

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 30th June, 1964.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade, Labour and Social Security*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. CODDARD; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Communications and Works*); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries*); 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 Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Development*).

Prayers were read.

Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. COWARD entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of this Chamber of the 23rd of this month have been duly circulated and if there is no objection, they will be confirmed. (*A Pause*).

There being no objection, I declare these Minutes now to be confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

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

Barbados Statistical Service - Special Studies No. 7 - Digest of Tourism, 1962.

The Customs Duties (Gifts Exemptions) Order, 1964.

Barbados Economic Survey, 1964.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay a Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 30th April, 1964.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Interpretation Act, 1949;

Also, a Bill to amend the Gambling Act, 1917.

NOTICE OF REPLY

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Question No. 4 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is now ready.

PRIVATE MEMBERS NOTICE

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

WHEREAS the House of Assembly views with grave disquiet the recent tragic events in British Guiana;

AND WHEREAS the House of Assembly profoundly deplores the inter-racial clashes which have marred the peace of that country and brought death and destruction to its inhabitants;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House supports the action of the British Government designed to maintain law and order in British Guiana, and supports a policy by which the independence of British Guiana will be delayed until peace, order and good government have been restored to that country.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Interpretation Act, 1949, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Gambling Act, 1917, was read a first time.

LEAVE TO GIVE NOTICE OF RESOLUTION

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave at this stage to give notice of four additional items of Government Business - three Bills and one Resolution. They arrive out of the proposals of the Budget which, as hon. members are aware, will be presented today around 4.30 p.m. These items spring out of the Budget and it is felt that they should be given notice of at this time; therefore, I am asking for leave to give notice of these items simultaneously with the Budget.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to enquire of you just this one question, I see some apparatus which seems to be connected with the broadcasting of the Budgetary Statement. Let me make it quite clear right now that I have no objection at all to it, but I would like to know if the same privilege would be accorded other hon. members of the House as has been accorded to the Government, that is to say, the privilege of having the speeches of hon. members broadcast relative to the Budget.

I am sure the Hon. Leader of the House ought to, at this stage, give us that assurance.
12.25 p.m.

Will Your Honour direct, if you have received applications for this broadcasting, that the same facilities be granted to other hon. members?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has referred to a point of privilege and I have informed him that that is not without precedent in this Chamber. Our Standing Order 68 on the question of privilege provides for and reads as follows:-

"1. A motion directly concerning the privileges of the House shall take precedence of all other public business.

2. If during the sitting of the House a matter suddenly arises which appears to involve the privilege of the House and which calls for the immediate intervention of the House, the proceedings may be interrupted, save during the progress of a division, by a motion based on such matter."

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has not given notice of any motion, but he has drawn my attention to certain apparatus which he has seen. I may inform this Chamber that I have received a written communication purporting to come from the Hon. Minister of Education - and I have no doubt that it is genuine - asking me to permit Radio Barbados to broadcast the Financial Statement, popularly called the Budget, of the Hon. Minister of Finance this afternoon, and I have acceded to that request. Therefore I say and know that there is a precedent for it. That is all I can tell the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Perhaps if he would have a word with the Hon. Leader of the House as to what he desires in connection with any motion which may be made in respect of the debate on the financial proposals, that can be a matter of mutual agreement and what is sought might be readily forthcoming. That is a matter for the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to take up with the Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If I may reply, Sir, I will say that I shall be most happy to discuss the matter with the Leader of the Opposition preparatory to his making a formal motion.

MOTION FOR THE SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 for the remainder of the day's sitting.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, before that is done I should like to say this: Your Honour has made a point that what I did is not without precedent and Your Honour pointed out the appropriate Standing Order quite clearly. Although no motion was actually made, Your Honour accepted the point of privilege which I raised. Your Honour has just intimated that you have received that communication from the Hon. Minister of Education and the Hon. Leader of the House intimated that he would be very happy to discuss the matter with me; I am wondering, since that is so, if Your Honour would appreciate the fact that having the right to bring any such apparatus in here for the purpose of broadcasting debates would not be entirely for the Debates Committee but for this House. It is a matter of what this House would decide. If this House were to decide....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the hon. member has proceeded without a motion having been made. I think he should make a motion and let us debate the motion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to make a motion because of the attitude of the Hon. Leader of the House; however, Sir, I should like to say that it is not a

question of discussing the matter with me, but it is a question for the House to decide. I have always found the Hon. Leader of the House to be very democratic in matters of this sort. While I am not making a motion....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is making a speech without having made a motion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am accepting what Your Honour said about the matter of a precedent and I am not making any motion. I want to be assured by the Hon. Leader of the House that every democratic right will be accorded to the Opposition Members, that if they must criticise the Budget proposals they will have the same medium as the Government has on this occasion. I appreciate the latitude which Your Honour has given to me, but I am only following in the footsteps of the most experienced Parliamentarians in using this point of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point with great clarity, if not with preciseness.

Mr. MILLER: Your Honour has mentioned that it is a question of precedent, but you can have every precedent or lack of precedent. I will make a motion in this matter and I would like it to be regarded as formal.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, a motion of this kind would require formal notice having been given at the appropriate time.

Mr. SPEAKER: There must be some motion made.

Mr. MILLER: It is only today that we discovered that certain equipment for broadcasting had been placed in this House, but this is the type of discrimination in democracy which survives in spite of what you have heard for the last 200 years. The speech on the Budget will probably take place within another two or three hours....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not asking for any formal motion to be made; the Standing Orders of this House demand that there should be a formal motion and that is not to imply any discrimination whatever. Your Honour has intimated to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition what the Standing Orders of this House require; you went further and suggested to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that he might discuss the matter with me and I said that I should be most happy to do so. All that is required in this matter is that a formal notice be given at the appropriate time. The Budget Speech takes place today and, as far as I know, if we were to attempt to proceed with the debate immediately after that Budget Speech is made, every single hon. member would howl in opposition to that.
12.35 p.m.

The normal practice is for the Financial Statement to be presented and for hon. members of the Opposition to have time to digest it, and then, Sir, to return at an appointed date for discussion on this Statement; so that there is ample time for the notice under reference to be given to request broadcasting time on the radio or through any other media for members of the Opposition. We are not going on with discussion on the Budget today.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I could not disagree with the Hon. Leader of the House more on this particular occasion. The Budget Speech will be made today, and if the decision of Parliament is not taken to reply to the Budget Speech today, we could be denied an opportunity under the pretense that no notice was given on this occasion. We are simply making a formal motion, and as I said, a point of privilege precedes every other discussion or motion by any other member including the Hon. Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is on a motion, but there is no motion.

Mr. MILLER: If you will permit me to make it, with all due respect to the Chair, I will do so. If the Hon. Premier is allowed to use the facility of broadcasting, every other member should be given the same facility, and I suppose

somebody will be willing to second this motion. I was alarmed at the objection taken by the Leader of the Opposition with all his milk and water talk for the last three years. There was precedent for this last year, whether good or bad, and maybe next week when we apply for permission to have the facility of broadcast, we might be denied, although the Premier would have already had the facility. Why is he afraid of the Opposition rebutting any remark he may make in the Budget Speech? Democracy fails when such an opportunity is denied. This brought a serious situation in Parliament with Dr. Banda, and it occurred again in Ghana before Nkrumah was sent to prison. Why should the West Indian islands hear a speech which might seriously effect the interest of the country's growth and development by the Premier who is the head of this country using the facility of broadcasting, coming here with some dog dance and old talk, and the other members are not given an opportunity? This same thing is taking place in British Guiana. Why should it take some clever manoeuvring in the hope that next week when the debate is taking place we are not allowed the privilege and use of a Christian, democratic right? If it is in the interest of the country, it is an elementary, democratic right. We have today a seasoned old statesman and politician in the Leader of the House using all forms and methods to deny us the opportunity of discussing on the air the Budget Speech by the Hon. Premier.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I think Your Honour's ruling in the first instance was very explanatory, and I am amazed, if I may be excused for saying so, that Your Honour has not attempted to correct the misleading harangue by the hon. junior member for St. George. I have not come in here to suggest anything. All I have done is to quote the rule which Your Honour quoted in the Standing Orders of the House by which we must all be guided, and I say with all due respect that since the hon. member does not understand what you ruled, Your Honour has not attempted to explain it more forcefully.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think I could explain it with greater clarity than by reading the appropriate Standing Order of our Chamber which is No. 68, but I might elucidate further by quoting from the Sixteenth Edition — which is still the latest Edition — of Sir Thomas Erskine May's *Law, Privileges and Proceedings of Parliament*, Chapter 17 page 388 on "Privilege Motions Admitting of Notice." It reads as follows:—

"In view of the requirement that a matter of privilege should be raised at the earliest opportunity it is generally brought on without notice. But provided there has been no undue delay, the claim to priority of such a matter is not prejudiced merely on the ground that it has been possible to place a motion dealing with it upon the Notice Paper.

The same treatment is accorded to a matter of privilege, if, through the adjournment of the debate on the motion in which it is embodied, it becomes an order of the day."

I will now ask the Deputy Clerk to read the motion of which the hon. junior member for St. George purports to have given notice.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I may intervene at this stage, the point is that nobody is contesting the right of an hon. member to raise a point of privilege any time at all. The rule Your Honour referred to and the guidance from May's apply only to the actual question of raising a motion of privilege. That is not at issue. What is at issue is this: the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I understand, wanted to make a motion requesting that the Opposition be given appropriate time on the air for broadcasting their speeches. That is an entirely different matter, and I am saying, Sir, that a motion like that requires formal notice. That is nothing to do with raising a motion of privilege at any time during a debate of the House. I hope Your Honour sees the two points clearly.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I am endeavouring to point out is that our Standing Orders, so far as privilege is con-

cerned, deal only with a motion concerning privilege of the House, and that speaks of a motion based on such matter interrupting the proceedings of the House, save during the progress of a division. In respect of "Points" our Standing Order No. 28 deals with a point of order and a point of elucidation, and Standing Order No. 26 deals with a person who has spoken to a question being heard to offer an explanation which might be regarded as a point of explanation. In other words, there are only three points for which our Standing Orders provide: a point of order, a point of elucidation and what may be described as a point of explanation. That is all I am concerned in pointing out. I think this matter might well be brought to a head now.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, from what I have heard you say and from what I understand is going on, what I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention is that if it is a question of broadcasting any matter in here, Your Honour has absolutely no authority under the Rules of this House to grant any person the privilege of bringing equipment into this Chamber and utilising the debates of this Chamber for broadcast, unless it is a matter that has been agreed upon by this Chamber. You cannot exercise these prerogatives without the approval of parliament. If we ever reach that sad state of affairs where it is regarded as your prerogative for someone to write a letter and you can permit him to come in here to do that, you would be travelling on very dangerous ground, because the debates in here are privileged, and Your Honour should call a meeting of the Debates Committee and have these matters settled. You have a Debates Committee set up at the beginning of Parliament, and any broadcast from the debates of this Chamber falls within the province of that Committee, and it should be settled at that point.
12.45 p.m.

You get this idea that Your Honour can give someone the right, provided that it meets with the approval of this Chamber; but I would like to make it clear that debates are privileged things in this Chamber and newspaper reporters are in here as a question of courtesy and not of right, and Hansard is printed in accordance with the Rules and Procedure of this House. Therefore, debates for broadcast cannot be settled by Your Honour without the approval of the Chamber. These matters should be settled as a matter of principle by the Debates Committee, and the Debates Committee should be able to lay down something to guide this Chamber. If a speech is broadcast by the Hon. Premier, that matter would be the subject of a discussion by other hon. members, and there will be no doubt about the matter.

Sir, I cannot see anyone writing you a letter asking for permission to bring something in here, and then your granting that person or that Radio Broadcasting Station the right to broadcast a speech. I do not understand that procedure in Parliament. I personally have no objection to the broadcasting of the Premier's Budget Speech, but what I object to is that I can hear on the radio that this thing is going to be done and as a member of this Chamber, I do not know anything about it.

I want to say that the House of Assembly is not the House of Assembly of the Government; it is the General Assembly of Barbados, elected by the people of Barbados; therefore, anything affecting this Chamber has to be dealt with in the Chamber as such. The General Assembly is the same as the Judiciary. We are up and above the Government. The Government cannot control the House of Assembly; the House of Assembly has its own rules. Members are members of the House of Assembly first and, secondly, you have the Government. You are not elected a Minister or a Premier; you are elected a member of the General Assembly and after that, you have your different positions.

I cannot see how Your Honour can fail to appreciate these elementary principles which do not need a lawyer to interpret them. Anyone can see that if there is going to be objection to a broadcast, you should have this question settled once and for all by the Debates Committee, and that the Debates Committee should meet and say what is the procedure you should adopt with respect to broadcast. Do not allow these things to take place.

I have a vivid memory that on one occasion when the last Government was in power, members of the other side protested against Rediffusion equipment in here because nobody knew that it was brought in and they said that these things should be settled by the House. What I would like to see is that a meeting of the Debates Committee be arranged and that Committee settle once and for all the procedure about the broadcasting of debates. The Committee should settle if the debates are going to be broadcast, in what manner should they be broadcast, and I do not think there is any question as regards the rule of giving notice of a motion for a speech to be broadcast or not broadcast. I do not think that a motion to that effect would be in dispute. But what is important is this: do you consider the Debates Committee should be the Committee to settle the procedure in respect of the broadcasting of these debates?

Sir, former Speakers have taken very serious objection to even photographers coming into this Chamber to take pictures. I remember on one occasion an ex-Speaker, Mr. George Evelyn, refused to allow in this Chamber a photographer to take a photograph of the Chamber because he said that it was a matter of privilege and it was not the privilege of anyone to come in here and flash a bulb to take a picture. I feel similarly that nobody should come in here and set up a microphone without the approval of this House. I say that because we are privileged; therefore, no one should encroach on the privileges which this Chamber enjoys.

Sir, I think Your Honour should have this matter settled once and for all. I do not think any hon. member objects to a broadcast being made of the Hon. Premier's Budget Speech; but what I understand is in dispute, is that there is a bamboozling situation in the second stage. How are you going to follow that up, that is to say, if you should give notice of a motion and all that bamboozling tomfoolery which to my mind is an excuse for decency? All it means is that the Hon. Premier's broadcast of his Budget Speech is going to take place this evening and then you will have to bring in a motion to give notice of your debating something which is in his Statement. All I would say is that if you want me to demonstrate what authority I have, let the person bring in his equipment and I will throw it outside and then let the person sue me; let them show how they have the right to put something in here without the approval of members of this House. I do not want to be tepid and lukewarm about this business. We are the highest Parliament in this Island, and as a matter of fact, very much is spent on bringing us in here. All this time is being spent on dealing with this matter.

I do not feel when it comes to the broadcasting of the Premier's Budget Speech or any member of the Government that we have any objection. What I am saying is that the right to broadcast any speech should not be done without our approval. It is a matter for the House; it is a matter for the General Assembly and if the General Assembly approves of it, that is the end of it. I think the best procedure is that you cannot have a broadcast of the Budgetary proposals by the Hon. Premier unless you have a broadcast of the members' speeches on the Budget because you cannot have a Budget without any debate by other hon. members. A Budget is so important that you must have a debate. Do not say that if a Budget Speech is made today, you cannot have a debate on it today and that you should give notice of a motion to have a debate on it. I do not want any week to prepare my speech on a Budget because the whole idea of a Budget Speech is that the Minister of the Government makes it today and the alternative Government should be in a position to debate the question the same evening and say what would be their proposals.

