
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 27th November, 1962.

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

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

Prayers were read.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD and Mr. F. C. GODDARD entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

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

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay an Agreement between the Governor-in-Executive Committee and Moffett Industries Limited.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to authorise the advance of a sum not exceeding \$250,000 for the purpose of making advances of salary or wages to persons in the employ of the Government.

A Bill further to amend the Rum Duty Act, 1906-6.

In connection with this Bill, I should like to give notice of my intention to deal with it in all its stages later in the day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill further to amend the Transport Board Act, 1955.

REPLY TO QUESTION

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 48/1962 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas on the 29th May, 1962, is now ready.

QUESTION

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Will Government cause a shed to be erected at the bus stop at Edghill Corner, St. Thomas, for the convenience of the residents at Melrose and Edghill, in the said parish? 2.40 p.m.

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

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to investigate the circumstances surrounding the employment, conditions of work, incidence of pay and discharged of the Barbadian Seamen who joined the S. S. Catalina at New Orleans, Louisiana, U.S.A. on 10th December, 1961 and who were discharged at the Bahamas Islands approximately three months afterwards.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill further to amend the Rum Duty Act, 1906, be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill further to amend the Transport Board Act, 1955, be now read a first time.

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

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

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time and we proceed from page 1 on the Order Paper as this meeting begins at the period of Question Time. There were three matters left over as hon. members were not in their places.

Question No. 13 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:-

Is Government aware of the damage caused to agricultural lands and to the property of residents in Speightstown during heavy rainfall periodically flooding the Salt Pond in Speightstown?

2. Is Government aware of the nuisance caused to residents in Speightstown by odours caused by rotting debris and rubbish in the Salt Pond in Speightstown?

3. Is Government aware that the appropriate Minister of the previous Government made an investigation with a view to the preparation of an estimate of the cost of the canalization of the Salt Pond?

4. Will Government facilitate the interests of these residents by implementing a scheme of canalizing the Salt Pond Area?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"1. Yes, Sir.

2. Yes, Sir.

3. There is no record in my Ministry of any such investigation.

4. The problem of drainage is island-wide, and so far as the Speightstown area is concerned, it will, as in the case of other areas, be fully investigated and, as far as possible, remedied. Meanwhile the Northern District Council has been asked, and has undertaken, to keep the Salt Pond free of all decaying vegetation and debris, and the Department of Highways and Transport will continue to render assistance as occasion requires."

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question to answer No. 3, will the Minister tell the House if he got the answer to Question No. 3 without the aid of the present Director of Highways and Transport?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the answer to No. 3 was as follows:-

"There is no record in my Ministry of any such investigation."

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, I did not ask the Minister to repeat the answer. My subsidiary question was a means of discovering the answer to No. 3. I do not know if the Minister heard me correctly.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member repeat his supplementary question?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Did the Minister glean his answer to No. 3 without invoking assistance from the present Director of Highways and Transport?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, if any directions were issued or any investigation carried out on behalf of any Government, records should be shown on files in the Ministry, and I said there are no records whatsoever in my Ministry.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister know of any preparation of an estimate being made in this connection?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, had any estimate been made, it would have been, according to Government practice, recorded in the Ministry; and if there was any

record found giving an estimate, then I would have had no reason to say that there is no record in this Ministry of any such investigation.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I now give formal notice that it is my intention to debate this question on another occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 53 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown who is on leave. I will allow this Question to stand over until the first meeting after he resumes his duties as a member of this Chamber.

Question No. 55/1962 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

Is Government aware of the unsatisfactory conditions of drainage existing around Kellman's Pond at Sugar Hill in the parish of Saint Joseph?

2. If the answer is yes, will Government issue a directive to the proper authority to have the said conditions remedied?
2.50 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Oral Reply to Question No. 55/1962, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph on 26th June, 1962, reads as follows:-

1. Yes, Sir.

2. Kellman's Pond, which is situated on private property is the responsibility of the Northern District Council who have reported that they are endeavouring to rectify the condition.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know from the Hon. Minister when it was reported to the Northern District Council.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, on my files there is a letter dated 15th June, signed by Mr. David A. Foster, Clerk of the Northern District Council.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask leave to debate this matter at a later date.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary to that question, relative to what the Hon. Minister has just said, I would like him just to say when it came from Mr. David Foster because he was out of the country for quite a long time. I would like to know more about this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will you put your question more precisely?

Mr. SMITH: Will the Hon. Minister of Communications be prepared and willing to read that letter from Mr. David A. Foster?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: The information in this letter is embodied in the answer which I have just given and which I have already indicated to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, notice has already been given by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph that he proposed to deal with the matter at a later date. Then, all non-members would have the opportunity to participate in the debate.

SURINAM ROAD, St. JOSEPH

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 74 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. COWARD: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware of the condition of the road known as 'Surinam Road', in the parish of St. Joseph?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government seek to have this road repaired as soon as conveniently possible?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 74/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph on the 28th August, 1962, reads as follows:-

1. Yes, Sir.

2. Normal maintenance has been done on this road but due to its condition it is proposed to resurface this road during the financial year, 1963-64.

Mr. COWARD: I must thank the Hon. Minister on this occasion for this reply.

CHARGES FOR LAYING WATER SERVICES

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 48 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. BOXILL: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism aware of the fact that Highways and Transport, who formerly charged the Waterworks 30 cents per square foot for road repairs after laying of water services is now charging the Waterworks \$1.50 per square foot?

2. Is the Minister aware that this extra burden has been placed on the unfortunate consumer?

3. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister state why? If not, will the Minister please investigate this sore spot immediately?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 48/1962, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas on 29th May, 1962, is as follows:

1. No, Sir. The charge prior to the new rate of \$1.50 per square foot was 36 cents per square foot.

2. Yes, Sir. This is in accordance with the Waterworks Act, 1895, section 32 of which provides that the owner or occupier wishing to have water installed in his premises by the Waterworks Department shall first deposit with that Department such sum as the Department shall determine.

The amounts of the deposit depends in part, however, on the cost as determined by the Department of Highways and Transport of reinstating the highway in which the pipe is laid.

As a result of certain representations made to the Minister and in order to verify whether the figure of \$1.50 per square foot imposed by the Department of Highways and Transport was fair and reasonable, a check of the actual cost of re-instatement was carried out in August, 1962, in the Northern, Southern and City Districts of the Department of Highways and Transport. The check, which was based on the final size of the reinstatement, revealed that it costs 80 cents per square foot for reinstating tracts of 25 feet and over in all areas and an average of \$1.20 per square foot for reinstating patches or small areas.

It has been decided therefore to charge at the rate of \$1.20 per square foot for small reinstatements for the Waterworks Department.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no other answers forthcoming.
3.00 p.m.

CORRECTION IN SCHEDULE OF RESOLUTION

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the consideration of Private Members' Business, there is something to which I would like to draw Your Honour's attention. On the 30th November, 1962, this House, in Committee of Supply, passed a Money Resolution for the sum of \$92,528. Its passing has been attested by Your Honour's signature on a copy of the Resolution, but, unfortunately, by a printer's error in the Schedule attached to the Resolution, under Head 2 there appears "Item 2, Clerical Assistance", whereas in truth and in fact, if Your Honour were to consult the Current Estimates on page 3 Head 2 "Service Commissions", Your Honour will see that "Clerical Assistance" is found next to Item 10. In other respects, the figures on the Schedule to the Resolution tally with the figures as laid down in the Estimates.

I rise to draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that the discrepancy as between Item 2 and Item 10 is due entirely to a printer's error. On behalf of the Executive Committee I wish to certify that the Executive Committee intended that Item 10 was to be supplemented. If Your Honour accepts my assurance, perhaps you might like to place your own initials after making the necessary correction in Your Honour's own hand.

Mr. SPEAKER: I accept the Hon. Minister's assurance and I will mention that the clerical error has already been drawn to my attention. I am prepared to affix my initials to the correction.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: As Your Honour pleases.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

ORDERS POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: Proceeding to the consideration of Private Members' Business, the first Order of the Day under this Head stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph:- To resume debate on a Resolution relative to the increased cost to peasants of the harvesting of their crops and assistance to such peasants with payments from the Price Stabilisation Fund. It will be recalled that it was decided on the last occasion to postpone that matter in view of the deliberations of the Sugar Enquiry under the Farley Commission which was sitting and which has not yet completed its labours. I take it that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has no desire at this stage of the deliberations of the Sugar Enquiry, to seek to continue the discussion of this item standing in his name.

Mr. SMITH: No, Mr. Speaker; I will await the report of the Commission.

Mr. SPEAKER: Accordingly, leave is granted the hon. member for the matter to stand over until the report of the Sugar Enquiry Commission has been laid.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. George:- To move the third reading of a Bill to authorise the sale of certain lands at St. George's Rectory, St. George.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, I am yet awaiting the decision of the Cabinet before the Report of the Select Committee, which is considering this Bill, can be presented.

Mr. SPEAKER: Therefore the hon. member is unable to proceed with this Order standing in his name.

REGISTRATION (BIRTHS, BAPTISMS, MARRIAGES AND BURIALS) (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that Order No. 9 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: As a matter of fact, all hon. members in whose names the Orders between Nos. 2 and 9 stand are not in their places.

There being no objection, leave was granted the hon. member to proceed with Order No. 9.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials) Act, 1891.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a very simple one. I think it is non-controversial and hon. members will clearly see the purpose of this Bill. The original Act of 1891 was passed, I may say, before any hon. member of this House had seen the sun, and since that time several Police Stations have been erected and the community has grown up in such a way that the Act of 1891 is inconsistent and somewhat anomalous. It is anomalous in that in respect of persons whose births take place in St. James, people have to take the tortuous way to go up to St. Thomas Police Station to have those births registered, when it is more convenient, reasonable and logical for them to go to the Hometown Police Station which does quite a lot of work and probably more than that done at St. Thomas, to have these births registered. If anything occurs in St. James you should report it to the Police Station at Hometown, whether it be a birth, death, accident or the like. It may be said that the Hometown Police Station might not have been in existence when the Act was passed, and even if it were in existence, it could not cope with a matter of this sort. The change which I am suggesting in this Bill does not call for any more work, expense or any appreciable preparation in order to accommodate such a change. I am quite certain that hon. members would not hesitate in giving support to the second reading of this Bill. I therefore beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, in reading through this Bill I do not know if there are any other parishes in which the same thing is done as what is happening in St. James; that is to say, I do not know if people have to leave their parish to go to another parish in order to do this kind of registration. I do not know how the matter stands in the parish of St. Lucy, for instance. The parish of St. Lucy also has a Police Sub-station and, as I say, I do not know if any other parishes are in the same position as the parish of St. James. It would be a good idea, now that we are dealing with this Bill if an amendment could be made to deal with other parishes as well. As far as the parish of St. Andrew is concerned, registration is done at Belleplaine Sub-station just as it is done at District "F" Police Station.
3.10 p.m.

As far as St. Joseph is concerned, I think they would be registered at Belleplaine or District "F". I do not know about parishes like St. John and St. Peter. I do not know if any of the other parishes have to do likewise, nor do I know if hon. members know of anything existing in their parishes, because it is hard having to travel so far to have these deaths and so on record when they can be done much nearer or in the same parish.

Mr. SPEAKER: That matter may well be considered and it is a useful matter to bring forward when the Select Committee considers it.

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

Mr. SPEAKER I now invite the following hon. members to serve on the Select Committee to consider this Bill: the Hon. and Learned member for St. James; the hon. senior member for St. George; the hon. junior member for St. Thomas; the hon. senior and junior members for St. Joseph; and the hon. junior member for St. Michael who is the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing.

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John who is not in his place. Order No. 11 stands in the name of the hon. junior member

for St. George who is absent, and Order No. 12 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John who is absent. Order No. 13 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to go back to Order No. 3 to be debated by the hon. senior member for St. Peter who unfortunately is not here right now. We will continue debate on that, which as Your Honour will recall, was the last matter dealt with during this time at our last meeting. I have sent to call the hon. member who, I think, is on the premises.

Mr. SPEAKER: The position is that the hon. member is not yet on the premises and I have called the Order standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael to move the passing of a Resolution re the operation of the Widows and Orphans Pension Scheme.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, in moving the passing of this Resolution re the operation of the Widows and Orphans Pension Scheme, I should like to draw your attention to certain facts concerning the revenue and expenditure of the Widows and Orphans Pension Scheme over the last five years 1957 to 1962. From figures available, Sir, you will see that over \$1/2 million have been collected from public officers and paid into revenue. Over the same five years only \$39,000 have been paid out in any pension or anything whatsoever for the benefit of these public officers. This, Sir, is bringing about gross dissatisfaction among public officers. I will give you the revenue and expenditure figures for each year from 1957 to 1962. In the year 1957-58, \$87,717 were paid into revenue and expenditure was \$5,070. In 1958-59 \$93,039 were paid into revenue and expenditure was \$6,150. In 1959-60 \$102,774 were paid into revenue and expenditure was \$8,500. In 1960-61 \$109,892 were paid into revenue and expenditure was \$9,493; and in 1961-62 \$110,000 were paid into revenue and expenditure was \$10,000.

Mr. Speaker, in fairness to these public officers, I should like to ask that the following Resolution be adopted and implemented by the Government of this Island. It reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS grave dissatisfaction exists among Civil Servants over the operation of the Widows and Orphans Pension Scheme and the meagre benefits derived therefrom;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government take immediate steps to carry out a full investigation of the operation of this scheme with a view to the immediate setting up of -

1. A Medical Aid and Surgical Scheme for contributors and their dependents; and

2. The setting up of a revolving fund from which....."

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member is departing somewhat from the terms of the Resolution even if not from the spirit, but very definitely from its letter.

Mr. SEALEY: I am sorry, Sir, The second paragraph should read as follows:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that Government take steps to carry out a thorough investigation into the operation of the said Scheme and if possible have its scope of operation extended to include:-

(a) a Medical Aid Scheme to contributors and/or their dependents;

(b) a Scheme further to assist contributors and/or their dependents in the construction or purchase of homes."

