

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 7th May, 1963.

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

PRESENT

His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade, Industry, Labour and Tourism*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. R. ST. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay on behalf of the hon. Premier the Report of the Fiscal Commissioner on the Federation of the Eastern Caribbean Territories and the Report of the Civil Service Commission on the Federation of the Eastern Caribbean Territories.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay a Statement from the Barbados General Agricultural Society regarding the appropriation of the Legislative grant for the year 1962.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I am commanded to lay the Audited Statement of Accounts of the Housing Authority for the year ended the 31st March, 1962; also, the sixth Annual Report of the Housing Authority for the year 1st April, 1961 to 31st March, 1962.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay the Approved Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the Financial Year 1963-64.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Resolution to approve the lease of 143,189 square feet of land at the Bridgetown Harbour to the Barbados Development Board.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Resolution to sanction an Agreement made on the 19th of October, 1962, between the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the Barbados Union Oil Company Limited.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Resolution to approve the transfer by grant of certain parcels of land from the Governor-in-Executive Committee to the Housing Authority.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On behalf of the Hon. Premier; A Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Public Treasury and appropriate the same for the service of the year ended the thirty-first day of March, one thousand, nine hundred and sixty-three.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: A Bill to consolidate and revise the law relating to Trade Unions.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: A Bill to amend the Married Woman's (Separation and Maintenance) Act, 1950.

A Bill to amend and consolidate the law relating to the maintenance of illegitimate children.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before we go on, I ask leave to give notice later on today of three items — two Bills and one Resolution — which would arise out of the proposals contained in the Budget Speech.

Your Honour will understand that it would not be practicable actually to give notice of these Resolutions before the Budget Speech is read; therefore I am going to ask leave to give notice of these items at a later stage in the day's proceedings. I do not think it is necessary to suspend the Rule to do this. I am sure if we are granted leave, we would act accordingly.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am afraid that despite what that Hon. Minister can do, Your Honour cannot permit a hypothetical appeal for leave to be given notice of when there is no Bill given notice of. You cannot ask for leave to do something which is not here.
2.55 p.m.

The Hon. Member will have to wait until such time as that Statement has been made; otherwise it will be making a mockery of Parliament to have leave to introduce a Bill. You can have leave to do something which is to be done, but there is no Bill before us and therefore there is no leave to do anything. You do not know if the person will die before that Bill comes here and therefore let us contain our souls in patience until such time as the Bill is here. The hon. member cannot have leave to deal with a Bill until it is here.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not quite understand the contention of the hon. member. Normally, no hon. member of this House knows what notice will be given of, but at the time of giving notice you read out the notice. Therefore it is correct to say that nobody knows, except the Government front benchers, actually what Bill will be given notice of.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am saying that the hon. member cannot tell Your Honour what the Bill is going to be; notice has to be given to deal with that Bill. The hon. member is asking for leave to deal with a Bill at a later stage and there is no Bill before us.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am not proposing to deal with the Bill today. The hon. member said that I am asking leave to deal with a Bill which is not before the House, but there is no such thing.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member is seeking to ask for leave to deal with something which, for practical purposes, does not exist. He is asking leave to give notice of a Bill at a later stage, but you do not have to ask for leave to do that. When the hon. member has the Bill before him then he can do that, but he cannot ask for leave now to deal with that Bill.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member would be the first person to say that, during the time for giving Notices, no mention was made of the fact that we intended to ask for leave to deal with a matter, if I did not ask for leave to deal with it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, today we have to deal with something of which we did not have any notice last week. It is something as important as a Budget Speech and I had to read that in the newspaper. Parliament does not even know that we are going to have a Budget Speech until we read that in the newspaper; but we are accustomed to these discourtesies. Hon. members have not been accorded with the courtesy of being informed that we are going to have a Budget Speech today. However, Sir, the hon. member can say what he proposes to deal with at any time, but I am saying that he is anticipating something which has not yet come down. The hon. member says that a Bill is coming out of a speech which it is proposed to make today.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Your Honour cannot grant leave for a notice to be given on your own. I must say that when one attempts to ensure that no discourtesy to the House arises in the future, the hon. member objects. All I am saying is that the time for giving notices is now; I am merely signifying to the House my intention to ask for leave, at a later stage, at a time when the Rules do not permit that to be done, to give notice of this Bill. I do not want anybody to say later on that we failed to notify the House of our intention to do so at the time when notice should be given. That is all I am doing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member is signifying his intention to ask for leave to give notice of this Bill at a later stage.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Yes, Sir.

QUESTIONS

The following Notices of Questions were given:—

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Hon. Premier:—

Has the Hon. Premier anything to add to his statement in the House that at least five Civil Servants should have gone home in connection with the award of a Government contract?

2. Will the Premier state the Ministry concerned, and if the contract was awarded with the approval of the Minister?

3. Will the Premier state why, in his opinion, the Civil Servants should have "gone home"?

Mr. WALCOTT: To enquire of the Minister of Social Services:—

1. Is the Minister aware that the residents of the parish of St. Peter have not yet been given a playing-field or social centre from funds allocated from the Labour Welfare Fund?

2. Will the Minister state the reasons for this unreasonably long delay?

Mr. WALCOTT: To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:—

1. Is it a fact that residents in the areas of the Ashton Hall, the Whim and White Hall St. Peter, have been restricted in the installation of domestic water services from the Waterworks Department?

2. Will the Minister state what is the reason for this restriction and whether it applies to all types of domestic water services including services for taps only?
3.05 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

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

WHEREAS the Domestic Science Class at St. John's Mixed School has been closed;

AND WHEREAS because of the cessation of such classes young women in the parish of St. John have no opportunity to avail themselves of the training necessary to qualify for the scheme of emigration as domestics to Canada sponsored by the Government through the agency of the Labour Department;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government recommence such Domestic Science Classes as soon as possible.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Public Treasury and appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ended thirty-first day of March, one thousand, nine hundred and sixty-three, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, a Bill to consolidate and revise the law relating to Trade Unions was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. A. DaC. Edwards, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, a Bill to amend the Married Woman's (Separation and Maintenance) Act, 1950, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, a Bill to amend and consolidate the law relating to the maintenance of illegitimate children was read a first time.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 54/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph regarding inconvenience to the general public at the Registration Department, is now ready.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 95/1962 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Philip

regarding installation of water services in the parish of St. Philip, is now ready.

LEAVE TO MAKE STATEMENT

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to ask leave of the House to make a statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Social Services is desirous of making a Statement and is asking leave to do so. If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

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

It is very unfortunate that the microphones are not working. I know hon. members would be most sympathetic and would speak in very subdued tones so that the member on his feet can be heard.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Statement is as follows:-

STATEMENT BY THE HONOURABLE MINISTER OF SOCIAL SERVICES ON PROGRESS OF STAFF REORGANISATION AT THE BARBADOS GENERAL HOSPITAL

A Committee was appointed on 24th September, 1960, under the Chairmanship of Dr. Horace Gillette, Medical Adviser to the now defunct Federal Government, with the following terms of reference:-

- (i) to examine the existing staff structure of the General Hospital under the following heads -

- (a) Medical,
- (b) Nursing,
- (c) Clerical and Administrative;

- (ii) To consider the demands now made on the out-patients clinics;

and

- (iii) to make recommendations and to advise the Minister accordingly.

2. The Report of this Committee was received during the same month and was laid in the legislature on 19th December, 1961. The Report recommended the increase of the Staff of the Hospital by some 30 doctors and 220 nurses in addition to clerical and ancillary staff of similar proportions.

3. I gave immediate consideration to this and two other Reports concerned with the administration of the Hospital on assuming office. The financial implications were considered to be beyond the resources of this Government and those items which merited priority were selected and requested of the Legislature. This action resulted in the creation of the following additional posts by the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.5) Order, 1962, which was approved by the Legislature in November, 1962:-

1. Senior Specialist Obstetrician (now Senior Specialist Obstetrician and Gynaecologist)
2. Registrars
2. Medical Officers
1. Accountant
1. Hospital Supplies Officer
1. Stenographer
1. Steward
1. Assistant Steward
1. Stores Assistant
3. Laundry Superintendent
1. Laundry Workers
1. Laundry Operator
2. Assistant Seamstresses
1. Messenger
22. Staff Nurses
11. Medical Secretaries

In addition to the increased staff provided by the Civil Establishment Order, two additional House Officers and 22 Student Nurses were added to the strength of the Hospital since the Report was laid in the Legislature.

4. Some of these posts have already been filled and steps are being taken to fill the others.

5. Following a number of adverse comments in the report, action has been taken to improve the accommodation at the Nurses' Home and at the Records Department and to provide improved facilities for Orderlies."

I should like to pause here and point out that prior to the regime of this Government, Orderlies at the Hospital were expected to go and wash their faces over a six-inch pipe on the lawn.

3.15 p.m.

There is another thing. The Nurses in the Nurses' Home were asked to go in the lavatory and sit on the plain porcelain because the toilets were without any covers or seats.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the Hon. Minister would give way.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: What has the Hon. member risen on?

