

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 12th March, 1963.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.00 o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade, Industry, Labour and Tourism*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E. STA. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); 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*) and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. BOXILL and Mr. LYNCH entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of the 5th March, 1963, have been printed and circulated and unless there is any objection, these Minutes will be confirmed. (*A Pause.*)

Hearing no objection, I declare the Minutes of the Meeting of the 5th of this month to be confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

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

Statement showing net Customs and Excise receipts for eleven months ended 28th February, 1963;

The Civil Establishment (Leave Passages) (Amendment) Order, 1963;

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.3) Order, 1963;

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.4) Order, 1963.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Leave Passages) (Amendment) Order, 1963";

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.3) Order, 1963";

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.4) Order, 1963".

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I also beg to give notice of the fact that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 14/1962 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas on the 23rd January, 1962, is ready.

Also Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 94/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas on the 4th December, 1962, is ready.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give notice of a Resolution which reads as follows:-

WHEREAS the Government has recognised the urgent need for trained professional men and women by declaring a policy of free tuition in liberal arts at the proposed University College to be established in Barbados,

AND WHEREAS this opportunity for higher education will inevitably be denied to many deserving students because they are forced to attend schools which have no sixth forms and so cannot write the normal qualifying entrance examination for the University College,

AND WHEREAS the Arts degree courses at the University College of Cape Coast, Ghana and at the Kuxmi Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana have recently been made O-level entry four-year courses;

BE IT RESOLVED that until such time as the Government can provide adequate sixth-form accommodation the degree course at the Barbados University College proposed to be established in Barbados be a four-year one based on a matriculation requirement of five O-level passes in relevant subjects following the Ghanaian precedent.

QUESTIONS

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Will the Honourable Minister of Social Services state whether Government is considering erecting another public bath or more public baths in the parish of St. Philip?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister make the necessary arrangements for one of the new sites of such public baths to be at either Brereton's, or Well-house?

3. Will the Minister further use his initiative to see that the erections begin as soon as possible?

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that quite recently a motor vehicle ran off the road adjacent to the Wharf into the Carriageway?

2. Will the Minister give urgent consideration to the erection of a rail or some other means of protection running along the length of the Wharf so as to prevent the recurrence of such an incident?

Mr. SEALEY entered the House and took his seat.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16 and 18 for the remainder of the day's Session. I gave an intimation last Tuesday that Government would like the entire day's Session to be devoted to the Draft Estimates for 1963-64.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16 and 18 and if there is no objection, leave will be granted the Hon. Minister.

Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition objecting? I take it that he is objecting.

Mr. MOTTLEY: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: If he is not objecting, I will grant leave.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: There can be no speech. Let the hon. member object and then the motion will be made.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am objecting.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, just allow me to say this. Last Tuesday, I intimated to the House that.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to state my objection and then withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member state it concisely.

Mr. MOTTLEY: My only objection is whether proper arrangements have been made for hon. members to have refreshments.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House can proceed to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16 and 18 be suspended for today's Session and in doing so, let him have the matter to which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has pointed clarified.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16 and 18 be suspended for the remainder of today's Session.
12.25 p.m.

As I said earlier, last Tuesday I informed the House that the Government would have liked to devote the entire day's session to the consideration of the Draft Estimates for 1963-64. Sir, this is quite normal practice annually; we are not creating any unusual precedent, and therefore the motion is made with this in view. With regard to the question of the provision of refreshment, it is very refreshing to see that the hon. senior member for the City is taking such an active interest in refreshments and what not, but this morning I spoke with the Clerk of the House and I requested him to discuss with Your Honour the appropriate arrangements which will be made for providing refreshments for the Staff of this House especially, during today's sitting. Your Honour is better informed than I am as to what actually has been done.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I say that such a discussion did take place, but there has been a difficulty at short notice of making adequate, or in fact, any arrangements, and the former casual system which was in vogue has apparently, at least up to a very short while ago, broken down. There are however, various other avenues which are still being explored and I have not given up hope.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in withdrawing my objection I just want to assure the Hon. Leader of the House that the interest which he said is refreshing is taken not only on behalf of the members of the House but also on behalf of the Staff. I regret very much that the arrangements have broken down, but I do hope that during the session such arrangements will be very fruitful, so that not only the members of this House but the Staff as well, will be able to get on with the business of this country. Mr. Speaker, I now formally ask leave to withdraw my objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has any hon. member seconded the motion of the Hon. Leader of the House for the suspension of the Standing Orders?

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

The question that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, and 18 be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE GUARANTEE OF LOAN TO THE TRANSPORT BOARD

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

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

The question that Order No. 4 be taken as the first Order of the Day was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. E. W. BARROW entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of a loan of \$45,000 made by the Transport Board for the purpose of meeting its obligations and discharging its functions under the Transport Board Act, 1955.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to approve the guarantee by the Government of a loan of the sum of \$45,000 made by the Transport Board from the Royal Bank of Canada. As is set out in the Addendum to the Resolution, Subsections (1) and (2) of Section 15 of the Transport Board Act, 1955, as enacted by section 3 of the Transport Board (Amendment) Act, 1960, provide that-

"15. (1) The Board may from time to time and with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee borrow by way of loan, overdraft or otherwise such sums as the Board may require for meeting their obligations or discharging their functions under this Act or any other Act conferring duties, powers or functions on them.

(2) The Government may, subject to the approval of the Legislature, guarantee in such manner and on such terms and conditions as it may think fit any sum which the Board may borrow under the provisions of subsection (1) of this section."

As a result of negotiations between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Transport Board the wages of employees of the Transport Board were increased with effect from the 1st January, 1963. The cost of this increase to the Board amounts to approximately \$144,000 p.a. and it was necessary to make retroactive payments in respect of the months of January - March. This amounted to \$45,000.

In order to meet this commitment, the Board has had to borrow \$45,000 from the Royal Bank of Canada. The loan was made on condition that if repayment was not made in six months, the loan would be guaranteed by Government.

Subject to the approval of the Legislature which is hereby sought, the Government proposes to guarantee this loan.

Mr. Speaker, it is clearly set out in the Addendum that the purpose of this Resolution is to guarantee this loan made by the Transport Board. Negotiations were carried out and finished in the month of March for three months' retroactive pay for these workers, and, as is set out quite clearly in the Addendum, this sum of \$45,000 is now required. This amount of increased pay has caused extra expense to the Transport Board in the amount of \$144,000 and the Royal Bank of Canada has loaned the Transport Board this \$45,000 in accordance with the Transport Board Act, 1955. The Government in turn is guaranteeing the loan by the Board of this \$45,000 from the Royal Bank of Canada. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. Da.C. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that with regard to this \$45,000 which is to be loaned to the Transport Board, if it is not paid in six months' time, the Government will be responsible for the repayment of this money? I see that the Government was already responsible for the money last year, and I would like to know when they intend to borrow this money; or is this money already borrowed? I see that last year the gross taking of the buses in February was \$96,000 and the expenditure was \$120,000. 12.35 p.m.

Sir, in fairness to the other concessionaires including myself, I feel that this is another \$45,000 which will be going down the drain. I cannot see, Sir, that any person would take the responsibility to feed a fowl that does not lay eggs.

Mr. SPEAKER: Many people feed their roosters.

Mr. SEALEY: Not year after year. I think this Government will have a terrible headache to run this Government year after year, contributing money to a bus service, when the other private concessionaires who have to carry out the same laws, rules and regulations as the Transport Board, pay the same mechanics, drivers and conductors, pay the same wages, pay income tax and trade tax, are still making money. I do not think this is fair to the others at all. I can inform you, Sir, that it was the intention of the former Government which was clearly indicated about two years ago to deliver these buses back to private concessionaires. I can also tell you, Sir, that routes 12 and 13 were assigned to one K. R. — I do not know who he is — and the Leeward route was assigned to one Hurley and Company — I do not know who they are. Routes 21 and 25 were assigned to one M. E. and friends. You would be surprised to know that in the early part of this year buses went out on excursions, and the only time the office knew that these buses were out was when they had a flat tyre and could not get back in.

I feel, Sir, that the entire administration of the Transport Board from its origin had been corrupt, and I would not like to say what I said on the last occasion about bringing Mrs. Rock before this Honourable House. If she has got the hardest concession in Barbados and can make money and buy a plantation, as I have heard, I feel that something could be done to this Transport Board. At Eckstein's Garage which supplies the entire Island with parts, they have only got three men for delivering parts, but the Transport Board has five men doing this job. I feel it is time, Sir, that Government should realise its responsibility and the headache it has in running this Island and place these buses back in the hands of private concessionaires, and relieve itself of having to pay out every now and then \$45,000.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that hon. members will realise that I have not yet changed my mind relative to the operating of the Transport service in this Island; not that I am such a die-hard as not to realise that there

are certain services in a community that must be and ought to be run by the State. I do not belong to this type of Conservative who would say that all services must be run by private enterprise. We have never said so; but speaking on this, I must say first of all that most of us appreciated the remarks of the Hon. Premier when he said then that a company which actually was operating and anticipated that it would be losing money and wanted money in that respect should be watched carefully before you voted that money. We all appreciated that and I think it has borne some fruit in this respect, because from keeping my ears to the ground I have discovered that there has been quite a lot of pulling up of the socks at the Transport Board.

When the hon. senior member for St. Michael made bold to say what he said just now, the public might believe that he is just using his position in this House or using some propaganda, but I would like to say to this Chamber that he knows what he is talking about. If, however, it is the policy of the present Government, which is a Socialist Government, to continue to operate part of the Transport system of this Island, they have already started to make diligent enquiries into its operation, and those of us who have had a nodding acquaintance with business in a small way and others in a large way, — some on the other side of the Table and some on this side of the Table — must view with great appreciation the fact that you have transport services in this Island running partly by the Government and partly by private concessionaires. As the last hon. member has said, at one time it could be said that the salaries, wages and retroactive pay which the Government was called upon to pay for the service operated by them was not paid by the private concessionaires. That cannot be so said today because the able representation made by the Barbados Workers' Union, which I understand, controls the great majority, if not the entire lot, of transport workers, had called upon the private concessionaires to meet these demands which the Government Transport Board had agreed to. It therefore must leave even the most avowed Socialist to wonder what is happening when without calling any names certain people can operate services, and give just as good or a better service and are able to make returns, and pay the same salaries to their employees as demanded by the Union. One concessionaire actually came to me and said that this retroactive payment has certainly put him in a hole because he had had to draw on resources which had nothing possibly to do with the buses. As I have said, Mr. Speaker, we all must wonder what is happening or what has been happening that this condition presents itself at the Transport Board. 12.45 p.m.

None of us grudge the workers who operate these big Leyland buses for the salary and wages which they are getting; but what we are worried about mostly over here is, if the people of the country decide that the fate of the Island must be in the hands of the present Government, then all we ask is, if this is the Government's policy to run the Transport service as a Government service and for it to go on as it is, that very great care should be taken as to how it is operated.

Sir, I do not want to indulge in any reckless generalisations on the floor of the House on this occasion; but I think it is common knowledge that however much money you take in by way of your conductors by way of fares on the routes which you operate and, on the other hand, you are using more from inside the offices and the various departments responsible at the Transport Board, you will never make money.

We are happy to see that it is only \$45,000 this time as compared with what it might have been if the stand had not been taken by the present Government by not putting anything in the Estimates for them. Any businessman operating as a business which he anticipates is going to lose money should pull his socks up and see whom he can get rid of, and so on, so as to make the business pay.

I am glad that the personnel of the Transport Board has been changed because you have some people on the present Board who have been making some diligent enquiries and I also notice that you are pulling things together. What the hon. member for St. Michael has said is an absolute

fact. This is the first opportunity I have got to say that I actually looked at the Report which was prepared by either the auditor or the secretary of the Board. In the Report I saw with my own eyes certain things, and then I saw in the Advocate that those things were denied. That just shows you what can happen and what has happened.

Few people believe this, but this is an absolute fact which has happened, not now, yesterday or week before, but something which has been going on for a long time. People were taking out buses on charter and the money was taken up by people working in the Transport Office. That was done within the knowledge of the people higher up on that Board and nothing was done about it. Private concessionaires send out buses on excursions and they know how many buses are out at 3,00 o'clock. If they did not know where their buses were, what would be the position?

Sir, as I have said, we do not grudge those bus drivers for getting retroactive pay. I, personally, know that it is a hard job to drive those big diesel buses; therefore, if they are getting \$30 to \$35 a week, I do not grudge them.

I am hoping, Sir, that this Government would keep such a keen eye on the transport service that the Transport Board will not sit back on their laurels and say that because the Government can back them with these notes or because the Government can guarantee them, they will not have to worry whether they get in this amount or not. If they get that in their heads, they will never worry whether the buses which are taken out on charter are paid for or not, and they will never worry as to how much of the oil that is paid for to run the buses is sold and a lot of other things. I can say quite a lot of things on the floor of this House about that, but I am not taking advantage of my position to say them and, therefore, I will refrain from saying them. It is an established fact that they have been very slack at the Transport Board; there have been people there who thought that the buses were theirs and that they were partners. They did not respect the salaries which they got, therefore, it is no wonder that you were always in debt. However, in view of what this Government has said, they anticipated that you were going to lose a lot of money on the service. It is known that you are running a bad business and therefore something will be done.

We are voting this money today and we hope that the Transport Board which you have at present will so keep their eyes open and see that it is not an unemployment agency, but that it is a business to be run for the Government along the same lines as one which is run by private enterprise and so that it would pay and give satisfaction to the public. I hope that the Board will see to it that you get your oil, gas or whatever it is that you require for the buses, at competitive prices and the most reasonable prices. See to it that your manager knows everything. Your manager or whoever is responsible and who has to sign orders for amounts over and above certain sums should be rather careful in doing so, and he should not sign anything without proper scrutiny. Those are the things which I have always said.

While we are not in favour of spending great sums on the transport system of the Island when private enterprise is operating their part of it and giving a good service and not losing money, we do feel, Mr. Speaker, if it is run by the Government at all, that they should be very careful; they should be very cautious in operating this service and see to it that even if it does not make money, it would not be a drain on the taxpayers of the Island. Some people feel that so long as the service is being run, it is all right and they do not realise that they are being taxed for it, and because they do not have to pay the cost for operating it out of their own pockets, it does not matter. There were one or two bosses up there who thought that they should do as they like, and as I mentioned on the floor of the House before, they had it that one could have a bus for their friends at a certain price and another person would have to pay another price. All of those things could not possibly operate with private concessionaires because they would have a standard price for doing something.

The law permits us to vote this \$45,000. The Note to the Resolution reads as follows:-

"15. (1) The Board may from time to time and with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee borrow by way of loan, overdraft or otherwise such sums as the Board may require for meeting their obligations or discharging their functions under this Act or any other Act conferring duties, powers or functions on them.

(2) The Government may, subject to the approval of the Legislature, guarantee in such manner and on such terms and conditions as it may think fit any sum which the Board may borrow under the provisions of subsection (1) of this section."

Before I sit down, however, there is one question to which I would like an answer from the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing. I would like to know if this money is paid after six months, will the Transport Board be paying back the money? I can quite see the Government's position. You are guaranteeing to let them have \$45,000 and you will back that note. What I want to know: will the Transport Board make any effort to pay it after six months and will the Government see to it that an effort is made to repay it after the six months?

12.55 p.m.

It comes to this: if they know that the Government have got to pay this money after six months, they will continue to take advantage of this particular section of the Act to borrow money, well knowing that if it is not repaid within the specified time, the Government will have to repay it; they will say: "We can go on as we like and we will not have to repay it." Will the Hon. Minister tell us from the point of view of this money not being paid back within six months, if after this period of six months, the Government will pay back this money? The month of affluence is the month of December when people travel about most, and therefore the greatest income for the month of February would not, from the figures which we have seen, permit the Board to pay out this money. But just as that month showed that they lost money, some months will show that they have made money. It appears to us on this side of the House that if they cannot repay this money within the period of six months, it is similar to anyone of us deciding in business to carry an overdraft for a period and getting somebody to guarantee it, and if we do not repay it, that person will have to repay it. However, if circumstances became affluent with them will they pay it? Will the Hon. Minister tell us if the Transport Board will repay this money or if this is an outright gift to the Transport Board never ever to be repaid? That is what we want to know over here.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, we are now about to guarantee this loan to the Transport Board. The hon. member who has just sat down wants to know if any of this money will be paid back by the Board or if any effort will be made or can be made by the Board to repay it. Sir, I know the meaning of being a guarantor; we are guaranteeing this amount of money, and if the Board does not pay it, the guarantor has to pay it. I want to find out from the Hon. Minister what is the financial position of this Board; how much money does it owe up to the last time when he got a Report or up to the time when the Government agreed to give the Directors of the Board the O.K. to enter this agreement with the Royal Bank of Canada? These Directors are not so foolish as to go to a Bank Manager, or I may say, that the Bank Manager is not so foolish as to take their word telling him that if the Directors of the Board do not repay the money, the Government will have to guarantee it. The Manager of the Bank would have to get the O.K. from the Government and, from my way of thinking, the Government have given the Bank the O.K. and they are now asking us to assist them with it. We should have known about this transaction before the Government committed us to it, because they could not give the O.K. in full without seeking the approval of this House to do it. They have to come back to us today; but since they have come back to us, what has happened? The cat has been let out of the bag, but we are called upon to fix-it-right. (Laughter.) I want to find out if this Govern-

ment has enquired into the financial position of this Board before they committed themselves to this Bank. I would like to know how much money this Board owes away because I have heard sometime ago last year that they had to meet commitments, that they had to borrow money from the Port Contractors or the Port. That is what I have heard and I want to know if any of that money has been repaid. I want to have information from the Hon. Minister if it is a fact that these people had to borrow money and it has not been paid back; and if they are committed to another \$45,000 or \$144,000 to pay increases, when will they repay this money?

Mr. Speaker, I am replying to the hon. senior member for the City now. This money is for the purpose of subsidising the Board and it will be handed to them for good. If they were in a financial position to repay this money, things would not be so far gone; they would not have to be calling upon us to guarantee this loan. It is set out in the Addendum to this Resolution that if the amount is not repaid within six months, not the amount or part of it, the Legislature will have to repay it. If the Transport Board were in a financial position to do anything by way of repayment of this money, I think that it would have been a question of the repayment of a part of the money, not of all. The hon. member is trying to make out a case for assistance with this money. Everything which has been said here today has already been said; therefore it is of no use to make excuses or to blame people for stealing a bus or carrying out a bus and the only way that you know that the bus was out of the garage was when it had a flat tyre. It is a waste of time saying that now, because some of everything has been said on the floor of this House relative to this Board. This Board has been accused of everything already (A MEMBER: And it was true.) Well, it was true. The Board will carry the blame for everything.
1.05 p.m.

Last year, Sir, the Premier said that Government was not subsidising this place anymore and asked why we should vote this money. He wanted to know why they should have it in mind that they were going to lose money before they lost it. I was in agreement with him, because he has to be listening like anybody else, and he felt then himself that better could be done. What has happened now? The same thing he did not want to do, he is doing today.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I think that you have given, as usual, this hon. member a remarkable amount of latitude to fulminate against things he does not really understand. The first thing I want to make clear is that the Resolution was introduced by the Minister of Communications in accordance with ordinary constitutional practice that if a Government is being asked to guarantee anything, in the same way that you come to the Legislature for approval of the expenditure out of the Public Treasury, if you want to under-write any kind of expenditure, you should let the House of Assembly know about it. For the hon. member to get there and say I am asking the House of Assembly to do the very thing I said I was not going to do, I must say that we are not subsidising the Transport Board. I do not intend to enlarge upon that at this stage, but I will dot the "I's" and cross the "T's" as soon as the hon. member has finished repeating himself for the fifteenth time on the things he does not understand. Now that he has the hon. junior member for St. George with him, the blind can lead the blind and I will probably hear him repeat himself some twenty-seven times; but I will deal with the hon. member when he is finished.

Mr. MILLER: Just on a point of order, Sir, why should my entry into the House of Assembly irritate the hon. member?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that query does not constitute a point of order.

Mr. MILLER: I have to point out that the hon. member made an unpleasant remark, and it was regrettable that you did not observe it and ask him to withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have heard everything that has been said in here so far, and there is nothing which I regard as unparliamentary.

Mr. MILLER: Again that is a question of opinion at the moment, but I still think it was unnecessary to make unpleasant reference to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course the hon. member has an opportunity of which I have no doubt he will avail himself, to speak and do himself justice.

Mr. MILLER: No doubt, Sir, but when these things happen, it is good to draw them to the Speaker's attention.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, in as much as the Premier has said that the blind can lead the blind, my reply to him is that there are people who can see but allow blind people to lead them, and he is one of them. In these things he is as blind as anybody else.

Now, Sir, the Hon. Premier said he is not subsidising this Board; but if this Board cannot pay this money or any money, who is going to pay it? The Government of Barbados has to pay it. Like some lawyers he is always doing and saying things; but if the Board cannot pay out this money, we would have to pay it. That would not be subsidising; that would be paying the Transport Board's bills. From last year this Government had the opportunity of going into the things we were hearing about the Transport Board, and although they had over a year to do it, what have they done? It is time for this Government to declare its policy. All that was said about this Board has gone to the ground; but from the time the Premier refused to bring down an amount of money for the Transport Board, the Government should have started investigations into the Board's running. Has the Minister, the Cabinet or the Government done anything relative to the straightening up of that Board? If unfair actions and dealings are responsible for the Board's losing money, why doesn't the Government check it? The Minister should be in a position to read a statement relative to the Board and let us know what they have done in the matter. I do not know what they have done, but I know what they are doing now; they are complying with the Act. They are not asking for anything extraordinary, Sir, but I feel it is unfair.

Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to say that unfair dealings or actions or dishonest doings are going on up there which is responsible for the Board losing money, but I know it is giving the people there a headache to run it. It is no mean sport to run a transport system in this Island. The hon. member referred to other concessionaires who are trying to keep their heads above water in running buses. That is true; but if you took the entire bus service and gave it to one of the present concessionaires, he would not be able to hold his head above water either, because it would be too much for him to do. I know that some concessionaires in order to get ends to meet and have the buses appear tidy next morning, have to sweep the buses themselves, help wash them off, get under the engine and do things for themselves. They do not sit in a wheelchair and put everybody to do this and that, because that is where the money gets away; so these concessionaires have to 'get up and get', and take advantage of themselves both night and day. You cannot expect that of the Staff or the Heads of the Transport Board.

I do not know, Sir, which is the largest concessionaire of the private group, but I do not think that the manager, assistant manager, foreman or boss would be able to make ends meet either if they had these buses. Do not expect from a Government Department what you would get from private concessionaires. What a man would do for himself, he is not going to do for you, and that is where the expenses will climb. It is time for the Government to declare its policy over the running of the buses, but it is not fair to be calling on the taxpayers of this country, who already have to contribute to the upkeep of their own motor cars and find gasoline and everything else, to pay more taxation in order to contribute to the running of buses. Is it fair to do this because you can call for money and whip it out of the people's pockets? Let us know whether or not you are going to run the buses.
1.15 p.m.

Let us know what you are going to do. Tell us that you are going to run the buses or that you are not running them. Tell us what you have discovered since you have had the Transport Board in hand. Do not come in here and shelter behind the Act. We know that you are not asking for anything wrong. The people who voted for you and put you into power expect you to run the country as it should be run. You are coming today to ask for money to run the transport service, and you are not in the position to tell this Honourable House the financial position of the Board. Something is wrong; but the Government should have it put right. On the platforms during the last campaign, if you had listened to certain members of the Government's party, you would have been obliged to say that you are going to have Heaven next year. What are they doing now? This is a Board which had to borrow a large amount of money in order to pay back-pay. I want to know if this amount has been paid back. The Government in December last agreed to lend the Civil Servants and people who were working in the Government Service a certain amount of money. I would like to know from the Minister in charge how much the Transport Board loaned their workers at that time. I understand that they loaned them some money, but not as much as the Government loaned the Civil Servants. It was not fair to the Transport Board workers to get half of what the workers in the Highways and Transport Department got. That must cause dissatisfaction, but I understand that the Transport Board did not have as much money to lend their workers as the Government did to their servants.

As I have said, they are not in a position to repay this money, and if I were the Directors of the Transport Board, I would resign and let the Cabinet run it. The Directors of the Transport Board are trying to get ends meet, but they cannot get it to work for one moment. We can only do our duty here. The Transport Board wants this money, and if we do not pass this Resolution, transport in this country would be crippled. But while we are passing this money, it is time for the Government to satisfy us and let us know what they intend doing. We are going to start consideration of the Draft Estimates today; we are entering another financial year, but we are not told up to now what is the true position of the Transport Board. We are about to start consideration of the Draft Estimates for the coming year and you are asking us to guarantee this money. We do not know what is happening and it is time enough that we be told something.

This Government has to be blamed for it — not the Transport Board. All sorts of blame were thrown on the Board. This Government, in order that the Board make a good job of it, brought down a Resolution some months ago to increase the membership of the Board. I thought that by increasing the membership, the Board would be running first-class now. I thought that it was due to the lack of another member on that Board that it was not paying its way, and for it to get somewhere it was necessary to have this member.

