THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 27th March, 1962.

A Special Meeting of the House of Assembly was held at 10 o'clock a.m. today.

PRESENT

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

Prayers were read.

Messrs. MOTTLEY and WALCOTT entered the House and took their seats.

Mr. WALCOTT CALLS ATTENTION TO STANDING ORDER NO. 5 (9)

Mr. WALCOTT: Before Your Honour calls the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw to your attention Rule 9 of Standing Order No. 5 which reads as follows:-

"If, during an adjournment of the House, it is represented to the Speaker by a Minister that the public interest requires that the House should meet on an earlier day than that to which the House is adjourned, he may give notice accordingly and the House shall meet at any time stated in such notice. The business set down for that day shall be appointed by the Government and notice thereof shall be circulated not later than the time of meeting."

I will like this opportunity to state that it is within your prerogative to call a meeting at any time when such matters are represented to you; but I think it should be made clear that the purpose of this section in accordance with May's Parliamentary Practice is that if an extraordinary thing has taken place since the meeting of Parliament for which there should be a meeting of the House before the date on which it should meet again, that is the circumstance in which the Speaker uses his prerogative to call a meeting.

I would not like the Government to think that it is purely a matter for them when the House should meet and the Speaker to call a meeting. It is the Speaker's prerogative.

The reason why I say that is because the matters on today's Order Paper for this Special Meeting are matters which were ostensibly fixed for Thursday's meeting. What circumstances have taken place that you have to call this meeting before the date to which the House adjourned to consider these matters? Was it something which took place which they did not know of when they moved the adjournment of the House at the last meeting? It should be only something of an urgent nature. We do not want this rule to be abused for any kind of reason, and for one to feel that Parliament can be summoned by someone saying that one is calling a meeting of the House of Assembly on a date other than the date fixed.

I want to register my protest because it was drawn to the Leader of the House that the House should have met on another date than that which was fixed to do the business of the Government. The Hon. Leader of the House is not in his seat and we are not going to be any little boys to be called here on this rule because they have it in their prerogative when they should call a meeting.

Mr. SPEAKER: With respect to what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, I wish to say that I myself am in complete agreement and it is only because the hon. senior member for St. Peter is of such athletic ability and rose before I did that he had the opportunity to put before this Honourable Chamber what I intended hon. members to know.

The House was originally adjourned until Thursday of this week at 3 o'clock p.m. Urgent representations were made to me by the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour who is the Leader of the House, that in the public interest he requested that the House should meet on an earlier day than that to which it was orginally adjourned. I gave the matter serious consideration because I am just as cognisant, if not more cognisant, than the hon. senior member for St. Peter of the powers of the Speaker, not one of which will be whittled down so long as I have the honour to be in the Chair. After the matter had received my anxious thought, and bearing in mind the Standing Order which the hon. senior member for St. Peter has read, which is paragraph 9 of Standing Order No. 5, to be found on page four of the Standing Orders of the General Assembly of Barbados, I had intended at the opening of this meeting to read this Standing Order and to explain for the benefit of the new members of the House the reason why they have been recalled prior to the date of the adjournment.

I decided, in view of the urgent, and I must say quite respectful, representation of the Hon. Leader of the House and by virtue of my power which is that I can give notice so long as it is in the public interest, to call this meeting and it is to be understood that the only business which can be done is the business of a special nature which appears on this Agenda. Let me assure hon. members that I regard this privilege as I do the other privileges of this Honourable House and, so far as the Government is concerned, it may govern, and so far as this Speaker of the House is concerned, the Speaker will rule.

ORDER NO. 1

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is a 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, No. 46, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the Order Paper in the normal way, I am asking for leave to lay the Port Estimates for the year 1962-63 and further to deal with the Resolution in connection with the matter at a later stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will grant permission to the acting Leader of the House to lay these Port Estimates, because they apply to a matter on the Special Agenda for today.

May I also add that when I agreed to acquiesce to the request of the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour to summon this meeting, I made it clear to him in a letter issued on my instructions, directed to him by the Clerk of the House that I had decided to acquiesce to his request by virtue of the power vested in the Speaker according to Standing Order No. 5, Paragraph 9.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries may lay the Port Estimates.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay:

The Barbados Estimates of revenue and expenditure for the Port Department for the year 1962-63.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to give notice of a Resolution to approve of the Port Estimates for the year 1962-63, a copy of which I just had the honour of laying.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1961-62, No. 46

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is a 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, No. 46, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.
10.15 a.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: 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 that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply 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.

Mr. BOXILL and Hon. E. W. BARROW joined the Committee.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1961-62, No. 46

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of $25,568 under three Heads of the Estimates, and I propose to take them separately.

HEAD III — ACCOUNTANT GENERAL

Head III – Accountant General – was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that Head III stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD XXVI — PENSIONS

Head XXVI – Pensions – was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that Head XXVI stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD XXIX — MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Head XXIX – Miscellaneous Services – was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

Mr. YEARWOOD came into the Committee and took his seat.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of $25,568 do now pass.

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

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

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

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

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

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

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (REMUNERATION OF MEMBERS BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949. As has been explained at the time of the passing of the Departmental Estimates, an amendment to the existing Act would be necessary in view of the decision, and the acceptance by Your Honour of that decision, of the House that the remuneration of the office of Speaker be reduced from its present level to the sum of $5,280 per annum. That is a reduction of $1,200 per annum. At the same time, under the same Act the decision was made to increase the travelling allowance of the Speaker from $720 per annum to $1,080 per annum. That effects an overall saving of $70 a month or $840 per annum. Without repeating what I said before and expressing the gratitude of the House for the example which Your Honour has given to the rest of the community and also the members of this House, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I was hoping that after the Premier spoke on the Estimates in connection with this amendment, on this occasion he would have had something further to say other than mentioning what is more or less the goodwill of the Speaker in accepting

a reduction which would mean a saving to the Treasury at the rate of $70 a month. For the sake of the record and of history I think you will agree with me that, for the sake also of posterity, that on this side the matter should be clearly stated even if you want to be repeating things and be redundant in making a case for this change. In any attempt to follow the United Kingdom in the policy which was followed in the last hundred years or so, we thought it necessary, with a growing democracy in parliamentary procedure, that we should probably perpetuate the customs followed and accepted by the office of the Speaker of Parliament.
10.25 p.m.

You will remember, Sir, that the Speaker of the Barbados Labour Party was forced to refrain from going on platforms in his constituency, in spite of the fact that there was a number of meetings held there during the election, and it was an attempt to follow the accepted practice of the Parliament in the United Kingdom. I remember only too well that it was agreed by the Leaders of all the Parties and the Speaker himself that the remuneration of the Speaker should be increased, and that they would expect him to accept his job as Speaker on a whole-time basis. It is true there was no Act — I do not know it was necessary — and we were following tradition and practice as was accepted then. It was for that reason that the hon. member resigned his job as Assistant Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union.

Mr. Speaker, it was unfortunate at the time when the decision was taken that a number of other things which should have followed did not take place; nevertheless the principle will remain for all time. You will remember, Sir, that we had a subsequent debate in the House when the appointment was made, but there was no Act. The Leaders of the three groups in Parliament met and agreed to increase the salary of the Speaker. In the circumstances that prevail, the idea that the office of Speaker could be regarded as a full-time job will probably entail some speculation, but, Mr. Speaker, you will forgive me if I repeat what I said during the debate on the Estimates. When the present Speaker decided that he would accept the post, there were a number of questions by the public as to whether the practice of a full-time office for the Speaker would continue. I agree, Sir, that if there is not enough work, you should continue to practise your profession in order that you could give the value of your accumulated knowledge and experience at the Bar, and since you are satisfied that the business of the House would not involve you in full-time employment, there is nothing wrong, and I rather think it is in the interest of the community generally that you should continue your practice at the Bar. If out of your good thinking and what would appear to be noble to the community you accept a reduction in your remuneration since you accept the post on a part-time basis, I want to agree with that; but there is nothing wrong in saying that for the sake of the debates and for the sake of history, I think the time has come when we want to be clear about these things. A number of persons inside and outside of the City have asked since you have been appointed as Speaker what is the position, and whether you should continue to work on a part-time basis and at your profession. I see no reason for comment on it other than that under the original agreement when the remuneration of the Speaker was increased, it was thought necessary that he should be on a permanent and full-time basis.