I beg to move this Resolution be now passed.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, in supporting the hon. senior member for St. Michael on this Resolution, for a long time Civil Servants in this Island have been dissatisfied from time to time over being called upon to contribute

such a large percentage of their salaries to this Fund when such a small percentage over the period has been paid out in benefits to their widows and orphans.
3.20 p.m.

It is true when people pay into a Pension Fund such as this, they hope that their family will not be beneficiaries themselves, because they hope they will live long enough to make provision for their wives and that their children would have grown up long past the age. But it is the case of when Civil Servants at an early age of their life pass on and these cases are thrown to public view.

I think the contribution is 4% of their salary, and over the years the large sum of \$1/2 million has accrued to this fund; and they now feel either that the percentage which they are called on to contribute should be reduced or else the fund spent in some other manner more realistic to their contributions.

It is not for us to make *ad hoc* decisions on such a scheme, but I do think the attention of Governments has been drawn to it long enough and this Government should investigate properly what should be done for the future. The hon. senior member for St. Michael somewhat departed from what I think is the creation of the fund and now is talking about assistance in a housing scheme. Speaking personally, that may not be the correct measure. It was created to assist Widows and Orphans and the terms should be adhered to as much as possible, but a proper investigation in the right quarter should produce some answer which should be satisfactory to Civil Servants thereby putting this money to a better use. It is not for us to make *ad hoc* decisions in here and say what should be done; but what we do say is that an investigation should take place, and something along the lines of what the Civil Service Association has been talking over a period of years should be done. For that reason I support the Resolution as it stands.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just sat down made several references to the fact that it has been aired about for a long time — I purposely used the words "aired about" — that members of the Civil Service have from time to time been hinting at this grievance but the Civil Service in Barbados has developed a lot in strength and not in status since the inception of this fund.

Now, Sir, the Barbados Civil Service has an Association and by now it should be a strong Association. They have annual meetings, and, I believe, annual conferences, and I believe that there should be a body of opinion in that Association so strong, that it should be strong enough to bring more forcibly to the attention of any Government in this country the fact that they want to have this fund put on a somewhat different business.

I would be the last man in Barbados to say that the Civil Servants have not been grouching over this business, but I do not think that they have been articulate enough about such a grievance; and however much hon. members of this House may sympathise with Civil Servants because it appears that they pay into this fund a lot of money and get nothing out of it, hon. members must remember that here in this connection they are now dealing with a certain element in the community which is well educated which has now found themselves in a strong Association, and there is no reason why they in their Association cannot make a step big enough to do something positive in the sense for themselves. We are still outside. Mark you, I have very close relatives in the Civil Service, and from the outside I am very sympathetic if they have a grievance; but I do not think a Resolution just drawing this to the attention of the Government that this fund is not working in the interest of the Civil Servants is the best thing to do for the Civil Servants. The Civil Service does not consist of people whose brains are worn out; as you know, the Government usually takes the cream of the people in this Island into the Civil Service. Do you mean to tell me that you cannot find in the ranks of the Civil Service a body of opinion to convince the Government that this fund is now run on antiquated lines?

I do not think the Civil Service Association means business in this matter. That is my candid opinion, no mat-

ter how much sympathy I have for the Civil Servants or how much sympathy this Honourable Chamber has for them. As a matter of fact, this Resolution would be passed; but as it goes to the Government, the first thing Government would have to do is to consult the Civil Service Association — and is that an impotent body which we are trying to do something for? That is not my opinion. I feel when things get difficult enough, when things get bad enough, when the Civil Servants feel it more fit not to contribute, they themselves will find strength enough, courage enough, to tell Government to do away with this fund or to put it on a proper basis.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. senior member for St. Michael made mention of a medical and surgical insurance scheme in which part of this money can be pooled.
3.30 p.m.

I have just risen to inform the hon. member that presently the Government is considering the introduction of a social security scheme, and all of these things will be taken into consideration. In the second place, inasmuch as this is a Civil Service matter — in fact, I move that the further consideration of this matter be postponed inasmuch as it comes under the aegis of the Hon. Premier who is not in his place at the present moment.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member would have to make a motion.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, when I was making a formal motion you asked me if I was making a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not realise that the hon. member was making a motion.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to move that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed inasmuch as the Hon. Premier is not now in his place.

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

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

RESOLUTION re REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FARM LABOUR PROGRAMME IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that Order No. 3 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: That Order stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter. Is the hon. member asking leave to proceed with that Order?

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, any hon. member can ask leave to do that because I am not speaking on it yet.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister to proceed with the Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Order is to resume debate on a Resolution re the Report of the Committee appointed to report on the Farm Labour Programme in the United States of America. On the last occasion, the Hon. Leader of the House was speaking when the debate on the Resolution was adjourned. The hon. member may, if he wishes to do so, continue his address.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I so desire, Sir. Mr. Speaker, this matter refers, as I recalled last Tuesday, to the Report of the Committee appointed to report on the Farm Labour Programme in the United States of America. As I pointed out last Tuesday, this Committee was appointed as a result of numerous complaints by returning workers to Barbados who had left the island to go to work on American farms. The complaints were with regard to wages and general conditions of work; and earlier this year, soon after we were

elected to office, we took steps to investigate the situation by appointing a Committee to go on the spot and discover the justification of these allegations. That Committee comprised the hon. senior member for St. Peter who is a very experienced Leader of labour in the country, and the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Labour, Mr. C.B. Williams. I should like to say that Mr. Williams is a very able and experienced officer of the Government. He is attached to my Ministry, and I have nothing but the highest regard for the conscientious manner in which he discharges his duty and the deep sense of responsibility which he brings to bear on all matters coming before the Ministry.

These two investigators signed the Report to which this Resolution refers. The Report shows that the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Labour visited a number of sites where these Barbadian workers were employed in the early part of this year. They visited the places where these people lived, they visited their houses, their kitchens, they investigated the kind of food which they got, they looked into the general conditions of work and into the general complaints which were made by people with regard to the food, the prices charged for meals, the type of meals they got, the work which they did, and the average earnings during the time that these workers were under contract. The also investigated other conditions of the workers, such as medical attention and transport; they also investigated the relationship between workers and Liaison Officers, accident and sickness benefits and the Report also paid proper attention to the basic question of recruitment and information.

Mr. Speaker, this is a rather comprehensive Report indeed as one would expect, with a number of recommendations for the improvement of the situation. It was suggested that leaflets should be printed expressing in simple language the main features of the programme and among other things, that the Minister responsible for Labour should, whenever his other duties permit, address each group of workers before they leave for the U. S. A. in an endeavour to impress on them the importance of honouring their obligations and the continuance of the programme to the economy of the island. The final two paragraphs of the Report emphasized the importance to this country of the Farm Labour Programme and urged the advisability of giving the American employer every encouragement to fight to retain our quotas; they also point out that we could only do this by sending the American employer men who are willing to work hard. I think that these are sentiments with which all of us will be in complete agreement.

I said last Tuesday that the raising of this matter at this particular time could hardly have been more appropriate for the simple reason that, as we are all aware, within recent weeks a considerable proportion of workers who left this country for the United States of America under contract have returned.
3.40 p.m.

Out of 900 odd who left the Island under contract within the last six weeks, nearly 200 have returned. In comparison I should like to point out that during the same period no less than 2,400 Jamaicans have left Jamaica for similar work in the United States. Out of that, 2,400 only four have returned to Jamaica before the completion of their contract. Naturally, Sir, this is a most distressing matter not only to the Government, but to all right thinking Barbadians, because it is common knowledge that the American employers were deeply concerned over the high ratio of Barbadian workers who returned without even any effort to fulfil the contract. Before most of these men left the Island, they were told in no uncertain terms by officials of the Labour Department and myself on numerous occasions how important it was to endeavour to fulfil the contract and not to consider themselves as tourists going to the States for a joy-ride at the expense of the American employers and the Barbados Government.

On several occasions, Sir, I went to the Drill Hall, on the night before these men were scheduled to embark — or the day before as the case may be — and I pointed out that the Liaison Staff in the States would do everything possible

to ensure that their conditions of work were satisfactory, and at the same time we expected them to fulfil their obligations. This high percentage of returnees to Barbados has resulted in a serious loss to the country from several points of view. In the first instance Your Honour will recall that through the efforts of the Premier the quota for Barbados this year was raised to 2,000, which is the highest quota for at least five years. Then, Sir, in consequence of the increasing area of cane brought under cultivation within the year in Florida for the first time, my Ministry made additional representations to the American Employers' Organisation, and when I was in the States about six weeks ago I was told that it had been decided to increase the quota for Barbados to 3,000. Mr. Edwards who is Head of the Liaison Service in Washington told me on the telephone that the employers had agreed to increase the Barbados quota to 3,000, but that the behaviour of the Barbadian workers had been of such a nature that they were completely dissatisfied, and they were only retaining the quota of 2,000 because both the American Employers and the officials in Washington were quite satisfied that the Barbados Government, the Ministers and the officials of the Labour Department had done every possible thing in their power to ensure that the workers gave satisfaction. Purely on these grounds they will still stick to the quota of 2,000, but we have lost the extra 1,000; and bearing in mind the number of people who really want work and who would really go to the States and fulfil their obligations to the contract, this is nothing less than a disaster to the colony.

Apart from that, Sir, when these workers return within a few days or a week of entering the States, both the taxpayers of this country and the American Employers are themselves involved in the loss of their transportation costs. As a Government, we cannot sit down and view with equanimity the possibility of frittering away the taxpayers' money on people who do not want to work nor on the other hand are the employers in America going to be satisfied to continue to advance money for transport costs for workers who apparently are not prepared to work.

The position of transport is this, Sir; under the terms of the contract the workers are required to remain in employment for normally six months in the first instance. If work is provided after, they can remain up to three years. The employer advances a sum equivalent to the cost of transport of the worker from Jamaica to America, because they can get all the Jamaican workers they want, and if we want to be included in the scheme, we have got to be satisfied to pay the cost of transport from Barbados to Jamaica and then the employer would pay the differential between transportation costs from Jamaica to the States. Now the employer advances a sum equivalent to the cost of transport from Jamaica to the U. S. A. and pays a similar amount in respect of repatriation, provided of course the worker has satisfactorily executed his part of the contract. The advance is recoverable by means of pay roll deductions from the worker. The Barbados Government on its part advances the difference between the amount advanced by the employer and the cost of transporting the worker from Barbados to America. As I pointed out just now, they can get Jamaican workers; and if we want to send ours we must pay the extra cost from Barbados to Jamaica and the employer will pay from Jamaica to the U. S. A. The amount we advance is also recoverable by pay roll deductions. Now where the worker has not worked for enough to cover this expense, it means, as I said earlier, that both the employer and the Barbados Government become involved in finding part or whole, as the case may be, of the transportation costs. Some of these gentlemen do not work for three days and therefore have earned nothing to contribute towards the cost of transportation, and the entire burden will fall to the Barbados Government and the American employer. Now the position is that the losses incurred by the Government and the employers within recent years have been steadily rising.
3.50 p.m.

In 1960, we had to write off \$5,568 because 94 people had broken their contract. Last year, the number was almost trebled; the number was 291, and this is going to cost us between \$16,000 and \$17,000.

Now, apart from the financial loss of the Government and to the employers, and to what we call the Regional Labour Board which is also involved in these losses, the irresponsibility of these workers is causing serious harm to themselves; and the employers have definitely stated that they are going to bring the Barbados scheme to an end if the situation does not improve. Even more important is the fact that the American Government itself has expressed deep concern over the situation because of the fact that invariably when the workers return home they make statements to the Press and the public; and the American Government whose business it is to concern themselves with preserving what they regard as a correct accountability of America abroad has been protesting in no uncertain terms over what they characterise as an incorrect picture of America's labour conditions which the reports of these returned workers represent. As a matter of fact, the American Government in itself has made representations to the effect that if the situation persists, recruitment from Barbados will be stopped for a trial period of a few years.

I need not worry the House with the actual figures of what this scheme means to the Island or the amount of earnings remitted during the time it was in operation or the value of this avenue of employment at given periods throughout the year to Barbados. I think that Barbadians are fully conscious of the fact that the scheme itself has made a vital contribution to our economy for the last 15 or 16 years, and the living standards of the people have been considerably improved basically due to the outlet provided by American employment; and I almost conceive that any talk of bringing the scheme to an end, would be an incalculable economic loss to the Government.

The Government therefore has been very seriously considering this matter and we are preparing Mr. Speaker, to use stringent measures in an effort to put an end to this disastrous state of affairs, and to preserve the project for that large number of responsible and reasonable minded Barbadians who really would like to find work in that country when they need it. The Government therefore proposes that apart from Trade Union Regulations, we are instituting new forms and records to be used by the Employment Exchange in order to tighten up on the possibility of misinformation being supplied as regards identity and what not because we all know of the subterfuges resorted to by a number of workers who go off to the States in *nom-de-plume* names, aliases, and what not, and we will be using these forms to tighten up the regulations and to obviate the possibility of continuance of the many subterfuges resorted to now by people who go to the States.

We are going to change the Form of Agreement to make it possible for the Government to recover as a civil debt from anybody who goes to the United States and returns the portion of the unpaid balance in respect of his transportation expenses. In other words, we are not to be content to continue to have the American employer, the Regional Labour Board and the Barbados taxpayers finding the transport cost for these "tourists" who under the guise of workers go to Miami on a little trip and come back down after a certain time. We are going to recover any unpaid portion as a civil debt. Also, any worker who is repatriated for a breach of contract unless the circumstances warrant it will be disqualified from any Government employment for a period of two years.

