Peter has said; but you can get people who have sufficient confidence in the Government to serve. On the other hand, if you want to select what are known as yard fowls, the colossally ignorant people, well, you can do that. You have serving on Boards people who do not draw anything except what they receive as members of such Boards. In every parish of this Island you can find three people who would be able and willing to serve on the Old Age Pensions Claims Committee without receiving one cent, just as you will have people on the Public Assistance Committees who would work without receiving any money.

I feel that in this country today when you are getting - it may be an indictment - thirty-six people putting up to the Postmaster General that they are only getting so much and so much for serving on a Board - I am shocked about that.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Well then, those members should be asked to leave. You have an artisan in the person of Mr. Greaves who was Chairman of the Coleridge-Parry School Board and he never asked for one cent for serving on that Board. He was a blacksmith, he reared a family in this island and he served on a Board; but because he is not a yard fowl, they kicked him off.

1.45 p.m.

If you are going to do that.....

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, the gentleman to whom the hon. member is referring is still a member of the Alexandra School Board.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I said the Coleridge-Parry School. I am not suggesting that you should walk about and take up somebody because he is some ignorant planter and put him on any Board; but you have people in all walks of life who would be willing to serve on these Boards, and I am surprised that you have increased the remuneration for people serving on Boards like that. The members on the Harrison College Board, Combermere Board and other School Boards do not receive one cent. They are willing to serve on these Boards, and there are people in all walks of life, people in humble walks of life, people in the middle class walks of life and people in the upper class walks of life, and therefore I do not care who was annoyed, I could not agree with the Minute which came from the Postmaster saying that the members of the Pension Claims Committee wanted an increase.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I hate to interrupt the hon. senior member for the City, but perhaps unwittingly he is conveying the impression that these people are for the first time being remunerated. From the time old age pensions began to be paid, the principle was established to pay the members of the Pensions Claims Committee. All that has been done now is to increase the remuneration on the grounds that since August everything has gone up. The rates in 1951 should be higher eleven years later, and there has been no revision of the rates paid for eleven years. But the principle for payment was already there.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sorry if I should convey that impression. The principle for payment is there, but the Premier has by his own admission in his speech said that we have a slender budget. This is only \$960. I am not suggesting that you should refuse this. You can go along with this to establish the confidence of people in the country, and when I come to deal with the Premier's speech, I am going to deal with that. You must show that you can get people to serve on these Boards; it does not matter whether it was a Conservative or Labour Government which established it. There are people willing to serve on all these Boards and I am surprised to hear the note read by the Premier. I do not want to call names again because I know there are in some of these areas Rectors who would do this. You are doing a social service, because you tax people to help to repair their houses; so why can't these people sit on a Board once a week?

Mr. HUSBANDS: I do not think anything I said involved any Rector in this Island.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The majority of these Boards have Rectors on them, but as far as I am concerned, I would abolish the members of that Board. The members who serve in the Local Government on various Committees will tell you that they serve without being paid one cent and they sit possibly every day in every week; so the note from the Postmaster saying that some of the members asked for this increase is absolute nonsense.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I did not want to enter this debate, but if and when honest and decent-minded people read this thing in the papers tomorrow concerning the remarks made relative to the remuneration of these officers, the right type of person would not accept it. It does not sound good at all; it is a disgrace. Here it is: you have people willing to serve on a Board. There are some people who may want an increase, and there are others who will serve on an honorary basis. The ones who want to do it on an honorary basis are not supposed to draw the remunerations and the ones who are not in a position and do not feel to leave it will draw it, because these people have to buy their motor cars and they have to pay taxes and do other things, and if they ask for a slight increase in remuneration - at least I would call it travelling allowance - you cannot be vexed with them.

Now there are some people who can do everything in this world for nothing, but there are others who cannot. But do not let us fool ourselves; the ones who can do it for nothing have somebody else to pay for it. It is being paid for in some way or in some form or fashion, and when these people read this in the paper, those who have not been out of their way to ask for an increase and knowing that they are members of a Pension Claims Committee in some parish or other will resign, because nobody will know who is who. I may be a member in St. Joseph, but I do not draw a cent at all nor have I asked for anything; but the people in St. Lucy reading the paper will feel that the member for St. Joseph is one of them too. The Government should write to these people asking them if they are willing to serve honorarily; those who say "yes" will remain and those who say "no" will go, and we will look for other members to put on the Board.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like too much freeness; so do not expect all these people to give their services for nothing when they have to pay taxes. It is not fair to me having to pay taxes and giving all of my services for nothing while my brother on my right has to pay his taxes but is getting paid for his services. Some member went so far as to say in a *sotto voce* remark that the Rectors want more money than anybody else; but they have to live; they have to pay their debts and they have to pay for everything; so it does not sound good. The Minister made it clear that they were not increasing the remuneration in the same way that they were increasing the pension, but I understand from the Minister that these things were asked for long ago. It is not a matter that you are increasing the pensions and increasing the remuneration of the Committee as well. I would say that a man ought not to be ashamed to pay his bills, and if he uses for the year five gallons of gasoline, he has to pay for it; therefore you should not expect him to pull his pocket to buy gasoline to perform this service for nothing. As I have said, Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of people who can do things for nothing, but while they are doing them for nothing, somebody else has to pay for them.
1.55 p.m.

Mr. LYNCH: I think the last hon. member who spoke may well re-orientate his thinking when he gets into what is known as the Municipal area. This is an area where much voluntary service is done. I can tell the hon. member that not one of us have drawn one cent for travelling allowance although the money is there for the drawing, and it does show that there are people still willing to give voluntary service.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am not going to let the hon. member get away with any-

thing. They are members who live in the City; therefore when they drive from their homes to the City Council, how can they expect to draw travelling allowance? The hon. member lives in Roebuck Street and if he goes to the City Council and ask for travelling allowance, he should be locked up. He does not live half a mile away. I am talking of those members who have to drive ten to twelve miles to get there.

Mr. LYNCH: Sir, half mile everyday for a period of years would swell it to something. What I am saying is that none of us in the City Council draws travelling allowance. This request for increase in remuneration in my opinion is ill-timed because if the Means Test is raised, fewer people would qualify, therefore there would be less work and, if that is so, why should people on these Pension Claims Committees get more money for less work?

The question that Clause 4 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 5 was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Session be now suspended for three quarters of an hour.

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

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

2.04 p.m.

On resumption:

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I observe that there is no quorum and I ask that the Bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to revert to Government Business.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, I notice that at this stage you are reverting to Government Business, but this is a stage when you do not revert to Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: Am I to understand that the hon. junior member for St. George is objecting to leave being granted?
2.55 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, since there seems to be an objection to the granting of leave, I am asking leave to withdraw my request for leave for the reversion to Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: Under Private Members' Business.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: No, Sir, I am moving that we revert to Government Business and that Order No. 2 be the next Order of the day under that Head.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I do not know that it is correct that by a motion you can change the Standing Orders of the House when we are in the time for Private Members' Business.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. member was present this morning when we suspended Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14 and 18 of this House. Perhaps the hon. member was not then in his place.

Mr. MILLER: I did not know that; I heard it from the Hon. Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will remember that we are not now in Committee.

Mr. MILLER: I am asking your permission to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: Three Standing Orders were suspended this morning; they were Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14 and 18. Now a motion has been made that Order No. 2 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. MILLER: If the suspension of these Standing Orders took place this morning, then there was no need for a motion. I certainly did not understand that we were suspending Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is what has actually happened, and also all the items under Government Business have been exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5 with the result that we can go on with Government Business however controversial it may be, until whatever hour the House sees fit to go on tonight.

Mr. MILLER: I understand that the Hon. Leader of the House is desirous of getting through with these Estimates, but honestly when these Standing Orders were suspended this morning I did not know that we had suspended the Standing Order in relation to Private Members' Business. That being so, it would not be in order for me to make a new request.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day under Government Business will be Order No. 6.

Mr. MILLER: I understand Your Honour to say that we have suspended the Standing Orders in relation to Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: We suspended not merely Standing Order No. 5 but all the relevant Standing Orders so that Government Business might be proceeded with from the beginning to the end of this day's Session, even including the time for the suspension of the sitting.

Mr. MILLER: I hate to resist any ruling which Your Honour gave on this matter, but you must pardon me. The Hon. Leader of the House suspended the Standing Orders so that we could proceed with today's Government Business; but we can proceed with Private Members' Business next Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, and I do not think that the hon. member will allow the matter to go unchallenged as he did today.

The question that Order No. 2 under Government Business be taken as the next Order of the Day was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: When the debate on this Appropriation Bill was adjourned on the last occasion, it was adjourned on the motion of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, seconded by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. The hon. junior member for Christ Church is now entitled to resume his speech if he feels so disposed to do, but it is entirely optional for him if he wants to resume his speech. It was on his motion that the further consideration of this Bill was postponed.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking now. I want to say at the beginning that when we came in here this morning at 10 o'clock, little did Your Honour or I think that I would be speaking at 2 o'clock p.m. on the Estimates, although you did ask me if I would speak. It is really after 2 o'clock and we are now resuming the debate on the Estimates for the current year. Last week the Hon. Premier gave us some picture of the financial position of the island

as it stands today and he also presented the Budget at least in a new form which takes out the Capital Expenditure proposed for this year to be dealt with between now and the end of June. He has brought in an Appropriation Bill for the current expenditure of the island for a year. That is not unexpected because in the past when the Premier was in the Opposition, he had always asked the Government to produce the Budget in that form. Now that it falls to his lot to introduce the Budget for these three years, he has taken the opportunity of changing the position right away. I commend him for that because, as he has explained, in three months' time we will be in a better position to assess the finances of the Island in respect of our crop which is the main source of our income, and the balance of revenue you would have after all of our bills have been paid.

In the past we have always had to estimate, and we have had experiences over the last ten years of the Government budgeting for a surplus of say, \$200,000, and ending up with a surplus of \$2 million or \$3 million.
3.05 p.m.

I agree with the Hon. Premier that when we look back over the last ten years the taxpayers and people of this island have been overtaxed to the tune of \$15 million. Some of us would say that it must have been a good thing in the past, because at least today we have these balances to fall back on. That is not good budgeting, and it is not my way of thinking, because you have been extracting out of the economy of this Island \$2 1/2 million more than you intended, money that could have been put to good productive use to help strengthen the economy; but instead it has been extracted and withdrawn from circulation and sent overseas in investments, and we are now at the point of realisation that over the last three years the economy of this Island has not moved forward one iota. To me that is a dark spot on the future of Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, we were given a White Paper in the latter part of last year when the last Government introduced a Five Year Plan of Development and taxation, and it was there for all of us to see without going back three years that the economy had not kept pace with other things in the Island. Well, we are just living off that; and unless this Government can inject into the economy of this Island some new force, some new capital by way of directing it here, it will be a sad plight for us in the years to come. I believe I can speak if not with authority with wisdom that this is going to be the first year that we are going to see a reduction in terms of income tax. It has not been so in the past, but it is so now. Our expenses in this Island have been rising and unless we can produce more, the two come together eventually, and you have less with which to keep this Island going.

I know that the Hon. Premier is worried when he is faced with the plight that the reserves which we had just a few months ago, not a year ago, in the Equalisation Fund - \$7 million - have been used up because the last Government lost its opportunity to raise capital when they should have done it at the outset of the development of the Deep Water Harbour. I was a member, Mr. Speaker, of the Committee which sat on the efficacy of the Deep Water Harbour. The hon. senior member for St. Peter was Chairman, and in those days we were told from the Colonial Office that funds could have been raised at 4 1/2%, and it was based on that interest that we went into this project. The Government was warned, if not by members of the House, by, I am sure, people from overseas that the demand of capital throughout the world was so great that the interest rates were rising. Do not think that the interest rates have been put up for Barbados or even for the West Indies alone; there is a world demand for capital for development, from India right around the world, and in large sums. Well, there is a limit, because what is capital but savings? This has been in great demand; and today we see that the interest rates throughout the world, even in America, are very high, and in England and in the sterling area it is 7 1/2%; but we lost that opportunity of making our loans available for the development of the Deep Water Harbour. We could not raise it at 7 1/2%, and we had no alternative but to revert to our hidden ba-

lances in the Equalisation Fund and other sources, and today the new Government is faced with the situation that the balances we have had in the past have been used up. They have not been wasted, and I do not wish to alarm anyone, whether he is in the Island or outside, that the financial position in Barbados is such that he should not bring money here.

Mr. Speaker, I am not an alarmist, and I am coming to the point where I would exhort the Premier to realise that it is only a phase, because we have seen the bank rate reduced three times in recent months, and it seems as if it is declining. I can only hope that this decline will continue, because, as I heard over the radio a couple of nights ago, there is a return of confidence in the pound sterling in England and that will influence the bank rate in future. The Hon. Premier is about to raise a loan now; he said he would have to raise a loan from some source, and it is his duty to see that the interest rates are as small as he possibly can achieve, because it will be an added burden to finance the loans if the interest rates are kept high. He is now faced with this Budget of Expenditure, let alone the capital expenditure, that will have to be found for the year, and a deficit of almost \$2 million. We in Barbados who are not accustomed to budgeting on the deficit side are apt to shudder and think that things are bad. I know it is his duty at all times to see from what source revenue can be achieved, because you cannot budget in a deficit way for any length of time; you have to pay your bills. I do feel that the finances of this Island are still healthy enough to prevent him from running into a policy of taxation that will do more harm to the economy of this Island. The cost of living is already high in Barbados, and for that reason I am warning the Premier that he should not attempt to increase duty on people or on products that are essential; and when I say essential, with the increased standard of living today, it does not mean purely food.

When Mr. Jacobs made his Report to the Government in the latter part of last year on the new rates for the Civil Service, he had a look at the finances of this Island. 3.15 p.m.

Sir, the resources that were there at that time were such that Mr. Jacobs came to the conclusion that this Island could afford \$2 million or \$3 million in increases of salaries to the Civil Servants because he was not told then by the Government that that money was needed for temporary advances to the Deep Water Harbour. That is where they must have gone wrong. There must have been the information that they could not have raised the loan at interest rate of 7 1/2% and they must have needed this money, because in a matter of months they used it all up. They used up \$7 million out of one Fund.

This is what Mr. Jacobs said as regards the state of Government's finances as he saw it at the latter part of last year:

"Financial considerations call for a closer look than economic ones. There is first of all the question of the money that the Government has at its disposal which could immediately be used to meet the cost of the revision of the current year. This question in turn has to be considered in the light of the reserves that the Government has that might be required if there should be a shortfall in the revenue or an unavoidable excess on the estimated expenditure - any such difficulty would of course be accentuated by an increased salaries bill."

He went on to say -

"I have also carefully considered whether I should examine the amount of reserves in relation to the Government's Development Plan and I have concluded that I should not."

He meant to say that that was a matter for the Government but he was going to look at the reserves which they had here in relation to the salaries. He goes on to say:-

"I have indicated earlier that I do not think it is really open to the Government to offset shortfalls from expectations as regards borrowing by curtailing salary increases that are essential and I assume that the Government will be able to raise the loan required to meet commitments already entered into in respect of Capital expenditure under the Development Plan, including advances for the Deep Water Harbour made from the reserves."

This is what he has done. He presumes that the Government has made arrangements to finance the Capital Development Plan, and even what they have been committed to under the Deep Water Harbour; therefore, when he came to these fat reserves he felt that he could use them up.

Mr. Speaker, the increased salary bill of \$2 million or \$3 million is money which would be spent in this Island. It would be spent here: therefore, the Government would be getting quite a large share of it in income tax; therefore, they will be getting back some good part of it. That has gone by, and it is the Premier's job to say that we have been satisfied that the increases are liberal and it is for him to see that the administration does a good job. It is also for him to see that the Civil Servants pull their weight and that the Heads do not ask for personnel when the work can be done with the existing personnel. Let them be satisfied that in the context of Barbados we have privileged and well paid Civil Servants. I know from my experience in Bridgetown that many Civil Servants are drawing salaries far above what executives in Bridgetown are drawing, and there are privileges attached to them which are not attached to the ones in Bridgetown. The Government has been faced with that and it is now up to the present Government to see that they get their return in good work and efficiency and not what we hear of today. This stampede at four o'clock should cease: and if that is done and all the other things remedied, they would have the backing of the entire Island.

I do believe that people should be well paid for what they do; but we also have to think that if all the money is to be spent in one direction, we would not be able to do enough for the underprivileged, and that is what we have been sent here to look after.

Now, I come to another thing which we have to keep in our minds' eye continually, not only at Budget time, but all time: and it is that the backbone of the economy of this Island is still the sugar industry, no matter how hard we have been trying over the last few years to diversify the economy and encourage other people to bring in new industries.

The economy of this Island is still the sugar industry and this year the agricultural estimate is 170,000 tons of sugar. Of that 170,000 tons of sugar, 131,000 tons will enjoy the bounty from the British Government at a very remunerative price. Ten thousand tons will be sold on the local domestic market at a reasonably good price which would equate that given by the British Government. But when we come to 29,000 tons which would be sold on the World Market and, Mr. Speaker, today World Market prices for sugar is in the vicinity of \$105 per ton whereas we are going to get between \$250 and \$260 a ton for that sold to the British Government. That 29,000 tons, if and when sold at that rate, is going to pull down the overall structure of the 170,000 tons of sugar. We were hoping two years ago after the Cuba-American incident that the American Government would have given the West Indies a quota for some of their sugar and at prices that they were giving Cuba. If we had achieved that, this 29,000 tons of sugar could have been sold in the American market at prices relating to what we are getting from the United Kingdom Government and we would be in a very happy position indeed. The Government, the plantation owner, the peasant proprietor and the worker would have all benefitted; but we are faced with this 29,000 tons of sugar this year having to be sold at what we call ridiculously low prices. You either take it or you keep the sugar here. 3.25 p.m.