We should see how the money was spent. If it is spent in the right direction, by all means spend it. As I have said, I think everyone of us in here has a motor car and each of us has to contribute to the upkeep of that car. As it is now, we are going to tax ourselves to pay to run the transport system. I do not mind the Transport Board running the service; but I am saying, do not run it at a loss. Run it in a way that it will pay for itself even if it does not make one penny profit or even if it is that we will have to vote a small amount yearly to help it out.

It is all right for the Hon. Premier to get up there..... Well, that is all right. I will wait on him. I am elected by the people and I have as much sense to know that if you subtract one from one hundred, it will leave ninety-nine; but there are some people who think that when you take one from one hundred, it is one hundred and nine. The Hon. Premier gets up on the floor of this House and whatsoever comes to his mouth he says and calls hon. members; but he is going to pay for it some day. If I do not die, I will see him paying for it.

This is the people's money and that Board cannot go on like this. Here it is: you have the service with you and every day you are accusing its members of dishonest actions. You have not sacked any of them, but you say that they are stealing this and stealing that. Some day the person will say, I will have to stop stealing and, as a matter of fact, he would be a very foolish man not to take your word and pull his socks up and stop stealing if he were stealing. There are many accusations which were thrown on the workers up there, and do you not think that they would not have made a change from stealing, if they were, in order to convince their employers? When you keep on saying that, it is a reflection on the members of that Board. Whenever you get on the floor of the House, you keep on accusing the people up there of stealing, among other things. I do not feel too happy about it. Members of this House scarcely go into the Transport Board yard; yet they keep coming to this House and saying how much stealing is going on up there. If that were so, do you not think that the people who have to deal with the transport service would have made some check and put out a spy or do something like that? I believe that they would have done that. I am talking of the Board, not the ordinary people. You have just added another member to that Board. What is this particular member doing now about the situation? Could he not have reported to the Hon. Minister of Trade privately and let him know his findings? That new member, I think, must be a strong supporter of the present Government. Do you not think that he should come out and tell the Minister privately: "Do not call my name, but I have found out so and so"? But what has happened? He has gone on that Board and cannot do any better than the other members unless he takes money out of his pockets and subsidise the service. Are we going to fritter away the people's money on a transport system which is not paying? I cannot stand here and allow something like this to happen for so long. I am blaming this Government for what is happening at the Transport Board now because the Government had time to pull up their socks. Along with the introduction of this Resolution, the Government should have told us their findings. They should have done that. They have done no more than what anybody else would have done, that is, to introduce the Resolution and ask to support it. The money has to be paid whether we vote for this Resolution or not. Whatever we do the Government has to pay this money and we could as well face the facts. I am saying that if this present Government does not do something tangible there and I am on the floor of the House again and they come here asking for money for that Board and asking our approval of it, I will not be giving my approval any more. I will be a traitor to the people of this country, especially the people of St. Joseph, if I allow anything to happen any more by my vote.

1.25 p.m.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, by this Resolution which is before us today, the Transport Board is asking permission to allow it to borrow the sum of \$45,000 in order to meet its obligations. We know that at the end of any financial year, business places always have to borrow money so as to meet their obligations. This is not granting, as the last Government used to grant, the Transport Board half a million or a quarter million dollars; the Board is asking us to allow it to borrow \$45,000 in order to meet its obligations. That is what we have before us today. I cannot feel in my right mind sitting here today and hearing the hon. junior member for St. Joseph trying to exaggerate on the Government. In my opinion, Sir, as I survey the hon. member's speech, he is neither hot nor cold; he is lukewarm and he can be spewed out at any time. The Board is asking for this \$45,000 to meet its obligations, and we do know that it will need some adjustment at the end of the year. The last Resolution which was brought down by the last Government was to give the Transport Board a quarter of a million dollars. I may say that when an estate is borrowing money to run through the year, it borrows money on the understanding that it will repay that money. How many hon. members sitting around this table here today could say that the Transport Board is not in a position to repay this money? How do they know that? The Board is asking permission to borrow this money, and I believe that there has been a great change in these latter months with this Board. As far as I

have seen, there has been a change for the better. I use the buses of the Transport Board six days a week; and when I go to any part of the island where the Transport Board is operating, the buses meet me at the time when I want to go where I am going. Their time is not like Alleyne, Arthur's 'run time;' that is, any time; I am quite certain that the Transport Board run their buses on time. They have to run their buses whether passengers are in them or not.

As I was saying, Sir, when the last Government used to ask for a quarter million dollars for the purpose of subsidising the Transport Board, I used to criticise them; but I now find out what the position is. The Transport Board cannot run their services in the same way the other services are run. They have more work to do, they run on time and they are giving a better service to the community than any other transport service in the island. Therefore, they will have to borrow money in order to meet their obligations and in order to give adequate service and satisfaction to the community.

When I hear the hon. junior member for St. Joseph speak on this Resolution, I will say that he was in the last Government. I have been sitting in this House when a Resolution was brought down here for the sum of \$180,000 or a quarter of a million dollars to be given to the Transport Board in order to subsidise the Board. But this is not a question of subsidising the Board or granting money to them; this is a question of asking for permission to borrow this money and they will have to run their business so as to repay this money. Any business will run short of money at this time of the financial year, and if this Board is borrowing this money we are quite willing to lend them the money. The last Government used to grant so many thousand dollars to this Board and yet the Board used to run short of money. With the last Government you heard that things used to go through one door and you never saw them again; engines used to pass through one door and you never saw them again. I cannot say that that is true; I have to say that that is what I have heard. The community and the public as a whole must have transportation and therefore we are willing to lend the Transport Board this money. They have to repay it and submit a financial statement as to how they are doing their business. We cannot say that the Government can make a complete change overnight; we will get everything that we want, but it will take some time before we can get it. Do not let us think that the Hon. Premier and the Ministers are not doing their jobs. We have never had a Premier like the one we have today; he can take the ship through the storm and bring it back safely, but we have to wait for that. We cannot do everything in a minute. We have confidential men to do our job; therefore be patient, my man, and you will see the salvation of our God. We will get what we want and where we want to go. I have said in this Chamber that in having God, I have everything and I say that the God of Heaven searcheth the hearts of men and trieth the reins of men and gives every one according to his doings. God himself has chosen his people to run the Government, and if they are causing dishonour to His Name he will remove them in His season. Every tree has its season and there is no tree which can put forth its fruits before its season. By their fruits the trees will be known. You only have to wait until the season has come.

Mr. Speaker, the Board has more bus conductors, more bus drivers, more sweepers, more clerks and more everything. Why is that so? It is in order to give adequate service to the community, and therefore this Board will have to use more money to do this work than the private concessionaires would require to do theirs.

1.35 p.m.

All they are asking us to do is to give them permission to borrow some money, \$45,000 to meet their obligations. Is it right for anyone to get up and criticise the Government on that? They want permission granted to borrow \$45,000 to meet the obligation of the Transport Board, and we hope for better and adequate service in the future. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that out of sheer courtesy for the Chair we are expected to sit here today and be inflicted with the folly and ignorance that has come out of the mouth of the last speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would counsel the hon. member to be careful and guarded in his language so that he does not go beyond the legitimate bounds of that which is parliamentary.

Mr. MILLER: I accept your counsels with unswerving respect, Mr. Speaker. We have come here today because we want to be concerned with important business of the people, but through respect and courtesy to the Chair and your position, I am persuaded to listen to this. We heard earlier today about the blind leading the blind, but the hon. member certainly would be better off if he were dumb. He would have done a tremendous good to the country today if he were unable to speak at least on this Resolution. In spite of the fact that he has documents before him, the hon. member has not got the faintest clue of what this Resolution is here for, and is talking about the end of the financial year and about Alleyne Arthur's time, clad in all his paraphernalia, to say nothing of the regalia of a grog lord. There is nothing *infra dig* or unparliamentary about that, Sir. It is unfortunate that he did not slip to the horizontal, but we must be inflicted with this thing and with this condition.

However, Sir, I must enlighten the hon. member that it is not a question of any commitment required by this organisation to the end of any financial year. This is a simple and straightforward matter. They request \$45,000 to meet wage commitments for a period of two months; it is purely retroactive and this will continue to recur during the operation of this company. From all that has been said today, I wonder if he really understands our responsibility in a community such as ours. Transport is an integral part of any country's development and progress. For me to repeat this is just as stupid as listening to the political Andy Capp, the member who spoke last; but to have us exposed to this for hours on end on almost every Tuesday is really asking too much of a civilised heart. A country needs a transport service. All over the world they have always been up against this problem. I have paid a lot of attention and spent a good time reading and re-reading the recommendations made by the British Committee when it examined the big transport service of the United Kingdom.

All over the world, Sir, and even to some extent in the United States of America, following the newspapers of England to scrap the old steam train and build roads and use gasoline engines, this has been going on; and when these top level gentlemen from the Continent were asked to serve and advise the British Government — it is there in the Report of the Committee about the transport services — the final recommendations were to spend more money, improve the vehicles and units and buy more units. We saw in Jamaica that the same thing happened, and they scrapped and sold out the whole of the Kingston and St. Andrew bus services, and in less than a year after returned and re-bought them. Not so long ago it happened in Trinidad, and all over the world, and in the United States of America where you have the elevator, the tube under the ground and the surface train, and the Greyhounds, and the country is always willing to pay for it. Do not let us make any mistake that if you fail to move the population, you are reducing the prosperity of a country.

What is the position with the Transport Board? Last year the Premier came in here with a token vote of \$1.00 which meant he was going to put them on their own. Every single asset of that Transport Board belongs to the Government. There is no member of that Organisation who can take out one dollar. You decided that rather than bring it like the other Government under a Minister, to appoint a Board, leave it on the outside and support it. Who supports the Transport Board? The taxpayers. I operate my own motor car; I pay taxes and I contribute to the upkeep of the Transport Board. It is a moral responsibility of the citizen; and when you understand the meaning of citizenship in a country, then you understand all. The Transport Board is owned by the people of this country. You appoint a Board of Directors, and if they make \$5 million, they cannot claim a dollar bill. That tells you that it is no private concern. It is operating on Government lands and the guarantee is given by the taxpayers of this country. You regard yourselves as the custodians of the public purse, but the public says it wants a decent bus service and decent upholstery and so on.

You know, Sir, that when you took over transport, most of the units were credited to a company on a long-term basis, some to the extent of five years. Are you asking the company to find its feet, to plough back from profit and declare a profit on top of that after they have paid for the units? That is asking too much. You are quibbling about this, but the Premier says he is not going to subsidise it. If that Board topples, this \$45,000 would have to come from the Treasury; so you are hoping that these people will make a success of it; but when you strangle and suffocate them, what do you expect them to do? You know they have to replace these units, and after four years maintenance would be heavy, but we anticipate and prepare for it. This is a type of utility which is so vital and important to life itself. There are thousands in the country areas who must come to church or go to the hospital or to the doctor, and if you do not provide a bus service, they will suffer. We know that it is not adequate or good enough, but it is a question of how much you can do with so much money. We were told last year that they would not be given a cent as though it were some private corporation being given a grant. Everything in that corporation is owned by the Government and we know that. There is not a single soul who can sell even old tyre without the permission of the Ministry. The Manager is paid from that company, but it is guaranteed by the Government; but every now and again we are given all this unnecessary argument because we want to shirk what could only be a responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, we want to improve the bus service. Like many other utilities we must find money for them. You do not expect to do it in one year and you do not hope to do it in two years, but we can continue to assist and subsidise this company until it is a satisfactory unit as the people of the country will require. The operation of this Board has been staggering for a long time on low wages. The Union in agreement with the Board of Directors and the Management agreed that there should be some increases in salaries. What are we going to do against the spiralling cost of living? Are you going to tell the taxpayers that we are not going to take a cent more from them because we are not going to increase wages? It costs \$12,000 a month or \$144,000 a year. I do not know whether or not that is reasonable, but I know that with the cost of living, if these men must take care of their families, you have to pay them these wages and that is expected. Now you come here because the company is not provided for and talk about under-writing a guarantee; but if the company should fail, the taxpayer must pay. We must learn and understand that the Transport Board is the property of the people of this country and the Government has full responsibility for it. If they make out a case that they need to expand and require more money or require some more units, it is the duty of the Government to come to Parliament and use the taxpayers' money.

1.45 p.m.

They want it. Tell us that you are not going to subsidise it. What are you asking the Transport Board to do? All that you can ask them to do is to increase the rate of fares and you will have to decide on that. The Transport Board cannot attempt to put on half cent on the fares. They must come to the Government with that and Government must decide. You are keeping that Board strangling and strangling all day for money to pay its bills. You see it is dying, and the cold, icy hands of death are tightening on the throat of this organisation. You know that that is taking place and you know that the people who are paying taxes want the service. You also know that the Board is trying its best to make ends meet. You also know that many of the units are not serviced and maintained as they should be. You also know that the Transport Board cannot function as a private company can function. There are a lot of areas which the buses of the Transport Board cover where a lot of the private concessionaires would not accept to run their buses. If you are losing money on the running of certain routes, what do you expect of the Board? They cannot increase the fares until you, the Government, agree to it. It is for the taxpayers to be satisfied about the service. It is not for us to decide that they should not have it; and the sooner we understand that, the better.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have said enough on this. I regret all that has gone before. You were sent here by the

people and they gave you the mandate to run this country; therefore, let us know whether you are running the bus service. We do not want a lot of stupid trucks; we want a proper and respectable service even if it means that we have to pay for it.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I was not prepared to make any comment on this Resolution, but I do feel that I would be lacking in my duty if I did not make a small contribution to this debate. Many hon. members have spoken on it and gave their reasons why it should be supported or not supported.

Sir, I am very happy to see that the Government themselves have seen the hardships in operating the transport service in this Island. The Resolution here today is for the sum of \$45,000 to pay retrospective pay to transport workers and that was in demand by the Workers Union. We cannot today think of the cost of living; we would know that each and every worker is worthy of his hire and the workers in the transport service are very hard-working men and women; therefore, they should be paid.

I am saying this. Not only the Transport Board had to borrow money to meet this demand by the Workers Union, but money had to be borrowed by every concessionaire who operates buses in this Island today to meet this demand. I can assure Your Honour that I have operated buses in this country for the past 27 years, and I have never found things so bad in operating buses as I have found in 1962 when we had to pay that large amount of money retrospectively to the workers. I am sure if you check, you will see that my company has been always making overdrafts to run the buses in its service, and I agree strongly that this \$45,000 must be paid. I can assure you that from time to time, if conditions remain as they are now, you will always have to vote a few more \$45,000.

Now, Sir, I do not agree with the comments which have been made by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew when he said that the Transport Board operates their buses on scheduled hours, but the private concessionaires, of which I happen to be one, run their buses something like "Alleyne, Arthur's rum time". I am speaking to this House from the experience which I know as regards operating transport, but I take it that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has spoken of the experience which he knows of "Alleyne Arthur's rum time".

Mr. Speaker, I think he was dealing with transport; so I do not agree with him in making such reference because I am sure if you do not give a proper transport service the public will get up against you.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I just want to say that I said the private transport service does not operate like the service given by the Transport Board.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. senior member for St. Andrew made a great error and blunder, because I can assure you, where my company is concerned, that we run buses regularly and more than the scheduled hours because we have to run according to the traffic on the roads. On a busy day, you cannot wait on the scheduled time which you have to operate at: you have to keep the buses going; therefore, I do not think the hon. senior member for St. Andrew was correct when he made that statement.

I think one should talk on what he knows something about and what he knows nothing about, he should not talk on. I would not speak on Alleyne, Arthur's rum because I know nothing of Alleyne, Arthur's rum, but I can speak on public transport because I know something about public transport. I will say that all of us know full well that the cost of gasoline plays an important part in the running of a bus so far as transport is concerned. Now, today, you will see that there are many estates using trucks with diesel engines and those estates pay 35 cents a gallon for diesel oil; but if you want it to run a bus, you have to pay 58 cents a gallon. It is the same diesel oil but at a different price.

Sir, the only thing which can be done at this time, if they do not want to increase the bus fares, is to give bus concessionaires some concession where diesel oil is concerned. Other than that, buses will continue to lose money year after year. That is my suggestion to the Government.

Now, Government will see that they have to subsidise the Transport Board; but what about the private concessionaires? Is there no subsidy for them? My advice to the Government is to nationalise the whole of the transport service. If you take over the whole transport service and subsidise it, nobody will be vexed about that; but here it is, you are subsidising one side and not the other.

1.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, those are my few observations which I make and I leave it to the Government to do what they feel is right.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has made certain statements here today which I cannot allow to go unchallenged. It is not for me to deny the Hon. Minister of Communications the privilege of completely demolishing the arguments which have been advanced by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. I will allow him to sweep the hon. member's arguments to the right place when I have finished replying to a few questions of fact which have been raised by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. Away back in 1955, the then Government in its folly decided — whether it was because of personal ambition — to become captains of industry or owners of rolling stock is a matter which is still being debated by the general public at large; but the then retired Commissioner of Income Tax, a man who was greatly respected in business circles in this island and one of the Directors of the Barbados Cotton Factory were among those who were appointed by the Government to enquire into the transport system. They made a recommendation after due deliberation that there should be an increase in bus fares. The then champions of the people decided that rather than have the fare-paying public inflicted with this grievance or burden of one million dollars, it would make a lot more sense to impose a burden of three million dollars on the whole community, than a burden of one cent per day imposed on the wage-earning classes of this island. Such is the arithmetic of the Labour Party politics as provided in 1955. They descended like the Assyrians of the olden days and took over the buses, and three weeks later they gave back a large proportion of these buses to some of their people who found better favour with them. The principle.....

At this stage Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the principle on which the buses were returned is yet to be disclosed even to the backbenchers of the Government Party. I am not here to say who got back buses or whether they were paid for; but I am sure that if any hon. member were to go to the Government and ask this question the Hon. Minister of Communications would give him the facts. A lot of water has flowed under the bridge and a lot of money has flown out of the Treasury too in 1955. The late Mr. Lewis and myself in 1955 pointed out that the Act in the form of the Transport Board Act was deficient in that it did not give the Transport Board any authority to draw any money from the Government or to have loans underwritten by the Government, and along with other members we queried how could a Board operate under such circumstances. I had raised this point which has been supported by the then hon. junior member for the City and other hon. members including the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for the City; but politics set in and they decided rather than do a commonsense thing because the members may get the impression that they had to do it because we pointed out the defect in the Act — a matter of pure commonsense — they decided not to do anything for four years and ordered buses from the Leyland Company. We came into this House of Assembly and asked them how could they order 42 buses from the Leyland Company when they did not have the approval of the Legislature for so doing. The then Minister of Communications said that it

was the biggest lie that was ever told in creation, that the Transport Board had ordered any buses at all. I have the debates here before me. On the 29th March, shortly after I had made that statement, the Minister came down with a Resolution, similar in its wording which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph does not appear to have read, for one million two hundred thousand odd dollars to guarantee a loan to the Transport Board for the purchase of 42 buses which eight weeks before the Minister said had not been ordered. We pointed out to the Hon. Minister of Communications at that time — and that included the hon. junior member for the City, — that this was not like the Natural Gas Corporation. We asked the Hon. Minister specifically whether this money would be guaranteed and said that obviously the Government would have to guarantee this loan because nobody in his right senses, whether it be a Bank or any other philanthropic institution, would lend money in this way because it would be heading towards a bankrupt undertaking in this island.

We also took the opportunity to point out the position of the Government in denying that these buses had been ordered and then coming for the money to underwrite or guarantee a loan of \$2 million. I am giving the hon. member a resume in order to bring us up to date. In 1960 they had to amend the Transport Board Act in order to give the Government authority to underwrite or guarantee loans. In that regard I wish to point out a mistake in the Addendum to the Resolution which states this:

"Subsections (1) and (2) of Section 15 to the Transport Board Act 1955 as enacted by Section 3 of the Transport Board (Amendment) Act 1960 provide that: "15 (1) The Board may from time to time and with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee borrow by way of loan, overdraft or otherwise such sums as the Board may require for meeting their obligations or discharging their functions under this Act or any other Act conferring duties, powers or functions on them."

(2) The Government may, subject to the approval of the Legislature guarantee in such manner and on such terms and conditions as it may think fit any sum which the Board may borrow under the provisions of subsection (1) of this section."

I would like to ask hon. members to correct the addendum where it says "Subsections (1) and (2) of Section 15 of the Transport Board Act 1955 as enacted by Section 3 of the Transport Board (Amendment) Act 1960." That was not enacted by Section 3 of the Act; it was amended by Section 3 of the Act and it took five years for the Government to move that amendment when in August, 1955, I was pointing out that the Act was deficient in that respect.

2.05 p.m.

Hon. members will make the necessary amendment. Now let us get our facts straight. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that I said we were not going to subsidise the Transport Board, but, look now, I am asking Government to do the opposite thing. What I said at the time of the introduction of the Estimates last year was that the then Transport Board as it was constituted had served notice on the Government that they intended to lose \$150,000 in the coming financial year, and I said that if I put a man in charge of my business and he served notice on me that he intended to lose money in the next financial year, I would ask him to have his head examined; and if I approved of his suggestion, then I would have my head examined, and for that reason I, as Minister of Finance, deleted the sum of \$150,000 as a subsidy for the Transport Board, because I was not satisfied that they had a competent Board at that time, and I said so although I was criticised for saying it. I was not satisfied that they were managing the affairs of the Transport Board properly, and I said that until they satisfied me that they were doing so, there would be no subsidy for them. We deleted the subsidy and then promptly we changed the Board because we did not intend to allow them to go on losing money systematically at the rate of about \$250,000 a year. This was the subsidy being given by the other Government, and from that time until now this Government has not given

the present Transport Board or the old Transport Board any subsidy whatsoever.

I must inform hon. members now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that my predictions and projections on the finances of the Board, even if I have to say it myself, were accurate because the difference in the operating surplus between the last Transport Board and this Transport Board, even with higher maintenance costs and everything else, has been in excess of \$150,000. In other words, the \$150,000 which I did not give them have been made up by this Board in every single respect. But this Board was saddled and confronted with an agreement made by the old Transport Board before this Government came into office to give wage increases, some of them to the order of 38%, because you will remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there was an election in the air, and so all kinds of promises were being made to all sections of Government workers and quasi-Government workers, and the previous Board made an agreement to give increases of 38%. But they did not come to the Legislature for the additional subsidy, which would have been an additional \$180,000 or \$190,000; they signed this agreement with the Workers' Union which we had to honour, and I do not grudge the people at the Transport Board or anybody in this Island any kind of wage increase. But if you are operating at a deficit, and I was there, and the Union came to me, the Union would have to satisfy me that the income of the Transport Board was such that the members of the Union were being deprived of the true benefit of their labour. As a businessman, that is what I would have done.

Be that as it may, Sir, the Union was able to convince the Transport Board, especially in the atmosphere of election in the offing, that their workers were entitled to 38% but they did not pay that 38% increase before the election because they would have had to come to this House for another subsidy in the height of the election campaign, and I believe some of the members of the Workers' Union might have been too busily involved in getting the last Government out of power to insist on being paid before the campaign, and so after the election was over, the new Board was confronted with an increased recurring expenditure of \$144,000 to \$150,000, and in addition to that, an agreement had been made that retroactive pay should have been given, even going back to a period before this Government came into power, and that is what the \$45,000 is for. Far from this Board losing any money, this Board has actually made out without a subsidy. In other words, they have done at least \$330,000 better than the last Board, because the last Board had a subsidy of \$180,000 and still lost, and this Board has not had any kind of subsidy at all, they did not get \$150,000 a year and they have made up the leeway; but that leeway has been absorbed by the increases granted by the Board which were made before we changed the composition of the Board.

That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is roughly the broad picture of it, but let me come down to cases, and this is where I would like the member for St. Joseph to pay particular attention. He has been fulminating against this Resolution on the grounds that the Government is being asked to guarantee a loan, and since the Government is the guarantor and there is any default of payment of that loan, naturally the guarantor, which would be the public Treasury of this Island, would have to make good the \$45,000. Now this is fifteen months and the Transport Board has not got a penny from us. The Act was amended in 1960 to allow for the guarantee of purchase of buses, but now I want hon. members to go back and remember that letters were written in the newspaper that I accused certain persons of being involved in dishonesty. I think the hon. member is absolutely right to get up and ask questions and to make sure when people come for a guarantee that they do not mean a subsidy; but when we say a guarantee, we mean a guarantee. That was the position when they came for the \$1/2 million, but the Minister of Communications specifically said that it was not for the purchase of buses, but in the very next Estimates he said it was only a formal Resolution to guarantee the repayment of the loan which was being advanced by the Bank. Our new Transport Board took over a debt, not only of inefficiency in operation and everything else, but a physical debt of over \$1 million, and they have to pay interest on that million

dollars every single month to at least two Banks as far as I can remember, and they also have, if possible, to try to repay the \$1 million which the last Transport Board under the last Government had borrowed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what happened was this: after specifically giving this House the assurance that the Resolution for \$1,200,000 which they then came for in March or April, 1960, was not for the purchase of buses, but was only a Resolution approving that the Transport Board should borrow this money, in the very next Estimates in the next year they slipped it in as a subsidy for the purchase of buses and it passed this House unnoticed, and that is what I drew to the attention of this House last time. This Government is now committed not only as guarantor to the purchase of buses in the first resort, but in the last resort, because we were asking whether these buses were going to be the property of the Government or the property of the Transport Board, and the Minister of Communications and the Minister of Trade and Labour both got up and said that Government was not purchasing any buses. Iforgive the hon. junior member for St. Joseph because he has been associated with this kind of rascality for seventeen years, and therefore he must be on his guard because he knows what goes on within the ranks of the people with whom he is associated. If this Government comes, as it should in accordance with the provisions of the Act, for approval of their being the guarantors of a loan from the Bank of \$45,000, that is what the Government intends, I am not going to stand here and say that the Government never intends to pay back this money, because we would be breaking faith with the Bank when we sign as guarantor and for political reasons I get on the floor of this House and say that far from advancing this money to the Board we do not intend to pay back. That would be nonsense. What we are saying is that this Board will have to devise ways and means of paying it back. If they cannot pay back, of course we have to pay back in the last analysis. Our policy with the Board is that the Board has made considerable improvements in their finances and I want to compliment them for it.