Mr. MILLER: If the Hon. Minister continues to read the Statement I will sit; but if he is allowed to comment on the Statement, Your Honour cannot stop me. Let him read the Statement and I will hear it in silence; but if he comments on it, he cannot expect to do so without hon. members interjecting.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: When I am finished, the hon. junior member for St. George is going to push his head in a bag of shame.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you cannot allow the hon. member to comment on the Statement; that is unfair to me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will both hon. members give way? I am not begging, but I am expecting the atmosphere in the House today and always would be such as you can expect from responsible members.

I will hear the Hon. Minister now.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: "6. Since the action outlined above was taken, proposals have been made by the University of the West Indies for adapting the Barbados General Hospital, along with two other hospitals in Jamaica and Trinidad, as a centre for the clinical teaching of medical students in training at the University. The proposals are that teaching should be undertaken in the three major subjects - medicine, surgery and midwifery. The proposals will entail the appointment of additional staff and some change in the scheme of administration of the Institution. Accordingly, the Government in consultation with the University, has secured through the auspices of the World Health Organisation a team of experts in hospital administration who have recently visited the Island and are at present preparing their report and recommendations.

7. Some of the benefits to be derived if the proposals are implemented are —

- (i) the appointment by the University of additional specialists to the staff of the Hospital;
- (ii) the presence of fully accredited teaching staff at this Hospital will attract junior medical officers who would otherwise have had to continue their studies in a recognised teaching hospital outside of Barbados;
- (iii) The hospital patients will have the services of additional specialists on the staff over and

above those which Barbados may have been able to provide.

8. Other recommendations contained in the Gillette Report will be considered in conjunction with the recommendations of the team of hospital administrators as soon as the latter report is received."

NOTICE OF RESOLUTION

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave of this Hon. House to give notice of a Resolution in connection with the Statement which has just been read by the Hon. Minister of Social Services.

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

Mr. CORBIN: The Resolution reads as follows:-

WHEREAS the Report of the Advisory Committee on Hospital Administration was laid in the House of Assembly on 19th December, 1961,

AND WHEREAS the Minister of Social Services has on the 7th May, 1963, made a Statement on the action taken on this Report so far,

BE IT RESOLVED that this House note and approve such action as has been taken.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Under Private Members' Business, Order No. 1 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter: Third reading of a Bill to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1957. On 30th January 1962, the Bill was read a second time and referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as Your Honour can see, this matter has been referred to a Select Committee which has not yet reported; therefore, I am not in a position to proceed with this Order.

THE YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION BILL 1962

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 2 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George: Third Reading of a Bill to incorporate the Young Women's Christian Association of Barbados.

On the 6th December, 1962 the Bill was read a second time and referred to a Select Committee. The Report was laid on the 11th December, 1962.

Mr. MILLER: As Your Honour has said, the Report of that Committee has been laid and at this stage I want to move that it be adopted.

Mr. SMITH: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I now ask that the Bill be read a third time.

Mr. SMITH: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I now ask that the Bill do now pass.

Mr. SMITH: I beg to second that.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church: To move the Third Reading of a Bill to incorporate the Home for Elderly Gentlemen in Straitened Circumstances.

Mr. GODDARD: The Committee has not yet reported.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael: To resume debate on a Resolution re the Operation of the Widows and Orphans' Pension Scheme.

On the 19th March, 1963 the Hon. Minister of Social Services moved, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Communications that further consideration be postponed. The hon. senior member for St. Peter spoke. 3.25 p.m.

The Hon. Leader of the House was speaking in connection with this Resolution when Government Business was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not ready to continue my remarks on this Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is one comment which I would like to make and it is this: it seems to me that there is some bamboozling between the hon. senior member for St. Michael and the Hon. Leader of the House in connection with this Measure. This is not the place where those hon. members have their own private Rules. If the Hon. Leader of the House is not ready to continue his remarks on this Resolution, then he loses his right to speak and we will proceed to deal with the matter. (ASIDES) The Hon. Leader of the House says that he is not ready to continue his remarks and you do not ask an hon. member if he is ready to speak. When the matter comes up, and an hon. member is not ready to continue his remarks, then he loses his right to speak. He has come to the end of the rope in so far as his speech is concerned.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member is in the habit of bamboozling with other hon. members in here, I am not in that habit. What happened was that on the last occasion when this matter was before the House, I remember suggesting that since this matter came under the portfolio of the Hon. Premier the hon. mover of the motion and the House itself might naturally prefer to have him deal with the matter. This is a matter which affects the Civil Service. I know that the Hon. Premier has to be at Government House at 3.30 p.m. of the clock, I presume he is there now, and I presume that he would like the opportunity to say a few words in connection with this matter. That is my only reason for failing to join in the debate today. There has been no preliminary agreement between the hon. senior member for St. Michael and myself to bamboozle in this matter, but I do suggest that before the debate is finalised, the Hon. Minister under whose portfolio the matter falls, might be heard on the motion.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Question! Question!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In the absence of any motion for the postponement of this matter, I will have to put the question.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Michael need not reply. This Order No. 4 under Private Members' Business is to resume debate on a Resolution re the operation of the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Scheme, and if the hon. member is not willing to continue the debate, the only thing to do is for Your Honour to put the question.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order. The hon. senior member for St. Michael, in whose name this Order stands, obviously has not given the House the impression that he

wants to reply. This Resolution is now the property of this House; it is not the property of the Government. Your Honour has almost bent backwards in inviting some hon. member to make a motion for the postponement of this Resolution and no hon. member has given any hint of doing so. The only thing to do now is to put the question in order to allow proper Parliamentary procedure to go through; otherwise there is nothing before the House. The time of the House is being wasted and Your Honour, as representative of this House and not the Government, will have to go by the Rules, Usages and Practices of this Ancient Chamber. I say therefore that the question must now be put.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have already intimated that in the absence of any motion for postponement or for the further consideration of this debate, there will be no alternative than for the question to be put and I will now put the question.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if it be the desire of the House that the debate be continued on this Resolution, I certainly will not lose my right further to participate in this debate.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member spoke, sat down, then he got up, went out and returned to the Chamber and is he now going to speak again? I repeat, the hon. member sat, and rose again.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member has risen on a point of order.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am saying that the hon. member has not got the right to speak now, he having spoken and sat down, he having risen again, left the Chamber and returned. What is going on now? How can the hon. member after having spoken and resumed his seat and left the Chamber, speak again now? I am saying that the hon. member cannot speak on this matter now.
3.35 p.m.

He has no right to speak; and if he does it, Sir, you will have to allow every other member to do that too, that is, to speak, to sit, to rise again, to leave the House, and to come back in and speak, all in one, each action following the other as a matter of consequence; and that cannot happen. It has never happened in this Chamber for 300 years. I have been here for fifteen years and I have not seen it at all.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. junior member for St. Peter has asked what is going on. I want to repeat the question, but I really want to circumscribe it by asking what is going on in his mind. Obviously there is something wrong with him.

Mr. HUSBANDS: That is rudeness, Sir. The hon. member has no right to castigate me in this House; he is out of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I do not want to expatiate on what I think might be wrong, but I want to ask the hon. member when I left the Chamber. I have not left this Chamber at all today.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The hon. member sat, rose, left the Chamber and returned.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Certainly, Sir, when the hon. member for St. Peter, is, shall we say, of sound mind

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must tell the hon. member that there cannot be any fringes on all these personal things. I am not entertaining that. The hon. junior member for St. Peter rose on a point of order, and amongst other things he has made one point, and I take it the hon. Leader of the House is answering that point and not replying to other things not relevant to the questions.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: What point am I supposed to deal with?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member was saying that the Leader of the House had spoken and had left the House, and he cannot speak twice. I will now hear the Leader of the House.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The point is this, Mr. Deputy Speaker; at no stage since this House started have I left the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me assure the Hon. Leader of the House that the point is not controversial anymore.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may rise on a point of order, I think I was the member who drew to Your Honour's attention that the Hon. Leader of the House had indicated to Your Honour that he was not prepared to continue with this debate, and I said that if the Hon. Leader of the House was not continuing with the debate, that it did not mean that the debate closes, and that is where the whole impasse came about. It is purely for Your Honour to decide if you accept the hon. member rising to say that he did not intend to continue his speech, and my rising on a point of order. It is for Your Honour to decide whether he has concluded his speech. If he wants to continue he may do so, because no one else has spoken since he has.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is not the point, Mr. Deputy Speaker. When the matter was called, I said I was not minded to continue my reply today and I gave the reasons why, but the suggestion was that further debate be postponed. Now if this question for postponement is not going to be put, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the motion is going to be for finalising the debate, I am going to exert my right to speak and nobody at all can stop that.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member should bear in mind that if he does not continue, no one can rise now, because he is the next speaker. If somebody else attempts to speak on this, he still loses his right to speak. You do not go backwards, and say that "As I did not speak I am going to speak now." He will have to make the motion himself or let somebody else make it; but that will have to be the position.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is so elementary that I cannot understand the reason for having this debate at all. I rose so that I do not lose my right to speak. That is all there is to it, and I am going to make the motion now which, if carried, preserves my right to continue to speak when the debate resumes, and the motion is that further debate be postponed.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph; to resume debate on a Resolution relative to the increased cost to peasants of the harvesting of their crops. Further consideration of this Resolution was postponed on the motion of the Hon. Leader of the House seconded by the Hon. Minister of Social Services.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this particular Resolution was postponed by virtue of the Sugar Enquiry which is being conducted. The Enquiry shall be reconvened on the 20th of this month, and I am therefore moving that further consideration be postponed.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas; to move the passing of a Resolution relative to the erection of a Dispensary in St. Thomas. That hon. member is not in his place. The same thing applies to Order No. 8.