The Government feels, Mr. Speaker, I think quite justifiably, that there are occasions when serious circumstances warrant harsh measures to correct them. And as I have said, apart from the financial loss involved and the expenses incurred by Government, and the American employers and the Regional Labour Board, this irresponsibility on the part of the workers will in the immediate future seriously affect the entire recruitment scheme of Barbadians to the United States. You and I know that there are large numbers of them who like to go there every year and who look forward to return. There are many whom I know from the parish of St. Philip who have been able to buy a new house or repair an old one through this scheme, and some are still in debt; and the only way they can earn

enough or save enough to pay off their present debt is by returning to the United States every year. If the scheme comes to an end, then many rational people would be affected, apart from the country losing the economic contribution to our economy which this scheme makes every year. 4.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that the hon. senior member for St. Peter himself will be satisfied that the Government has not been unmindful of the observations and recommendations made in the Report under reference. The Report itself expressed no basic disagreement or it has not made any very adverse criticism of the general terms and conditions of work, and the Government would be lacking in its responsibility to the community — it would also be unmindful of the duty which it owes to the community as a whole — if it were to permit a number of irresponsible individuals to wreck completely a scheme which it took a lot of determination and a lot of effort in the early days to institute. This Government certainly could not allow itself to be placed on record as not exerting every possible effort to maintain the project and to inflict the proper discipline on those wicked people who are trying to bring the scheme to an end.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member want to contribute to this debate before the hon. mover of the passing of the Resolution exercises his right of reply? (*After a pause*). Seemingly no other hon. member wants to contribute to this debate and accordingly the hon. senior member for St. Peter may exercise his right to reply now.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution which seeks the approval of the Report of the Mission which investigated the Farm Labour Programme in the United States of America, was moved as a formal matter in view of the fact that sometimes one would hear hon. members say that when these missions go abroad we do not get any report from them, and sometimes it is wondered if the persons who went on these Missions really went on a holiday. I can assure hon. members that the comparatively short stay which we had in the United States of America — Mr. Williams and myself — to carry out this Mission was by no means a holiday. I was very pleased indeed to hear what the Hon. Minister has said; I feel that at times and in these days especially it is necessary for us to be forthright in our remarks on fundamental matters which affect the nation. There are lots of people who take refuge in some of these temporary aberrations among human beings and, for one reason or other, try to find them as a means of becoming popular at the expense of the national good.

Mr. Speaker, when I moved the passing of this Resolution, I could not anticipate what would have taken place last month, and I was very pleased to hear the Hon. Minister making a policy statement on behalf of the Government and making it crystal clear as to what is the Government's attitude towards this very vital matter. I would say, Mr. Speaker, as you will very well know, that in a vital matter such as this, when you have an investigation made and you have conversations with people, it is not always possible to put every single important matter affecting a broad issue like this in a report, because at times you do not want to give too much publicity to the adverse side of things. The United States Government, as distinct from the United States employers, is not at all bending over backwards in order to bring aliens to the United States of America in order to do any kind of work. They regard work in the United States of America as work for citizens of the United States of America; and in order for anyone to get into the United States of America, the United States Department of Labour has to issue a certificate making it clear that the kind of work to be performed by an alien cannot be adequately performed, and therefore the labour cannot be adequately procured in the United States of America. If there are Barbadians and Barbadians suffer from an over dose of conceit, if Barbadian people believe that the people in the United States of America are waiting on Barbadians to come to the United States of America to perform a task for them, I want to say that they are living in the very far and distant past. The United States Government is not waiting on Barbadians to perform this kind of work. As the Hon. Minister of Labour

has said, they can get Jamaicans. If you were to look at the Appendix to this Report, you will see that it reveals in 1961 an alarming thing for Barbados. The employers said to us that they were fed up with the Barbadians. If you were to look at page nine at Appendix 2, you will note what is set out there. I will try to give hon. members some information with regard to the incidence of AWOLs, that is, people who are away with leave, territory by territory, you will get this alarming situation. In 1961 there were 7,469 Jamaicans and in the same year there were 1,548 Barbadians, in the United States of America. Of the 7,469 Jamaicans 47 of them went away with leave; and of the 1,548 Barbadians, there were 76 who went away with leave. When you get that alarming differential, Jamaicans were more than four times the number of Barbadians in the United States of America and yet you find that the Barbadians left at the rate of nearly twice as much as the Jamaicans. The total number of aliens in the United States of America including the Leeward and Windward Islands and Trinidad was 10,267 and 151 of them went away and Barbadians were more than one half of that total; Barbados therefore had 76 going away with leave out of the whole total of 151.

4.10 p.m.

Barbadians were going away at nearly twice, three times or four times the rate of other people doing the same kind of work as Barbadians. From the Leeward Islands' total of 695 — about half the total of the Barbadians — four went off, when 76 Barbadians went off, and from Jamaica's 7,000 who are in competition with Barbados only 47 went off. The incidence of breach of contract is as follows: Of Jamaica's 7,469 there were 477; of Barbados' 1,500 there were 190; now these are purely statistical figures, Mr. Speaker, and you can very well understand that this will require a sociological survey, which this Committee was not in power to carry out, to study why this figure is so much higher than the Jamaicans; but we had to take that as a matter of fact.

I agree with the Hon. Minister, and I would like, if I have not done it in the beginning, to underwrite what the Minister said about Mr. C. B. Williams as a competent and conscientious public servant. We worked very harmoniously together in carrying out this mission on behalf of the Minister and the Government. We did not consider our task merely to look at statistics, but we considered it essential that we should visit the places and see as much as we could possibly see among the workers themselves. As we indicated in the Report, I will say here again, Mr. Speaker, that migrant work any part of the world is hard work. You have to relate a migrant in the same terms as you regard a man recruited to the Army or military service; it is tough work. Cutting canes in Florida is different from cutting canes in Barbados, and that is why we advised the Minister whenever it is practical and possible to speak to these workers, because in Barbados a worker cuts canes by the ton, and it does not matter, as it is a straight line method of cutting canes, what the price is, because if he cuts half a ton he is going to be paid for half a ton.

In the United States the method of cutting canes is not that simple straight line method. It relates more to a method we had here called a sliding scale. But it is not a sliding scale; it is quantum that you have to produce within a given period in order to maximize the amount you must receive. The American employer is not accustomed to a man coming into his work place and blowing a comb, and as long as he is there for eight hours he wants eight hours' pay. That is not the American employer's concept, nor is it the concept of the American worker, and that is why if 8 o'clock is the time to go to work he never fools around home waiting to catch the 8 o'clock bus; he realises that is the time to be on the job; and the Barbadian worker must be told that a few Barbadians cannot go to the United States with nearly 180 million people and try to transform them to Barbadian work methods and say "this is how we do it in Barbados!" I met some of them and they told me that they cut canes in Florida differently from how they cut canes in Barbados, and if they were in Barbados the situation would be different. I asked them why did they come and why they did not cut canes in Barbados.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that if they want to go on a migrant scheme, they must be told that they must be prepared for the hardships of a migrant. Now with respect to the cooking of food, the average Barbadian would like to get soup, but the Americans do not cook soup with pumpkin, sweet potatoes and yams in it. The Barbadian wants a regular soup. If they give him what the Americans regard as a straight soup, he would say this is water. Imagine waking up at 4 o'clock, Mr. Speaker, and cooking soup for 800 people. You would have a stream of soup as long as the river Nile. They do not understand these things. A fellow told me he did not have a little soup for a long time. Some fellows live in the camp to do the cooking with which they are satisfied, but you have the problem that some of them said it was cold and when they came in they did not get it warmed. We investigated that. Like all investigators, we were told that they only did this because we were coming to make a dressing. We were informed by the Liaison Officers that under the American State Laws they are very strict with these kitchens, more so than in Barbados, and if they go inside one of these camps and find a caterer not complying with all of the sanitary requirements, they will just take away the licence from that caterer and he would no longer be able to operate in the States. It is not as simple a matter that any old body can come along and cook for them; but as you will understand, it is a camp with 800 men and they endeavour to get West Indian cooks. I have not been in a kitchen where I have not seen a Jamaican or Barbadian cook, and there is not much difference between the eating habits of the Jamaican and the Barbadian. Both countries are highly and heavily eating carbo-hydrate people, and therefore on many occasions when the American would use more vegetables, that would not satisfy the regular palate of these people; they would prefer a little more rice with some salt meat in it rather than green vegetables which would to them not have any taste.

These were some of the problems we faced. Some of the workers complained that from the time they went to America they ate rice, and when we asked why they did not vary the diet, the problem arose that a variation of diet also meant a variation of cost, and if you varied the diet on the menu, then the worker would say that too much money will be deducted for food. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of food in the United States on these farm labour schemes is nothing in keeping with the normal food a man would have to purchase if he had to pay for it in the United States on the cheapest basis. The only place you would get food as cheap as this is if you went to Father Divine, and he cannot feed all these people, nor could they make the pilgrimage to get to his place in New York; so they have to be satisfied with what the camp is doing.

I will say on the whole that the scheme will be disastrous, and I do not know what will happen to Barbados, because I do not see anybody outside the United States of America willing to take 1,500 Barbadians with the exception of the Transport scheme in the United Kingdom. I do not know where Barbados can turn immediately as a wage economy as distinct from settling and you would have to carry out a very serious investigation to find the type of Barbadians who are willing to settle, whether in British Honduras, British Guiana, Surinam or any of the places in our area or any part of the world which have vast stretches of land available for settlement. This is a wage economy to which Barbadian workers are accustomed, and if this falls — if the United States Government and employers become fed up with this scheme — I do not know what will happen to this little Island. I was pleased when I saw the Hon. Premier was able to get the quota increased, and I was extremely glad when I heard the Minister of Labour state that on further representation he had got the figure increased to 3,000.

4.20 p.m.

I will tell this House, Mr. Speaker, about five years or six years ago, the then Minister of Labour in Jamaica or the Minister of Education in Jamaica, Mr. Glasspole, who was known to the American Federation of Labour and the C.I.O. President, Mr. George Meany had to make a special trip to the United States because if the powerful

Trade Union in the United States did not lend their weight to this scheme, the pressure of the U. S. A. was to clamp down on the scheme and make the employers in the United States look for labour there. The U. S. Government cannot easily look upon the farmers and discount them, and the farmers were finding it difficult to get these men to work in agriculture. It is a known fact that the U. S. Department of Agriculture has a strong organised Labour Union; therefore, even with the minimum wage that is in the United States which is \$1.25 an hour, it does not apply to agriculture because the farmers are so powerful in the United States. The Labour drift from farm work into industries was so strong that it had become difficult for the farmers to get labour. It is for that reason that Jamaicans and Barbadians were able to get work on these farms. Were it not for that internal dislocation of labour, Barbadians would not have been employed.

I was extremely pleased to hear the Hon. Minister of Trade say today that the Government proposes to take strong methods in dealing with this matter. I am only suggesting to the Hon. Minister that in view of the fact that migrant labour has an international code in respect to penal sections of that code, I would suggest that you carry out consultation with the appropriate bodies so that we will not in any way treat a matter like this out of keeping with the code and so that we debate the measure along the lines of the Migrant International Code.

I would like to inform the House that the cost of flying out this labour to the employers in the U. S. A. is borne by the Barbadian Government, that is to say, the differentiation between what it costs from Barbados to Jamaica. The rest of the cost of flying this labour out is borne by the employers; but those who know the difference would know that a plane would take not less than three hours to fly from Barbados to Jamaica. May be, it is done in two hours nowadays. Therefore, you will see that it is not far from Jamaica to Miami; therefore, the fare from there is a low one and the employers in the U. S. A. would prefer to have labour from Jamaica where they can get all they want. I say that the Barbadian workers and the public should be made aware of it. I am not satisfied in my mind over the recruiting method. I am satisfied in my mind that the American scheme has met with a lot of difficulties because there was too much "hocus pocus" going on in the matter of recruitment. There was too much passing back going on, somebody's girl friend going out and meeting people late at night in order to get somebody on the scheme. By that sort of thing, you got a lot of undesirables getting through and the people who were willing to work in the United States were left behind. I know people who have met with so much success and who pleased the employers there so much that they had to come back after the three years because of the Immigration Laws of the United States and then they were recruited again by the same U. S. employers and, as far as these persons are concerned, they made a contribution by sending money back here. The ones who are going out just as "tourists" are making it difficult for some other person and we should do all in our power to see that wherever we have Barbadians who are incapable of this work and to ensure the economy of this country for which we cannot get a similar outlook by putting our hands in the air, we take all the steps necessary to see that we send the best workers.

I feel that steps should be taken to end forever any breaking of the interest of the public and to kill any idea that people give encouragement to that type of behaviour. I support the Hon. Minister wholeheartedly on the proposals that Government propose to take in the matter and I assure him that I give the Government my co-operation.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member used the words "hocus-pocus" what do you mean by that?

Mr. WALCOTT: There was an occasion when I was speaking to the Commission of Enquiry that I said "by the Grace of God, I am what I am." "Hocus-pocus" means what it is.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 o'clock we proceed to Government Business.

The first Order stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: To consider the grants of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before I move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and this House go into Committee of Supply, I am asking leave for the Hon. Premier to make a Statement to the House.

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

STATEMENT BY HON. PREMIER *re* REDUCTION OF CONSUMPTION TAX

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, whenever a Minister of Finance appears on the threshold of the Parliamentary Chamber with the black box which I now have before me instead of the customary red despatch box, people who are aware of this circumstance begin to wonder where the axe is going to fall because it is then only that a Chancellor of the Exchequer or a Minister of Finance appears with the Finance Despatch Box on such occasions as important pronouncements on taxation are going to be made. I intend today to make an important pronouncement on the General taxation policy of this country. 4.30 p.m.