Now I remember the criticisms that were made in and out of the House and on the platforms with regard to the travelling allowance for Ministers of $90 a month, and I remember the distortions and all that was said on those occasions. I remember that during the discussions in Parliament, members referred to the tremendous salaries of $700 or $800 to Ministers and to the fabulous sum of $90 a month in travelling. At that time it was not thought necessary to increase the Speaker's travelling to $90 a month, and inspite of this we are having this amendment to increase the travelling of the Speaker against the criticisms which were levelled at the Ministers who so often had to be out of their offices, and I am happy from some of the remarks of the members from the Government benches from time to time that they now realise the laborious task of operating the Ministries. I think they have had an opportunity of seeing what it is to run a Government; it is a lot more than could easily be said from the Opposition Benches.

With that comment I thought for the sake of history that the public and the world should know the reason for this reduction, and whether or not it was a question of asking you to tighten your belt further because the economy would mean something. I do not think that is really the position at the moment, and I do not know that I need say anything further on this as there are other items to get through with; but I thought for the sake of the record that mention should be made in order that in future we would be able to follow the decision of this Parliament.

Mr. WALCOTT: I would not like to bring Your Honour into this discussion about money, but I fail to understand why it is that the hon. junior member for St. George repeats this nonsense. I owe no allegiance to anybody or any Party in this House. I am interested in the people of St. Peter and my next allegiance is to my conscience. All Governments have their peculiar way of acting. The hon. member's Government changed the Speakership twice. The Speakership was changed on one basis from what it was before to $400 a month; so I do not know what nonsense the hon. junior member for St. George is talking. It was changed to suit Dr. Cummins. The hon. member was a Minister then getting $600 a month, but they carried the Speaker's salary to $400 for no rhyme or reason only because Dr. Cummins was going to get the post.

I would tell the hon. member that the Speaker of the Party to which he belongs went on a platform in 1956 in the constituency which I represent; so therefore there is no question of the Speaker as Speaker not going on a platform. The Speaker is a member of the Assembly: and if he decides for any given reason to do anything he feels like doing, that is his prerogative. If any person reaches the high honour of the Chair after he has run, Mr. Speaker, and he is going to allow any Government, whether or not he is a member of that Government, to tell him that they are going to make him Speaker on the understanding that he should give up another job or that he should do this or do that, then I say, Mr. Speaker, the matter is left for the incumbent of that Office to decide. If the last Speaker was such a marionette and puppet that he was made Speaker because he said he was going to give up a job and that was a condition of employment, I would say that we do not employ Speakers.

Mr. MILLER: I hope the hon. member will give way on a point of order, in order that.....

Mr. SPEAKER: If it is a point of order, automatically he gives way. If it is not, it is a matter for him whether he will give way. Is it a point of order?

Mr. MILLER: I think so, Sir. When the salary of the last Speaker was increased, it was as a result of agreement by the leaders of the three Parties. It was for that reason and for that reason alone that we could justify an increase in salary.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. George talks about history. The point I am making is that the Speakership was increased to $400 in 1959. That was done ostensibly for Dr. Cummins who was a former Minister, and the hon. member who is now speaking came in and succeeded him in the Ministry and held the portfolio which the former Premier held. He became Minister of Social Services after Dr. Cummins, and that is when they increased the salary to $400 a month to suit him. It did not suit him to accept it as a whole-time job; so they did not say it was a whole-time job. Now the hon. member is saying that the Speakership is a whole-time job.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in Parliament for 17 years, and there are only three members in this House who are older than I am, and it was never yet said that the Speakership was a job. The jobs in here are the Clerk, Deputy Clerk, Marshal, Typists and Reporters. Members of Parliament are Members of Parliament. There are no jobs here. Nobody told me it was a job; who applied for it? Who looked into the application? What testimonials did he have? This is a totally elected Chamber and you can only become a Speaker of this Chamber when you first become an elected member. If you want to change this, you would have to do what is done in the United Kingdom. They have single member constituencies, and therefore they say that when once

you elect a Speaker — and this is nothing to do with any question of making it a whole-time job -- and it has the approval of the House, they would not contest that seat. Not that the seat is not contestable, because any member of the United Kingdom Parliament can go tonight and contest an election where the Speaker is a member, and if he has more popularity than all the Parties put together, he would beat the Speaker and you would have to elect a different Speaker.
10.35 a.m.

Do you know that Mr. W. S. Morrison, afterwards Lord Dumfarline, went to Australia and died? He was a member of the House of Commons and the Conservative Party differed in the appointment of the Speakership as to who was going to be elected because the other side said that the Deputy Speaker should be the man; but the new Party brought in a man and put it to the vote.

The hon. junior member for St. George is making out today that the Speakership of this Assembly is a job; therefore someone gave up their job to become Speaker. Therefore, the designation of your job, if someone was to ask you, is "Speaker". He is saying so because it suits somebody to be a political idiot: but are you asking Parliament to accept that? Must I agree with that? When the hon. member said that these people know, that is a matter for the Government and the various Parties. I was never a party to a matter like that and I would never be a party to a situation where the Speakership of this House is a whole-time job. I would be a party to a situation where you say that you should not contest the Speaker's constituency. But even when it comes to that, the Party to which the hon. member belongs voted against that. I think the hon. junior member for St. George should be the last member to say that, knowing the policy of the Party to which he belongs was to contest the very seat in which they said that an arrangement was made with that member. The former Leader of that Party with this cooked-up arrangement with the former Speaker turned around and asked him if he wanted to agree to something like that. They put another candidate to run against me and they failed and failed badly and I am not going to sit here and for the sake of the record allow any statement to be made that there was an agreement with Parliament that the Speakership of this Chamber should be a whole-time job.

I want to say this. Do not say that Parliament agrees to these things. The position of the Speaker should not be used in debate because you may use that position of the Speaker as if you are making a gift. If Parliament feels that the Speakership as such should be in a particular position and the person who is Speaker is not in that position, well, you do so. When a person is elected as Speaker of this Assembly, as Speaker, that person stands above all Parties. I would be alone in defending the rights and privileges of the Speaker. Of course, I do not feel that Your Honour should allow yourself to be pushed around in that Chair. All of us have agreed to elect you as Speaker; therefore all of us have to give to you the respect and honour which are due to you. I do not know if anybody, because they want to push the Speaker around, said that the Speakership of this Chamber is a wholetime job so that they may tell you that you must decide to name the hon. senior member for St. Peter and that you in your position must not allow him to talk against the Government. I do not know if that sort of arrangement was made so that you may do so. I do not know if one of the reasons to make the job of Speaker a whole-time job was that he could name the hon. senior member for St. Peter freely because he would not have to go at the Union and work with me. If that is the sort of thing, I have a name and anybody can call my name anywhere.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. senior member for St. George said that he was speaking for the record and for posterity. Any speech made in here is a speech which is recorded and it is part of the archives of the House, unless there is some catastrophe, for generations to come; so I do not think the hon. member should say that he is speaking for posterity. Hon. members should realise that in future years some archivist or historian would go to the archives of the House of Assembly and scrutinise the debates to see what types of people were in the House of Assembly in days of yore.