2.15 p.m.

What the future of the transport system of this Island is, I cannot say. Whether we give back the buses or not, as we have been invited by the hon. senior member for St. Michael, I cannot say; but it does not mean that the transport system is now being run in the way in which they can get a reasonable rate of return for their capital. This is a fact; but we have been embarrassed by the vindictive action of the last Government. As Dr. Williams said in his White Paper that he was embarrassed by having \$3 million worth of houses when he refused to repay the Federal Government and Her Majesty's Government — they have been embarrassed to find that these houses were up there when they could use their land — we, too, have been definitely embarrassed by the vindictive action of the last Government by their expropriating the one industry which was under the control of Barbadians just because they felt that it was too much for them to own. Unfortunately, a Government has perpetual succession and we have to take over their liabilities and, I hope, their funeral expenses also. We have to take over all these things, and we have been embarrassed by finding ourselves with a top-heavy organisation which probably could be more efficiently run by private enterprise. I do not believe in a Civil Service or a quasi-Civil Service controlling any industry at all. Mr. Wilson of the British Labour Party has said that should his party get back into power, they would take over the steel industry. He may have reasons for doing so; but even although I am a Socialist, I do not agree with that.

What I will promise hon. members to do — and I will do it as soon as possible — is to get some competent people to look into the whole setup; and when they have reported, that is the time when I would come to the House and ask the House to act on whatever recommendations that Committee may make.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the sitting of this House be now suspended for one hour. It is now 2.20 p.m. and I take it that we can come back at 3.20 p.m.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an amendment to the motion by the Hon. Leader of the House. My amendment is that we come back at 3.30 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I accept the motion by the Hon. Minister.

The question that the sitting of the House be now suspended until 3.30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

2.25 p.m.

On re-assembling,

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the hon. junior member for St. Philip for drawing that matter to my attention and I direct that the bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

ORDER POSTPONED

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

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I want to propose that we deal with Replies to Questions as the next Order of the Day. In fact, I beg to move that the Replies of which I gave notice that they were ready earlier today, be now dealt with.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No 14/1962 to which the Oral Reply has been laid, stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas who, I observe, is not now in his place.

UNEMPLOYED WORKERS IN ST. THOMAS

Mr. SPEAKER: The Oral answer has also been laid to Question No. 94/1962 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, and it has been enquired of the Hon. Minister of Labour.

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Minister of Labour:—

Is Government aware that there is still a number of workers in the parish of St. Thomas unemployed?

2. In view of the fact that it is not practicable for Government to employ all the workers in the Island, would the Minister take steps to establish a National Committee to study a programme of industrial and economic expansion which would (a) provide alternate employment for such unemployed workers, and (b) create jobs in the community?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's question is as follows:—

1. "407 persons from the parish of St. Thomas were on the register at the Employment Exchange at the middle of February, 1963. The figure quoted cannot be regarded as indicating the actual number of persons unemployed at that date, as a large number of registrations at the Exchange relates to persons who are seeking better paid jobs or jobs

different from those which they hold at the time of registration.

2. The Government does not consider that it would serve any useful purpose to set up a National Committee at this stage to study a programme of industrial economic expansion. The Government is conscious of the need to reduce the incidence of unemployment and under-employment in this Island. The major objective of the current three-year Development Programme is to accelerate industrial and economic expansion with a view to creating new jobs.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, as result of that Reply, am I to understand that the Labour Department cannot give the number of those persons who are registered from St. Thomas, who are unemployed as against those who are in employment but who are seeking other work?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the position is that when people register at the Employment Exchange, they actually register as being unemployed; but as the answer to the question points out, in many cases they may be actually in a job then, and they are seeking different employment. There is no machinery to ascertain accurately whether or not these people are employed at the time of registration.

Mr. GODDARD: That is presupposing that of the four hundred and seven persons on the register for St. Thomas some of them are already in employment. Machinery should be set up whereby only applicants.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this a supplementary question being put?

Mr. GODDARD: It is. All those registering at the Labour Department should be unemployed. Some machinery should be set up in relation to those who wish to improve their status and move out from one job to another.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I hope the hon. member appreciates what is involved in that, in having persons to check the employment position of the person who is registered. In other words, if he or she has put down his or her name, we would have to have officers to go around and check as to whether these persons are working or what is their actual position of employment at the time. I am not saying that it could not be done, but it would involve a lot of additional machinery and additional staff on the part of the Employment Exchange simply for the purpose of finding out whether a person who has registered there is working. It may be that in order to ascertain accurate information of this kind, something may have to be done in the future, but it does not now obtain.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Oral Reply to Question 99 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has previously been laid.
3.40 p.m.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:—

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:—

Is it the Government's intention that all primary schools throughout the island should have kitchen gardens?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will Government issue a Memorandum to the effect that the produce from the said gardens be used by the schools which have already been selected in the pilot scheme for hot meals?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, The Reply is as follows:—

"1. It is the intention of the Ministry that where land is available and where there is a teacher at the school qualified to take charge of the scheme, primary schools throughout the Island should have kitchen gardens.

2. The Ministry is prepared to issue a directive to the effect that the produce from such gardens should be sold, where possible, to the School Meals Service and the proceeds used for the further development of the gardens."

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question, would the phrase "a teacher at the school qualified to take charge of the garden" refer to the enthusiasm of the teacher or to some degree of agricultural science?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Well certainly, Mr. Speaker, the enthusiasm of the teacher; but as the hon. member knows, part of the teacher training course at Erdiston does involve and include the imparting of skills to teachers in these matters.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no more answers laid to Oral Questions.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 under Government's Business which is the second reading of a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ending on the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-four, 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.

THE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1963

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the provisions of the Executive Committee Act, it is necessary for the Government to bring before the House for its approval the Estimates of revenue and expenditure for the forth-coming year which begins on 1st April, in each and every year in this territory. It has been the custom in the past to introduce about the same time proposals for taxation to meet any deficit in the Estimates of expenditure, but beginning in March last year I introduced a different procedure whereby the House was given the Estimates of revenue and expenditure to approve or disapprove, and, following that, and in accordance with the customs of the United Kingdom and other countries which enjoy parliamentary democracy like ours, a Finance Bill with the proposals for meeting any deficit, or the proposals for so managing the finances of the country so as to generate a high level of employment or take care of any inflationary or deflationary pressures which may exist in the community. Those were introduced on 26th June last year.

I propose to follow very much the same procedure this time, but although what I am doing now is merely laying the Estimates of expenditure and revenue before the House for the comments and the approval of the members of this Place, yet I think that it is incumbent on me to give a very brief outline to the background of the Estimates which were presented last Tuesday. I do not intend to make a Budget Speech. That I propose to introduce a little earlier this year, some time towards the end of April. As you know, in June some of us hope to go to the United Kingdom — members of the Opposition as well as Government members — to further the cause of Federation upon which we have embarked. This is going to be the final Conference, we hope, before the Federation comes into being, and it is because we expect to have our hands fully occupied in the month of June, that I am going to vouchsafe to the House the benefit or otherwise, depending upon your point of view, of our proposals towards the end of April this year.

In June last year you will remember the general background against which the Budget proposals were made. At that time we were confronted with a deficit of \$2,352,189. We had taken over the Government six months previously, and we had been confronted with an additional liability for the payment of increases to members of the Public Service of this Island, and my proposals were made in an attempt to bridge the gulf — a very deep gulf from the point of view of our limited resources — that existed between the actual

out-turn of the revenue and the expenditure with which we were confronted. That was one of the reasons, Sir, why having had a deficit budget in the previous year we had to wait until the end of the financial year when all the receipts which possibly could be gathered were accounted for before we took so bold a step as to make any further taxation proposals on the people of this Island.
3.50 p.m.

The proposal which I made, like any other taxation proposal, did not meet with universal acclaim, joy and jubilation. It has never been known in the history of mankind that people who try to impose any kind of taxation on the people of any country are the most popular people in that particular country; therefore, I was not unduly perturbed by the criticism levelled against the Government because we decided that we would have to impose additional taxation to meet the expenditure which was not of our creation. It was a very trying thing for a very young Government — and when I say young, I mean not in office alone, but in body and spirit as well, after we were confronted with a burden which no Government of this country had to face for a period of 38 years or 39 years. This was the situation with which we were confronted and we took very bold methods to deal with it.

Despite the predictions of the pessimists, I am very pleased to say that the income which we have derived as a result of the Revised Estimates in June last year and the financial proposals which we introduced have exceeded the amount which we proposed that we would have got in; but at the same time I must confess that the usual seasonable raids were made on the Treasury for supplementary votes so that although our figure for revenue anticipated was somewhat smaller than what we expected, at the same time the figure for expenditure was also in excess; and we have, Sir, from our calculations — and it is not easy to say now because the financial year still have some few weeks to run — at this stage I can estimate for an overall deficit of \$350,000 as against \$2.3 million. As I have said, this deficit of \$2.3 million could easily have been a surplus after the financial proposals which were made, if we did not have these raids on the Treasury for these supplementary votes which we have been very careful to keep a check on, but which nevertheless have come down.

The expenditure this year is going to be in the region of \$30.5 million. In the Draft Estimates which have been submitted, hon. members will see that the figure is \$30,221,087 million, but during the course of this debate we have to move in certain additional items of expenditure which would send the estimate up about \$1/4 million, bringing it to \$30.48 million.

The estimated revenue is put at \$22.8 million in the Draft Estimates, about \$940,000 below the estimates of expenditure; but, as I have said before, the estimates of expenditure are under-estimated in the Draft Estimates, and it is much more likely to be in the vicinity overall of \$1.1 million deficit as compared with the deficit of \$2.3 million when we started of the financial year 1962-63. Therefore, some time between now and the beginning of June — probably towards the end of April — I intend to inform the House of what proposals I intend to make to breach the gap between estimated revenue and estimated expenditure.

I think that we have done remarkably well during the past financial year because we inherited a situation which was nothing else but economic stagnation in this country. We inherited a situation that the Local Government Councils were short of money because of the failing of business and trade in the Island. But there has been a considerable upsurge of business activity in this country since this Government has implemented its proposals for capital works which we introduced last year. My projection right now is that the national income of Barbados which has been fluctuating in the vicinity of \$95 million to \$100 million for the last two years — in other words a situation in which there was no economic growth, a situation in which the population also remained on a standard level and actually there was a decline in one year — my estimate for this year is that the economic growth is approximately five per cent on

what it was, thus making it a national income of \$105 million at least.

I would like to compare this with the recommendations of the National Economic Development Council of Great Britain who around about the same time said that it was essential for the Government in industry to base their economic growth to four per cent for the next ten years in order to ensure that the economy of Great Britain remains well. The economy of Barbados has exceeded the figure which was proposed for a highly industrialised and developed country with a large overseas market at their hands and even despite all predictions which have been made by the people who were not in favour of seeing this country get anywhere at all in order to embarrass this Government. They do not embarrass the Government when people go overseas and try to discourage investors putting money into this country; they are embarrassing the underprivileged people of this country. Of course, their offensive was countered by the Hon. Minister of Trade; and the counter-offensive was highly successful in that we were able to stimulate the economic growth in the economy and we have attained the figure of five per cent over the figures for the two or three previous years.

What I want to do in the coming financial year is to stimulate the rate of growth of the national economy by approximately eight per cent over the figure of 1962-63 because we feel that, with our population figures tending to rise again due to a decrease in migration and a decrease in the death rate and the increase in the birthrate, it should be increased by that figure because we not only have to take care of the people who would be coming into the world, but we also have to take care of all the people living and the children who will be leaving school and looking for a job. 4.00 p.m.

Therefore we have embarked upon a rather ambitious programme of Capital Expenditure of the order of \$13 1/2 million in a serious effort to prime the economic pump and keep this moving action so that the economy of this island can get off the ground.

I do not intend to be too detailed in my analysis of the Estimates because I credit nearly every hon. member here with the ability to read for himself. It is not necessary for me, as Minister of Finance, to read something which we have already submitted to members of the House and which they have not only read but which they have studied, inwardly digested and learnt for themselves. But there are one or two main points to which I should like to draw to the attention of hon. members. The first point that hon. members would notice is that the Estimates of Current Expenditure are grouped under the various Ministries. The Department of Prisons, which was formerly under the portfolio of the Minister of Social Services, has been transferred to the Ministry of Home Affairs, and the Ecclesiastical matters have been transferred to the Ministry of Education from the Ministry of Home Affairs. That was done not because I find myself incompetent to deal with ecclesiastical matters and the Minister of Education is more au fait with these matters, but because of the tremendous amount of work which has been imposed upon my Ministry by conferences and other matters. I do want to have something done about what is frequently referred to as the disendowment of the Anglican Church. This Government has had a mandate from the annual conferences from year to year that they are not in favour of the disestablishment of the Anglican Church. The Establishment should provide funds and we have a large number of denominations within our fold. The Church is one foundation in the true sense of the term. We have all of these different religions, sects and denominations in our Party, and therefore we have to give some kind of credit for the opinion of our Party members who are not in favour of the disestablishment of the Church, but the endowment — not the disendowment — of the Anglican Church. The proposals which have been submitted by the Anglican Synod to the Government have not been proposals for the disendowment of the Church at all; there are proposals for endowment; but what we are attempting to do in this exercise is to repeal the provisions of the Anglican Church Act. Some have considered it better for the Church to ordain its

own Ministers and run its own affairs, and to remove the financial affairs from the Treasury of this island and let them have their own affairs. That is what the Government intends to do, if that is what is meant by disestablishment. It is necessary to give the Anglican Church a golden handshake of one kind or another if we are to keep in juridical bonds. We have Church property, and therefore we have to set up some kind of Fund to allow for the taking over by Government of the lands which are at present vested in the Anglican Church. We may actually have to set up an endowment Fund for the Anglican Church, and that is why I say that we are not disendowing the Church; we are rather endowing the Church. We want to have the Anglican Church Act repealed, we want to sever the financial connections between the Treasury and the Officers of the Church. That is one of the reasons why Ecclesiastical affairs have been transferred to the Ministry of Education so that the Minister and his advisers among the "arnestytes" would be able to devote their time and attention to the long vexed question of disendowment.

Mr. Speaker, another good reason why these Ecclesiastical matters should be transferred to the Ministry of Education is that the relationship between the Department of Education and the Anglican Church is such that it is better for them to get together and bring about this annulment of the financial support which they have been getting from time immemorial.

Public Relations and press Liaison Services have also been transferred from the Ministry of Home Affairs to the Ministry of Education. In the Estimates you will find the names of the Ministries and the Departments which fall under the control of the Ministers, and there is also a summary of estimated expenditure under personal Emoluments, Other Charges and Non-Recurrent Expenditure. It is therefore possible to ascertain at a glance what the total expenditure of a Ministry will be, as well as the expenditure of constituent departments. That is an innovation. I would not worry to go through the list of the Heads of expenditure; but you have Governor, Service Commissions, Legislature, Audit, Judiciary, Legal, Registration Office and Crown Solicitor in the first part. Then you have the departments which come under the control of the Minister of Finance and there are some twelve or fourteen departments in number. The Departments under the control of the Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries number six. Under the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing you have eleven Heads and under the Ministry of Education you have nine. The Departments under the control of the Ministry of Social Services number some twelve and under the Ministry of Development, Trade, Industry and Tourism the number is three, and that Ministry also deals with Subsidies, Controls and Tourism. Then we have Subsidies and Grants. 4.10 p.m.

As I said before, it is not really possible even now to give a very accurate estimate of the expenditure for the financial year which is now coming to a close. The Draft Estimate in March last year was some \$25 1/2 million, but this figure was revised to \$28.1 million, and the expenditure was revised from \$27.8 million to \$28.36 million. The estimate of revenue for this year is shown on the cover of the Draft Estimates, and as I said before, the estimates of expenditure will be affected by moves-in to the Estimates to the order of some \$1/4 million. The estimate for Customs and Excise duties was \$2.7 million more than the Approved Estimates for 1962-63, and exceeded my own calculation at the time of the Budget by nearly \$1/2 million. I think that it is a very encouraging feature indeed. It means that although some miscalculations might have been made in the excise tax on beer, the overall calculations really were not very far out. The estimate for Inland Revenue was \$30,000 more than the Approved Estimate, and \$110,000 more than the Revised Estimate for the financial year 1962-63. The net increase of estimated revenue for this coming year 1963-64 over the Approved Estimate for 1962-63 is \$3.7 million. In other words, we will be collecting, we hope, \$3.7 million more this year without any additional taxation than we had set out to collect at this same time last year. It will be \$3.7 million with the same level of taxation; but that still leaves, of course, a deficit of

\$1.1 million to counteract, for which we may have to introduce some kind of financial proposals later on — and I may say in passing that financial proposals do not always have to be in the nature of increased taxation. You can balance a budget by means other than increasing taxation, and although I am not promising anyone that taxation is going to be increased this year, I am saying that every possible device will be used to make sure that the gap is covered by the end of the financial year 1963-64.

Mr. Speaker, along with the Estimates for revenue and expenditure, we have the Annexed Estimates, Capital Estimates, Estimates of the Post Office and Estimates of the Port Department. I do not intend to deal with these in detail because Capital Estimates and the Estimates for the Port Department come in separate Resolutions, and I will deal with them at the time when these Resolutions are before the House.

There are two ways in which people can look at a Government's budget. You can separate the capital expenditure from recurrent expenditure and deal with them as two separate items as we are accustomed to doing at least since this Government has been in office, and I think this is the proper way to do it; or you can follow the customs of some of the neighbouring islands and mix up your capital expenditure with your recurrent expenditure and claim that your deficit financing is to the tune of the difference between the current expenditure and the current revenue, and then add your Capital Estimates on to that. We like to deal with our finances not in watertight compartments for sure, but so that people can know what investment is taking place in the community over and above your normal domestic expenses for running the Civil Service, social services and so on.

Mr. Speaker, we like to divide our financial proposals into Capital Estimates and Current estimates of revenue and expenditure, and then we have the Annexed Estimates because there are certain trading Departments like the Port Department and the Post Office which really can be looked at as something separate and distinct in the same way we do not introduce into the Estimates the Balance Sheets of the Barbados Savings Bank, but because there are Government Departments, we do bring in the Port Department and the Post Office Department, and we show them as the Annexed Estimates.

Now I would like to say this about the National Debt and the Harbour and so on. I will deal with this much more fully when I come to make my Budget Speech later this year. You will find that this country now has a National Debt probably very close on \$40 million, but of that you will find that there is a considerable amount which will be financed by the projects for which the debt was incurred. An illustration of that, Sir, will be the Estimates of the Port at the Deep Water Harbour, because the Treasury is not called upon in the first instance to meet any of the Charges of Debt which are ascribed to the Harbour. These Charges of Debt, Sinking Fund and so on, are met from the Port Department; so I do not think that we should be unduly alarmed; and if the size of the National Debt appears to be growing in Barbados, when you break it down, you will find that a lot of capital expenditure is being incurred, but incurred by projects which more or less pay for themselves. For instance, when later on this year we start the construction of the Government-owned hotel which will be operated by one of the international groups, it may call for additional capital expenditure of over, let us say, \$5 million; but this has not been put into the Capital Estimates because that project is supposed to meet all its interests and loan charges and eventually amortize itself over a period of years, and we hope it will be paid in a period of ten years. There are other projects of that nature upon which Government will be embarking; so that even Capital Estimates will not give any statistician a true insight into the amount of capital investment which is going to be pumped into this economy over the next twelve months.

We are also working on the private sector, Sir, to try to discover approximately how much capital investment will be forthcoming from that sector during the financial year 1963-64; and the purpose of that exercise is to see how

best we can manage our man power budget, because although this is a financial budget, there is such a thing as a man power budget. After all, our main object in relieving the unemployment of the country is to raise the standard of the masses of people, and unless we know how much money is going to be spent in the public and private sector over and above the money spent on people who are already employed, we will not be able accurately to plan the economy of this Island so as to achieve our objectives which have been stated. I hope, therefore, that business people in this Island will not take any questionnaire coming from the Ministry of Finance — it is really from the Statistical Office, because I do not see the actual returns myself, neither does any Government Minister, but only the people in the Statistical Office who are sworn to secrecy — as an unnecessary prying into their private, domestic affairs or anything of that kind, because you know we live in a community where people's ideas are only now becoming adjusted and reconciled to the Twentieth Century, but there are a lot of people born in the 20th Century who are not reconciled to the 20th Century yet, and if you believe in planning an economy, it is necessary to plan the economy of adequate supply on an analysis of the information relating to what is going on in the country overall.

4.20 p.m.

No Minister of Finance can give out accurate budgeting unless he knows the level of investment, the shade and volume of capital formation in the country. You may accumulate, but you may not spend; you may save, but you may not lend. All of these things we want to know.

I think that this job is more properly the job of the Inland Revenue Department. I think that members of the business community should co-operate with the Statistical Department so that we can get a more accurate picture of the level of investment in this country so that we can plan more suitably for the future.

Another feature of the Estimates which we are now dealing with is that a lot of our predictions may be somewhat inviolated by the transfer of some of these services to the Federal Organisation during the course of the financial year; and when next we present Estimates, we may not present Annexed Estimates for the Post Office or Estimates for the Police or the Judiciary or the Audit Department for which we are presenting Estimates this year because not only would be the revenue, like that coming from the Post Office, be taken over by the Federal Department, but the expenditure would be necessarily taken over as well. During the course of the coming financial year the shape and form of the Government's expenditure by the Government of Barbados may be somewhat different from what it is at the present moment because of the voluntary handing over of some of the functions of this Government to the larger organisation. This, of course, would also account for import duties — and I say import duties advisedly — because there is no recommendation that Customs will be taken over by the Federal Government. The White Paper says that the Federal Government will derive its revenue from import duties, postal services, port fees and currency profits. The reason why we are placing emphasis on import duties is because Customs receipts are not entirely made up of import duties. In many of the countries, there are import duties and there are other duties, such as excise, which form no part of the receipts which the Federal Government can hope to get from these territories.

There are certain amendments, Mr. Speaker, which have to be made to the Draft Estimates which was submitted last week and these amendments were circulated earlier today. I hope hon. members have had the opportunity to study them, but I think that I should get it on the record to say what these amendments are; therefore, I will ask hon. members to bear with me while I read what I would call "these Moves In".

On page two, there is Item 19 (New), Motor vehicles, to be inserted; (To be voted) \$4,950. The Note to read: "For the purchase of a new Car to replace one of the State Cars".

I forgot what the estimate for the sale of the car is. This is the normal thing which is done. This is not for an

additional car for anyone; this is a replacement and from the price for the new car must be subtracted the selling price of the old car. If the new car is worth \$8,000 or \$9,000, market price, it means that the Government would have to pay \$4,950.

Under Head 3, on Page 7, Item 33 — (New) Ceremonial Dress, to be inserted (To be Voted) \$750. The note to read: "Provision for the purchase of a Wig and Robe for His Honour the Speaker, and to meet incidental expenses in connection therewith".

Therefore, you will no longer have to arrive in discomfort in borrowed finery.

Under Head 5, Judiciary, on Page 11, Item 32 — Incidentals, to be added to existing provision, \$221. Revised provision (To be Voted) \$7,469. Add to existing note: "Additional provision to pay Cleaners at District 'C', \$65; District 'D', \$36; District 'E', \$24; District 'F', \$36; and Belleplaine \$60.

I believe this is one of Your Honour's perennial questions before you assumed office which you have been bringing to the attention of the Legislature and I believe your colleague has also joined with you in your remonstrations.

Under Head 12, Charges of Debt, on page 23, Item 8, Public Loan Act, 1957, delete amount Authorised by Law — \$287,924; substitute — \$224,660. Existing note to be deleted. Substitute: "Act 1957-13: Sinking Fund at 1 1/2% on Local Loans of \$2,500,000 and \$1,449,050; and at 1% on London Loans of \$12,403,200 and \$6,139,200".

May I just say in passing that the state of the latest financial report has disclosed that the loan which we raised in London in December and which was quoted at 95% is now 99 7/8% or something like that. That is a \$6 3/4 million loan which we raised last year in London and which is certainly the highest overseas loan made available on the London Market.

Again at Page 23, Item 9, Public Loan Act, 1961, delete amount Authorised by Law — \$7,500 and substitute — \$70,071. The existing note is to be deleted and substituted therefor: "Act 1961-59: Sinking Fund at 1 1/2% on Local Loans of \$1,000,000 and token provision in respect of further Loans to be raised".