Order No. 9 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown; to move the passing of a Resolution relative to the degree course to be instituted at the proposed University College in Barbados.

RESOLUTION *Re* DEGREE COURSE AT PROPOSED UNIVERSITY COLLEGE IN BARBADOS

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in view of the fact that an assurance has already been given that Government is prepared to admit students for the degree course at the proposed University College who possess five passes at Ordinary Level, and in view of the fact that Government apparently agrees in every respect with the Resolution which I tabled, I now ask for permission to withdraw this Resolution.

3.45 p.m.

Leave was granted the hon. member to withdraw the Resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph: to move the passing of a Resolution *re* the appointment of a Committee to investigate the entire running of the Northern District Council.

ORDER NO. 12 WITHDRAWN

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before you call the next Order, I would like to be able to get your permission to regularize the Order Paper. In view of the fact that Order No. 10 is likely to be debated, I am asking Your Honour's permission to withdraw Order No. 12 which stands in my name because the Government gave notice of a Bill today which deals with the same thing; and as you cannot have two Orders dealing with the same matter on the Order Paper, I am asking leave to withdraw Order No. 12.

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

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE RUNNING OF NORTHERN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Resolution reads as follows:-

BE IT RESOLVED that the House of Assembly view with great concern the statement made by a Councillor at a meeting of the Northern District Council on the 14th March, 1963, and the alleged irregularities that are existing therein;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government be asked to appoint a committee to investigate the entire running of the Northern District Council.

Sir, this matter is causing great concern to the North. As Your Honour would know, the Vestry System was changed over to the Local Government system, and from the time the change was made the taxes soared highly in that area and all over the island. But at the same time taxpayers are still wondering to know what has caused the people in the Northern area to pay such a high rate of taxation and yet nothing has been done commensurate with the increase in taxation. It is a fact that the former Vestries used to carry out their work in each parish as cheaply as they possibly could and tried to keep the administrative costs as low as possible. There are certain things which are being done now in the various Councils which taxpayers have to pay for but which in former days under the Vestry system used to be done for nothing.

Sir, there are a few irregularities existing under the Northern District Council. You have some people who are interfering with the professional duties of persons in the area, and I feel that that is going too far. When a particular individual can give an order to override that of a doctor, I think that is going too far. In other words, if a doctor gives an order and an individual comes behind the doctor and gives another order, there is the possibility of some one losing his life.

Sir, it is a fact that some Councillors do not understand the running of a particular institution or they do not take time off to familiarise themselves with the rules and regulations and they try to pass their own views, which is a wrong thing to do. There are some taxpayers who are very much dissatisfied with the taxes which they have to pay and they find out that nothing is being done for their money, as I have said just now. In other words, they are only paying the taxes, but they do not know or cannot say how their money is being spent.

We have had a case which I have heard about at a particular institution where a doctor gave instructions to the Matron not to allow a particular patient to leave the institution except someone was prepared to come and be responsible for the particular patient when he was out of the institution, and it is alleged that a Councillor went into the same institution and gave instructions that this particular patient must go. Whether or not it was the doctor or the Councillor, the patient was discharged and a couple of days after the patient was found in a cane field dead.

Sir, if we are to sit and allow such things to happen, well, that is one life gone now; but you can expect more lives to go as a result because I take it that if the doctor is responsible for the running of the institution, so far as his professional duties are concerned, then no one as a layman has any right of questioning or giving other orders counter to the doctor's orders.

Sir, I have also understood that a Councillor of the same Northern District Council tried to fix the hours of attendance of the doctor. He was trying to state what time the doctor was to come in and when he was to leave the institution. That is a very serious thing. It is a very serious thing for a layman to fly in the face of a professional man to tell him what time he must come to work and what time he must go. There are two people whom, while I am not altogether afraid of them, I highly respect and will do nothing to annoy or embarrass. They are my doctor and my cook. As soon as you interfere with your doctor or your cook, you are looking for trouble; you are trying to provide a better living for an undertaker.

3.55 p.m.

When you find a Council doing such things, then the people are bound to suffer.

Another thing is that members of the Council are trying to fix the hours for the Public Assistance Officer. That is another serious thing. Such an officer has to work at any time just like a doctor because you can call upon him at any time. If you are specifying or limiting the times of the Public Assistance Officer, it will mean that when he has put in his hours of work and goes home, he is not supposed to go and answer a call, and there is the possibility of the patient suffering until the next day when the time arrives for this Officer to appear at his office. I do not think that you can compel a Public Assistance Officer to be meeting any particular time. There are poor people who are not in a position to call a doctor on their own because the wherewithal is not there. Imagine this Public Assistance Officer going home at 4 o'clock and, say that at 5 o'clock, somebody calls him to go to a patient. The rules are that before that Officer can send a doctor to a particular patient, he has first to go and investigate the case. He is supposed to be out of office at 4 o'clock and it may be 5 o'clock when he is called upon to visit a particular patient. It may be a case of a woman in travail for that matter and the particular person is told by the Officer: "Well, I will come tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock."

This is a serious matter. When we come against members of a particular Council trying to do these things, then the people will suffer. I am saying it is high time that when people are doing these things the Government should be called upon to set up an enquiry into the working of this particular Council for the benefit of the poorer classes of people who are not able to call in a doctor on their own, and find out what is responsible for members of the Council to be interfering with the professional duties or the professional administration of a particular infirmary or institution. All of that should be investigated in order to set everything in its right perspective, and to get things working

smoothly as before. I have referred to the old Vestry system and I say that with that system we never had anything of this sort. The old Vestry system has worked well as far as administration is concerned. What I am concerning myself with is not so much the high rate of taxation because we have to pay taxes according to the high cost of living; but when the taxes are collected the money should be spent wisely.

It is a known fact that the old Vestry system or the old Vestrymen always tried to make things go as far as they possibly could and we always had harmony existing throughout the particular parish as far as administration is concerned, both professional and otherwise; but today the taxpayers, or most of the people who have to depend upon such services, are not getting 100 per cent benefit and it is our duty as representatives of the people to say what is the trouble. Something is wrong; and the only way in which we can find out what is wrong is to have an investigation into the matter and get the records put straight. It is of no use when the taxpayers are dissatisfied and all they can do is to pay the taxes. They should know what is really the trouble; they should even know what is responsible for the high rate of taxation which obtains today, although one can clearly see it.

On the other hand, there are expenses which are incurred now but which were never incurred during the time of the Vestry. The Vestry used to work at a great sacrifice; they did everything for nothing and they tried to make a very good job of what they did. But today things speak for themselves because no sooner than the Vestry was abolished, up went the taxes; therefore something is wrong there. I am submitting that, regardless of how much or how little the old Vestry system was doing before, it is quite certain that we were getting much better services during the time when they were in operation than what we are getting now. I repeat, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Vestry used to work at a great sacrifice, but they tried to make a very good job of everything they tried to do. 4.05 p.m.

Sir, the Vestrymen before that day only had at their disposal a very small amount of money, and they used to make sure that they would not have to go back and tax the people again in any one year. As far as Local Government is concerned, there is more than one parish which has to be always asking for more money to reimburse a particular vote which has already been overspent. That is another case which should be investigated immediately, because if there are three or four, and sometimes six parishes in a particular area, and two or three are always over-spending, something is wrong, and we should protect the others that are not over-spending, and by so doing we will be protecting the taxpayers at the same time.

As I said, Sir, all is not well as far as the administration is concerned or as far as the taxpayers are concerned. I cannot speak fully on the matter, Sir, because I am a member of a Council, and I should not try to embarrass other members; yet I have to protect the taxpayers and the people who sent me there. I am asking for this protection by asking this Government to investigate the running of the Northern District Council. I would have been able to talk much longer on this matter if I was outside the Council, and with the knowledge I have I would be able to speak in a different tone; but I am doing my duty by letting the Government know that it is time for an investigation to put matters straight. We should do something like that because all is not well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution, do now pass.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in seconding this Resolution, I begin at the outset by saying that when an hon. member of this House, especially one who is also a member of a District Council, introduces such a Resolution invoking the aid of this House to set up a Committee of Enquiry to investigate what he, from his knowledge and experience, regards as a matter of public dissatisfaction, I think this Chamber should regard it in a very serious light. I have

had the experience of listening in this Chamber to a very lengthy debate on one particular occasion in which I remember the Government was asked to come to assistance in a matter which concerned a particular Vestry. I do not think, knowing the hon. member who moved this Resolution as I do, that he is being actuated by any light motive. He is an experienced Parliamentarian and a very experienced member in Local Government.