That explains partly why the plantation or factories today have to reduce the first payment on canes to \$14 per

ton because they do not know what they are getting for that \$29,000 tons of sugar. They will have the same wages they pay on the 10,000 tons consumed here as on the 131,000 tons which is going to the free market. If you can find some other agricultural crop to take the place of sugar to the tune of 29,000 tons at the same economic price of the 131,000 tons, it would be the Government's duty to insist that this is done. If we could grow coconuts to produce the equivalent of 29,000 tons of sugar at \$250 a ton, it would be the Premier's duty to insist that that be done. These are facts with which we are faced and it is what the people should understand. People often jump off on the fact that this is only money to be thrown away; we want to continue to pay our way as we have been doing all along, because if there is one independence that Barbadians know of, it is economic independence, but let us think of the other independence we have. When you can pay your way you are independent; but when you have to ask the British Government to help you to finance your Government expenses, then you lose your independence.

There are still many people in Barbados who have great faith in the future of this Island. We have heard about flights of capital because there are some people who do not integrate into the life and economy of this island to the extent they should do. They only see the surface; they see a few little shadows around the area and they take fright. Our people in Barbados, however, seem to be made of sterner stuff than that and I am sure that we will live through this period. With the dynamic leadership of the new Government - I used the Premier's words - we can find something to replace that part of the sugar industry which is unprofitable; and even if we have to give over some of our line of projects which are more economic, we shall do so, although in Barbados it has been said for generations that all Barbadians are agriculturalists at heart, first, second and third.

The hon. Premier also touched on the question of rum and he gave a note of advice to the rum industry and those who control the rum industry in the matter of promoting more actively our rum in the overseas market. This is nothing new. Many of our visitors agree with us that Barbados rum is far superior to anything else you get around the West Indies. The mere fact that we can ship our rum from Canada back to Australia and New Zealand as we are doing today, testifies to the fact that our matured rum stands up and is likened to brandy. Of course, it must be aged and properly blended; then it has to be properly distilled; but I agree that a greater effort in the outside world should be made to promote Barbados rum. I remember that about ten or twelve years ago, just after hostilities came to an end, we were enjoying a good market in the outside world and we were flooded by mushroom businessmen to export rum; people who had never bottled rum before came into the market. They got the rum straight from the still, bottled it and sent it up to America. They killed themselves and they also helped to kill the industry. They sent up rum which should never have been exported.

I think that one of the members of my family was instrumental in trying to form an association so as to prevent that sort of thing from taking place. There was to be a Certificate of Age before rum is allowed to go out of the island for export, but that fell through. These mushroom liquor dealers also fell through, because the market became flooded and they went out of business leaving those who are only rum dealers. I would like to tell the Premier that the cost of advertising anything in any of these countries or to sell rum runs into money. To put an advertisement campaign in London today, the cost of doing that would run into the vicinity of \$1 million and you do not expect to get results in the first year either. You must have an intensive promotional scheme and we do not know what would be the result even after that. All of that has been thought out; we have estimates as to the advertising costs of our products in the big countries and that runs into a lot of money; but if any help can be given to the export trade of the rum industry, that is in the interest not only of those who participate in it but in the interest of the Government as well. It is for the Government to call in the Rum Committee and let them put up

proposals as to how best this matter can be handled. 3.35 p.m.

I do not know if the Premier knows that today there are producing rum in Canada. They are distilling rum in Canada from molasses, not from the British Caribbean area, but from wherever they can get it cheaper; so they are now competing with us. They actually have a Canadian brand of rum called "Bridgetown", because they have a Bridgetown in one of their maritime provinces. Well, you can draw your conclusions. We used to hear of the Japanese manufacturing goods and labelling them "Birmingham", and they named a town "Birmingham" for that purpose; but the Canadians happen to have a Bridgetown and they have a Canadian Bridgetown rum being sold in Canada. That goes to show the problems we are up against when we think we have a good market for Barbados rum in Canada. They are paying domestic excise duties whereas we have to pay an outside tariff. When you know these things, you think again and you do not say the things that you would otherwise have said.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the Premier's proposals and I am glad to know that he is interested in the export trade. He mentioned rum, but I know it is not only from that export trade that we get dollars with which to buy the things we need which we do not produce. From the increase to Civil Servants we can get back some income tax, but we cannot do that forever; it is the outside dollars that we need just as much. The other fellow wants to get our dollars or pounds from us. The Premier has been keeping a watchful eye on some of the recurrent costs in Barbados; it is his duty and I am glad to see that an attempt has been made to ask the Transport Board to put their house in order. We are not a wealthy nation and we know that in some parts of the world transport has to be subsidised. We are prepared to do that, but there is also a form of subsidisation by way of gasoline tax which they are getting along with the private concessionaires, and with these new buses which they have got, they have no right coming here year after year and telling us that they want another \$150,000 and that next year they would not come for it. When the time comes, they will say they meant the following year. You have to call a halt somewhere. They can put their administrative ability alongside that of the private concessionaires and see how they come out. We warned the last Government about that, but we never realised that it would have snowballed so quickly and so fast.

Mr. Speaker, if this is permitted to go on, it will only be a matter of time when they will come here for an increase. It will not be \$150,000, it will be \$250,000; and it will go on until we get into the millions and we will have to say what we said with the railways - "no can do". I have been through the Estimates of revenue rather carefully and I think that they are Estimates on existing rates both of customs and others and cannot be expected to exceed this amount. But I think that what we miss from the Premier's speech more than anything else was something to tell us about the happenings and the expected profits from the Deep Water Harbour.

The Deep Water Harbour, Mr. Speaker, has cost the taxpayers of this Island \$31 million. It is a service and we have seen the benefits already to the community; but surely nobody in Government can spend \$31 million and not expect to get revenue to at least not only service the loan, but, if possible, put something into the till to relieve taxation at a future date. We have spent \$31 million and I can only say that we have seen visually that there seems to be an increase in freight coming into the Island; there is a quicker turn around of ships; and I would like to ask if Government or anybody else has taken up the matter at conference level with steamship companies which put a surtax on us a couple of years ago when they claimed that the ships could not be turned around fast enough in Barbados because of poor workmanship. That could not apply today. A ship gets away from there now in a matter of hours; therefore that has been put on us as a burden and the consumers are paying for it through increased rates. I want to know if anybody has taken up the matter at conference level to have the surcharge which was put on us taken off.

It is true, Sir, that the Harbour has not been operating a year yet, but it is nine months and I would like to know what are the indications. What are we going to get out of the Harbour by way of a profit so as to service the loan of \$31 million? I would like to know also - I have seen no figures whatever - what is the expected revenue from the bunkering of ships that started to take place there two months ago. You cannot prevent a politician from hearing things. I understand it has only just begun, and for 15 days in this month they have delivered 60,000 barrels of fuel oil to ships at the Harbour. I know the Government is getting royalties - I am not trying to pull anything out of you - but I want to know what are the sources of revenue that we can expect and what are the estimated amounts we can look forward to from the expenditure of \$31 million. They are savings and they have to go to the entire community. If we have just started bunkering ships - and only a few little ones come here - and we can put in 60,000 barrels in 15 days, if this is properly handled and if my figures are right, I can anticipate from bunkering alone - I would not say in the very near future, but within a couple of years - that should bring us \$1 million as a result of the bunkering facilities in Barbados, something that we could not have had without the expenditure of \$31 million. I am only posing this because I do know that when the Minister gets up to reply, he will furnish us with some statement.

3.45 p.m.

Sir, we have discussed it at length and I am pleased to see, although our financial position at this stage is not as happy as in the latter part of last year when we discussed it, that we are able to increase the old age pension to \$2.40. I say no more but that we have fought for that for a long time. It was a promise not only of the Government Party but of our Party that that would have been instituted at the earliest possible date. I am glad that this increase takes place from the 1st April next. If the Party to which I belong had been placed in the position of members of the present Government, we would have done it too because we feel that this increase could be afforded with our reserves. Those of us who are in Local Government and who have to administer Public Assistance in this metropolitan area know only too well that that pittance of \$2.40 a week means very much to those old people - and not only to them but to their relatives because, were it not for that, their relatives would have to pull their pockets more.

Although my colleague on my left has said that the Means Test has been raised to \$5.00 - and I agree that \$4.00 is far too near - I still feel that it could be calculated. When Ministers come in here with these things, they should be able to tell us what it is going to cost and that is what I hope the Hon. Minister of Social Services would have been able to tell us today. It is true that the Resolution for the amount would come in next week and by that we would be able to find out what the cost is.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I remember standing here last Tuesday and stating that the increase in old age pension would amount to \$130,000 a year.

Mr. GODDARD: I thank the Hon. Minister very much. It is not a matter of criticism, but it is what we expect from you when you bring in Resolutions or Bills which have financial implications.

A lot of play has been made from time to time about Local Government and that is going to have a bearing on the finances of this Island; therefore, the Premier may just as well know it. Local Government takes money to run it. For the 15 years which I have been in Local Government, I have never seen in any one year that the expenditure was less than that of the previous year. It goes forward. These are things which we have to face and this year would be no exception; therefore it should not come as a shock to the Government, to members of this House, or to taxpayers when I say that we of the City Council are trying to cut out unnecessary expenditure wherever it may be or even to hold it down. But as a result of the revision of salaries of Government servants, as a natural corollary you have to pass

on an increase to members of the Local Government and we will be faced at Local Government level with giving an increase to our employees although we may not be able to give such handsome increases as were handed out last year to the Civil Servants. However, we will have to do it and the money would have to be found for doing it. As every hon. member knows, we have only two sources of revenue, one being trade tax which is now fixed by law. The maximum of that is 18.5% and the next source is tax on local property rates and in St. Michael the rateable value is in the vicinity of \$4 1/2 million.

We have to find the increased amount so as to carry on the Municipality of Bridgetown for another year. It is therefore, Mr. Premier, your concern because it is under your portfolio which deals with the financing of this Island.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the hon. member cannot address his remarks to the Hon. Premier.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, it is through you that I address all members of this Chamber. I am saying that it is the Premier's responsibility. The finances of this Island either at Local Government level or at Central Government level are the Premier's responsibility; therefore it is for him to take note of our finances and the means for raising revenue.

At this stage, I only want to say that by last year's Budget, it would be a considerable sum more to be found this year to carry on Local Government. It will be increased considerably by the increase in salaries alone. I do not know the figures, but I know that it will be over and above what it was last year plus the improvements promised to the citizens of Bridgetown as regards street lighting and other things. If the Local Government trade tax is 18 1/2% and it cannot be increased save by a Bill passed in this House, the entire increases with which we are faced will fall on property owners in the municipality. That would be a burden which they can hardly bear. It is for the Minister of Finance to pay some measure of attention to that because in getting to the revenue he would be involved. If the trade tax is to be increased, and it can only be increased from his Ministry, it would mean that a greater reduction would have to come out of his company tax revenue because trade tax and property tax are a first charge and expense on a business.

The Northern and Southern District Councils will similarly be faced and they will have to face the realities of having to increase taxation when they come to it.

I do not know what is the Government's intention although the Hon. Premier has said that he is going to be very strict on supplementary Resolutions coming to this House. I am not one of those who feel that Local Government can be abolished. It just cannot be abolished. You can turn it into a Government Department but it would cost more money and people would get less service. Local Government looks after the needs of the underprivileged, and by its administration you select from among those people the people whom you think can best serve.

3.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I wish again to commend the Hon. Premier for the manner in which he has introduced the Appropriation Bill, and we will look forward with even more interest to the introduction between now and June of his Estimates in relation to Capital Expenditure. He will then have had an opportunity of hearing what hon. members have to say today, he will have the reaction of the public and a re-assessment of the trade finances of the island so that he can make a sound analysis of what he intends to do and where we are going in the next two or three years. This is the Premier's first opportunity. I know that he has courage, but he needs that courage today because we are at the crossroads. This island needs an infusion of something more than what we have been getting in the past if we are going forward to a new era and greater prosperity.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, we have reached the time here where we are back to the Estimates. I would like to

begin by saying that a number of things have happened since we left the Ministry in December, 1961. As I recollect, the Estimates were at the Committee stage then. I have a printed copy of the Estimates with a number of amendments and reductions which may amount to \$3 million and it is possible that these amendments could have been done before the Estimates were sent to the Printery. Of course, I have had nothing to do with the matter since then and I cannot imagine what problems and difficulties the present Government might have had, Sir, you cannot think today in terms of twelve months a year, and what we have got in the Capital Estimates is approximately \$2 million - and that is more or less for the purpose of continuing existing services for the next three months.

The Estimates generally continue the operation of the various Departments of Government. I was at pains to listen to the Premier; I have heard him on a number of occasions laying down his economic theories and I was quite determined on this occasion to hear everything he had to say, to study his mannerisms and gesticulations, and there were occasions when my desire for a cigarette took me out of the Chamber. However, I wanted to be very careful in hearing everything the Premier had to say on these Estimates. I must say that the speech of the Hon. Premier leaves us somewhat frightful as to the general attitude towards the presentation of the Estimates; it was covered with fear, if not with dismay. I can see his anxiety; when he gets into the Government and finds that there is a quarter million dollars, that must have been a great thing for a newcomer who had no experience in dealing with Ministries. I think that he is rather bold in making the changes as expressed here. He has promised us that in the next three months we will have something of a Plan and my own imagination leads me to think that he is thinking in terms of a Three Year Plan. The Estimates were more or less the second phase of the Five Year Plan and there has been a considerable change in these Estimates as amended by the Hon. Premier.

In our Five Year Plan we had planned spending the sum of \$53 million over the next five years in order to carry out the various programmes, but for some reason or other the Plan has not been our own. We thought it advisable to get some advice from a specialist in his particular field and we got hold of Mr. George Cadbury. I should like to say how it was that Mr. Cadbury came to Barbados. I was on a mission of Government studying administration and equipment and I met Dr. Lee of Beth Israel who was the Director General of that institution, and after spending two hours in the Department we relaxed with a cup of coffee and it was there that I discovered that Mr. Cadbury had completed his term of service in Jamaica and a wedding was being arranged for Mr. Cadbury's daughter. When I got the signal that Premier Cummins was coming in, I got a cable to remain in London with him to attend the Conference from which we are now benefiting, that is, complete internal self-government. I journeyed on the train to meet the Premier and I remember that my first request was to get a cable to the Doctor in Boston asking him to get in touch with Mr. Cadbury. We had a cable from Mr. Cadbury to the effect that he would be willing to meet us. He presented his identification card as a Trade Unionist when he was rather a young man, and we knew of his connection with the Socialist Party and the Fabian Society of the United Kingdom. It was at the United Nations that Mr. Cadbury had lunch for us and we discussed the matter. We were told that he was third in the line of economists, and when he accepted the request to go to Jamaica it was because he was desirous of helping Mr. Manley; but his company objected because they thought he was too big in outlook and his effort to serve a population of 1 1/2 million people would be wasted. I think I am correct in saying he will be serving India with a population of 400 million. The United Nations would not be expected to release Mr. Cadbury to Barbados to deal with a 1/4 million people but he was desirous of helping the community wherever possible and he decided to give us a little of his time in Barbados. He agreed that he would be given a place in which to live and a car to take him to the Ministerial Buildings and back.

4.05 p.m.

He got no compensation for his time, though he gave up three months of his vacation, and we requested him to assist us in the Five Year Plan. The Plan is with the hon. member and I believe he has had an opportunity to read it. For good reasons, I believe, the Premier has decided that he would abandon Mr. George Cadbury's recommendations in the Five Year Plan, and the utilisation of \$53 million, and we were assured before he left the Island that that money would be available.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Estimates we have been looking forward to, fails to pump into our community life the vitality and inspiration necessary to make it possible. You must agree, Sir, that the Premier has been up against a number of things, and the member is in constant fear of the finances, when in truth and in fact the country was never in any danger for funds. Before the Harbour was started, the money necessary for its construction was more or less agreed on with the Crown Agents, and you will remember that some two or three years ago it was necessary to have careful timing and planning to apply for a loan. I do not remember how much we wanted, but I think it was some \$2 1/2 million, and in less than five minutes of the request from the Barbados Government, that amount of money was over-subscribed on the London Market.

You have heard the hon. junior member for Christ Church, Mr. Speaker, on this matter of financing and timing. You are aware that there has been a change in the last three years where the Bank Rate has been going up and down at a sharp rate; so it was a question of raising the funds to meet our commitments, and we had to use the General Revenue and Equalisation Funds to offset the requirements until it was appropriate for the Government of Barbados to make demands on the London Market for a loan. We are not in any trouble, and I fear that to some extent the discussions in the House on the Estimates will go abroad that will hurt our good name when you think in terms of loans and assistance.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what would more or less persuade the Premier to feel that he was a prophet of gloom, and it was at that stage that I myself was a bit afraid. I remember he lifted his head in the direction of the sky, his eyes narrowed to slits as though there was one quick meditation. I believe, Sir, that these are normal and natural habits and I believe I am correct in saying that it is customary for man to resort to prayer if he is at all in trouble. What probably has been operating in his mind that would have caused the sudden change in his attitude is seen in between pages 12 and 15 of this documented speech. There is so much to be said on this that we could probably discuss this for weeks and hours. His fears are expressed over the use of the word "buoyant", but all over the world as long as you can keep afloat and keep above the water, whether it is rippling or not, it is a question of buoyancy and that has been the position with the Government of Barbados. I do not know that he should have any fear; he is probably thinking of the \$2 million; but what did shock me was his reason for committing what could only be regarded as a cardinal sin in budgetary policy when he indicated on my inquiry that there would be no budget speech, but subsequently said that there would be no increase in income tax and trade tax. Then, Sir, the bottom fell from all this.