As the hon. junior member for St. George has been reminded on more than one occasion by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, there is no such thing as job of Speaker of the House of Assembly. There has never been any such suggestion, except at a time when an increase in the emoluments was sought to be justified, and there has not been any Speaker of this House from 1627 until today who has been deprived of another job or who has regarded this as a whole-time job. That is the position as it stands today because it would be absolutely ridiculous to expect a person who is Speaker and who is not normally entitled to vindicate himself in the eyes of the electors to give up his employment and sit down in the Chair to preserve law and order and to see that the debates are conducted in the right way and when an election comes up he has to take up his opponents. Therefore, no one has ever expected that the office of Speaker should be any other than an office to which the Speaker is elected by a unanimous or majority vote of his fellow elected members of this Chamber. That is the position. I do not think therefore that such a statement was made in the matter anywhere.

If the hon. junior member for St. George would reflect back to some time back in 1957 after his predecessor as Minister of Social Services in rather distressing circumstances was elected to the Chair of this House - circumstances which did not have general approbation even of the members of this Chamber or of the general public — he would remember that the then Premier stated that one could no more expect the Speaker-designate, who was the former Minister of Social Services, to give up his profession in the practice of medicine than Mr. Attlee to give up Mrs. Attlee and that it would be easier to ask the Speaker to go out and hang himself than to give up the practice of medicine. Of course, that is a view which I never shared. I do not think there would be a catastrophe if he had to officially desist from that practice, but that is a matter of personal opinion.

When a Leader of a Party makes a statement like that and then like the allegedly responsible former Minister of Social Services comes in here and says that the Speaker's job is now a whole-time job and we are making some departure from it, it appears to me that he has some illusions that the Party to which he belongs may be at some time in the unforeseeable future returned in this country and then he would have to justify re-instating the salary to what it was before or make some greater emoluments in the salary of Speaker. He appears to be speaking not so much for the record but to prepare the ground for an increase in the emoluments of Speaker. If we come to circumstances after taking them into consideration that the emoluments of Speaker should be increased again, we will come to the House and give the reasons.
10.45 a.m.

One of the reasons, I would like now to make it abundantly clear, will never be that it was a whole-time job, that we made it a part-time job and we want to make it a whole-time job again. Until such time as the office of the Speaker is one of the nomination of a Speaker who has not faced the electorate, I do not really anticipate any circumstances arising as a result of which we will have to come here and say that the office of Speaker is a full-time job. It has never been so regarded and I do not see why any change should be made in that respect. The only reference to this question of the office of Speaker being a whole-time job which I can find in the records of this House, was on the 5th May, 1959, when the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour who I understand is a warri-er of no mean repute *(Laughter)* made a statement to that effect. After that the then Premier said this:-

"The office of Speaker becomes a whole-time office and he is, so to speak, the Head of a Department. He has under his supervision two Clerks, Reporters and Typists, Messengers and Librarian. He will be required to come to his office daily and the reason for the service of a free telephone is this: As Your Honour and the House know, Your Honour very often has to be called to the telephone on the business of the Legislature" so do we all, in order that Ministers may get your permission to proceed with certain Orders relative to the House such as Bills, Resolutions and things of that sort.

There is hardly anything more I can say except in order to repeat that by this Bill we are making an effort, as some people say even though belatedly, to bring the office of Speaker up to the status of similar offices in this area. I may add that this is in accordance with the agreement of other parties in this House. This was submitted to them and we have the agreement of the leaders."

That is what the then Premier said. And then Your Honour felt yourself constrained to correct the then Premier by saying this:-

"It is a fact that this matter has been the subject of discussion between ourselves and we understand what the Government proposed to do and this Bill has come down to us only after previous discussions. However, I would say that I was rather surprised when I heard mention of a free telephone because I do not recall that being the subject of any prior discussion. I am also rather surprised to see that the travelling is a separate and distinct thing instead of that amount being part of the salary, so as to bring it into line, as desired, with the salaries of that of the Speakers of British Guiana, Jamaica and Trinidad."

There was a long debate on the matter and I think that the hon. senior member for St. Philip and the hon. senior member for St. Peter both expressed their views very strongly on the matter. I just thought that I would mention what previous discussion there had been on the matter. We do not at all subscribe to the idea that the office of Speaker is a full-time job. The position in Trinidad is different in that the Speaker, up to a few months ago, was a nominated member and not a member of the Legislature as such. In 1959 the Speaker was a retired judge of the Supreme Court of that Colony and not a person who had stood for election.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: 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 on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do not report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

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

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

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

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

RATES OF INCOME TAX BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year one thousand nine hundred and sixty-two and to make provision for certain matters in connection with the levying of the said tax.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is in all respects similar to the Bill providing for the rates of income tax for the current year 1961-62. The rates remain unchanged as I indicated to hon. members at the time of the introduction of the Appropriation Bill. I therefore beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

10.55 a.m.

HOUSE GOES INTO COMMITTEE

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, just before you put the question, I am a bit worried myself. I suppose the House will remember what I attempted to say on the occasion of debating the Estimates re Income Tax and Companies Tax. There has been a good deal of unrest developing since the decision by the Minister of Finance to make that statement which I thought was rather unfortunate although it was clear that some arrangement would be made whereby we could collect tax for the year 1962-63. In a growing and developing society such as ours.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, we are considering a Bill to settle the rates of income tax, and the hon. member says that the statement I made saying that there would be no increase in Income Tax and Companies Tax is unfortunate. Would I have to come here with some Bill showing that there is no change in Income Tax?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the Premier means by that. How could I say that? I was just discussing the statement he made during the Budget. He said it was not a Budget for the year and that he would bring a Plan later in the year whether for two or three years - we hope it would not be for more than three years - and it was then that he said there would be no change in Income Tax and Companies Tax at least for the year 1962-63. Am I free in Committee to discuss this? I am yet to understand the whole idea of appeasement in a flourishing economy like ours with a prosperity that is clearly and easily seen. In recent years you have seen Barclays Bank expand in a new structure costing some $3,000,000; you have seen a changed structure and expansion in the Royal Bank of Canada; a new Bank opened its door in this country called the Nova Scotia; Barclays Bank has acquired the whole block and are going to move into Roebuck Street after a period of three years when they complete this construction.

In addition to this, Mr. Chairman, there is a fourth Bank in the Island, and it is obvious that in a community such as ours a Bank would only move into the Island where

there is an expression of prosperity that would warrant the cost of its operation. Now a cardinal condition of socialism is that the services, social and otherwise, in a community must be developed at the expense of industry, but it was accepted all over the world that poverty and unemployment were inevitable, and even though things have changed considerably over the years, not more than thirty years ago when the population in the United Kingdom was 56 million, there was the false idea and belief engendered by the monied classes that poverty was inevitable, and we can see it as expressed in Barbados where in a country of 166 square miles, we find it necessary to build eleven almshouses.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we are missing a tremendous point of vantage in our country's development, and there is no mistake that you can see in every village the building industry, and this must always and can only come from earnings and savings. What are we going to do in a society like ours if we must carry this wheel another turn? How are we to find money to provide social services? The whole idea was for a philanthropist to give the little pennies he could not get into his purse. It should no longer be left to industry or to the wealth of a community to decide what share is taken; it is a question of the Government's intervention in industry, and I am unhappy to see today the decision that there will be no change when it is obvious, and if the Minister of Finance was willing to examine or have his Financial Development examine, he would discover, that there are some companies in this Island that are making $1/4 million or $1/2 million a year in excess profit. We have reached the stage in the development over the last fifteen or twenty years to warrant money to provide services; and remember, the history of our country is still speckled in its outlook. After the emancipation of the slaves, some people worried about the slaves, and when it was thought that the cost of shelter and the provision of breadfruits would mean $200 a year for fifty slaves, it was decided that the plantation owners and industrialists would continue to pay $200. It was not whether or not he was a free citizen.