I do not know where they get this idea from, that they have to go home and consult somebody else before they can reply to a Budget Speech and that they cannot speak on it the same day. You do not have to do any research because a Budget Speech is made on broad principles. The Government comes down and say that it has put a tax on something; and if you do not approve of what the Government has done, you can say so immediately. A speech on the Budget deals

with taxation and proposals and with the national life of the community; and if the Budget Speech by the Hon. Premier is going to be broadcast, then every speech made by other hon. members on it should be broadcast.
12.55 p.m.

If you ask for a motion to have those speeches broadcast, what motion would you ask for to broadcast the Premier's Speech? If the motion is that the Premier's Speech be broadcast, the motion should be that the debate on the Budget Speech should also be broadcast. If the debate on the Budget Speech is to be broadcast, automatically the one who leads off the debate would have to have his speech broadcast. I have seen that from time to time difficulties have arisen which need not have arisen. I think Your Honour should scrutinise not only the Standing Orders of the House or the privileges of the House, but there can be absolutely no doubt about it that the broadcasting of a debate in this Chamber must, of necessity, be a matter of privilege and it would not be an inherent right of any hon. member, whether he be the Premier or other hon. member of the Government. I think that that matter should be settled once and for all; it should be settled once and for all that Parliament is supreme, and not that the Government is supreme in Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: Reference has been made to the Debates Committee and to this matter not having been brought before the Debates Committee of this Chamber.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am sorry, Sir, if I gave that impression. What I said was that the Debates Committee should meet once and for all and lay down the Rules, because it is not now a question of writing the debates but of broadcasting these debates, and we should have this matter settled once and for all. Let us have the matter settled by the Debates Committee once and for all. What I am saying is that the question of deciding whether a debate should be broadcast or not is outside Your Honour's province; it is a matter for the House. If the House agree to the broadcasting of the debate, that is a matter for the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: In respect of my decision for Radio Barbados to broadcast and record the Budget Speech or the Financial Statement to be made by the Hon. Minister of Finance this afternoon, in respect of my granting that permission in reply to a written request by the Information Officer at the direction of the Hon. Minister of Education, I was guided by the precedents of 1963 and 1962 in which permission to record and broadcast that speech was granted. That is merely in line with what is now to become an established convention, as far as I am concerned. It is entirely without prejudice to any decision made as far as the Chair is concerned, to record and Broadcast any debate on a motion on the budgetary proposals in respect of which, if application was made to me, for due concurrence, as I said earlier, by the Government, and the Opposition, I would have no hesitation in giving permission. The Debates Committee has no power, as far as I can see, taking a look at the Legislative Debates Act of 1894 which is described as "an Act to provide for the reporting and publishing of the debates of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly" — the Debates Committee has no express power to deal with this matter; but there is nothing to prevent this House from setting up a Committee to give a decision on such a matter.

In respect of the particular issue before this Chamber, I have given my concurrence for the perpetuation of the convention. That is all before me now, at least up to the time when I gave my approval for this broadcast, which was given yesterday after I received that request by registered post. It was post marked 29/6/64 at 3 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I did not have the advantage of being present when the hon. senior member for St. Peter started to speak on this matter, but I have been listening to him in the latter part of his address and I have no fear of the problem which faces him. I have also listened to Your Honour and I will say this: Following the precedent which was established in 1962 and again last year, I instructed the Information Officer to ask Your Hon-

our's permission for Radio Barbados to record and broadcast the Budgetary Statement of the Hon. Premier this afternoon. When I gave that instruction I was not excluding the broadcast of any debate which followed the Budget Statement. Again, following precedent, I had no means of anticipating how many hon. members would wish to initiate a debate this afternoon on the Budget Statement, because the practice has been that the other side always wanted to have written copies of the Statement, which is quite legitimate exercise, and then on a motion, the debate on the Budget takes place. Your Honour would not thereby make any decision with respect to any future or subsequent request which would come for hon. members to have their speeches broadcast if they took part in the debate on the Budget. There certainly could be no objection on the part of the Government to the speech of the Hon. Premier being broadcast, and if that is so, there could not be any objection to hon. members having their speeches on the Budget Speech broadcast. I am sorry that the hon. member spoke and referred to the fact that if the equipment had been brought in here he would throw it out, if this privilege was not to be accorded to all hon. members.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I do not think I said it in any way different from the way in which the hon. member took up the Mace on one occasion. I said that if it is regarded that that privilege is taken away, I would promptly have to remove this equipment. It is in that context that I made that remark. I am not offended by this method; I entered the debate and I tried to reconcile these things. I am not offended by the Hon. Premier's broadcast being made, but I said that it needed no motion in connection with this matter.
1.05 p.m.

All I am saying is what the Minister has said, and it is that it needs no motion for the Hon. Premier's speech to be broadcast, and then to follow with a second request to get these things. It should be axiomatic that the Premier's speech will be broadcast, and therefore the debate on that will also be broadcast.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member has taken my point except that I should point out to him in passing that when I removed the Mace I believe it was because I had no confidence in the Chair at the time. If he removes the equipment, it would show that he has no confidence in the Chair at this present time. However, Sir, the assurance is completely given, if and when.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Minister of Education repeat what he has just said. It was not so audible.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I said the assurance is now given that when hon. members are making their contributions to the Budget debate, their speeches like the Premier's will be put over the air by the same facility.

Mr. MILLER: Now, my motion, with Your Honour's very kind permission and with unchanging respect to the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Deputy Clerk, was there a motion?

Mr. MILLER: You will remember the motion, Mr. Speaker. If you want me to repeat it in the interest of the Chair, I will be happy to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am bound by the records of the House, and I am having a check made by the Deputy Clerk as to whether he has recorded a motion by the hon. junior member for St. George.

I am informed by the Clerk that there is no such motion recorded, nor was any such handed in at the Table. Therefore, the only motion which is now before the House is that of the Hon. Leader of the House that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be now suspended for the remainder of this day's Sitting.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would only like to say this.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what now is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition speaking? I take it he is expressing his gratitude to the Hon. Minister of Education.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I wanted to thank the Hon. Minister for his assurance that any contribution to the debate on the budgetary proposals will also be broadcast.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Government Business is to resume Committee on the Bill to amend the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank Act, 1943.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be the first Order of the Day.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1964-65 No. 8

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the 20th Century in democratic countries shows a continuous developing not only in the voluntary organisations but also in the functions of the State. In developing countries every effort is made to build a better community whether it is by improving the economic, constitutional or social and health standards of the community. It is in the last mentioned in which I am directly connected and in which I am deeply interested. The World Health Organisation and the United Nations Children Fund are spending large sums of money in developing countries to raise the health standard in the community, and even in the United States of America over 6 per cent of the national income is spent on health. This shows, Mr. Chairman, the importance of health in any community. It is to be appreciated that no country can develop economically or for that matter constitutionally if it is not doing something for health. We on this side believe in having healthy minds and healthy bodies, and it is with this foremost in our minds, that we, after careful scrutiny, invariably make any sacrifice possible to see that a high standard of health is maintained in our community.

We are therefore ever conscious of the importance of developing and maintaining the standard of health in our country. When we assumed office in 1961 we endeavoured to keep Barbados abreast of some and in front of most of the developing countries in the field of health as well as in other fields. We found an estimate of \$5.8 million for the construction of the new Hospital. This estimate, Mr. Chairman, was unrealistic and grossly inadequate for the kind of structure that was planned, and it was therefore necessary to have this amount supplemented considerably. May I point out here that in this estimate of \$5.8 million provision of \$112,000 was made for furniture and equipment. The overall expenditure now on the Hospital is approximately \$9.4 million, which shows that if the \$5.8 million was not supplemented, the Hospital would be left unfinished.
1.15 p.m.

Now, Sir, we have availed ourselves of a Consultant from the World Health Organisation in the person of Mr.

Jack Castro, who has advised us on the question of equipment for the new Hospital. He has pointed out that no less than ten per cent of the amount spent in constructing the new Hospital was necessary for the provision of the equipment for it. As a matter of fact, he pointed out that the average cost of the equipment for the Hospital was 12 1/2% of the construction cost.

The cost of additional equipment for the new Hospital is really \$785,797 which is an increase of \$662,977 on the estimate given before we were in office. You will see, therefore, that the estimate given previously was very unrealistic. In order to determine what equipment was necessary for the new Hospital a Committee was appointed, and this Committee is comprised of the following members: The Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Health, the Director of Medical Services, the Medical Superintendent of the General Hospital, the Secretary of the Hospital and Mr. Jack Castro, who is the World Health Organisation Consultant. I attended the first meeting of the Committee and certain principles were observed in some of the recommendations which were put up by those concerned. At this meeting, it was agreed that a savings would be effected by bulk purchase and it was also agreed that in future there should be a permanent standardization committee by the Hospital. The Heads of the various Departments were supposed to put up their recommendations to the Committee for its deliberations, and in the making of orders, the Heads of the Departments were made aware of the position in respect of placing orders and they were told that they should give priority to facilities of the equipment necessary.

The Committee discovered after a number of meetings that the extraordinary cost of increase was the result of the fact that in 1958 there was an estimate given which was not realistic and this was not given after consultation with the people who knew about the equipping of a Hospital. There was an increase in the cost of X-ray equipment which was underestimated when the early estimates were given and, as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the price of the X-ray equipment is \$150,000 as against the early estimate of \$1,000 given in 1958.

It is to be appreciated that there are eight operating theatres in the new Hospital instead of four which are in the old Hospital, and if we are to have standardization in the future, it is necessary for us to have new equipment.

In view of the construction of the new Hospital, provision was not made during the last 25 years for any great amount of non-recurrent items. The provision for non-recurrent expenditure was kept to the minimum for the old Hospital. It is to be appreciated that what non-recurrent items which were not permitted to pass in the last four or five years would have to be included in this expenditure now.

Now, Sir, the increase in the estimate for this new equipment was also due to the fact that there are certain additions made to the plan and those additions were agreed to in 1962. For example, there is an addition made to the Out-patient Department of the new Hospital and this was not included in the former plan. Then, in 1962, an agreement was also made to air-condition the operating theatre in the Maternity Block. The plan before that was to have the operations of maternity cases dealt with in the operating theatres. It was pointed out by the consultant that it was better and in keeping with present day trends to have the operating theatre for maternity cases attached to the maternity centre of the Hospital. After much consideration and discussion, this agreement was arrived at.

Now, Sir, if we were to equip the new Hospital with a complete set of new equipment, it would cost us approximately 10% or 12% the cost of construction of this New Hospital and this would be a tidy sum; therefore, we have decided to make use of some of the old equipment, that which is serviceable. There is certain equipment in the old Hospital which with certain repairs will become serviceable in the New Hospital. There are at least 300 beds which are being re-conditioned at the price of \$40 a bed

for the new Hospital as against the price of new equipment which would cost between \$110 and \$120 per bed, 1.25 p.m.

There is certain equipment in the old Hospital which is over 20 years old and that equipment could not be transferred to the new Hospital because of the fact that parts were not available for that equipment. I refer chiefly to the X-ray equipment. You will note, Mr. Chairman, that in the past two years there has been a great development in the department of Pathology and anaesthesia and, as a result of that, it is inevitable that the standard of material used in this section be raised. Hence there will be an increase in expenditure in this department. There are several other departments in the new Hospital which are not present in the old one. We can think of the central unit department and other departments and all of them are to be equipped with furniture.

Mr. Chairman, I may point out that it is expected that there will be a saving in the sale of some of the old furniture which will be left in the old Hospital. The sale of this old equipment and furniture will reduce the liability of the Government in the purchase of the new equipment. There will be a central kitchen which makes it necessary to make provision for trollies for the purpose of conveying the foodstuffs to the wards from the kitchen and the funds which are to be voted for the purchase of these trollies are considerable. We should express our appreciation and our thanks to the Masonic Order and to the Barbados Council of Women who have generously contributed to the equipping of two wards in the Hospital, one to the tune of \$1,300 and the other to the tune of \$2,000. Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$415,884 do now pass.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I should like to get a quick reply from the Hon. Minister without his necessarily going into details now. What is the initial cost of the surgery for gynaecology and the additional cost of the studio for midwifery? I have a very faint recollection of this; we had a survey made as to the supply of equipment which could be carried over to the new Hospital and which would curtail the cost of having the new equipment for this Hospital. I believe that they are now thinking in terms of the surgery. I could probably say one or two things more, but I am wondering if the Minister would give us some idea of the cost of the overall expenditure.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The operating theatre for gynaecology will be one general theatre, and the furniture and instruments from the general operating theatre amount to \$32,565. That includes the first stage and operating theatre. The amount of equipment and items occupy 59 pages of this document here, and I do not think that any hon. member would want me to go through all of this.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1964-65 No. 9

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING

LAND DEVELOPMENT

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for the sum of \$18,000 to be placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1964-65 No. 9, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution. This Resolution is in connection with the Town and Country Planning Department, and it is in connection with the general development normally of the island.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, Sir, there is no sewage disposal system in Barbados as such from what has been referred to as septic tanks. This island has been referred to as a large septic tank; that is the way in which the island

has been described and I do not think that at that time reference was being made to the sewage disposal of the island. This Resolution is for the purpose of employing consulting engineers to make a report on sewage disposal in respect of this project which we began at Cave Hill. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.
1.35 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, now that you are getting these experts to carry out this exercise in this area, what I would like to know is what steps the Government has in mind to utilise these areas which have now been declared by the Town and Country Planning Department to be dangerous areas from the point of view of the water system and digging of wells. It is all very well for these people to say that this is a danger to the island; but when you look at the demographic information, the Barbados population is not lessening and the island is not getting any bigger. At some time or other, you will have to come face to face with the problem of having to utilise these areas of land that are now being regarded as not suitable owing to the water supply. We have to circumvent that by not interfering with the water system and by introducing a sewage system, and I should like to know if the examination of this matter is going to include areas other than this one in the Resolution so that you can utilise the services of these people. I would say in a broad way that in a place like the City of Bridgetown and its environs, it is an extremely dangerous situation to have this perpetual sewage tank system radiating around this area. This is a system that can be very dangerous, and I would like to know if any thought has been given to an exercise outside of this to deal with such areas.

There is in my constituency at Ashton Hall in the parish of St. Peter, and in other parishes large areas of land which are declared not suitable for building. Where are you going to send these people owing to the fact that you do not want them to affect the water supply? We have to get around this in some way, and I should not like you to wait for twenty years hence to find that putting down a sewage system has become prohibitive. I would like to know if some thought has been given to an examination like this in other areas.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, this survey and report is very necessary and was actually approved by the last Government. What is intriguing, if not signal, is that I am happy to see the name of Howard Humphreys and Sons. I think I am right in saying that Humphreys made a survey of this island, and if you look in the Government files, you will see that there was a survey for the Hastings and St. Lawrence area due to the water level. I suppose there can be no quibble about the \$18,000, because engineers' fees are so much higher than what they were three years ago. I am admitting that it would be nice to see Humphreys submit a survey and what it would cost for this area, and also what it would cost for bringing it to the City. I myself have been worrying about such areas as Lakes Folly and Fontabelle where the water is 18 inches or two or three feet below the surface. You cannot use a sewage system in Lakes Folly unless you use the type required, and it would be good if we could get some idea in the interest of health of what is to take place in the City. I am wondering if Humphreys would be asked to give some idea of what a project like this would mean. I can think of a similar service in Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, which, speaking under correction, I think, was done by the same Humphreys. This was done in what was to be regarded as the City of Trinidad, not necessarily the heart of Port-of-Spain, and we have been worrying for a long time about sanitation in the area along Fontabelle and Cheapside, where you would probably have the first sewage system or some control taking place. However, there is no quibble with this \$18,000 for the consulting engineers on this project, but we have reached the stage in development where we are thinking of 1,000 acres in the little Island of Barbados, and you would not want to reserve that area which has been described as a sheet water area.