The last one which I made was on the 26th June, 1962. It is rather unusual at this time of the year — in midstream, as it were — to make any Financial Statement, but I have no intention of changing horses. I intend to make a Financial Statement with your permission and I hope that those who viewed my arrival with the Finance Box with some apprehension will have their fears allayed by the time I come to the end of my Statement. In the Budget Proposals submitted to this Honourable House on the 26th June, 1962, among other things which were imposed in order to lessen the gap between the expenditure which we had estimated and the revenue which we expected to derive, was a consumption duty of \$1.03 per gallon imposed on all beer and stout, whether imported or locally produced. Prior to the establishment of a Brewery in Barbados, the Government, at the invitation of that Brewery, raised the import duties on beer to \$1.13 preferential and \$1.20 general so that there was a protective tariff in favour of the proposed Brewery of a substantial amount. As far as I can remember, that Brewery went into operation in September, 1961, and met with, perhaps due to the novelty of the production, immediate success, and at the end of a period of six months they were able to demonstrate a substantial margin of profit — the rate of return over cost. At the same time, Government revenue which had been estimated at a figure of \$600,000 import duty on beer, took a spectacular nose dive, so that we found ourselves in a position where the last Government had committed us to an inordinate increase in the salaries of public officers in the island, and a budget deficit because of the fall in the import duty on beer and the Civil Service salaries and other causes, due to the lack of proper financing, in my opinion, and budgetary planning — of some \$3 million a year.

You will remember, Sir, that at the time when I introduced the Financial Statement, I said that very drastic measures would have to be taken in order to correct this *malaise* in the financial affairs of the island. I want to make it abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker, that when a Minister of Finance imposes any measure of taxation, he does not do so for political reasons, but purely for economic reasons. A Minister of Finance is not supposed to be a prophet; furthermore, all the best economists in the world always make their projections with the reservation or qualification that all other things must remain equal in order for those projections to be granted any degree of accuracy — as we say, *ceteris paribus*. Very often in a community such as ours we cannot control a large number of factors; we cannot control people's propensities to be malicious; we cannot control people's propensities to run down local products; we cannot control the propensities of the people in whose in-

terest it may be to do otherwise, to give the general impression that products are too expensive and are not worthwhile buying — I do not want to refer to any particular individual or group of individuals; neither can we control the irresponsibility of the Press or the well-established habit of Barbadians to set a higher premium on products from abroad and even on people from abroad than they set on their own products and on their own people. These are things which no Minister of Finance has it in his power to control; therefore when we make calculations as to the revenue effect of the imposition of a certain tax or of a certain duty, we are only doing so — we are only making these calculations — on the basis that all other things must remain equal.

The effect of the imposition for the first time of a consumption tax on beer was normally to increase the price of a bottle of beer, whether locally produced or imported from abroad, by eight cents. That was the calculated effect. However, by some peculiar device, retailers in Barbados have decided that they were also entitled to some kind of tax as well, because instead of the price of a bottle of beer going from 21 cents to 29 cents, they decided to tack on a few more cents for themselves as an additional imposed tax and make the consumer pay something like 33 or 34 cents for a bottle of beer. Coupled with that, there were irresponsible statements made by people who should know better, coupled with a campaign which gave the general public the idea that the ruling Party had some political axe to grind and wanted to see our own local brewery discontinue its operations, all of which was completely untrue — I need not mention that — but there had been a sharp decline in the consumption of beer. For this I make no apologies. Even after the proposals which I will disclose in the course of this Statement, Mr. Speaker, I expect that the taxpayers of Barbados will be subsidising beer consumption in the construction of the Brewery of some quarter of a million dollars a year. This might very well afford us the privilege of extending the school meals service to four more public elementary schools in this island. There has been, since June, a fall in the production of beer and the importation of beer from abroad; the Government therefore has to be extremely flexible and keep the study of the economy under constant review.

4.40 p.m.

This from a revenue point of view has been agitating my mind and that of the Minister of Trade and Development for some weeks, if not months, but we did not feel that we had a competent analysis in so short a time to bring about any change in the taxation structure. I would like to say that the whole commercial set-up in Barbados is one which will do justice to an enquiry by a Royal Commission. I do not intend to interfere with the free interplay of supply and demand in any way or to perfect and fair competition, therefore I do not propose to say anymore on that; but we do know that there are certain monopolistic practices which go on in this Island which only tend to send up the cost of the commodities to the consumer.

We feel as a Government that consumer goods have to filter through to many so-called middle men, and that very often when you examine import prices of a commodity including cost, insurance, freight and duty, by the time it leaves the Port duty-paid, and reaches the consumer, there are fantastic mark-ups in the price of these commodities. In the case of local industries the situation is somewhat different, and therefore in the same way that a Government has to exercise external vigilance over its revenue position, any industry which is trying to capture the public imagination should not do so by trying to wage an economic war either with the consumer or with the Government. Very often an infant industry in order to establish itself will sell its commodity at a very small margin of profit, or in some remarkable instances will even go to the extent of putting that product on the market at a small loss to itself. That is not a generally accepted principle in Barbados business circles that you should make any sacrifice at all in order to capture the public imagination and to cultivate public taste in demanding the product which you are manufacturing.

Well, prior to the imposition of the consumption duty of \$1.03 per bottle of local beer, Sir, the price varied between 19 cents and 21 cents per bottle. It is not beyond my knowledge that certain shopkeepers charged what the market could bear, but certainly that was the retail price over the counter, and that was the price which shopkeepers — truthfully speaking, storekeepers but they prefer to call themselves shopkeepers — were instructed by the parent company that the marketable price was in the vicinity of 21 cents per bottle. This price, I suppose, varied because that is something which we cannot control among the retail and other shopkeepers in this Island. They will charge what they think people are willing to pay, so that you have very often in Barbados two sets of prices, tourist prices and Barbadian prices. I daresay, Sir, that if you ventured into any parish other than the one you have the honour to represent, anyone looking for you would readily come to the conclusion that you were not a man of straw and would want to make you pay, perhaps, 35 cents for a bottle of the beer he would only charge me 21 cents for, but this is the way of the trade.

I am mentioning these things because I think both the consuming public and the distributing public ought to know that the Government is not unaware of the practices which go on in business. As I said before, when the consumption tax was put on in order to lessen the gap between our expenditure and our estimated revenue, and in order to make up, maybe, not to the fullest extent, but in some measure for the loss in revenue which the Government has suffered by the construction of a local brewery and the coming into production of beer and stout on the local market, the price then should have been in the vicinity of 28 cents or 29 cents. It is our opinion, Sir, that an attractive price for a commodity such as beer would be a price in the vicinity of 25 cents a bottle, because a quarter or 25 cents is a unit of our fancy, and very often if you charge one cent more, that additional cent acts as a disincentive to a man who is willing to spend a quarter, but would find it very difficult to break another quarter to spend 26 cents especially in Barbados. That is why I think some merchants reduced their prices to 99 cents when perhaps they could sell the commodity for \$1.03 or \$1.04, because it is a psychological factor which they are invoking in selling a commodity just on or below a unit of currency. You will find that a commodity may be priced at \$1.99 which is really \$2.00, but people will readily purchase a commodity at \$1.99 and they would think twice before purchasing it at \$2.05.

Let us take airline passages. The fantastic increase in visitors coming from Toronto and Montreal during the summer months of 1962 must in a large degree be attributable to the fact that the airlines reduced the return prices from Toronto to Barbados to \$199.00 Canadian. It is not the duty of Government to go into business as such except in those sectors of the economy where a stimulus is needed, but a good Government is a Government that has business sense and a Government that is properly advised. It is therefore in the desire to stimulate consumption of local products and, in particular, locally produced beer and to try to afford a commodity of a reasonable price and at a unit price, say, of 25 cents that I have decided in my capacity as Minister of Finance to reduce the consumption tax on all beer, whether imported or locally produced, from \$1.03 to a figure of 61 cents per gallon. This is a substantial reduction in the price of beer, and I think that the slogan which I can attach to this announcement is "cheaper beer for Christmas." (Cheers.)

4.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, we are satisfied after studying the economics of the industry and the economics of the brewery that this should provide the purchasing public with ten-ounce bottles of locally brewed beer at a price of not more than 25 cents a bottle. What they charge at dances and clubs for it is another matter because we do not want to put on any price controls on locally produced goods and commodities; but the Government will keep the situation under constant review; and if the concession which the Government is now making is not reflected by Saturday morning which is the date of publication of this Order in

the Extraordinary issue of the *Official Gazette* — this will be law by Saturday morning that beer leaving the brewery will not have to pay a consumption tax; but I hope no merchant would have reduced this beer until after the period of the inflationary tax.

But the reason why we cannot make it effective as from tomorrow is because it would create certain accounting difficulties in the Customs Department because monthly returns are made and it would mean switching off the whole system, metaphorically speaking, in the middle of the month.

This is a dramatic drop which we are making in both local and imported beer. This reduction affects imported beer to the same extent as it affects the local product; but it does not mean that the locally brewed beer would be sold at the same price as the imported beer because there is still a margin of difference of \$1.13 preferential and \$1.20 general in favour of the local product. I think therefore that this is the first of a series of Christmas gifts which the Government is making to the community in general and in certain sectors in general.

We have brought in a Resolution for Government employees which we will deal with later on to make advances towards them, and later on we are going to introduce an amendment to the Rum Duty Act of 1906; but I would not like hon. members to get elated because we do not intend in any way to reduce the duty on rum but only the consumption tax. What is now known as distiller's tax of eight cents a gallon we intend to remove that altogether so that Barbados rum can become more competitive in the overseas market with rum from other rum-producing countries. I will say more about that later.

I believe that next Tuesday the Hon. Minister of Trade will make some further pronouncements which would vitally affect the cost of living in a favourable way in this country.

LEAVE GRANTED TO MAKE A FURTHER STATEMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier having concluded his Statement to which he obtained the leave of the House to make.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave for the Hon. Premier to make another Statement.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Before the hon. member does that, I would like to give notice of my intention to move a Resolution.....

Mr. SPEAKER: There will be no point of giving notice of it at this stage because we are dealing with Government Business. Just before the adjournment comes, the hon. member will find that time more appropriate.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the first Order, I am asking for leave for the Hon. Premier to make another Statement.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not objecting to it, but I rise to support the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I think the Hon. Premier will have to give an undertaking that when Statements are made that contain taxation proposals, it is his intention to have the matter placed on the Order Paper so that the House can debate these things. We are having this rigmarole way of debating these things.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in order to explain the position. As regards the Statement which I have just made, it is not a Financial Statement; it is not a Statement which I could have placed on the Order Paper before I make it. Any member is free, as I think the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown has indicated that he has some Resolution, to move a Resolution or motion approving or disapproving any statement introduced by me; but I could not in all seriousness without doing great violence to constitutional proprieties

give notice of a Statement of this nature. Any member is free to debate any measures which I introduce here.

According to the amendment of the Customs Tariff Act, after the Financial Statement in June, when the Order is published in the *Official Gazette* to change any of these taxes, it needs not, strictly speaking in law, be debated or discussed when any change is made. When the tax is imposed, it should be published in the *Official Gazette* and it becomes law from the date of the publication. This Order will be published on Saturday as I indicated. After that the law says as soon as possible after publication in the *Official Gazette* to change the tax that both Houses of the Legislature have to disapprove of it within certain days, either ten or twelve days, I cannot now remember, but it is not the usual forty-one days; otherwise those Orders continue to have the full force or validity of law. There is no provision for putting one of these Resolutions on the Order Paper or to make a statement on it, but I consider it not unconstitutionally improper for the Minister of Finance before he tells the general public to treat hon. members with a statement on the proposals so that they would know what is going to be done with the finances of the Island. With this whole set of circumstances, I think I am treating hon. members with a matter of courtesy when I make statements of this kind.
5.00 p.m.

It is not a matter as of right; all the right you have is to read the *Official Gazette* and read the documents which are laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: I must say that I will have to join issue with the Hon. Premier on that. Taxation proposals are matters which this House has the right to know and approve of. We have the right as soon as possible, when these statements are made known to the public either from the *Official Gazette* or by Order, to know of these proposals; they are taxation proposals and this House has the right to approve of them. If we disapprove of any taxation proposals, at the time we disapprove of them no more legal enactment can go through. I do not want the Premier to say that we can make taxation proposals by any Order-in-Council. This is a representative Body and we have the right to know that any taxation proposals which you may make, can come into operation, provided that the House will subsequently approve of them. The day that we disapprove of them, they are no longer valid. I do not want the Hon. Premier to think that we are being treated with courtesy by making these taxation proposals because, in that case, I would submit that he should not make them in this House but he should make them outside the House, and let us see if we can abandon the House and see what would be the function of this Chamber. This House has the inalienable right to discuss these things as soon as they are made. In the United Kingdom, the Chancellor of the Exchequer would make a statement and the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hugh Gaitskill, can decide that he would discuss that statement tomorrow. Whenever the Budget proposals come down, they are introduced today and discussed tomorrow by the Leader of the Opposition whether he agrees with the taxation proposals or not.

The constitution of the House of Commons is such that the Leader of the Opposition will lose, but he has the right to discuss any taxation proposals. Look up the procedure of the House of Commons and you will see that budget proposals of any nature are introduced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer on one day and they are debated in the House of Commons on the next day. As I say, I do not want the Premier to think or to say that he has treated this House with a matter of courtesy. I have never heard that you could introduce budget proposals other than in the House; you do not do that under a tamarind tree in Well House or in some other place. I do not like these off-hand statements being made as legal statements. Where could Dr. Dalton ever produce things other than in the *Official Gazette*?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point of order. I think that the Hon. Premier was referring only to the fact that he was making this statement this afternoon.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is exactly what I was trying to say. The hon. member has purported to quote from the procedure in the House of Commons, but as far as the consumption duties are concerned, they are budget proposals. Our procedure is laid down in the 1962 Act at Chapter 22, the Consumption Tax Act, and I say that it is a matter of courtesy for me to make this statement. I need not have done it at all; I need not have come in here and made any statement about what is going to happen on Saturday. In the Consumption Tax Act of 1962 and at Section 19 this is what happens. This Section says this:-

"Regulations made by the Minister under section eighteen of this Act, and any Order made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under section three of this Act, shall be laid before both Houses of the legislature as soon as may be after the making thereof, and if within a period of forty days....."

I said it was an abridged time, but apparently the period is still a period of forty days. The Section goes on:

"beginning with the day on which any such Regulations or Order are or is laid before either House of the Legislature resolves that the Regulations or Order be annulled, the Regulations or Order shall thereupon cease to have effect but without prejudice to anything previously done thereunder or to the making of new Regulations or a new Order."