On page 24, Item 18, Public Loan Act, 1957, delete amount authorised by Law — \$1,756,088 and substitute — \$1,383,031. The existing Note is to be deleted and substituted therefor: "Act 1957-13: Interest on Local Loan at 5 1/2% on \$2,500,000 6% on \$1,449,050, and on London Loan at 6% on \$12,403,200 and 6 3/4% on \$6,139,200".

That is the loan to which I referred just now which is being quoted almost on par and which is a considerable improvement in the short space of three months in the market value of the stock which was issued in London.

Again on page 24, Item 20 — Public Loan Act, 1961, delete amount authorised by Law — \$33,750 and substitute — \$367,500. The existing note is to be deleted and substituted therefor: "Act 1961-59: Interest at 6 3/4% on Local Loans of \$1,000,000 and token provision in respect of other Loans to be raised".

Most of these are printers' errors which do not make any difference or very slight difference, on the credit side to the overall figures. You will see that these "Moves In" send up the estimated expenditure by \$2 1/4 million. 4.30 p.m.

In connection with the "moves-in", whenever you see the word "new", that is a "move in" which will send up the estimated expenditure by \$1/4 million. Under Head 13 — Customs — on page 25 — Item — Overtime, there is to be added to the existing note: "Also to pay duty allowances to staff stationed at the Harbour. Under Head 17 — Premier — Home Affairs — Page 32 — Item 14 — Stationery, there is to be added to the existing provision the sum of \$150. Revised provision (To be voted) is \$6,450. On page 33 —

Item 26 — Furniture and Office Equipment — there is to be added to the existing provision the sum of \$695. Revised provision (To be voted) \$1,775; to be added to existing note: "provision is also made for a photo-copying machine. This is an additional item of expenditure. On page 23 — Item 37 — Revision of Laws — there is to be deleted (Token provision) \$1. Substitute (To be voted) \$12,800. The existing note is to be deleted and there is to be substituted "Provision to meet initial expenses of the Commissioners in connection with the Revision of the Laws." That is an additional item. There was a token provision put in because it was not known what the estimated expenditure on the Law revision would be for the coming financial year. The people who actually do the printing of the Laws do not expect to get a volume ready probably before next year; therefore they do not want any payment for printing before the end of this financial year. There is therefore no amount for clerical and other expenses, fees for law revision and so on. Under Head 18 — Police — on page 39, Item 84, we have "Weights and Measures Equipment." There is to be deleted (Token provision) \$1, and to be substituted (To be voted) \$7,050. Under Head 19 — Fire Service — on page 40, Item 13, Cleaning, water and Light, there is to be added to the existing provision the sum of \$324, revised provision (To be voted) \$3,014. Under Head 24 Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, page 58 — Item 112A, there is (New), Expenses on Commission of Enquiry, to be inserted (To be voted) \$11,870. The note is to read: "Provision to meet the expenses of the Commission of Enquiry into all aspects of the Sugar Industry in Barbados." Under Head 27 — Public Works — page 65, Item 24, there is "Leave pay to casual employees," the existing note is to be deleted. On page 67, Item 46, (New) Law Library, there is to be inserted (To be voted) \$3,500. The note is to read: "To meet the cost of renovating two rooms on the first floor of the Law Courts, and to air-condition one of them to house the present Law Library and the recently acquired "Reece Library". Under Head 30 — Waterworks — on page 74 — Item 38 — Leave Pay to casual employees — the note is to be amended and there is to be deleted "Paid on the basis of the Public..... Act, 1935-36." On page 74 Item 46 — New Furniture and Equipment — there is to be inserted (To be voted) \$662. The note is to read "To provide one Steel Cabinet, one Card Index Cabinet, Metal Plates and Index Cards. Under Head 32 — Highways and Transport — on Page 79 — Item 56A — (New) Pump House, there is to be inserted (To be voted) \$11,654. The note is to read: "Provision for maintenance of the Pump House on the South Access Road to the Bridgetown Harbour. Under Head 36 — Ministry of Education (5) Schools — on page 97 — Item 15A — (New) School Meals Service, there is to be inserted: (To be voted) \$200,000. The Note is to read "Provision for a pilot scheme to be carried out at centres in Bridgetown, Christ Church and St. Lucy." Under Head 39 — Medical (2) General Hospital page 117, Item 127 — Furniture and Equipment, there is to be added to the existing note: "And to provide additional desks, chairs and tables for the General Office and for the Nurses' Home." Under Head 39 — Medical (4) Lazaretto, page 123 — Item 10 — Carter — there is to be inserted (To be voted) \$3. The note is to read "To pay personal allowance at the rate of \$120 per annum to the present holder of the post."

Mr. Speaker, if I might pause here, I should like to say that during the coming financial year the Lazaretto, as we know it, will probably be closed. The number of inmates there, I believe, is less than 12, and five of them are due for discharge and that will leave the sort of chronic places at the number 6. The Director of Medical Services, the Ministry of Social Services and I, have been holding discussions on this matter and we intend to use the Lazaretto building as an archives Department for the University of the West Indies and for the standby Isolation Hospital which is very seldom, if ever, used. We will reserve one building as an Isolation Hospital because we are going to build a hotel on the site where the present Isolation Hospital is. We have Government land there and we intend to use this land and not to buy land from anybody at an exorbitant price when the Government has land lying down and is not being used. The Lazaretto will therefore take on a different role in the eyes of this community because these archives will be housed there. As a matter of fact, I think that work is currently going on there. We have books coming to us and we must find somewhere to put these reference books. We

have old records to be stored and all the necessary precautions will be taken to remove the ancient prejudice which people entertain against leprosy which is not supported by modern medical science. In order not to intrude on people's susceptibilities, we are taking the precaution of fumigating and disinfecting in order to make sure that anybody who is using the archives department will stand no risk either of infection or contagion.

Under Head 39 — Medical (5) District Hospital Services, on page 125 Item 14 — Subsidy to Christ Church Almshouse, there is to be added to the existing provision, the sum of \$1,500. Revised provision (To be voted) \$13,500. Under Head 39, Medical (7) Maternity Hospital, page 132 — Item 26 — (New) — Furniture and Equipment — there is to be inserted (To be voted) \$600. The note is to read: To provide an incubator." Under Head 47 — Subsidies and Grants — on page 145 — Item 31A — (New) U.N.I.C.E.F., there is to be inserted (To be voted) \$3,450 and the note is to read: "Contribution for the year 1963." On page 146 — Item 48A — (New) Pan American Health Organization — there is to be inserted (To be voted) \$3,790. The note is to read "Contribution for the year 1963." On page 147 — Item 48 (New) — Civic Circle. There is to be inserted (To be voted) \$1,980. The note is to read "Provision for payment of a gratuity to the former Supervisor of Government Grounds and gardens."

As you know, Sir, Miss Neil Manning who is well advanced or stricken in years like Sarah who has been looking after the public gardens for a long period of years certainly without being compensated for all of her efforts, has recently retired and the Government proposes to grant her a gratuity which is based on one month's salary for every year of completed service with the Civic Circle. 4.40 p.m.

This is the customary kind of gratuity which we grant to public servants who are not entitled to pensions, and I am sure everyone around this Table here will approve of the grant of this gratuity to Miss Manning who has done 26 years of very, very able work in developing gardens to the pride and joy of the people of Barbados, and we wish her good health in her retirement. (Cheers).

Under Capital, Sir, we will be moving in certain items. In Part II Head 5 — Health Services on page 167 — Item 6 — (New) Health Centres, an amount of \$28,890 is to be inserted, and the note is to read "for carrying out improvements at the following Health Centres:— (a) Speightstown — Tiling of floors; (b) St. Philip — Altering servants' room and wash-room of Officers' quarters and providing furniture; and (c) St. Michael — Provision of additional office space for X-Ray Office and Sanitary Inspectors Office; air-conditioning of Laboratory, making alterations to Clerical Staff Office and providing additional accommodation for Ophthalmological section."

Under Head 6 — Education on page 168 in Item 1 — Erdiston College, an amount of \$4,065 is to be added to the existing provision making the revised provision \$36,565 and a further note is to be added to the existing note to read "includes revote for the purchase of a passenger van for transporting trainee-teachers." I think that is a revote from last year. Also on page 168 under Item 13 — (New) Industrial Arts Wings, an amount of \$41,785 is to be inserted and the note is to read "to complete construction of Industrial Arts Wings at ten (10) schools."

Mr. Speaker, on the 5th March, 1963, His Excellency the Governor sent down a Message in which he said he had the honour to present for the consideration of the Honourable House of Assembly the Draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the financial year 1963-64. On the same date, Sir, the Hon. Leader of the House moved the first reading of a Bill entitled an Act to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ending on the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-four.

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

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, there has been a departure both last year and again this year, and I quite agree with it. The Estimates are laid, and the Budget proposals as the Hon. Premier has said, will not be put to the House until the end of April. That will give him an opportunity to see the ending of the financial year and how we come out. We are just three weeks away and he can make an assessment of the position. He has given us a glimpse of the past year's working, and the figures before us give the proposals of expenditure for 1963-64.

As I said, in the past we were given an opportunity to study the Premier's Speech, and although it is not being given on this occasion, I am going to make this appeal now. When the Budget proposals do come to this House, a space of at least two or three days should be given to the Opposition to make their observations on the proposals. The Budget is more important because it tells us how he intends to widen the gap between expenditure and revenue which is now in the vicinity of.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, I think the hon. member means to narrow the gap. He does not want to frighten us that much.

Mr. GODDARD: I am sorry. I did not mean 'widen,' and I thank the Hon. Minister for drawing it to my attention. The Budget tells us how the Premier intends to narrow the gap between revenue and expenditure.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but I prefer to say "bridge the gap," because I have no intention of narrowing the gap if I can help it.

Mr. GODDARD: I hope he is as successful on this occasion as he was on the last occasion when he had a gap of \$2.3 million, and I think he eliminated the gap entirely. What I want to point out, at this stage, is the reference between now and his proposals. I think that is a most important part. When the Estimates were made, I presume they were done over the Christmas session, and the Premier would not be in a position to see as clearly as today and between now and the end of April, the future of this Island in the coming year. Since Christmas, the crop has started. It has got off to a very good start and the estimated crop is in excess of what anyone would have said around December. At the end of April, therefore, he will be in a better position to get the Agricultural Department and his agricultural advisers to state more accurately what the estimated sugar crop will be this year. I have good reason to believe — and I have been advised too — that it is going to be in the vicinity of 180,000 to 190,000 tons. We have not seen that for a number of years and we may say that we have again returned to agricultural prosperity, because over the last three years it had dropped below the five-year average, but this has now gone up. Added to that is another important factor in his proposals. The price of the world market sugar has jumped tremendously, and this year we will be having quite a considerable amount of sugar to sell on the world market, and if that can be sold at this price — and there is no likelihood of its going down, because it may even go higher — the revenue from the sugar crop this year should be considerably higher than it has been over the last three years.

Now, Sir, the resulting income tax from that — and it will come in — and the resulting activity in trade must also be taken into account, because more goods will be imported and more money will be available, and the revenue from the customs can easily be in excess of what the Premier has in mind today. These are figures which I am sure he will take into account, and he should at all costs try to avoid increased taxation of any form. We are trying to encourage capital into this Island, and one of the means by which we encourage that capital is to prove to the investor both local and foreign, that the Government has a strong, healthy and stable economy and is not only so bankrupt in ideas that it can only balance budgets by increased taxation. 4.50 p.m.

That has to come to an end some day, and we cannot only look to them; we must look to encourage the productivity from all quarters so that there are more and more businesses in their efforts of putting money into the Treasury. I am sure that the Hon. Premier is conscious of that and I am advising that these items be taken into account when he is making his Budget proposals.

Now, we have not been able to increase the gross national income of this Island since 1957. It has been, I think, between \$97 million and \$100 million, since it was started over the past five years and the Hon. Premier tells us today that it is now in the vicinity of \$105 million; therefore, it shows that we intend to move forward again. That has worried business people and intended investors because when there is stagnation of the colony's income, something has to happen.

The person to move it forward is the Government, and this can only be done after the infusion of something new which can move forward the economy.

This year there is a bumper crop, and apparently this year the trade has been better than the previous year; and if we can find productive industry, that will also help the economy of this Island. If that is possible, then we are going places. Added to this is the Deep Water Harbour which is still in its infancy, but the revenue from the Port Department already is on the incline. We have watched the revenue from it going up and today with our being able to bunker ships, we are seeing an ever increasing flow of new ships and liners coming here to take their fuel before going on to bigger places. That is a direct infusion into the bloodstream of the island's revenue of foreign exchange. These are the pointers to which we have to look and those are the things which we wish to see.

The Hon. Premier has said that during the year the Statistical Department will be sending out forms on which they will be asking certain information so that he would know better the size and part which private sectors are playing in the capital development of this Island. I wish to assure him now that businesses in this Island would be readily co-operative and are willing to co-operate in this matter. Long past are the days when people felt that these things are of a private nature and not the concern of anyone else. Today, it is everyone's desire to help in pushing the economy of this Island, because as that increases, so does business increase. That is exactly what we all live on.

If we may point out to the Government what we think could be their errors or what they might be spending money on which we think to be unproductive or that would be a long time in coming into production, if I may mention one thing which many of us have doubts about, it is the construction of the Hilton Hotel here for which \$5 million plus will be required on such a project.

Barbados is somewhat unlike Trinidad. In Trinidad, they had no hotels of any standards and you must also remember that Trinidad is many times bigger than Barbados and the economy is ten times as large as that of Barbados; and with that colony just having a few hotels, something would have to be done as regards the building of hotels. Therefore, when they erected one, it was necessary that they erect one. The Hilton Hotel there is providing the necessary function of the business community and it will eventually help the economy of this Island. However, our tourist business is being built up on another sort of hotel - the resort hotel type. It is being built up on small hotels where people come here for longer stays and they want a hotel as a resort and not as a business hotel. The Hilton Hotel had to come to Trinidad because they had their business executives coming in and out. Trinidad is now an independent nation and they have people coming in for conferences with nowhere to stay. Furthermore, we are not told that the Government of the country will get any returns for quite a few years to come. I would have preferred if our Government would have waited to see the outcome of the running of the Hilton in Trinidad and see if that Government has really profited or eventually would profit by means of dividends out of the Hilton. Of course, Sir, I will have a greater opportunity to debate that matter on another occasion.

Sir, I also see where the churches have been put under the Ministry of Education. The Hon. Premier said that it was more the concern of the Minister of Education than it was the concern of his Ministry. I would like to say that so far as endowment or disendowment of the Church is concerned, the Government will have to meet its financial provisions because it is only through a golden handshake, as the Hon. Premier himself has put it, that this can be done, and it will be by a golden handshake of some considerable sum of money. Although the Hon. Minister of Education may be able to work out a scheme between the Church's authorities and his Ministry, it will eventually devolve on the Premier to find that sum of money, whatever it is, and to make proper financial arrangements for the separation of the Church from the State.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I just would like to tell the hon. member this. The Church, so far as we are concerned, will not be separated from the State, but only from the Treasury.

Mr. GODDARD: I am very pleased to hear that.

Although the Hon. Premier entered very briefly on his Capital Estimates - which to my mind is the important matter before us on this occasion - it will be more adequately dealt with when we go into Committee on that Head. I just wish to say now, looking at it and the overall picture, that we see where it is proposed that in 1963-64, which is this year, we will spend \$15,368,929.
5.00 p.m.

Last year the Estimates were \$9,902,913. Granted that it is the desire of the Government to find as much employment as possible for the large numbers of the unemployed, I doubt that we are, at this stage, geared with personnel and equipment and trained people to undertake such a task in one year. The sum of \$15 million is a lot of money, and you must remember that over the years previously, five or six years ago, when we were spending large sums on Capital Expenditure a very large project, the Deep Water Harbour, was under way. And on every occasion, two, three or six million dollars a year was spent on the Deep Water Harbour. With that scheme there was a contractor with trained personnel and the whole set-up was going all out; but today the only large project which we have undertaken is the General Hospital which is coming to completion. The largest sum of money will no doubt be spent on the Hospital, and for budgetary reasons this year, this matter should be gone into more carefully because it would tend to swell the estimate of expenditure in one year and you must always remember that we are coming to the point of borrowing money and we will have to give more consideration to the servicing of these loans.

Mention has been made of that in this Memorandum on the Estimates. I will read the particular paragraph, paragraph 23. This is what it says:

"It is estimated that at 1st April, 1963, the Public Debt of the Island will be \$33.9 million."

That is the end of this month. The paragraph goes on to state this:

"The further loan funds to be raised will amount to \$21.4 million but loans amounting to \$802,216 will be redeemed during 1963/64, so the total debt at 31st March, 1964, will be \$54 1/2 million. The capacity of the Island to bear the loan charges on this debt will depend on additional revenue from productive development."

That is what we wish to stress. From now on the Government must pay strict attention to the productive development so that they may, in the future years, take care of this large public debt. If at the end of next year - well, I do not anticipate that we would raise this loan in one year; but if within two years we have a public debt of \$54 1/2 million, we will have to find out of current expenditure the sum of about \$4 million to service that loan. That will cut down current revenue, what we are now spending on the essential services in this island. This financial view needs a clear examination and it also calls for the Government, in

the spending of its capital funds, to exercise the strictest economy in order to see that every dollar that they spend is well spent and that no waste takes place. We are having an increasingly large population; our population is growing rapidly and if we are to maintain our standards—far less to improve them, which we do wish—it can only be done out of the annual earnings of the economy. This year has been a reasonably healthy one, but let us look at certain happenings. We have recently seen in Roebuck Street a certain number of bankruptcies; that is the indication for which most people look and there are many people who are near bankruptcy. When these things start to happen there is a kind of panic which takes place in the money market. It is imperative for the Government to pay strict attention to this matter because with our economy, competition is becoming keener and keener, prices are being driven down and profits are beginning to disappear. That is a reflection in the revenue derived from income tax. The big income taxpayers in this Island are the corporations, the business people. There has been a shrinkage in the business activity over the last three years, and for that reason you will see a steady loss of revenue being collected by the Income Tax Department because there has been no expansion but rather there has been a contraction. Expenses have risen, business has been static, profits have been falling and less revenue has been going into the Income Tax Department. These are things which we have to watch; we should never get scared of these things, provided that we are taking the necessary steps to infuse the economy with something which will drive forward the basis of the economy in this island. We have great faith in the businessmen of this island. They have been shrewd in the past and they are being shrewd today; but they must be allowed a certain amount of money out of their earnings to plough back into the business. You want money to plough back into the business which is the bloodstream from which we get revenue so that we can be as efficient and as competitive as any other West Indian island, barring none. As a matter of fact, we should be in advance of them because we have had the necessary number of trained business people here although I see that they have been accused very recently in certain quarters by people of very low intellect, by persons to whom I would not entrust my business, the young economists who are yet to prove that they can run their business or make a living. 5.10 p.m.

I also wish to assure the Government that it is the desire of the private sector, although they are by far in the great majority traders rather than industrialists—and a note has to be taken of that because there is a vast difference between an industrialist and a trader—to assist the Government in every respect. There is an awful lot of know-how that is required in each sector. I view with great suspicion that some of these industries may come in, and if they are not properly examined from the start, they can make demands on the Government, if not immediately, eventually that will also take off from the economy of this Island and make a drain on it.

Mr. Speaker, when we go into Committee on the Estimates, I am sure ample opportunity will be given to us to point out what we like and what we dislike in the proposed Capital Expenditure, which is the most vital part of the Estimates; but I wish to end with this warning to the Premier. He has a gap of approximately \$1 million to eliminate, and he should look around for other avenues and other ways and means of lessening or eliminating that gap, but should avoid as much as possible increasing taxation on the people of this Island at this moment. They are recovering from a period of stagnation. We have had five years of a gross national product of \$100 million; it is now beginning to roll, and this is not the time to tax people.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it would not be expected of me to make any speech for the simple reason that in a Shadow Cabinet you should always have your Minister of Finance, and how refreshing it has been, I believe, to hon. members to listen to the hon. junior member for Christ Church replying to the Hon. Premier without any rancour or ill feeling. I have purposely decided that this should be so because on the first occasion when a budget was brought in by this present Government—not that I apologise for it—and I did not stand from this side of the Table and rant and tear and possibly abuse everybody over there, those critics

who thought I should have done that said I was a member of the present Government, I believe hon. members have listened with patience to the speech of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, who as our Minister of Finance replied in my opinion on every aspect raised by the Hon. Premier. It is very refreshing, especially when so often from that side of the Table in those days we were referred to as businessmen in Barbados who knew how to buy salt fish at one penny a pound and sell it at three cents. One thing which is refreshing is that we knew how to make money; but that is not a reflection on those who are making money today, but those who made money to educate those who made the criticism then.

I am not saying any more on this because, as I said, the hon. junior member for Christ Church has at our request as Shadow Cabinet Minister of Finance made his reply to the Premier's Speech. This is a departure from what we have been accustomed to, and I have been told by young intellectuals that this seems to be the right procedure. We have here before us the Appropriation Bill which comes in together with the Estimates, and then we shall hear the budgetary proposals later, on what my colleague claimed will be bridging the gap. The Hon. Premier thinks there will be no gap, but I say that there is no necessity for a bridge unless there is some sort of opening. I think the suggestions—I would not say warnings—made by the hon. junior member for Christ Church are sufficient, if they do not fall on deaf ears, to let the Government see that there is every willingness on the part of business people—and we speak for the business people because they are going to live here—to co-operate so that we can see what the financial position in Barbados will be.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we gave the undertaking to the Hon. Leader of the House that we would come today prepared to proceed with the Estimates in detail, and therefore I have no further comments to make upon this other than to say that we are very happy at the present moment that the gap which we see is no greater than it is, and we hope during the course of this Session, as the Premier has said, that it will not necessarily mean he will have to balance the budget by actual taxation, since there are other means by which it can be done. This at least is some consolation to us, although he has not promised that he will not tax. It is the duty of the Conservative Opposition wherever possible, Mr. Speaker, to give every opposition to taxation which we feel would be for the purpose of squandering or unnecessary spending, but because we are of the Conservative Opposition, it does not necessarily mean that it is our duty to oppose something which is for the benefit and social amelioration of the country.

I am sure, Sir, that if you take the speech of the hon. junior member for Christ Church side by side with that of the Hon. Premier, you will see that we are as interested in the progress of the people and of this Island generally as anyone else, but we are cautious and our approach may be different from that of the Government under the circumstances. We have given the undertaking to go ahead this evening with the Estimates in detail when other members of the Opposition and others will speak.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I have made a careful study of the Estimates for 1963-64, and I have had an opportunity to discuss them with some of the members of my Party, especially the members who have had to do with Government policy in matters of finance. On the surface, and looking at the crude figures set out in the Estimates, the estimated revenue moves to \$29,280,443. Again, Sir, the estimated expenditure is at \$30,221,087, and there is a deficit of \$940,644, just under \$1 million. 5.20 p.m.

I do not think this should cause any anxiety to the Government because it is clear by all that has happened during the last three or five years that a \$1 million deficit with almost \$30 million as revenue is little to worry about.

As regards the question of the contribution from revenue and the estimated cost of projects, that is where we want to be happy and what we have to be afraid about. You will remember the Estimates of last year and what they set out to do. This year's can only be regarded as a revote

because none of the schemes that were promised during the last year have been completed, and I am not afraid to say that some have not even begun.

What is another thing to cause us anxiety is the lack of inspiration as is found in the Estimates which are now before us and the dire need for enthusiasm by your failing to give the country, particularly as regards your Capital Estimates, a hope for the future. May be I am thinking of the everlasting spring of hope, but even the Hon. Premier's speech on this occasion lacks the ring of feeling and sentiment which are so necessary and vital to inspiration, especially as regards the Estimates of the country.

We have a lot of reasons to worry about this. There is the situation of the sharp decline in trade last year of which much has been said by the hon. junior member for Christ Church. Indeed, we have heard about bankruptcy during the past year and we know exactly what has happened. It is a question of throwing money out of circulation. It is for that very reason that a Socialist Government will come into power in England. If we take a small look at what is taking place by way of unemployment, it is rather an indication of the sharp decline in the circulation of money. When you are speaking of increasing your revenue over last year, it is clear where this money is coming from. It is coming by way of taxation: but the distribution which we have always dreamt of when we thought of the vast number of working class people of this country, that is not clear to us.

I am no alarmist; I want to be quite sane because it is vital to the country. We knew that Federation would cost the Island more money; we know that it is going to cost the country, not one dollar more, but a lot more dollars. Independence always costs money and shortly we will be asked to pay that sum. It leaves one wondering as to what would be the fate of this little country.

Much as you want to be careful in anything which you want to say on the Estimates, it is more or less what you have to bear. You can see the spiral change in the cost of living and the lack of adequate distribution of the earnings of the working classes. The indication in the last two or three months is frightening. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that by now you are putting two or three things together in your mind.