It would be good, Mr. Chairman, if we could have an idea of the hazard in that area of Fontabelle and Cheapside. The Premier might have something to say on this, because

it is unfortunate to have a large area which it might be regarded as dangerous to continue to build up, especially with the erection of the new Harbour and all that has taken place where drainage is concerned.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1964-65 No. 10

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, some time ago we passed a Civil Establishment Order in this House for the personnel of the Department of Lands and Surveys. The Resolution which we have before us now for the sum of \$62,820 is to meet various other charges in connection with the establishment of the office, and these charges are for the drawing office and surveying expenses, including maintenance of vehicle and equipment \$4,500; the cost of three chainmen to each surveyor \$13,500 and travelling expenses for 6 surveyors \$4,320 making a total of \$22,320 on the recurrent account. On the non-recurrent account we have various items of a capital nature such as office furniture, \$3,600, Survey instruments \$16,900, Requisites for survey office \$10,000, Printing machine \$5,000 and a Land Rover \$5,000, making a total of \$40,500.
1.45 p.m.

I, therefore, beg to move that the sum of \$62,820 under Part I, Current, Head 17A (New), Lands and surveys, do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this is a very necessary thing, but the approach to it seems to be typical of the method of keeping up with the Joneses. When are we going to stop repeating what is done in big countries by our setting up these half-cent Departments? We are having more departments in Barbados with only 166 square miles for the work we are doing than you have for the work which is done in the United States of America. I do not know what you have to be done by the Agricultural Department, the Town and Country Planning Department, the Lands and Surveys Department and all these departments for which you have given plenty of names, but the amount and volume of work which can be done administratively can be done in a single department. This is like putting a big trousers on a small boy. This is typical of some country boy whom you bring to town and you put a big pants on him and when someone rips the pants off him, you find that he is nothing else but a small boy.

Sir, when are we going to get down to the idea of making the people understand that you do not need a separate department for all these things? What is going to happen is that you are going to set up this Land and Surveys Department and before the next five years, this Department is going to want a repetition of everything which you have in the Agricultural Department. The Head of the Department there is going to want an Assistant, a Secretary and three telephones, one of which is to be a direct line with the Minister so that he can get him whenever he wants. You are going to have a repetition of a Land Ship Department because you have this mentality that if you are a Head of Departments, you must have an assistant to the doctor, and a doctor assistant to the doctor, and therefore, only by that method are you going to get it function properly.

I also have that to deal with in private employment. I have a job of resisting claims to a lot of things to which they give a lot of fancy names. We hear them talk of having a Librarian and when I ask them, they tell me, that he is the Librarian and you find that they have a library of three books. Bear in mind, this Librarian is spelt the same as the others; it is not spelt with an "o".

Sir, you must relate this to the work which they do. I say this quite sincerely to the Hon. Premier and the Government. There is too much of this temptation among white collared workers, and this includes members of the Civil Service. I am not opposed to the granting of suitable staff, but I am opposed to creating independent departments in our

Civil Establishment when we should be integrating departments on a comprehensive basis.

The time has come, with the introduction of Ministerial system where the Ministers have to integrate a variety of departments under their jurisdiction and control and where there is one Minister to a number of departments that if we had Ministerial system as long ago as our Civil Service system that you would have as many Ministers as you have departments. I am not suggesting that one Minister can handle ten departments in the same way as one department Head can handle his department. I think the time has come when a review should be made of the structure of the Civil Service as it relates to today's needs and mobility in the same way as where you have a better transport system in Barbados than you have in many parts of the world. There is no point in Barbados in which anyone would ask me to travel from to another that I cannot get there within sixty minutes by means of a motor car. I can do so because the roads which you have are good. I make this plea on the ground that I have been watching the estimates of this country closely, and a brutal analysis of these estimates indicates to me that the Government is doing a good thing in employing people; but one of the dangers of it is that if you put people in unproductive work, you had better think closely because then it would cost you money.

I am of the opinion that the Agricultural Department or the Town and Country Planning Department is quite appropriate to handle this created department of Lands and Surveys. There should be some integration in the Barbados Civil Service. There are too many little petty departments and in my view, and I say this without any reflection, when you integrate departments you find that you can pay a person or some persons a higher salary and by so doing, you can get more power-producing people. By that, I mean you may be able to contract people who can do jobs efficiently and at a very high level and who can give you greater efficiency at work. I do not like these little departments and sometimes they spell mediocrity; and by their size, they are forced to pay salaries in relation to what they are doing. Therefore, sometimes, it is better to have an overall department with subsidiary departments rather than to have all of these little departments.

Sir, I say this on this matter in order to deal with the general matter that the time has come when there should be a close examination of new departments of the Government, and see whether if there is consolidation of this work in one department, it would not create greater efficiency owing to the fact that you can streamline the service. For one, I think it would reduce the paper work which would go to a Minister because the more departments that you have, the more paper work you are going to produce for Ministers to look at, and that would mean that they will have less time to give to matters of policy because they would be paying attention to these half cent questions. I feel the time has come when the departments of Government should be streamlined in accordance with modern lines. In a small place like Barbados, you have all these Heads of Departments, and in a short time, by your creating all these departments, you will find that this Island of Barbados will have as many Heads of Departments as you have in the United Kingdom.

I know that things are often added to the Hon. Premier's office.
1.55 p.m.

That is what I want to say. I do not care who you are as a Premier; you will not be able to make certain decisions which are expected to be made by the Ministers. If you have all of these half-cent departments — and I do not mean that in any derogatory manner — if you have the Premier to deal with finance and with all of these other departments, he will be inundated with papers. In that case, the real function of the Premier would not be getting through with the co-ordination and streamlining of departments. If you were to give the Prime Minister of Great Britain the task which the Premier of Barbados has or wants to do, then his job would be to sit at his desk all the time and deal with papers. That is not the task either of the Premier or

of the Ministers. If you lay it down that all the papers have to go to the Ministers, then they will have a very difficult job to do. You do not send down and ask the Minister how many people there are at the Mental Hospital. Apart from making a survey of this matter periodically, what Minister has time to see how many mad people there are in the Mental Hospital? If everybody comes to you for information, you would become an Information Officer. The Minister must get information when they require it.

I feel that these small departments should deal with what are technical matters and not necessarily that a department be set up to deal with them, and then they find their true place within a department which exists. It is easier to have this dealt with as an administrative matter. We have the Director of Medical Services, for instance, and some people think that he must know every aspect of medicine. I feel that in these small communities we have to be realistic. Because we are building a hospital, it is not expected that we have every specialist to deal with one case which occurs about every ten years in Barbados. We have to be brutal in these matters. I feel that, essential as this department is, these things should not have a new department to deal with them, but that there should be a co-ordination and streamlining of departments to deal with these things.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of three Resolutions in Committee.

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

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

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

On motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is now after 2 p.m., of the clock, and I think that it is a convenient time for us to have the suspension of the sitting. I am therefore suggesting that this sitting be now suspended for three quarters of an hour. In fact, I beg to make that motion.

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

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

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time, albeit certain Standing Orders have been suspended.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 4 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

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

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware of the fact that the Post Box at Mayers Corner in the Parish of St. Joseph has been out of order for some time?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government cause same to be put in order with as little delay as possible?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"1. Yes, Sir.

2. The position of this box at the junction of the two roads was not considered satisfactory, and it has been replaced on a site across the road near to the entrance of the public bath."

Mr. COWARD: I thank the hon. member for his reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is another question to which an answer was laid at the last meeting, but in as much as the hon. senior member for St. Michael is not in his place, I will allow that to be deferred.

There are no other answers ready.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now resumed.

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, you will recall that earlier today I said there were a few matters which would come down to this Chamber of which we could not give notice at the time. One is now before us, and the remainder will come down at the time when the Financial Statement is presented. The one before us now which is being circulated is a Resolution for the sum of \$2,100 to be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65, Part I: - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1964-65 No. 11 which forms the Schedule to this Resolution.

I beg to give notice of this now, and I want to say we are going to ask for leave to deal with it in all its stages later today, because the expenditure is to be incurred before another meeting of the House in connection with our participation in the Volunteer Professional Service Programme for Mental Health. I am sure that hon. members would want the Government to provide the maximum benefit from this programme.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

Hearing no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Minister.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 6 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

RESOLUTION re RENTAL OF WAREHOUSE

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 6 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works; to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the rental by the Government of the Warehouse situate at Hincks Street, Bridgetown to Messrs. West Indian Suppliers Co. Ltd. and the Barbados

Marketing Corporation respectively in two lots, on the terms set out in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as the Addendum sets out, this warehouse forms part of the property including 31,449 square feet of land which was purchased by the Government to facilitate the building of the South Access Road to the Bridgetown Harbour. The other part of that building was demolished to make way for this road, and it is the area which has not been demolished which it is proposed now to rent in two lots to Messrs. West Indian Suppliers Co. Ltd., and the Barbados Marketing Corporation. The rent, in the first case, for approximately 3,737 square feet will be at \$200 a month on a month-to-month basis, and the remainder of the warehouse containing approximately 1,470 square feet will be rented to the Barbados Marketing Corporation at a monthly rent of \$75. The object of putting them on a monthly rent basis is because the whole area is under review and certain proposals may have to be implemented in the foreseeable future. The rent is considered economic, in that the building is far from being in a good state. It is used for storing various commodities.

3.00 p.m

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I know the area of the warehouse and I quite agree with the Government that, if it is not being used, they could turn it into cash and, as the Hon. Minister has explained, the reason why they are only renting it on a month to month basis, is because they may have to pull it down and widen the street in that area.

Sir, I wonder if it would not be cheaper to rent it for the purpose of storing crates which they have now stored at Waterford. If they store them there, they would be near for the purpose which they bought them for. Would it not be cheaper to utilise the warehouse for that purpose? Probably the Hon. Minister of Communication would tell us what nature, what kind of stock West Indian Suppliers Limited would be storing in that warehouse, whether it would be stock of an inflammable nature or whether it would be of the nature to send the insurance upon that building. I think that should also be considered.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I would like the hon. member to know that --

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Hon. Minister replies, perhaps there may be some other member who would want to speak on this matter. *(A Pause).*

There seems to be no other hon. member who desires to speak; therefore, the Hon. Minister may now exercise his right to reply.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I would like to bring to the hon. member's attention, that a portion of this warehouse is reserved for the purpose of storing of these crates and that the whole warehouse has been treated against termites. It is for that purpose that we are seeking the approval of the Legislature now.

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

RESOLUTION re ESTIMATES OF PORT DEPARTMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works: To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the expenditure required to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1964-65 as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as the Addendum sets out in part, there is a Special Loan Act of 1963 authorising the raising of a loan not exceeding \$409,360 for the purchase of a second tug for the Port Department. The sum of

\$288,000 (U.S.) was borrowed and this sum is repayable in yearly instalments over a period of four years and the interest to it has been outstanding from time to time.

Through an oversight, however, adequate provision was not made to meet the instalment and interest for the first year which is \$22,780, and the two instalments amounted to \$102,340 and interest for the first year \$22,780 making a total of \$125,120.

Now, Sir, the sum of \$44,870 was included under Item 62, Capital Charges, in the Annexed Estimates; so we are coming now for the difference between these two sums, which is \$80,250. The first instalment becomes due on the 1st September, this year. I do not think there is any other question which I need put, but if there are other questions which hon. members want to raise, I shall be pleased to answer them.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION re COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF TRAFALGAR HOTEL

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

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this matter in the absence of the Hon. Premier

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day, accordingly, is to move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of the property known as the Trafalgar Hotel together with the land whereon the same stands.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, this Resolution seeks the approval of the House of Assembly for the compulsory acquisition by the Government of the building and property together with the land whereon the same stands known as Trafalgar Hotel situated at Palmetto Square in the City of Bridgetown containing by estimation 3,791 square feet or thereabouts abutting and bounding on two sides on Palmetto Square on lands of Martin Doorley and Company Limited and on lands of S. S. Gill or however the same may abut and bound.

The position, Sir, is that as the Island progresses, with the accompanying expansion the administration of the Island will thereby be extended.
3.10 p.m.

The Government feels that land or property like this which are situated in close proximity to the historic building in which we now stand, and which by and large can be devoted to the purposes of administration, should be acquired in order to provide additional space for the country's administration. In this compound we have the Houses of the Legislature and a number of important Government Departments, and like any normal commercial enterprise where it would be possible for administration, we feel obligated if and when properties in the vicinity can be secured, they should be secured against the time for the expansion of the country's administration. It has been accepted beyond the slightest shadow of doubt that from year to year the administration of this colony is being expanded in its scope and, as a necessary consequence, additional areas will have to be found in order to accommodate the administration. Since this property is in close proximity to the Public Buildings

of this country, the Government feels that it is obligated, as custodian of the public purse of the country, to ensure for the service of the colony the land on which this property stands so that when the time comes, as it inevitably will come, that an additional area will be required for public administration, we will have already acquired a valuable site which is almost adjacent to the Public Buildings in which this historic Chamber stands.

Negotiations between the executors of the will of the late owner of this property and the Government for the acquisition of this property have broken down. The price which the executors feel is the price which should be paid for this property is nearly double that which the Government has been advised by its competent officer, the Standing Valuation Committee and that which the Government itself feels should be paid for this property. As is customary in cases of this sort, we are resorting to the Land Acquisition Act 1949 in order that the Government might acquire the property at a price which is considered by the Government Officers and the Government itself to be a reasonable price and in the public interest. The Addendum to the Resolution points out what I have just said, that is to say, that there have been protracted efforts at negotiations between the Government and the owner of this property. These efforts have failed to reach a reasonable price and the Government has no other recourse than to resort to acquiring this land compulsorily.

I think that hon. members will agree that the Government, faced with the responsibility for conducting the affairs of this colony, could not afford to allow a property like this in the location in which it is, to change hands without some attempt being made by the Government to acquire it. In that case, we should be failing in our responsibility to discharge our obligations to the country. It does not mean that the Government should acquire every single property in the area and that, of necessity, we should attempt to do so; but on the other hand, this property will be of some use to the Government. Now that the property is about to change hands, we should not miss the opportunity to add to the properties which we already own and control. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I cannot share the views which have been expressed by the Hon. Leader of the House as to the Government's reasons for acquiring this site. The reasons which have been given by the Hon. Leader of the House seem to run contrary to what the Hon. Premier said recently about the acquisition of land. The hon. member's view was that the Government would be in competition with private people in the matter of the acquisition of land, and it does look to me as if somebody had asked the Government to acquire this property known as the Trafalgar Hotel, we would have been asked if the Government should buy all properties in Barbados. This building, in which we now are, is becoming most unsuitable for Parliament. It does not matter how much we cherish the fact that we have been here for so many years, but now we hear the exhilaration which comes from the Olympic Cinema. The hon. member now wants to buy a place in an area which is in close proximity to this cinema and to the other places where you have the characteristics stemming therefrom, and in the juke box area where you can hear the Calypsos "Sparrow Come Back Home" and "Come Leh we Go Sukie." What atmosphere are you talking about setting up Government Offices in and whom are you competing with? If you are competing with the element to which I have referred, by all means you should buy this property; but on the other hand, if you are competing with the element of a more dignified atmosphere, then you do not have to look for an area to acquire Government property for the purposes for which the hon. member has stated. Sir, I am voting against this Resolution. The Government has no plans for the utilisation of this building. If you are saying that you will not allow this land to pass from these people into the hands of other people, then it means that you are in a subtle way entering into competition with other people who want to purchase land. This is a different matter from the acquisition which we were debating last week: The Govern-

ment wanted that land for the purpose of siting the College of Arts and Science of the University of the West Indies. I did not agree with what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said then, but if you do not have any use for this property you do not want to acquire it like that.
3.20 p.m.