Section 3 of the Act clearly gives the authority to impose a consumption tax, not in the House of Assembly but in the Governor-in-Executive Committee. Section 3 of the Act, says this:-

"Subject to and in accordance with the provisions of this Act, where any chargeable goods are imported into the Island for consumption therein or manufactured in the Island for the said purpose, there shall be charged on the said goods a tax, to be called consumption tax, at the rate applicable to each such item of goods as is set out opposite to that item in the Schedule to this Act."

Sub-section 2 says this:-

"The Governor-in-Executive Committee may, from time to time, by Order, add to, rescind, vary or amend any of the items of goods or any of the rates in the Schedule to this Act."

What the Governor-in-Executive Committee is doing is to vary the rate of consumption tax on imported and locally manufactured beer. That is done by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. For that to become law, all that is necessary is for a notice to appear in the *Official Gazette*, which I think I told hon. members will be done on Saturday, and then the Order is the law as from the date on which it is published. For accounting and other reasons we prefer to have it done on the 1st December, because great difficulty would be created if it were done before then. It could not be made retroactive anyhow. The reason why I have treated hon. members to the courtesy of making a statement — and do not let the hon. senior member for St. Peter tell me that he does not want anything to be done as a matter of courtesy. It will appear in the *Official Gazette* before the next normal meeting of the House and I would prefer hon. members to have prescience or some foreknowledge of what is going to take place before the Order is laid which, according to the Act of 1962, would be the first reasonable date on which the Order should be made.

The hon. member has joined issue with me on a point of law. The Law says that the House of Assembly does not approve of these Orders; these Orders are law as from the date of publication in the *Official Gazette* but the House has the right, as it has with so many other Regulations, Orders and Proclamations, to disapprove of them if within forty days during which they are laid on the Table of the House, by Resolution moved by any hon. member, the House disapproves of them. Notwithstanding disapproval of any Chamber of the Legislature, whatever has been done before remains valid and binding. Furthermore, we are arguing from different premises; the hon. senior member for St.

Peter is talking about budgetary proposals and I am talking about a specific taxation Act which is nothing to do with the House of Commons, but a Statute which we ourselves have allowed and to which no hon. member of the House objected when it was being done.

5.10 p.m.

The reason why it is being done this way is that in consumption taxes and other fiscal proposals of this nature, Mr. Speaker, we cannot go through the normal machinery. You give the House the right to disallow or invalidate a tax when it has been put on, but you cannot fetter the discretion of the Minister of Finance to put on a tax. If the Minister of Finance had to come here and get the approval of the House before a tax was put on, all you would have to do is filibuster for a whole year. I am not suggesting the hon. member for St. Peter, but all one would have to do is filibuster for the whole year if one did not consider this tax personally acceptable to any individual member or company to which he belonged, and Government would never raise any revenue; so the reverse is done. Taxation impositions are law until they are disapproved; they do not become law when they are approved.

Again, I would like to mention to the hon. member that this is not any legal contest or trial of wits between the hon. member and myself. There is nothing really to dispute in the law. I do not disagree with his general pronouncements on Parliamentary democracy, because I am the greatest defender of them in this Island.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder if the hon. member means after the Chair?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: After the Chair, Sir, *ex cathedra*.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, after all that has been said, I am wondering if you will accept notice of my intention to move a Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would suggest that the hon. member draft his Resolution and give a copy of it to the Clerk, and immediately after the Orders of the Day are concluded and before the House adjourns that he reads it out formally to this House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If Your Honour so pleases.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House had asked its indulgence that, before we resume Government Business, the Hon. Premier be permitted to make a second statement, and if there be no objection, leave will be granted.

Apparently there is no objection and leave is granted. The Hon. Premier may proceed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, in the 1962-63 Capital Estimates, the provision of \$110,000 was made under Head 9 — Miscellaneous — Item 3 — Staff Requirements for Capital Works. It is however stipulated in the note to this item that the staff should comprise the following: one Engineer, three Assistant Engineers, two Architectural Draughtsmen, one Accountant, four Clerks and one Stenographer. This stipulation has allowed for no flexibility in the type of staff which it is found necessary to provide as the Capital Works Programme progresses. In order to achieve a measure of flexibility which is necessary, it is proposed to amend the existing note by adding the following: "and such other temporary staff as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may from time to time determine." May I quote again? "And such other temporary staff as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may from time to time determine."

Mr. SPEAKER: That Statement being concluded, the hon. senior member for St. Philip may now proceed with the motion standing in his name. Order No. 1.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1962-63 No. 27

Head 5 - Judiciary - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the Resolution which is now engaging our attention is one for the sum of \$348,00 to be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1962-63 No. 27 which forms the Schedule to this Resolution, and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein, and if concurred in,

RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution.

There are two Heads, Sir, and the first Head is under Part I - Current, Head 5 - Judiciary for Inquests. The amount which is needed here is an additional \$100 to meet likely expenditure for the rest of the financial year.

I beg to move that Head 5 stand part.

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

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

Head 18 - Police - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, under this Head we need an additional amount of \$200 for Court expenses because the amount originally provided turned out to be insufficient; and \$48 for the purchase of tickets to be used in the Central Foundry and Jubilee Garden car parks.

I beg to move that Head 18 - Police - stand part.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolution for \$348 was passed.

5. 20 p.m.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

RESOLUTION TO MAKE ADVANCES TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to deal with the Resolution of which notice was given today for the sum of \$250,000 to be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of making advances of salary or wages to Government Civil Servants and members of the Unestablished Staff and Casual employees.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not objecting but I am objecting to the method, I do not like this dancing about with the Order Paper. Not so long ago, Your Honour was in the

Chair. The hon. member could have given notice earlier in the day that he was going to deal with it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I did not know.

Mr. WALCOTT: Therefore, if he did not give notice earlier in the day, how is it that he is not saying that he is giving notice to deal with it now? If that is true, I say that the Hon. Minister does not know how to run Government Business.

Mr. Speaker, I would like you to pay more attention to me. I do not like to be addressing the House and Your Honour speaking to someone.

Mr. SPEAKER: No one knows better than the hon. senior member for St. Peter that anyone who is sufficiently experienced as the hon. senior member for St. Peter is, I have no difficulty of hearing.

Mr. WALCOTT: I object to this method. The Hon. Leader of the House said he did not give notice; so he could not mean what he said when he said that he was asking leave to deal with it.

What I am suggesting is that I do not like this dancing about with the Order Paper. When Your Honour was in the Chair, the Hon. Minister could have asked that the Resolution which he had given notice of earlier in the day be dealt with when we were in Committee. There are other items on the Order Paper which are to be dealt with. Your Honour and the Clerk can see this nonsensical move which I am speaking about. I am not saying that the Hon. Leader of the House misunderstands what is going on in this House, but he must respect procedure; and instead of asking the Chair to move that the House go into Committee with one Resolution, at that same time he should have asked that this Resolution should be dealt with in Committee. If we are going to waste time, why not waste time at one time?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think that I should point out to the hon. senior member for St. Peter that the Hon. Leader of the House asked permission to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today when he gave notice of the Resolution earlier in the day. After that, we had a money Resolution for \$348, as far as I remember, and we went into Committee; but after consultation with the properly constituted authorities of this House, I came to the conclusion that this Resolution was not a Resolution to be dealt with in Committee, and that is the reason why the Hon. Leader of the House did not ask for leave to deal with this in Committee of Supply.

This is not a Resolution on the Estimates. We are not granting sums of money; we are advancing sums of money. This is the same as a Resolution, say that we were renting the Public Buildings to the Barbados National Party for the purpose of holding a Christmas dance.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House has asked leave of the House to proceed with this Resolution, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted the hon. member.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is a financial matter; therefore, the Hon. Leader of the House is not competent to deal with it, and he has asked me to deal with it.

This Resolution is for the sum of \$250,000 to be advanced from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of making advances of salary or wages to persons in the employ of the Government.

Hon. members will remember last year, shortly after the beginning of the current session, that similar advances were made to members of the Civil Service, the Unestablished Staff and the Public Service of this Island; but there was a situation different between the Resolution for the advances which were made at that time and the advances which

we are at present discussing. At that time, there were arrears of pay due to the members of the Unestablished Staff, the Public Service and the Civil Service, and the advances were made pending the receipt of the arrears of pay for those public employees. In this instance, we are asking the House to approve of a Resolution to advance money out of the Public Treasury for the purpose of making advances to members of the Public Service.

5.30 p.m.

In doing so, it will be necessary for us to get the consent in writing of the Public Servants to whom this facility is being granted so that if any individual finds himself in such affluent circumstances that he does not want to draw this money because he feels that it would be too great a hardship on him to pay it back in three months or three weekly instalments between the last pay day in December before Christmas and the end of the financial year on the 31st March, he can contract in order not to enjoy the facility which is being provided. We do consider it only reasonable that at a time of the year when private enterprise makes substantial *ex gratia* payments in the forms of bonuses to their employees, when there is a tremendous difference between the purchasing power of people in private enterprise as against those who are employed in the Government Service of this island — we consider that we should do something to put the Government employees not perhaps in quite as favourable a position as employees in commerce and industry, but certainly in a position where they do not have to hang down their heads in shame, especially to their children and people who normally expect them to meet extraordinary expenses.

The purpose of this Resolution therefore is to provide such advances to members of the Government Service. The basis on which the advances will be made will be found in the provisions (a) (b) and (c). In proviso (a) we have: "Government employees who receive monthly salaries shall be eligible for advances equivalent to 25% of the net salary receivable for the month of December 1962 in addition to such salary receivable." In proviso (b) we have: "Members of the unestablished staffs and casual employees who would normally continue to be employed until the 31st March 1963 shall be eligible for advances of wages and/or salary equivalent to twice the net weekly earnings receivable during any average week in the month of November or December 1962 in addition to the wages and/or salary normally receivable during the month of December, 1962."

If I may explain the distinction which has been made between monthly employees and members of the unestablished staffs, monthly employees include School Teachers and members of the Police Force who will receive 25 % of their salary, if they elect to do so, as an advance before Christmas, in addition to their salaries which they are paid before Christmas during the month of December for the month of December. The members of the Unestablished Staffs, because they normally receive incomes which are far below the incomes of members of the Established Staffs, will be entitled to draw two weeks' wages; and as to the way in which the two weeks' wages is calculated, some of these people may not have worked during the month of December on account of the slowing down of Public Works, projects and considerations of that nature. However, these amounts will be calculated on the weekly earnings receivable during any average week in the month of November or December, 1962, in addition to the wages and or salary normally receivable during the month of December, 1962. Whereas members of the Established Staff will be receiving 25% of their salaries, members of the Unestablished Staff and casual workers — I may say that we have different types of casual workers. We have the casual staff and the casual casual workers. A man who is employed on the Hospital project can be considered for the next two years as a permanent casual employee. There are some permanent casual workers who have been working for ten years and they are eligible for pension; they are also those who have been taken on during the Government's crash programme as casual casual workers, who are working as cantoniers out of crop season. These people would not normally be entitled to any Christmas bonus for the simple reason that these people can go back to the estates to cut canes during the month of Jan-

uary. The people who go and work on the roads doing cantonnier work may do so during the out-of-crop season and soon after Christmas these people return to the sugar estates. Mr. Speaker, it would be administratively impossible — I am saying this for the benefit of those who represent rural constituencies — to make advances to the casual casual workers; we can only make advances to those who would be normally employed to the financial year 1963. We expect, all things being equal, to recover these amounts in twelve equal weekly instalments which will bring us up to the 31st March, 1963, or until the pay day immediately preceding the 31st March.

I sincerely hope that hon. members will appreciate the difficulty in the case of some people who have only worked for about ten days in the Public Service or someone who was taken on during the crash programme at Seawell. Finally, Sir, there is Proviso (c) in which we have: "Such advances shall be deducted from the salary and/or wages of each Government employee receiving same in equal monthly or weekly instalments as the case may be between the pay day next following the date of the advance and the 31st March, 1963, with the consent of such employee in writing to be obtained before the advance is made." The Resolution ends:

RESOLVED that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein, and if concurred in,

RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution."

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I want to know if this is a question of largesse or a Resolution, because when I was speaking earlier about these Orders, it was said that this is an abstract Resolution, and you need not go into Committee.
5.40 p.m.

I do not agree with it, but I accept that. This is money you are going to take from the Treasury. It is true it is money which you have approved Civil Servants will draw from the financial year until now, but you agree that they would draw that money under a Civil Establishment Order at such a rate per month and not at a higher rate, which means that at this stage in the year you are taking out of the Treasury more money that would be drawn under normal circumstances, and if you go back to the Civil Establishment List, you will find that the amount of money you estimate you will spend is going to be \$250,000 which at the end of December would not have been that figure in ordinary spending. I can understand that the Government has done this for many reasons. It is convenient to have a debate like this because last week when I was coming to the House, a member was told to finish his debate early because I was coming. I had no intention of speaking on the matter on which the member was speaking, but that only shows the stupidity of members who try to anticipate other people. I have been to this House so long that I have led people into believing I am going to speak on something, and when I do not speak they are left deflated.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the place of the late Mr. A. E. S. Lewis. We have always protested against these abstract Resolutions. We accept them as money Resolutions which should pass through the regular process of the House, because when this goes to the Other Place, they cannot fiddle around with it or make an amendment and send it back here changing the amount to \$249,000. This is why speakers have always disagreed on that. I should also like to take this opportunity to remind the Hon. Premier that when he is dealing with legislation and subsidiary legislation, he must bear in mind that there are some Orders which we pass that the Governor-in-Executive Committee can pass and you do not need to come to the House. The Commissioner of Police can block Kensington or Roebuck Street without permission being granted from here, and the Governor-in-Executive Committee can give the people at the Garrison the right to

hold races three times a week. This is where the law is tripping the Hon. Premier. He could not pass the Rum Tax because stupidly the lawyers have framed a law which says you can only do something if it appears in the *Official Gazette*, but it can be passed here as in England.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, the rum tax is not in the *Official Gazette*.