We are gratified that the Hon. Premier did take time off to tell us that he had given something more to that organisation of Family Planning. Mr. Speaker, you will remember the Premier's attitude on the last occasion, but because of what he has done this time, the country is to some extent happy to learn that some of the taxpayers' money has been used in that direction. I have no doubt that the recent figures of unemployment have shocked the Hon. Premier into realising that in another 25 years we would be doubling our population, and that means that we would be taking one-third of the productive land out of production. Can you start to think what it would be if you have to double the number of your houses, to say nothing of your administrative buildings and the buildings which you will need for school accommodation? Can you imagine the amount of land which will be forced out of productivity?

Then, Mr. Speaker, if we are really in danger, is it reasonable to believe that something will happen and something will turn up? What are we doing about it? Is anything reflected in the Estimates before us to tell us that there is hope? No matter how well you think about it, you can see that it lacks the enthusiasm and inspiration which is so necessary to send the people forward when they are facing a danger. I am shocked to think that I will have to leave my children to face this danger, and I wonder what they will be able to do about it. Can we hold body and soul together when our present products wake up one day to find that one-third more of this land would be taken up by shops, schools, roads and so on, to say nothing of dwelling houses? How are we going to support such a population when no indication is given in the present Estimates that the Government is aware of these things other than the increase in funds granted on this occasion to Family Planning? I can think now of the cruel things handed to us because I was one of those who had to spearhead that organisation. I remember what some

Barbadians at the University College of the West Indies had to say when we attended a conference there, and we had to decide to do something to keep the population of this island down. Now the Premier can see the sharp change and what is going to be the ultimate outcome. I believe this increase in the fund voted to Family Planning will bring a lot of comfort to the people of this Island.
5.30 p.m.

I remember the Premier, Sir Grantley Adams, being accused of madness; but, fortunately for us, if he had not been here I do not know what the country would do today. All of these things have come to pass; you may say whatever you like. It is true because you were living close to the Party when the Harbour was being constructed and you could see what it would mean to the country and its immediate needs. If you were to do without the Harbour today and remove it as a facility and go back to what we were before, I do not know if we would be in a position to keep our population together. There is a lack of economic planning; we have, to some extent, forced down the goodwill in our country and I am always thinking of what is happening in the United States of America. The National Debt is held by Americans who are living in the United States of America; they are United States Savings Bonds. Within recent months, in order to cover our immediate needs for finance, we were forced to draw \$1 million in two half-million dollar portions out of the country's earnings and you must earn before you can attempt to save. When you take one million dollars out of the economy of a little country like this, you are stagnating the economic growth.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I do not know what kind of nonsense the hon. member is talking now. This Government did not take any money out of this country. It is a deliberate part of my policy, and that is the Government's policy, that we should discourage the sending of capital to be invested abroad. This country should not be a capital-exporting country, and we have gone through a programme of raising money locally as well as raising it abroad whether we need it or not. When we raise half a million dollars, it is not that we raise it because we are half a million dollars in debt at the particular time. We have a Capital Works Programme of \$13 million, and a substantial portion of that will have to be raised by way of loans. If you have anything happening in the country, you do not raise money and have it invested in Brisbane, South Africa and all over the place. The last Government were not raising any local loans and they were sending the money outside. The hon. member is now posing his economic theories, but he should stick to milk, water and biscuits.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, you see the type of sarcasm.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am giving him free, gratuitous advice.

Mr. MILLER: It is not necessary for the Hon. Minister to use that type of sarcasm; it will more or less militate against him. You can say what you like. Six months after you imposed a tax on beer.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed with the debate on the second reading of the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad if that would apply in the case of the unnecessary sarcasm of the Premier. Do not let us have the impression that you are taking sides, Mr. Speaker, and I apologise. I was saying that it was unnecessary for the Hon. Premier to make the sort of vulgarisms to which we are being treated. Parliaments are respected all over the world as an example. You have the type of decorum and indignity to which we are exposed here from day to day. Is he the Lord High Pope or Einstein or the Economist who almost destroyed a five million dollar operation on the production of beer and called it a miscalculation?

Mr. SPEAKER: Again, I repeat, let us continue with the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. MILLER: Will you allow me to speak as I like? I want to respect you without change of thought and with

unswerving respect, but Your Honour must permit me to be free in my approach.

Mr. SPEAKER: In so far as the Standing Orders can permit.

Mr. MILLER: You can apply the Standing Orders, but I have a right to address this Chamber and you must not let the Chamber feel that you are destroying a democratic right. As far as the Standing Orders are concerned, I have had to do with them. What does the Premier indicate when he talks about money going out of the island? There was a lot of money collected by Insurance Companies going to Trinidad; do not let us fool the people of this colony that you can stop money from going to Trinidad for development there. We raised the rate of interest.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. The Hon. Leader of his party did the same thing in London over the B.B.C. in the statement which he made. In December, 1962, we raised a loan of nearly \$7 million in five minutes. We came here, much to their disappointment, and raised \$500,000 in two successive months, and now the hon. member is saying that his party raised the interest rate so as to prevent money from going to Trinidad. They raised the rate of interest so as to allow Olds Discount to destroy the economy of Barbados and take the money out of Barbados. Olds Discount inflicted the hire-purchase situation; they were friendly with the past Government and far from stopping the money from going to Trinidad you had Barbadians sending money to Trinidad to come back to this country to inflict the credit market. However, Olds Discount has ceased operations.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I take it that you are a stickler for the Standing Orders and for members speaking on points of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was a point of order. It is a fact that certain hon. members make their points of order more concisely than other hon. members.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, you hear a statement about Olds Discount and what could be more disgraceful and dishonest than a man of his standing in the community? He fought about the interest rate and I will get the debates.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement. I said that the rate of interest was raised for one specific purpose; that is to allow Olds Discount to ruin the economy of this country.
5.40 p.m.

Now the hon. member says what could be more disgraceful and dishonest. I am asking you, Sir, to ask him to withdraw those words first, and then I will deal with more facts; the more he provokes me, the more I am going to hurt.

Mr. MILLER: Well, I am in the mood today, and I am in a bad mood too. If you can hurt in here today, the Speaker can go home because we will roll up on the floor in here.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member will be rolling by himself, but he will withdraw the remarks he made. I am therefore asking you to ask him to withdraw the remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: I trust I will not have to remind hon. members that no two hon. members may at any time be on their feet together, and when the Speaker rises, both hon. members must sit down.

Now the Hon. and Learned Premier is asking that certain words be withdrawn. Will the hon. member please restate those words?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. junior member for St. George said what could be more disgraceful and dishonest about some remark that I made; therefore he is accusing me of dishonesty, and I am asking you, to ask him to withdraw those remarks. I could say a lot more, but I do not want to aggravate this situation any more, if you will do as I request.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier has taken exception to certain words used by the hon. junior member for St. George. Those words as I understand them are as follows:- "what could be more disgraceful and dishonest than remarks of the Premier." Exception has been taken to the words "disgraceful and dishonest" in reference to the remarks emanating from an hon. member of this House, and I would ask the hon. junior member for St. George on reflection to withdraw those words in relation to the said remarks, and the implication that arises apropos of such an expression as "disgraceful and dishonest", in reference to the remarks of any hon. member of this Chamber.

Now Standing Order No. 26 (7) lays it down that no member shall impute improper motives to another member, and it is my view that it is an imputation by one member on another member of improper motives when it is stated of remarks of that hon. member that they are disgraceful and dishonest. I would accordingly ask the hon. junior member for St. George to withdraw those remarks, and after which, to proceed with his remarks on the Budget.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I have anything to withdraw. Nothing that I have said is an insinuation of his dishonesty. You copied it from him, but I must ask you to refer to the Reporters. I am free to say that it could be disgraceful and dishonest to do this or to say that, but that does not impute dishonesty to the hon. member. You took it *verbatim* from the Premier himself, but the Reporter is there and you can probably ask the Clerk to have it read. Nothing I said insinuated dishonesty, and it would be dishonest for you to accuse me of accusing the Hon. Premier of dishonesty.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the other hand, the hon. member would be taking it one step further if he is saying it would be dishonest of the Chair.....

Mr. MILLER: No, Sir. I could never think that. I do not think there is anyone alive who would think that of you. I am simply saying that to say that the Premier would be dishonest is an entirely different thing from saying that it would be disgraceful and dishonest of him.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have never heard of anyone making a reply to the Speaker when the Speaker has made a ruling. That is what I find difficult to entertain and understand as a member of this House, because he is laying a condition upon his withdrawal of the remark and went further and repeated exactly the same remark about the Chair, and said the Chair would be dishonest if you ask him to withdraw. The Chair has already asked him to withdraw; therefore he is calling the Chair dishonest.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am perfectly aware of that.

Mr. MILLER: I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that is what I said either.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is one thing which the hon. junior member for St. George said, and that is that I was taking the words from the hon. member who was objecting thereto, and he was implying that I was not taking them from what might possibly be regarded as an independent source. Before I quoted the words to the House, I checked with the Clerks at the Table, and I was advised by them that the words were "disgraceful and dishonest", in reference to the remarks of the hon. member. I will put this to the hon. junior member for St. George. At all costs, I presume we want to get on with this debate. Is the hon. junior member for St. George assuring this House that he either did not intend or did not realise that he used any such remarks in relation to any hon. member of this House, as being disgraceful and dishonest in his remarks? Is the hon. junior member for St. George saying that?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, you are now coming to the point. There is nothing I said that would insinuate that the Premier was disgraceful and dishonest.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not merely that. Is there anything that the hon. member is conscious of having said which would insinuate dishonesty?

Mr. MILLER: Oh no, Sir, I am not aware of the accusation of disgracefulness or dishonesty in any remarks to the Premier. I am more than satisfied that that is the case. As we continue the debate, Sir, the question of saying.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I just want to get the record straight. I got up and objected to certain words and asked the hon. member to withdraw them. I have heard no withdrawal of those words. I have merely heard a palliative extended by the hon. member, and I used the word "honourable" in its very loose sense; it is purely in its parliamentary sense and no other sense at all. The member says that he is not aware, but the point is this, Sir: whether he is aware or whether he is unaware — and I know that he speaks in his unconscious state most of the time — the point is that the words were used, and whether he was conscious of having used them, Sir, is immaterial. The point is that the words are on the record, and before I leave here this evening, I want to hear that the hon. member, whether he used the words consciously or unconsciously, has withdrawn those words — not what he intended to say, but what he actually said; otherwise this debate can end right now, and we would not vote any money for next year. I will devise other means of getting money to pay the Civil Service, but we will not be concluding this debate here tonight. It is my motion and I can withdraw the whole motion on the Estimates and stop the debate now.

Mr. SPEAKER: In as much as the hon. junior member for St. George has denied having used those words, I am sending for confirmation by the Reporter who took the words down. (A Pause)
5.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have now received from the Official Reporter his verbatim copy of the passage spoken by the hon. junior member for St. George. I quote: "You hear a statement about Olds Discount, and what could be more disgraceful and dishonest than a man of his standing in the community? He fought about the interest rate and I will get the debates."

If I may repeat the first part of this sentence, it is, "You hear a statement about Olds Discount, and what could be more disgraceful and dishonest than a man of his standing in the community?"

I draw your attention also to Standing Order No. 26 (5), which says: and I quote: "It shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about Members of the House."

In view of what I have read, which is the Official Report of what the hon. junior member for St. George has said, and there can be no question in my view, right or wrong, that that constitutes offensive and insulting language about a member of the House. I am asking the hon. junior member for St. George to withdraw that remark and that expression to which exception, in my view, rightly has been taken having regard to the Standing Order of this House, apart from any other consideration.

Mr. MILLER: If Your Honour feels so - -

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member withdrawing those words?

Mr. MILLER: Give me a chance. You are satisfied that those words constitute a breach of the Rules of this House. I want to withdraw them and I do withdraw them now.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. George has withdrawn that remark.

Mr. MILLER: If the Report is correct, then I am sorry and I withdraw the remark.
6.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I assume that that is correct, and if it did come out of my lips, I withdraw it. However, it takes a lot to bear with the Premier all the time and sometimes you go to the very limit. If that is the sort of material we are made of, it takes many types to make a world. It is not correct

to believe that the last Government brought Olds Discount to Barbados and I do not know what I consider as decent in an attempt to reply to an insinuation by any hon. member. It was necessary to increase the interest rate because it was tied to the bank rate of London and we made it possible for investors to come from outside. We knew nothing about Olds Discount; it meant nothing to the old Government. We wanted C.D.C. and that is tied to the Bank of England; if we had to raise the money locally, the rate of interest was tied by Statute at 6% and we had to increase the interest rate overseas if we had to benefit from Colonial Development and Welfare for the development of this country. To say that that is to impute something unkind, the more often it is repeated, the more it causes the country really to examine us. Only time will do these things.

The hon. member is to some extent unhappy about this, but we do not want to be lacking in enthusiasm and inspiration and the progress which is so vital when you come once a year to decide what the finances of the colony will be. There is no operation in this country which is not pressed for an overdraft beyond its collateral. It is pressure in this community at the moment.

At this stage, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have heard all the glorious things of the last Capital Estimates; you have heard all about the East Coast Road and about the Americans coming here. You have heard what would be finished in a couple of months. We were forced to pass an Act for the purpose of making a Treasury loan, and that is something which has never happened in the three hundred years of the existence of this country.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the hon. member makes statements like that about people pressing the Banks for an overdraft, it is only people with useless equipment who would press a Bank for an overdraft. And when the hon. member accuses the Government in this way, I would ask the hon. member to stipulate which loan he is referring to. I would like him to stipulate which loan the Government had refused and to what Treasury loan he is referring.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is the sort of sarcasm which we hear in here, in almost every sentence.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. To say that the hon. member does not understand something is a different thing from saying that he is dishonest.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you cannot stop some people from having fits; it is only a matter of time. The people of this country have a way of deciding through the ballot box what they want. I am not asking the hon. member to withdraw what he has said. The loan for the Deep Water Harbour was arranged before the last Election, and it was settled in London in half a minute. Years ago it was agreed that we would come to you for a loan and why was it necessary to pass a new Act in order to borrow money at an interest rate? Why was it necessary to get that provision? When was it necessary to get a \$1 million in less than six months or a year? It is true that money has been pouring into Trinidad when it could have been used for things here, but we provided against that when we amended the Interest Rate. The Labour Government in Great Britain, at the end of the last War when it came into power, was in a position to stop the flood of funds from going across the Channel and into the Continent. That was no excuse. The amount of money from the Capital Estimates last year was not used because it was not available. We have now got to underwrite...

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. The hon. member is now acting like Hitler. What money lapsed in the Capital Estimates last year because we could not get the money? Instead of the hon. member making statements like the former Minister — well, I do not think that in view of the irrelevancy of the debate the hon. member should be allowed to go unchallenged. I have asked the hon. member a question; he has declined to answer my previous question and that is patent to everybody sitting around this Table. I would like to know what money has lapsed in the Capital

Estimates because we did not have the money to carry out the works. If he can answer that, I will have an investigation made and I would recommend that the people involved be dismissed.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, is that a speech?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not allowing the hon. member to get up here and talk about matters of finance which he does not understand. The members of the last Government did not understand anything about finance and that is why the economy of the country remained static for five years. We have increased the economic growth by five per cent, and now we hear what the hon. member is saying. 6.10 p.m.

What moneys could we not raise? In one breath he says we took \$1 million out of the poor starving community and managed to raise \$7 million in London, all within the space of six weeks, and then say we could not get money for Capital Estimates. I would like to see the Government that could spend \$7 million in six weeks.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am accustomed to these distortions. You had all the projects in the Capital Estimates, but you have not laid the foundation stone to the first grog shop in Barbados. You have not developed a public urinal, yet you are asking me that question now. All you have done is to complete the works we had left unfinished, but you are asking me this stupidity and talking about the Prime Minister of the West Indies. The country is crying night and day for his return. You are laughing at this, but this country needs Sir Grantley Adams. You promised to call an election in three years, but I wonder what the excuse is going to be. Call an election whenever you like, but the gentleman you are talking about, Sir Grantley Adams, must rescue what is left of this country of ours, though sometimes it does not matter who is in power. All of you get there like a pack of hyenas laughing and smiling, because you know the country is bending with woe under a year of your regime, with hunger and starvation rampant — and you know it — and unemployment such as we have never seen it. Answer this to the people in the streets.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Again on a point of order, the hon. member is talking about unemployment. What are the unemployment figures now, compared with unemployment in December 1961? When the hon. member can answer that question, then he is entitled to make statements like that about the country crying for the Federal Prime Minister. We will be crying to him for another fifty years, because it will take us fifty years to recover our pride in the comity of nations, but not for him to get back.

Mr. MILLER: The result of their laughs will be when they add up the figures in the ballot box.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: At this stage, I will hear no more about the Federal Prime Minister.

Mr. MILLER: Thank you, Sir. Oh, what a tangle web we weave, when we practise to deceive. Little things amuse little minds: and in the same way, little things affect little minds. Would you like me like a full grown idiot to sit down and listen to him like a loyal member? He will have to interrupt me every minute.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, the hon. member can only sit down in the same state in which he rose; so if he chooses to call himself a full grown idiot, it is a matter for him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the hon. junior member for St. George speaks, I am making it clear now that I am not listening to any more personal attacks at all. Members must stick to the Resolution.

Mr. MILLER: That is so kind of you, Sir. Then I need not fear any more unnecessary interruptions. I thank you, Sir. I know there is some anxiety as to what the community will think about this, and I wish it were possible that I could save them of their misery in not having to refer to it. We have had all sorts of things and promises, and what grieves

me is to think that you could hope to come and push this down the throats of people with searching and enquiring minds if they want to carry the country forward. It does not matter who is in power; my country comes first; and let me kneel at the feet of the great American whether she is right or wrong. That is how I feel about it; and it is not because the D.L.P. is in power, it is not because we have lost the election that matters at the moment; that will be settled at election time. It is what is happening today that we want to worry about. Go and see some of the figures and see what is taking place in the country. A number of people have applied for accommodation at the Almshouses with the sharp fall in the last four years, when we could take a decision to close the one in St. Joseph.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, a business in Roebuck Street turning over \$500,000 was forced out of business for a debt of \$86,000. What does that speak of? What is that telling industrialists overseas? Do you understand what is taking place in this financial and economic wind? Why was Britain forced out of the Common Market by the great DeGualle? It was because they knew that all that England and Britain could do was to pauperise and reduce that great Continent to cutters of wood and carriers of water. I must always be grateful to Britain because it is my country and I would have to fight to preserve it. When the French Premier decided against Britain's entry, he was concerned about saving Europe from a generation of British conservatism. Are we not again in the throes of that ugly monster that would continue to loom its head? Can you not see the tentacles squeezing the last drop of blood in a mercenary method? They are not selling any of the plantations; they have not sold one since thy Kingdom come, only the one in Trents belonging to a forlorn group in Panama. You saw what happened to James Tudor, and soon you will see who will go into King's place and operate it. Two or three months ago it happened to little Sainsbury, and the hon. member knows the deals that will come. We know there is a Committee that goes in and counts the cash in the cash box in that monstrous business in Baxters Road known as the Shamrock. All this is because you have failed to inspire the country in its normal and natural growth and development, but have left it to the crows of finance who have always throughout the Century, oh heavens, done it wherever it was left possible. The country is thinking.

The hon. member speaks about milk and water. Is that referring to me? Can you allow this debate to go on referring to me? Is he worried about it? Is he unhappy about this? I am not. I have the fortitude of my own courage and the strength of my beliefs to lean on. Is he unhappy about the decision? I am not. You cannot stop me from going forward, and right is a might that will defy even the Premier. The Treaty of Milk in the Tobago Cays! Can we still conceive of a Socialist sharing a state room with a Conservative Capitalist and his economic adviser and with the captain paying tribute and a word of gratitude to his old boss? Is he worried about that?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is making statements about some Treaty in the Tobago Cays. As a matter of public and general knowledge, after Christmas I went to the Tobago Cays. Is the hon. member insinuating that the Minister of Communications and I made some Treaty with some capitalist in the Tobago Cays? Because I would ask the hon. member to say "yes" or "no" right now. If he is, I am going to ask him to withdraw that as well.

Mr. MILLER: You cannot ask me to withdraw that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I can ask you to withdraw. 6.20 p.m.

I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to Rule 26 (5) where it is stated: "It shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about Members of the House."

That remark I have found both offensive and insulting. When I come in here next Tuesday, I will be reading the Statement about the hon. member and his machinations from documents. But I am not going to sit down here and let any hon. member make remarks about me or any hon. mem-

bers of the Government. I am asking the hon. member to withdraw those remarks and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not want any more debate on it either.

Mr. MILLER: As I was saying, Sir, I did not know that was on his mind or that he is unhappy.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not asked him anything and if you find yourself incapable of dealing with this matter, call the Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If both hon. members would sit.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: One hon. member is on his feet and that is I.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. George made a statement to which the Hon. Premier asked: what he meant: if he meant this thing or if he meant that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I rise on a point of order. I did not ask: if this thing was meant or if it is that thing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I heard what you asked. I am not going to argue with you or any other hon. member of this House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am asking you to send for the Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You will have to send for him.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Well, it is very simple. Either you are going to deal with this or you are not going to deal with this. I do not think that it is to the credit of this country if I take the law in my hands. You also know that previously outside I had to deal with the hon. member my own way.

Mr. MILLER: Yes, Sir. We are coming to a sorry pass; a spectacle which has never been seen or heard of. Look what the decorum of this place is coming to! Look at the many things which lead up to threatening this House! I am wondering if there is any occasion where man's pride comes to his rescue. This is something which is not necessary.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this debate on the Estimates probably will be shorter than it has ever been. There is no doubt about that. You can see the lack of life and spirit and enthusiasm all through these Estimates and what is usually associated in debating this. When I close my remarks I am more than sure that this is going to take place.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, as you will recall.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What has the hon. member risen on?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. As you will recall, the Premier objected to the remarks made by the hon. junior member for St. George and the hon. member is aware that under Standing Order 26, No. 7, no member shall impute improper motives to another member. There is no doubt about it in our minds that those remarks by the hon. junior member for St. George did impute dishonest and improper motives.

The Hon. Premier has asked that the words be withdrawn, and we take it that the Chair intends to perform its function as it is entitled to do under the Standing Orders of this House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am dealing with what I heard. I heard the Hon. Premier on a point of order ask the hon. junior member for St. George what he means: if he means this thing or that thing.

Mr. MILLER: What right has the hon. member to join in the debate? He should know the sequence. He is not a young parliamentarian. As an old parliamentarian, he would know what is the case when you join a debate as a third party and say even one sentence. If you want me to give you the Rule, I can.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. What the hon. member is talking of refers to the old Rules of the House. When, before another member intervenes, the Speaker must order that the words be taken down. But that does not obtain now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will get the exact report of what was said.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Nobody has asked for the exact report.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will get the exact report on the issue.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Wait and listen to what we say.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes; but not to what you say.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: You do not understand what I object to. I object to the statement of the hon. junior member for St. George. Your next move is to call on the hon. member to withdraw the statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting now stands adjourned for fifteen minutes.
6.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: His Honour the Deputy Speaker has intimated to me that, during my temporary and brief absence, when he took the Chair of the House — and as is well known under Standing Order 3(2) the Deputy Speaker is invested with all the powers of the Speaker until the next sitting of the House — he, on account of a certain incident, by virtue of Standing Order 36(8) suspended the sitting of the House for a time fixed by him. His Honour the Deputy Speaker has pointed out that exception was taken by the Hon. Premier to certain remarks made by the hon. junior member for St. George and that he had ordered a verbatim transcript of the words in question, which is what I understand, I have before me now. I will read from the official transcript. I quote:

"The Treaty of Milk in the Tobago Cays! Can we still conceive of a Socialist sharing a state room with a Conservative Capitalist and his economic adviser and with the captain paying tribute and a word of gratitude to his old boss? Is he worried about that?"

I am instructed that exception has been taken to those words. In the transcript which I have before me I have not received any sentence prior to the one beginning "The Treaty of Milk in the Tobago Cays," but I note the last sentence is "Is he worried about that?" Is the hon. junior member for St. George referring, when he says "Is he worried about that?", to any hon. member of this House?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to reply? It is more a question of conjecture of what may appear to the Chair, and that can be regarded as interesting. The obvious answer to that question is "No". When I use the word "he", there is no reason for the Hon. Premier to feel that I am referring to him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that the hon. member shares the desire of us all to continue with the debate on the Appropriation Bill; I am asking the hon. member if he is referring to any member of this House when he used the words: "Is he worried about that?"

Mr. MILLER: I could have been referring in my subconscious speaking to the Deputy Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member saying unequivocally, unconditionally and unreservedly that, when he used the words "Is he worried about that", and the preceding sentence: "Can we still conceive of a Socialist sharing a state room with a Conservative Capitalist and his economic adviser and with the captain paying tribute and a word of gratitude to his old boss?" — Is he saying that he was not

referring to any hon. member of this House, of whom he knows that it is out of order to use offensive and unbecoming language?