The Government is going to knock the building down anyhow, and it means that if you are going to change the corner, you are going to lose some of the land in any case. I do not subscribe to this view. If the Government is in need of land for offices or the further utilisation of offices, it should look into the City and find out if there are other places with land which it does not have to compulsorily acquire. I am not in business, Mr. Speaker, nor can I from my seat tell the Government what to do; but if the Government is looking for land or an area to put up Government offices, depending on the size of the offices, I can tell them that there is an organisation that is selling a building in Roebuck Street next to Barclays Bank, and there is no question of acquiring the land compulsorily because they will find a willing seller. Why go to the expenses of acquiring land compulsorily when you can negotiate with people who are willing to sell, if you have to put up offices in keeping with what you are going to do?

Let us examine, Mr. Speaker, the area that we are talking about. The area is right above this building, and if I had to go to the country tomorrow in an election, I would go to the country and say that the present House of Assembly building is unsuitable for a modern House of Assembly, and we should go somewhere and get quarters that are more conducive to a House of Assembly, rather than buy the building next door to the House of Assembly. This area is becoming a rugged area with the noises you get around it, and the inconvenience we have to create in the heart of the City for traffic. Let members go outside at 4 o'clock on a Tuesday afternoon and they will have some indication of the problem which is created with the House of Assembly being in the heart of the City, with the Bridge running south and a diversion of traffic. This building is becoming a nuisance to modern trends, because to make it a silent zone which it is not, you have to divert traffic and create a problem in the heart of the City. At one time it was mooted that the Government Buildings or House of Assembly should more appropriately be situated somewhere around Government House, or in some other area where Parliament could meet in quietude and where you could have a decent parking area for members. Members have to struggle in this place for a parking space, and if you leave your parking space, sometimes you have a problem. Members cannot even come here on a day other than when the House meets to attend business in this Chamber and park their cars conveniently. This was all right in the horse and buggy days, but not today with the motor traffic in Bridgetown. This is a juke box and rum shop area, and does not compare with when we bought the Central Foundry site. We bought that site because there were two fires and you wanted to remove this paint shop and other shops. A big Department store is going up somewhere around here; so this is not an area to talk about acquiring for the purpose of expanding Government offices. The Government proposes to put up buildings on the Central Foundry site. What are the valid reasons for acquiring this site other than that it is likely to be sold and if you do not buy it, somebody else will? If you are going to do it like that, you can compulsorily acquire land anywhere and utilise it for that reason.

This to me, Mr. Speaker, is the opposite of what the Hon. Premier said last week. The whole purpose of compulsory acquisition is to say what you are going to do with the land; but to have this hypothetical case that in the not distant future you propose to expand Government offices is no reason to commit the Legislature today to acquiring this land. You have no projection in mind for utilising this land, and from what the hon. member says, this savours of an envious mind. If somebody is willing to pay a better price than you are paying, let that take place. I hope that members are going to utilise this argument for themselves that where they own property the Government will be able to come and acquire the land and property, because it is in an area that is more conducive to future Government

projects. If the hon. member had said that they intend to put up offices there, that would be a reason even if you did not agree with putting offices there. This is a rat-infested area with Martin Doorly on one side, Gittens Crouney on the other and hotels and sweet drink shops around, and to my mind is no area for Government to bend over backwards to acquire because it is a valuable site. Next time you will be going in Broad Street and struggling with the merchants over the acquisition of land there because it is valuable land. The family of the hon. junior member for Christ Church has just sold the Ice House; that is an old building. Are you going to compete with them because it is a valuable site in the heart of the City?

I do not feel, Mr. Speaker, that enough arguments have been given for acquiring the Trafalgar Hotel site. I would say that if the Government is looking for a place to put offices, there are good buildings adjacent to Barclays Bank in Roebuck Street; but you should not acquire a corner site unless you want it for a specific purpose. You should not acquire this land and keep it hoping that somebody will come and want it. We have had the Central Foundry site for nearly ten years, and many planners have said that it was not a suitable site for buildings, and one planner condemned it for future use. You can acquire land if it is pasture land, but you should not buy sites in the City to knock down where you have no plans because the market value is likely to go up. It looks to me that the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act which you are using and the reasons for this are incompatible. There is absolutely no harmony in the purposes of the Act and the speeches I heard last week.
3.30 p.m.

The Hon. Premier made an excellent speech on the question of acquiring land at "The Mount" last week. Put that alongside what the Hon. Leader of the House is saying today; you have a complete metamorphosis. I can see no reason for acquiring the property known as the Trafalgar Hotel on the basis that nothing at present is to be done with it. In the first place, it is a very narrow strip of land, only 3,791 square feet. That amount of land is nothing which anybody would go and raise their blood pressure about. It is less than 4,000 square feet. What size building can you put up there and how high can you go? What is this to talk about and say that you are going to put up a Government Building on it? What sort of Government building are you going to construct there and at what cost? Is that what you are asking legislation for? My view is that if this land is acquired by the Government for a specific purpose, well then, acquire the land; but the Legislature should not be asked to underwrite the Government being a real estate broker. You are buying land now because in the future you are likely to want this land. There is nothing which the Government should worry about as acquiring land for the future.

What the Government should do is to go out in the areas to be developed and create fresh areas where land can be acquired much cheaper, and I am sure if you go outside of Bridgetown, you will do much better. You just had a classic example. You suggested purchasing an area of land outside of Bridgetown at £300 per acre and that land is situated in a position where you can drive a motor car and get there in ten minutes time. When you considered purchasing the Trafalgar Hotel, were you considering opening a rum shop or having a place for a juke box? The Government should think about remaining here and do not worry to talk about acquiring that land. I am sure the cost of acquiring that land on that site would be greater than going on Cave Hill or at the Pine or at Waterford and putting up a Parliament Building consonant with a Twentieth Century Parliament Building and you can then convert this Parliament Building into offices, thus creating better offices for the people of this country. Think of something to do with these offices without destroying the architecture. It is a question of judgment. The last Government had a plan for the building of a new Parliament Building, but at the same time they were projecting a cost which was too much. As time goes on, I am satisfied that this present building is not only hot but the acoustics are not good and we have to install all sorts of contraptions to make it suitable; therefore you have all these sort of situations in order to keep the House of Assembly going. This is one of the poorest Parliament

Buildings in the world. You come here and find one of the officers fast asleep when a Session is going on. It is worse than your having a jury at a Court of Grand Sessions which is trying a man for murder, and you find that one of the jurors is fast asleep while the man's life is in the balance.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would just like to inform the hon. member that that is not so in the case of the present holder of the office. It has not happened during the time of the present holder of the office.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do feel that the reasons for the acquisition of the site are not valid enough for the Government's going in for this experiment.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to see the Hon. Leader of the House presenting this Resolution for the reasons which he gave, but it is just because they feel if this building is going on the market, that they should acquire it. I thought that they had some good reasons for acquiring it. The amount of 3,791 square feet is not sufficient for the average development area. What is more against it is its location. Some of it would have to be taken away for sidewalks. That is how I see it; and that would reduce the land to less than half the size of what it is.

The Hon. Leader of the House said that it was going on the market. That means in your acquiring it that you are competing with private enterprise. You are coming into the House with this issue just to wring this land out of the old lady's hand. You cannot say that you need it for the country. You say that you are acquiring this property for the public's use. It is like flogging a boy today because you think that he is going to commit an offence next month.

What does the Addendum say? It says that 'protracted efforts at negotiation with the owner of the building and property together with land whereon the same stands described in the Schedule hereto for the purchase of the area in question have failed to produce any agreement on price'.

What you intend to do is to wring this property out of the old lady's hand. You have no reasons for acquiring it. What are you going to give for it?

I do not agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter when he talked about turning this Parliament Building into offices and our moving from here. These old buildings will stand here for another 2,000 years, and you will find that Parliament will continue to be held in here long after we are gone. Lots of things will change, but this will not change. You do not change buildings like these. This is not made to be changed. Human nature has something to do with this, and as long as human nature has something to do with this, it will not be changed; you do not rewrite history. You may have a new Olympic theatre; you may have all the juke boxes around the corner; but the time will come when Parliament will meet here almost every day. We are going to be the head of the Eastern Caribbean Federation. There is bound to be a Federation; therefore, you must have all the square feet around here if it is only for ceremonial purposes, if for no other reason than having a third of June parade. Take down all that old rubbish which you have on the next side of the street which houses the Income Tax office. You have a Westminster Abbey and a Big Ben already. You can look off from here every square foot up to the Cathedral. You want to leave the square alone. You talk about buying this old building and you have given not one reason for buying it.
3.40 p.m.

This is like taking a bit of bread out of a poor blind man's hand, and I do not think I can support this Resolution. Now that the Hon. Leader of the House has heard the debate on this matter, he must have something sacred when it comes to talking about conscience. Now we see the expression of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, that unsavoury part of human raw material. Mr. Speaker, this is unfair; it is un-Christian and un-democratic to wring this property out of this old lady's hand because she has no defence. This building is too small for anything even including a hatchery. You have missed the ship. If you are

thinking of the Post Office you should consider acquiring some land which is yours for the asking; but instead of that you are thinking of this old lady's property because she is powerless and defenceless and you will put this property in cold storage. I repeat that this is un-Christian; there is no end to all of this.

Mr. Speaker, retribution for this is no longer ten years off; it is coming right now. If this concept is accepted and it is understood by the Hon. Minister, how can he ask us to agree to wring this property out of this poor old lady's hand? This is unfair in any language. It has no foundation at all in Christianity. "Flee as a bird to the mountains".....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now lapsing to the poetical.

Mr. MILLER: "Flee as a bird to the Mountains,
Oh thou who art weary of sin."

I say, Sir, that this is uncouth and undemocratic. You want to secure a niche for yourself; you want to undertake these things for which somebody must pay. You come into Parliament to acquire this building and you are wringing it out of this old lady's hand. You are merely seeking the development of a community, and you are putting a commercial property to compete with a commercial entity. You have no immediate use for this property. If you are buying property there must be the need for it by the community; but in this case there is no such need. You are tinkering with folly and imagination because it would look to you as if somebody would go and buy this building. We are not speaking with any jollification now.

Mr. Speaker, in this modern age of civilisation you can think of the early Pilgrims. You should cease to plunder. Do you think, Sir, that I would feel happy if you were to wring something out of my hand? But this is taking something from a soul who is helpless. However, Sir, there is one thing which is certain, that is, that they will not return here and therefore they can do as they like. I am simply asking that you take a realistic view of our responsibility. There is no pantomime or concert in this. You are acquiring something which must be removed ten feet from one side and ten feet on the other side and therefore what are you acquiring this property for? You can remove Lord Nelson and put him in the Harbour. I say, Sir, that this is un-Christian and ungodly, and I do hope you will see the wisdom of what I am saying. I feel sure that the Hon. Leader of the House will not go too hastily in this matter. I do not think you could ask any civilised person here to join in this. This is holding hands and joining in plunder.
3.50 p.m.

Are you asking us to join hands with you in this plunder? This is ungodly and indecent, and all the arguments adduced can be swept up in an ugly heap of debris. If you had a single purpose, I would support you; but you say you are going to buy this old building and keep in cold storage. Why not go and buy other buildings that you will need? This matter will have serious repercussions in this country if Parliament agrees with this. You are asking us to join with you in pulling the goof off the old lady's head, and all the reasons and arguments given by the Minister cannot justify this act. You are asking us on this side of the Table to join hands with you in plunder, and, maybe, to save face, you will use your fourteen votes on the other side.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will advise the hon. junior member for St. George not again to use the word "plunder", unless he explains what he means, because it would seem to be offensive and insulting language about members of the House.

Mr. MILLER: Are you taking objection to the word "plunder"? If you wring a milk bottle out of a baby's hand, I cannot think of any other word. There is nothing undignified about the word. If you think of Sir Walter Raleigh, you will remember that his ability to plunder had a significant meaning for the Queen.

Mr. SPEAKER: Sir Walter Raleigh was never a member of this Chamber.

Mr. MILLER: History reveals that as a result of his plundering, the Queen honoured him. I refuse to associate myself with what might appear to be the plunder of a defenceless old lady. I could not agree with the Minister more if he had a single reason for acquiring this property. If he is thinking of a place for drinking beer, I can see some nice elaborate place with doors and elevators operating; but the Minister has given no earthly reason for the acquisition. He does not speak of the price he will pay for the wood ants. Even Robin Hood had a specific reason for plundering, because he took from the rich and gave to the poor, and he will forever remain a hero in the hearts of every boy.

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister had any reason to use the Act, I would agree with him; but it seems to me that he is only competing with private enterprise. Why did he not a few months ago buy the building which was bought by Wilson's and preserve the Square? It would have been a wonderful idea; but if he is bankrupt of ideas, we have them in cold storage and he can ask for them. You should go and develop the Cavans Lane area and have a small ferry to take people across and back for a nickel. You should remove the shops from Broad Street and develop the Cavans Lane area and remove Lord Nelson from Broad Street and erect the monument on the other side where he can be looking over the sea. I know you are bankrupt of ideas, and you are using taxpayers' money to buy an outmoded idea of a period. This building will be unsuitable for offices, and you should look around for buildings which can be used for development in a country which is bound to be the capital if you are talking about federation.

4.00 p.m.

You talk of independence. We talk of independence and we want to know what the British Government is doing to help Barbados. We can build a nation of our own. We have a capital and a square. With all the other areas to be developed, we have a capital and a square which will redound to the credit of any Government or any individual who is capable of thinking. You want to show a projection to overlap decades. Take this money which you are going to buy the Trafalgar Hotel with and buy the old warehouses which are in Cavans Lane. If you do not know what to do, come and listen to me and let me tell you. We have done lots of development in Barbados in our time. The Ministerial Buildings and the new Hospital were done by the last Government.

Sir, I am sorry about all of this. This is the taxpayers' money which they are going to take up to buy the Trafalgar Hotel with. This is an area where you have to be very careful. Do not let us continue with this old joke of buying this building. I do not think I need say anything more on this. What I have said was not intended to embarrass the Government, but certainly to ask me to join hands with you and shake the Government's hand in this matter is like Ali Baba and the forty thieves.

Mr. Speaker, I will ask you to use your influence with those on the Other Side and stop this. This is a Resolution which should be thrown out. Why should the House be saddled with this? It is contrary to their very consciences. It is not that this property was offered on the local market and the Government felt that they should buy it. If this property was offered to people outside and nobody was interested in it and the Government saw something which they could do with it in the future, well then, they could buy it. But do not say that you are competing with modern society in the acquisition of it and you are invoking this Act to get it out of the hands of this defenceless old lady.