I do not know if the Minister understands what is taking place. I do not know if he is aware of the number of overseas telephone calls which are taking place since that statement has been made. I am sorry the hon. junior member for Christ Church is not in his seat; but I do not know why the Premier felt it necessary to appease that element of the society when he said he was hoping they would go to sleep with some ease and relief of mind that there would be no increase in income tax. The point is that in budgetary control and economic planning - I am thinking probably of some time between the two world wars not so long ago - in the United Kingdom it was accepted that poverty and unemployment were inevitable in almost any community, and that was almost fostered by the idea of the conservative outlook with its powerful ally in capitalisation, although, Sir, in the wealthier classes it was felt that the crumbs from the

table would be enough to provide mercy and solace. Poverty was accepted as a condition and a way of life. Things have been changing and modern Government particularly with a socialist outlook at home can realise it.

Mr. Speaker, industry is vital and important. Now the hon. senior member for St. Peter said a good deal on this. You will remember that the first six Trade Unionists in the United Kingdom were banished from that country. I think two or three of them scrambled back in the country but it took a long time, because it was accepted by the then Government that poverty and unemployment were not only used as a weapon but as a condition of life. I am at a loss, Sir, as to why the Premier thought it necessary to release what is indeed the big secret of the budget. Industry and commerce have found open avenues with the Trade Union, and in latter years the United Kingdom Government accepted the authority of a Labour Department. In Barbados we have such a Department. But what is of more concern is the country's resources. I am not thinking only of the physical resources, for instance, your coal as in the United Kingdom, natural gas, water, electricity and what have you, but manpower resources, and that is where Government must feel the need. What is wrong with making a closer check to see if it is possible for the companies tax to stand a further increase of 5%? What is the position with some element of the companies tax that could probably stand 10% or 15% in excess profits?

Mr. Speaker, you have to cover your deficit and your planning for the next three years, and in another three months you may come to us and require a further \$3 million deficit; but surely you are not going to look to overseas loans for all of this although it is within the reach of the present Government. Why should we not look to the possibility of excess profits tax? What are we worrying about if it is available? That can be told to you by the Income Tax Department where you can discover the general increase and the overall increase in companies tax. Again, in income tax, something can be done in the higher brackets, and we can bring some sort of relief in the lower brackets, particularly to men and women earners who are more or less taking care of education, overseas and otherwise, for their children.

4.15 p.m.

If the Hon. Minister of Finance is thinking of getting in another \$2 million, I think it must be levied on Customs. It must be levied on food rather than tobacco. That change must offset his appeal for higher productivity. There is nothing wrong in that, but you want to stimulate, interest and enthuse; and I am not sure at all from the Estimates if you read them that you can find the vitality and enthusiasm that are necessary to take you over the year. In another two or three months according to what the Hon. Premier has said, he is going to present his Plan. However, if you go through these Estimates, there is much to express his fear. Although he is particularly keen in using the pruning knife, the language which he used showed the fear which he expressed.

Now, Sir, if you look on page five of the Hon. Premier's speech you will see this:

"In the year 1955, the people of Barbados were over-taxed."

That was repeated here today by the Conservative Party and I presume that is how they would always look at it. Someone would say that, because this sentence falls from the lips of the Hon. Premier, it is true; but we have reached the stage of our history when we can look back to 1955 and see the trend. That was a time when the former Government mastered the ship of state. We answered the pre-determined course of prosperity. That is all in history. You cannot deny it in Parliament. Although 1955-56 was what you may call a prosperous year in which you were, as it were, riding through, it was not until you put into effect the Pay-As-You-Earn Scheme that we were in a position to bring in thousands and millions of dollars into the Treasury. The Hon. Premier knows this. Were it not for that, we could not have collected as we have done by way of income tax: and even if

it is regarded that we had overtaxed the people then, it is fortunate for us now because the Minister of Finance will have something to fall back on.

You cannot say that the former Government did not move this country on to prosperity. You just have to look around into the building industry and you will see that in every village concrete houses have been built up. If you look at the number of concrete bungalows which have gone up all over the Island, you are bound to say that this country has enjoyed a period of prosperity.

The Minister of Finance knows that with the revenue to be derived from one item alone, as a result of the coming into operation of the Deep Water Harbour, it would provide a yield of about \$1 million per annum so that even if your Harbour cost \$31 million, the revenue from that one item would bring in that amount in 31 years. I hope the Minister of Finance would take this in good faith. You should start something as was done in the United Kingdom where you collected a fee of, say 25 cents, on all motor vehicles entering the Port. I am sure you have seen it done all over the world. They do all of that if you must save posterity from carrying 50% or 80% of the loan. Why have I said that the Hon. Minister of Finance needs to have no fear? I said so because you do not cut for the sake of cutting; it can become false economy. I fear that within a year, the Premier would have some regrets of the number of things which he has taken out of the Budget. If posterity is to gain anything and if you have been working towards it, you would not come to a standstill; you must be in a position to move on and you must ask yourself some questions. Long before the Labour Party was discussed in Barbados, we had our assets set aside overseas, and the setting aside of such assets has provided goodwill for our country. That is why I can be so strong when I say that two years ago when we applied on the London Market for a loan it was over-subscribed in less than two minutes. That was so because of the goodwill of the country. As I have said, the setting aside of these assets was something done even before the Labour Party was discussed in Barbados; therefore, you must admit that it was the Conservative Government who saw to it that these investments should be made.

Mr. Speaker, I spent the whole night going through this speech by the Hon. Premier and I have been unable to really settle my mind about what is likely to happen in the ensuing year. As Your Honour knows, people like to be assured; but from this speech of the Hon. Premier, I think that you are apt to hurt your overseas investors. You want to attract investors here as has been so often said; therefore, you should do what is necessary to attract investors. It is all right to talk about industries and you can have a lot of industrial missions visiting you; but before an industrialist opens an industry anywhere he must settle first with you on a couple of points. He wants to be sure of a market for his products; he wants to be satisfied that skilled and semi-skilled labour is available - and in large numbers, among other things. It is only just earlier today that the Hon. Premier took time off in the debate on the increase of old age pension to scorch the previous Government.

4.25 p.m.

In his speech the Premier said that the Government was spending \$3 million in an Election year; obviously that is by no means correct. You will remember that the cost of living bonus was given prior to this, and we have always kept our figures down to salaries paid, say, in British Guiana and to some extent Trinidad; but with the specialised group where we fish in the common pool, there are occasions when we are expected to pay rates comparable even to those in Jamaica or in the United Kingdom. The specialists are in short supply and it is a question of getting the best out of your Department. However, when it comes to the rank and file of the Establishment, we were always close to British Guiana or Trinidad. On this occasion when the decision was taken, we were satisfied by the changing cost of living that it was difficult for people to live on the existing wages; all that was the promise made about a year before the Election. It was unfortunate, however, that we were delayed in getting the Commissioner to come into Barbados, and things followed such as what has been referred to by

the hon. junior member for Christ Church. When you have people who are serving the Government, you like to know that they are happy and I may say that you usually get the best out of inspiring confidence. If you think that a Head is not satisfied, you search other avenues in order to get away from what is tyranny even if it is expressed in words. The Premier must make a success or failure in his career. Again his speech was unfortunate in that he followed his majority and set on a criticism of the Civil Service. I think that if the Premier is unhappy about the Civil Service, it is apt to have an entirely different meaning from casual criticisms made, for instance, by the senior member of the Parliament. Like all Governments, you want to get the best. I am satisfied that you cannot stop individuals from having their feelings of loyalty, but the training of the Civil Service has been rigid, cold and hard, and it has been done by Englishmen who have served as Colonial Secretaries. I know that the Civil Servant of Barbados is concerned about his job; he might have a drink in his own home, but his responsibility to the Government matters. This is not a criticism of the Premier's attitude other than probably this is a case where, in his crucial moment, the best in man does not always come to the top.

There are a number of other items which are probably proper for discussion; for instance, the matter of the privileged people in the community for which there was no appeal for any increase in pay. The Premier spoke of the fat salaries of the former Ministers. He will always remember how much was said in the House and on platforms outside about the \$90 a month for the Travelling Allowance enjoyed by the Ministers. As it applies today, it was so years ago before we gave up the Government. It was said that the Civil Servants were enjoying better salaries than the Ministers; it was not a question of comparison, anyhow; it was just a question of what the Government decided that Ministers should be paid. If the Premier is worried about the finances of the country, that will go down the ladder and the country is bound to suffer; but there is absolutely no need for fear. Probably the Minister of Finance has certain plans to put forward, but even then there is no need for fear. If we are calling for a higher level of productivity and an increase in the standard of living, there are levels of living and levels of productivity; then there is the question to be settled, so to speak, in the hearts of the people in this country. There is a deficit of \$2 million in spite of the fact that the Premier must gather capital for the next nine months of the year which would probably be tied up in the Three Year Plan; however, I do not want to ask any questions about that.

On the question of salaries having regard to the cost of living, the country is not expecting the Minister of Finance to tighten any belt. This means little or no appeasement to the people; this is an indication that you are in trouble. I have served for five years in the Government when I was told about this colossal salary; I am glad that the Minister has realised the responsibility of a Ministry and what running it entails. It is not a question of what appears on paper or even what takes place in discussion; you will find that, as to your commitments to the country, you are in trouble to keep under a certain figure.

4.35 p.m.

I would like the Hon. Premier to think about the commitments made on him; I am not thinking of the people in his constituency, but what I would like to say is that there is no appeasement. As a matter of fact, it brings no solace to a country for you to tell it that you are not asking for increase of pay because of these reasons that you must pull in your belt in future. That is why I am worried. You do not want to cheesepare on efficiency for the things expressed in the columns, because it would invariably result in faults. I was brought up in this island by my father and I have some knowledge when I speak of this matter. To attempt to sacrifice efficiency is purely farcial; and you must think of what you do to yourself psychologically, and what you do to your staff and Heads of Departments. When you cut the non-recurrent things in a Department, something must take place. If you believe it is necessary and advisable to take off things in the first year, I would like to advise the Premier that the time will come when you will have supple-

mentaries, and this year you were at pains to say there will be no supplementaries. You are bound to run into trouble, and that is why I said that to read this carefully, it lacks the inspiration and vitality it takes to make your Service tick and make it glow and bubble; something will be passed on to the masses and it is bound to have its reaction generally.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, \$3 million is part of the second phase of the Five Year Programme. The Minister of Finance, the Premier, knows this Plan and can see the work in that Ministry done by Mr. Cadbury; and if the Premier is telling us that he will discard Cadbury, surely, Sir, it leaves us thinking anew. I think the world today demands people like Cadbury who serve with the United Nations, and who probably would enjoy a salary approximately equal to that of the Governor General of the Federation if he decided just to go back and be a Director of Cadbury Companies of his founding - Cadbury chocolates and what have you. But his interest is in people and I think, Sir, that that is the type of life that he wanted to live and to serve.

Returning to the question of the fiscal policy, I think that the Premier must have had some little qualms of conscience on reflection when he made the release on the companies tax. Why it was necessary I do not know, but certainly he has run his gauntlet further, and you can see he was worried about the psychological influence which activates the human breast, and therefore it was rather dramatic that he should say he considered it unpatriotic to take money out of the country. I take it he was worrying about money from the Insurance Companies which is now used as development money in as near as Trinidad which is 220 miles away from Barbados. I do not know to what extent and how much money is leaving this colony, but to say it is unpatriotic! I would like to tell the Hon. Premier that the United Kingdom found it necessary to provide legislation to curtail the money which was swarming across the Channel for investment on the Continent. I am not asking you to do what Jagan did in British Guiana; that is not necessary at all; but you do not ask the hard core Conservatives, who are not bound to have sympathy and love for people, to miss 1% in using \$1 million or \$2 million in Trinidad for the development of that country when that money was earned in the first place in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, if you have got to be ruthless, that is where you can be as hard as you like. I am not asking you to go to desperate extremes, but surely you can arrive at a means where the money collected by the Insurance Companies - and it represents millions going over the water every week or every month - should be used for development. It is bound up in Socialist philosophy, and I do not think I need remind you, Mr. Premier, of my feelings.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member address the Chair exclusively.

Mr. MILLER: With the greatest respect, I was thinking about Karl Marx again and the classic phrase "from each according to his ability to each according to his need"; and if your country knows that \$2 million or \$3 million are going overseas by cable or mail transfer by the Banks to develop other countries, you can get as ruthless as you want to be and you would earn the sympathy and respect of every man in this country. To talk glibly of it as being unpatriotic means nothing to the Conservative who is bent on profits. You can use half of 1% of the money that is going to Trinidad for development; and do not let us fool ourselves.....

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of order, does the hon. member mean "Conservative" or "capitalist", or is he confusing the terms?

Mr. MILLER: Conservatism, Sir, means you must have something to conserve, and Conservatives have a powerful ally in capitalists. Is the hon. member afraid or ashamed of the word being called? Certainly there are loyalties and I believe the hon. member is capable of feeling strongly on a matter particularly when it is a matter of conscience.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. junior member for the City speaking as a member of a Party which in this Chamber is known as the Barbados National Party?

Mr. MILLER: Sir, I would like to continue the discussion on this matter. So many things have been happening in the recent months that it is felt that the hon. member's Party is beginning to be an affiliated organisation of the Socialist Party. I do not know why you need to shed your colour. You can be loyal to something, and I am sure my friend the hon. junior member for the City will take no offence at my saying something that could be true.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member will continue with the Appropriation Bill and not the appropriating of names.

Mr. MILLER: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of order, all I wanted to point out to the hon. member was that in his ramblings he was getting confused in his terms, because I do not think that Conservatives are the only people who invest money. Surely he must have meant capitalists, and there is a difference.

Mr. MILLER: I can probably be rambling anywhere, but I think every living and thinking soul will understand conservatism. They probably believe in the philosophy of a Government that probably want to change their name every year; but a rose by any other name would smell exactly the same way. May I continue with your sweet permission, Mr. Speaker? I was just calling attention to the Hon. Premier's reference to "unpatriotic" as the sort of term we think of when there is a national spirit and something to fight for, and I am only hoping that he will examine this further, and for the development of our own country make use of the available funds earned by the Insurance Companies, money which is being used to develop other countries.

The Premier spoke of diminishing the gap between Estimates and Expenditure. That probably would be a beautiful dream because you would like to tighten the figures up, but if you want to leap - I think you are thinking of Glenn and making the orbit three times - you would require to do it 17 times if you must land on the soil of the United States; but you need a lot of vitality and energy and maybe another two pages in the Estimates in supplementaries today on the debate of the old age pensions. I do not know if some time later you might want to add another page, but I would be too happy.
4.45 p.m.

Well, it needs a fighting spirit, and if you are capable it needs a punch, and I think it is always in the grasp of the present Government. There is no need for the Hon. Premier to be worried about the expenditure and he should shake off that fear and intimidation. Why should you be worried with over taxation? I only want to remind the Hon. Premier that we are really not in trouble if you look at the economy of the country. It is inevitable that you should worry about poverty and we should not regard it as a condition of life in our country.

Look at some of the things which the Hon. Premier has said in his speech! He says: "In the year 1955, the people of Barbados were overtaxed. We also discovered that proper deductions have not been made out." He was referring to the paying back of tax to people who paid income tax. Why worry about that? It is known that because of the introduction of the P.A.Y.E. system, you collect income tax on a weekly or a monthly basis; therefore, if a person works for nine months and you were collecting tax from him all that time, after you had added it up and found that you had collected more tax than what that person should have paid, you will have to say that that person paid too much and therefore you would refund that person. Those are the little things that are besetting the Hon. Premier when all he needs to do is to turn his face to the sun and go forward. You should be going forward with a desire to doing something good and you have the manpower. It is only a question of harnessing it. You need your Civil Servants more than anything to inspire that confidence.

Now, as regards the question of emigration, listen to what the Hon. Premier has to say! It is really unfair to the last Government. It is a question that you should give Jack his jacket; but to speak like this you make it appear as if it originated in the minds of the last Government. You like to hear big things falling from the lips of the big man. I remember a debate which we had in this House on the question of the Ministerial Buildings. I remember the remarks of the various members, particularly the Minister of Finance. He called it Adams' Castle. They have been there for the last three months and I am sure that they must have seen by now that it is really too small to carry the load which the administration calls for. The decision to erect a Ministerial Building was taken for the sake of efficiency. There are occasions where something happens in the corner of his conscience. The Hon. Premier says:

"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 now have a Department 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."