Mr. WALCOTT: If I said "rum tax", I meant the beer tax to which he referred.

Mr. SPEAKER: And the beer tax is not in this Resolution. (*Laughter*).

Mr. WALCOTT: I am aware of that, but I think Your Honour is quite clear that I did not want to prolong this argument earlier with the Consumption Tax; so I do not want the Premier to believe that we were differing on the basis of what the law was; we were differing on the basis of the words he used, and that is why I said where a matter had to come to the Legislature it ceases to be a matter of courtesy; it is a matter of right. The Governor-in-Executive Committee has a right to make regulations and we understand that and know why that is so, because if we came here to discuss tax, people would sell all the rum and by the time the tax is to be put on there would be no rum to be consumed. I should like to know by what process or computation you arrived at \$250,000. I do not like this hurried business, because it is open to too many pitfalls. I have no objections to advancing this money and putting \$1 1/4 million at the disposal of the merchants at Christmas, because you would be priming the economic pump by putting more money in circulation at Christmas.

In dealing with this Resolution, I want to point out certain things. What is the distinction between a Government employee receiving a monthly salary and a member of the unestablished staff receiving a weekly salary? When you delve into these things, Mr. Speaker, these are points that can arise. I am not doing this to lead members to adhere to what I say, but you have no basis for saying what you are going to give a man. When you give a man 25% of his monthly salary that is equivalent to a week's pay. Why have you arrived at a week's pay for a man getting a monthly salary, and two weeks for a man getting a weekly salary? Are you perpetuating this same old time nonsense that a man who gets paid by the week is inferior to the man who gets paid by the month? There are workers who get less by the month than those who work by the week. To bring an example to you, you can have a road roller as an unestablished man working for more money than a Policeman who is a recruit. One may be working for \$80 a month and will get \$20 for the week, but the man who is working for \$30 a week will get \$60. What is the logic in it? Why do you want to give a man with a low salary less than would amount to two weeks' pay? If you want to give two weeks' pay, you should be prepared to say that people working for a salary up to a certain point would get two weeks, and persons above that would get one week. You cannot come out with this *carte blanche* business of giving a man working for a monthly salary 25% of that salary. What is the equality in that system?

You want to help a man of a certain income bracket at Christmas to buy a fowl, turkey or ham; it is nothing to do with what he carries home. If a man is getting \$80 a month he will get \$20, and if a man is getting \$25 a week he will get \$50. That is where I want to point out to the Hon. Premier that dealing with money is my business everyday. If you were an employer and I was a Trade Union and you came to me with this scheme, I would tell you the iniquity of this scheme, because one of the basic iniquities of this scheme is that you pre-suppose that everybody being paid a monthly salary is paid a higher wage than a man who is working by the week.

5.40 p.m.

I hope the Hon. Premier is listening because he will understand. All of us are not blessed with the same amount of knowledge on everything. The whole basis of giving anything is based on need. Far from that, a man working for \$600 or \$800 like the Attorney General really does not need

your lending him this piece of change because it is not that he cannot buy a piece of pork to make merry at Christmas. According to this Schedule, he can borrow up to \$200. Now, what about the fellow who is not even getting \$200? The man who is getting \$800 a month would not want his \$200 to buy a Christmas ham; he may take it to buy a refrigerator; but the man who is getting \$200 a month as salary and can get a loan of \$50 may want to send his children to Queen's Park on Christmas morning to hear the carols; so, naturally, he would want some money to buy a pair of shoes and such things for his children so that they could go along.

What I am pointing out to the Hon. Premier is that what you are doing is not wrong, but the computation of the assessment is not right. On the basis which you have here, you are giving the man who is on the Established Staff or is a Casual employee a better facility forgetting that a postman, although he is working for a salary, is not better off than a cantonnier. You have a lot of small paid monthly people whom you are only giving a loan of 25% of their net monthly salary which is equal to about a week's pay. It does not matter to the man who is working for \$600 or \$800 a month, but it does not mean much to the man who is working for under \$200 a month. I frankly say that you should not bring a Resolution like this because how can you reconcile your former statement about increases of the Civil Servants who were above a certain raise of pay? How would you reconcile your statement to say these same people are entitled to a Christmas advance?

In the far days, Your Honour on making a pronouncement for the giving of a Christmas bonus, had in mind the poorest in the Civil Service and you were not aiming at the granting of it to such persons as those who work in the brackets of \$400 and over per month. A man in that bracket at least should be able to provide for himself and his family something at Christmas. If you want to withdraw \$250,000 from the Treasury between now and the end of December, I will tell you that you should spread that money amongst the larger sections of the Service who work in the smaller brackets so that it would have a greater meaning.

I want to point this matter out to the Hon Premier. I do not know how you arrived at this \$250,000 because it says that the amount required should not exhaust \$250,000. I do not know how you arrived at it, if you did so by taking everybody in the salary scale or if you arrived at it by taking a percentage of the people who are likely to apply. From what the Hon. Premier has here, Government employees who receive a monthly salary shall be eligible for an advance of 25% in addition to such salary receivable, which means that postmen and all such people in the Civil Establishment would get one month's pay and about one week's pay in advance. Then the Hon. Premier say that members of the Unestablished Staff and Casual employees who would normally continue to be employed until 31st March, 1963 would be eligible for advances to twice the net weekly earnings receivable during any average week in the month of November or December in addition to the wages or salary normally receivable during the month of December. I heard the Hon. Premier say — I do not know what is the position in the Government Service — that they must give notice in writing. It means that if a man cannot read and write, he is outside the pale of grace. I do not know if by your giving notice in writing, the Hon. Premier means to say that somebody can do the writing for you. I say that because when you say you must give notice in writing, that has its own distinction. It means it has to be written and someone may argue that it has to be written and signed by the person. Anyhow, that is a small matter because there are not many people who cannot read and write.

Sir, I have no objection to what is being done. What I do not quite agree with is that you are lending people in the Unestablished Staff two weeks' pay and you are asking them to pay it back in 12 weeks' time. Of course, I do not consider that length of time unreasonable. (*A VOICE: They have forms on which the person will just attach a pen.*) O.K.

Mr. SPEAKER: O.K. is not a Barbadian term.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is a Barbadian term. Maybe some day you may evolve a language of speaking in Barbadian

terms in this House just like the Americans have the American language as distinct from the English.

Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Premier can see with the point which I have been making on the total basis of dealing with the salary structure, he can have the text of the Resolution so amended to carry out his whole intention. Lastly, a man working by the week is going to get two weeks' pay. And the man who is working for an equivalent pay by the month is only going to get one week's pay but that is so because he is in that exalted position.

Mr. Speaker, I know for what I am saying I would have your wholehearted support. I feel the magnetism coming from the Chair to say what I am saying, but it is only because your exalted position does not allow you to enter into debates.

Those are the points which I have to make on this Resolution. It is a very good innovation and I am not so old fashioned as to say that you cannot make these advances; but I would like to see you aiming at giving consideration to the points of opinion which I have just raised.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I deem it a pleasure to support a Resolution of this nature this evening. This Resolution is seeking to give an advance to casual workers and to all Government employees in order that they can have some additional money to spend at Christmas. I just heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter commenting on those who are working for large salaries and those who are working for small salaries. I want the hon. member to realise that there are some people in big holes and they need to be lifted up and there are some people in small holes who also need to be lifted up.
6.00 p.m.

I am saying, Sir, that at certain times the little man is satisfied with what he is getting and the big man will also be satisfied with what he is getting. This money is for the purpose of meeting the needs especially of those who are in difficult positions. At this time of the year we all know that not only the little man has expenses to meet or debts to be paid, but the big man also needs money to pay off his bills. I think it is necessary that all those who are working in the Government employment should receive this advance payment. However, there is one thing which I want to say. It is this; as to the people who are working at the sugar factories, I would be glad if the Government would make it possible to utilise some of the Provident Fund that they have in store for the benefit of these poor factory workers who have been laid off without any consideration being given to them and who are yet waiting and perishing. I am quite certain that some factories have been abandoned and the workers who were employed at these factories cannot get one penny. These poor people are not employed; they are walking about the streets hungry and desolate. I would be glad if the Government would utilise some of the Provident Fund for the benefit of those workers who have been laid off because of the abandonment of the factories.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to remind the hon. member that this Resolution deals with persons who are in the employ of the Government.

Mr. CORBIN: I am making an appeal to the Government on behalf of those who are not working.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member has made his point and a word to the wise is sufficient.

Mr. CORBIN: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, I remember that this Government brought down a Resolution to this House last year, and as regards people throughout the Island of Barbados, some of them danced, some sang and some rejoiced knowing that they would get an advance payment so as to pay off their debts. Some of these people said that they could pay off their debts, some of them said that they could buy a pair of shoes, some said that they could have a nice suit and some said that they could have a nice Christmas dinner, because they were asking for this facility or benefit from the last Government but they did not

get it. They thanked God that they had sent the right men to this House and that we had remembered them. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the passing of this Resolution and for those who are receiving this benefit I wish them a happy Christmas.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that anybody would expect me to oppose this Resolution because I think every hon. member of this House quite well knows that example is better than precept. I have had the experience of leading the way in this matter even at the suggestion of being sent to prison by the last Government for doing so because they said that I was breaking the law. However, there are one or two things with which I must agree, things which the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said. When I read the text of this Resolution, I was somewhat disappointed because I think I remember listening a few nights ago to what was said in the public square, and if I recall correctly what was said, it was to the effect that this advance was to be given to people in the Service below a certain bracket. I will say here and now that at times you must save people from themselves. I was born in Barbados and I have lived here; I was born without any type of spoon, and therefore I know what it is to have nothing. On the other hand, I do not believe that people who are getting \$400 a month in Barbados should be encouraged in getting any loan. People who are working for \$400 a month and over should be saved from themselves; it is my view that it is not really necessary for a person who is receiving that salary to be granted this loan even if he is renting a house, because his children can have a happy Christmas on that salary which he draws on the 19th day of December, 1962. I think that these loans should be made to people who are receiving salaries below \$400 a month.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether the Hon. Premier would see the necessity for making a change. This is something with which I have had to do for many years and I can say that we have never lost one cent. The money was paid back beginning from the 1st January to the end of the financial year. If you are making a loan of two weeks' wages to persons in the Unestablished Staff — I think that all the workers who earn \$22 a week and so on will be loaned \$40; but if you take the lower brackets of the Civil Service — I think of the School Teachers and a lot of young men who are married and who are receiving between \$100 and \$120 a month — you will loan them \$30. When you loan these people in the Unestablished Staff two weeks' wages, you are really lending them more money in actual fact than you are lending these other people. I am not objecting to this Resolution, but you are also lending money to the monthly paid worker who, in fact, will go up higher than those who are only drawing salaries like \$80 a month and \$100 a month. As a matter of fact, you still have Postmen, Teachers, junior Civil Servants and such people who are coming into the Service. You have Porters and the like, and, according to the basis of this Resolution, they will get two weeks' wages.
6.10 p.m.

Let us take it in figures. At \$100 a month a man will get \$25 a week, but a carpenter working for \$5.50 a day — and you have a scale in your service — is going to get \$55 or nearly \$60. I favour this Resolution, and while I do not suggest interfering with the amount, I do not favour lending people working for over \$400 a month. I say that because I feel people can be saved from themselves. If you lend people working for over \$400 a month, they are going to be reckless. A man is entitled to have fun and provide something for his family, but I am not hearing the argument that a man working for \$400 is infinitely worse off than a man working for \$80. \$400 is \$400 any part of the world, and a \$400-a-month man cannot go begging at Christmas unless he is one of these rummies who want to "lick out" money from shop to shop. I do not agree that you should lend a \$400-a-month man to encourage him to live above his means. When you lend this money you are not lending it to buy rum or a ham alone; you are lending it so that the man can give his wife or woman to buy clothes for his children to go in the Park or to 5 o'clock service like anybody else's child. I do not agree that you are lending it for a man to have a spree or go to night clubs three or four times in Christmas week. I was never able to do it and I do not encourage any Civil

Servant to do it either. As a matter of fact, whenever I hear that a Civil Servant is always doing that, I can swear that something is going on in some Department. When a person can spend \$25 a night four times a week in night clubs, there must be some "bauball" going on.

Mr. Speaker, I want the Minister of Trade to listen. It pains me to see the planes bringing back people from America who went on the scheme, and I feel something is going wrong some place. I am not accusing anybody for taking money to send somebody to America, but I know there are a lot of 'hard-hand' men who are willing to work who have been turned down, while a lot of 'soft-hand' people are getting selected and go to play saga-boy. I always view that with suspicion. I counsel the Minister of Trade to go into this matter seriously. If I had my way, everytime you sent them out and they returned without fulfilling the contract, I would send everyone to goal. They are messing up the scheme and starving 200 or 300 people; they are hampering the lives of many people who would go to America and work. I was not a swivel chair man all the time; I saw hell. (Mr. SMITH: Order.) You are not in the Chair now. Do you think you are in the Mechanic's chair?

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect, I have never done anything else. That is how I feel about the matter, Mr. Speaker, and it makes no difference to me if it is published. Mr. Speaker, I support the Resolution; but like the hon. senior member for St. Peter I suggest to the Hon. Premier not to lend people who are getting \$400 a month. This surprises me because I did not understand it in that way when I heard the Premier in his speech a few nights ago. The great majority of monthly people who will borrow will be in the \$80, \$100 and \$120 class and you will only be lending them between \$20 and \$30, while carpenters, masons, porters etc. who work for \$20 a week will get \$40 which is two weeks' pay. I suggest to the Hon. Premier to go into the matter and look at it from that aspect.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of this Resolution and anything that will help the people of this country. In making loans of this nature, one can clearly see that the Government is out to help a certain class of people, but I do not think that those working for \$600 or \$800 should want a loan. I would keep my eyes on a man working for \$800 and applied for a loan of this sort. (Laughter). Now, Sir, I would prefer when it comes to men working for \$200 or \$240 for the Government to give them 25% of their salary by way of a bonus, and it would not kill this Government. (Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not agree with that.) Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking to the hon. senior member for Bridgetown; I am addressing the Chair, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Ignore him completely when you are on your feet.