Now, Sir, the hon. member has made two major points. One is that a particular doctor in the service of the Northern District Council, during the discharge of his functions in medical administration at a particular institution, has been crossed by a lay member of the Northern District Council. Now that is not a matter to be regarded very lightly at all. I have heard rumours of this same interference, but now we have it on the authority of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph given to us in this Chamber. It must be very frustrating to a medical man when he gives an order, to have a layman to his profession give a counter order; and if such incidents were to be repeated, I am very, very sure that we would have something approaching a civil disturbance in this Island if it were treated on a great scale; and I take it an honour to second this Resolution and to add what I can to the arguments put forward by the Hon. Introducer, and to bring more forcibly before this House how serious such a situation might become.

The hon. member has opened our eyes. This might be just a sign of the times. I remember on one occasion when in a particular Vestry an application for a local Medical Officer went out, and the call was answered by a single applicant. 4.15 p.m.

Now, Sir, when members of the medical profession hear that in a particular parish of the Northern District a doctor of medicine can give an administrative order and a layman can come and turn that order upside down and give a counter order, that is no inducement to members of the medical profession to apply for such posts. As a matter of fact, I understand that in the Northern District Council there are only two medical men who are appointed and I think the other four are holding acting appointments. If that sort of behaviour continues to increase on the part of Councillors — I think they call themselves Councillors — I would not be surprised if in the very near future they would have to put up with all acting appointments which would be terminable at short notice. Anyone would know what that would lead up to. Obviously, it would lead up to inattention to the poor.

Therefore, when a member of the Northern District Council, who is a member of this House of Assembly gets on the floor of this Chamber and makes that statement, I think every hon. member should begin to think and think seriously, and I think members of the Government should see the need for setting up a Committee of Enquiry to investigate into the working of the Northern District Council.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has also stated that as far as Public Assistance is concerned, the hours of duty of a particular Public Assistance Officer are not really conducive to serving the poor of the parish to which he is appointed. When a member of the Northern District Council makes that statement on the floor of this House that is a serious matter and I do not think that would need any extra urge for the Government to set up a Committee of Enquiry to investigate into the working of the Northern District Council.

I was patiently awaiting for the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to state more instances than those two, because I have heard more rumours. He did not say that the present-day members of the Council are spendthrifts, but I am going to tell you now of a rumour which I have heard as regards travelling allowances. I understand that some members go out of their way to get increases of travelling allowances. As a matter of fact, one particular member of that District Council, I understand, chooses to put his address a sufficient number of miles away from his place of residence in order that more travelling allowance may accrue to him. That is what I have heard and it has not been whispered to

me. I am sure hon. members of this Chamber who are members of the Northern District Council, Your Honour not excepted, know much more about that than I. If it is true that a member of the Northern District Council who lives in Rock Hall, St. Thomas, can put his address as Free Hill, Black Rock, St. Michael, in order that he may draw more money as travelling allowance, that is serious business and that is enough for the Government to look into the matter of how travelling allowances are provided. Of course, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is still a member of the Northern District Council and I think he too gave a hint that he was holding back something. I have nothing to hold back.

Sir, for those three reasons, two which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has introduced and one which I have brought to the attention of the House and which is a very persistent rumour, I think they are sufficient grounds for the Government to conduct an enquiry into the working of the Northern District Council.

As far as taxation is concerned, Sir I look on that in a businesslike way. If people want improved services and they clamoured originally for them, they have to expect increased expenditure. A voice has asked me what are the increased services. I do think, if I reflect, that there are a few new services added since the inauguration of the Local Government Act and I think some increased expenditure has accumulated since the Local Government system has replaced the old Vestry system. I am not in a position as those who are members of the District Council to know the figures. I am not a member of any District Council. Those hon. members would know the additional taxation and the new services, and it is for them to weigh the two to see how good a job they can make of the entire matter. Therefore, I am not going to make any reference to taxation because I do not know anything of the expenditure. People are today clamouring for new services and improved services; therefore, they have to accept increased taxation.

Sir, I think there are other hon. members of this Chamber who might want to speak on this Resolution. They are more familiar with the working of Local Government than I am. As a matter of fact, they are more familiar with the working of the Northern District Council than I am and I am sure what is known to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph may be also known to other members of the Northern District Council who are members of this House. I think he should be complimented for bringing to the attention of this House what he considers are matters which affect the public and which affect the poor and are not in the interest of the best working of the Northern District Council. I also think that the subject matter on which he has spoken is serious enough to invite the attention of the Government to have an enquiry conducted into the matter.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution as it stands before us today is in connection with seeking an investigation into the running of the Northern District Council of which I myself am a member.

Firstly, I want to say that doctors are not responsible for running of institutions. That is what I heard the hon. junior member for St. Joseph say.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Am I correct in saying that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has said that I said that the doctor is not responsible for running the institution?

Mr. CORBIN: I am saying that he is not responsible for the running of the institution.
4.25 p.m.

That is what I said. He is not responsible for the running of the institution; he is responsible for the sick people who have been admitted by him to the institution. Where any person goes to the doctor and the doctor finds that he is sick and is unable to take care of himself, it is the doctor's prerogative to admit that person to the institution; it is also the doctor's prerogative to discharge any person from the institution. On the other hand, if any other person has been admitted to the institution for care, it is the sole preroga-

tive of the Guardians Committee to discharge such a person. The doctor has no part in the administration of that matter. I am sure that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph can say that the St. Joseph Almshouse is being run very smoothly and I am also certain that that is the case with St. Andrew and St. Peter. We did have some worries at St. Thomas, but we have gone into the administration and we have corrected what was wrong. We have pointed out that it is not within the prerogative of any Councillor to interfere with those who have been admitted to the institution. I am sure that no Councillor can go to the institution and interfere with the powers of the doctors who have admitted people there.

The hon. mover of the passing of this Resolution knows that we have a case now to be investigated in relation to the same matter. The expenses of the Northern District Council are high and we surely know that they will be higher still. Why is that? It is because the cost of foodstuffs has gone up and we have more people going into the institutions than we have ever had; and we have to buy more clothes for them. We have to pay increased salaries to the Nurses, we have to pay greater water rates and we have to pay more for the commodities which are needed in the institutions. Where is this money to come from? It must come out of the pockets of the taxpayers. Through our taxation, we are contributing to the poor people who have worked so hard; therefore I am saying that the taxation will go up.

At this stage, it being now 4.30 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 4.30 p.m. of the clock, the time when the consideration of Private Member's Business come to an end.

DOCUMENT

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we proceed to the consideration of Government Business, I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following Document:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
BARBADOS

7th May, 1963.

Your Honour,

I have the honour to advise you that in accordance with the provisions of Section 4 (b) of the Boundaries Commission Act, 1962-41, I have appointed Sir Frank Holder, C.M.G., Q.C., to be Deputy Chairman of the Commission in accordance with the advice of the Premier.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 4 (c) of the same Act, I have appointed the Honourable W. A. Crawford, M.C.P., Senior Member for St. Philip, and Mr. Russell Lowe, M.C.P., Senior Member for St. George, as the two members of the General Assembly on the Commission, in accordance with the advice of the Premier.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 4 (d) of the same Act, I have appointed Mr. E.D. Mottley, C.B.E., M.C.P., as the Member of the General Assembly on the Commission, in accordance with the advice of the Leader of the Opposition.

I have the honour to be,
Your Honour,
Your Honour's obedient servant,

JOHN STOW
Governor.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER
OF THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY. "

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Under "Government Business", the first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:- To move the passing of a Re-

solution to approve the Agreement between Hilton Hotels International Incorporated and the Barbados Development Board.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the first Order of the Day under Government Business be the Budget Statement and the Financial Proposals relating thereto.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the question is put, I should like to say this: I do not understand what the hon. member means by that. That is not an item on the Order Paper; if it is an item on the Order Paper I would like to have a direction as to what Order it is. We have on the Order Paper under Government Business, Order No. 1 which is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Agreement between Hilton Hotels International Incorporated and the Barbados Development Board. The second Order is the Third Reading of a Bill further to amend the Bank Holidays Act, 1905, and the Third Order is the Second Reading of a Bill further to amend the Bank Holidays Act, 1905. What the hon. member wants to do now is not an item on the Order Paper and I am submitting that the procedure should be set in order. Let us get things in their right perspective; as I say, there is no such order on the Order Paper as the Budget Statement and the Financial Proposals relating thereto.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will recall that earlier today I gave notice of my intention to ask for leave to deal with this matter. I am now carrying out the motion in accordance with the statement which I made earlier, that is to say, I am asking for leave to make the Budget Statement and Financial Proposals relating thereto the first Order of the Day under Government Business and I am also asking leave to give notice of two Bills and a Resolution of which notice was not given earlier today.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not objecting to that, but I do not want the hon. member to mix up two things. Today, the hon. member was giving notice of his intention to ask leave to give notice of a Bill. The hon. member never informed the House that it was his intention to give notice that Order No. 1 under Government Business would be the Budget Statement and the Financial Proposals in connection therewith.

4.35 p.m.