Why move the Ministry of Education out of the Ministerial Building across the street into the extended building? It is because you can no longer accommodate them in there. Not less than five years ago, there was criticism from the other side that we were wasting money on the Ministerial Building and they were calling it Adams' Castle. Now that they have had the opportunity to see the people working there and they too want to see people working free from the strain and overload, they have found that the building is not sufficient to hold everybody and they say that they are moving all these Departments out of it. I know that you need buildings to continue the successful continuation of your Government, Mr. Premier, I hope.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is addressing remarks to the Hon. Premier and not to the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, I ask you in all humility to excuse me. You know that I always want to be faithful and loyal in my respect to the Chair. I do intend that all my remarks should be addressed to you, Mr. Speaker. May I be permitted to go on? The Hon. Minister of Finance said that he was the only one Minister of Finance in the country. The way he said it you would have wondered if something had happened, and if from the American Laboratories they had transferred the brains of the late Professor Einstein which now lie there in alcohol into the head of the Premier, I have had the opportunity of making a close study of the Hon. Premier and I know how you rotate: but when you have the responsibility of a quarter million people, stability is the very first requirement; and even the temptation to err is sometimes in sadistic fury.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Again I have to say that the hon. member is not addressing the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: Maybe, Sir, my wanton heart has taken me elsewhere, but it is my intention to address my remarks to you.

If I may go to Page 14 of the Hon. Premier's speech, he said:-

"Under Head XXXII we have not included any subsidy for the Transport Board, although they have put in an estimate of \$160,000."

I would like to say a word to the Hon. Premier on this. To remove a subsidy in a country like Barbados is a form of cruelty. I would say that it can be regarded as a brutal thing in a society fabricated such as ours. There is no mistake about this. We need have no argument on this. All the authorities tell you that a country's progress at a glance is always measured by its transport.
4.55 p.m.

You cannot get out of this at all. I remember the hulla-baloo and the squabbings in the British Parliament on this question of transport. I was searching for that this morning. I remember the top level Committee, and after probably two years of discussion and debate and creaking machinery a rail service was provided in the United Kingdom. After meetings of Committees and Sub-Committees, a recommendation was made by the Minister of Transport to provide more money for transport. When you fail to provide transport in a country, then a number of things are taking place. You want to get people into the City and back and there is therefore the need for transport. Are you going to leave this matter of transport hanging for \$150,000? A part of this money is to pay some of the original cost of these new units because they were more or less taken on credit. When we were building the new market, extending the Airport at Seawell and extending the water services all over the country we expended money, and now we had a long-term credit on the Transport Board. If there is one thing which would be a credit to any country, it is the question of transport; but this is like the cheese paring on the Police dogs.

I do not mind what you talk about the private concessionaires; but if the Premier decides that he will try out his idea, he will worry every night about springs, gasoline and tyres. That will wear him down and the machinery will grind to a stand still. Do not let us fool ourselves that in any six years, such and such a thing is going to happen. Make an examination of the Transport Board and you will see that you are toying with the life-blood of the people of this colony. In Trinidad Dr. Eric Williams has always been looking at the railway service. Like the water service, no Government expects to make a profit out of that; it is the type of utility which the Government handles, and which it feels should be provided for the community. A man is first born as a citizen and he is not expected to provide all the services for himself; and in the modern trend of development, the Transport Service is almost as important as the health service.

The Premier has made his decision on this occasion not to grant this subsidy of \$150,000 to the Transport Board when the bulk of this money will be used, I believe, in paying for the cost of the original units. I can imagine the feelings of the Minister of Communications on a matter such as this; he will want to make a success of his Ministry.

I am discussing the matter of the construction of the East Coast Road. There is the unit, the barber green, which would be used and which has two speeds, namely dead slow and stop; but with the changes which have taken place since all the argument which has been going on as to the construction of this road, you must think of an East-West Road, because you must provide the trunk roads.

Going back to the question of the Transport Service, if you are going to make a comparison with the private concessionaire and decide that you would make a profit, I am appealing to the Hon. Premier and to his better judgment. I am appealing to him to make a further examination of this matter. You may cripple movement, you may cripple education and with all of these things as a result of your decision, down comes your dream for increased productivity and a higher standard of living. All of these things are possible if you are curtailing the transport service. I am appealing to the Hon. Premier to give further thought and study to this matter. I remember Dr. Eric Williams dealing with this matter of Transport and what happened on every occasion is that he spent more money on Transport. If liquidation were to come about with this Transport Board and it is possible to remove this little subsidy which you are providing on this important service to this community, woe betide the Government which will find itself guilty of this occurrence. I am not advancing this theory on my own; this is a matter which the Cabinet should be willing to review. You cannot take the people anywhere unless you can provide them with a proper transport service. In other countries, you have the transport provided by way of trains and buses being run on either side. The Hon. Premier is worrying and he has this personal fear in financial matters. 5.05 p.m.

I make this suggestion to him, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the Minister will be able to examine this. The total national debt of the United States of America is borne by the people of the United States of America. As a matter of fact, on two occasions at our Cabinet I asked the Premier to consider the possibility of offering bonds. If you offered \$5 bonds and gave them the same interest, you would not have to borrow \$2 million from overseas whether at 5% or 6%, and you would be able to redeem them in 3 or 5 years.

The Premier has mentioned that there has been a falling off in the deposits at the Government Savings Bank because of the competition offered by commercial banks. I would give the Governors of that Board a little more authority to make cable or mail transfers of money and allow them to retain the interest rate and borrow this money to use as goodwill against an overdraft. Those are things that should be used to move your money back. There is no point allowing this money to be used for development outside when this Government can use it for their own development. It is a question of economic planning and its control. What are you going to do about it? You have to use the force of law to make sure it applies. There is nothing new or novel in it even as an idea. If my appeal to the Premier is likely to have any bearing on his decision, then, Sir, I will move on.

I see, Sir, that the subsidy to the Transport Board has been removed. You will either have to keep the subsidy or increase bus fares which would in turn increase the cost of living. Do you want to do that? In the modern philosophy of Government, it is regarded as a utility, and it is the type of facility that should be owned outright by a Government. That is the position as I see it, and I worry why there is need for it.

I see that you have increased Education by \$1.4 million and that the bulk of this as expressed is probably to offset the cost of salaries consequent upon the increase. The Premier did express that he disliked using the word "buoyant", maybe because Dr. Cummins used it on more than one occasion, but he talked about dynamism in the economy of the country. When you say that an economy is buoyant, a buoy sits on top of the water whether there is going to be a storm or a ripple; but I do not know, Sir, that little things like these would involve the use of a whole paragraph.

If we move to something else that seems to be very important, again I am at a loss at the difference in attitude and the difference in trend when we are worrying about the population growth. I think the Premier must have paid some attention to our democratic and changing trends in society, and is worried about emigration of the young people who are trying to escape the severe conditions which confronted the majority of working class people. How long ago could you find people on every pavement or near every store begging - the blind! How long ago could you stumble against a nauseating voice begging for a copper! Today that is not known, and all over this country you see what is taking place. Can we miss all of this and worry about emigration? It is true that overpopulation has been more or less an obsession with thinkers if you want to force numbers down. It is always correct to say that a large population would be an asset to a country provided there are physical resources. In emigration, usually the cream of society, the skilled and semi-skilled class go overseas and we are left with the balance; but what does it actually mean to a country such as ours? How many do you hope to absorb in industrial development? Actually the amount would not be more than 40,000 as set out in the Five Year Plan. But what does emigration mean to us in Barbados? Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? I am thinking of the \$4 million or \$5 million that come in by letter. We know not of it because it is invisible.

Mr. Speaker, do you know the number of persons who take home their pay packets on Friday and by Sunday morning it is too long to get to the Post Office? The Premier said that the amount is something like \$7 million. Do you know of any resource that would return that amount in any one year? The lovely thing about it is that this is distributed in almost every home in the country and that is

what emigration has been doing for Barbados ever since back in the days of the Isthmus of Panama and later of the United States of America. What is more, in a developing community such as ours, if we should get on the wheels of progress and industry, a lot of our men who would never have had an opportunity for training are now engineers overseas and are willing to come back home. That has been the spirit of a Barbadian wherever he is and wherever he goes to work.
5.15 p.m.

We have men in this country who are tied to the land. Fundamentally, they belong there. We have the man who works his half acre and he is tied with the responsibility to his children. However, do not break your heart about that. What you see in the last three years is the artisan getting \$3.00 and \$4.00 a day. What about all these things we have been hearing? It is a question of injecting the necessary vitality; above all, the hope and the aspiration to go forward and then lead your ship of state on the course which you have determined, and even in difficulty our country is capable of it. As hon. members know there is no West Indian like a Barbadian. You do not have to teach them as you teach others. You do not have to worry about them as you worry about the people of Jamaica or Trinidad. The Barbadian fundamentally is made up of that material.

The Hon. Premier is worried about this. He says: "The other popular jargon which has been bandied around is that this Island is over-populated." I remember a few years ago in here I said that in the next twenty-three or twenty-four years, we would double our population. The Hon. Premier was in here at that time and he was quick on his feet to say that it was not true. Now he is saying so, Mr. Speaker, you will see it in the debates. Twenty-five years is a short time in the life of a country. Within the next twenty-five years all the marginal lands and even some of your productive lands will have to be used for schools and such things and you can pretty well imagine the trend which your administration must take.

The Hon. Premier referred to the crash programme and the spending of a quarter million dollars and making labour available for the reaping of the harvest. That is too small a sum and probably you would need more money to carry on that programme. What I am worrying about is that the Premier must have had something to worry about. I am hoping, although I know his strong will, that he would take my counsel not to worry and have that fear.

My special interest in Government was economic planning. Now, the Hon. Premier has said that he is going to make these reductions. He is taking away \$24,000 from the Training Fund, \$25,000 from Leave Passages and from the Judiciary he is taking \$250 off Travelling Allowance. That is cutting it down furiously. When you take off \$25,000 from the Training Fund, it means that you are not prospecting. The efficiency of a community can only be measured by the yardstick of whether you are providing your men and women with the knowledge and the know-how. Looking at this purely as a matter of fact and with quite an open mind, with general wages and the overall development what they are, what is the whole idea of your reduction of leave passages by \$25,000? Is it because you are afraid of the Civil Servants? Is there any reason for you to be afraid?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not warning the hon. member again that he should address the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: I am prefacing my remarks to Your Honour.

Mr. SPEAKER: Cannot the hon. member proceed to address the Chair exclusively?

Mr. MILLER: Yes, Sir, I will. I am saying that the last Government too, was tied to the idea that we should abolish leave passages, but why are you going to cheese-pare on the vote for the police horses and dogs? Why are you going to cut down on the vote of training when you know what training means to our development? Another thing; you are still toying with the idea of buses.

There are a number of other things which the Minister of Home Affairs has picked out. He goes on to say that he is taking off \$1,850 from the Information Service. That is sad and lamentable. Democracy only succeeds in its application by having your community informed. Sir, we decide a number of things in here. The man in the street does not always understand what we have done; therefore, for him to understand you need to repeat it to him. When you have your community so well informed that it becomes loyal to you, that is why a nation down to its last man is willing to shed its blood. But you can only get that happening by developing your Information Service. In my way of thinking, we have reached the stage where you need a second officer. When you cut down Information Service by \$1,850, it is a curtailment of the process of democracy especially in a community such as ours. I do not know if it is too late for the Hon. Premier to reconsider this item.

The Hon. Premier has also thought about cutting down the stationery in his office. That is what I call false economy. I think the Hon. Premier would be writing more letters to industrialists and to other people overseas. I thought he was thinking of expanding his Department. I do see that the Hon. Premier is expanding in a way. He is expanding his Department of Home Affairs to the bottom floor where the last Government housed its Ministry of Education.

Now, Sir, the Hon. Premier did make mention in his speech which I heard about a reduction in Police horses. I heard horses.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have been reading in the Press since my speech on the introduction of the Appropriation Bill on numerous occasions reference to my cutting down on the number of police horses, and now the hon. junior member for St. George has made this reference again. At no part in my Budget Speech did I make reference in the cutting down on the number of police horses. Any reference I made to four-legged animals was in relation to the Police dogs, some of which are getting old and some of which are getting inefficient and I said that one should not shoot dogs because I suppose that some people would want to take them in their homes; but in the meantime we have to make provision for two-thirds of the strength in the dog department, if there is such a department.

5.25 p.m.

I have never made any reference to cutting down on police horses at all. I do not understand where the Press or the hon. junior member for St. George got this information from; nowhere would you find any such reference in my Budget Speech and I know that I did not make any such reference. Nobody could say that I said anything about abandoning police horses; and I do hope that the gentlemen of the Press will take the opportunity to correct a very serious mistake in the debates of this Chamber.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry about this. I am supported by my friends on this side.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Is the hon. member seriously suggesting that what he said is in the Report of the debate which took place? Is the hon. senior member for the City saying that I said that we are abandoning police horses? Or is he depending upon what he read in the Press? I want to say this; nothing in the way of the hon. member saying that there is cruelty to the Transport Board would prevent me from cutting down the subsidy and I was shocked about hearing him say that I said that we were abandoning these animals. I think I mentioned the species, the four-legged animals to which I was referring; I referred specifically to the dogs.

Mr. MILLER: This is what I said.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. If the hon. senior member for the City said that I said I was going to abandon the horses, if the hon. member does not know, I will tell him that the Police dogs perform for the tourists. If the members of the Press took that as an indication that I meant the Police horses, then they are entirely wrong. The Police dogs put on the grand finale of the display at the

Police Station, District "A"; but we have decided to cut down on them. I should like to know where can the hon. member find a diminution of the vote in relation to the horses; because I said that they performed, it does not mean the horses. If the Reporters do not take sufficient interest on what is going on in the community - the hon. senior member for the City was present on the last occasion when the dogs were performing. The hon. member is now understanding.....

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I should like to know what is meant by the statement "and we hope that there will be no dogs by the end of the year". That statement appears on the top of the page 21 of the Premier's speech.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read it for the benefit of the hon. member. This is what I said:-

"When we come to the Police....."

I hope the Press will come in here and report correctly. They come in here and they open their mouths wide and they sleep sometimes. They do not seem to possess any pencils when they are in the House, but when they go back to their respective places they are like troglodytes; they write from their imagination. We have Shorthand Writers in here; they make minor mistakes, it is true, but at least they try to do their jobs. They dare not lift their pencils from their books while the debates are going on. I suggest that something be done about giving scholarships to the Press and the Reportorial Staff and, of course, to pay them better salaries when they have benefited from the training. I do not like being misreported, and you have a editorial written on something which I have never said. This is what I said:-

"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....."

Is there anything cruel about that? I went on to say this:-

"We have taken out \$360 which is one-third reduction on 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....."

I mentioned that there is only \$1,300 for Band Cadets, but the only reference made by me to any kind of animals was made in respect of the dogs. If I wanted to reduce the vote for the police horses I would say that the Police horses are useless; but some kind of case was made out for the horses. If the hon. member can show me any reference in my speech to horses, I would be grateful to him. And the hon. member is invoking the assistance of the hon. senior member for the City!

Mr. MILLER: The question was whether the dogs should be replaced or not. There is need for them in a service such as ours. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if there is a mistake in connection with this \$47,000 for a ladder. 5.35 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of explanation, that is absolutely no mistake. They wanted \$47,000 and we said they were not to have it. I am not afraid to say what I have cut out. I do not see what they want that ladder for, unless they are going to bring a skyscraper. They have ladders of each type, but what I believe they wanted was one of those ladders that they could stay 5 miles off and like somebody performing at a Circus let somebody spout water into a building.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, to move the Hospital back into it, I see the reduction of \$10,450 which was allocated to washing and painting your hospital building, and the hon. member says we can do without this. The poor old hospital is taking another beating. You will remember the cruel

manner in which the Report was released to the Press and the slant which was given, reducing the old hospital to shackles in a couple of weeks or months, and just on Saturday night we performed in that Institution with one of the stalwarts of our country a brain operation; and now the Premier is going to cut off \$10,450 from that old weather-beaten Institution.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. junior member for St. George knows the meaning of valuable time! Are we going to sit down in here today and let him go on like that? Do you mean that he has no sympathy? He is just like a sinking ship; he would never be able to survive as long as he is in here. What is wrong with him?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Andrew can express his point of view when he gets on his feet. We speak one after the other.

Mr. MILLER: I have been worrying, Mr. Speaker, but there must have been some given reason for the hon. member rising. I suppose he is persecuted at the moment and that is how he usually reacts. I do not know if he is running for the "Old City", Sir, but he says I will not survive in here. He must be running for the "Old City"; you know the "Old City" where they sell all that grog. If he is in a hurry, I can assure him that the Party whip would not exercise its influence.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is only a matter of opinion.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. junior member for St. George was a Minister, and he knows the difference of wasting time. He knows the most valuable thing in the world is time; it is more valuable even than all the riches in the world; yet he is trying to waste precious daylight saving time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Andrew made that point a moment ago.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, that is one of the failing processes of democracy, and whether or not I want to, I have to sit here and bear with it. Imagine the folly in a Chamber such as this. There should be some means by which we could be spared. We are discussing the Estimates for the year and are dealing with the destiny of a quarter million people. Is there a term by which I can describe him that would be accepted as parliamentary? To him it does not matter. It would be of no concern to him whether it goes to the vote, but like the Premier and every responsible Minister of the Government, I have a responsibility. The thinking members of Parliament are not angry or annoyed; how could I be wasting time? We are dealing with a vital and important document.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed with the vital and important document. The hon. member is too experienced a Parliamentarian to be disturbed by any interruptions.

Mr. MILLER: This is a club of inexperienced political raw material. If he were home the vote would still go on. He only wants to know the millions, and whether it is \$25 million or \$26 million, that is enough for him. Am I correct in believing, Mr. Speaker, that you would want to hear a fair and open debate on a vital document like the Estimates of this country?