Mr. SMITH: I allowed him to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. I am afraid I allowed him to speak.

Mr. SMITH: What I would like to see the Government do is to establish a Loan Fund to help family men who are working for small salaries in case of sickness, where his wife or children have to pay for operations and things of that sort. That is what is hitting the poor man today. There are some men working for \$200 or \$300 a month and have a wife and six or eight children who have to pay doctor bills. We should try to consider them, because many people have passed to the Great Beyond through lack of attention and care because they did not have the wherewithal to get medical aid.
6.20 p.m.

There should be some Fund established in the Government Service to lend Civil Servants money so that they would be able to pay for doctor's fees and things of that sort and to help keep their family going. But at this late hour you are coming down with a Resolution so as to lend Civil Servants 25% of their salary and some are going to borrow it without any use for it at the moment, but when the time comes to pay it back, it would become very hard on them.

We have to consider, as I said just now, the family man. You have today some people working; they are still at home with their father and mother; they have no responsibility whatsoever and they are working for a good salary. The same facility is handed out to them. It should be just as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said; that you lend to the monthly man in the small bracket in the same way as you are lending to the weekly man. I would say that what you are doing here is an insult to the monthly man because if a man is working for \$200 a month he would get a loan of \$50 and if a weekly man is working for \$20 a week he would get as much as \$40. There should be no difference and the man who is working by the month has more responsibility to his job. His is a job which calls for talent and intellectual ability and you are giving the one who is working by the week more; therefore, the monthly paid man is not going to feel too happy. Of course, I know that you cannot please everybody at the same time.

You are trying to help and you are going to help. Remember that it is to those people whom you have given an increase of salary and wages that you are now going to help. You have some old Government Pensioners who were off the line for years without any increase of pensions, and they have to exist on that small pittance. The present Government can see its way to provide \$250,000 to help the ones who have been helped already, and the poor Government pensioners whom I know of and whom every Government member knows of who should be getting a little pittance, even a fifty cents more this month and next month, are yet popped up. I hope the present Government will see to it that these pensioners are given a little more. As I warned members of the Government Party, these pensioners still have two Xs.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, after single-member constituencies come into effect, they will spoil their votes if they mark two Xs.

Mr. SMITH: We do not have single-member constituencies yet and, as the hon. member for St. Peter said *sotto voce*, you can put two Xs opposite one name.

However, Sir, we must be more considerate to these poor pensioners. I tabled a Resolution of this sort last year and it was passed; but it did not come to anything. I dare say it must have been too late to do anything about it.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, anything to help the poor of this country I am here to give my support. Regardless of whose Party it comes from, I will vote for it; but I still feel, although this may make my colleagues laugh again, that instead of asking the people to pay this advance back in three months' time, you should make it six months. (A VOICE: You are giving them until the end of the financial year; you cannot go over that.) An hon. member talks of the financial year. When you are using the words "financial year", that is no excuse. If I were one of those porters or cantonniers and I took ill in January and could not work for sometime, and the financial year came to an end, what will happen? You will have to wait until I repay it. Most of these people who will get this money have their children and they have other commitments. I am putting this to you, because of their other commitments — let us say that they have to pay so much for house rent, so much for the education of their children and so much for other things — although this loan will only be \$25, with three months or twelve weeks in which to pay it back, it will be a hard hit to them. It is the person who wears the shoe that feels the pinch of it and I appeal to the Government, if they can see their way, to make it repayable in six months' time. I am making this appeal for those small salaried people. These people did not know that Government was going to lend them this money and some of them may have borrowed from somebody else already and they might have other payments to meet; so I am appealing to the Government to make it six months instead of three months.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, this debate was going on for some time and I am sure that you have displayed the patience of Job. I do not want to take advantage of your patience, but I would just like to say that I am pleased to support this Resolution. I always feel that it is a good thing when we are able to make people feel happy. And certainly

this loan to people in the Public Service must make those who receive it feel happy although I would be glad if in the future Government would see its way not only to loan these employees but at Christmas time to give them a little bonus. I would be pleased when the time comes around to consider the Annual Estimates, knowing how much it would take to give these people a loan, that you set aside something in the Estimates to give them a bonus which would not have to be repaid. As regards this loan which you are making to them, I will not say that it should extend over three months because I know that the end of the financial year is the 31st March and everything should be closed by that time. I know whenever anything is started, it generally finishes on the other leg. You start loaning them now, but in time to come you may find it possible to give.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, no hon. member appears to be in disagreement with the proposals which Government has introduced in this Resolution to make an advance to members of the Public Service of this Island. 6.30 p.m.

Various amendments, not of a formal nature, but tentative amendments have been advanced by some hon. members, and suggestions have been made to, and strictures have been levelled against, the Government for discriminating against employees who receive their salaries on a monthly basis. Those are the main objections which, I understand, were levelled during the course of the debate on this Resolution; the rationale of these criticisms is that there are Government employees who receive very small salaries although they receive them every month. The hon. senior member for the City himself has expressed that he heard some tentative suggestion made on a public platform — I presume that the hon. member was referring to me — to the effect that a line would be drawn somewhere in the vicinity of the \$300 or \$400 a month salaried people, and that those below that line would receive an extra two weeks' wages and those above the line would receive no extra money at all on their Christmas pay day. I want to make myself clear because there must have been about 15,000 people at a meeting recently at which I did make a statement to the effect that the Governor-in-Executive Committee was giving consideration to the question of extending this facility again to Government employees this year as we did in 1961. I said that we were considering whether there should be a line of distinction drawn somewhere between the \$200 or \$300 a month mark. I did not commit myself to any statement that there would be any distinction. If I had a cut and dried proposal I would have made an announcement then, although I think it is better to make announcements of this kind in this House.

I want to go on record as saying that I did not lay it down that we would make a distinction to this community. I was not in the Island last year when salaries were paid out, but I understand that there was a tremendous upsurge of activity in Bridgetown which could be mostly attributed to the advance made by the Government at the time. This is not a gift or a bonus; I want to say that at such time as the national income of Barbados begins to increase by leaps and bounds as a direct result of the activity of Civil Servants, and that increase is over and above the net rate of population growth, I certainly would actively consider the question of giving a production bonus to the Civil Servants. I am not at all satisfied that the Civil Service is creating production in the Island, but we are trying to make that production in the economic sense of the word; we are trying to promote activities of this kind.

Your Honour, for a long number of years, brought forward a Resolution relative to the payment of a Christmas bonus to all Public Works employees of a certain level. I do not think that this Resolution in any way does violence to the principle or principles, which Your Honour has expressed from time to time, of a production bonus. As a matter of fact, I remember that either last year or in the year before when a similar Resolution was moved, Your Honour accepted the principle of a loan, showing some departure from the stand which you had originally taken, that there should be a loan for Public Works employees, particularly the Key Scale workers. I do not like to re-

mind hon. members of their sins of omission and or commission in the past, but I have a slight recollection that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, who is now agitating for a free gift or grant or production bonus to be made to these members of the Civil Establishment staff in the Government Service — I seem to remember that when a member of his own Party saw the writing on the wall and realising that the compromise which Your Honour made at the time was unanswerable from the point of view of sound public finance and budgeting, when the then hon. junior member for the City made this amendment which Your Honour accepted, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph opposed the idea even of granting a loan. Now that he is.....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. Except the Premier is twisting things he is not living.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I ask the hon. member to withdraw that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member make his point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the House is divided on this issue. An amendment was moved by the then hon. junior member for the City, and I said that my recollection is that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph voted against the idea of granting a loan. If he tells me now that he belonged to the Government Party then and he is repentant now, I will accept that; but do not let the hon. member say that I am twisting things. There are other hon. members who might have done 20 years' service in this House, there are some of us who have done ten years' or eighteen years' service, and some of us have been here for no more than two years when this Resolution was opposed by hon. members on the opposite side.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. What does the hon. member mean by saying members on the opposite side?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not mean members of the Opposition Party.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Oh! Because we led the way in this matter.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The position is, Sir, that despite the fact that the Government inherited a tremendous budget deficit as a result of the Jacobs' report, the Government still felt that it would not be doing violence to the principles of sound financing if this advance was made; but it is only elementary that the House is only committed to expenditure from year to year, and the financial year ends on the 31st of March in each and every year. We cannot make proposals which would cut across the right of the Minister of Finance or the House to make proposals within the financial year.

Why was there a distinction drawn between salaried workers and those who work casually?
6.40 p.m.

If we attempted to cater for all the anomalies which would necessarily arise out of such a formula, we would never get this Resolution through the House, and we could never get the money paid out by the 19th December, because it would present the Accountant General's Office and the people in the several Departments who make out the vouchers with so many accounting difficulties, that it would be virtually impossible, in addition to the preparation of the normal monthly and weekly vouchers and wage sheets, for us to invoke any formula which catered for every possible anomaly which would arise. I would not like the hon. senior member for St. Peter or any other member here to think that Government has rushed into this as a sort of miracle which we are trying to produce to get us over some difficult situation, some disquiet in the country or anything of that kind. As I said on a public platform, Government was considering the matter for a long time and we are trying to arrive at some kind of formula which would not operate to the detriment of the people who are the recipients of these advances.

Now let me attempt, Sir, to explain very, very briefly why this particular formula was arrived at. By and large, people who receive monthly salaries receive more money than people who receive weekly salaries. That is so not only in Barbados but almost in every other country. It is to be admitted that there are people in receipt of monthly salaries who get less money than people in receipt of weekly salaries.

Mr. Speaker, at this stage I want to move that Standing Order No. 5 be suspended so that this debate may continue. There is one other Bill, an amendment to the Rum Duty Act, which we would like to have done. I do not think it would take more than half an hour altogether.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has not completed his speech. He has only intimated his desire to have Standing Order No. 5 suspended.

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: With all due respect to you, Sir, I protest against that method. If you ever indulge in that, you are indulging in an extremely dangerous precedent. I would say that that would reduce Parliament to something we would not like it to be. We cannot have it that way. You cannot have the Hon. Premier in the middle of a speech, hearing the chimes of the bell and remembering he has not made this motion, sitting down as though he had completed his speech. We are in the House, and if the Hon. Premier sits down, he has completed his speech. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw completely from this House in protest against this action which you will permit today, because you would be reducing Parliament to something we cannot have. We can go on after 7 o'clock. Who decreed by law that we cannot meet after 7 o'clock. This is Government's time; so what is wrong with going on? If Your Honour accepts that, I want to say I will withdraw because I would be protesting against this ruling and would show my disgust and disapproval by withdrawing. No member can sit down in the middle of a speech and make a motion. We must have behaviour in Parliament. I am not accepting that any member can withdraw his speech and another member can get up and make a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order has been made. I will say this: it was intimated to me by the Hon. Leader of the House that in view of the fact that the sitting might be completed within a short time after the time when we would normally have to suspend, he would be moving before 7 o'clock that the Standing Order be suspended, and there is precedent for it. As I said, there is precedent for such a motion being made before 7 o'clock when normally the Sitting would have to be suspended.

Mr. WALCOTT: What question are you putting?

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the fact that the Hon. Leader of the House had given me the intimation that he would be making this motion before 7 o'clock, when the Hon. Premier who was on his feet intimated that he sought to give way in order that the motion could be made by the Leader of the House, I allowed him to discontinue his speech in order that the Leader of the House may make the motion for the suspension. I do not disagree that it is not a desirable thing for a speech to be interrupted for a motion of this kind to be made. In fact, I agree that it is unfortunate that it had to be so this afternoon.

The question that Standing Order No. 5 be suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order No. 5 is now suspended and the Hon. and Learned Premier may resume his speech.

Mr. WALCOTT left the Chamber.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I should resume my speech by saying *sic transit gloria mundi*.

Mr. SPEAKER: All debate should be conducted in the English language in this House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was not debating, Sir; I was making an aside. I was on the point of disclosing the reasons behind.....

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before His Honour left the Chair, I was disclosing to hon. members the reasons behind Government's decision not to discriminate in the entitlement of public employees to advances of salary during the month of December. We have made no distinction between salaried officers and members of the Unestablished Staff and weekly paid workers. There are several reasons; but if I may enumerate some of them, the first reason is this: it would be extremely difficult for us administratively and from the accounting point of view to say that people below \$300 or \$400 a month would be entitled to two weeks, and those above would not be entitled to it. Not only would it be administratively and from an accounting point of view difficult, but we feel it would be unfair and inequitable to make such a distinction. We have clearly said that all public employees may draw these advances.
6.50 p.m.

We know that some of them will not and we are stating that none of them must draw them. Any person who is in receipt of such a large salary, if he feels he does not need any advance, need not to draw it at all.