I want to make it clear as that was not on the Order Paper and it was not done, it should be done in order that the Rules and Procedure of the House be adhered to strictly. After all we are in Parliament and we cannot run Parliament like an ordinary rum shop.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the House has asked leave to make the Budget Speech and Financial Statements, the First Order of the Day under Government Business, and if there is no objection leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGET PROPOSALS

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I shall lay the first part of these Budgetary Proposals in the form of an economic survey of the Barbados economy in 1962. This will be printed and circulated. It is not my intention, however, to read or to quote from the economic survey, but I am asking leave, perhaps, to make an introduction so that Your Honour will be in a position to say whether leave should be granted or not. I could easily have incorporated these proposals in the Budget Speech, but one has to attack and separate the tares from the wheat.

The purpose of this economic survey, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of the Barbados economy in 1962, is to provide a background picture of general trends in the economy of the island against which the budget proposals for the year 1963-64 can be more clearly viewed and appreciated. As it is necessary in a developing country like Barbados, where Government's fiscal policy is aimed at providing an infra-

structure and pre-conditions for take-off from a period of stagnation that the members of the general public, as well as members of the Legislature and the more politically sophisticated should be kept fully informed, the survey has been presented without an abundance of statistical tables, and with the minimum use of technical terms. For the business man and research student who may desire more precision, we recommend the publications of the Barbados Statistical Service, since in order to meet the deadline of the budget, no accurate check could be made on the out-turn figures so soon after the close of the financial year.

In keeping with the usual practice, Mr. Deputy Speaker, neither copies of the economic survey nor of the Budget Speech will be available even if there is an original copy of the latter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, 1962 was a critical year for the economy of the Island, but the Government faced the situation it had inherited with determination, and, although there are still many difficulties, confidence in the ability of the Government to tackle and overcome them has never been higher. Our high financial reputation, a most valuable asset, was in grave danger; it has been preserved and strengthened.

The success of our London loan in December last, the immediate oversubscription of the loans offered locally in January and February, 1963, and the collection of revenue of \$28 1/3 million for the year 1962-63 as against current expenditure of \$28 1/3 million in the financial year are indications of what has been achieved.

Between the end of March, 1959, and the end of March, 1961, deposits in the commercial banks rose by less than \$1 1/2 million. Since then they have risen by \$9 1/3 million. At the end of March, 1961, loans and advances by the commercial banks totalled \$48 million; they now total little over \$39 million. The fall in deposits in the Government Savings Bank — they fell by \$2 million in 1961 — has been arrested, and there are now signs of a slight improvement.

These are all sound facts; but it would be unwise to imagine that a great deal more has not to be done by the Government to lay firm financial foundations for the kernel of the East Caribbean nation we are now building.

The essence of our financial strategy is that as regards spending we should be able to withdraw to prepared positions when the pressure on our resources is too great, but that we should always be ready to attack with all the resources we can muster when an opportunity for expansion of the economy presents itself. Above all, we must plan to stand on our own feet, as we, in Barbados, have done throughout our history.

We are not unmindful of the interest shown in us from time to time by the agencies of certain Governments, but all too often there proves to be nothing tangible behind it — perhaps I should say — other than pious expressions of goodwill. However, I make no apology for the approaches which I propose to make to the Governments of Canada and Great Britain, countries which are intimately linked with us by history.

The failure of the negotiations between the United Kingdom and the European Economic Community towards the end of January, 1963, was a relief, but we are watching the position very carefully. It is becoming clearer every day that we stood nothing to gain by becoming an appendage of General de Gaulle's Europe on his terms. Now the "Kennedy round" of trade talks with the object of reducing tariffs is beginning not very successfully. Reductions of tariff undoubtedly lead to expansion of trade, and we welcome any reductions in the tariffs of the giant nations or groups of nations. The economy of this Island — and this group of Islands — can be developed substantially only by our producing goods for sale abroad. Our home market is small. However, we are not content to remain in the position we have always been in the past, importing most of what we consume. In 1962 the total value of our exports and re-exports was only \$42.5 million, while our total imports

cost \$83.9 million. I propose that this huge gap should be closed by local production and that, in addition to the local market, we should look to markets abroad and the market afforded by visitors to the Island. It should now be clear why we are devoting so much time to the establishment of industries, the development of agriculture and marketing, the improvement of external communications and the building of hotel accommodation.

Perhaps one of the drawbacks has been the relative cheapness of imported commodities. If we are to enter export markets with our products, we must keep down the cost of production, and strive to improve their quality. Because of the larger home markets of the foreign manufacturers who sell us their surplus produce, such manufacturers enjoy advantages over persons who establish industries here. I propose, therefore, that local industries should be protected from unfair competition abroad. I also urge the people of this Island to take pride in buying commodities produced here. In nine cases out of ten the Barbadian article is better than that imported, be it carrots, beer, handbags or clothing. If the wholesalers and retailers do not soon give preference always to Barbadian products, the Government will take measures to persuade them to do so. At this stage I simply give a warning. It will be far better if they and the public give me their whole-hearted support in a campaign to buy Barbadian goods and produce because they are better. In a short time I hope to be able to extend this slogan to goods and produce of the group of islands with which Barbados is to be associated. Price controls on local produce will be relaxed immediately.

4.45 p.m.

In one very important respect our terms of trade have improved recently. The world price of sugar has reached the figure of (£70) \$336 a ton. This is largely due to the Cuban situation and poor crops in certain countries. I think we ought to remember that sugar is not a tropical product; it is a product which is produced with equal facility in temperate climes as well as our own. Fortunately our own crop is now estimated at 188,000 tons (an increase of 8,000 on the original estimate) and we should derive some benefit from the increase in the world price. Most of the crop has, however, already been sold at the negotiated price, and we have to supply our own needs.

Last year the expansion of the tourist trade was greater than in 1961. 44,258 tourists arrived in the Island — an increase of 7,198 as against 1,525 in the previous year. In the first quarter of 1963, 14,161 tourists came here as compared with 12,323 in the same period last year. This is the sector of our economy which can be expanded most rapidly, and the recent intensified activity of the Tourist Board and the agreement I have signed with Hilton Hotels to build a hotel to be operated by Hilton here indicated how forcefully the Government is pursuing a policy of developing the tourist industry.

I have already indicated how essential it is that we should, as far as possible, meet the needs of this industry in food and other commodities produced locally. Already some of the capital goods — such as bricks — required by the industry are being produced in the Island.

How necessary it is to find employment for our people in Barbados is emphasised by the population figures. In 1961 there had been a slight fall in the population because of migration. Last year there was a net increase of 3,422 in the estimated population, which rose to 245,077. The natural increase was 4,767; there were 129 more births and 294 less deaths than in the previous year. It is probably true to say that the problem of a rapidly rising birth rate is being solved in this Island, for, despite the increase in births recorded in 1962, the number of births in that year was less than that in 1952. The number of deaths, however, fell much more steeply. Net migration fell from 4,963 to 1,345. In the future, with the approach of federation, we must expect increased migration to Barbados from our sister Islands. Such a situation should not be met with fear but with regional planning. We must not treat those Islands as poor relations; we must give them freely the benefits of our knowledge, experience and development. In

return this community will reap the benefit of a considerable expansion of its economy.

There was again a slight increase in the retail price index, but the rise was even less than in the previous year, only 1.6 points, which is less than 1 1/2%. As other countries continue to follow more and more a wages and incomes policy to combat inflation and to make their costs competitive, we shall have to watch carefully any factors which may increase the cost of production here. Already the cost of Government services is being strictly controlled. If the economy of the island is to make a leap forward, every one of us must make some sacrifice. Retail prices here compare favourably with those in the other Islands of the group with which we are about to associate, except perhaps in one or two instances where we make the articles ourselves. In Antigua and St. Vincent rice is 17 cents a pound; in Montserrat the price is 19 cents. In Barbados it is sold at 11 cents per pint. The fact is that we, in Barbados, are subsidising the British Guiana producer.

I have heard one eminent Trade Unionist claim that we are subsidising low wages when we do that, the theory being that whenever you have to subsidise a commodity like rice, then the people are not paid subsistence wages because they cannot buy food out of their own pockets. This is a theory with which I entirely agree and I think this learned gentleman and I are agreed on many other things although not on all.

Now this subsidy to British Guiana is one of the items in our budget, and we might now have a look at the provisional figures of the Treasury out-turn for the last financial year 1962-63; but before I do so, I should like to allay any fears which the populace has about the rice shortage. As Your Honour knows, there is a general strike in British Guiana, but I am sure that there are supplies of rice available in this Island at least until the end of the month and this is not any shortened period at all. It is quite possible that we will get additional shipments before the end of the month.

It should be emphasized that they are not the final figures, but they give a good indication of the out-turn. Current expenditure was \$28,353,000; revenue was \$28,336,000. The deficit on these figures was \$17,000, which is negligible — so that my impositions in June last have been amply justified. I was, if anything, over-cautious in budgeting for a deficit of \$133,000. If I may say so myself, never in the history of this Island had a budget worked with so much mathematical precision as to whether the people were over-taxed or under-taxed. We will remember that under the *ancien regime* that the usual amount of overtax rode happily on the waves of \$2 million of \$3 million a year. I regret that I have undertaxed by \$17,000 this year, but I tried to rectify it in this budget.

Capital expenditure 1962-63 has been \$7,644,000 which refutes any charges of extravagance. Of this amount, \$1,249,000 has been charged to surplus balances and \$392,000 to the Labour Welfare Fund, we have received \$1,837,000 from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds and \$4,166,000 has been chargeable to Loan Account.