What I am yet terrified about, Mr. Speaker, is why the Premier of this country needs to be so worried as expressed in the manner in which he is using the pruning knife. I see that at the Mental Hospital there is the reduction of the amount for a refrigerator. I would like to make a very special and humane appeal on this matter. A refrigerator in an Institution like the Mental Hospital is much more than those who live on the outside would ever understand or appreciate, and I appeal, with all that there is big and decent if there is any such left in me, to the Premier to realise that in that Institution there is twenty-four hour supervision; and I really feel sorry for any person who has to go to the Mental Institution.

Mr. Speaker, you do not know what it is to be under twenty-four hours supervision. I appeal to you, Sir, and I pray with you that this refrigerator be given to this Institution. You refer here to the bequest which I do not think you were quite familiar with, but we have been operating on the interest accruing from this money and using it for furniture to be placed in the Pay Wards. It seems discriminatory and sometimes you think of the expression "were they not ten cleansed, then where are the nine". This money from the bequest is used for replacing furniture in that Institution.

5.45 p.m.

What we have been doing for the last five years is to replace the old with new furniture, but we took the old furniture out into the Charity wards. This was the intention of the deceased who left this money, and instead of leaving it to accumulate we removed the furniture across to the other place. You do not know what it is like to be separated from your friends and then to be under a 24-hour a day supervision. We have broken the barriers down at that institution to bring it into line with modern trends. I believe wherever you go in this world, because of the modern trend at the Mental Hospital of Barbados, somebody would have a word of praise to say about it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would just like the hon. member to know that these refrigerators are not for the wards but for the doctor's quarters.

Mr. MILLER: There is no means of knowing this and the way it is written in this document you could not understand that it was so. I take it that the hon. member has a copy of the Hon. Premier's speech.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Is the hon. member saying that I should tell him what part of the Mental Hospital the refrigerator is? I thought that he would be in a better position to know where it is.

Mr. MILLER: I probably may know about the Mental Hospital, but I cannot spend as much time there as you may be forced to spend. Are you preparing a special ward there and because of that you are advising the Minister that the necessary things should be done there? You may have good reason for doing that.

Sir, may I pass on? Anyhow, the question of fear has been expressed throughout this Budget and apart from the moment of exchanges of jokes, I want the hon. member to regard this as a very serious job and one which I view quite seriously. Sir, I think it is not too late for the Hon. Premier to inspire the vitality and thrust which are needed to take this country along the road to carry us to greater fields of prosperity.

The second thing which I want him to understand is this. He said quite strongly that there will be no supplementaries. I do not know how they can be avoided. (Mr. MOTTLEY: He did not say that there will be no supplementaries.) I do not know for what reason that hon. member wants to be affiliated but the Hon. Premier was crystal clear about this.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This is about the third time that I have heard the hon. member saying that I want to be an affiliate of that organisation. I never wanted to be an affiliate of the crooked organisation which was thrown out of in here. I care no more of anybody in the present Government than I cared about the last Government, and I am warning the hon. junior member for St. George not to say that again. I have always had my views. It is not I who is hurt. Why should I be hurt? I have not lost any \$1,000 or \$800 a month nor have I lost any progue. Stop saying that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet. The rule is that when an hon. member rises, every other hon. member must take his seat.

Mr. MILLER: I do not know why the hon. member should be annoyed. That is the sort of thing which he will

know about. That is his peculiar function in Parliament. He is making all these insinuations about bribery, corruption and dishonesty. The hon. member knows me well. What particular attraction will that have for me when he talks of the salary of a Minister? Why should he get offended? Is there any reason why he should be hurt?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understand the ex-Minister of Social Services to say - I nearly said the mad Minister - that I said that there would be no supplementaries. If the hon. member would look at page 23 of my speech he would see when I was discussing the Labour Department and emigration, that I said: "for emigration there was an amount of over \$1 million under the Labour Department, Head XLV, Item 22, and therefore we have reduced the item by \$262,925 and later on in the year if we see that a supplementary vote is necessary, of course it would be forthcoming."

I have always made it clear throughout the whole of my service in this House of Assembly, that I do not like the practice of Heads of Departments coming for a vote which the Government deleted before the Appropriation Bill was brought to this House, and I said that they need not come to me with the voting back in of anything; but I did say speaking about emigration, that a vote would be coming by way of a supplementary for emigration and anything that is necessary. I said that if things are ordered and it is inevitable that you have to come for supplementary estimates for them we will be bringing them down; therefore I do not know what ramblings the hon. junior member for St. George is talking about.

Mr. MILLER: That is the sort of sarcasm and base attitude with which the Hon. Premier approaches important matters. Do not let me swallow you! Do not let me bite you up in here! He is filled with all that sort of sarcasm and that naked barefooted, little boy talk.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member restrain himself. Let hon. members with years of parliamentary experience set an example to the new members who have given such an example in decorum to so many of the older members.

Mr. MILLER: It is symptomatic of the Hon. Premier. He is always attacking members of my Party and me. He is always making personal remarks.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, what is the remark to which he objects? I mentioned what I said and sat down. Why does he not name the remark or call it a dissertation, address, submission or whatever he is glorifying it by? I suppose he thinks he is a Horatio Bottomley.

Mr. SPEAKER: Horatio Bottomley was a very clever politician.

5.55 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Other hon. members are in here and they are of the opinion that either the hon. member is delirious or he is rambling; and rambling is the more charitable of the two.

Mr. MILLER: Horatio Bottomley was of the same stamp and type as the Premier. Can you picture in here a changed elephant? Can you imagine the effect of anthropology? We know that all inhabitants are due to have their offspring. I am not thinking of the hon. member as a chip of the block probably of criticisms, but you are thinking and talking about going to a mental hospital.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. If the hon. member makes a statement about my being like Horatio Bottomley and other things, I would like him to withdraw it.

Mr. MILLER: I never said anything that would have to be withdrawn.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I know what he is referring to. I said that he is in a better position to know whether the refrigerator would be in the Mental Hospital because I thought that he is right next door to the Mental Hospital and he would be in a better position to know.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member wants to supplement the Budget with that sort of talk. I do not ask him to withdraw anything. Mr. Speaker, I would bite him up in here and all of us would go to the floor. I will wipe up all the carpet on the floor with him and his spectacles. This is the attitude adopted by the Premier when he finds himself in a corner. We are thinking of a serious document which the Hon. Minister brought to this House in exaggeration, but he is asking us to lean forward to the hill side.

These are my final remarks. I have the interest of the people of this country at heart. I have my responsibility to them and my remarks will be recorded in Hansard. I will have to refer to, and remind hon. members of, what I said here today; but in my final remarks I should like to say that it is not in the best interest of the country to have it to go abroad that we are in trouble for money. I appeal to the Premier for the sake of the future of the country to make the necessary statement which is appropriate in order that he might rightly guide the country. We are not in any trouble for money; we are told about borrowing \$6.3 million; you should borrow it from the point of view that you will use it, but above that it is a question of the reason for which you are borrowing it. I warn the Premier that he must attract capital to this country, but in doing so he must not give the impression that we are in any trouble for money. I repeat that we are not in any trouble for money; we are not in any danger.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak on this Budget because those of our members in the Opposition have decided that the hon. junior member for Christ Church should reply to the Minister of Finance in a matter of this sort; and although I was absent I was told by my colleague that the hon. member replied and expressed the view which we had collectively decided upon as soon as we had received this copy of the Premier's Speech. I shall begin by saying this; I wish the *Advocate* would listen. In the first place, it is a pity that this entire document has not been published for the benefit of the public of Barbados. I am a member of the Opposition, but as a member of the Opposition, it does not necessarily mean that I must oppose everything that the Government has done. When I sat where the members of the Government are now sitting, when the last Government was in power, whenever I thought they were right I supported them. Today, I think that after my 17 years' membership of this House, this Speech is the finest Budget Speech which has ever been presented to this House and it is a pity that the Press did not publish it in full. It is the one Budget Speech which has not been written by any Civil Servant. I have read it three times. The other speeches have always been composed of milk and water and you could see the milk and water running through them. The Hon. Premier did not read his Speech except when he was referring to figures. I am sorry that the hon. junior member for St. George has left here because he has told me that I want to be affiliated with a Party. I have fought the beasts at Ephesus and I am still in here. I have always known the hon. member to be a Socialist but he has supported "Bob" Cumberbatch and myself in Speightstown.

Mr. SPEAKER: To which hon. member is the hon. member referring?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am referring to the hon. junior member for St. George. If I have to tell him something, he cannot stop me from living or eating. I see that in this Budget Speech there is something to tell the masses and I told the Editor of the *Advocate* that what was published as the Budget Speech was far from what was the Budget Speech. I say that one of the most intelligent speeches ever made on the Budget since I have been a member of this House was made on this occasion. I have a conscience and my conscience dictates to me that that Budget Speech was one of the finest ever made in this House. What the hon. member has said he did not carry far enough; you could have cut out the horses, as far as I am concerned. I do not wear any red tie. 6.05 p.m.

The hon. member mentioned here that hundreds of people are still sleeping on floors and what not. I was one man who had the guts to say something, and if the Premier is

saying it now, he is saying it after me. When the last Government rushed that last Report through here increasing the salaries of the top brackets in the Civil Service, I said then that they were wrong. It was the people in the middle and lower brackets in the Civil Service who were in need. I cannot understand socialism, and I am sorry that some of them are not here today to listen. I really cannot understand some of the things they did, because some of the things they did were more conservative than the Aubrey Williams days in this House.

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. junior member for St. George says that we are not in trouble, he is talking through his hat. I am in a position to tell you now that even the estimated revenue from direct taxation last year was not up to expectations. Of course the Premier is right. As far as the Bridgetown City Council is concerned, it is no secret, because the Inland Revenue Department has to give us the estimated revenue from trade, and he has allowed us to know already that it is going to be down because of the lack of business which was carried on in this Island last year. I am sorry the hon. member is not here, but I challenge the Hon. Premier with this. I am hoping that you have had sense enough.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That the Premier has had sense enough.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, that the Premier has had sense enough to go into these budgets and the estimates which were presented to him by the last Government for himself, because he has publicly proclaimed that he is not going to raise income tax. As an economist, you have given your reasons, but I ask you now to examine other means of taxation and you are going to find that the last Government gave away nearly \$500,000 unnecessarily. I want the ex-Minister to be in here and I want the Premier to be here also because he said he would tell us what he was not going to tax. You must remember, Mr. Speaker, that the deficit must be raised. You know the means of raising taxation; you are not raising it by direct taxation, but there are those of us who can think, not like the hon. junior member for St. George who began to think "am I next?" Or "when is it going to be?"

One thing I am certain of, Mr. Speaker, is that there is nobody over there who is so stupid to put a tax on anything that will affect the lives of the ordinary, humble, consuming public - the masses. There are those of us who must scan properly every avenue from which taxation comes to find where it comes from, and if you do not look for it and discover it, I am going to expose it on the floor of this House. The last Government in the Ministry of Trade and with the consent of the Premier gave away \$500,000 unnecessarily which they did not have to give away. I challenge anybody to deny this, and though I may be making enemies among my friends, I am going to expose it in here and if this Government does nothing about it, we will all see why. Wait until the time comes and they do not exert their ability which I know they have over there. What I am saying, Sir, is commonly known within the high brackets of the Civil Service.

There are some people, Sir, who can take an adding machine and add figures, like any third standard or fourth standard boy, which were proclaimed to the world, and these things were done knowingly and connivingly. I wonder whether the hon. member has gone out of the House. I want somebody to challenge me. I am looking directly at the Minister of Trade; so do not keep those shades on and look at me that way. It was done unnecessarily and it was done for a reason, and when you look behind the wall, you are going to see. No wonder a person could get up and proclaim to the world that whether or not he loses his seat he was not going to shed a tear. Look in your Ministry through all these industries and you will see. A hint to the wise is sufficient.

We consider, Sir, that this Speech should be published in the *Advocate*. It is no sense the Minister whispering to anybody, because until the Premier comes I will not tell you what I have to say. My colleagues will never know from where this information came. Prod your Civil Servants at top and they will tell you; and top ranking Bank people said it was unnecessary. I have never said anything

in this House which I could not prove. My colleague, the hon. junior member for Christ Church whom we term as our Minister of Finance, has given his blessing to the Premier's approach; it is a departure which the ordinary man can readily understand. The hon. member could have followed tradition and made a different type of Budget Speech. I am not going to waste time and be accused by the hon. member for St. Andrew, but when I am out to have a little fun, I have a little fun.

There is one thing I am going to say and it is this: I notice in this speech that twenty more people are to be employed by the Waterworks Department. The Premier was at pains to say that he would not put anybody out of work; it is not a matter of putting people out of work, because I have the greatest respect for the Head of this Department; but you have a tremendous lot of Departments which I believe you have to pull up. You have the Social Welfare Department, and I counsel you to look into that Department. Then you have the Probation Department which is absolutely necessary in this Island, and one is beginning to wonder when you look into your whole social security system whether it would not be necessary to have all these Departments running counter to each other.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Eric Williams abandoned the Social Welfare Department for some time now in Trinidad. Some of my friends may get vexed, but I have a duty to perform to the people of this country. In these Departments you have people answering correspondence from each other all day long. As far as the Probation Department is concerned, it is absolutely necessary and possibly could be strengthened; but I am wondering whether some of the people in these Departments could not be transferred to the Waterworks Department where they can do some work for the money they are receiving. That is not speaking disparagingly about the Civil Service, because when I have something to say about Civil Servants, I say it here on the floor of the House. I hope the Government will not like the last Government attempt to defend Civil Servants whom they know to be wrong. This is no accusation against any Civil Servant; it is a question of seeing that more of the Departments in this country need reorganising.

6.15 p.m.

Some want abandoning because the work which is being done can be done, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter said today, when you have your whole service of social services under one head. Sir, I was surprised some day this week. I visited my colleague and I asked him: "in what department do you run this and that?" You have all these Departments and you can only say that this is done by that Department, old age pension is run by that Department and social welfare by itself. That is all nonsense and I am glad that you have somebody who understands that and has come to reorganise it. It was the practice of the last Government whenever a member of the Opposition got up and said anything about Civil Servants, whether they were right or wrong, to get up and defend them. There was never an occasion when a member of the last Government would say that a member of the Opposition was right and that he would go into it and put it right. That is not good enough for us. It is not good enough for us who had to face the electorate to get in here. When we say things, we expect you to go into them very carefully. We had a Social Welfare Officer here and she was shocked to hear of all these Departments by themselves.

The hon. member might say: "why is the hon. member picking at these Departments?" The Officer in charge is one of my best friends but the reason why the last Government organised Public Assistance by itself was because they wanted to find a post for Mr. Hutson Williams to strut around and walk around. Mr. Speaker, what are you paying all this money to do? Find work for the people in this office in another branch of the Service. You are putting up all these little Departments when you have a Social Welfare Department. I hope the Hon. Minister of Social Services or whatever the Ministry is, with the guidance of the Hon. Premier and such experienced parliamentarians as the Minister of Trade, would look carefully into these matters.

Sometimes I sit down and smile at what is happening. Whatever anybody thinks of this speech by the Hon. Premier, as far as I am concerned, it shows that if we have any respect for learning and intelligence and not the *ad hoc* way of doing things, we are bound to say that this is a very intelligent approach to make to the Estimates this year. If, however, we of the Opposition find that there is any slipping up, we are prepared to launch into the Government like anybody else. That is why I took umbrage when the hon. junior member for St. George said that I wanted to be an affiliate of the Party in power.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I never said that and I think the hon. member would know that himself. You have to be born a Socialist. You are not made a Socialist. I could not make that mistake.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I wonder when Mr. Bob Cumberbatch came into my Party whether he was a Socialist.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am still on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: If both hon. members do not take their seats, I will adjourn this House for disorder.

Mr. MILLER: I was on a point of order. The hon. member is characteristic of making these mistakes. My Prime Minister, Sir Grantley Adams, knew when he took the sole decision at a Council meeting in Fairchild Street that he was going to run Mr. James Ramsay that the whole of the Barbados Labour Party had disagreed with his view. I believe the hon. senior member for St. Peter knows this too. It was at that meeting that I told Sir Grantley Adams that I would oppose Mr. James Ramsay. The member for St. Peter was there at the time and it was the first time a loud-speaker was used on the Island of Barbados to address the electorate at a political meeting. I remember it very well because there was some sort of incident at the meeting in which I had to take refuge in a tree in order to get away. My only reason for supporting Bob Cumberbatch was that I would support anybody at the time against the person they brought forward. I felt it was unfair to the junior member then. This man did not know the office; he never knew anybody on the Executive. That is the sort of thing which the hon. senior member for the City is capable of. Mr. Bob Cumberbatch is still alive.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order has been made.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not care what he says. It was \$500 which he took to run Bob Cumberbatch.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, that is disgraceful. The hon. member is a liar.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I could never be a liar like you. I could never be a liar like a Miller. Not one of you went to school.

Mr. SPEAKER: Since each hon. member has called each other a liar, I will not call on either to withdraw his remarks.

Mr. MILLER: It is in keeping with the hon. member to say what is untrue. He knows that there is no means to prove that because it is untrue. Before I had my first long pants, I had money to spend as much as \$500. Imagine the hon. member calling somebody dishonest! He does not want to be reminded.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You cannot remind me of anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member is referring to another member of this House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am referring to the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not know what the hon. member is talking about. Imagine the hon. senior member for the City accusing somebody of being dishonest!