Mr. MILLER: When I said that, could you conceive or imagine that it is possible.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the transcript of the debate is not a complete extract from what took place. That is the first thing which I want to draw to Your Honour's attention. The hon. member was referring to two members on this side of the House specifically; and why I took exception to his remarks was that the Deputy Speaker who was in the Chair made no attempt to get the hon. member to make any direct statement, but allowed him to continue the debate. I drew it to the attention of the Deputy Speaker that exception had been made to the remarks. I went on to say that the hon. member could only be referring to the Minister of Communications and myself because we were the only people who went to the Tobago Cays, as a matter of public and general knowledge. At the time the hon. member was referring to milk, about which he had put in an application to the Government for pioneer status.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have not yet finished my point of order and the hon. member should take his seat.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, you must rule or surrender the authority of the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just before the Hon. Premier continues, I am directing that the Clerk secure the Official record of the sentence immediately preceding where the Official Reporter started his transcript.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of public and general knowledge that at the prompting of friends the newspapers have been making much of this every day, that the Government has neglected a local industry, because the hon. member has put in an application to the Government for processing milk, which application I have on my desk now and which he will not get granted as long as I am a member of this Government. On Friday I will lay an official statement that this Government is entering an agreement with Northern Dairies Limited in the United Kingdom, and we will make shares available to the public by establishing a milk processing plant which would be in direct competition with any conglomeration of machinery which the hon. member may have at the time. He is referring to the Hon. Minister of Communications as 'the captain', and then inserting that the reason why he had not been granted pioneer status for the operations he is carrying on down there is because some clandestine pact has been made in the Tobago Cays. It is not in the Standing Order to which Your Honour has referred, but, as the Hon. Leader of the House has pointed out, it comes under Standing Order 26(7) which says: "No member shall impute improper motives to another member".

The hon. member is saying that because he and his associates, whoever they may be, have not been given a reply by the Ministry of Trade, two other Ministers of this Government had improper motives for refraining from giving him something to do which he has had no previous experience of doing. I will be making a statement in here on Friday much to his embarrassment - and it is such an embarrassing thing that a member should be included in this matter. However, I will be laying a statement on Friday concerning all the applications which have been made, and who has made applications while he was a Minister and I will be disclosing that the hon. member was awarded a tender two days after the tenders were closed and the other tenders were not opened.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may not anticipate the contents of a Statement which he intends to lay.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not anticipating anything. At least five Civil Servants should have gone home on that.

Mr. MILLER: I must refute the statement which has just been made. Nothing which the Premier has said in his last statement is even related to the truth.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member.....

Mr. MILLER: If you rule that I should withdraw that, then I will withdraw it. I have withdrawn three or four times.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am still looking forward to hearing more of the debate on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. MILLER: Little things amuse little minds, and the measure of a man's capacity to think is always accepted in the same manner.
7.05 p.m.

The hon. member has been up fifty-two times. Why would you want to curtail the debate from the Labour Party's point of view? I said nothing in here to show I was worrying about milk, but the hon. member got up and talked about milk and water and the things he said on public platforms. He cast the first offence and did it a second and third time, but in reply I would battle it out with you like an old warrior or an old boar cat in a bag.

Mr. SPEAKER: No one is going to battle out anything with me here. He is bound to lose, whoever he is.

Mr. MILLER: I am happy you have adopted that attitude, and I want to apologise for the incident which occurred prior to the adjournment of the House by the Deputy Speaker. I have been a member of this Parliament for fourteen years, and I believe it is easily fourteen or fifteen years before that I used to come to this Chamber and listen to debates. I think the decorum, honour and dignity of this ancient and august Chamber has suddenly been reduced and thrown to the dogs.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is why, if I may interpose, I look forward to the assistance and co-operation of the hon. junior member for St. George to enable me to maintain the dignity and decorum which he, like myself, so dearly loves.

Mr. MILLER: History is constantly in search of the records, and looking back on thirty years of the debates of this House, I have seen fiery debates by members of this House, but they never involved the Speaker. When any man like the Premier reduced the dignity of the Chair, what do you expect the other members of the House to do?

Mr. SPEAKER: If it is a bad example, never follow it.

Mr. MILLER: If I might remind you, Sir, you came to the House and found the Mace on the stand, but the House was in suspension.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Sitting was suspended which was perfectly in conformity with the Standing Orders.

Mr. MILLER: When the Mace was removed the Clerk was ordered to replace it, and if I may refer to Standing Order 36(8) on page 34, it says "in the case of grave disorder arising in the House, the Speaker may, if he thinks it necessary to do so, adjourn the House without question or suspend the Sitting for a time to be fixed by him."

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that matter has been settled now, because we have resumed.

Mr. MILLER: That is true, Mr. Speaker, but I can refer to an incident which occurred in the Chamber one hundred years ago, and do not have me feel that you are denying me the right.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would deny the hon. member no right, and his instant right is to talk for as long as he likes on the matter of the Appropriation Bill, and no one can stop him.

Mr. MILLER: But, Mr. Speaker, we were toying with the idea of whether it was right or wrong to deny me the opportunity of expressing my feeling, and there was an attempt to curtail the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will read in Hansard what took place in my absence.

Mr. MILLER: I hope you do not want to have me feel that you want to stifle a democratic opportunity.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. junior member for St. George proceed to discuss the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. MILLER: I believe it is less than two years when we enjoyed this condition and faced the electorate which gave me the same right in this Parliament. I am driven to believe that, because you are speaking, I should not respect you in your position in the Chair; and least of all, Mr. Speaker.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I think Your Honour should make it clear that there is nothing unparliamentary in the Mace remaining on the Table during a suspension of the Sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Deputy Speaker reported to me that under Standing Order 36(8) he had suspended the Sitting for a time which he fixed, and it was proper for the Mace to remain where it is now; but I would again ask the hon. junior member for St. George to proceed with the discussion on the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. MILLER: I am persuaded to accept a change in the procedure. However, with your very kind and sweet permission, I would like to be permitted to resume discussion on the Estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been exhorting the hon. member to do that for some time.

Mr. MILLER: How very kind indeed if we are permitted to go on without interruption! These Estimates leave the country with a quarter of a million souls little or no hope, if we are anticipating a budget expenditure in five years, or a Five Year Plan to come three years later, but we were provided by the Minister of Finance with a housekeeping budget. Lacking as it is in inspiration, and lacking even in thought, with a quarter of a million souls looking for what is going to take place by a decision of this House, I must be afraid, worried and equally as anxious as you are of what is likely to come to pass. We know that hunger and unemployment are rampant in this country as never seen prior to 1938. I hope anything I say would not be regarded as an insult, and out of defence and in warm appreciation I would withdraw to avoid interruption.

Mr. Speaker, there is reason for concern. Too many people in small business have been forced out of business. You have heard demonstrations of things which do not come into the Estimates, and to say these things about an application and what not is not true. I need not go back to this because the country is now aware of what is happening, and it has a way of protecting itself; it is usually a matter of time. We were promised an election in another year or two, but I wonder if it would be necessary to change the life of this Parliament to ten years in order for some one to remain in power and destroy the fundamental and central democratic rights prescribed for only three hundred years for the freedom we now accept and enjoy. To say the truth on the Estimates is to say the very least. I know you feel as I do to be interrupted every other minute or fifteen times in the course of half an hour's debate and to be asked to withdraw this, or to say that something was regarded as an insult and an insinuation, and all the other intriguing methods made to interrupt debate when we sit and listen to him, although invariably he says exactly nothing even if he takes four hours.

What I am unhappy about, Mr. Speaker, is that this holds no inspiration to the people we want to join a Federation. If we hope to blunder to success or hope that by acci-

dent something will happen after making a million mistakes, then, Sir, I do not know what there is left to think. To run a budget like this where you pay the Civil Service and have the normal recurring expenditure and a deficit of nearly a million dollars involves no reason for fear with a Government which understands about finance and with a measure of goodwill in the money markets of the world. Everybody borrows at some time, but what we have learnt through grim experience is that all savings must first come from financing, and if you are unable to harness the man power resources of your country and convert it into dollars and cents, then you have failed. It is clear, Sir, that the example is on the wall and maybe in the cruel shade of red that would daub the path of any enquiring soul.
7.15 p.m.

There are reasons to be unhappy and genuine reasons to be afraid. Should we be restricted with fear. Even if the one who is in charge, the Minister of Finance, understood, all would need to understand to make the country better. Why should we be harnessed and saddled with fear? We have a lot of reasons for worry and there is no point in intimidating somebody from telling the truth. Sir, we are in danger. The country is in danger and you know this, too. There is not a dangling head.

Mr. Speaker, you have heard that laughter from over that side. I know that you probably have no flair about matters financial. They can afford to laugh. They are like the sadists. You know what a sadist is in his sadistic fury. You are in the hands of death. Imagine the icy hands of death! Imagine your watching a nation of a quarter million perish at your hands and you can laugh with that silly sadistic laughter! I have six children; I am concerned about this and your becoming the proverbial ostrich and pushing your head in the sand. The Hon. Minister of Trade is laughing.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is entirely permissible, according to the Standing Orders.

Mr. MILLER: The Hon. Minister of Trade is laughing at the misery which he has inflicted on approximately a quarter million souls. Today we are faced with this grim and ugly reality. The Hon. Minister of Trade should be worried like everybody else, but this means nothing to him. We must be concerned about this. The Estimates as they stand speak of another year of misery and of torment to the underprivileged of our community; and when you are conscious of your responsibility and when you bear in mind that you were sent to this Parliament to do all that you can for the helpless and defenceless people of the community and it is left to you to bring them out of the mire and then you slip to the river of no return, think of the bitterness of all of this. We need probably to be advised by someone; probably by an expert if we wish to succeed. What do you find? Every week there are grievous mistakes: and the blunders are costing this country this and that, and there is this squandering of the taxpayers' coppers, some of which is so often wickedly misspent.

Sir, I feel there are great reasons for fear. I am afraid because I really cannot see any way out of this.

You have a bill for \$13 million for Capital Works programme which you know cannot be carried out. You know that you cannot spend \$13 million on capital works in this financial period. You cannot do that along with the normal work of maintenance and the recurrent things which you have to do in the various Government Departments. You have this type of inflation. The Estimates are not what they should be. I would wish that I had the power to spare it. I have a way of accepting these things. As I have said earlier, on the strength of the truth, there is strength on which you can always rely, and if you set out to examine yourself you can decide what your fate should be. I never believed in destiny. I believe that fate is something that you make what you want of it.

Sir, these Estimates offer no hope to an aspiring community. You know, Sir, that when the time comes we will be told that funds will have to be found for Federation. We are now seeing Trinidad and Jamaica struggling under this

are now seeing Trinidad and Jamaica struggling under this independence. It is true that they backed down from taking us with them because they were not prepared to share a life with their poor brothers. This is the time when we need all the physical resources of the country. We want to get to the meadows and the untouched areas. We want to exchange and plan for our manpower resources in such a way as to make our country something which would make it big and great; and I hope that I will live long enough and have an amount of physical energy left to be able to play my part in the making of a nation of our people in order that we become citizens of the world.

Mr. Speaker, these Estimates are void of inspiration and even of decent thinking. I may have to say that 'I told you so' although I dislike saying so. As far as I can see, we will have to come back within a year and do something about these Estimates. The small businessman is in a squeeze. It is because of this lack of knowledge and distribution of the country's wealth. You have not examined these things. Look at what is taking place in this country! It is just a change in thought which can help. I do not think that we should discard or shed or give up the little things that make men great. Let us go forward. It is getting late and very late.

Sir, I have reasons to fear. I am only asking you to change your sights and to change the things which you have in mind which would never mean anything to the community. If it is negative and without force, it cannot survive. I repeat — laugh at it as much as you like — this country is in danger; it needs direction. I say this; the massive, accumulative knowledge and experience of the great which is like smoke in the hills to the Arab, they are seeking to reduce. However, Sir, we must wait and abide in patience in the knowledge that the course of the events can be averted as time goes by. I thank you, Sir.
7.25 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I suppose that the next thing is that we should hold the Board of Lunacy. (Laughter).

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction to the Committee to deal with the Annual Estimates for the year 1963-64.

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

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

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

HEAD 1 - GOVERNOR

Head 1 - Governor - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Head there are certain items which are to be moved in. In connection with Item 19 (New) - Motor Vehicles — there is to be inserted: "(To be voted) \$4,950" and the Note is to read "For the purchase of a new car to replace one of the State Cars." I have already given notice of this amendment during my speech on the second reading of the Appropriation Bill. The total amount under this Head will now be \$38,416. I ask leave to make that amendment.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$38,416 under Head 1 as amended stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$38,416 under Head 1 as amended stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 2 - SERVICE COMMISSIONS

Head 2 - Service Commissions - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$722,795 under Head 2 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the Hon. Premier can explain Item 19 "Overseas Service Aid Scheme". The Note states: "To be reimbursed from U.K. Government Funds. Provision to cover three-year period beginning 1st April, 1961." This is a new item and apparently it has been taken from some other place.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Department of Technical Co-operation in the United Kingdom has sent down to all the territories proposals for paying an inducement allowance to certain officers who are recruited overseas. When this Government came into office, all the Caribbean colonies had agreed to this Scheme and they sent repeated requests to this Government to find out whether or not we would agree to its implementation. They pointed out that the additional allowance will be met from the United Kingdom Government. I must confess that the Government had certain reservations about this scheme after we interviewed the members of the Civil Service Association who were concerned in the scheme. After I was satisfied that the different reservations of the Civil Service Association had been covered and all the necessary amendments had been made, I sent the Agreement to the United Kingdom. They sent it back with certain amendments and we sent it back to the United Kingdom again. The position is that the other Governments in the Eastern Caribbean have entered into this scheme and this Government was accused of holding up the scheme. The responsibility would have to be mine as Minister of Finance. Speaking under correction, we brought the Agreement down to the House and this House passed it. We approved of this Overseas Service Aid Scheme. The whole idea of this scheme is that some assistance should be paid to certain officers. We told the United Kingdom Government what our position was, and they said "It is not your money, but our money which you are spending". Every other Caribbean colony agreed with this scheme and the Barbados Civil Service Association agreed with it too.
7.35 p.m.

After the Civil Servants here who were the people directly affected by it agreed with it, I then signed the Agreement, because it does not affect my salary or that of any member of this House. If they agreed with it, it would be rather invidious for me to say I did not like what they have agreed to; so the Agreement was signed. The implications of the Agreement were apparently only brought to the attention of the Civil Service Association when it was discovered that situations would arise in which the junior Registrar, say, in the Hospital, would be getting more money than the Surgeon Specialist, and we have a situation in the Legal Department where one of the junior legal officers would be getting more money than the Chief Justice. There are numerous anomalies in it.

Now the Caribbean Civil Service Association have been frantically in touch with each other, and they have persuaded their Governments to review their assent of the scheme, and we have set this down on the Agenda for the Conference which is to be held in Barbados on the 25th March by the Regional Council of Ministers. The other Governments have requested that we set it down and we have agreed. In the meantime the Government of Barbados was supposed to advance an inducement allowance to the officers when the scheme was implemented, and we already know how much money is involved, but we are to be repaid this money by the United Kingdom Government. We have to set it aside because we pay the money here and then they pay it back. There are lots of things about the scheme that I do not think hon. members would consider consonant with the movement which has been made towards independence in the 20th Century, but the House will have opportunity to

debate this, and I will ask the House to wait until the Regional Council of Ministers has made a collective decision on the scheme. This is not a direct charge on the Treasury of this Island, and that is about all I can usefully say on this matter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, my memory is not good at this thing, but I do not remember this coming to the House. What I am worried about here is that the note says "to be reimbursed from U.K. Government Funds. Provision to cover three year period beginning 1st April, 1961." This is the third year and apparently it has not been in the Estimates for two years if this is to cover for the period from 1961, and as I understand it, Sir, contrary to what the Hon. Premier has said, the local Civil Servants seem to think that they would be at a great disadvantage in this matter. From certain Civil Servants who have spoken to me on this matter.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: May I ask the hon. member when they spoke to him because only in the last three months were representations made? The scheme was so involved that they really did not appear to understand its full implication, but in the last three months we have heard objections.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I am saying is that if this is for a period beginning April 1961, that would mean 1961-62 and 1962-63; so we are actually paying two years of this money. In other words, it is an agreement which the other islands reached, but which Barbados has not reached. I can tell the hon. member that I have been hearing this for about a month or so, maybe, because it was being discussed then. As I understand it, if a Civil Servant is recruited from British Honduras to Barbados for a similar job to one appointed in Barbados — and I speak under correction — it puts him in a position, although he has no more years in the Service, to get a bigger salary because he is recruited from outside, and it is causing some dissatisfaction in certain ranks of the Civil Service. Although we have not agreed to it, we are paying this money for two years, and I am wondering whether this is not a matter which should have been allowed to wait until the matter had been thoroughly discussed by the Closer Association of the eight Units instead of voting this \$342,000 — which is quite a sum of money, although it is to be reimbursed from U.K. Government Funds. What is worrying me is whether United Kingdom will continue to reimburse us. In other words, if a Civil Servant is recruited in British Honduras for Barbados and gets \$60 or \$80 more than a Civil Servant recruited in Barbados in a similar job, if that goes on for as long as the particular Civil Servant is in the job, will the United Kingdom Government reimburse us or is it only for the recruitment and after that we have to carry the expense?

Mr. Chairman, that is the only thing we would like to know, because I do not recall having seen this before this Chamber before. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister can explain whether this is something which we must continue to vote as a recurrent expenditure or it is only for those persons who have been recruited and the U.K. Government will continue to pay this as a matter of assistance to us.

The question that the sum of \$722,795 under Head 2 — Service Commissions — stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 3 - LEGISLATURE

Head 3 — Legislation — was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, under Head 3, there is an amendment. On page 7 under Item 33 — (New) Ceremonial Dress is to be inserted and an amount of \$750 is to be voted, so that the amount will now be \$45,915. The Note reads "Provision for the purchase of a Wig and Robe for His Honour the Speaker, and to meet incidental expenses in connection therewith".

I beg to move that the sum of \$45,915 under Head 3 — Legislature — as amended stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would really like to know, and it would be in order dealing with Legislature, if the Minister of Finance would consider an amount for refreshments, though not going back to the amount which was spent originally. I think I have the temerity to stand and ask this question because no one can accuse me of wanting to partake of anything. I am wondering if the Premier would give consideration to an amount for refreshments for members, especially during periods such as the Estimates, and when members are meeting for long periods, I will go a little further and say that when we are here for long periods and want to have a glass of iced water, we must go out and ask the Reporters to let us have a glass of cold water from the ice they have bought.

7.45 p.m

I would say that the cooler which we had inside here was used indiscriminately. I wonder if the Hon. Premier would consider a cooler for the Speaker's office so that members of this Chamber can get a glass of iced water. I realise what happened when you had the cooler outside.

I do not know how backbenchers feel about it, but I agree that the large sum of money which was spent for refreshments should be taken out; but what should be done is that on occasions like this when we meet, you should provide a small sum so that members can get a cup of tea and a few crackers to refresh themselves. But above all, you should get a cooler so that hon. members can get a glass of iced water instead of having to depend on the Reporters who send out and buy ice to put in a water can.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the last speaker on that. Although the Committee as a whole disagrees with the furnishing of a heavy meal, I agree that an adequate sum should be put in so as to cover occasions such as when we are considering the Estimates and times like that so that members can get a cup of tea and, maybe, a few crackers. I also support the idea of an adequate refrigerator for the Speaker's office so that members can get a glass of iced water. I am sure His Honour would allow hon. members to use that, and it would be of great benefit and service to members. Anyhow, we can only throw that out to the Government. Probably, we can recommit the Head later and allow you to put something in. I strongly support the provision of a small sum for a cup of tea, a few sandwiches and crackers and such things for occasions like this and the provision of a refrigerator for the Speaker's office.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: There is provision under Item 32 for a water cooler, as hon. members will see in the Note to that Item. The point is that the Legislature has to set an example to the community and, as I have said already on previous occasions, this is not a cabin cruiser and two cars Government; this is an emerging country, and we have to make certain sacrifices in order to gear the economy of the country for the country's needs especially since it has been in a state of stagnation for so long.

I appreciate that it is a hardship on hon. members when they have to sit here from 12.00 o'clock to 9.00 o'clock with nothing provided, and when they go outside of the Chamber, the catering outside needs a lot to be desired. However, I feel that hon. members must bear with it. They have a duty to perform. We must make some kind of sacrifice, and this is more a matter of morale than a physical matter from my point of view. I fear that the wails of hon. members and their pleas will have to go unheeded for yet another year. What we may consider is that, as a result of the staff of this House of Assembly having had some change of conditions — because I think when they were first employed they had meals served them — therefore, when we have some kind of long sitting, some special vote should be put in so as to provide for them; but I would not like hon. members to feel that they come to the House of Assembly to eat, drink and be merry. I do not think that any member of the House can be afraid when he goes out of this House and states that he is making the same sort of sacrifice which we are calling upon Civil Servants and other people to bear. There is provision in these Estimates for a water cooler,

and if the Estimates of Revenue show some increase later, I will consider the other points raised by hon. members.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the Hon. Premier for his gesture, but lest it be thought that I was thinking of anything like the \$14,500 which we used to provide for refreshments, let me make it clear that I was one of the first members to get up and say that I thought it was excessive and that it should be cut out of the Estimates.

I do not think the Hon. Premier referred to me when he talked about eat, drink and be merry. I may say that I am always merry when I come in here because I think it was the greatest honour to achieve to come to this House of Assembly. I would never think of your providing that \$14,500, nor would I vote for it again. I was thinking of your providing a small sum, something in the vicinity of \$2,000 for what I spoke about. I am glad that the Hon. Premier has said that if the revenue showed any appreciable increase during the year he would give consideration to it.

The question that the sum of \$45,915 under Head 3 - Legislature as amended - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 4 - AUDITOR GENERAL

Head 4 - Auditor General - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that the sum of \$4,850 under Head 4 - Auditor General - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 5 - JUDICIARY

Head 5 - Judiciary - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Under Head 5 - Judiciary - Page 11, Item 32 - Incidental - to be added to the existing provision, \$221. The revised provision (To be voted) \$7,469. Add to existing note: "Additional provision to pay Cleaners at District 'C', \$65; District 'D', \$36; District 'E', \$24; District 'F', \$36; and Belleplaine \$60."

I beg to move that the sum of \$55,976 under Head 5 - Judiciary - as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 6 - LEGAL

Head 6 - Legal - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that the sum of \$2,930 under Head 6 - Legal - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 7 - REGISTRATION

Head 7 - Registration - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that the sum of \$34,917 under Head 7 - Registration - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 8 - CROWN SOLICITOR

Head 8 - Crown Solicitor - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that the sum of \$1,400 under Head 8 - Crown Solicitor - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE

Head 9 - Ministry of Finance - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The next group of Heads comes under the control of the Minister of Finance. Head 10, Accountant General; Head 11, Pensions; Head 12, Charges of Debt; Head 13, Customs; Head 14, Inland Revenue; Head 15, Statistical Service; Head 16, Federation.

I beg to move that the sum of \$40,728, under Head 9 - Ministry of Finance - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 10 - ACCOUNTANT GENERAL

Head 10 - Accountant General - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the sum of \$55,891 under Head 10 - Accountant General - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 11 - PENSIONS

Head 11 - Pensions - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, there is an amount in the Estimates under this Head of \$1,100,000 for public pensions and gratuities. Just to anticipate hon. members, some time ago - a few months ago - the Government asked the Whitley Council to make recommendations as regards increases for pensioners of the Government Service who had already retired. As far as I have been made to understand, the recommendations of the Whitley Council have been sent in, but they have not reached my desk. I understand that the Whitley Council has made their recommendations and, therefore, hon. members should expect that some time later on we will be coming for Supplementary Estimates to pay increases to these people. What the bill is, I do not know.
7.55 p.m.

I cannot say what the details of the proposals are at the present moment. The pensions will have to be made retroactive from this financial year and if financially possible we will try to give them retroactive operation from last year. That is all I can say at the present moment. The amount spent on pensions is about \$1,100,000. In addition to that, I will be coming down with proposals for changing up the Widows and Orphans' Pension Act because I do not think that the Act as it is at present constituted is in the best interest of the members of the Civil Service of this country. I think we will be making these proposals and this

is one Head in respect of which hon. members can anticipate that there will be a fairly substantial increase in expenditure during the current financial year.

Mr. Chairman, that is all that I can say now, but I can assure hon. members that something is being done about pensions and the Widows and Orphans Fund. I beg to move that the sum of \$1,709,089 under Head 11 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, there is one item which must be near and dear to the hearts of all hon. members. I am speaking now on Item 4, "Allowances, Gratuities and Pensions to B.W.I. Soldiers and their Dependants." Is this money being reimbursed by the British Government, is this our contribution or how is it done? I see that there is an amount of \$1,260 under this item but there is no note in relation to it. Is this a contribution by the British Government or do we give this amount as a token?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I cannot remember what this amount is for. We go through these things in detail in a kind of Finance Committee. I understand now that this is our contribution to the War Office Veterans whether they be from the First World War or the Second World War but I can get the information for the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the Hon. Member. There have been some ex-service men who have been continually making application for certain things. Captain Williams has always been making requests for these men, for those who have been incapacitated or otherwise, but I thought that this was a contribution from the British Government. Mr. Chairman, it is a pity that something better could not have been done by the British Government for these people.