The General Revenue Balance was reduced from \$3,483,000 to \$2,217,000 during the financial year; and loans totalling \$7,161,250 were raised in the period.

The whole picture is of solid financial achievement in difficult circumstances.

4.55 p.m.

Details of Revenue collected in 1962-63 are as follows:-

Customs Duties	\$11,144,000
Excise Duties	2,210,000
Income Tax	8,997,000
Other Receipts	5,985,000
Total	<u>\$28,336,000</u>

At 31st March, 1963, the Public Debt was \$34,398,978. This is a formidable amount, but in addition, advances

pending the raising of loans amounted to \$5 million. To the extent that this money has been spent on productive development, there need be no apprehension; and I wish to assure the House that the Capital votes to the amount of \$13,824,000 on loan account which have been approved will only be spent with strict control.

A local loan of \$1 million has just been announced by the Treasury, and even people with only \$49 to invest would be well advised to take advantage of its favourable terms. The running yield will be nearly 7 per cent.

There is one thing I would like to see started in this Island — a National Savings Movement. Such a movement has been of immense value in other countries. I feel sure, however, that such a movement is much stronger where it is a voluntary movement, as in the United Kingdom; and I am considering inviting a few interested persons in the community to form a Committee to promote savings. The Government would give such a Committee full support and assistance; but first I would like to have the general public reaction to this proposal.

While it may be necessary to obtain loans from abroad to initiate certain projects, such as the Hilton Hotel, which will "prime the economic pump", it is in the long run greatly to our advantage to raise as much as possible of our loan requirements locally. This is so from the balance of payments viewpoint, that of the Revenue and, indeed, for the good of the general economy.

At this juncture I do not propose to deal with the statutory undertakings which are owned by us. There is a strong committee examining the working of the Transport Board; a world famed expert has examined problems regarding housing and his report is awaited; I may add that I have received his first interim report this morning. The Natural Gas Corporation is consolidating its position. I would repeat, however, that there is no reason why the general taxpayer, and this includes very poor people, should subsidize a service which would pay for itself and make a profit if it were operated by private persons.

Let us now consider the Treasury prospects for 1963-64. Despite the more favourable sugar crop position, I am not at this stage prepared to put before the House estimates of revenue any different from these which are already in the hands of members. The estimated Revenue of \$29,280,443 is exceeded by the estimated Expenditure on Current Account) of \$30,508,515 by \$1,228,072. These are the figures in the Approved Estimates which have been laid today. As I have already mentioned, of the \$15,443,669 authorised in the Capital Estimates, \$13,823,992 are to come from loans. It is therefore essential that we should demonstrate our ability and willingness to meet the difference between Revenue and Current Expenditure.

The principal measures which I propose should be taken to balance our budget are: consumption taxes on aerated and mineral water, cigarettes and gasoline; and reduction of the rice subsidy. I shall also propose other measures to improve our position.

About 50 million bottles of aerated and mineral water are drunk in this Island in a year, and it is not unreasonable to ask the people who imbibe these beverages to contribute one cent on each bottle to the Revenue. To give effect to this proposal a consumption duty of 16 cents a gallon will be imposed with effect from tomorrow.

On cigarettes I propose a consumption tax of two cents on a packet of ten.

On gasoline the tax is to be five cents a gallon. This additional tax will also apply to other petroleum distillates, except kerosene, used in the Island.

I am conscious of the fact that there are two grades of gasoline used in motor vehicles in this island. I have fiddled about, if I may use that term, with a greater tax on the premium gasoline than on the ordinary variety of gasoline, but I have been advised that legally that would be extremely difficult and tricky to implement. Therefore, the tax on

gasoline is five cents a gallon which will make the increase from 65 cents a gallon to 70 cents a gallon in the case of the ordinary grade of gasoline, and in the case of the premium grade the increase will be from 73 cents to 78 cents. I am satisfied from the expression on the face of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that I have fixed-it-right. (Laughter).

These taxes are collectible from tomorrow. If the extra amounts are charged on commodities re-sold the proceeds must be paid into Revenue. In other words, there will be large numbers of retailers who will have considerable quantities of gasoline in their storage tanks, but we have a means of gauging and testing the amount of gasoline from tomorrow so that the difference will not inure to the benefit of the retailer but to the benefit of the Treasury of this Island.

It is estimated that these taxes should yield \$930,000 in a full year or about \$835,000 in the remainder of the current financial year.

If you will bear with me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to quote from a fiscal survey of Barbados by Professor C. B. Beasley, the Economic Adviser to the Comptroller for Development and Welfare in the West Indies. 5.05 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must apologise for the hiatus in my speech, but there was a very important excerpt which I have misplaced amongst the papers. But you will remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that subsidies were imposed during the time of the Second World War, and round about the year 1950-51 the amount of subsidies being paid out by the Government of Barbados in support of the control prices of commodities was over \$1 million.

Now you are bound to get in a House like this where people are always playing to the Gallery the wails of the wounded and the howls of anguish, but I should like to give you a short history of subsidies. On 2nd April, 1953, the last Government removed the subsidy on flour. On the 2nd April, 1953, the subsidy on Sunrise and Eclipse biscuits was also removed. On 14th January, 1952, the subsidy on salted fish was removed by the last Government; on the 31st March, 1954 the subsidy on pickled pork, feet, ears and neckbones — and if I quote some prices they would be quite startling; at that time 30 cents per pound and 32 cents for neckbones — was removed. The subsidy on other goods was discontinued in October, 1954, so that by the end of October, 1954 all the subsidies on salted meats were removed by the last Government. On the 18th December, 1951, the subsidy on balanced animal feed which was then 7 cents per pound was removed. On 10th April, 1952, another subsidy was removed, and it was followed shortly by a further reduction in the subsidy, I think, on the 11th November, 1957, and the subsidy which was reduced by the last Government on these dates was the subsidy on rice; so that the subsidy came down from over \$1 million to the figure of perhaps about \$250,000 to \$300,000. The only two commodities which we have now still being supported by this very uneconomic measure is sugar and that is in addition to rice. On the 8th April, 1952, a reduction was made in the subsidy by the Government, and in April 1955 the subsidy was further removed.

The difference between my removal and their removal was that I tell the people over the radio and in the Press that I am removing it, but the removals done by the previous Government was surreptitiously done in the Estimates where the figures were altered; but we have the courage of our convictions on this side of the Table, and we have no intention of subsidising farmers in British Guiana who are not interested in us, it would appear, but in countries further afield, while potatoes and yams grown in Barbados are controlled at ridiculous prices like four cents and five cents per pound. We eat too many starches, anyhow; but if you must eat starch, and if the increase is too much, we suggest you turn to potatoes and yams. On the steady margin of reduction, we have taken another enlightened step. I have never at any time disagreed with the removal of subsidies, because, as I said before, I consider that to be entirely unrealistic and not a proper economic device in modern day economies.

Perhaps, Sir, at a later stage, you will give me permission to quote further from the work of Professor Beasley which I have temporarily misplaced. On a date to be fixed by the Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour after he consults with the Controller of Supplies, the price of rice will be fixed at 12 cents per pint. I have already mentioned that this price is far less than in our neighbouring islands where the prices are in the vicinity of 17 cents and 19 cents per pound for the same rice imported from British Guiana, the same source from which we get ours. We import in this Island something like 8,000 tons of rice per annum, and at the rate we are going, we will be subsidising the British Guiana farmers probably to the tune of \$1 1/2 million, judging from the pressures which they put on us at the last Rice Conference.

There are certain changes which I propose should be made in the Customs Tariff, firstly for the purpose of raising more revenue, and secondly, in accordance with the policy which I enunciated earlier in this statement, for the purpose of encouraging the importation of raw materials for manufacture locally. These are as follows: You will bear with me, Sir, because it is a very long list.

Fish Fresh chilled or frozen per 100 lbs — \$1.00;
Macaroni, spaghetti, noodles, vermicelli and similar preparations — 15% and 20%.

When I quote either ad valorem or specific duties, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in two columns, the first is preferential or Commonwealth, and the second one is the outside world.

Sugar confectionery and other sugar preparations — 20% and 40%;

Beer and ale in bottle and in wood — \$1.50 and \$1.56.

The present duty on imported beer is \$1.03 and \$1.09 as far as I can remember, and therefore we are increasing imported beer to \$1.50 and \$1.56.
5.15 p.m.

These figures may sound rather strange, but according to the General Agreement on Trade and Tariff, we have to maintain a differential and we cannot increase. In other words, we cannot do what Mr. Todman, the Customs expert, has recommended for the Federation and put it up by \$2.00 yet, but it will go up to \$2.00 when the Federation comes into effect.