Mr. Chairman, even the Historians seem to have forgotten a little folk song and fail to repeat it. When St. Mary's was being built and the contractors instructed what was then accepted as the Clerk of Works to pay a penny a day to the men who were selected, the workers sang "Before I work for a penny a day, I would cut off my fingers and throw them away."
11.05 a.m.

Today, we can afford to swell the coffers of the Treasury by excess profit tax on Companies, if the Hon. Premier thinks you should bring relief to the people paying income tax in the lower brackets. This country has been prospering at a rate that a blind man on a trotting horse can see. Look at the country's improvement in every village and every district. In this small society of ours, look and you will see that we have four big commercial banks and the persistence in their expansion can be seen just across the streets where a new structure is going up in the Roebuck Street commercial centre. That is an indication of the country's prosperity. If the Hon. Premier would take time off and make use of his Financial Department, I am sure that he would see some of those companies which put aside $1 1/4 million could probably swell the coffers about which he is now unhappy.

I believe it is unnecessary for me to speak on this any longer having said what I said on the Estimates. Fortunately, we are in Committee on this Bill and probably I will have another opportunity to express myself. If you are satisfied that today we should continue to improve the social amenities of our community, if we fail to collect earnings from excess profits, it must mean something in a community such as ours. It is all right to talk idle talk sometimes, but when you reach a stage where the Conservative bloc in Parliament faces a situation where you are saying that there would be no increase in companies tax, you must start to wonder if we are not in trouble.

The entire national debt of the United States of America is borne by the people of the United States. If what the Hon. Minister of Finance says is the true situation, that is, that they are experiencing difficulty in getting the loans asked for on the local market, the answer is very easy. The answer to that is that fabulous sums are collected by insurance companies operating in the Island and the exporting of that money needs to be examined. When you find tremendous sums going overseas to develop other territories, then you must decide whether we are doing the right thing in allowing all that money to be sent abroad. You may blame the last Government; but if the last Government was responsible for everything, then you can very well abolish the idea of government. But it must continue to grow and review; it must continue to expand and change in its philosophy as it brings relief which is so important to the nation.

Sir, I have spent many hours examining the question of the income tax rates. I think that considerable change can be made in the scale of rates on income tax so as to bring relief to the middle and lower income tax brackets. It is not only the lower income tax brackets that need relief; the people in the middle income tax bracket also need relief so as to provide education overseas for their children. If you were to do that, I think it is likely to have commendable action on our society.

With these few remarks, I express myself on this matter and if it is necessary for me to speak again, Mr. Chairman, then surely, I will crave your indulgence and patience.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I wish to inform the hon. senior member for the City who rose the same time as I that I would not be half as long as I expect he would be. I want to be free from this Assembly in a short while because, as Your Honour knows, I do not agree that we should be meeting today.

Now, Sir, the greatest of political prostitution is that which I have just heard from the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I must ask the hon. member to give way. I want to know his interpretation of the word "prostitution". It is not only ugly in the sense which he has used it, but I wonder if he would want to reconsider the use of this word so that the debates of this House would have a better expression.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, this is the biggest piece of political prostitution which I have just heard from the hon. junior member for St. George. The reason why I say that is because a man would have to prostitute all of the canons of good parliamentary decency to have sat in Parliament up to three months ago being a member of another Government and then to make these statements which he is now making in so far as what this Government should do. These are statements which were made on a number of occasions by those of us who sat on the other side of the Government of which he was a Minister, the last time being when they brought down a Bill last year which did not increase the rates of income tax.

When the Government of which he was a member had a request from the bank to open, because before a bank can open here we have to give permission to do so, not one thing was said. A bank does not come here and operate as how you open a shop to sell sweet drinks. The hon. member said that they should have been taxed and that income tax in the higher bracket should go up. I wonder if all of this thinking by him has come since December last. Did the Government of which he is a member when they came down to this House with their Five Year Plan come with that as their taxation policy? What they indicated in their Plan as their taxation policy was not based on this. Not only that, go and read the Hon. Premier's speech and you will see his reason for not increasing the rates of income tax.

Insurance companies have not now begun to operate in Barbados. What has the last Government of which he was a member done as regards the money which insurance companies send away? That is why I say, how can the hon. member who was a member of the last Government get up in here today and say what he did?

It is a question of commonsense. If the Hon. Premier comes down here after only three months in office and makes any stupid statement about fiscal policy what would you say of him? Only a political idiot would come down here after only being in office for three months with a fiscal policy without having made any examination of the fiscal position of the country and say that he is going to introduce a type of taxation on income tax.
11.15 a.m.

When the Hon. Premier said that they are not increasing the income tax rates this year, he said that because this is a Bill which we pass from year to year. When the Hon. Premier said that, I do not think that anybody would believe that the rates are "frozen" at this point. This Government did not do what the last Government did. Any new Government should have a thorough investigation of matters: but you cannot ask the Premier to have an examination of this matter at this time. You cannot have any thorough investigation of the finances of this colony now. Today is the 26th March and the Government was elected on the 4th December; even if they were Euclid or Professor Arthur Lewis they could not tell us that they have a complete fiscal policy today. You know the reaction to income tax; where you have small income taxpayers you have to be satisfied that you can answer every single point that is raised when you increase income tax, and everybody comes up and asks for an allowance here and there. No new Government would be stupid enough to think of Trinidad and the other places which were setting up an industrial department and say that income tax is something which you will raise before you study the system. The hon. member's Government allowed the Sandy Lane Company to do what they are doing - and I will have a lot more to say about that later on - they have allowed the Sandy Lane Company to buy a lot of land and now they are selling that land at the rate of 30 cents to 50 cents a square foot, which means that the land is being sold at $13,000 and $14,000 an acre.

We warned them about that; we warned them that they have people selling land in one-acre lots and then the poor Barbadian would not be able to buy a square inch of land. Sandy Lane has been sold, Heywoods has been sold and they said that they could do nothing about it; they knew about this money and they never said anything to indicate that the income tax position was such that they would tax these people. All their speeches were on the basis that things were so tight that they could not even give the Old Age Pensioners as much as 15 cents a week more, and why does the hon. member say that now? I feel that if the hon. member wants to oppose the Government, well, I do not think that he would be in a good position to oppose the Government; he would know points on which the Government would be weak, but not on the question of making a broad speech on social services because on the fiscal side - I speak on the failure of the Government and I do know what was the answer of one of the colleagues.

The Premier complimented me for the speech which I made sometime ago and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas said or asked: "How long since you became an economist"? From a pamphlet which they had on the economy of Barbados written by Jeanette Bethel, when the hon. member talked about a bank, and we told them that they should be thinking in terms of a central bank which would control finance in a positive way for ten years, they sat down and did not know how to go about the matter although the Leewards and the Windwards could do it. It took a new Party for this dynamism, and now the hon. member is raising his question. It is those who have left finance into the hands of people who have money; whenever we talk about financing, they have the idea that you must be a millionaire so as to talk about financing. They have done nothing to show that they understand elementary things in financing; but they went on in the old time fashion.

I thought that after the Budget Speech and hon. members had expressed their views, having expressed your views, you allow these things to pass as a matter of course, and wait until such time as the Premier comes down with his Budget in June. The Premier has indicated to you that he is coming down with a fiscal policy in which he will lay taxation. I would, therefore, prefer to leave any criticism which I will make until then. We do not want to fool the community that we must have a community run without taxation; but we should reserve our comments until the time which the Hon. Premier has indicated - and I do not think we should discuss this matter now. The creation of anything cannot be put down to this Government. Nobody starts a criticism of the last Government, but the hon. member is always approaching the last Government as some organ of goodness, and therefore if we have to pull down this goodness we must plead with him. I should like to say that income tax is one sore point that the Government, of which the hon. member was a Party, has shown an absolute lack of knowledge. They fiddled about with the income tax rate and with the interest rate. Imagine that the hon. member is telling us that people are rolling in money and they increased the interest rate six months ago! They tell you that money was in short supply and now they tell you about the banks rolling in money, that people are doing this and they are doing that and they raised the rate to 33 1/3% more! I have in mind something in which it was thought that we would have to foreclose or continue to have the loan; and the rate went up to 33 1/3%. Do you know what it means to carry the rate to 33 1/3%? That means 33 cents more you have to pay on each dollar. You cannot increase anything in order to recoup the things which have taken place; but you have to increase a loss on the loan which you advanced when you thought you could have done better.
11.25 a.m.