I think the Hon. Leader of the House is keeping something back from us. My colleague on my left, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, has said that nobody in his senses, nobody with elementary decency, would go and buy this for the Government. Look and you will see that the Clerks of this House have disappeared from the Table. It is because they do not want to be soiled with this demean-

our. There must be some good reason, too, why the Hon. Premier has withdrawn from his seat now that this is discussed. I do not know if he wanted to start his Budget Speech then. This is like Ali Baba and the forty thieves. I repeat, if this property was on the market and nobody wanted it and it would be of any use to you, well then, I would say "yes, acquire it." I would say that even if you had no use for it at the moment. But it is not fair for Government to do this to that old queen. Look what the Addendum to the Resolution says! This old lady is going to resist the Government. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I think that I should add my voice to that of hon. members on this side of the Table who have objected to the purchase of this old building known as the Trafalgar Hotel by the Government. It is not a usual practice of mine to rebuke the Government, but on this occasion, I must certainly do so. I cannot join hands with the Government on this issue because this, to my mind, would be just a farce and I would be counted as Ahab who coveted Nabob's vineyard.

I can see no reason for the Government purchasing the Trafalgar Hotel. It is an unsuitable site for Government offices. The Government has nothing to do with a building of this sort and it is very near to other buildings which are filled with juke boxes and the like. It reminds me of some small children who because their parents give them money, whatever passes their way, they buy. I can only say that the Government is purchasing this building because they want to buy a building. Here it is, I have sat and seen just a few moments ago from another Resolution that the Government is renting part of a warehouse to the West Indian Suppliers Company Limited. They have now turned around and want us to agree to the purchase of 3,791 feet of land opposite this building with an old building on it only because they have the power to do so.

I do not agree with them. I think the Government should think that all the people in this Island are responsible for forming the Government, and since that is so, I was appealing to the Government and asking that some help be given to the people of St. Joseph. If you were to go there, you will see that there is not one single house which is owned by the Government which can be rented to the poor people of St. Joseph.

4.10 p.m.

When I put the question to the House, the Hon. Minister replied that there is a housing scheme in St. Joseph, but that scheme was never intended to be a housing scheme; it was intended merely to relieve some people who were suffering in Parris Hill. However, Sir, I cannot assist in taking advantage of people who cannot help or who cannot defend themselves. I am quite sure that some private individual will pay this old lady more than what the Government is going to pay her for this property and he will be able to make use of it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I did not interfere in this debate earlier because I could not think of replying to the mass of meaningless rhetoric which flowed from the hon. junior member for St. George, but Sir,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member make his point of order in respect of what the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is saying. Is the hon. member doing that?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. senior member for St. Joseph is now quoting remarks which have been made by the previous speaker with reference to wringing property out of the hand of some defenceless old lady. The hon. member is now repeating that and saying that he is sure that some private person would pay this old lady more for this property than what we propose to pay her. In due course, I will reply to the deliberate and misleading assertions; but I said a little time ago that the owner of this property is now dead, and therefore the negotiations for this property are between the Government and the executors to the old lady's will.

Mr. COWARD: Is the hon. member making a speech?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is attempting to elucidate a matter mentioned by him during the course of his speech.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I said when I introduced the Resolution that the owner of this property is now dead. I repeat it at this stage because, normally, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is not one who deliberately misleads the House. I want to put the hon. member straight; the owner of this property has been dead for sometime now.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would not attempt to accuse the Hon. Leader of the House of being ignorant because he is not ignorant by any stretch of the imagination. I was putting it to the hon. member that it would be unfair to purchase this building known as the Trafalgar Hotel because the Government has no use for it. This is what is stated in the Resolution:

"RESOLVED that the House of Assembly approve the compulsory acquisition by the Crown in right of its Government of this Island under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, of the building and property together with the land whereon the same stands described in the Schedule to this Resolution for the following purpose, that is to say, for the provision of office accommodation for Government departments....."

It does not say what Government Departments will be housed. In my opinion, the Government has more buildings in the City than it can manage to use. The Government has the old Hospital, and what is it going to do with the buildings up there? I am quite sure that the Town and Country Planning Officer would advise the Government to set back this property if it is acquired. I think, Sir, that we are going a little bit too fast, and we will have to tax the people. It is all well and good when everything is going all right; but as soon as the Government has to deal with something more, then you are going to have opposition.

Mr. MILLER and Mr. SMITH rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. George caught my eye first.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I did not want to say.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that a point of elucidation?

Mr. MILLER: I said that this was a matter of wringing property out of the hand of this old lady. I did not want to say that she was dead. I did not want it to appear that they were wringing this property out of the hands of a dead woman. Her will has not yet been probated.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, when I read the Addendum to this Resolution, I thought that the Government wanted to acquire this property for the purpose of widening the corner around this building. I was saying that if they were to take down this building and widen the corner there, we would have a first-class square; but now the Hon. Minister has explained to us that there is no immediate need for this particular place. That makes me remember what I said in this House last week, that is to say, that the Government has the big stick in the corner, it is sheltering under this Act and it is willing and ready at any time to take up this big stick and use it. Why should the Government try to acquire this property if there is no immediate need for it?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, at no time during the course of this debate has it been said that there is no immediate need for this property. What was said is that the property was required for the accommodation of Government Departments and for highway improvement.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I did hear the Hon. Minister say something about Government Departments, but I did not hear him say anything about highway improvement. Well, Sir, if it is the intention of the Government to improve the highway, that is all well and good. The only purpose which the acquisition of this property could be used for would be for improving the highway. As far as I was listening to the hon. member, it does appear as if I was putting something in his mouth. The only time when I heard the hon. members say anything about highway improvement was when I got up and began to speak. If the Government is improving the highway at this point, then I will have nothing to say because the volume of traffic is increasing and we must widen corners so as to get away from accidents; but when the Hon. Minister is talking about building, what can he build here?

As I have already said, the matter of the acquisition of land is becoming very prevalent. It is becoming a household word that the Government is doing nothing else but acquiring land.
4.20 p.m.

Every Tuesday, Sir, we have a Resolution for the acquisition of land. I do not know if anything appeared in the newspaper this morning, but I believe the Minister would have said that "protracted efforts" was a misprint. From what is stated in the Addendum, it is clear that the owners did not want to sell this place because the Addendum states that "protracted efforts at negotiations with the owner of the building and property together with land whereon the same stand described in the Schedule hereto for the purchase of the area in question have failed to produce any agreement on price". Why does Government want to acquire immediately? If the owner was willing to sell, then the Government could buy the property; otherwise the people should be allowed to carry on as long as they like, and at any time the Government can acquire it.

Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to make a motion that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed for the purpose of carrying on with other business, but I wanted to make my speech before the box which I have just seen was opened. I wanted to do that because I did not know if I would be alive after it was opened.

I respectfully beg to move that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members will recall that earlier today there was, as I understood, general agreement that at 4.30 o'clock p.m. the Hon. Minister of Finance would lay the Budget Statement enunciating the Government financial proposals for the instant financial year.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph can rest assured that we have every desire to permit him to finish his speech on the matter just postponed, and at the expiration of the Financial Statement, it is our intention to resume the debate on the matter just postponed; so that the motion for postponement of further consideration was done in no way to preclude him from saying his full on this matter. We are looking forward to what he has further to say as well as any other hon. member who wants to speak on it.

I now beg to move that the Financial Statement on Budgetary Proposals be now taken.

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

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

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGET PROPOSALS

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on the 26th day of June, 1962, I made my first budget speech as Minister of Finance on the floor of this House.

At that time the Island was faced with a deficit of two million three hundred and fifty thousand dollars and had passed through a period of stagnation out of which it was necessary to jolt the economy. The Government introduced a new development plan to create employment, generate purchasing power amongst the masses of the people and to lay the foundation of a programme of industrialisation and diversification of agriculture.

On the 7th May, 1963, my second financial statement was introduced and for the first time an economic survey of the Island for the year 1962 was tabled.

Earlier today the Economic Survey 1964 reviewing the state of the affairs in 1963 was laid on the table of the House.

In the foreword to that document I have stated that the purpose of its presentation is to enable the general public to appreciate the background against which the fiscal proposals will be made by me this evening. The new survey is much more informative than the last. We have been able to collect more data than formerly and it is deficient in one respect only and that is in the examination of the private sector of the economy.

I hope that by this time next year private firms and businesses will be persuaded that it is in the national interest and their own to volunteer information on their plans for expansion replacement and investment so that the economic picture will be fully displayed.

I do not intend therefore to read or quote from the survey and such reference as I may make to actual figures will be for the purpose of providing more up to date information than contained in the Economic Survey.

The Island's finances have now recovered from the serious position in which they were two and a half years ago. Then there was a large gap between current revenue and current expenditure, and there was a prospect of the situation worsening. The transformation is as much due to the strict control of current expenditure as to the extraordinarily large increase of revenue which resulted from the general economic improvement and collections in respect of previous years. The following figures of current expenditure speak for themselves:—

1960-61	..	..	..	22.7 million
1961-62	..	..	..	27.7 "
1962-63	..	..	..	28.4 "
1963-64	..	..	..	29.1 "

On the revenue side the figures are:—

1960-61	..	..	..	26.0 million
1961-62	..	..	..	26.2 "
1962-63	..	..	..	28.1 "
1963-64	..	..	..	33.7 "

It must be admitted that the extraordinary increase in the revenue is due to fortuitous circumstances, and that there is no assurance that these will be repeated in future years. The salient fact is that sugar continues to dominate completely the economy of the Island. We were perhaps fortunate last year that this was so. Sugar and its by-products accounted for 92% of the total domestic exports.

World trade has been increasing and any measures to expand trade must be welcomed by this Government. We, therefore, watch with interest

the deliberations at the World Trade Conference in Geneva. It is important however, that we should know where we stand on the various issues and should not ally ourselves too closely with any of the large groups. While we favour the expansion of markets for the tropical products of under-developed countries, we oppose any reduction in the preferences which we enjoy in the United Kingdom and Canada and any modification of the commodity agreement for the sale of our sugar in Britain.

The Kennedy round is not making any real progress, but we continue to be interested in these negotiations as they affect the question of reduction of the tariffs of the United States of America, which is not so far away from this Island.

We must expand our production in goods and agricultural products in addition to sugar and this task has to be tackled with urgency; it is made clear by the figures of population increase and the latest information in regard to sugar. In 1963, the birth rate did not increase, it was 29.1 per thousand, but the death rate fell further to 8.8 per thousand. This resulted in a natural increase of 4,793 souls. The net emigration was somewhat greater than in the previous year, but the net increase in population for the year was still over 3,000 (3,092). This is a steep rise in our population, which was estimated at 240,468 at 31st December, 1963.

The 1964 crop which had been estimated at 195,000 tons was 33,600 tons less — only 161,400. The world price of sugar has also continued to fall and it is now £46 (\$221) per ton: the same as the negotiated price with Britain.

It is difficult to predict what will happen in the world sugar market or in world trade generally in the coming year, but the basic position is not too discouraging. The increase in the tourist trade continues, and it is good to report that the number of tourists who arrived in the Island in the first quarter of 1964 exceeded the number in the same quarter of 1963 by 1,436. The support to the economy given by remittances from overseas continues and the amount remitted to the Island through the post office in the first quarter of 1964 was \$1,267,693 as compared with \$1,205,240 in the March quarter of 1963.

Considerable progress has been made in the arrangements for our new currency following the notification by Trinidad and Tobago and by British Guiana of their intention to issue their own currencies. The Crown Agents have been asked to obtain quotations for the supply of the new currency, and an agreement between the Islands which will share the currency and a Bill to ratify it have been drafted and will soon be before the House. Our currency will be exchanged for sterling at the rate of four dollars and eighty cents to the pound sterling.

Every month from January to May this year deposits made in the Government Savings Bank have exceeded \$700,000. This is a record. Savings in the Commercial banks have also reached record figures. At 31st March, deposits in the Government Savings Bank amounted to \$18,229,000 while savings in the Commercial banks totalled \$26,730,000. At that date total deposits in commercial banks reached the record figure of \$66,146,000 while loans and advances amounted to \$42,430,000.

If savings are to be of maximum benefit to the community, they must be invested locally. One of the reasons why many people hesitate to invest in the Island is that it is sometimes difficult to sell local securities on the best terms. The Government welcomes the steps which are being taken to develop local stock exchanges and money markets in this area. As a concrete contribution to this movement, I propose to remove the stamp duty on the transfer of Barbados Government debentures. No substantial loss in revenue is involved.

Despite inflationary tendencies, the cost of living has been kept down. The index of retail prices for the month of March, 1964, was the same as the figure for July, 1963.

The Marketing Corporation is providing a vital and long absent link in the chain of distribution of foodstuffs. That consumer demand far outstrips production is now clearly evident. This is a challenge to agriculturalists and fishermen which they should speedily accept. Incentives and encouragement by the Government are not lacking.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

The capital expenditure for the year 1963-64 totalled \$9,553,178 as compared with \$7,930,184 in the previous year. This capital expenditure of \$9½ million was financed as follows:—

Loan Funds	\$ 7,939,250
General Revenue Balance ..	464,762
C.D.&W. Funds	159,481
Labour Welfare Funds ..	989,684

The Island's public debt is now over \$40 million. There are already advances pending the raising of loans of about \$7 million and interest rates are unusually high. Some re-assessment of the method of financing capital expenditure is therefore necessary. To reduce the amount which we shall have to raise on loans, I therefore propose that the surplus realised on current account in 1963-64 be allocated to defray part of the capital expenditure in the current year which would otherwise fall to be financed from loan funds. This will reduce the amount which we will require to raise on loans and will strengthen our position.

The new Hospital is a building of which all Barbadians can be proud, but we have not yet met the full capital cost. We expect, however, to obtain a further grant from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds, and that the Hospital Sweepstake (Act 1964-20) will provide money towards both capital and recurrent expenditure on the hospital. The additional recurrent expenditure for staffing and running the new institution will be considerable, and ways and means of meeting it will have to be found. We also have to bear in mind that the Mental Hospital and other medical services have to be maintained.

In accordance with our policy to encourage public support for international and intercolonial cricket, tennis and athletics, I propose that the following items be deleted from the Schedule to the Entertainment Tax Act, 1953:

Intercolonial and Test Cricket Matches, and other cricket matches where one of the teams is from without the Island.

Intercolonial Tennis Matches and other tennis matches where one of the teams is from without the Island.

Intercolonial Athletic and Cycle Sports.

This relief is estimated to cost less than \$3,000 per annum, but will also serve the purpose of removing difficulties experienced by our sports officials in bargaining with international and inter-territorial sports organisations.

Improvements to Seawell International Airport are being carried out at an average annual cost of some \$700,000 over and above the cost of extensive land acquisition for necessary expansion. Proposals are being worked on for certain additional charges to defray this capital expenditure over a period. The net revenue from these proposals is estimated to be in the region of \$135,000 but the details have yet to be settled.

For some time I have been concerned with the lack of control on what are known as racing service businesses. They operate in what is known as the field of fixed odds betting on horse races and are inconsistent with the existing laws relating to wagering and betting. To solve the problem,

I propose that all premises at which the business of receiving or negotiating bets on horseracing is carried on should be registered and that they should be charged a licence fee of twelve thousand dollars per annum. The necessary legislation has been prepared and will be introduced forthwith, and I shall be asking permission to deal with a bill to amend the Gambling Act of 1917 in all its stages today.

There are other forms of Gambling taking place in the Island which the Government considers ought to be restricted if not curtailed.