Stout and Porter in bottle, \$1.50 and \$1.56; Stout and Porter in wood, \$1.50 and \$1.56; Cork, raw and waste (including natural Cork in blocks and sheets, Free and 10% Coir fibre, Free and 10%; Other Textiles fibres n.e.s. and wastes of such fibres, Free and 10%; Paints and Enamels 15% and 16% — again to maintain the GATT differential; Other toilet waters (e.g. eau-de cologne, lavender water, Florida water, etc; Other perfumes with or without alcohol, Cosmetics: Toilet preparations except Soaps (e.g. powder, rouge, lipstick, hair dyes, bath salts, deodorants, etc., 20% and 30% — unless some ladies in the community consider it beyond the call of duty to pay this price. Tooth paste and powder (including denture powder and dental soaps, 10% and 20%; Lead shot, buck shot and bullets, 20% and 30%; Synthetic plastic materials in blocks, sheets, rods, tubes, powder and other primary forms, Free and 10%; Carpets, Carpeting, Floor rugs, mats, mattings and tapestries of wool and hair 20% and 30%; Carpets, Carpeting, floor rugs, mats and matting of vegetable plaiting materials (including coconut matting) n.e.s. 15% and 25%; Jewellery 25% and 35% other Goldsmiths' and Silversmiths' wares including articles for household use (e.g. dishes, salvers, tea sets, cups, etc.) 25% and 30%; Imitation Jewellery (Jewellery not of precious or semi-precious materials) 25% and 35%; Projectiles and Ammunition, filled or unfilled, except sporting ammunition for Revolver and Rifle 20% and 30%; all other 20% and 30%; Other tools of Iron and Steel (including Artisans' tools Free and 10%. As far as the following list of commodities is concerned you will find that we have done a considerable amount of liberalisation especially in the Commonwealth countries. You will also notice that most of these commodities are commodities which will be useful for our production in the Island. Other tools of Iron and

Steel (including Artisans; tools) Free and 10%; Machine Tools for working metals (e.g. boring, drilling, milling, planing, grinding, gear cutting machinery) free, from Commonwealth sources; and 10% from the outside world; Conveying, hoisting, excavating, road construction and mining machinery (e.g. Cranes, hoists, stacks, well drilling machinery, road rollers) Free and 10%; paper mill and pulp mill machinery, and machinery for paper manufactures, Free and 10%; Book-binding machinery, Free and 10%; Textile machinery and accessories (including bobbins, spools and similar articles) Free and 10%; air conditioning and refrigerating equipment (excluding mechanical refrigerators (classified 899-08) (that is standard international); Free and 10%; portable electric tools, Free and 10%; Portable electrical appliances (including domestic), 10% and 20%; Travel goods (e.g. shopping bags, haversack, packs, and similar similar articles, 20% and 30%; Handbags, wallets, purses, pocket books and similar articles of all materials, 20% and 30%; watches, watch movements, cases and other parts of watches (including marine chronometers and instrument panel clocks), 20% and 30%; pipes, cigar holders and cigarette holders, 20% and 30%.

These are the figures.

Before I leave these adjustments — and I should like to call them adjustments and not increases, because in many instances we have slashed the tariff and in some instances taken it off altogether, and in a few instances, particularly in connection with goods which can be obtained locally, although this is done for fiscal and not for protective reasons — you will find that we have made some increases and brought them into line as far as possible with the Orion Report of the past Federal Government when the Customs Union was envisaged and the report of Mr. Todman the expert whom I mentioned before.

Now I mentioned just now that rice and sugar were the only two commodities which are still being subsidised, the subsidies having been removed from flour, salted fish, balanced animal feeds, pickled pork, brown crystal sugar and four reductions in the rice subsidies by the last Government. We have carried it a step further now because the figure of \$400,000 would service a considerable loan, say, at 6% or 7% for our Development programme.

I promised just now to quote from Professor Beasley's Report and my colleague has just found the passage. This is what Professor Beasley had to say. "Although the current attitude as to the Budget is justified, there is one respect in which early reconsideration of it is called for — the large vote for subsidization of certain commodities. It must now be clear that the Government of Barbados cannot afford a sum of money for this purpose which is large enough to have any significant effect. The provision of one million dollars annually for this purpose works out at ten cents a week per head of the population and it is idle to pretend that in normal circumstances this contribution is really important. Moreover it must be appreciated that, if Barbados is to embark on a large loan programme of development, employment will be at a high level for years and a large part of the total capital outlay will be spent on labour in the island. The Government would be acting inconsistently if it made crippling provision for subsidies at the same time as embarking upon schemes designed to add to the national income.

It should be appreciated that the monies at present absorbed unprofitably in meeting subsidization would be sufficient to service a very large external loan; if for example a million dollars annually were used to pay interest at four per cent together with the rather high contribution to a Sinking Fund of another three per cent, it would be possible to carry a loan of more than fourteen million dollars from the source alone."

5.25 p.m.

It is proposed to bring into force the new Customs Act — 1962 — 18 — by proclamation on 1st June, 1963. It is also proposed to introduce new Schedules consolidating the various and numerous amendments to customs duties and exemptions from duty at an early date. The work of consolidating the duties has already been done in accordance with the latest international classification, and, as soon as

the necessary legislation has been prepared, the proposed new tariffs will be printed. They will embody all the customs amending Acts and Orders which have been passed since the Customs Tariff (Amendment) Act, 1953 came into operation. These measures will greatly improve and facilitate the collection of customs revenue and should be an excellent foundation for Customs Union Legislation. The new tariffs will also facilitate the production of customs statistics.

Taking into consideration the proposals which I have made, there is still a small gap between estimated Revenue and estimated Current Expenditure.

Quite apart from this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, every cloud has its silver lining. It is not that there is anything cloudy about the measures which I have projected here today, but it is only fitting that I should say what I have done on the other side. For a long time now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the members of the Civil Service Association, the members of the Public Service Commission have been fulminating against what they consider an impolite thing and an unnecessary imposition on their slender resources. Having regard to the 1961 Salaries Revision, I do not know if they regard their resources as being slender now, but there is a considerable degree of validity in the contention which they have been making that the Widows and Orphans' Fund is a system of robbery with violence. I have examined very, very carefully the provisions of the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Fund and I have discovered that the Government is doing something — and when I say the Government I mean this colonial system we are now emerging from. In this connection there was a recommendation made to the British Guiana Government and it caused rioting and bloodshed because of its implementation. Although it may be following economic advice that you should have a form of compulsory savings, it makes me remember a game which used to be played when I was at school — the game "Never to give back". Members of the Civil Service feel that this filching has been going on at their expense for quite a considerable period of time in the form of taking 4% of their gross emoluments. On the other side of the picture, it would seem that since we do not have a social security scheme yet implemented, it is necessary to provide for the fatherless; in other words, the orphans and for the ones who have been deprived of their husbands, namely the widows. Taking into account the amount of annual disbursements out of what is called the Widows' and Orphans' Fund — and which is not a fund at all, even if I am the Minister of Finance — I cannot find that fund anywhere and I defy any member of the House to find it because it is simply taking money in the same ruthless manner as the one-armed bandits disarm people of their money. This does not give benefits to the Civil Servants commensurate with the contribution they have made from month to month. I have considered employing the device of adding additional amounts to the Treasury so as to reduce the contribution by 50%, so that instead of paying \$4.00 per hundred dollars of their salary into the Treasury that amount would be reduced to \$2 per one hundred dollars and the cost to the Treasury will be \$75,000 per annum (*Cheers*). Of course, that is subject to review, I hope, in a backward direction. The other bright and certainly the silver lining which I can now indicate is in connection with Government Pensioners. Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are approximately something like 1,400 Government Pensioners drawing a total amount annually from the Treasury of perhaps 1.7 million dollars. A scheme like this for any improvement in the position of Government Pensioners always has to be examined with a great deal of care because it is almost impossible to devise a system whereby you can do justice to every single Government Pensioner without at the same time doing violence to some other Government Pensioners who are equally deserving. For about nine months now I have waited patiently for the Whitley Council to put forward to me some form of recommendations on which I should act; I am not prepared to wait any longer on them, but I leave it to the Whitley Council to say whether they approve of the measure I have introduced. If they do not, the people who like it would have the money in the Treasury. These deliberations have been going on for a long time and I did promise that some consideration will be given to the lot of these Government Pensioners. I propose to make a sum available of \$144,000,

and for the balance of the financial year this amount of \$144,000 will afford a payment of \$10 *per capita* to each retired public servant in the employment of the Government of this country; the payment will be \$10 a month or £25 per year.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is my plan, if it is accepted by the Whitley Council. Whether you are getting \$150 a month or \$15 a month even, you are getting a minimum increase of ten dollars per month and this increase will be payable from the 1st April, 1963.
5.35 p.m.

I very much regret that due to the state of the Island's finances, not having much surpluses, we cannot go back and give increases from 1st April, 1961, the date on which the new salary scales came into operation; but these increases will apply only to those employees who retired before the 1st April, 1961, because the ones who retired on or after 1st April, 1961, would be entitled to the increases under the Jacobs Salaries revision. I have made a very rough calculation and there are few Government employees, at least in the clerical and technical grades and so on, who did not get salary increases of at least \$20 a month; and since pensions run at about 50% of your emoluments during your period of service, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that this is about the fairest thing we can do at this juncture; so the Government Pensioners who have been waiting patiently for a very long time for some kind of relief will find that their prayers have been answered.