If a man borrowed $200,000 for a business and you did not foreclose the loan but came back and told him that he had to pay more money, imagine what the man's position would be. Some people own houses and the majority of them live in the houses on which they owe loans. Imagine what the actual rent would be if the interest rate went up; it would be more than what the people would charge as a normal increase. Interest charges automatically make rents go up higher; therefore the hon. junior member for St. George should not make a speech like the one he has made today because it condemns the attitude of the last Government.

Mr. Chairman, I would get too hot on this and therefore I am going to watch some cricket.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to cause the hon. member any pain at all by referring to any political prostitution. I did not even feel the necessity for speaking here today and would not have spoken had it not been for the hon. junior member for St. George who said that when a Conservative *bloc* in Parliament praises the Budget Speech, we are in trouble. During my seventeen years in here, I have seen the member's Government raise income tax once and we as Conservatives praised them and they were in no trouble. I would sit and let the hon. member deny that. I am going further than that, Mr. Chairman; I am not a hypocrite, but his Government on the last occasion budgeted for a deficit and did not raise income tax. That is either true or it is not true. They said they were not going to raise income tax at all and therefore they were going to make people pay more for cigarettes and rum. I remember the big row in here when the income tax was raised. I do not think the Conservative *bloc* praised the Government then when the tax was fixed at 40%, but at the time greater deductions and allowances were made for married men. When the hon. member says that because the Government is praised by the Conservative *bloc* they are in trouble, they were always in trouble.

Mr. Chairman, when the last Premier made his Speech, we on the Conservative Bench said that we were very happy that the Government did not raise income tax or Companies tax because it would leave reserves for people to improve and money to circulate in the community. I would not have risen had the hon. member not said he was in trouble when a Conservative *bloc* praises the Government. On the other hand, I would say that the hon. member has a great amount of guts - I cannot call it other than that - and brass. I sat on the other side of the House for five consecutive years when his Government was in power, and I told the Government that there are Insurance Companies operating in this country, some of which are registered in places where they pay no income tax. I asked the last Government to pass an

Act making it compulsory for all Insurance Companies to put down a substantial sum of money here in case anything happens. One Insurance Company was rude enough to write me, an elected member of Parliament, telling me a lot of nasty things. All the money in the world is controlled by Insurance Companies, not by Banks. These Insurance Companies collect sums by the week and by the month, and I have said that if they want to operate here a certain percentage of that money should be invested in the Island.

Mr. Chairman, I backed up that with our Conservative policy, but the hon. junior member for St. George is now accusing this Government for not doing something which we said his Government should have done so many years ago. There is an Insurance Company operating in this country which is registered in Bermuda and you cannot catch them for anything at all. They do not pay one cent in taxation. The hon. member who spoke last took a lot of my thunder away when it comes to this question, and now he has gone to cricket. When it comes to the question of praising a Government, I must say that we praised the last Government for not increasing income tax. As a matter of fact, we praised them for increasing the allowances for married men and for children. I am not like the hon. junior member for St. George. I do not run a Company, but the idea behind the Government's decision is that you allow people to have reserves. The hon. member runs a Company; how else could he develop unless he had reserves? You do not develop with a loan; you develop by employing labour.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the hon. member's speech was an attempt to pull out the Hon. Minister of Finance as to what he will tax, but I do not believe he is such an idiot as to let any human being in the Island or in this House of Assembly for that matter pull him out as to what he will tax. He has told us quite clearly that he is not going to increase income tax which includes companies tax for 1962-63; but his real Budget Speech on what he will tax in this country may possibly shock those of us who praise the Government now. The hon. junior member for St. George has said something about capital tax and excess profit tax, and I would like to ask him a simple question. Far be it from us to defend the Government, but I do not like to hear these things. Elections were on December 4th and in another few days it will be four months since this Government was in power.

11.35 a.m.

I am a Conservative; I am no hypocrite and I would not agree with him. I cannot understand hypocrisy. I heard the late Mr. "T.T." Lewis talked about taxation on excess profits year after year. The hon. junior member for St. George sat in Government under Sir Grantley Adams and Dr. Cummins and heard the others saying that it would be a good thing to have an excess profits tax but a deaf ear was given to them. Now he comes in after four months and says that you should tax excess profit.

When I continued to say in here that you should tax these insurance companies and compel all these companies which we have here to invest in this Island a certain amount of the money which they have collected here, did the last Government take it into consideration? I wonder if the hon. junior member for St. George behind closed doors ever expressed that view to his Government. He is suggesting today to let us do it, only four months after his Government has gone out of power. He never said "let us do it" when his Government was in power. I agree with him that you should look into this question of the operation of the insurance companies, but I am not such a hypocrite as he to say that now, when I know that he was in power for five or ten years, heard people clamouring for it and did nothing about it. Now he is telling people who have just come into power for four months that they should do it. If that is not the essence of hypocricy, well, I have never seen a hypocrite.

Sir, I do not want to discuss the question of the banks. On the question of the amendment to the Usury Act when there was an increase in the interest rates, I remember the Premier's speech on that occasion. If there is so much money knocking around here, what have you to do with it? Are you saying that people rather tie it up in a stocking before they invest it?

However, Sir, most of us are not in a mood for such speech making today and I think the hon. junior member for St. George should realise that. I would just bring one thing to his memory. The last Government of which he was a member budgeted for a deficit and yet they did not think fit to raise the rates of income tax to offset that. These rates of income tax are the same as those for the past two years. As a matter of fact, I remember in 1959 that they did not raise income tax; they raised the tax on beer and cigarettes. They found out that the people were drinking more beer than rum and they put a tax on it. They did not raise income tax; they raised the tax on commodities.

Do not accuse my Party when we praised the Government by saying that we agreed with them for not raising the rates of income tax although the country was budgeting for a deficit. We praised the Government because we sat and discussed the matter with people who know. The people who gave the Government commercial advice at the time also gave us advice because there was nobody in there capable of dealing with the economic question. I do not say because a man is trained in economics that he knows everything. I have a great respect for education but I do not say that I am not going to use my commonsense and experience while taking the theoretical knowledge from people who have the experience. Therefore, the hon. member would be surprised to know that some of the people who gave the Government advice also gave us advice.

There is nothing to be alarmed about. What I think the hon. member is worrying about is that I spoke definitely to the *Advocate* and I proclaimed to the public that beyond any shadow of a doubt after I listened to the Hon. Premier's speech and then read and re-read it, it is the one speech which the Hon. Premier got down to earth with. It is one speech which the common man in the street can understand and because of that I questioned the *Advocate* why it was not published in full. It is a speech which newspapers should publish in full. I am not speaking particularly of members of this House or high ranking people of the country; but if you were to get out on the street you will hear how intelligently the man in the street is discussing the Budget Speech. I have no brief for the Hon. Premier and I have never asked him a favour. I am not saying that he has all the brains in Barbados: but I do say that his speech was one of the best Budget Speeches which was made in here. I said that and I have no apologies to make. I am a man who will give him hell if I think he is going wrong.

The hon. member must also bear in mind that we praised Sir Grantley Adams and Dr. Cummins for not raising the rates of income tax; therefore, do not say that after four months the present Premier should be in a position to say something on what he intends to do as regards a change in the income tax rates. The hon. junior member for St. George is talking about excess profits tax when the late Mr. "T. T." Lewis and all of them in the Government Party were telling you about it.