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I came in here in 1946 when the hon. member was outside. I heard the hon. member talking about socialism across the swing bridge on one occasion then and the only thing which the hon. member did not talk about as regards it was what he did not think about. The only things which he did not say about Grantley Adams were things which he could not say. Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the hon. member not to say "Mr. Chairman" because the Chairman is not in the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member is referring to Bob Cumberbatch. Ten or fifteen years ago if there was one man who started my interest in politics, it was my father and then it was Dr. Duncan O'Neale. I remember when he came to use my little box as a platform and I said to him that the late Mr. "T. T" Lewis was going to speak on the platform.
6.25 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not a point of order. (*Asides*).

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me remind hon. members of Standing Order No. 28 which deals with interruptions. That Standing Order reads as follows:-

"No Member shall interrupt another Member except - (a) by rising to a point of order, when the Member speaking shall resume his seat and the Member interrupting shall simply direct attention to the point which he desires to bring to notice and submit it to the Speaker or Chairman for decision; (b) to elucidate some matter raised by that Member in the course of his speech, provided that the Member speaking is willing to give way and resumes his seat and that the Member wishing to interrupt is called by the Chair."

Mr. MOTTLEY: I want the hon. member to get rid of the idea that I am being affiliated to any Party. The hon. member knows well enough that I do not want to be affiliated to any Party. I have resisted all sorts of things; because it was felt that there was going to be Adult Suffrage, the Prime Minister suggested to me that I was material which he could use and I said "No". I was friendly with everybody except the senior member for St. Michael and the senior member for St. Thomas, both of whom are now out of this House. One is drinking water in front of me and the other is playing "warri" and has a watchman's job all day long. I want the hon. junior member for St. George to say why I want to be affiliated to any Party.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order. The hon. member was friendly with my brother. He talked about love but he loved him just like how a butcher loves a pig; and now the hon. member is being offended. I did not say that he was affiliated to any Party: I am now trying to remember who told the hon. member: "I would not take your word to hang a thieving cat." If the hon. member accuses me of dishonesty and now he feels hurt because he sees.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's point of order has been clarified.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Because I support something which the Government has done, there is no idea of my affiliating with them. It does not look to me.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to remind the hon. member that this is a debate on the Second Reading of an Appropriation Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir. But the hon. junior member for St. George aggravates me to a point by saying stupid things. He said that I have been doing this and that so as to become the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order. I have never said that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Then the hon. member says that I said things but he cannot prove them. The hon. member forgets that I have witnesses.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. member that we are now dealing with the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I hope that the whole thing will be published. While it is our duty in the Opposition to make the burden of the Government intolerable for them, it is also our duty to support whatever they bring in here which we think is right. It is not our duty to offer opposition just for the sake of opposition. That is why I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Andrew that we should not waste any time. When we see that things are all right we let them go through. That is what I said today. We have discussed these things; we have discussed these matters in our Party and we feel that the hon. junior member for Christ Church has put our point of view. As the hon. member has said, towards the end of June we will have a picture of the colony's position. We are absolutely certain that this deficit will not come from any Heads which will affect the masses in this country and their wherewithal daily.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say anything on the Second Reading of this Bill. We cannot call it a Budget because the Premier says that it is not the Budget and the Budget will be forthcoming later on. I can quite clearly see that the approach to this question is the right one and, as I said earlier in the Session, we should not oppose for the sake of opposition. If a thing is wrong, well, it is wrong; but if it is right, then it is right. However, there are some things in the Premier's speech with which I cannot agree; he may be right or he may be wrong, but having to run the Government is no idle joke. You cannot expect to please everybody; you have to displease somebody but you will have to quit yourself and do everything to the best of your ability in order to make a success of your Government.
6.35 p.m.

Now, Sir, I can say that this present Government has started off in the right direction by considering old age pensions. I cannot offer my congratulations yet because I have to wait and see the rate at which they are going to travel and see how far they will get, as it is possible that they may stop in the way; the machine may stick up. Anyhow, it has started off and with all the support possible I feel that the machine will go ahead as long as you give it the necessary lubrication and gasoline.

I notice from the Premier's Speech, Sir, that he intends to use the knife all over, and he did not use it from the bottom. It appears that he used it from inside his own Cabinet. I would never be able to put up a case for the Cabinet - I would not make myself so ridiculous - but I will pass on to a few of the Premier's remarks. The Premier said that he is not appealing for any increase in pay for the Ministers, and that the people who are responsible are now being paid less than perhaps the first five or six people in the respective Departments. "If therefore we are in this year calling upon all sections of the community not only to effect 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, and 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."

As I have said, Sir, I am not making out a case for any Minister, but if the Ministers have a duty to perform and the responsibilities are greater than the people who are working with them, it is not fair to keep them down there and let their employees draw more than they, because in my opinion the employees will feel that they are the bosses. They may not want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that is not fair to them, but they may feel so. You cannot expect to pay the Assistant Manager more than the Manager if you want respect to be paid to the Manager by the Assistant. 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. I do not think Your Honour wears a belt, but anyhow the Premier is asking you to tighten it. In other words, it may start to make an impression.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no belt small enough; I do not wear a belt.

Mr. SMITH: Anyway, Your Honour is to have a reduction of \$1,200 in your personal emoluments. The Government has also decided that the Legislature should make a gesture in order to emphasise 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. There are quite a lot of members who have spoken already on this, and I know that they are too big and too great to talk about food. They would do everything except talk about food, Sir, but I can talk about it because I like it. I like food more than clothes, Sir, it is not fair to the members of this Legislature to sacrifice themselves up to a certain pitch by leaving their homes to come and do the people's business, and then to be deprived out of a cup of tea and a slice of bread. I say it is mean, it is low, it is depraved, it is undignified, it is everything that is bad.

Now, Sir, you are doing a service to the people, and I believe that you even provide meals for your chauffeur because you would feel safe when he is going along and are sure that he could not drop dead at the wheel from starvation; so you make sure you give him a cup of tea at the same time that you are taking one, because you are not sure that he can take it at home as he may have to leave it in order to get on the job. It is the people's business we are doing and it is important; so you stand to lose more than you gain because this House cannot start without a quorum, and by having to wait at home to get a meal, it is possible that you may turn up late and find that the House had to be adjourned for one member, and business would have to be put off for another week. We are not paupers, Sir; everyone of us is in a position to buy a meal, but that is not the point. It is the principle of it. I can leave and go anywhere, but a politician must not take it upon himself to eat all about. *(Laughter)* This may sound like a joke, Sir, but I am expressing my feelings in the matter. This is something that has been going on for years and years.

Could you tell me, Sir, that the Island is in such a bad financial state of affairs that \$14,000 could break or bankrupt it? You have made promises which you want to carry out, and you are doing everything to carry them out. Now the 24 of us in here could not elect a Government and we cannot break it; so you do not have to care anything about us. I am saying that it is undignified to interfere with the Speaker's emoluments. It is true he may be in a position not to take anything at all, but I am not speaking about the individual, I am speaking about the office.
6.45 p.m.

When we are elected in this Chamber, we are all hon. members, and it really does not sound good to hear or to know that the same hon. members are talking about food. When it comes up, I am going to vote against it. It would put you to great inconvenience if you have to leave here. The House will be adjourning, I dare say, about 7 o'clock. I will not be able to get home and get back in time. I dare say other hon. members will have to go home and there is the possibility of your not getting a quorum. You cannot make me go anywhere in town to buy something when I do not know how it is being cooked. You cannot expect me to do that. I am an hon. member; I did not beg for this; this is an honour. The sacrifice which you have to pay for this honour is no mean sport. It is a very expensive one. Mr. Speaker, you know it. *(To a Member)* You are paying for this honour daily.

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

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I am not begging; you can do as you like; you can put it in or you can take it out. If there is one thing which I can do, it is to buy a meal. Do not think that I am going to shed a tear about this. All I say is that it is undignified to hon. members and it should not have been mentioned at all. It does not show a sign of decency among ourselves; it does not show a sign of respect.

Now, Sir, this is by the way. You get the ordinary type of fellow saying all sorts of things about it since last Tues-

day when the Hon. Premier mentioned it. You have an ordinary type of fellow who said this of me: "Lloyd Smith's guts are going to fall away now." That is how one of those fellows accosted one. That person forgot the old saying that one belly full cannot fatten a barrow. That is only once a week; so that person is only stupid in saying that. No decent, respectable person would accost somebody like that along the streets. I would not do it; but that has happened only through the announcement made by the Hon. Premier.

Sir, I do not mind because you can throw me anywhere. I am not afraid.

I will pass on. The Hon. Premier went further and said: "We have not interfered in any way with the provision of the meals which the Other Place obtain 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 do not think it competent for us to reduce that amount because the members of the Other Place do not receive any salary."

That is the reason why he stopped it in here. It is because members of this Honourable Assembly receive a salary; but he knows better than we do that the salary which an hon. member gets in here is one which on my part can go to blazes. You cannot carry this salary and put it on the bank and let it remain there forever. You always have to be spending it. I would be very glad and I would come and vote tomorrow to stop it. I would agree to this. Do not pay members of the House of Assembly, but allow the Government to pay the members' political expenses. Do not pay one cent to us. I would be very glad if that were to happen and if I thought that it was in my power, I would bring in a Bill tomorrow to that effect. I would say, let the Government pay our political expenses. That is the answer to this and I am sure the Government would lose more, especially when it comes to election time. What are you telling me? Do you think the salary which a member draws is something to catch at? I would prefer to be over in the Other Place. I still say that it is not fair.

Now, Sir, when you turn to page 8 of the Hon. Premier's speech you see this paragraph:

"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 is reasonable."

That is very good. You are doing your best to avoid raising income tax. You have mentioned income tax and the companies tax but you did not mention anything about tax on rum and cigarettes. That is taxation too.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think if the hon. member reads correctly what I

said on the second reading of the Appropriation Bill, he would see I said that I do not contemplate any increases in the rate of income tax during the next financial year. I did not say that I do not intend imposing taxation of some kind this year.

6.55 p.m.

I said that I was prepared to tell hon. members what I would not do, but I was not prepared to tell them what I was going to do. I would be very grateful if the hon. member would not go on to speak about any consumption tax because that is not in the debate.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member mentioned some, but in not mentioning the other two, which are my rum and cigarettes, there is a possibility that he might come out with these next week. Up to now, the Premier has not committed himself. I was issuing a warning about rum and cigarettes. The hon. Premier has asked me not to go any further with that matter and therefore I will not go any further with it. However, I am happy to see that there is no increase in these items and I do not think that anybody would quarrel with that.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has decided, as from the 1st April this year, to increase the amount of the Old Age Pension. I am asking them to keep on like that; they have started off well, but they must also think about the repairs to the homes of these old people. I am sure that the Government will do that.

In respect of the Transport Service the Premier says that he has not included any subsidy for the Transport Board. This is what he says in this connection:-

"Under Head XXXII we have not included any subsidy for the Transport Board, although they have put in an estimate of \$150,000. 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 quite agree with the Premier, taking it as it has been put; but it could be taken at a different stand point too. I do not know if this is money for the purpose of offsetting losses or for paying bills. I know that the Transport Board some time ago..... (Pause).

Mr. Speaker, at this stage I beg to move that further debate on this motion be now postponed.

Mr. COWARD: I beg to second that.

The question that further debate on this motion be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for three quarters of an hour.

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

The question that this sitting be now suspended for three quarters of an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

On re-assembling,

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to your attention that there is no quorum present and I ask that the bell be rung.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: On the suspension of the sitting the House was debating 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 31st March, 1963. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph was addressing the House. The hon. member is at liberty to continue his speech.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, when the sitting was suspended, I was making the point relative to the subsidy in respect of the Transport Board. I would like to know from the Hon. Premier, since it is not his intention to carry on with this \$150,000, what would be the policy of this Board. What is this Board going to do about this matter? We have to look at the matter of Transport very seriously today; this transport is the poor man's motor car. I do not feel that things can work out so easily. If they were not working so easily with the subsidy, I do not know how it will be with the Board when it is working without that subsidy. I do not know if this money is required for off-setting losses or if it is required to pay for the new units. One has to pay so much money for so many buses, and I take it that this money would be required to subsidise the Board and help them to pay for the buses. Judging from the Premier's remarks, these people appear to be so sure that they will lose this money that they are asking for it now. Everybody knows how I stand in relation to the matter of transport, and even now some of the old units are the most disgraceful things to be seen on the road. It seems to me that they did not have a sufficient number of new units and I am wondering if this \$150,000 is for the purpose of helping the Board to replace these units or for repaying the debt. I understand that the school children pay half fare on these buses. I know that there are some concessionaires who give free tickets to the school children; the parents of these children are so poor that they cannot afford to pay for the education of these children and also pay the bus fare. There are the private schools and the children who are attending these schools are from very poor families. The ones who are attending the Government-aided schools are those who do not pay now and when this subsidy is withdrawn from the Transport Board, the bus fares must go up. Another thing is that the Barbados Workers' Union is making demands on the Transport Board. It is very easy to take this subsidy out of the Estimates, but then what are you going to do? I have read in the *Truth* that the Board will soon be changed and I am wondering if this Government will be able to work miracles by getting this Board to run without this subsidy. I daresay that that is a good way of asking the present Manager to leave. The Premier says that the Banks are there and therefore the Transport Board can make use of the money from these Banks; but I do not know if the Banks will go so far as to lend the Board money in the circumstances. 8.00 p.m.

They are not going to lend out the Bank's money without the O.K. from the Government; so the Government will still be responsible for it, because the Government will have to sign it. I do not see that two or three members of a Board are going to hold themselves responsible to a Bank for money to run the Transport Board. The Government will have to stand guarantor for it, so that if there is any loss the Government will have to pay it; so it is not a case of saying that they can make use of the Bank. I am very unhappy about the situation with the buses, because you are allowing other public utilities duty-free materials which the Transport Board is not allowed. I think the Telephone Company and the Electric Company get their goods in duty free, and at least the Transport Board should be getting their tyres, gasoline and everything of the sort duty free.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you are taking away the \$150,000 because you can see that amount, but I do not know if the Government knows how much they are giving to the Electric Company, the Telephone Company and Rediffusion. I am not quite sure of the position with Rediffusion, but I would like to know how much per year is being allowed both the Telephone Company and the Electric Company. It may be more than \$150,000. You can see in cash the amount that is voted for the Transport Board, but you cannot see how much is allowed these other two Companies; they may be getting \$300,000 each. If these Companies are getting materials duty free, then some consideration should be given to the Transport Board, because these people took over the buses

and inherited a bad legacy. They gave something for nothing at the time, and it will be a long time before they can get out of this predicament. I do not doubt that they owe away a lot of money, and this \$150,000 may help them to keep their heads above the water; so to take it away from them now, it is possible that they would go under.

It is not everything that you see in a newspaper that you can believe, Mr. Speaker, but I saw in a newspaper last Sunday that they will be having big shots who will be members of the Board, and they may be in a position to work miracles; they may be able to put their own money into it. Anyhow, I would still like to know from the Minister what he is going to do. We have some millionaires in this country, and we only have to go up Roebuck Street for one or two of them. I would like to know what is Government's policy because this is a serious thing. School children have to get to school, and domestic servants, cooks and so on have to get to work, and the buses are their only means of getting to and from work. There are some employers who can be very hard on their cooks when they turn up late whether or not the rain falls or the bus breaks down, because they want their tea at a certain time. We have to take that into consideration and not look at the money on one side, and create a disservice on the other side. These people have votes too; so we have to look and see what we are going to do. I could not sit here and allow this to be taken out of the vote without knowing what will be the policy of the Board. We were listening for the Board's policy for several years, but have not got it yet.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has changed and they are changing everything; so they may have a policy. This money should not be cut out because it would not be fair to the bus users. As I said just now, you are subsidising the Electric Company and the Telephone Company by allowing them to bring in certain things duty free. I think I am correct in saying that. I do not see, if you are allowing them to bring in goods duty free to the tune of \$500,000 or \$600,000, why nothing is being given to the Transport Board along that line. Some consideration will have to be given to the Transport Board before you turn it upside down. They have to pay more money to the drivers, conductors and inspectors, and they will have less income with which to do it. You are asking for trouble and I do not want you to get into any trouble yet. I would not tell you to pull up your socks, because I mentioned it today and was attacked by a member who asked what I meant. I think you should pull up your pants this time and draw your belt also.

I notice, Sir, that you are taking the \$150,000 from the Transport Board and using it to get some Barber Green equipment for road surfacing. That will be used to help build the East Coast Road which is a very good thing. That is in my parish and I am very glad to hear that it is to fix the roads up there, but I still cannot forget the fact that there is no sense breaking down Draxhall to make Kendal right, because here you will be getting road surfacing equipment, but it will be bought from the money formerly given to the Transport Board. Let us get the road surfacing equipment, but let us still help the Transport Board. Children have to get to school, you know, and you cannot expect the whole fare from them either, because the parents are not able to pay. I understand that the private concessionaires give money off and in some cases give free tickets, and I understand that the Transport Board gives a ticket at half the price; so the private concessionaires are pulling their weight with respect to the children. I may be told that the Transport Board is not a Government concern, but I cannot believe it because the Transport Board, as I said, cannot go to the Bank and get money without the sanction of the Government. I do not know if the new members of the Board are going to do it, but that is very risky. I would not commit myself to a Bank for \$300,000 or \$400,000, knowing that if the Transport Board loses I would have to look for the money. I feel that the Government has to come in somewhere, and the Hon. Premier will be able in his reply to tell me how it is being done. As I said, do not try to break down Drax Hall to make Kendal right. We want everything; we want the buses and we want the road-surfacing machine.