I now come, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to Income Tax. We have been advised that to encourage local industry certain reductions should be made in income tax rates. Unfortunately, for budgetary reasons this is not at present possible. If the purchasing power released was going to be spent on locally produced goods, as in other countries, such a proposition might have been considered. I know that it will be said that the tax reductions should come first, but I have weighed all the factors carefully and decided that no such reduction can be made this year. However, I propose that the rates should not be increased, and the necessary legislation is being introduced forthwith. We will concentrate on the defaulters.

The deficit at the end of the Financial year is \$1,228,072. With the proposals which I have just outlined, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there will still be some kind of deficit at the end of the financial year, except in the event of the out-turn of receipts of revenue being in excess of what I have calculated. The deficit will be in the vicinity of perhaps \$340,000. This, I consider an improvement over the deficit of \$1 million. Some of the measures which I have had to introduce here today have been of a rather drastic nature; but when one considers that the overall cost to the average person in this community on the removal of a subsidy on one of the basic commodities, a process which has been going on systematically for the past eleven years, is in the vicinity of 1 1/2 cents a week or 72 cents a year, I am sure that the wails of the wounded on the other side will go without heed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I propose to give notice of the necessary financial Bills. I have laid the Orders and I can only say that I hope that the efforts at balancing our revenue and expenditure which I have made on this occasion will meet with the success which attended my last attempt. (*Cheers*).

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Bills:

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

A Bill further to amend the Petroleum Act, 1882.

A Bill to amend the Pool Betting Duty Act, 1960.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I very much regret that in the course of my Budget Speech, if you will give me time to do

so, I forgot to mention that it is also proposed that the amount of tax on Pool Betting on foreign pools should be increased from 20% to 50%, while the local pools will remain at 20%. I now beg to give notice of the Bill which will give effect to that.

I beg also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to lay the following Documents:

The Customs Duties (Amendment) Order, 1963; and

The Consumption Tax Order, 1963.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three, and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax, be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill further to amend the Petroleum Act, 1882, be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Pool Betting Duty Act, 1960, be now read a first time.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGET PROPOSALS

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

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House approve of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure the Chairman would not mind. You have fledglings in all societies and even in the House of Assembly, the Chairman can be a fledgling. This is Government Business. I am not aware that the hon. member has been elevated to the position of a Government Bench that under Government Business he is now undertaking to give notice of a Resolution without leave of the House.
5.45 p.m.

We have Rules. This is Government's time; and unless we are moving the adjournment, the hon. member cannot give notice of that Resolution without leave of the House. I want to know if the Government has concluded Government Business.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Peter has anticipated me. If this is going to be the procedure for us to debate the Budgetary Proposals, then the hon. member should ask for leave to move that Resolution. I do not know if this is going to be the procedure where you come in with your Budgetary Proposals and then postpone so that we can study the proposals and would then be in a position to debate it at your next meeting.

I think the hon. senior member for St. Thomas should ask leave for the purpose of giving notice of this Resolution.

Mr. BATSON: Sir, I am merely giving notice of the resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: What connundrum is that?

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot understand why the hon. senior member for St. Peter should arrogate unto himself all this authority.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not want to be rough because the hon. member wants to be rough. I credit him with having a little courtesy which I feel other members should be given; but when he is going to impute motives of another member, something which he is incapable of doing, that is another thing.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am merely asking leave to give notice of this Resolution. (A VOICE: You did not say so.)

Mr. WALCOTT: According to the Rules of this House, no hon. member has any right to impute any motives against other members. I rose and asked if this was Government Business which you are dealing with. A motion was made to introduce the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas after that gets up and states that he is going to introduce a Resolution to approve of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals. If the hon. member does not understand the Rules, let him read them. Do not get up with impertinence to ask what has happened with me. Do I look like some person to whom something has happened? Do I not look as someone who is normal? Has the hon. member got inflated now with a sense of his own importance? I will sit here when the time comes and await his presentation of that motion. I really would like to see how he is going to deal with it. That is, if he knows how to deal with it.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to give notice of a Resolution.

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

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

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House approve of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Minister of Finance."

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that brings Government Business to an end for today's sitting.

I now beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next 14th May, 1963 at 12 o'clock noon. The Order Paper will consist of the financial provisions of which notice was given today and the other Bills *seriatim*.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Speaking on the adjournment, I want to get the position clarified. There is this Resolution by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas that this House approve of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Hon. Minister of Finance. Notice of this Resolution having been given by that hon. member, naturally it would be under his name; therefore it is his right to have it placed on the Order Paper in like manner as he thinks. On the last occasion a similar Resolution was tabled from this side of the House and moved from this side of the House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member might give way on a point of order. As I understand him, the Resolution notice of which leave was granted just now, must necessarily be put under Private Members' Business. It is not Government Business.

Now, I must point out to hon. members, however much they might disagree, that any of the measures arising out of the Budgetary Proposals, it is necessary that they should have priority under Government Business. The Resolution moved by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas would not take precedence under Government Business. I do not know if this was made clear to hon. members.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not know what is going to be the procedure, but there is nothing wrong with debating the Budgetary Proposals if the Government itself has brought in a motion to invite comment on it on the next day whenever you meet. I take it that by the bringing in of this Resolution, you want hon. members to debate it.

What I do not like about this affair - and it serves the Hon. Leader of the Opposition right - is that I was going to make a motion in order to debate the Budgetary Proposals and I was going to do so because when you get a party member getting up and making the motion when he is under their control, you do not know when you will ever get the hon. member introducing debate on this matter.

What I think the Government should do today is to give us the undertaking that when you come in here with an important matter like this, arrangements should be made by you and you should say that you are going to have a debate on this matter on the next day that you come in here. The first thing which should be done is to have a debate on this. I do not know what are the arrangements between the hon. Leader of the House and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition on this matter.
5.55 p.m.

Up jumps the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to present this Resolution. Well, I would love to hear his presentation next week by going through this matter in detail to know what study has been made of the Budget Statement and the Financial Proposals. This is something for Parliament to deal with on the highest level. I was prepared to bring forward a Resolution in connection with this matter. The hon. senior member for the City does not realise why we are meeting at 12 o'clock noon next week; we are meeting at that hour and we are going to have a two-hour hiatus. I can wait until next week and, as the Hon. Premier has said in his Budget Speech today, I could go through the whole gamut of the Speech so that the Resolution is only a belated thing. The debate on the Financial Statement is essentially something to take place before we come to deal with these ends of Bills. These Bills will come in order; if you approve of the thing, then the passing of the Bills is automatic. I did not realise that the Hon. Leader of the House would have adjourned until 12 o'clock next week, the idea being that we will not debate the Premier's Speech first. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was in here for 18 years and I know every trick of the trade.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will remember that on the last occasion I moved the passing of the following Resolution:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House view with anxiety the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals for the Fiscal year 1962-63 contained in a Statement laid in this Honourable House on Tuesday 26th June, 1962, by the Honourable Premier."

Before I had the opportunity to get up today, a member from the Government Party got up and gave notice of that Resolution; but if the hon. member is going to put that in his name, I will talk on every one of these Bills next Tuesday from 12 o'clock noon until 2 p.m. This is a Statement and there are no other means of discussing it but by giving notice of a Resolution for that purpose. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas has given notice of his Resolution and I would like to hear him debate it.

I want to say that you cannot debate that Statement until you have had a copy of the proposals made by the Hon. Premier. (ASIDES). You cannot pad anything for me; every Bill that comes up in this connection on Tuesday next I will debate until 2 o'clock. I am giving notice now that unless I am ill I will come in here and we will discuss the whole Budgetary Proposal on every one of these Bills; however, you cannot do justice to this Budget Speech until you have had a copy of the Speech which was made today. Even if you were to sit up and listen to it on the radio, you cannot discuss it. I am therefore asking Your Honour to give direction to the Clerk that we obtain a copy of this Speech. We should like to have this Speech in order that we can study it over the week-end. Why should a member of this House be denied the opportunity of discussing these proposals? The only way that we could discuss this Statement would be to move the passing of a Resolution saying that we view with apprehension the proposals made in the Budget Speech or something of that sort. How could I get up before the hon. senior member for St. Thomas who had a copy of the Resolution already prepared? (Mr. WALCOTT: You should have had it too.) I am saying that everyone of these Bills will come in for a full-dress debate and I defy anybody to stop me. I will take the opportunity of debating the whole Budgetary Proposals. How can you stop any member of this House from debating the whole Budgetary Proposals if you come down with one Bill? I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to make sure of your position in this matter.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is an old member of this House and he knows the Rules of this House. Is he really suggesting that, on the motion for the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the rates of Income Tax or on the motion for the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Pool Betting Act, he could discuss the whole Budgetary Proposals? (A MEMBER: Not all.) He can debate only what concerns the particular Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is a joke. Let us try it out and see who will stay in the Chair and who will stay in the House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the hon. member threatening the Chair and telling you what to expect? I am submitting that you have the authority of the Mace and of the members of this House to deal with that matter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is a promise backed up by a threat. If you do not do what they think you should do, the hon. member is saying that they have the support not only of the Mace but of the members of the House. I am submitting that that is something more than a threat.
6.05 p.m.

I really do not believe in any padding. How can he prevent somebody from debating it? How do you mean I must wait until next Tuesday?

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 14th May, 1963, at 12 noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.06 p.m.