I am going to confess something. When you walk with the wise, you get wiser. I wanted to discuss a matter with the City Council. I thought I was elected and I asked a few managers of businesses to sit down with me. I got reports from the Clerks. I listened and I learnt something.

11.45 a.m.

If you were a Socialist Government and you had to find money to run the country, you saw that you had a deficit and you were told that you had a deficit, were you going to hit direct taxation on the commodities which people have to eat? I am not defending my Party; because we pressed them they said that we were in trouble.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, this debate has been going on for almost three-quarters of an hour. The Premier has failed after several attempts to stimulate interest even to the listening members of Parliament. What did he have to say? The hon. senior member for the City objects to being called an affiliate member; well, are we to substitute the word "subsidiary"? Do you think it is his duty to oppose? And he is talking about hypocrisy; imagine hearing that word! It should be removed from the dictionary. Imagine the hon. senior member for the City calling somebody a hypocrite! On the question of finance, he would advise this

Government to do this and that. I should like to say that when I served as a Minister, I served under a Premier who assumed full responsibility and leadership of the Party. I have the same respect for him which I have always held for him, and I would say that few Parliamentarians have achieved what the last Premier has achieved for this Island. With our little quartette in this Assembly now (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Quartette?) Well, our little quartette has been reduced to a trio. *(Laughter).* I would like to be emphatic in what I am saying and I want to say that I have a mind and a soul of my own which no man can disturb.

What I said was no criticism of the banks; one would like to see the banks coming in (A MEMBER: Unnecessary.) How do you mean "unnecessary"? What is the business of a bank? The hon. senior member for St. Peter in his speech was like "Millie gone to Brazil". He even used the word "prostitution", but you would think that he is at the end of the chain representing the Government. Now he is talking about finance because the hon. senior member for the City has said that he made the best speech. I never said anything about that; he used the word "prostitution", but in a community like this everybody knows who is Jack and everybody knows who is Jill. That is the attitude of the hon. senior member for St. Peter; he makes his remarks and slips out of the Chamber immediately after; but think of his using the word "prostitution". You find that a bolt must fly no matter whatever debate is on; that is the hon. member's attitude.

As to the criticism of the Usury Act, they have had enough time to amend this Act about 55 times. When the Interest Rate was fixed at 5%, people were still being loaned money at 2% or 2 1/2%; but the hon. member was rambling in his remarks. In Trinidad, you can borrow money at 9%. You should not fail to pay attention to how finance works in a country. Imagine the hon. senior member for St. Peter arguing and using the term "prostitution"! But I say that when you think of this country's economy, tell me of any Government spending $31 million unless you had the interest and the courage to forge that country forward. Now the hon. member is talking about economics glibly as if he knows something about it; however, we should not make a lot of ugly speeches. We are in Committee and this is the attitude which you find, that the Government is denied an opportunity to reply on this occasion. You are thinking of the little pup with the chain around its neck. That is the attitude which is adopted in here by hon. members. All I said is that if there is an opportunity and you are satisfied to go back to the age of excess profits tax, what is wrong with that by a Socialist Government? In a Five Year Plan do you expect the Premier to say that in 1962-63 he will change this rate or that he will collect more money in companies tax? If the Premier has decided that he will bring down a Budget in another three or four months but without having an opportunity of examining the country's economy, would he not do that between this and June? It has been stated that the rates for the next year will be the same as they are for this year. Apart from saying that this is your attitude, are you going to change your attitude to change from a jack-daw and be a peacock when it suits you? You have people masquerading in khaki shirts in soup kitchens and we are talking about poor relief when it is realised that you have all of this poverty in this country. The Minister of Social Services wants to reduce the number of Almshouses to four; it is a fact that in less than 166 square miles you have a soup kitchen in every Almshouse and you talk about somebody making sport?

11.55 a.m.

Mr. Chairman, I would revel in the joy of saying what I would like to say, but I would not like the hon. member to persuade me to say what may appear to be unkind or even vulgar. It is my God-given right to express my views on behalf of the electorate of the parish of St. George. Now is the time that we can get this money. Is it nothing to you where you bring people into humiliation and embarrassment by robbing them of a little elementary decency in talking about soup kitchens? You are criticising a socialist view and outlook and calling me a hypocrite when you are humiliating decent human beings by asking them to go to a soup kitchen in a community where we need not continue to believe that it is compulsory or inevitable to have poverty. Some of us need poverty where like a peacock we can masquerade and use the very poverty against the masses to say we will be this and that. God help us. The time has come when the old complexion and outlook of this House has been changing, and from time to time names have been changing and a Party objects to its being said that they are affiliated to another Party which they supported on the platform, in public and in their attitude in the House.

All I would venture to say, Mr. Chairman, is that the unpleasant and unhappy remarks of the two hon. members make one feel that they must be the watch dogs at the entrance of the door denying the Government an opportunity to put its case. You cannot deny, if the interest rate was taken to 9% or 10%, the effect it would have on the community. The hon. member knows that if there is an influx or if you bring money back into the economy from profits, the interest rates must fall, because funds would be available for mortgages and loans. You have seen the interest rates fall twice in the United Kingdom within one month.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member comes here and criticises the last Government for their Five Year Plan when they thought of employment for 40,000 souls and an expenditure of capital of $53 million, but today you hear all this sarcasm and see the bamboozling and rambling attitude of those who would assume responsibility to the masses, because we know that their very misery rests in your palms since you control the finances of the Government. Now we were accused for overtaxing the community in one year to the tune of 5 1/2 million. Now, is the Premier aiding and abetting and using that money, knowing it to be stolen, when he is a criminal lawyer? This money which provided this country with security and goodwill was taken from budget balances; it was taken from taxes and was collected in excess taxes; and when a country is going forward and you are satisfied, you can use that money as something to fall back on. If you were operating a small shop, you would have to think in terms of a reserve fund. In an industry you have to be able to take care of an emergency. You do not expect to spend one penny today and receive one cent. The Budget of the Government must work like that of a family; you must put something by for a rainy day, and large countries like small countries would have the same problem.

Mr. Chairman, if the Premier had said that in his Budget in another three months he would tell us what the position would be with regards to income tax and companies tax, it would be different from the point of view given by the hon. member, but that was not the case. We did not expect the Premier to say what he would do, but we knew that we would have to find the money to carry out the Five Year Plan which we had, and I simply ask the Premier to have his Department examine the finances of this country and he would discover that there are some companies making $1/2 million or $1/4 million from which he could collect a greater amount of taxes. I have had the opportunity of being in the Government, and I am not afraid of anybody accusing me. If the last Government flies a kite at Easter, you are going to accuse Freddie Miller for it; but it does not matter. I am a member of this Parliament and I have a right to my own ideas. I have a soul and mind of my own and you have to respect me if you expect me to respect you. That is a simple, civic right.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that we can get over some of our difficulties, and when you think of the development of the country, the construction of a $6 million Hospital, a new Airport and a $31 million Harbour, you must tax people if you are going to take your country forward. I heard the Conservative members praising the Government for not increasing income tax; that is what we are being reduced to; and as long as I am in here - and I have no doubt I will be here for a long time - I will express my feelings. If I happened to have been in the Cabinet with Dr. Cummins, I would express them if the majority went against me.

If you will allow me to climax my remarks without recapping all I said during the discussion, I simply said that the indications are clear that we would get some rather revealing results as far as capital and excess capital tax on

which you can carry forward the country are concerned. The country is behind the Premier; he has the backing of almost every single soul; and when he said that there will be no increase until March, 1963 when he could have left it alone until he came with the Budget Speech for 1962, he does not know the number of telephones that were clicking night and day and the many radio-telephone overseas calls that were made since he has made that statement.
12.05 p.m.