The question that the sum of \$1,709,089 under Head 11 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 12 - CHARGES OF DEBT

Head 12 - Charges of Debt - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Head, most of these items are to meet sinking fund charges and interest on loans under various Acts of Legislature. There are some amendments to be made under this Head. As regards Item 8 - Public Loan Act 1957 - there is to be deleted the amount authorised by law - \$267,924 to be substituted by the amount \$244,660. The existing note is to be deleted and the following substituted therefor: "Act 1957-13: Sinking Fund at 1 1/2% on Local Loans of \$2,500,000 and \$1,449,050; and at 1% on London Loans of \$12,403,200 and \$6,139,200.

In connection with Item 9 - Public Loan Act, 1961-1 I am asking leave to delete the amount authorised by law, \$7,500, and to substitute the amount \$70,071. The existing note is to be deleted and the following substituted therefor:-

"Act 1961-59: Sinking Fund at 1 1/2% on Local Loans of \$1,000,000 and token provision in respect of further loans to be raised."

With regard to Item 18 - Public Loan Act, 1957 - there is to be deleted the amount authorised by law - \$1,756,038 - and the amount to be substituted therefor is \$1,383,031. The existing note is to be deleted and the following substituted therefor:-

"Act 1957-13: Interest on Local Loan at 5 1/2% on \$2,500,000, 6% on \$1,449,050, and on London Loan at 6% on \$12,043,200 and 6 3/4% on \$6,139,200."

In connection with Item 20 - Public Loan Act 1961 - the amount authorised by law, \$33,750, is to be deleted and substituted by the amount \$367,500. The existing note is to be deleted and the following is to be substituted therefor: "Act 1961-59: Interest at 6 3/4% on Local Loans of

\$1,000,000 and token provision in respect of other Loans to be raised."

Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to make those amendments.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that the sum of \$2,780,204 under Head 12 as amended stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$2,780,204 under Head 12 as amended stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 13 - CUSTOMS

Head 13 - Customs - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, under this Head, there is an amendment to be made, and that is to Item 12 "Overtime". There is to be added to the existing note the following: "Also to pay duty allowances to staff stationed at the Harbour." That is the addition to the note. I am asking leave to make that amendment.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the sum of \$45,196 under Head 13 as amended stand part of the schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$45,196 under Head 13 as amended stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 14 - INLAND REVENUE

Head 14 - Inland Revenue - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$11,565 under Head 14 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a word in connection with this Head. This is one Department in respect of which, I believe, everyone who is interested in this island would appreciate what I am saying. We will all appreciate that if ever there were Departments in which the Clerical Staff have to work, it is in the Department of Inland Revenue and in the Auditor General's Department. I think hon. members are aware of the fact that the Acting Commissioner of Inland Revenue was a youth who has just passed to the Great Beyond. I have visited this office on several occasions and what I have in mind to say is this: I have noticed that for many years you have been employing a Commissioner and one Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax, and since the coming into being of the Local Government Act, the Head of the Department is now the Commissioner of Inland Revenue and he is responsible not only for the collection of Income Tax as we know it, but also for all of the trade and other taxation departments of Local Government.

8,05 p.m.

This is the first time this has come from this side of the Table, and I am wondering whether the Government would give consideration to having another or two more Assistant Commissioners so as to relieve some of the work on the person who has to carry out the duties of Commissioner of Inland Revenue. Any man who does this job seems to me to have a herculean task. It is not usual for this Legislature to pay tribute to any of its Civil Servants here, but I believe all of us are conscious of the service which this Officer rendered. I have heard from the mouths of people who have had to do with the person performing these duties day after day and week after week, and from

solicitors who are engaged particularly in this form of work, that in nearly every instance where there is some disagreement on some point, one man is expected to make a settlement, and it is a tremendous task. Even now persons who are judges and have to adjudicate, take some time off to make decisions and what not, but the officer in this Department is supposed to be a very hard-pressed man. This is one place which I would like to see the Government give favourable consideration to, if the Civil Service Association considers it, having two or more Assistant Commissioners instead of merely inspectors. From what I have had to do in my capacity at the Bridgetown City Council and having to get guidance from the Officer who holds this office, it shows me plainly that it is nearly impossible for anyone to carry out these duties without the assistance of competent and trained men. I am not saying that they are not competent, trained men there, but they hold positions where decisions must be made by the Head of Department.

I throw it out for the consideration of the Government that in due course, if they do not want possibly to shorten the lives of some of the others in that Department, they should give consideration to the appointment of two or more Assistant Commissioners to carry some of the heavy responsibility in this office.

The question that the sum of \$11,565 under Head 14 - Inland Revenue - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 15 - STATISTICAL SERVICE

Head 15 - Statistical Service - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$18,770 under Head 15 - Statistical Service - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 16 - FEDERATION

Head 16 - Federation - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$250,000 under Head 16 - Federation - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 17 - PREMIER - HOME AFFAIRS

Head 17 - Premier - Home Affairs - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this is a new group of Heads from 17 to 23 which come under Premier - Home Affairs. The Heads are Police, Fire Service, Local Government, Prisons, Cabinet and General and the Barbados Regiment. When I get to the Barbados Regiment I have a certain pronouncement which I want to make here because some change has been brought about in the Barbados Regiment which, I think, is consistent with our independence and self-Government. We are dealing at present under the Ministry of Home Affairs with a total expenditure of \$2,747,578. On page 32 under Item 14, you will see an amount for stationery of \$6,300 and this is to be revised to \$6,450, which is an additional \$150. Under Item 26, on page 33 which is 'Furniture and Office Equipment', an amount of \$695 is to be added to the existing provision so that the amount will now be \$1,775, and the note will be amended by adding 'Provision is also made for a photocopying machine. This will save a lot of work in that Department.

Under Item 27 - Revision of Laws - the token provision of \$1.00 is to be deleted. At the time when the Estimates were printed, the requisition had not come in from the United Kingdom for the expenditure for the coming financial year. The amount to be voted therefore is \$12,800

and the existing note is to be deleted and substituted for that the words 'Provision to meet initial expenses of the Commissioners in connection with the Revision of the Laws'.

I beg to move that the sum of \$74,186 under Head 17 - Premier - Home Affairs - as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 18 - POLICE

Head 18 - Police - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Under Head 18 - Police - on page 39, Item 84 - Weights and Measures Equipment - the token provision of \$1.00 is to be deleted and be substituted therefor by the amount of \$7,050.

Some considerable time ago we had a Federal Adviser on weights and measures, and he made certain recommendations. Weights were made locally except the sort of model weights of similar gross weight or whatever terms they use. There is one sort of test weight and there are several heavier weights which have been made by one of the local foundries. These weights are for use on scale beams and for testing scale beams at factories and places like the Deep Water Harbour and other places where heavy equipment and goods are weighed. The amount required is \$7,050 as we had that amount in the Estimates for the past couple of years.

I beg to move that the sum of \$369,486 under Head 18 - Police - as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 19 - FIRE SERVICE

Head 19 - Fire Service - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, under Head 19 - Fire Service - on page 40, Item 13 - Cleaning, Water and Light, an amount of \$324 is to be added to the existing provision, so that the revised provision to be voted is \$3,014.

I beg to move that the sum of \$42,046 under Head 19 - Fire Service - as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 20 - LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Head 20 - Local Government - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$22,423 under Head 20 - Local Government - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 21 - PRISONS

Head 21 - Prisons - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$64,570 under Head 21 - Prisons - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, speaking on this Head, I am not at all happy about the treatment that the prisoners are getting. I think it is a bit too good.
8.15 p.m.

I went to the Prison one day and I was shown around: and to be truthful, I believe we are fooling ourselves as regards the treatment of prisoners. I do not agree with what the psychologists have to say: this is one of the times I feel that they are wrong. Prisoners go to prison for punishment and not for special treatment. I am sure that the food which prisoners are getting is much better than what the representatives of the people are getting.

When I was there, they had split peas and crumbled rice with about a half barrel of pig tails thrown in. Along with that, they had fried salt fish, diced carrots, string beans and also fruit. In the afternoon, as far as I was made to understand, they were to be given stewed beef and cou-cou.

It is all well and good for the psychologists and those who profess to know something about human nature to be pampering these prisoners, but it is no sport for a man who tries to be a law-abiding citizen when he knows that there are people who know their room number and they are treated in the best possible way. You cannot afford to get in any argument with any of those people because you might lose an eye or some teeth, and all that will happen is that he will go up there and get better treatment than when he was a free man.

I remember the Superintendent of the Prison telling me that a prisoner made a noise about an egg because that egg was too small. This morning I did not have an egg; therefore, it leaves me to think that it would be better if I were up there. He had another request from a prisoner. He sent and called the Superintendent and when he came and found out what was this prisoner's request, it was that this man wanted his clothes steam laundered and not pressed by a hand iron because he was going out in a few days. In other words, he wanted a Hoffman machine to press his clothes.

I say this in all seriousness. I realise that a prisoner is a human being and some have gone to prison wrongfully; but it does not make sense that we take up the money of the taxpayers who try to keep in the right path to pamper people who do not have any regard for decency. We are wasting our time.

What I advocate to this Government is that the Superintendent should be given a freer hand. Glendairy Prison is more conducive to good health and better living than the General Hospital. When I went into the prison yard, it was extremely clean and the yard is surrounded by a nice garden of poinsettias, gerberas and such garden plants. As a matter of fact, you could not believe you were in a prison. If we go on with this kind of thing because some psychologists feel that they know better than somebody else as to what treatment should be handed out to prisoners, I am not going to put up with it. I am not saying that prisoners should not be properly fed; but I feel when a man goes to prison two or three times, that man should be made to provide his own food. The other day at Government House one of the prisoners who were working up there fought a warder because the warder while looking at the food which was sent up for prisoners helped himself to a taste of it. The prisoner knowing that the warder had no right to eat better food than he, fought the warder. It is deplorable that prisoners who are sent to Glendairy to do punishment are getting better food than the warders who are supposed to see that they are fitting their punishment.

Another thing is this. They are taught all sorts of trades and they are put to work in the carpenter's shop, the tailor's shop and so on. On top of that there is a cricket field on which they can play.

I was not happy at all seeing prisoners working with those sharp-edged weapons in the carpenter's shop when the warders had nothing with which to defend themselves. I am not advocating that the warders should be armed, but do not wait until some prisoners hold a few warders as hostages. It might not happen today or next week; but some other day you may have there the real criminal-minded man who would intimidate the other prisoners and eventually they may hold up two or three warders as hostages and make demands on the Government. I am hoping that should such a day come, this Government would still be in power.

It is time that we hit the nail in the head. A man goes to Glendairy to do punishment. Glendairy is not a health resort. Every prisoner that goes to Glendairy for two weeks, you will find that after he has served his sentence and he comes out he is much healthier. The treatment at Glendairy Prison is conducive to people returning to the prison. We do not want that. We want people who go and serve a term and come back outside to think that they will not want to go again. We want them to stay outside of prison. But if you continue with this big set of vote to give them the kind of food which they are getting, you will not keep them out.

I say that the Superintendent's hands are tied. We, the Government, must untie his hands and give him a freer hand, but we must keep a watch over him because we know that power can corrupt. "Power corrupts: absolute power corrupts absolutely." We should keep an eye on the Superintendent, but give him a freer hand. As I have said, if you allow this thing to go on happening at the prison, you are bound to have it full of prisoners.

Now, there are people who are saying that we should rehabilitate the prisoners; but I feel that prisoners should also rehabilitate themselves. I do not see why we should be calling on the taxpayers to support to its best a superstructure in pampering people who have been sent there to do punishment. The Chief Justice and quite a number of people have been advocating that we have a Borstal for young people who have committed some offence. Now, at present, at Glendairy, there is a large block for women prisoners and there are three women prisoners who have five matrons to attend to them. I feel you will be doing the community a good if you ask those women prisoners to go. I know that women are no better than men, but the reason why they are so few up there is because they are not caught committing offences as often as men, and they generally get away. However, I do not see any reason why you should have this big superstructure for only three women prisoners, and on top of that, paying five matrons to look after them.

8.25 p.m.

I am throwing out this suggestion to the Government now; it is either that we govern or we will be governed. If we are in the seat of Government, we must govern and not be governed. I am asking this Government to do something about the part of the Prison which is not occupied. You can use that part of the Prison for Borstal training. I do not have any idea of putting people out of work, but you can have these Matrons dealing with delinquents. In my closing remarks I am going to say that you should give the Superintendent a much freer hand in the running of the Prisons; you should not allow warders to be guarding prisoners who use forks — and I mean agricultural forks — chisels, hammers, saws and things of that sort while they are unguarded. At some time or other we will be faced a crisis which will be something big on our hands.

The question that the sum of \$64,570 under Head 21 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 22 — PREMIER — CABINET AND GENERAL

Head 22 — Premier — Cabinet and General — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the sum of \$55,581 under Head 22 stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$55,581 under Head 22 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 23 — BARBADOS REGIMENT

Head 23 — Barbados Regiment — was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, under this Head I must draw to the attention of hon. members that the total provision in this year's Estimates to be voted is an amount of \$78,386. The provision under Item 1 is \$8,789 for the Staff Officer and Adjutant. Under the new British Army rates of pay and allowances, this figure would be \$17,000 for the Staff Officer and Adjutant and \$13,400 for the Sergeant Major and Drill Instructor with allowances. The practice hitherto has been to second an officer from one of the British Regiments to take the position of Staff Officer and Adjutant and similarly with the Sergeant Major and Drill Instructor of the Local Forces. At the celebrations recently — I do not know whether they were centenary or not — I said that the time had come when we should staff these posts by local people, either by Barbadians or West Indians. Subsequent to that, we held a meeting with the Staff Officer, the Chief Establishment Officer and myself and we decided that the time had come, in view of the demands made by the War Office, for the payment of these allowances and I am glad to say that we have recruited a Barbadian Staff Officer and Adjutant for the first time in history. (*Hear! Hear!*) Lieutenant-Colonel Robinson Secretary of the West Indian Committee, is looking for an Instructor from one of the Regiments who has to retire at the age of 45 years or 48 years, who would be only too glad to come out here and work for a reasonable salary and we are putting in an amount of \$5,400. We hope to recruit a Drill Instructor so that this man will be on contract for about two years; but we have recruited a Barbadian as Staff Officer and Adjutant and the amount is \$8,789 with Uniform Allowance and other allowances to which the Officer is entitled. I beg to move that the sum of \$78,386 under Head 23 stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$78,386 under Head 23 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 24 — MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, LANDS AND FISHERIES

Head 24 — Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this Head of the Estimates deals with the following Departments:— General Administration, Science and Agriculture, Co-operatives and Friendly Societies, Fisheries, Markets and Agricultural Credit Bank. Under this Head there is an item to be moved in. On page 58, there is to be inserted Item 12A (New) "Expenses of Commission of Enquiry" (To be voted) \$11,870 and the note is to read: "Provision to meet the expenses of the Commission of Enquiry into all aspects of the Sugar Industry in Barbados." This Head is set out in the regular pattern and the notes are explanatory to the various items in accordance with the regular pattern. However, if there are any questions asked in so far as a breakdown is concerned, I will be quite ready and willing to supply the information. I am asking leave to make the amendment I have intimated.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that the sum of \$1,052,601 under Head 24 as amended stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, this is a very big Head of the Estimates and we have to look through it. In the changeover, the new Market will be opened in a matter of months and there will be changes, we understand, in the method of employment. It has been told to me that the Government intends to employ slaughterers as distinct from the butchers on a whole time basis; I also understand that these slaughterers are to be engaged at the rate of \$18 a week, 8.35 p.m.

Now there are some 25 or 30 slaughterers at the market, and if eleven are going to be employed, what is to become of the others? I know in any change-over there is going to be a certain amount of redundancy, but some consideration should be meted out to those persons who earned their living by slaughtering in the market over the past years. It is not a large number, but if it is the intention of Government to pick eleven of the younger men, I think some provision should be made to take care of the others either by way of a pension or a gratuity. If the amount of \$18 a week is true, I think it is wholly inadequate, because even if they slaughter on four days a week, I may say that the perquisites now attached to the post of slaughterer, for Saturday killings alone he could make as much as \$20 or \$25 easily. To depart from the practice which has been going on for a number of years and suddenly change over, I am putting it to the Minister in charge because I do know he will be very sympathetic in this case and I do not wish him to be unaware of what is happening, that he should not adopt methods or a suggestion from one party without knowing the opinion of all sides. These slaughterers should be called in or some representation on their behalf should be made to the Minister, so that when the change-over comes, it would be as smooth as possible, or we would have repercussions down there. I just thought I would draw that to the Minister's attention because it will devolve on him in a matter of months to decide who will do the slaughtering, how many, the time and what pay, and what provision will be made for the others.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Before the Hon. Minister replies, unless he thinks my colleague is singing a solo, I should like to say that it is a fact that representation has been made. Whether it is just rumour being a lying jade that this thing is going to happen, they want to know what is going to be their position. A number of slaughterers have been pursuing their calling for a number of years, and besides worrying about the salary, they are worried that the younger men have been selected; but I do confess that I have assured them that, knowing the Minister as I do, he would give consideration and a sympathetic hearing to their representation, and I suggested that rather than get around and vent their grievances, they should have a delegation to wait on the Minister and discuss the matter to know what exactly their position would be. Anybody who knows about the Bridgetown Market knows that there are people who have been following this calling for many years, some of whom are getting on in years, and they are wondering whether in the new change-over everything will be slaughtered under Government supervision. I am not making any particular objection, but I do hope this comes about, because with my little experience of public sanitation, I know the danger of having things slaughtered outside and sold to the public with the various diseases which can be picked up when meat is not inspected by the proper officers and so on. I urged upon these people to go into the matter with the Department, and if the Minister has not heard yet, he should have one of the inspectors make enquiries in case these grievances should foment more rapidly than we anticipate, and try to arrange some means by which people can be satisfied under the circumstances. We all know the various diseases, if pigs or cows are killed outside and people are not *au fait* with the sanitary method and particular conditions, that can be picked up by people and children. We are not opposing this in any way, but we realise that these changes might bring about conditions which might not be very pleasant.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the Hon. Minister that his colleague, the member from my Party, is not singing any solo in this matter, but only repeating what has been brought to us on several occasions, and I would ask him to look into the matter very carefully.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I can well sympathise with the anxiety of the hon. members who have spoken in making the representations which they have made, and I may say that while generally speaking their remarks fall on the markets generally, those remarks could more properly have been made in dealing with the Capital Estimates where the Abattoir and fish cold storage plant is actually mentioned. The hon. members who have spoken have however seized the opportunity of speaking on

markets generally with special reference to the Abattoir and cold storage plant which is causing them a certain amount of anxiety for the slaughterers they represent. I may say that the cold storage plant is not quite complete yet, but we hope to bring it into operation some time next month, and the slaughterers of whom mention has been made, especially the old ones, can rest assured that their cases will be carefully considered. No representation as such has been made to me yet, but I am always willing and ready to receive any such representation; but the hon. member will realise that the object of having this new abattoir and cold storage plant is a means of bringing up to date the methods of slaughtering animals. Everything will be done electrically; so the old methods will be departed from, and if everything is brought up to date, you will realise that there will be no necessity for employing quite as many people because of the modern methods.

I will assure the hon. members that due consideration will be given to the cases they mention, and the cases of the slaughterers in particular will be attended to in the best possible way, and full consideration will be taken of their service and the number of years.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the hon. member.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, under Item 94 — Recovery of fishing boats — I was very much disturbed to read an account of some distressed fishermen whose pleas for rescue were ignored by others who were fishing near by. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is true to say that on land one does not have to go to the assistance of anyone in distress. There is a maxim "thou shalt not kill, but needest not strive officiously to keep alive". At sea, however, it is a different matter and there is some ordinance or regulation that people who are fishermen or seafaring men on the whole who see others in distress are bound to go to their rescue. I am wondering whether any investigation can be made into this incident and the inhuman fishermen who refused to go to the help of the others brought before the board of justice.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, lest you think I am pounding at the Minister of Agriculture too much, when I saw this I felt this was somewhat rather inhuman and if it were possible some investigation should be made into the matter. If I may recall rightly, the Minister of Trade has been here longer than I and I think we passed some Act here. The hon. and gallant member ought to be able to tell us whether there is something international, but I know we passed some Act here concerning those who refuse to assist a drifting boat. I am sure there is something on the Statute Book.
8.45 p.m.

I am hoping that the Hon. Minister would not let this go unnoticed and have this matter investigated. There is something which we passed here to the effect that if a fisherman sees another boat in distress and does nothing about it, he can be brought up. I hope that you will have the police to investigate this matter because if it goes unnoticed, it will be a very sorry thing. I think it is a most inhuman thing if it did happen.

Let us make no mistake about it. We, in this country cannot do without the fishing industry and, as a matter of fact, we do not pay enough attention to them. In a matter of this sort protection should be given. I go as far as to say this. I would like the Hon. Minister to give very serious consideration to the fishing industry. When we go to the market and there is no fish there, we begin to wonder what else we can get. I think the Government should assist in the payment of boats when they go adrift to St. Lucia, St. Vincent or any other place. If all our fishing boats were to go adrift, you could not very well feed the people of this country. Fishermen are risking their lives when they go out. It is true that they are working for money, but I believe that every taxpayer would agree if you loaned a fisherman an amount of £300. A lot of us would not go out fishing; a lot of us would not do it.

I understand that the insurance for a boat is so high that few of them can afford to carry it. I understand that engines put in by the Government are insured from the

point of view that those people have loans from the Government. The men who risk their lives, like these men, and go out and do fishing and happen to drift to St. Vincent, we should not allow their boats to become wrecks. I am sure the Hon. Minister of Communications will use his good offices to encourage the Government to do something about getting the boats back. We, the people of the country, benefit from bringing back a fishing boat to Barbados and that should be done instead of the Government just collecting the insurance for the loss of the engine. I would like the Hon. Minister to give very careful consideration to that. I know that he will do that because in his own constituency there are several fishermen, and they so believe in the hon. member that you can hardly say anything about him. As regards these fishermen when they go adrift receiving no help from other fishermen in another boat, I feel the Police should be called upon to investigate the matter and if it is true, they should be brought before a Court of Justice.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I, too, was surprised when I read that account in the *Advocate* and no sooner than I arrived in the office, the matter was brought to my attention by my colleague, the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, and a full scale investigation is being carried out.

The Hon. Minister of Communications has already done certain preliminary investigations, and while you will understand a little more later on, he is more or less of the impression that the story has been concocted; in other words, that the account in the Press does not express a true account of what has expired.

In so far as the other points raised by the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown, the Hon. Leader of the Official Opposition, you will see that provision is made in the Estimates to the tune of \$1,000 and the arrangements which have been made with the other West Indian colonies for the bringing back of fishing boats and fishermen have been as follows:—

"This Government accepts charges directly attributable or reasonably incidental to the cost of repatriation by the cheapest available means of crews of boats which drift to the neighbouring Islands and of their reasonable maintenance pending repatriation. Such expenditure may accordingly be incurred without reference to this Government (which however should receive early information of cases arising) and reclaimed in the normal way. This authority includes the supply of fuel, lubricants and the supply to a powered boat to enable it to return under its own power, when that is practicable, to safety and when this method of repatriating the crew is the cheapest."

As far as the boats are concerned, provision has been made for them, and it is not a question of coming here for that. We have \$1,000 specifically set apart for this purpose and if more than that is needed, we will come back for more. Every year three or four fishing boats go adrift.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Sir, the high winds over the last twelve days brought out forcibly to my knowledge the value of our present fishing fleet to our Island. If we had not been equipped with powered launches, I am very sure with winds of over 40 knots, we would have lost several of our old fishing fleet. Several fishermen would not have been able to go out, and those who ventured out would have gone out with very great danger to their lives. The difference in that type of boat which we had last, compared with the launches, would make it that they would be more likely drowned because under the old system of fishing before another boat was in the vicinity there would be no chance of their swimming to save their lives.

I feel quite happy when I considered nine to ten years ago the idea of changing the type of fishing boat. I was the man who decided on the conversion of the fishing fleet. They had brought in a design called the Calvert design of fishing boat and I said that it was a modern day, a day of power and I decided that we should have a type of powered boat for fishermen. I had conversations with many people and they told me that the fishermen would not be able to operate a powered launch. At any rate, I decided that I would start and

build a powered boat and I designed and built the first ever fishing launch. In those days, there was no money loaned for building fishing launches, but after four years, we now have a fleet of over 300 launches.

This morning about 3.30 a.m., I took a paper up and what I saw on the front page, I think was a bad advertisement for the Island of Barbados. People all over the world read newspapers and anybody who takes up an *Advocate* newspaper dated 12th March, 1963, and knows nothing of the Island must think that the people of Barbados are a bunch of pirates and they do nothing but go out to sea and demand money on the lives of people.
8.55 p.m.

International Law provides for the protection of the lives of people at sea. We, in this island of Barbados, would not have any jurisdiction outside of the three-mile limit, but fishermen in Barbados should know that after they leave the three-mile limit they are in the hands of international law which prohibits that sort of thing. In the United States of America, for that sort of thing, there is a penalty of two years' imprisonment along with a fine of \$1,000. Immediately I saw this Report in the Press, I got in touch with the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries and asked him to have a thorough investigation carried out and legal proceedings taken if such a thing were true.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot have people demanding money at the expense of the lives of two men at sea. This is something near to piracy; piracy is the only other thing in which you would have a demand like that made. We want to do everything to eliminate that sort of thing for the good name of Barbados. I am absolutely surprised to hear something like this and to see it appearing in the newspaper. I spoke to a fisherman about two days ago and he said that he knows one of the fishermen who were in the boat personally, and he told me a completely different story. He told me that the fishermen asked for the loan of a spanner and they said they could go ahead; the two men said that they could get the engine going if they had received the spanner. They got the engine running and they got into trouble about six miles off the island. I am sure that this Government will do everything in its power to eliminate such barbarous ideas of fishermen so as to save the good name and reputation of the people of Barbados.