It is proposed to introduce a comprehensive revision of the Gambling Act, the Gaming Act and other ancillary statutes later in the year to control these practices. The Government has no intention of legalising Casino gambling in any form.

After discussion with the Civil Service Association through the Whitley Council machinery, it is proposed to make certain concessions to civil servants and changes of conditions of employment of civil servants.

I propose that civil servants should be refunded half of the contributions they made to the Widows and Orphans Pensions Scheme in the eight months before the Widows and Children's Pensions Act came into operation. It is fair to make this refund, because it will be remembered that, in my budget statement in May last year, I announced the proposed reduction in the contribution, and it was only because there was a delay in enacting the new legislation that the civil servants had to continue to pay 4% of salary contributions instead of the new 2% contributions. (Only men at present make such contributions). This refund will cost \$56,000. Quite apart from the reductions in contributions the benefits to be derived have been extended and increased considerably by the legislation which came into force in February this year.

Amendments to the Leave Regulations and terms on which leave passages will in future be granted, more in keeping with the Island's advance towards independence, have been agreed on. The adjustments in leave conditions will not result in any appreciable saving for some time, and the reduction in leave passage concessions will only gradually lead to a decrease in annual expenditure under this head, reaching about 35% after 5 years.

Details of the changes will be laid before the House as soon as the necessary Regulations and Order have been made.

Another alteration affecting the Civil Service which has been considered in Whitley Council is that of the Travelling Regulations. At present the rates of allowance paid to public officers who travel by motor car are:—

First 200 miles each month at 28¢ per mile
Next 150 miles each month at 8¢ per mile
Any mileage over 350 miles each month is 7¢ per mile

Higher costs of maintaining and running motor cars have been put forward as reasons for an increase in the rates paid, and I have accepted that the following new rates are reasonable:—

First 200 miles each month at 30¢ per mile
Next 200 miles each month at 8¢ per mile
Any mileage over 400 miles each month at 7¢ per mile.

These new rates will come into effect as from 1st July. The increase is expected to cost \$10,350 per annum in the current financial year, and \$13,800 per annum.

As a result of further representations by the teachers, I propose that a final concession should be made in regard to the equalisation of the salaries of women with those of men. Equalisation in such cases is, of course, always expected to be upward. The House will recollect that, under the present arrangements, equalisation is to be achieved in five years which began on 1st April 1964. When I made the statement on the subject last August, it was calculated that in the first year the additional

cost would be \$40,000 and that the ultimate cost would be \$240,000 per annum. Since that date, however, one hundred and fifty additional teachers have been added to the establishment, and it is now estimated that the first instalment will cost \$70,600 and that the ultimate cost will be in the region of \$400,000 per annum. The most I can do, in such circumstances, is to propose that the equalisation be effected in 4 years instead of 5. It is calculated that the additional cost this year, over and above the \$70,600 will be \$17,650.

It must also be remembered that fifty per cent of the difference between the salaries of male and female teachers was liquidated at the time of the salaries revision in 1961 and that a similar policy of equal pay was implemented over a period of seven years in the United Kingdom.

In all of these measures relating to the Civil Service, I have along with the officials of the Ministry and the official side of the Whitley Council been granted the fullest co-operation of the Civil Service Association although the compromises reflected in these proposals were in most cases arrived at only after exhaustive examination and discussion by both sides.

We are at present negotiating a thorough revision of the Double Taxation Agreement with the United Kingdom Government. As a result of this revision it is expected that tax spared under the various industrial incentive Acts will be considered by the United Kingdom tax authorities as having been paid and therefore eligible for relief in the United Kingdom. This should be of considerable benefit to non-resident investors. In this connection, I propose that the Income Tax Act be amended to make it clear that relief given under Section 4A to non-residents is given with a view to promoting industrial, commercial, scientific, educational and other development. It is necessary to set this out specifically in order that corresponding relief may be given in the United Kingdom.

There is a small additional concession which I propose should be granted in respect of initial allowances. Legislation will be introduced to deem any expenditure incurred before commencement of the business or trade to have been incurred on the day on which the trade or business commenced.

Another encouragement which I propose should be given to local industry is an increase from 2% to 3% in the allowance granted for industrial buildings. These measures of relief will come into effect from the beginning of the next year of assessment 1st January, 1965.

Various other ideas for adjusting taxation have been examined such as depreciation for machinery on a straight line basis rather than on written down value. I have also considered special allowances for scientific personnel engaged in industry. They have been found to be either too costly or worthy of more careful scrutiny at this stage. One of the legacies we have inherited which results in inequitable taxation is the trade tax of local authorities. Unfortunately, most of the money spent by these authorities comes from this source, and they, therefore, cannot do without it. There is, however, one direction in which the Government is pressing forward with reforms. We have enlisted the help of the United Nations, and an expert, Mr. Copes, is advising us on land valuation for taxation. I propose that, with the advice of the expert, a new department should be brought into being. Legislation will be introduced, staff will be properly trained and a land valuation mosaic of the whole island will be prepared. In this work the aerial survey will be invaluable: in fact this is one of its main purposes. It will take three years to complete the work of introducing the new systems, which will be based on the most modern practices in the world. The qualification for valuation officers will be of a similar status to that of other technical officers; and the complete land registration supported by maps will provide information the need for which has long been felt.

The Inland Revenue Department is now vigorously collecting arrears: 217 cases have been lodged by the Department. The pressure will be intensified.

The excellent collections last year should lead to some optimism as to the prospects in the current financial year. Much of the taxation will be based on extraordinarily large profits from last year's bumper sugar crop which was sold at record prices; so income tax collections in the current financial year should exceed those in 1963-64, which amounted to \$10,183,960. I am informed, however, that profits of traders fell below expectations. This may be the direct result of a policy of vertical integration being pursued by commission houses in so far as wholesaling and retailing of goods is concerned. There has been during the year a spectacular growth in the number of supermarkets which must inevitably lead to the liquidation of the small retail shopkeeper.

If this class of small businessman is to survive he will have to learn quickly the benefits of co-operative enterprise, pleasant and sanitary business premises and the building up of confidence amongst his customers that they receive fair measure and good quality. I hope that the small business loans operations of the new Development Bank whose directorate will shortly be announced, will guarantee some measure of relief and upgrading of standards in the retail trade.

It seems that most of our people saved the extra money, rather than indulging in an orgy of reckless spending on imported goods. They are to be congratulated. (They may have been influenced by the National Savings Movement which has, however, not got into high gear yet).

Some months ago, Mr. Speaker, during the course of a debate I pointed out that it was not justified to accuse this Government of being unfair in not taxing the rich, since less than 1,200 people in this community were already paying 95% of the income tax collected and out of a total working population of close on 100,000 persons there are only just over 10,000 tax-payers, whilst two hundred and sixty companies account for the bulk of the receipts collected by the Department of Inland Revenue.

My statement was immediately transfigured by the local press into a pronouncement that it is unfair to tax the rich whilst I was merely pointing out that we were taxing the rich to the limit of their capacity to pay whilst the people who complain most are those who pay no direct taxes at all. Moreover, the middle income groups in this Island are hard pressed to meet demands placed upon their resources for housing and even the normal requirements of comfortable family existence. I have, therefore, examined the feasibility of assessment of the wife's income separately from her husband's where both happen to be in receipt of incomes.

I am of the opinion that such an exercise would lead to substantial reduction in revenue which cannot be entertained at this state of development.

In view however of the healthy balance achieved last year and the unlikelihood of an actual deficit during the current year, I do not propose that there should be any increase in the rates of income tax this year, and accordingly a bill to fix the rates of tax on the same basis as last year will be introduced in this House today.

I shall now proceed to summarise the main features of this budget.

The out-turn figures for year ended on the 31st March, 1964 have disclosed a surplus of approximately \$4.6 million.

I propose to employ the whole of this amount to reduce the borrowing for capital works this year which leaves a balance of approximately \$4 million to be met from Loan Funds.

In the Approved Estimates 1964-65 we showed a deficit on current account of some \$820,000 which, with increased expenditure for the new

hospital and other concessions made in this budget, should make an overall deficit of \$1.5 million and a total expenditure of \$34 million.

Additional receipts from my proposals, along with licence fees from the Hospital funds and greater returns from the Department of Inland Revenue, should however offset the deficit of \$1.5 million.

It is proposed to

Remove the stamp duty payable on transfer of Barbados Government debentures.

Remove the Entertainment tax on Intercolonial and International cricket matches and similarly on Tennis and Athletic and Cycle Sports.

Remove the radio licence fee.

Impose certain charges at Seawell International Airport.

Impose a licence fee of \$12,000 on premises where racing services are carried on.

Refund arrears of contributions paid by civil servants to Widows and Orphans Pensions Scheme.

Revise the Leave Regulations and terms upon which leave passages are now granted.

Increase the rates of travelling allowances paid to public officers.

Reduce the period of implementation of equal pay for female teachers from five years to four years.

Initial allowances will be deductible in respect of expenditure incurred before the day on which trade or business commences.

The allowance on industrial buildings will be increased from 2% to 3%.

The licence fee payable for television receivers will be \$10 per annum.

There will be no consumption tax for five years on either radio or television receivers but the duty on both will remain at 20% preferential and 30% general.

The profit margin on television sets will be controlled at not more than 25% of the cost to the dealer.

The general revenue balance at the 31st March, 1964, was \$6,241,000; at the end of this financial year it should be \$1,678,000.

From this you will see that the Government is pursuing a policy of utilising our surplus balances to boost the economy of this country rather than exporting our capital abroad. There still remains a considerable demand for capital for local investment. There is no reason why the private sector of the economy, the insurance companies, the commercial and agricultural interests who have received much benefit from their operations in Barbados, no reason why the average man or woman who has modest savings in the banks or at home should not follow the example set by Government and generate more prosperity by investing their surplus funds and savings in Government bonds.

In three short years, Mr. Speaker, the economy of this Island has moved forward with a quickening pace which is conspicuous to all who witnessed what was not happening before. It is exemplified by a steep and steady rise in the Gross Domestic Product at factor cost and current prices from \$119.8 million in 1960 to \$149.2 million in 1963 giving a *per capita* increase of \$110 per annum. If the growth is to continue, if the period of reconstruction is to be shortened, then the planned mobilisation of all our material and human resources will continue to be our surest guarantee of success. (*Cheers*)

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I now beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$2,373,547 at the disposal of the Government to defray the Capital expenditure shown in the Schedule to the Resolution;

Also, a Bill to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year 1964, and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax;

Also, a Bill to amend the Entertainment Tax Act, 1953;

Also, a Bill to provide for the registration of all premises at which the business of receiving or negotiating bets on horse races is carried on and for other matters incidental thereto or connected therewith.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year 1964, and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Entertainment Tax Act, 1953, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to provide for the registration of all premises at which the business of receiving or negotiating bets on horse races is carried on and for other matters incidental thereto or connected therewith, was read a first time.

HOUSE RESUMES DEBATE ON RESOLUTION
re PURCHASE OF TRAFALGAR HOTEL

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the debate on Order No. 4 be now resumed.

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

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

5.10 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON RESOLUTION TO
APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION
OF TRAFALGAR HOTEL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume debate on the motion for the passing of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of the property known as the Trafalgar Hotel together with the land whereon the same stands.

When the further consideration of this Resolution was postponed, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was speaking.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the motion was made for the postponement of the debate on this Resolution, I was making the point that in connection with this particular building which we are now being asked to give the okay to acquire, the Hon. Minister was very vague in explaining to us the purpose for which this site will be used. Before going further, Sir, I should like to say that at any time when the Government is asking this Hon. House to give them permission to acquire plots of land or property they should always set out the purpose for which the land or property will be used in the Resolution. That should be set out in the Resolution so that we will be able to give it a perfect study, and we will be able to contribute to the debate in a more

intelligent manner. In this case nothing has been stated as to the purpose of the Resolution. As I am always saying and as I will always say, we should be told the price which has been offered by both sides for property; we should know that regardless of the consequences. We are passing a Resolution to acquire the property, and allowing the public to know the price of the property could not stop the sale from going through in one way or the other, because we are protected by the law. It is not that the hon. member will be in the happy position to say that the owner has said: "You have allowed the public to know what I have asked for this land what you have offered for it and therefore I will not sell it any more". If that could be done, then I would agree that the public should not know the price which is being asked or offered for this property or for any other property.

In this case we are asked to give the Okay for the acquisition of this property. This is what is stated in the Addendum to the Resolution.

"Protracted efforts at negotiations with the owner of the building and property together with land whereon the same stands described in the Schedule hereto for the purchase of the area in question have failed to produce any agreement on price."

We know that they have failed to reach agreement, but we do not know who has failed in reaching agreement; we do not know whether it is one party or the other or whether it is both of them. If you have to use the big stick in the corner to take one's property, then everything should be done by way of settlement before trying to squeeze this property out of the hands of the owner. Your Honour will pardon that expression. In this case, we are not informed that they have a particular purpose to which they will put this building. I would say that it should be acquired for the purpose of highway improvement. Even so, in this particular area there is one-way traffic. There is no possibility of one vehicle going in one direction and the other vehicle going in another direction and so they are liable to run into each other. In this area, one vehicle can only run into another from behind, but not in a head-on fashion. You cannot prevent a collision occurring from behind, but you can avoid a head-on accident. If you are acquiring this building for highway improvement, you can allow it to remain there and keep the money in the Treasury. If you feel that the money will burn itself and you want to get it out of your hand, then you can hand it over to the Housing Authority which is there to help people in the country, people who are still waiting and knocking at the door for the necessary amount of money to help them getting somewhere to live. It would be better to do that with this money than to purchase this building and allow it to remain there until you are ready for it. You will be losing revenue meanwhile because some taxation must be paid on this building.

5.20 p.m.

I cannot see for the life of me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what type of Government buildings that area will carry. The only building I see that particular area can carry is one for public conveniences, with a hotel on one side and business places on the other. In building on that side, you will also have to set back from the corner according to the specifications of the Town and Country Planning regulations, and you might just as well get somewhere else. The time has come when we have to go out of town with some of these buildings, and even business places will have to do that rather than be congested in the area. The time has come also when Government cannot expect all the time to expand on the ground floor. You have to go up in the air, and erect a building that can carry 100 offices. That building will cost a lot of money, and when you buy it and demolish it, what will be your floor space? This would be an ideal place for public conveniences, because it is practically in the heart of the City, and rather than having to travel so far away when nature calls, you will be right on the spot. Now if the Minister had said that, I would approve; but there is no immediate use for it at the moment; but it will be there in case they need it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, this is about the second time that I have heard the hon. junior

member for St. Joseph repeat that kind of argument about no immediate use of the spot. That is a figment of his own imagination, because nobody on the Government benches said that today at all.

Mr. SMITH: Well, he did not say that there was no immediate use, but why not tell us what is the immediate use? What is the building to house?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am having no exchanges from both sides of the House.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Your Honour was not in the Chair, but His Honour the Speaker would recall if he were here that I rose on a point of order to repeat what I said about the proposals for this property, and I said that we needed it for public departments and for the improvement of the public highway. This is the third time I am saying it today.