The Premier went on to say: "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."

We cannot get away from paying people, Sir; we have to pay for the music, no matter what the tune is. This free secondary education is a very nice thing, and I am sorry I am not one of the parents who will be enjoying this relief. 8.10 p.m.

I still have to pay for the education of my children at a private school and I have to contribute also to the educating of some children whose parents can afford to educate them and mine also. That is not fair. We have to take this thing seriously. You have a certain class of children whose parents are in a position to pay for their education and they are getting it free. On the other hand, you have some children in schools whose parents are not able to pay for them. That could never be fair because the majority of children in private secondary schools are from country districts and most of them are from very poor parentage and you are not making provision for them.

How are these parents going to take it? They were told by you that there would be free secondary education but they are still paying fees for their children. I want the Government to take this thing seriously. I do not want to embarrass them. I do not mind if the people keep the Government in power for three thousand years; but it cannot be fair that some parents who are in a position to pay are getting free secondary education for their children and those who are not able to do so will have to pay. The Government will have to go into it.

I should not have to say anything on this matter. They should know it because I know that many Principals of private secondary schools are finding it very difficult now to collect the fees. I was hearing that there are some Principals who have told pupils of their schools whose fees are not paid not to come back to school in the new term because their parents did not pay their fees for the last term. I do not blame the Principals because they have their expenses to meet. The Government would have to do something for those children who are going to private secondary schools because they should share the same way as those who are going to Government grant-aided schools.

I am saying this to the Government by way of a warning. I want to help the Government. I know that they do not want to hear anything more from me; but I do not want to embarrass them because the time will come if I do not go up to Heaven that I am going to holla very hard if the parents of children who go to private schools do not get any help. When you warn a child that "If you do not do so and so, I am going to lash you", that would encourage him to do what he is told so as to get away from the lashes. A gentleman told me recently: "Lloyd, I feel ashamed that I do not have to pay school fees for my child now, but I still give the money to the mistress and she has told me that she is going to put it down and bank it for the child." He said that he felt that he was in a position to pay. You are not doing this chap a favour, but there are others who would like to thank you but cannot thank you.

I hope the Government will find ways and means to relieve the parents of those children who are at private schools.

The Hon. Premier said that his was not a budget speech and he has cleverly put it in such a way by saying that we are passing money and we should know the policy of Government on education, transport and certain things. Well, we are not voting anything for transport. There is only \$1.00 for the Transport Board to be voted. However, we should know the policy on education before we vote this money. We should know what is to be done for children at the private secondary schools. Anyhow, I will have to wait until the next three months to hear about that in the Premier's Budget Speech. It is a very fine way of doing it so as to get along

with Government Business. I can say nothing more than that I would have to agree with it. I hope by June the Minister will have everything ready for us and is going to lead us in the right way. I can only hope that the Government will tell the parents of these children how far they are prepared to help them.

I do not own a bus, but my colleague owns a bus company: and I know how much I have to give out by way of loans to parents to help pay their children's school fees. The parents come to me and tell me that they have half the amount of the school fees, but the Principal of the school told the child not to come back without the fees. You will have to have a heart of a brute not to lend the parents the money which they ask of you. I can speak on this at length because I know it. It is not every politician that pays out this way.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot more which I can say on this speech but I am not saying anything further tonight. I will say a few words when we come to deal with the Heads of the Estimates themselves. Do not think I have finished with the Ministers yet. However, I am going to sit now and appeal to the present Government to do everything that lies in their power to help these poor children who have to be educated at the private secondary schools.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, before I declare my sentiments on a few of these items mentioned by the Hon. Premier in his speech, I would like to agree with you in saying that the old members in this House should set an example to those members who have just come in here. I do not know if this is the example which old members should set by filibustering for so long on certain items on which in my opinion they could have spoken in a shorter fashion.

Now, Sir, as a junior member of this House I would like to express my satisfaction to the Hon. Premier in his capacity as Minister of Finance for the able manner in which he has presented the facts in connection with the proposed receipts and expenditure for the coming financial year and also to the Cabinet for their effort in controlling expenditure by reducing what they considered to be unnecessary expenditure. I will therefore only speak on a few items.
8.20 p.m.

I will only speak on a few items because I am not a long speaker. As I say, I will speak on some of the items and the first item on which I will speak is Education. From the proposed expenditure, the highest amount is on education; the amount is nearly three times as much as it was ten years ago. I know that this Government has introduced a scheme of free secondary education in the Government-aided Schools; I know, Sir, that with the capable Minister of Education which we now have, this is an expenditure which is worthwhile. I am proud to know that the Government will not have to bring down any Cadbury or Chocolate (*Laughter*) in order to show us how the Department of Education should be run. What I would like to know, however, is if any provision has been made in this expenditure for the purpose of supplying hot meals in the schools or if we will have to come back here with a supplementary Resolution in that connection when the Committee makes its final report.

Mr. Speaker, another thing I have noticed, and hon. members will agree with me, is the great number of children who are attending the secondary schools. I think that we will have to explore every avenue in order to see that employment is obtained for some of these children when they leave school. I would like to impress upon the Hon. Minister the necessity for seeing that these schools give of their best in order to justify the money which is spent on education.

The next highest expenditure is under the Head — Medical and all of us appreciate that the health of a country is of paramount importance. I hope that the Hon. Minister of Social Services will soon see his way to make a statement on the future of the General Hospital, because, as far as can be ascertained, all is not well up there. What is responsible for that state of affairs I feel we should know. I must say that no amount of praise can be too high for the services which are rendered by the Director of Medical Services. (*Cheers*). I hope that if I have the honour to be

here to debate the next Estimates I will be able to say what I have just said about the administration of the General Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk by hon. members about the transport service and I must say that if I did not mention anything about that service, I would be lacking in my duty. I feel it is time that the appropriate Minister should make a statement on the Transport Service. That should be done very soon. It is nearly seven years that the Government was fiddling with the Transport service. I am not prepared to say whether the Government should run the Transport Service or not, and I am not surprised at the present state of affairs because it is believed that the running of a transport service is so simple that any person or persons can operate it. If you were to take up the newspaper, you will see from day to day that someone is directing how the Transport Service should be operated. I feel that the past Government also felt in the same way as I have expressed; that is the reason why they have been throwing away money from year to year on transport. I am happy to know that this Government has decided and is determined not to throw away any money in this direction. (*Cheers*). I would appeal to this Government not to follow the pattern of the last Government where transport is concerned in throwing away the taxpayers' money from time to time. I would appeal to this Government to be realistic and make a statement on the matter of transport at their earliest convenience.

Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat, I want to express my sincere satisfaction for the decision which the Government has seen fit to make to remove the expenditure for refreshments for members of this House. (*Laughter and Cheers*). We, as representatives of the people, should be reasonable. I feel that all of us are businessmen; all of us are running our businesses and we are in a position to provide ourselves with lunch. The Government is quite right in removing the expenditure in this connection and allow that money to be spent in helping the poor, unfortunate and under-privileged people who are more in need of this help than the members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will tire you any longer by saying anything more on this Bill. Whatever I have to say on other matters I will reserve until when this House goes into Committee on this Bill. (*Cheers*).

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member propose to speak on this Bill before the Hon. Minister of Finance makes his closing remarks? (*After a Pause*). Since it appears that there is no other hon. member who wants to speak on this Bill, let the Hon. Premier proceed to make his reply.
8.30 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, there are a few corrections which I would like to make to the typescript of the second reading speech on the Appropriation Bill. It is customary in order to get them on the record of the House not to approach the printers or the Reporters but to have them embodied in the debates of this House as formal amendments. There are a few typographical errors and other errors in the transcript, and I have already supplied a list of these to the Clerk of the House, and he has agreed to all the corrections of what he himself remembers when the speech was made. The corrections are as follows:—

On page 3 in line 14 of the speech, that is two lines before the end of paragraph 2, the word "equilibrium" should read "disequilibrium". In the third line of the last paragraph on the same page, you will see "Bank of England reduced its rate of 5 1/2%". That should read "Bank of England reduced its rate to 5 1/2%". On the next page in line 8, you will see "factors which obtain on the market rate of interest", but that should read "factors which influence the market rate of interest". That is, the words "obtain on" should be deleted and the word "influence" inserted instead. In the last paragraph on the sixth line, or eight lines from the bottom of the page, you will see these words: "dates as far back as 21st July, 1955." That should read "dates as far back as July"; the "21st" should be

deleted, and it is not "1955" but "1957". On page 5, the first word on the last line of the first paragraph which is line 10 on that page should be deleted, so that the last sentence will read: "and the situation which obtains at the present juncture". The word "now" is tautologous. In line 21, that is in the second paragraph, or four lines from the bottom of the second paragraph, that line reads "by a stroke of genius, it was decided, so large was that fund accruing"; that is incorrect and it should read "so large was the amount accruing to the fund".

On page 6, line seven, you will see "all the money was being delegated towards"; that should read "dedicated towards the construction of the Deep Water Harbour". On page 8, six lines from the bottom the word "advisably" should be "advisable" and on the very next line, the last word in the sentence on that line should be "personally", so that it will read "since I am calling on you personally". On page 9, five lines from the bottom, the last word in that line "interest" should read "investment". On page 10, line seventeen — I will have to read the whole sentence which reads as follows: "to simplify the layout of the Estimates as much as possible and as compatible with the accuracy of commonsense". This does not make either sense or commonsense and that is not what was said. It should read "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". So the three corrections are the words "may be" to be inserted before the word "compatible" on that line, the word "the" before accuracy is deleted; and the word "and" is substituted for the word "of" before the word "commonsense". On the same page in line 32 or four lines from the bottom, you will see "The figure is known to fluctuate to \$500,000;" the word "to" should read "around".

If you turn to page 11, Sir, in the second line the word "audited" should be "added". On page 13, line 15 which is in the second paragraph about one-third of the way down, you will see the words "you will have a Minister of Agriculture with technical advisers under him". It should read "Minister of Education with technical advisers under him"; therefore the word "Agriculture" is deleted and the word "Education" is substituted therefor. On page 18 in the first line the word "would" should read "should". In the last line but one which Your Honour would call the penultimate line of the last paragraph but one, there is a correction to be made. The line should read "country which owes him a livelihood".

On page 22, Mr. Speaker, in the last paragraph on the fifth line the word "deficiency" should be "efficiency", something which is a contradiction in terms.
8.40 p.m.

On page 23, Sir, if we go down to the 10th line from the bottom of the debate you will see the word "Stokes". I think I should read from the 12th line from the bottom which reads as follows: "It does not mean that we are going to discourage any private or charitable organisation from promoting family planning in the way that the Stokes Clinic does in the United Kingdom very effectively."

That Clinic should be "Stopes".

On page 26, line four you have the words "negotiating price of sugar". It should be "negotiated price of sugar".

On page 27 line seven, the second word is "by". The word should be "about". Then in line eleven you have the word "exporter". That should be deleted and the word "importer" should be inserted. In the last line but one you have the phrase "quite apart from our export population", it should read "quite apart from our export of population" which means that the word "of" should be inserted after the word "export".

On page 29, line 12 is as follows: "we have to offer rates of interest competitive to those". It should read: "we have to offer rates of interest competitive with those". The word should be "with" instead of "to".

On page 32, line 22, which is the second line in the third paragraph instead of the word "resources", there

should be the words "such reserves". That sentence would now read "Mr. Speaker, the immediate demands for expenditure will be met from such reserves as may be still left." Then we go down to line 29 which is in the same paragraph and that sentence begins: "If you do not have any money on call at short notice and liquid cash," it should read: "If you do not have any money on call or at short notice liquid cash,". The word "or" should be inserted before the preposition "at", and the word "and" should be deleted before the word "liquid".

On the next page which is page 33 in line 12, the sentence starts: "The value must fall to \$50,000...." This should read: "The value does not fall to \$50,000...." Therefore, the word "must" should be deleted and the two words "does not" should be inserted before the word "fall". I am asking that those corrections be made.

Now, Sir, I think that hon. members would want to move into the Committee stage on this Bill. I know that certain questions were asked but I am sure they would be asked in Committee. It is pretty difficult for me sitting down here all day long to remember all the questions. A lot of those questions were rhetorical.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph asked such a question about the Transport Board: whether we would allow the Transport Board to have the same concessions as the Telephone Company and the Electric Company. To the best of my knowledge, the Transport Board has all the concessions possible. It enjoys exemption from duty on the payment of gasoline and it also gets in all its equipment free of customs duty. As far as the Telephone Company is concerned, it is not within my knowledge that the Barbados Telephone Company Limited enjoys any duty free concessions at all. I have never heard of it. It is possible, but I have searched through the Customs Tariff Act and I find no reference to any duty free concessions granted to the Telephone Company. As far as the Barbados Electric Company Supply Corporation which is now called the Barbados Light and Power Company, in the Confirmation Order for the old Barbados Light and Power Company, they were given exemption from customs duty for certain engines, materials and tramways. Large sections of that Act have now been repealed and I am not aware, apart from the new installation equipment which was brought down, that any exemption from customs duty was afforded the Barbados Light and Power Company. There are certain provisions in the Customs Tariff Act stating the rates of duty for electrical equipment and there is no discrimination. In the 1957 Act, Chapter 27, on electric motors, transformers and such material you pay the normal rates of duty, 19% preferential rate, and 20% general rate. As far as the Transport Board is concerned, that already has all these concessions and it is still incurring a loss every year.

I was very much encouraged by the remarks by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph because he himself is an operator of transport. If the hon. senior member for St. Joseph still finds himself viable and not insolvent, it seems to me that we can tell the Transport Board: "Go and do thou likewise".

I think the hon. member has got two things mixed up, the question of operating losses and the purchasing of capital equipment. The Transport Board by something which has got to be exposed at some time or the other which I call an elemental piece of dishonesty, asked the House to bring down a Resolution — and I want the hon. junior member for St. George to sit down now because we do not have to hold a public investigation about this. There are certain members in this community who manage their business affairs in this manner and they have imported this kind of business practice into the Transport Board. The Transport Board came to the House of Assembly and said that they wanted the House of Assembly to guarantee the payment of a bank loan for them. You will see in the Estimates the figures for bringing in new machinery. This was in 1957.
8.50 p.m.

Hon. members of the House got up at that time, including the hon. senior member for the City, and made a contribution to the debate. That was in 1957. The hon. senior

member for St. Peter and others asked the Minister in no uncertain terms to let the House of Assembly know what they were doing, whether they were coming to the House for money to buy the buses or whether a loan was guaranteed, whether the buses were ordered or not. But we knew that the buses were ordered. They said that the House was being asked to guarantee the raising and repayment of a loan. They had already borrowed the money from the Bank and the Bank did not ask them for any guarantee. I have chapter and verse for this. I am not saying what I intend to do with the Transport Board. The hon. senior member for the City has made some suggestions already and if they cannot take a hint, the Minister of Communications will deal with that. It was stated that this money was to guarantee the repayment of the loan at the rate of \$4,500 per month; the Board had no intention of repaying that money, but having had it put in the Estimates by way of a Resolution in 1957, they came back to the House for diminishing amounts year by year.

If you were to look at the notes to the Head "Subsidies and Grants" you will see - I am looking for the amount as it appears in the Estimates - that the amount was \$252,000. They took the approval of the Legislature for permission to take \$625,000 out of the Public Treasury which was never the intention of the Legislature. They refused to repay the Bank the money, but everytime that they ordered new buses they would come to the House - I was not in the House at the time or they would not have got away with it. The Minister was asked questions by the hon. senior member for the City and hon. members can say what they like when we come to deal with this matter in Committee. I say that it is an elemental piece of dishonesty; they systematically purchased the buses when all that the Legislature had undertaken to do was to guarantee the repayment of the loan. As to this \$150,000 the Legislature in Barbados never undertook to subsidise the Transport Board at all. They knew very well that if they had to come to the House for money to purchase the buses, there would have been a kind of inquisition into the workings of the Board. They said that every statutory Board has its loans guaranteed by the Government, but they used a method of purchasing the buses.

When the hon. junior member for St. George described my action as being brutal, I am sorry that I could not be a bit more brutal with them. I would be fairly brutal with them if the matter were in the Law Courts. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I have to refer to a Statutory Board in this way. The peculiar circumstances under which the buses were taken over and given back to the private concessionaires never met with my approval. I do not think it would be advisable for me to say that we are going to give back buses to anybody. If there has been any giving back of buses by the former Minister of Communications, he knows to whom he has given them back and for what reasons he has done so. We are dealing with the Board dispassionately; and in the light of what we know about the financial machinations of the Board, we are not advocating that one penny should be used to subsidise the Board in these peculiar circumstances because the whole thing is being run dishonestly and they are still wanting money. They are using a sleight of hand, if I may describe it as that. I do not need any commission of enquiry; but on the Resolution on which they came forward to this House and by the debates, we can see that they were using public moneys on the assumption that the money was appropriated for the use of the Board when it was never so.