The question that the sum of \$1,052,601 under Head 24 as amended stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MOIION FOR REPORTING PROGRESS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I think we have reached the end of Government Business for the day. I am therefore moving that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

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

The question that the Chairman do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as I intimated just now, it is only out of consideration for the Staff that we have reported progress at this stage, but I am now informed that the Staff is quite willing to continue with the consideration of the Estimates. I am sorry for the occurrence. I am now moving that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House resume Committee on the Appropriation Bill.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Staff is quite willing to continue their work, so long as the preparations proceed according to plan.

The question that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House resume Committee on the Appropriation Bill, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

HEAD 25 - MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS, WORKS AND HOUSING

Head 25 - Ministry of Communications, Works and Housing - was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, this Head deals with the following Departments:- Ministry of Communications, Works and Housing, Housing, Public Works, Printing Office, Town and Country Planning, Waterworks, Transport Services, Highways and Transport, Civil Aviation, Electrical Inspection and Lighthouses. Those are all under the control of the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing.
9.05 p.m.

HEAD 25 - MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS, WORKS AND HOUSING

Head 25 - Ministry of Communications, Works and Housing - was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$135,227 under Head 25 - Ministry of Communications, Works and Housing - stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.
The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 26 - HOUSING

Head 26 - Housing - was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$51,396 under Head 26 - Housing - stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.
The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 27 - PUBLIC WORKS

Head 27 - Public Works - was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, under Item 24 - Leave Pay to casual employees - the existing note is to be deleted.

Under Item 46 - (New) Law Library - the amount of \$3,500 is to be inserted and the note is to read "To meet the cost of renovating two rooms on the first floor of the Law Courts, and to air-condition one of them to house the present Law Library and the recently acquired "Reece" Library".

I beg to move that the sum of \$513,539 under Head 27 - Public Works - as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.
The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 28 - PRINTING OFFICE

Head 28 - Printing Office - was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$87,567 under Head 28 - Printing Office - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Minister could tell me what is wrong with the Printery that we cannot get the various Acts that have been passed put into book form so that the legal men can purchase them. This is very distressing because it hinders in some way the ad-

ministration of justice, I am not now thinking of hon. members of this Chamber getting their copies, but I am dealing with the judges and magistrates. I think in the Letters Patent that it is provided that by the end of a certain month, copies of these Statutes which are passed in the Island should be put together and bound so that lawyers and other people including the police can buy them.

I hope the Hon. Deputy Speaker is not going to let me sing any solo on this matter, because as the only legal member present on the floor of the House now, I am sure he has found this difficulty. The last of these books was published in 1958. Will the Hon. Minister tell me what has gone wrong? This is now 1963, and it is time that the magistrates were armed with these books. The Judiciary and other people are complaining that they cannot get these books to buy. I hope the Deputy Speaker who has a flourishing practice will support me in this matter lest the hon. member thinks I am just singing a solo. This is a very important matter which should be taken up. When you are a member of this House, people expect you to know everything; so I am sure the Deputy Speaker will support me in a matter of this sort.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Chairman, I must confirm what the hon. senior member for Bridgetown has said, because he never attempts to say anything unless he knows clearly what he is saying. Even the Police find difficulty at times in getting a particular Act that has been passed, and when barristers attempt to buy them, they are told that they are not ready yet. At any rate, it is clear that there is difficulty in getting them.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: For the information of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, an investigation is at present going on as to the extension of the Government Printing Office. Over the last two years, the Government Printery has taken on a lot of extra work for various Departments. With the Port coming into operation, the Education Office, the Development Board and various other Government Departments, a lot of work has been thrown on the Printery to such an extent that it has actually outgrown its size, and we are at present investigating the possibility of extending the building, and considering certain questions asked in this House a few weeks ago concerning the Printery and about having the laws bound in Barbados with the amount of Printers here. We are at present considering the extension of it not only to cope with the amount of work, but also to find employment for a certain amount of printers whom we understand are out of work and would have been available for revising the laws of Barbados. I can assure the hon. senior member for Bridgetown that nothing is being left unturned to see that these laws and all the required documents for the Police and so on are in order, and in a very short space of time something should be done to assist the Printery in carrying out these requirements.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I must thank the Hon. Minister for giving me his explanation, but I must draw to his attention that my way of looking at it is that after a man's health, you want to have a satisfied community, and nothing is more important than the administration of justice. Justice cannot be administered if those who must administer it do not know what laws had been passed or cannot have them in their possession. I appreciate the fact that the Printery has taken on all these things, but what is first must come first. As a matter of fact, I have been very calm in these matters recently, but it is a breach of the Letters Patent which says that laws must be printed by a certain date; and if you have people practising at the Bar, how can they do justice to litigants if they cannot get the laws? I suggest to the Hon. Minister that steps be taken immediately to see that the Letters Patent are not observed in the breach. You can neglect some leaflets or receipt books or give some of these things out to private printeries at a reasonable rate for the time being, but have the laws which would cost you more done at the Printery. We cannot afford to go on this way.

I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, that when people make application to the Printery for copies of the laws, they seem to think it is only a joke. People go there and are willing to pay for them, and you can make money from them. Every month you pay thousands of dollars to magistrates and

judges, and yet they cannot get the laws which you have passed. Do you think it is sport that in 1963 the laws which you have passed in the previous years cannot be in the hands of lawyers and police sergeants? It may be all right for hon. members who are practising to keep their copies and put them together, but it is not fair to the other people in this country. I appreciate the Hon. Minister's explanation, but I strongly suggest to him that this is a matter of paramount importance to the entire community.
9.15 p.m.

How can I retain Counsel in a matter when he says: "I know nothing of this?" It is not just right. I thank the hon. member for his explanation.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I drew to the attention of the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown that it has been brought to my knowledge just a few days ago and I made an inspection and I am satisfied that it is too small. There is no room to carry around anything at all. The matter is under consideration. I have made a recommendation that it should be extended and to get the additional staff which would be required to carry it out. I am sure that will be done in a very short time. We are doing everything to make sure that it is brought up to the standard required to print the laws.

The question that the sum of \$87,567 under Head 28 - Printing Office - stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 29 - TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING

Head 29 - Town and Country Planning - was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to move that the sum of \$26,033 under Head 29 - Town and Country Planning - stand part of the schedule.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, there is one thing which I want to know as regards this Head. I recall when the recent Public Health Bill came in, that I made certain suggestions for amendment and as a result the Bill was sent to a Select Committee. It came back in and it was passed by this House.

Now, Sir, this is something which I hope the Hon. Minister in charge will answer me. We have seen in the Press that you have abolished all of the activities of the Board of Health in respect of the valuation of land and the granting of permission to sell land and divide it up, and so on, but we have not yet seen by whom the responsibility will be for the purpose of valuing land. In other words, all those things, such as the dividing and selling of land, rested with the Board of Health and then you went to the Executive Committee for the appointment of appraisers. That is to say, after you had the land passed by the Board of Health as regards proper drainage and so on, you then applied to have appraisers for the valuation of it.

I understand that under the Town and Country Planning Act all this is to be done through the Town and Country Planning Office and I must commend the Government for appointing three able people who have been seeing to it that the objections which I have raised have been taken into account.

Let me make my position clear here and now. I am not afraid of any living Civil Servant. When I have one to curse, I will curse him and no Minister can stop me. I will never accuse one of them for corruption unless I found him so. I am not accusing Mr. Stevens of any corruption. I have had an investigation made into the actions of a former Town and Country Planner and he had to clear out of the Island and go back where he came from. Mr. Stevens is vested with a lot of power but I say that he is not corrupt. What I would say about him is that he is over-zealous.

I am glad the Government in their wisdom has taken notice of the objections which I have taken and the disagreements which I had with Mr. Stevens, and has agreed with me and not with Mr. Stevens. I will give you one instance of a

matter which I had to fight Mr. Stevenson. There was a man who was living in the middle of two or three acres of land and Mr. Stevens decided that he was not allowing him to come forward because some day he might put a house on it for his grand-son.

Of course, the last Government so much agreed with Mr. Stevens that if Mr. Stevens said that the moon was green and the sun was red, it was so, except of course with the market in Bay Street, and the place down St. Thomas where they wanted to put down some gas station. Even now it is none of Mr. Stevens business if people sell land and put down gas stations because it is not for Mr. Stevens to say that you have too many gas stations.

It is for you to put your feet down on that. What I have found in Mr. Stevens is that he is over-zealous. What I am asking you about is this and the general public wants to know about it. There is no more Board of Health; therefore your applications must go to Mr. Stevens as regards the sale of land. A lot of hon. members get in here and do not find out anything of what they should know something about. Do not get in here and know nothing of what you are doing. From the time I have been on the floor of the House, I have made myself acquainted with all that I felt I should know something about in order that I must answer intelligently. I challenge any hon member to answer this. Applications which went before the Board of Health now go to Mr. Stevens. He says: "Oh, yes, you can sell". I have seen nothing in the Act to say who fixes the price. Is there no longer the need to control the price? No one man should have the authority. Can the Hon. Minister tell me who is to fix the price? I have seen nothing about it. Are you placing that in the hands of one man? I see the Hon. Minister looking at me quite wisely.

9.25 p.m

I have heard it said that the best land in Barbados is not worth more than six cents a foot. What are you doing? Are you developing this whole country? I do not agree that people should take land in Barbados and just sell it at any reckless or exorbitant price or anything of that sort; I agree that the price of land should be controlled. What have we done? We want to fix the value of land. The hon. member said that he had heard it over the radio and, of course, I heard it over the radio too, that people have asked what is this that has been done. Is one man to have the authority to value the whole island of Barbados? Mr. Chairman, I will sit down and allow the Hon. Minister to answer the questions I have asked. If you were to commit an offence tomorrow — God forbid that you should — if I were to commit an offence tomorrow, I am in a democratic country and I am entitled to be tried by my peers, by my own people; therefore, if you have your property, why should you allow one man to value your property? You may have paid the sum of £500 for your property in 1930. I see that the Hon. Minister of Education is looking at me; well, he knows a lot of things. People from Panama may have bought a quarter of an acre of land for three hundred dollars which amount is like \$3,000 now. A man wants to sell his land and because he is getting his price for it, Mr. Stevens says that he is getting too much for it! I am saying, Sir, it does not matter what was the amount which you paid for your land 30 or 35 years ago; it is a question of what it is worth today.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out to the hon. senior member for the City that we are quite willing to answer the questions which he has asked if he would give us until the next meeting of the House when we can get the files and answer those questions without any errors. We would hate to answer the hon. member's questions without having any reference to the files.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister has been so sedate about this matter that I cannot quarrel with him. What else can one do but bow and sit down? But this is a very important matter; it is very important to answer my questions without errors. It went over the radio that one man has been devaluing people's land. You may give school meals or anything you like; but if you sit down and allow one man to value people's property, you have not got any more chance. People's parents have worked hard in order to get what they have, and do you say that you will permit one man

to value people's land? I thank the Hon. Minister of Social Services for the answer which he has given and please do not let the next meeting pass without providing the answer to the question which I have asked. If you do not give me the answer, you can give it to the Information Officer and let him release it to the Press and put it over the air.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, what I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister is this; I do not know what yardstick the Town and Country Planning Officer is using, but I do not know how he could allow people to build a Bank building at the Corner of Roebuck Street and Palmetto Street, but there is at King's Village a person who is living in a shack because she cannot get permission to renovate her home. This person was formerly living in a board and shingled house and the family went out and accumulated some money and they have aspired to the ownership of a better home. This woman built a bungalow front to her house, which is much smaller than the house which she had formerly but she has been refused permission to continue the other offices. For some reason or another this woman cannot go on any further with her house and I do not suppose that the Town and Country Planning Officer knows the reason himself.

In supporting what the hon. senior member for the City has said, there is a place called New Barracks between St. Matthias and Harts Gap. This property formerly belonged to a lady called Miss Everard but it has been acquired by Mr. Taylor. The land has no proper roads, there is no water or light but the people have been served recently with notices that by the month of June they must quit occupation, those who cannot afford to pay the sum of \$1,400 cash for a spot or \$1,750 on credit terms. As I have said before, the people of Barbados have put us in Government and I think that we had better govern the country or otherwise we will be governed. If we are not going to govern, then we are wasting our time as well as the people's time.

9.35 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot see what spot of land in the back in Barbados can be valued at \$1,400 unless you find uranium or oil in it. People who want to divide land cannot get permission to do so in order to give a cousin or a brother a spot, yet these people, whoever they are, can be allowed to cut up this land and sell it in house spots without first building proper roads and putting in water and light. I am therefore drawing to the Minister's and Government's attention that they had better see about doing something about this before it is too late.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, the Town and Country Planning Officer has not got the last word. There are certain laws and regulations governing the distance from the centre line of the road, and if any of these regulations are not complied with or if the Town and Country Planning Officer is not satisfied about it, the people have a right to appeal. The Government has appointed three competent Reporters with other persons for the carrying out of the appeals, and several of these appeals have been carried out contrary in several instances to the Town and Country Planning Officer's ideas; so he has not got the final word. As a matter of fact, a certain amount of discretion is allowed. There may be a spot on the corner of a road where a person might lose too much where he had to comply with the Act on both sides of the road. Several of the appeals which have been carried out by the Reporters have been done completely contrary to the decision made by the Town and Country Planning Officer.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Chairman, if people are not satisfied with the Town and Country Planning Officer's decision, they can apply to the Executive Committee, and there are three men to deal with these matters. I would like to know how long it takes for people to have this done, and to apply to a Magistrate.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, I will tell the hon. member that twenty-eight days are allowed after you get the decision of the Town and Country Planning Officer to file an appeal, and as soon as we get those appeals, they are put up to the Judges and then sent on to the Reporters. As soon as the Reporters' decision has been made, it is

dealt with by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, I would say it takes possibly four to five weeks.

Mr. SEALEY: I thank the hon. member very much, but I can assure him that too much latitude has been placed in the hands of the Town and Country Planning Officer who has been retarding progress in the Island. There were two men who came from St. Lucia and Trinidad to spend a couple of thousands of dollars, but the Town and Country Planning Officer turned them all round and they have gone back to Trinidad and St. Lucia. A lot of carpenters, painters, masons and others are kept unemployed through the Town and Country Planning Officer and the latitude which he has been given by the last Government. If you go back the required distance from the road and decide to take up the whole of your yard, that is your business. There are men all over the Island of Barbados who are suffering through having nothing to do due to the decisions of the Town and Country Planning Officer, and yet day after day the Government gives him more power.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, my colleague sits in on these meetings and what he has said is true, but I want to assure him that as Chairman of this Committee there are several things in which I agree with Mr. Stevens, and I must agree with him in cases where people want to go on a corner and put up a building. I must commend this Government for appointing a panel of Reporters who are very able men and not afraid of Mr. Stevens or the Government, and they have been deliberately upsetting Mr. Stevens' decisions because they are men who have an interest. When Mr. Stevens describes a road as a particular type of road, they ask him to show them by what stretch of the imagination the road can be described as such. That is what is worrying me, and that is what should worry the Minister of Trade and the Minister of Communications and Works. You refused to look at the amendment I brought, but I am awaiting the answer which the hon. member will give, and I have every faith he is going to bring the right answer.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly sure I can give the hon. senior member for Bridgetown a direct answer that no one in this Government would leave anything completely in the hands of one man; I am 100 per cent sure it will never be done.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have every confidence the Minister will not leave it in one man's hands at this juncture. I know he is going to be very annoyed when he finds out what I am saying. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture can give me an answer.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the point raised by the hon. senior member for St. Michael, I would like to say that the complaint was a very justifiable one a few months ago, but since the present Government has set up a system of dealing with appeals and Reporters have been appointed, cases which had been pending for the last two or three years have more or less been disposed of; so like that the old grievances which he has just expressed no longer exist, because a system of dealing with appeals has been instituted and appeals are expeditiously dealt with; so things are not as bad now as they were a year ago.

Mr. SEALEY: I thank the Hon. Minister.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: As far as the point raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is concerned, I have been perusing the various relevant Acts to see exactly the point raised by him. The Public Health Act, 1963 repeals the old Public Health Acts of 1908 and 1945 which deal with the division and sale of land in lots. Under the old set-up, a system was devised of appointing appraisers who lived contiguous to the land and who were aware of the value of the land in question. That system has gone by the board. The hon. member wants to know what provision has been made on apparently equitable basis to deal with this present matter, and whether appraisers are to be appointed under the Town and Country Planning Interim Control Act, 1959, or whether that power which formerly was vested in the appraisers is now vested in one individual. Let me say this: this Government would hardly be seen doing a thing like that, because it would be a retrograde step to vest power which was formerly in the hands of about five appraisers in

the hands of one individual who might not even be aware or conversant with the area and would be less in a position to give a proper valuation of the land. The system of Government in dealing with matters affecting land is to vest power not in a single officer, in this case the Town and Country Planning Officer, but to vest that power in a Valuation Committee which is comprised of about four or five Heads of Departments.
9.45 p.m.

They are: The Director of Public Works, the Chief Agricultural Officer, who acts as Chairman; the Director of Highways and Transport and the Town and Country Planning Officer. They sit as a Valuation Committee and no one man sits. If the Act is not worded in that way and if it is not made specific, an amendment would have to come down to cover that.

The question that the sum of \$26,033 under Head 29 - Town and Country Planning - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 30 - WATERWORKS

Head 30 - Waterworks - was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to this Head. Under page 74, Item 38, Leave pay to Casual Employees. The Note is to be amended as follows: Delete: "Paid on the basis of the Public.....Act, 1935-6".

Under Page 74, Item 46, (New) (Furniture and Equipment) is to be inserted, (To be Voted) \$662. The Note is to read: "To provide 1 steel Cabinet, 1 Card Index Cabinet, Metal Plates and Index Cards".

I beg to move that the amount of \$1,266,069 under Head 30 - Waterworks - as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 31 - TRANSPORT SERVICES

Head 31 - Transport Services - was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to move that Head 31 - Transport Services - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 32 - HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT

Head 32 - Highways and Transport - was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to amend Head 32 - Highways and Transport - as follows:- On Page 79, Item 56A (New) Pump House is to be inserted and to be voted \$11,653. The Note is to read: "Provision for maintenance of the Pump House on the South Access Road to the Bridgetown Harbour".

I beg to move that the sum of \$1,841,940 under Head 32 - Highways and Transport - as amended stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 33 - CIVIL AVIATION

Head 33 - Civil Aviation - was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to move that the sum of \$189,028, under Head 33 — Civil Aviation — stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Under this Head, Item 27, dealing with telephones, I am appealing to the Hon. Minister of Communications to look into this matter. Mr. Chairman, if it is not you, directly, it is your colleague, but I remember that one of the hon. members for St. Thomas did ask a question in respect of having telephones for the rural area. There may be merits and demerits against that, but I think the advantages outweighed the disadvantages. The telephone in the Thorpes area is working satisfactorily. The people are not so savage as to cause any damage to that. Endeavour, St. James is a populous area which adjoins Baywoods and the type of people who have houses there do not have telephones, and they are unlike the people of Fitts Village where if you do not have a telephone you can go to someone near and ask for a telephone message. You will have to walk two or three miles to ask some factory owner for a telephone message.

I am seriously appealing to the Hon. Minister of Communications to instal telephones at certain points in certain districts. I am prepared to help in any way as regards the siting of them in the parish of St. James. I know that at Baywoods there is one telephone to accommodate the many people living in that area. I know that no one would be bold enough to say that it would not be a good service to have these telephones installed. I would say no more than that I am looking forward to that service being rendered as a priority.

Mr. BOXHILL: Mr. Chairman, dealing with Head 33, — Civil Aviation — I wish to say that I was somewhat disturbed when I took up my morning's paper and read where planes had to be diverted from London to Seawell to Piarco and as far as I learnt, one of them had to land at the Antigua Airport.

This Government is paying two maintenance men: one is getting \$670 a month and the other \$498 a month, to maintain the runway.

I would like to know if the Hon. Minister was aware of these planes having to leave without landing here. I am always somewhat worried when people who come to Barbados and want to spend some money who through some fault or the other of somebody, are not able to be accommodated. What I would like to know is, What are we paying these two men that money which I mentioned plus over time to do if it means that you cannot get this job done properly? I am calling on the Government to ask them to resign or you should fire them because Barbados in its present state cannot afford to lose money from the tourists. We cannot afford to lose anything at all. We have to catch the crumbs. I want to draw this matter to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Communications and I would ask him to make an investigation into it in order to know why those planes could not land at Seawell.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. senior member for St. James, I would like to draw to his attention that this Government would love to be in the position wholeheartedly to put these telephones in some of these areas where it would be convenient for the people who require the use of them. It is rather heart burning and heart rending when one sees the damage done to a telephone in an area where the Government has spent a large sum of money to instal. We would like to instal a telephone in all the districts where people who are not able to have them in their residences would be able to make use of them in cases of necessity, like sickness or death.
9.55 p.m.

The hon. senior member for St. James has just mentioned the Thorpes District. Well, it is only a few weeks ago that a good friend of mine from the Telephone Company mentioned to me what I would call a massacre taking place in that District. There was a complete destruction of a telephone down there. It took in the vicinity of nearly \$2,000 to

erect some of these telephones, including the booths. I am quite sure that the amounts of money through rent from these telephones would compensate for the installation of them; but it is deplorable when you see the amount of malicious damage which is carried out to these telephones in these areas. Mr. Chairman, it is something which would turn back the heart of a mule, to see the damage done to things which have been placed there in order to facilitate the people. Nobody can put through a case for these people to be prosecuted for malicious damage. We would be glad to ask the Telephone Company to erect these telephones in these housing areas; the cost of the erection of these telephones would be covered as far as the collection of rates is concerned, but there is the question of malicious damage taking place; otherwise the Telephone Company would instal these telephones at their expense and the fees collected from them would repay for the installation.

With regard to the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, I cannot altogether agree with his remarks about the Airport. The majority of the work at the Airport must be carried out when the planes are not landing. The repair of the runway at the Airport is very responsible work because it must be carried out when planes are not coming in, or when the majority of the planes have stopped coming in. I have heard about this particular instance as to the planes; the repairs had to be carried out and it was discovered that these repairs were more extensive than anticipated and they could not be finished in the proper time. Knowledge is power and you cannot take any chances with people's lives. I have had the matter investigated and it was a matter of urgency; it was better not to take the chance of having a plane landing in the circumstances. It would be a question of the risk of people's lives being lost.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to what the Hon. Minister has said, but if there are 3,000 persons in an area, must they suffer at the hands of these people who do this damage? What the Hon. Minister says is what does happen; but the fact that there is an evil and that there are evil doers must not mean that the service must not be carried out.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I quite agree with the hon. member, but we have to consider the question of finance.

The question that the sum of \$189,028 under Head 33 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 34 — ELECTRICAL INSPECTION

Head 34 — Electrical Inspection — was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$11,528 under Head 34 stand part of this Schedule.

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

Mr. BOXHILL: Mr. Chairman, there is a rule here that when a person acts in a higher post he is entitled to one half the salary of the holder of the other post; in other words, the person who is acting in the higher post is entitled to something more. I know of an Assistant Lighthouse Keeper who worked as Lighthouse Keeper for nine months and the man has not been given any extra pay for acting in the higher post. He has made a request and he has been told that it has not been found possible to grant his request. I am saying that it is unfair for one person to do another person's work and not be paid for doing it. I am sending out this feeler to the Hon. Minister to have this matter investigated. You may not deal with this matter and the next thing you may know is that a ship has run aground. I am therefore asking the Hon. Minister to investigate this matter.

The question that the sum of \$11,528 under Head 34 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 35 - LIGHTHOUSES

Head 35 - Lighthouses - was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$48,800 under Head 35 stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$48,800 under Head 35 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

CHAIRMAN REPORTS PROGRESS

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, I have been here since 12 o'clock and I am perfectly willing to accommodate the Government. My colleagues and I are quite willing to accommodate the Government, but I do not think it is fair for us to remain here any longer. We are quite prepared to come back here next Friday and continue the consideration of the Estimates.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, nobody wants to ask either hon. members of the House or the Staff of the House to do what is physically impossible. It will be recalled that earlier this afternoon the Government actually made a motion for you, Sir, to report progress and ask for leave to sit again with the intention of returning here on Friday. At that time it was suggested that we should con-

tinue with the Estimates. We accepted the suggestion then; but if hon. members have now reached the end of their tether, we have no intention of imposing upon anybody any further.
10.05 p.m.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that brings Government Business to an end for today's Sitting, and I now beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Friday, 15th March, 1963, at 2.30 in the afternoon.

We accept the intimation from the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, and as a matter of fact, it is Government's intention that the entire Sitting should be devoted to the finalisation of the consideration of the Estimates for the year 1963-64.

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

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

10.10 p.m.