Mr. Hugh Dalton would have thrown his portfolio and his hat to the winds and would have retreated to the quietude of his home. I am only saying that you should see if there is opportunity where it can be examined and instead of paying interest, see what you can do. There is one item there at the Deep Water Harbour which is going to bring in $1 million. That one item alone is likely to increase the country's income by $1 million. You may whistle like a canary, but you can only pay taxes when you are in a position to pay taxes.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, before you put the question, I wish to say that I sat and listened to hon. members' speeches on this matter and I would just like to say that this Government has only taken over the running of the country within the last three months. The Hon. Premier is studying and has everything under consideration but it must take time for him to reach a correct solution. He is the Minister of Finance of the country. He has the whole Island in his hands when it comes to finance and I think that he should have time to go into the economy of this Island and to make a thorough study of it before he can decide what he can do. I assure hon. members that the Hon. Premier has the Island in his hands and is thinking seriously about his task and I am sure everyone of us can entrust him with this job.

I have heard the hon. senior member for the City talking about the different Budget Speeches which were made in here and compared them with this speech by the Hon. Premier. I want hon. members to know that we have a good captain and that he is trying to save time. He does not have to carry the ship around Cape Horn; he can carry it through the Suez Canal.

One of the greatest evils done to the people of this Island is when the last Government sold Sandy Lane Estate to one man to put down a hotel. I just heard the last hon. member who spoke say that Barbados is 166 square miles with nearly 240,000 people. This is a small Island and yet you sold to one man 300 acres of land so as to put up a hotel and that man is selling some of that land to foreign capitalists at $10,000 an acre.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to throw the hon. senior member for St. Andrew off his stride and I hate to interrupt him, but I have to. It is not true that the Government sold Sandy Lane. The Government never owned Sandy Lane; therefore the Government could not sell it.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, it may have been an error on my part to say that the Government sold it, but that Government was solely responsible for the land in Barbados and they could have ordered the owners not to sell it. They gave sanction to the owners to sell it. It is the greatest evil deed which has been done to the people of Barbados. God Almighty is looking down on them for the evil which they have done. Members of that Government have to pay for all of those evil things which they have done because they have taken advantage of the poor people of this Island. They were even negotiating, at the time when we put them out, with the owners of Heywoods to sell it out. Ah! my friend, the time will come when you will stand responsible all by yourself before the Great Judge for the evil which you all have done and I am sure that you are going to be scourged for it.

I am saying, Sir, if at any time my Government decides to sell an estate to a foreigner, I will criticise them for it whether they have any use for me or not because I know the danger of selling our birthright. The former Government was selling us out piecemeal but I have still lived to see that the people have run them all out and have left only one of the bell ringers. All he can do is to ring the bell. They will never be able to sell anything more or to have any more jurisdiction over the Island. If we had allowed them to remain in Government, they would have given sanction to sell every estate in the Island to foreigners.

I understand that there are people living off China in barges on the sea. Here it is, a little Island like this with 166 square miles of land with nearly 240,000 people living on it and you had the situation where the last Government allowed owners of an estate to sell it to one man who is a foreigner. However, I am here to say that our Premier has everything under consideration. He has the finance of this country in his hands. He is just like a tailor; he has the scissors and we can trust him to cut the suit as it should be cut. With God's guidance, I know that he will make a success. The only thing which is needed is patience. The present indication shows that he is about to do good. Watch the course and see how the ship is sailing! Watch how the bow is set and which latitude we are going on! I am sure that he is leading us on the right course. I hope the Hon. Premier will not give the people of Barbados any chance to lose their confidence in him. We hope they will soon meet with recompense, but they must wait. Just give us a little chance, and every little mistake which you see us make, check us. If you see that this Party is going astray, just check us because we have the compass and we know when the ship is going off its course. I am happy to know that everyone of us in this Party, even your humble servant who is the least, can hold the wheel sometimes and steer the ship; therefore when you see us going off the course, just check us.
12.15 p.m.

It will never strike the Premier or any of us. I can assure you that if you move towards the future you will see the good work which this Party is going to perform. We know that in all our ways we will acknowledge God and He will direct our paths.

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

The Schedule was call'ed' and passed.

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

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

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

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

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

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to continue various expiring laws.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I should like to mention that there are eleven statutory enactments which it is proposed to renew today for another year by this Bill which is cited as the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, 1962. It is usual that a similar Bill be passed before the 31st day of March, in each and every year. The Cabinet has had under consideration the question of consolidating some of these enactments and repealing some of them. As you know, Sir, the codification and revision of the Statute Law of Barbados has been actively engaging the attention of a Commissioner but, unfortunately, there was a cessation of his work on account of the ill-health of the person who was appointed as Commissioner. We hope to have the work renewed under the Statute Law of this island shortly and to have the recommendations of the Commissioner in respect of these eleven enactments which we find it necessary to embody in

the Schedule of this Bill which is now engaging the attention of this Assembly. With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. J. C. TUDOR, the Preamble was postponed.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

The Preamble was called and passed.

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

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

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

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

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

12.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is a Resolution to approve the Port Estimates for the year 1962-63. Is the Government ready to proceed with this Resolution?

PORT DEPARTMENT ESTIMATES

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is in the form of Annexed Estimates of Expenditure and Revenue for the financial year 1962-63. As Your Honour is aware, there is a Statutory Authority set up called the Harbour Advisory Board. The Estimates for the Port are not part of the Departmental Estimates because money is not voted out of the Treasury in normal circumstances for the running of the Port. The Port is run on an internal accounting basis but is still subject to audit by the Auditor General's Department. Because of the peculiar nature of the operations, it was thought best to leave the accounts of the Revenue and Expenditure of the Port Department as an internal matter.

The position, Mr. Speaker, is that the Port Authority has accounts at two Banks in this Island. Money is paid over to the Port Manager in the Port Department by people who make use of the Harbour and by the Port Contractors on a basis of, I think, 20% of the handling charges which are charged at the Harbour. I say 'at the Harbour' advisedly because the question of handling charges in the Careenage is now under active consideration.

Now the Port began operations in July, 1961. It is very difficult therefore for us at this stage to assess with any degree of accuracy what the revenue for the Port for the year 1961-62 — the full period of operations for twelve months — would be from July, 1961 to the end of July, 1962. The Estimates of Expenditure and Revenue were to cover the financial year, 1961-62, that is, from 1st April, 1961 to 31st March, 1962; but for three months after the Port was in operation and staff was being paid, no ships used the Port at all. I think that before the Port actually opened, one or two Harrison Line boats actually took sugar from the facilities offered by the bulk installation at the Harbour site, but the Harbour was not officially opened as a Harbour; so that the actual expenditure incurred over that three month period would not be met by a corresponding amount of revenue for the same period, because there was no revenue actually coming in.

In addition to that, Sir, as you know, the supply of bunkering facilities, fuels and other oils at the Harbour started some time, I believe, towards the end of February, 1962, and therefore these facilities have been operating for a period of even less than two months. Indications are very favourable that the revenue which would be derived from the royalty charged on the amount of fuel supplied to ships coming to the Habour will be substantially more than we at first anticipated. As the facilities become more widely known, obviously ships which would normally be held up in one of the neighbouring colonies having to travel through a gulf or come to a place called Brighton or very often take bunker fuels from Paradise, would no doubt, although we have no guarantee, avail themselves of the more convenient arrangements prevailing at the Port of Bridgetown.

The Port charges are considered to be very reasonable and the turn around of ships is as quick as one should hope after installing a project of that magnitude and for that volume of money. We hope that in some comparatively reasonable period of time the quick turn around will be taken into consideration, and that the cleaner and easier handling of goods, and the reduction in the losses due to pilferage and breakage will induce the shipping lines to reduce the freight charges to and from the Island of Barbados. As you know, Sir, some years ago a 15% increase was made in these Port charges on the grounds that the laborious method of handling cargo gave rise to much ineffiency and losses. The inefficiency was due to the fact that one had to transfer goods out of the ship's hold into lighters and then from lighters to the wharf-side and from the wharf-side into the warehouses. Sometimes goods had to be left overnight or covered down in lighters before they could be unloaded and put into safe custody either in the Customs Bond or private warehouses.