Mr. SMITH: This is the third time he has talked about improvement of the public highway, and it will be the third time that I did not hear it. He did not say anything about the improvement of the public highway.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The records are there and will show what the hon. member said. Let the hon. junior member for St. Joseph continue with the Resolution.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I think the hon. member, if he would sit down, is taking advantage of Your Honour's absence, because not only did the hon. member hear, but the hon. member has been describing how fatuous it is to talk about the improvement of public highway because buses come around behind one another; and for the member barefacedly to abuse Your Honour's absence in that way to tell such a patent untruth is not becoming to the dignity of this House. If he is talking about highway improvement and a one way street, where did he get it from if he did not get it from the hon. member and the Resolution as such?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would not call that a point of order. I did not misquote the Hon. Premier. I cannot even remember seeing him today.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I said nothing about his misquoting me. I was merely saying that he was abusing Your Honour's absence and telling what were patent untruths, because his own statements give him away.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On that matter, I will say that the Resolution states that the site is required for Government Departments and for highway improvements; therefore what was said or what was not said is settled. I am going to hear no more on what was said or what was not said with regard to highway improvement. Let the hon. member continue.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I said just now, I do not see the necessity yet for highway improvement at this junction for you to squeeze this land from the people when in truth and in fact it is a one-way street. You are acquiring this building to improve the corner and to erect offices, and we should be told the price which the Government has offered and the price that these people want, because as far as I understand, these people do not want to sell.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I should like to inform hon. members that I am hearing more than one voice.

Mr. SMITH: I also understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the owner can get a lot more than what is being offered for the place.
5.30 p.m.

Well, Sir, if these people can get one dollar for this property, it is not fair for the Government to use the big stick in the corner and pay them less. It is a fact that they will get more from a private individual, and if the Government wants it, dear me, do not try to squeeze it from these people.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There are certain procedures under the Land Acquisition Act. When we come in here with a Resolution to acquire anything under the Land Acquisition Act, it is after a notice has been published in the *Official Gazette* of the intention of the Government to acquire a certain property. In many instances, it may not be the question of the price involved; it may be for a marketable title. In this particular case, it is a question of negotiations. We are not here as members of a public body, but we have this peculiar situation in Barbados that any member of the public can write to the newspapers or a member of the House of Assembly and fill their heads with a lot of unfounded, unusual statements and think they are acting for or on behalf of the vendors.

What has the price to do with it? That is a matter for the arbitrators. As Your Honour will know, we have had several of these matters before us. I would not like to sit down here any more and hear hon. members discussing whether Government is paying a good price or a bad price. We are not fixing any price; that is a question for the arbitrators. If they never come to an agreement, under the Act, we can occupy the place for thirty years. I do not think that it is right to discuss a matter which would become the subject of arbitration.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am taking it that the reason for the Government calling on us or bringing in Resolutions of this kind to this Hon. Chamber is because they have done everything and there has been some refusal one way or the other. I take it this way. Here it is: I have a property and the Government wants it. I say "pay me \$10 for it" and the Government says: "I am giving you \$5.00 for it." Government is not moving from its price or it may move from \$5.00 to \$8.00, but I would not move from \$10. The Government feels to itself that it has made every effort to satisfy me and to get me to some kind of decision, but I refuse and then it brings the matter before the House. If I say \$10 and the Government says \$5.00 and it moves up to \$8.00 and I say, split it in half and call it \$8.50, I do not think the Government would take up the valuable time of this House to acquire it under the Land Acquisition Act; but if the Act is there, and you say "I am acquiring it under the Act," and for thirty years you can do whatever you like with it, that is something different.

I think that it is only when you cannot agree that you should come here; but if I go by what the Hon. Premier has just said, it seems as if they only want to acquire this property behind the owners' back. Anyhow, Sir, be that as it may. As far as I see it, I think that it is something more than that. In other words, as the old people say: it is more in this particular mortar than the pestle, and that is why I am going to vote against this Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will observe that I speak only when it is necessary. In this particular matter I speak *ex cathedra* because this is part of my vocation. I am quite acquainted with this particular statute. As a matter of fact, the hon. member who has just sat down should have known that this property was actually set up for sale and I think that he should make himself acquainted with the method and means by which the Land Acquisition Act works.

What has really happened, as I can see from the Resolution, is that it would appear as if the negotiations for acquiring it have broken down. Hon. members should know that as soon as this is submitted to arbitration, it would be unusual for hon. members to discuss the price in here. You might say, if it is not generally set out and you have understood that it was because of some other matter that the Addendum has not set out the true state of affairs, that therefore, you are calling on the Minister to let you know what was actually misleading.

In this case, I know that this property was actually set up for sale. Hon. members should know that under the Town and Country Planning Act in this country when it comes to acquiring a property, you should not buy unless

you get permission first from the Town and Country Planning Officer to do certain renovations and the like; so sometimes it would appear to the layman that a place is not set up for sale; they do not realise that even by public auction the conditions have changed, so to speak, since 1959, when the Town and Country Planning Act came into being. They do not realise that they cannot remodel or do certain things to their property without first gaining the permission of the Town and Country Planning Officer. As a matter of fact, agreements to purchase properties are entered upon subject to the approval of the Town and Country Planning Officer and then, they become null and void because the Town and Country Planning Officer refuses to accept what the would-be purchaser wants to do with the property. I can think of many buildings just around the corner which the Government anticipates acquiring but I know, myself, that there is little chance of remodelling these places in keeping with the Town and Country Planning law. Therefore, when the time comes, it is so obvious that there would not be much encouragement by people to take them over.

Now, Sir, in this case, it is not a matter of the owner not wanting to sell. What it is correct to say is that because of the Land Acquisition Act, people are not very willing to buy. Although the owners are willing to sell, they cannot settle on the price stipulated by the Government valuers. Therefore, it seems right where they cannot meet an agreement on that, that each side appoints a referee. This is nothing to do with the Government's policy of whether it is plantation land, arable land or rab land.

5.40 p.m.

As to the actual law and how it should apply to the acquisition of land, we have our policy on that. I do not think that I would have to bow to any hon. member, including the Hon. Premier, where my knowledge of this matter is concerned. I would suggest to hon. members that it is not a question of taking this property from anybody. The legatees of this property can give permission to sell this property. If these negotiations have broken down, it is a matter for arbitration and we must leave the matter to the arbitrators. That is the democratic way of dealing with these matters. There are cases in which, if you wanted land and the people with whom you are to negotiate were in Australia, New Zealand or anywhere else where you could not find them and the Government must acquire the land, you may fix a price for this land. Personally, I will vote for the compulsory acquisition of this property by the Government because I am absolutely certain of the facts which I have stated here today.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before you put the question I should just like to reply to points which have been raised. There has been a lot of vague and irresponsible talk on this matter today. The hon. senior member for St. Peter, who, unfortunately, is not now in his place, took opposition to the Resolution on the ground that since the Chamber in which we now stand was entirely unsuitable for Parliament, there is no justifiable reason why the Government should acquire land in this area. That is to confuse two entirely separate and distinct issues. Granted that the Government is in possession of the land where we now stand, and granted that the property is in the vicinity of this land, the fact that these buildings are unsuitable for Parliament Buildings does not mean that we should not acquire other property in the vicinity. I say that because this building is not only used for Parliament; the buildings in the compound are also used for Government Departments. If and when we decide that the continuance of the utilisation of this upstairs part of this building is unsuitable for the Legislature, all we have to do is to erect the Houses of the Legislature elsewhere and then convert these buildings to serve as Government Departments. Therefore, Sir, I was very surprised to hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter who normally looks at these matters quite clearly, confuse these issues.

When we construct the new Financial Building in this area, we will still not have enough space to accommodate the Government Departments which need rehousing. Under-

neath this very building there is the Post Office and the Savings Bank which are badly congested, and the buildings on the other side are also congested. If we allow buildings in the vicinity of these Parliament Buildings to be sold and acquired by Commercial business houses, at some time or other we will hear that we sat down here, not being conscious of our obligations to the community, and allowed buildings in this area to be sold to other people. The Government therefore proposes to acquire the Trafalgar Hotel together with the land whereon the same stands. The contention about the acquisition of the Trafalgar Hotel not being suitable is entirely out of order because that building is only a part of the properties in this area which we hope to acquire.

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph referred to the fact that Government has rented one of its properties out as a warehouse to a private firm for \$200 a month. That is merely temporary because the building is to be demolished so that the rental of it on a temporary basis as a warehouse purely has nothing to do with the over all purpose of acquiring greater space to be devoted to the accommodation of public departments and for the additional purpose of improving the highway in this area. This contention begun by the hon. junior member for St. George and echoed by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and repeated in part by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph about squeezing this property out of the lady's hand, is completely unfounded. First and foremost the owner of this property is dead. In this case there is no old lady. I should like to say, Sir, that the Barbados Labour Party in the 1940's some twenty years ago, assessed land in this area at a high price. (*ASIDES*). In the 1940's the Barbados Labour Party, against quite a howl in this Chamber, paid \$27 a square for land on the other side of the road (*ASIDES*).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Minister still addressing the Chair?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I opposed the proposal by the then Government to pay this high price for land in this area for about five hours. The Leader of the House was Sir Grantley Adams. I am not quite sure if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was in this House, but the Barbados Labour Party in Parliament made this assessment and they paid \$27 a square foot for the area which we now own and which was formerly the Central Foundry's Building which was destroyed by fire.

5.50 p.m.

Since the Government paid \$27 a square foot for that land, it is not to be surprised at that the executors of this deceased person's Will are now demanding from the Government a price approximating that. That is what they are asking; around \$27 a square foot. In our opinion this land is not worth anything like that, nor is there any commercial enterprise or individual, despite what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said, who is going to pay the price they are asking for it, when the Old City sold recently in the same area at \$1.00 a square foot, and it was sold at public auction. Therefore, Sir, it is the height of stupidity, irresponsibility and mischievousness to come here and accuse the Government of squeezing something out of the old lady's hand or plundering a dead woman, and of refusing to let the beneficiaries under the Will get the maximum price possible for this land by resorting to acquisition under the Land Acquisition Act. I am reminded that at the corner of Roebuck Street, a far superior site standing on one of the four corners of one of the most important highways of the island - the Johnson and Redman site - Barclays Bank only paid \$9.51 a square foot less than two years ago, and Roebuck is considered of high land value, because it is an important commercial site. They paid \$9.51 per square foot for that land as compared with \$27 which the last Government paid for the Central Foundry site. There is not a single person in this Island who is going to pay anything like the \$27 a square foot for which the beneficiaries are asking.

Far from squeezing the land out of their hand, as the Hon. Premier has pointed out, all we are doing is resorting to the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act under which

both sides have the right to appoint an arbitrator, and even then if there is no agreement with the decision of the arbitrators, they can appeal to the Supreme Court where the Judge is authorised by law to settle the issue. Under the 1949 Land Acquisition Act, there was no right of appeal, but I am reminded that it was this Government which in the amendment of 1963 included in the provisions of the Act the right to appeal; so that it is ignorant, it is stupid, it is mischievous and everything wrong for any hon. member on that side to come in here week after week, as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has been doing and has done again today, and attempting to create the impression that when we resort to the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, we are trying to squeeze something out of somebody's hands, we are trying to rob and plunder them, and as the hon. junior member for St. George has said, we are trying to rob a defenceless old lady. I am reminded that when the actual executors of the Will had to make a return to the Inland Revenue Department for death duty purposes, the value of the whole property was assessed at \$8.00 a square foot. We offered more than that. They valued it at £6,000 for 3,791 square feet, less than £2 a square foot, and for two hours we sat here today and heard the irresponsibility of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph's ranting and raving, we heard the hon. junior member for St. George with words falling from his mouth like the Niagara Falls on the Government accusing them of robbing this defenceless old lady, and this is what we have to hear every Tuesday, because people who come here have no conception of what we are doing. They have no conception of the legislation they are passing, and they want us to sit down here and let the taxpayers be fleeced by people who own land in this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when they acquired the Central Foundry site, there was no question of resorting then to the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act or any other kind of arbitration; the Government was being taken for a ride and the taxpayers were being called upon to pay more for land than they should have paid. If the owners wanted \$40 a square foot, they would have bought it. They should come in here and congratulate the Government on refusing to pay these exorbitant prices being demanded for land in this Island, and for having taken steps by legislation to ensure that the Government can acquire land when it has to have it for public services. Instead of that, just to make speeches for cheap publicity and to make fools of themselves, they come here week after week, hold up Government Business, expose themselves, and on the back of it accuse us of something that is not happening. I am sure that hon. members will agree that if we can acquire this compound comprising a reasonable portion of land with one or more properties at a reasonable price, we would be lacking in our obligation to the country if we failed so to do, because if you have not got the whole property, with the expansion in the economy of the country and the constant expansion in its administration, you should have to acquire more properties for Government Departments, and if you have not got them, you have to rent them, and you will be held up to ransom to pay a price, because everybody knows there is a shortage of accommodation in the area of Bridgetown, and we know from experience what we have to pay for rental for the Tourist Board and the Development Board in Lower Broad Street in Bridgetown.

6.00 p.m.

The new financial buildings obviously cannot cope with all the demands for accommodation by public departments, and I say that the Government should be complimented for taking steps to acquire it at a better price, and more so a building like this which is so near to Government buildings and which is actually in the centre of the City and at a price which the taxpayers will be called upon to pay that is reasonable.

The question that the Resolution do now pass, was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

AYES: Mr. BATSON, Hon'bles. E. W. BARROW, W. A. CRAWFORD, C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSON, A. DaC. EDWARDS, J. C. TUDOR, Messrs. N. W. BOXILL,

R. StC. WEEKES, CORBIN, LOWE, YEARWOOD and MOTTLEY - 13.

NOES: Messrs. COWARD and SMITH - 2.

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

TOWN AND COUNTRY DEVELOPMENT PLANNING (INTERIM CONTROL) (ADMENDMENT) BILL, 1964

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 8 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to take this Order which stands in the name of the Hon. Premier.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Town and Country Development Planning (Interim Control) Act, 1959 to extend its duration for a further period of one year, from the 9th July, 1964.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: As hon. members will observe, this Bill seeks to amend the Town and Country Planning (Interim Control) Act, 1959, in order to continue it in force for another year from the 9th July, 1964.

It has been found advisable to extend this Act for another period of twelve months and hon. members are fully aware of the necessity for doing it and the necessity derived thereby.

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

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

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

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

Clauses 1, 2, and 3, were called separately and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE RATES OF INCOME TAX BILL, 1964

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I propose at this stage to deal with the Resolution and three Bills arising out of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals, and I therefore beg to move that the Bill to settle the rates of Income Tax for 1964 of which notice was given a short while ago be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.
6.10 p.m.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to move the second reading of a Bill to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year one thousand nine hundred and sixty four and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is one which we usually pass every year. It is a Bill to settle the rates of Income Tax for 1964 and the rates of income tax are exactly the same as they were last year and the year before. It is the custom that these rates should be settled every year before the returns are sent in to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in the temporary absence of the Chairman of Committees, I beg to move that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph be appointed as Chairman of Committees.

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill to settle the Rates of Income Tax for the year 1964.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. COWARD in the Chair.

The two clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and agreed to.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

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

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

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

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

ENTERTAINMENT TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Entertainment Tax Act, 1953, be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Entertainment Tax Act, 1953.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of the Entertainment Tax Act, 1953 Chapter 1, certain taxes were imposed on a specific number of entertainments such as:

"Cinematograph films including inflammable and non-inflammable silent films and phone films.

Barbados Turf Club Race Meetings.

Intercolonial and Test Cricket Matches, and other cricket matches where one of the teams is from without the Island.

Intercolonial Football Matches, and other football matches where one of the teams is from without the Island.