The House was only asked to guarantee the loan. If I ask anybody to guarantee or if I ask for a guarantee at the Bank, I do not expect them to take back my motor car in order to recover the money. That is absolute nonsense. At the time when they came for the guarantee, the Banks did not ask them for any guarantee and they had already advanced them the money. These things have been kept under cover for too long. I have no animosity against any organisation in this country, but you are asking me to look after the finances of the island of Barbados and you have people whom I cannot trust within 5 miles of the puzzling box which my son has at home.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, I wonder if the hon. member would help us as to whether the figure was \$120,000 or \$625,000.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The figure was \$600,000 first and then \$125,000 which makes a total of \$725,000.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, I want to know if the Hon. Premier is in a position to say whether that money was used in the purchase of the buses.
9.00 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would not go in Court and swear it was used for anything, but they said it was used for the purpose of the buses and there are supposed to be, I think, \$242,536 left back out of that allotted vote, and the reason why that has been brought to my attention is that they recently came for the rest of the money, and I asked them which money! When I checked back all the legal steps by which they had been spending this money, I discovered that the Legislature never intended for them to have any money at all. You can check the debates of 1957 - I cannot remember the precise date - but when the hon. member over there gets up and talks about my being brutal, I have to give the public the brutal facts. This Government has no confidence over the running of the Board. If that is telling the hon. member what he wants to hear, that is what we will have to say, but I am not prepared to say that we are giving back anybody the buses. We will do whatever is in the interest of the community.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that answers the hon. member's question. I do not feel it is any part of my duty because I am a Government Minister to get up here and conceal facts, however unpleasant they are, from the public. I do not feel at the same time that it is any part of my duty to run down the people because somebody meets me in the Public Buildings and tells me that somebody has carried away gasoline. I do not pay attention to that kind of thing at all; but when I have printed evidence in the handwriting of the culprits themselves, what do you expect?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would like the Premier whenever it is possible to state the facts, and if there is anything to say, do please say it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: A lot more can be said, but I suppose in the course of the debates, hon. members will be calling for information and we will give the information. It is all there. This is only a short reply, and if there are any other questions which hon. members would have liked me to answer, I would be glad to answer because I cannot possibly remember all the questions. I think I have answered the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain items which will have to be moved in as amendments, but we will do them when the different Heads come up. There are certain amendments which have to be made to the Addenda and to the main services.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction while in Committee of Supply to deal with the Estimates.

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

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, we are committing ourselves to the appropriation of money for certain Government Heads, but is this properly regarded as Committee of Supply? This is the Appropriation Bill. I am informed now that we are dealing with the Estimates at the same time. Formerly we dealt with the Resolution appropriating certain sums of money before we dealt with the Appropriation Bill. This year we are doing this a little differently in that we are passing the Appropriation Bill first, and I was wondering if we are really passing the Estimates as such. I am informed by the Clerk that we are doing so, and therefore I have had my answer.

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

HEAD 1 - GOVERNOR.

Head 1 - Governor was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, Head I will be found immediately after the first blue sheet in the Draft Estimates. I would like to make an amendment to Item 6 - Unestablished Staff. I would like to point out that the note to Item 6 says "For details see Appendix D". Actually, Sir, there should have been a note there. We are not actually amending the addendum, but I want to point out to hon. members under Item 6 that His Excellency the Governor will pay into General Revenue, a fixed annual contribution of \$1,500 towards the wages of Government House staff.

I beg to move that the sum of \$31,299 under Head I - Governor, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 2 - SERVICE COMMISSIONS

Head 2 - Service Commissions - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, Item 13 - Training Fund - is to be reduced by \$40,000, and the revised provision therefore is \$110,000 instead of \$150,000.

I beg to move that the sum of \$412,445 under Head 2 - Service Commissions - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am looking at Item 14 - Leave Passages. Now I heard the Premier say that he is pruning and taking off money; therefore a lot of fringes have to be looked into. I want to ask this: how long since was it that we passed an Act and it cannot be amended? I have not heard the Premier say anything on leave passages. 9.10 p.m.

I want to say here and now that the Barbados public has been given the general feeling - if you had to take a referendum, there would be possibly no man who would vote in favour of your paying out leave passages. The Civil Servants themselves have come to the realisation that we cannot afford this colonial method which was instituted 25 years ago, the continuation of leave passages at this stage. All of that bogus argument that we pay leave passages to these people so as to refurbish their minds has absolutely no meaning as a condition of employment in these days.

I think in this Budget, if the Hon. Premier wants to save money, a positive notice should be given to the Civil Servants who are looking for a free ride that you are going to stop leave passages. There is absolutely no reason why Barbados should be saddled with the paying out of leave passages to the majority of its Civil Service personnel. For the most part they are all Barbadians and why must they be able to go to the United Kingdom out of the pocket of the taxpayers of this country when they are on holiday? It has no meaning to me and this should be the last time we should see provision for it in the Estimates.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if you look at Item 12, you will see Acting Allowances, Payment of Substitutes, \$160,000 and the Note to it says: "to pay officers required to act in various capacities and substitutes for officers going on long leave. Increase in number of officers going on long leave, and on training courses, overseas." From that Note, you can very well see that it is more than \$75,000 for Leave Passages which you are paying out. You have to pay other officers acting allowances when those officers go on leave. We cannot afford these things with the other things which we have to do. You cannot afford the amount of

\$75,000 which we have for leave passages and it will amount to that plus possibly half of this \$160,000; so I certainly agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I was never in favour of these leave passages at all because this amount of money which we vote for it seems to keep up the airline and steamship companies more than anything else. Even the people to whom this money is paid do not get very much from it. There are a lot of things which can be done with this money. Imagine you are taking an ordinary "Bajan" and giving him a trip to England. I can understand your doing this for one who comes from abroad and after a certain number of years he wants to go back home, so you help him along with granting him a loan; but you have the ordinary "Bajan" whom you are picking up and sending him to England by this means. I was never in favour of it. It is not that I am against the people who go on those trips, but it is the principle of the thing which I am against. We are not able to do it. The Hon. Premier seems to me to be using his knife in one direction. When he is going to use it, use it and cut this out altogether.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, I agree with the cutting down of this, but I do not agree with the cutting down on Item 12 which is for Acting Allowances and Payment of Substitutes. I do not agree with what the hon. senior member for the City said.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I said was this. The Hon. Premier mentioned this \$75,000 for Leave Passages. I said that it was not only this \$75,000 but if you look at Item 12, Acting Allowances and Payment of Substitutes, you will see that there is \$160,000 to be voted under that Item and the Note said: "to pay officers required to act in various capacities and substitutes for officers going on long leave. Increase in number of officers going on long leave, and on training courses overseas." Therefore I said that it was part of that too. In other words, I meant that it was more than \$75,000.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, I do not think any hon. member who has been in the House for any time is in any doubt about this whole institution of leave passages. This sum of \$75,000 is more complicated than the question of people working here and going on leave. It also includes provision for officers on contract. The \$75,000 was authorised by Government and it is true that any law which has been made can also be unmade. We have this matter now under consideration; but in the short time which was at our disposal we did not want to take precipitate action of repealing regulations which might have a very bad effect on the status and benefits to which certain officers may have been entitled under contract or otherwise.

Some people may have booked their passage even before the elections to go abroad. We have not yet given a comprehensive study to the officers on contract and Leave Passage is part of their condition of service. According to a recent regulation, we must not only give it to certain officers, but even increase the frequency with which certain officers from the United Kingdom may be entitled to leave. Of course, the United Kingdom Government is going to pay the substantially increased cost in its participation of the frequency in which these officers may leave the colony and come to the United Kingdom. That is what is happening in this colonial era which is coming to an end. They are also insisting that their children may come out to the colony once a year. They are going to pay for all of this and the only reason why I did not take it out entirely was because we do not want to do any injustice to some of these officers. This is something which we hope by next year if we are not able to entirely eliminate it that it would be so reduced that it would be a negligible portion of what it is now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I will like the Hon. Premier to look at Item 17, Loans to Public Officers. The Note says: "To provide loans to public officers in special cases. May be paid only on the authority of the Executive Committee". I would like the Hon. Premier to explain that more fully. Does it mean through illness or defalcation?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: This sum, Mr. Chairman, is provided for cases of emergencies such as that in which a pub-

lic officer and a member of his family may have to go for an emergency operation.

The question that the sum of \$412,445 under Head 2 - Service Commissions - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 3 - LEGISLATURE

Head 3 - Legislature - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Under Head 3, there are quite a few amendments which have to be made. If hon. members take their pencils in hand, they will be able to follow me. On page 5, Item 6, Speaker, the amount of \$6,480 is to be reduced by \$1,200 making a revised provision \$5,280. The note is to be amended in accordance with legislation to be enacted. That Bill will shortly be brought to the House.

Under the same Head, on page 6, Item 20, Refreshments, the amount to be deleted is \$14,000. The revised provision is nil under this item. Hon. members may have noticed in the Press that the figure quoted to be reduced under this item was \$1,400. The actual figure is \$14,000. 9.20 p.m.

Some hon. members are asking if any alternative arrangements are being made whereby hon. members can get light or not so light refreshments. I should like to say that I have discussed this matter with His Honour the Speaker and everything is being done to make sure that some kind of canteen arrangement is made for hon. members to get refreshments for which, of course, they will pay. On the same page 20, this note should be deleted altogether because the Act 1891-7 is not the correct one. Under Item 21 - Stationery - there is a bit of confusion here. The note which reads "to meet stationery requirements" is the correct one; but as far as Note 20 is concerned, that is, "Act 1891-7 as amended by Act, 1946-13" is incorrect. You will see that that is a printer's error and that the note should read "Act 1891-24 as amended by Act, 1946-13". Then the Travelling Allowance for His Honour the Speaker should be increased by \$360 so that the revised provision would be \$1,080 instead of \$720. That has to be amended in accordance with legislation which was laid in the House today. The Government Hospitality Vote is to be increased by \$4,000 which will make a total of \$10,000. I am asking leave to make these amendments.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: With those amendments, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$44,613 under Head 3 - Legislature - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I feel it is my responsibility to say a few words on this matter. I do not know that the Hon. Premier has given all of the facts.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. That is not true. If the hon. member will look at the speech he will see that I traced the matter right through. It was decided to put His Honour the Speaker on the same scale as a Minister and this Item has amounted to a net reduction of \$70 a month in the emoluments of the Speaker.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the point I wish to make is this: when the last Speaker was serving elsewhere the salary was taken to the present level. I think it is unfair to the Speaker and I think that he himself would like the public to know what the position is. When the salary was increased so as to facilitate the last Speaker, it was done with the understanding that this job was to be a full-time one. I believe that the work is not enough to keep the Speaker tied up and today he is operating on a part-time basis. I think it is only fair to allow the public to know that when he is seen working in the Law Courts he is doing so with some understanding that the Speaker's job is not a full-time job and there has been a reduction in the salary. Now how

can you justify this increase of travelling allowance? The present Speaker is operating from his Chambers once to this Assembly whereas the past Speaker was operating from 24 miles. I remember the criticism which was made by hon. members opposite in this House, on platforms and elsewhere in connection with the \$90 a month as Travelling Allowance for the Ministers.

I feel that His Honour the Speaker would not like the country to feel otherwise in respect of this reduction in salary, and I hope we will see a tablet on his door. On the question of this additional \$360, the present Speaker is not expected to do the same travelling which the last Speaker did and therefore I think that you would be in trouble in order to justify this amount. It is perfectly honest and it is good for the country for the Speaker to accept this reduction of \$1,200 a year with the understanding that he will continue his practice in the Law Courts, but there is nothing you could advance to have Parliament and the public feel that it is necessary to increase this travelling allowance by \$360. As I have already said, the Speaker is operating from his Chambers, a distance of less than a quarter of a mile from Parliament; but when the previous Speaker was in office, this Travelling Allowance was based on the understanding that there was a distance of 24 miles involved. 9.30 p.m.

I believe, Mr. Premier, that with your anxiety to use the sharp edge.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like the hon. member to address the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: I am addressing the Chair. When I say "Mr. Premier" I mean Mr. Premier through the Chair. I am pointing out to the Premier that he cannot justify it, and I feel that it may involve some embarrassment to the Speaker. If you are going to use the sharp edge of the pruning knife rather than the back of the blade, you should use that \$320 or \$330 to buy lubricating oil for the Barber Green and you would make the Speaker happy. I am more than sure about this.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the hon. junior member for St. George. The hon. member knows that the last Government got and cooked up something for the former Speaker; no law was passed in here. Who passed any law in here saying that the post of Speaker is a whole-time job? It was a convenient arrangement because you lost the election in St. John, and you ran helter-skelter and asked the former Speaker to come back, but which law says so? There is no debate in this Assembly which says that the Speaker's post was to be whole time, and I challenge any member who was a member of the House at the time to bring the debate showing the dictatorial methods that were used. The first time you heard about this whole-time business was in this election when the hon. member's Party was trying to cook up another election and had the former Speaker in some position, and now the hon. member is saying that he was made to understand not to run. Who passed the law saying that the former Speaker had to give up his other job? There is something very sordid about the whole affair. The former Speaker had a job which they told him to give up, and he did. Somebody probably thought it was *in fra dig* for the former Speaker to be a Trade Unionist, and he probably felt so.

Mr. Chairman, I would not consider it *in fra dig* for me to be a Trade Unionist and be Speaker, because I feel that my profession is as honourable as any barrister, doctor or lawyer, and I could go into any cane piece at any time to meet a worker and still come back and sit in the Chair without lowering the dignity of the Chair. If a schoolmaster was made Speaker, and he did not want to remain as a schoolmaster and felt like giving up his post, that would be a matter for him; but do not tell me that anything was passed here making the Speakership a whole-time job. That is what you may have done behind the scenes. That is what I believe may have happened, but nothing was done in Parliament telling somebody that he must give up his job in order to come here and serve.

Mr. Chairman, the question about people giving up their jobs was suggested in the case of Ministers, but it was ad-

hered to in the breach. You were a piece of Minister and a piece of something else. That is why when the hon. member asked if the Ministers were running anything else, he could be told "no", because the hon. junior member for St. George was a Minister but still had his ice factory. Mr. Chairman, I am saying that the Speakership was not a whole time job; it was only a bogus arrangement, and I am not going to sit here and underwrite any foolishness. Imagine a Minister telling another man who is drawing less than a Minister that he must give up his job, when that Minister had an ice factory which he did not give up when he was drawing \$800. The former Premier practised as a doctor and was drawing \$1,000 a month. He was letting down his basket and taking up the dollars. A woman by the name of Mayers who used to be my servant said that the person whom the doctor sent back for a penny was she. Therefore the doctor was getting \$1,000 a month and still letting down his basket and practising on Sundays, because Sunday is the big day. Yet they came back with some bogus arrangement saying that it was undignified for a person to be Speaker and have to go in a cane piece to a worker. The Ministers whose salaries were higher than that of the Speaker did not give up their other businesses, but the hon. member is now saying that it was agreed that the Speakership should be a whole-time job.

Mr. Chairman, if the present Government of which the Speaker is a Party member has decided that the Speaker's emoluments can be reduced, it is a matter for the Government in power. They are not asking for more money. The hon. member raised the question about travelling allowance. All of us here know where the Speaker lives. You may ask the Government to explain what are the reasons for increasing his travelling allowance to the same amount as the Ministers, but where he lives or where he operates his office does not come into it, because if you base it on where his office operates, you will have to ask what the travelling allowance was based on on the last occasion. Let me tell everybody in this House that we are intelligent men in here. We are not dealing with somebody in Flat Rock or Bawdens.. (A VOICE: That is in St. Andrew.).....Or in Mile-and-a-Quarter, Rock Hall, Lonesome Hill or Roebuck who does not understand the intricacies of Parliament. I would not say "Cats Castle", because that is the University. We are members of this Chamber, and we look through things and know when it comes to these small allowances that the total salary was brought back to \$600, but you gave the member an opportunity of not having to pay income tax on all. What was the original position? The Speaker's salary was put down at the rate of \$6,480 per annum and then he had a further allowance of \$720, so that when you add \$720 to \$6,480, the figure is \$7,200. Therefore you gave a salary that was less than \$600 out of the Treasury so that the income tax was reduced by a taxable amount of \$720 a year less. You were giving the Speaker a travelling allowance of \$60 a month, and it was done to suit the incumbent at that time; so do not say you cannot justify it. What was the justification of giving the Speaker \$600 when no other member in the House was increased? This was done to the Speaker

alone after the Federal Elections when a new incumbent was made Speaker and you came with an amendment to the Speaker's emoluments.
9.40 p.m.

In 1959, that is three years ago, the then Speaker resigned from a job which he did; therefore, he would have to make an increase in this emolument for somebody who was giving up a job. You cannot call on any member of Parliament to give up a job to be Speaker.

The hon. junior member for St. George was a party to this cooked up business of the Speaker being paid \$600 a month because if a gentleman by the name of Mr. J. W. B. Chenery had been made Speaker, the situation would have been entirely different. The hon. members from that side should not open their mouths. I do not know what the hon. member is talking about this being a wholetime Speaker. We never had anybody yet being a wholetime Speaker. He is Speaker of the House of Assembly and after the House is adjourned he can go and play a game or play a saxophone.

Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. MILLER and the Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will listen to the hon. senior member for the City.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, it was the intention of the Government to move the adjournment of the House at 9.30 o'clock. We were here since 10 a.m. o'clock. Therefore, at this stage I want to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Before I move the adjournment, in fixing the Order Paper, the first item would be continuation of Committee in Supply to discuss the Estimates. I presume that Private Members' Business would remain the same.

I now beg to move that this House do now stand adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, 21st March, 1962, at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

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

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