Mr. Speaker, all of these difficulties have been overcome and we have not witnessed any corresponding reduction in the freight charges to this Island in the same way that the Shipping Companies some time in 1959, I believe, made an additional increase in the cost of freight. 12.35 p.m.

I hope that they will make some readjustments so that the consumers, although this is not necessarily a direct result, will get some benefit from the facilities which are offered at the Port. When I say "not necessarily a direct result on freight charges", it will be up to the shipping agents and consignees of goods to make sure that these savings are passed on to the consumers who are the general public. They must exert external vigilance in this regard. There is no Consumers' Association here making any direct representations to importers of goods. It is not good for Government to set up an elaborate system of price control of goods. We already have a system of price control to deal with the essential commodities. Some essential commodities are being subsidised in this Island.

I certainly would welcome some reduction in the cost of goods other than the essential commodities which are now taken care of, and it is up to John Citizen, himself, to get together with people who have an interest in a reduction in the cost of living and see that any savings which are effected in freight rates and handling are passed on to the general public.

Prior to 1958, the rates had increased by fifteen shillings per ton on freight charges to the West Indian Islands due to the slow handling and poor facilities in West Indian ports. They have these shipping conferences with the main Trade Union, ship owners and ship chandlers. They are societies which devote themselves to the promotion of the interest of the ship owners.

In 1958, as a result of the revision made, the charges were $7.20 per ton for these West Indian Islands. The charges now made at the Deep Water Harbour amount to $6.30 which is made up of $6.00 handling charges plus 30 cents per ton which gives a saving still of 90 cents a ton. It is 90 cents less than the figure agreed to in Trinidad in 1958.

Quite apart from that, any goods which come from the West Indian Islands and are taken alongside are allowed a reduction of 20% so that West Indian goods coming from

West Indian ports pay a handling charge or a landing charge of $4.80 a ton as compared with $6.00 a ton handling charge for goods from other countries.

The position now in respect of goods landed at the Careenage is under consideration. There is a bit of confusion over the matter because we have instances of ships with cement coming alongside the Careenage and paying no handling charges either of $4.80 or $6.30 per ton, while in the case of goods coming from the West Indian Islands with similar commodities, because they are put on a larger ship and cannot come alongside the Careenage and the ship goes into the Harbour, the consignees will have to pay a charge of $4.80 per ton. Of course, cement is a very heavy material and you pay something like $2.65 for a 90lb. bag. Of course, this means a substantial saving to the person who can bring cement alongside the Careenage. There may be unfair competition there, but the Government is not concerned about the competition; it is concerned with collecting the just fees which ought to be paid by people importing things into the Island. We are aware that there is a situation like that and we want to get it resolved both from a legal and a just point of view.

When it comes to the Port, we do not authorise the Accountant to pay out the money which we have in the Annexed Estimates of $1,758,976; we only authorise that that money may be collected. If, therefore, the Port Manager wants to spend any money in excess of this amount or in different directions to that which have been approved by the Legislature, he would have to come back to the House for a Resolution and get approval for that. He is free without going to the Accountant General to draw money off the bank to expend in any direction which the Legislature has approved, but he is not free to spend money in any other direction. Because we allow him to spend $7.6 million it does not mean that he can buy a dredger or something like that. He can only spend under the Heads approved by the Legislature.

The Port Department has its own Accountant and they draw cheques directly from the commercial banks; but their books are subject to very rigid audit by the Audit Department. I have suggested to the Port Management Accountant and the Financial Secretary that there should be a permanent check and it is not because you do not have confidence in the Accountant at the Port, but the situation is a bit loose. If you do not have someone in that Department who is of the same integrity as the Accountant there, then it would be possible for him to draw $1 1/2 million from the commercial banks and I would not consider that a proper state of affairs. It is quite possible for an Accountant and someone to get together and say, let us draw this amount off and clear off this bill. Of course, that is not likely to happen now because we have the utmost confidence in the people down there. Hon. members must bear in mind that we are not in here for a lifetime. Some of us may be in here for life; some may stay 25 years but some may not be here for another five years; and though we know that at any given moment of time the danger is not likely to arise now, it does not mean that it is not likely to arise. The Port is a new department and therefore, it must be given the kind of financial viability which is necessary because they have people to pay by the day, by the week and by the month. Of course, that does not mean that I am quite satisfied with the present system of accounting.

12.45 p.m.

I only want hon. members to know what the system is and what the Government contemplates doing with the system. When they come to the Legislature and ask for $1.70 million, I have to be satisfied with these several safeguards, checks and balances that the money is not overspent, when a department comes to receive a transfer for something which they have already done. There is agreement between the Financial Secretary, the Auditor General and myself that there is room for improvement. We are satisfied that everything is more or less in order and having been in operation for only nine months, it is very difficult to predict what the definite pattern of expenditure and revenue will be because of the shortness of time during which it has been in operation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that there is much more that I can say on these Estimates. You will notice that there is a $77,000 net deficit on the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure this year. Of course, we can increase the revenue for bunkering of ships by another $75,000 to show that the Port will be making money. If we make a kind of prediction I think we will collect more money than we have estimated here; but it is better, if we are not quite sure, to give a comparative basis of what we have been collecting and estimate that there will be a general trade pattern than to estimate what the revenue will be. I have every confidence that the Legislature will not be asked to subsidise the vote because I do not think that, having spent $21 million, actually $15,000,000 on the immediate Port Area apart from the bunkering and the facilities for the bulk shipment of sugar, with that kind of investment, we will also call upon the taxpayers for more money to subsidise it. I do not think that the Port should operate in that way. If anything, the Port should not only be charging the interest payment, sinking fund and that sort of thing, but it should be bringing revenue over and above what we used to get from Carlisle Bay; at least it will bring in $3 million additionally. But we have no basis to make any comparison and therefore the Estimates have been very conservative and there is this deificit of $77,000 in the Estimates for 1962-63.

The Estimates are based on a revenue of $1,681,100. If we collect money at the Careenage we may get another $125,000. With cement alone the figure is brought up to five figures, but we would collect at least $125,000 if these handling charges were collected in the Careenage. There is the argument that since the contractors are not handling the cargo it would be unfair to ask intercolonial schooners to compete with the large shipping lines which have facilities themselves. The operating costs have increased because of the revision of salaries granted and individual and pension contributions have increased correspondingly. The cost of the marine services are grossly under-estimated; they are a lot higher than was thought. I do not accept responsibility for that; I accept responsibility for what is going on now. In respect of Item 56 "Office Furniture and Equipment", the furniture and equipment for the mechanization of the accounts which we consider highly necessary and a time-saving and money-saving factor is introduced. We have adjusted the current estimates of overall revenue for the island to agree with the estimate of capital charges now shown in the Port Estimates.

Mr. Speaker, with those remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Mr. SPEAKER: That concludes the Business of the House for today.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I have two statements to make, the first one dealing with the question of over-time pay. You will remember, Sir, that the hon. senior member for the City asked a question about over-time pay during the consideration of the Estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to inform the Hon. Premier that I do not regard anything other than the special business of today's meeting as being in order to be dealt with today. We will meet again on Thursday according to the adjournment.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: For what reason?

Mr. SPEAKER: We have adjourned until Thursday. The consideration of that last Item on the Agenda concludes the business for which this Special Meeting of the House was summoned. This House now stands adjourned to meet, as was decided on the last occasion, on Thursday next at 3 o'clock p.m.

This House now stands adjourned.

12.55 p.m.