The reason why we made the decision between 25% of those drawing monthly salaries and two weeks' pay for those who are working by the week is that as a general rule, looking at the overall salary, people who are in receipt of monthly salaries receive more than people who receive weekly wages. It is true that you get, say, a foreman or some people like those working at the Pumping Station and some people who are working overtime, who are paid by the week receiving more money than say a Postman or a Long Grade Clerk or a Police Constable. That is possible; but, by and large, if you look at the Jacobs' Report and compare the wages of the Key Scale Workers with other people under the "L" Scale and the other scales for the Unestablished Staff, you will find that the maximum for those in the Unestablished Staff is somewhat below or the minimum for Civil Servants. This is not a hard and fast rule, but it is the general picture. If the monthly workers on an average receive more money than weekly workers, the next question you may ask is why advance him only 25% when on the border line you advance two weeks' pay to a fellow who just receives a little lower than the other fellow? When you give a man \$20 and he does not have so large a family as the man working for \$20 a week to whom you give \$40, that does not leave him much in debt, it does not make very much impression on his repaying it in three instalments as it would if he was granted double the amount and has to repay it in three instalments. The man who is working by the week has 12 weeks to repay his; so the twelve instalments would not make as great an effect on him as the man who works by the month and has to pay it back in three months. Let us say that a man gets a salary of \$200 a month. That means that you are going to advance him \$50. He is already in a higher standard than a man working for \$20 a week. The man working for \$20 a week can get an advance of \$40. But he has 12 weeks in which to repay it. Will you wisely advise that this man getting \$200 a month be advanced \$100? We say "No; because the man working for \$200 per month does not need as much money as the man working by the week". The argument advanced by the hon. senior member for St. Peter is that he does not believe in the distinction. The man who is getting 25% — and let us say that he is in the \$200 bracket and he is advanced \$50 — will have to repay that in three months' time which is equivalent to \$16.66 per month, and the man working for \$20 a week who will be advanced \$40 has twelve weeks to

repay his and which would be equivalent to \$3.33 which would be easier. The man working by the month may also have to pay for furniture, may also be paying off a Government loan for a house and all of that; so from the two points of view he does not need as much extra money. You also must bear in mind that he will be going to the Treasury and drawing \$200 plus this extra \$50 and he only has six days in which to spend it; so that is far more than the man who will be getting his week's pay of \$20 and \$40 advanced to him, making it \$60. Is the hon. member seriously saying that we must advance the salary man 50% instead of 25%? Once you accept the principle that a man working for a salary draws more money than the people who work by the week, you can see the fairness of the Government's argument that the advance of the monthly workers should be less than to weekly workers. That is the reasoning of the Government in this matter.

I want to say again that it is almost impossible to work out a formula which would please everybody, but I am sure that we are doing a good thing here; and if we had given monthly workers the same consideration and facility we had given the Unestablished Staff and casual workers, the same hon. member who is complaining now would say that we should have left out the monthly workers altogether. Now we have given the people at the bottom more hon. members complain. Whenever this period is over, whenever this session comes to an end, whenever we have an election, you have people in Barbados whom you have not been able to please. You can only do your best, something which will be best for the greatest number — and that is the general principle which we have adopted at all times.

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

THE RUM DUTY (AMENDMENT) (No. 2) ACT, 1962

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Rum Duty Act, 1906, be the next Order of the Day.

Notice of this Bill was given earlier today and at that time we gave notice that we were going to proceed with it in all its stages. later today.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House; to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Rum Duty Act, 1906 - 6.
7.00 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Rum Duty Act, 1906 - 6 at Section 22 and sub-section (4) reads as follows:-

"Every owner of a licensed still shall pay to the Colonial Treasury the sum of eight cents on every proof gallon of rum distilled or re-distilled, the payment of which shall be subject to the provisions of section fifty-seven of this Act."

That is the Act of 1906 - 6; the Colonial Treasury is now the Accountant General. The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Act at Section 22 and to make provision for the payment of this eight cents which has been described as a distiller's fee or license — it is really an excise tax but it has never been described as that — paid on rum for local consumption. The effect of the amendment which we are introducing to the Act will be to leave the price of rum in Barbados exactly where it is. There is not a quarter or one eighth of half a penny difference which this Bill is making to the present excise duty or tax, but the export of rum from Barbados has been falling off and it has been declining for the last three years. I would welcome some greater activity on the part of the rum exporters of this Island because there is almost no limit to the amount of rum which can be exported. We have a great capacity for distillation in the country, and our exports both to Canada and to the United

Kingdom and other countries have been falling off, and in only two instances has this reduction in the quantity of rum exported been due to circumstances beyond the control of the rum exporters themselves. The first instance is the discriminatory tax imposed by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago some two years ago, and the second instance is the 15% surtax which was imposed by the Conservative Government in the Dominion of Canada earlier this year. However, long before that, our exports of rum were declining. I have examined the position critically. We have made suggestions for marketing; we have advocated that this rum should be exported only in bottles and that every manufacturer, distiller and blender of rum should have the word "Barbados" prominently displayed on the label just as the Puerto Ricans and other more intelligent people — and when I use the term "Intelligent people" I mean that those exporters of rum appear to be more intelligent than our exporters of rum. I remember not very long ago going into a hotel and sitting some distance from the bar and noticing some two-pint bottles of rum which were prominently displayed on the shelves, and I could not make out the second or first word. It was Barbados rum, but all the label had on it was: "Best matured Rum" and it did not say one single word about Barbados. In very small print they had the name of the blender. You have Jamaica rum, Puerto Rico rum and British Guiana rum and they are making something between gin and vermouth. The Canadians themselves are importing molasses from Cuba and Barbados and they are distilling their own rum and blending it with Barbados rum; they are blending it with small quantities of Barbados rum. If the exporters of rum in Barbados had any sense — I make no apology for saying this — when they saw this trend they would have got in with the Canadians and made some kind of contract to ship rum under their trade names. The Canadians themselves have said that the Barbadian distributor is unenterprising, that people, when they give money to a newspaper or advertising agency to promote our product, feel that it is like giving some money to some Sunday School for advertising. In my opinion, the decline in the exports of Barbados rum has been due to the tight-fistedness and lack of imagination of the exporters of this country. That is the consensus of opinion. We are supposed to have the best rum in the world, but just sitting down and saying that will not get us anywhere.

If I were to disclose the figures which countries are spending on the importation of rum — we have over three million gallons of rum piled up in the bonds and the distillers are only working intermittently. They work for two or three weeks and then they close down. There is not enough room in the warehouses and in the bonds to take the full production of the distillers. The next thing we will know is that we have to be throwing away molasses because we have no room for it. I have spoken of the lack of drive and imagination on the part of the rum exporters of this country. Perhaps the consuming public has treated these exporters too well by assuring them of a return of profit which makes it easier for them to survive without bothering too much with the export of their own product. Rum is one of those products which will assist us in bringing in money from outside. I do not think you have to add half of one per cent to anything produced outside of Barbados to our rum.
7.10 p.m.

That is our situation and we should therefore be encouraging the expansion of industries like that which are not extracting industries and industries which do not commit us to the importation of a large amount of raw material. What I find surprising in a community like this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the people who clap their hands under socialism — which we advocate and which is really a planned economy — look for every kind of protection from Government and Government has to step in all the time and pull the chestnuts out of the fire for the Conservatives in this Island; and if you look at the kind of restrictions and barriers they have built around and invoke the assistance of the Government to preserve their position, they do nothing with one or two notable exceptions to try to stimulate the economic growth in the community in which they live. Some of them go to the extent of investing money all over the place, in New Zealand, Jamaica and elsewhere; but when it comes to pushing the product to sell more to increase the

overall run of profit, they would normally expect the Government is going to come in and in the interest of employment try to do everything for them. I do not understand how these people understand the idea of a planned economy in socialism at all, because they get more benefits from planning than the masses of people generally speaking.

That was a little discursion on political and economic theory, and I will now return to my main topic which is the exemption of export rum from the distiller's tax or licence. The Government therefore looks at all aspects of an economy and we are interested not so much in private enterprise growing fatter and fatter; we are interested in our balance of payments problem and we are interested in exports. The more exports we get and the more companies tax, the less our balance of payments difficulties will be. We have a balance of payments position here in Barbados where we are importing more than twice what we export by value; so that if we sell \$40 million worth of sugar and other by-products of sugar such as rum and molasses in any one year, we can normally expect our imports to amount to \$85 million or nearly \$90 million. This kind of situation cannot go on forever; therefore Government is taking the initiative to prime the economic pump in every sector of the economy, and stimulate and foster economic growth, and to chart and to guide private enterprise because they do not seem to know where they are going, and for that reason the Government has decided to give every possible assistance to the Rum Industry of the Island by taking off the distiller's licence on export rum.

Again I will repeat and in conclusion say that this has got absolutely nothing to do with the local market. There is no increase in rum. We introduced earlier today a reduction in the consumption tax on beer, and there should be a substantial decrease in the price of beer by Saturday. We are satisfied that the tax which was imposed on rum at the time of the Budget Speech on the 26th June, 1962, has not really created any hardship to the community. We think it has done a lot of good, both financially and from the point of view of the health of the members of the society in which we live. We have got additional revenue from it and the revenue is continuing to rise, and we hope to get a lot more revenue from it. We do not anticipate any increase in the immediate future, but we want to make it clear that this Bill which we have before us does not in any way interfere either in an upward or downward direction with the present retail and wholesale price of rum either in casks, bottles or flasks.

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

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the Hon. Premier has said, private enterprise always welcomes the guidance and any assistance which is offered which would bolster or give private enterprise a filip. From the point of view of the rum industry in this Island, I do agree with the Hon. Premier that it is suffering terribly, and I believe he omitted to mention that the first shock we had in the rum industry as a by-product of our sugar was when Dr. Williams of Trinidad became Premier. We suffered a tremendous set-back because our one special blend of rum going there — I think it was Mount Gay — was actually prohibited in one way or another. I rose mainly to say that some of the suggestions whether socialistic or not which he has expressed have been expressed by many of the manufacturers and bottlers of rum, who feel that the time has long passed when the Island should be shipping Hanschell and Larsen, Goddard and Sons, Mount Gay and the like, but that they should concentrate and make every effort — and I am speaking on behalf of the commercial community when I say this — to push the industry as Barbados rum and export it to Canada, the United Kingdom and wherever they can.

The hon. member is quite right when he says that if you go to places in England you will see Jamaica rum, and in nearly every pub in the United States you will find Jamaica rum or Puerto Rico rum, and only here and there you might see a little Mount Gay. I rose to say on behalf of the people in the rum industry that that is an absolute fact, and while there are some three million gallons odd of rum lying down which we cannot sell, we do hope they will be sold though

Canada and other countries have now been developed, but I suppose these are things which we must provide against. About a year or so ago I met a Canadian from Mid-West and I took him to one of our local sugar factories. He was interested in beet sugar and he discussed with me what would be the position with Barbados sugar in the next ten years. We also discussed the question of rum. Time was when we sent what we call "syrup", but what the Canadians prefer to come in as molasses, to Canada, and they acquired a taste for it. Most members in this Chamber would remember the heated debate we had over the shipment of molasses to Canada. That trade has gone and we are depending purely on sugar, and the Canadians themselves have begun to manufacture rum. It is not only lack of foresight on the part of some of our businessmen, although it is true that some of them are still living in the past, but it is because in these countries young and enterprising businessmen see an opportunity for manufacturing rum in Canada.

7.20 p.m.

Therefore, you are getting people in Canada and other places to develop a taste for rum. It is true, we in Barbados can say that it is the best rum, but it is not good enough to say that Barbados has the best rum; so I agree with the view put forward by the Hon. Premier of sending our rum abroad as Barbados rum and not merely as Goddard's Gold Braid Hanschell's Scotch Braid or Martin Doorly's Macaw Rum. That is not good enough. I will tell the Hon. Premier that he is not singing a solo, because what he has said has been taken up by big businessmen because they realise that the economy of Barbados depends on it.

This amendment which Government has offered will stimulate the trade. We welcome it greatly. It is nothing to do with the tax on rum and I was pleasantly surprised by the statement which the Hon. Premier mentioned that the actual tax for the consumption of rum sold locally has been bringing in additional revenue. Private enterprise does appreciate the steps taken in this matter. Indeed, the manufacturing of by-products of sugar offers employment to a tremendous number of people, and it also brings income tax into the coffers of Government and therefore offers greater opportunities; therefore, any encouragement that is given to assist in pushing the rum industry as such we appreciate. When you assist those persons by doing the planning, all you are merely doing is to sit by as a silent partner and draw more income tax. The greater you help the industry to expand, the more the people would get out of it and the more you will get out of it. I remember attending a party some time ago and a distinguished Englishman once said to a member of the House: "Why do the people in this country continue to drink whisky?" I cocked my ear and listened because I wanted to know why he said so. He went on to say: "Since I have been here I have been using more rum and I have found it to be one of the finest drinks one can take any part of the world." If you develop this industry from \$20 million to \$30 million, the people of the Island stand to benefit because you will sit back as a silent partner and draw income tax. We appreciate the incentive which you have offered and we agree it is nothing to do with the local consumption of rum.

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

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

Clauses 1 to 4 were called separately and passed.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL)
(AMENDMENT) ORDER NO. 5, 1962.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 4 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of a resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1962.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: This Order with which we are dealing, entitled the "Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1962", made under the Civil Establishment Act, deals almost exclusively with the Barbados General Hospital and there is a substantial increase in the staff of the General Hospital in the following manner:

- 1 Senior Specialist Obstetrician
- 1 Registrar
- 2 Medical Officers
- 1 Registrar (Anaesthetics)
- 1 Accountant
- 1 Medical Secretary (Matron's Office)
- 1 Hospital Supplies Officer
- 1 Stenographer
- 1 Steward
- 1 Assistant Steward
- 1 Stores Assistant
- 1 Laundry Superintendent
- 3 Laundry Workers
- 1 Laundry Operator
- 2 Assistant Seamstresses
- 1 Messenger
- 22 Staff Nurses
- 10 Medical Secretaries (to replace 2 Female Clerks and 8 Temporary Clerks)

The re-designation of the post of Accounts Officer (\$3,096 - 3,960) as Assistant Accountant; and the establishment of the non-established post of Assistant Foreman (\$1,872 - 2,352).

Mr. Speaker, those are the major changes which are being introduced by the Resolution which we have before

us. I am sure that the Hon. Minister of Social Services will be only too willing to answer any questions which hon. members might like to raise. I beg to move that this Resolution 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.

THE ORDER PAPER

The Order Paper having been fixed in respect of Government Business,

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to debate the Budget Statement made by the Hon. Premier today. The substance of the Resolution will be presented in due course. I am informed that this is the correct procedure which I should follow. I am also asking that this Resolution be made Order No. 1 for the next meeting of the House under Private Members' Business.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking that the Resolution of which I gave notice today, be the first Order of the Day under this Head at the next meeting of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for the City has already had his Resolution made Order No. 1

Mr. BOXILL: Very well, Sir, I am asking that my Resolution be made Order No. 2 at the next meeting of the House.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until next Tuesday, 4th December, 1962 at 2.30 o'clock in the afternoon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next 4th December, 1962 at 2.30 o'clock in the afternoon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

7.35 p.m.