Intercolonial Tennis Matches and other tennis matches where one of the teams is from without the Island.

The Annual Agricultural and Industrial Exhibition.

Theatrical performances and stage plays.

Fetes, Fairs, Bazaars and circuses.

Professional Boxing Matches.

Intercolonial Athletic and Cycle Sports."

Under the provisions of the Bill which we have before us now and which forms a part of the Fiscal Proposals which we have before us, it is proposed that Items 3, 5 and 10 of the forms of entertainment specified in the Schedule of the Act shall be deleted and that the Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on the 1st day of July, 1964.
6.20 p.m.

This therefore means, Sir, that intercolonial cricket matches, tennis matches and athletic and cycle sports will not now be subject to the provisions of the Entertainment Tax Act, 1953, and that any amount which they collect from the gates will be net amounts accruing to the organisation as the case may be.

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

Mr. COWARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear all that the Hon. Premier said as I was not here, but what he has not said in introducing this is how much money is involved. There is no point in saying that you are reducing it unless we know how much money you were collecting under the Entertainment Tax Act. There are ten items in this Schedule.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, the hon. member was not in his place, and therefore I rise to give him the information. This amendment would mean about \$3,000 mostly from the Cricket Association, but under the Act it is probably about \$75,000 which should appear in the Estimates under Entertainment Tax.

Mr. WALCOTT: The reason why I ask that is because the time has come when some of these nibbling taxation proposals which operate in Barbados should be removed. This is an attempt to do that. I should also like to see an attempt made to remove what is regarded in my view as a tax nuisance by putting a piece of metal on a bicycle with all the administrative arrangements and making somebody pay

64 cents a year as a bicycle tax. You could more appropriately have a tax placed on something worthwhile, because this annual tax of 64 cents creates unnecessary administrative arrangements. The Schedule needs amending because the word "intercolonial" does not now have the same meaning, because if you have a match with Jamaica which is not a Colony, they would object to the match being regarded as an intercolonial match, and the same thing would also apply to Trinidad. As these things were not particularly defined in the Schedule, I would say that you mean matches between Barbados and the Windward Islands, because they are still colonies. It is a small point, but I think this is a worthwhile amendment which would give some of these organisations the benefit of operating with more success.

In the meantime, I should like to see some of these organisations which are operating as sports organisations and will enjoy this facility, put their own business affairs on a proper footing and not run them in a slipshod manner. I hope the hon. junior member for Bridgetown would not mind me saying this, but when it comes to athletics in Barbados, there is something fundamentally lacking in that section of sports, because it is not keeping apace with the other sporting activities, though it had a very high and honourable place both in quality and in financial arrangements. I do not know what is responsible for it, but it seems to me that cricket and football have been maintaining their relatively high position in the island, but athletics have from a high position been gradually going down, and I feel that with the injection of a coach something can be done to stimulate these things. I agree with this amendment, because although the money will not go back to the Association — I believe that some of them claim that the entertainment tax would not necessarily go to them, because they arrange prices on the basis that you have to pay an entertainment tax: but now that this is off, some of them will be able to attract greater features.

I am very glad to see that the Minister of Finance has got around to removing one of these tax proposals that could give some help to the organisations concerned.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to those responsible for rescinding the entertainment tax in so far as athletics and cycle sports are concerned, and I would also like to set the mind of the hon. member for St. Peter at rest in so far as athletics are concerned, because look as I might whenever there are athletic meetings held at Kensington, I fail to see certain faces of people who piously pretend they are interested in athletics and cycling. Our athletics do not come so low as the hon. member fears. I would point out that the first medal ever gained by a Barbadian was gained by the athlete Norris who gained a Bronze Medal in Australia last year for jumping 6 ft. 8 3/4 ins., a feat which has not been duplicated almost anywhere with the type of jump used by this particular athlete. Caspar Springer also did the 800 metres in Brazil in 150.8 seconds. They are both now at the Inter-American University trying to qualify for the Olympic Games. 6.30 p.m.

These are not performances to be in any way decried; therefore, I cannot sit here and see that athletics is left out. All that is the same sort of sport.

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—

"The Schedule to the Entertainment Tax Act, 1953 is amended by the deletion therefrom of the forms of entertainment set out in items 3, 5, and 10 thereof."

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. senior member for St. Peter raised the question of the use of the term "intercolonial". Of course, that is not the term which I used in my Budget Speech; but for the purpose of amending the Act, we have to employ the same term in view of the fact that we are deleting three of the ten sections of the Schedule. We still have the situation in the Eastern Caribbean where we do have inter-colonial matches. We are deleting three of the four items in the Schedule which deals with inter-colonial matches and we are leaving only one. These Islands in the Eastern Caribbean would still be having inter-colonial matches although Jamaica and Trinidad now that they are independent would come under the term "other football matches". However, I am very glad that three of these definitions will be deleted and we are only retaining the one dealing with inter-colonial football matches.

As regards the question of money involved under entertainment, we collected \$60,000 last year, but that is three times the amount collected before.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thank the Hon. Premier for the information, but I do not understand why you have given an exemption for Inter-colonial and Test cricket and you have not given an exemption to Inter-colonial football matches. The thing which amazes me is that cricket is the prominent sport in Barbados and the cricket barons in the West Indies make more money than the football people make. The West Indian Cricket Board received \$144,000 from the last Test Matches in England, and the Barbados Cricket Association is an affiliate of the West Indies Cricket Board and when inter-colonial cricket is conducted under the auspices of the West Indies Cricket Board of Control, the Barbados Cricket Association does not lose any money as such on that sport.

Sir, I do not think it is fair to the Barbados Football Association just because this Association is running its business with competence and appears to be prudent. You are taxing that body when you should be thinking that they are more deserving of public assistance. I feel that the Football Association should not be penalised in this manner. I feel that if you have withdrawn your tax from inter-colonial cricket, inter-colonial tennis and inter-colonial athletic and cycle sports, you should have put the Football Association on the same par because the Football Association have to pay for a lot of things which they do. Each time the Football Association uses Kensington Oval for staging an inter-colonial football match, they have to pay \$80, and if it is an ordinary match, they have to pay \$40. I cannot see any justification why intercolonial and other football matches should not be exempted. Any inter-colonial match is as important as a cricket match between Barbados and British Guiana. As a matter of fact, I have never seen a crowd at Kensington as big as that when the Australians were here. That crowd was 13,000, and when the Australians come here next year, there will be more people, I expect, than what you have ever seen at Kensington. I see no justification in not exempting the Football Association. It seems to be discrimination without justification.

Now, Sir, at No. 8, you have fetes, fairs, bazaars and circuses. What is a fete? What is a fair? As far as I know, a fair is held generally by a church keeping something for charitable causes. I do not see any reason why when somebody is keeping a fete, a fair or a bazaar which often they say they are keeping for charitable causes and which may not be true in every instance, that they should be subjected to this sort of thing of having to pay entertainment tax. I do not think that they are in the same category as theatrical performances and stage plays.

We cannot see — and I speak as one of the officials of the Football Association — and I do not believe anybody in Barbados would be able to understand on what grounds the Government would withdraw its entertainment tax from cricket, athletics and tennis and retain it for football. They must have felt that football is of such a quality that it is to be taxed. I would say that cricket is of a higher quality than football. If you say that cricket is of the highest quality, I would agree with you. I would say this to the hon. junior

member for the City of Bridgetown. The fact that you get a Bronze Medal or a Gold Medal at the Olympic games and nobody who has played cricket has received comparable medals does not mean that the sport of athletics is greater than cricket. Barbadians *vis-à-vis* the international people in cricket stand supreme, but our athletes are not on the same terms. I appreciate the medals which we have obtained by our athletes, but our cricketers have produced more for us.

I make no boast about it, but I am a member of the Barbados Football Association. I did not go to the last lot of international matches which they held, because I protested against their way of running of the game; but that is no reason why you should not have accorded the Barbados Football Association the same facility as the Barbados Cricket Association. I was at the point of showing you that tennis here is not up to the same standard internationally as cricket or football, but you say that athletics and tennis are in the same position as cricket, and so you are according those two forms of sport the same facility as cricket. If you are doing that, I do not see any reason why you cannot accord the same facility to football. It is not fair to the Football Association. I also feel that this item — Item No. 8 — relative to fetes, fairs and bazaars should come out because they are small things which people keep for small purposes.

Mr. LYNCH: Sir, I should make it clear that the Boxing Board which I am now responsible for in Barbados is sponsored by very prominent members of the community and we find it most difficult to contract persons at present. I feel if boxing was exempted from this tax, that it might well result in this form of sport being advanced more. This is a form of sport which takes very little equipment and without much explaining, people understand readily what it is. That cannot be said of cricket. I have had great difficulty in explaining to other people what cricket is because so few people seem to understand it; but when it comes to boxing and athletics, everybody knows about those forms of sport. 6.40 p.m.

Trinidad is not a colony, neither is Jamaica a colony; so that any contest between Barbados and Trinidad or between Barbados and Jamaica could not be called an Inter-colonial contest because these places I have mentioned are not colonies. Some change would therefore be necessary in the description of this type of game. I should like to state on behalf of the Boxing Association that Barbados has had some good boxers in the past, and therefore I do not see why boxing and football should not have the same favourable consideration which is being asked for in respect of other types of sports.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: In reply to the hon. junior member for the City I would like to say this: it is to be noted that in these proposals the exemptions are not given to individuals but to organizations. The hon. junior member for the City is well aware of the fact that the Boxing Board of Control are not the promoters of boxing. The funds realised from these professional boxing bouts go to individuals as against going to an organization. A boxing bout is promoted by an individual and not by an organization. It is not the Government's policy to remit taxation where individuals are concerned, but where organizations are concerned. All these boxing bouts are promoted by individual persons.

I would just like to make a reply to the passing remark made by the hon. member. The hon. member mentioned that some of the faces seen in this Chamber are not seen at athletic meetings. Well, Sir, I should like to explain to the hon. member that when hon. members are actively engaged in other voluntary efforts, invariably when the Athletic Association is conducting a meeting, that often clashes with another engagement of these voluntary organizations with which certain hon. members are directly connected.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not think it would be fair to let what the Hon. Minister has just said go unnoticed. In my earlier days I was interested in boxing and I also participated in wrestling; but, Sir, I have now become more

civilised in my years of maturity than to follow what I regarded or what are regarded as manly pursuits. I have arrived at this stage where I regard boxing as something which is brutal and not as a form of sport which I regarded in my youth. If I had my way I would ban boxing as a form of sport in the 20th century; it no longer belongs to an age like this. There are many other things in the pursuit of which nobody is so consistently and persistently trying to destroy the other person in order to show how strong he is. I feel that you can do that in other ways. To try to take the life of anyone in order to show how strong you are, I am not interested in that. There is no difference between that and cock-fighting or bull-fighting and I would join in having these things banned; at least I would join with those who feel that these things should be banned. However, Sir, it will take time to get these brutal and barbaric pursuits out of people.

As to what the Hon. Minister has said about professional boxing being organized by individuals, that could not be the answer in this case. Boxing all over the world is organized by individuals, but your idea to keep on the tax cannot be based on how this boxing is organized or by whom it is organized. A tax was put on boxing because it was regarded as one of the forms of sport or entertainment which is pursued. Are we really and seriously suggesting that some of the stuff which we have on parade as boxing is something which is worthwhile? It is really criminal to tax some of them. A boxer may earn about \$400 in these parts and I do not regard that as professional boxing.

Now you classify some of these things as being inter-colonial, but if anybody were to organize a boxing bout here, that would be regarded as entertainment. In my opinion, Sir, the amount of money which you are collecting for professional boxing is very negligible. 6.50 p.m.

I feel that you should reserve taxation for something where money-making is going on. The ones who organise boxing here do it because they like the fun. My organisation has contributed to this sport through their borrowing of our equipment to broadcast the fights, but when they come back they tell you that they did not do so well. People believe that there is money in it, but I know that there is no money in it to tax. You should exempt these organisations like the Boxing Association and the Football Association and leave the ones where money is involved. The Turf Club is making money; but when you talk about a heavyweight fight, when a fellow gets cuffed on the elbow, he is finished. If you have taxed it to discourage it, I am a supporter of that, because I would ban boxing or any of the sports that damage the human body or brain. You would send to school a child who is a bright scholar, and spend money educating him, and then somebody can come overnight and make him an idiot. There are some people who have brawn and no brain, and therefore they utilise the strength with which God had endowed them. I agree with the hon. junior member for Bridgetown that this is one consideration which should be given, but I am sure the Minister will agree that because it is organised by an individual and you are exempting the individual, he is not going to gain anything from the tax. The idea of the tax is that it is going to give a relief, maybe, for a better distribution of what there is, but there is not much money coming from boxing.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I am hoping that the next time this matter comes up, the Hon. Minister will find it possible to include boxing in this Schedule. I will excuse those who do not go to athletics, but prefer to spend their time following the fortunes of the private race horses. There are some persons who are more interested in slow quadrupeds than fast bipeds, but there are some of us who would like to improve the standards of athletics in the youth of the community, and I would point out that there is so little to be gained by this tax in so far as boxing is concerned, because those who organise boxing even find it difficult in finding passages for the competitors they are bringing, and it is high time that the whole position in so far as professional boxing in this country is concerned, be regularised before somebody gets killed and people find themselves on a murder charge purely because the Gov-

ernment, not necessarily this Government, has been remiss in this matter, and there is no properly constituted Boxing Board of Control.

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

Clause 3 was called and passed.

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

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

THE RACING SERVICE BUSINESS (REGISTRATION OF PREMISES) ACT, 1964

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to provide for the registration of all premises at which the business of receiving or negotiating bets on horse races is carried on and for other matters incidental thereto or connected therewith, be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the businesses which it is proposed to provide registration for in this Bill have been a comparatively new innovation in the sporting life of this island. There are at the present moment approximately seven places, and I do not know whether they are companies or individual businesses; but anyhow, there are seven places where fixed odds betting is indulged in within the limits of the City of Bridgetown. There is not to the best of my knowledge and belief any such establishment outside the metropolitan area. There has not to my knowledge been any test case on the legality of these operations. Nevertheless the practice has been established now, probably for about two years, and many members of the public have resorted to these places without any undue protest or alarm being created in the Press or by religious organizations who are generally supposed to be opposed to any kind of gambling.

7.00 p.m.

We are not aware that these establishments have created any public or private nuisance. They have in effect been above board in respect of their operations.

The Government is faced with two alternatives: (1) whether Government should go through the legal processes to insist that prosecution should be brought against them — and it is not a matter for us but for the Director of Public Prosecutions acting by the instructions of the Commissioner of Police; or (2) whether Government should acknowledge their existence, regard being paid to the fact that no civil or other cases have been brought against these organizations, and do what the Government of the neighbouring colony of Trinidad has done, and that is to remove any doubt of their legality by exempting them from the provisions of the Gaming Act, Chapter 3, and the Gambling Act, Chapter 6. If Government has come to accept that these operations are carried on, in the interest of perhaps peace and domestic tranquility from the provisions of these statutes, it only stands to reason that the Government should make an effort to control these organisations in order that they may not get out of hand.

The Barbados Turf Club is exempted from this and the Government gets some revenue from them. What we have to do is to put these outside betting shops on the same basis as the Barbados Turf Club except that there is no tax being

charged on the stake money because this would involve a very vigorous inspection to see that books are properly kept because we know that it involves people in other countries. You will also have to have some kind of eaves-dropping on the telephone because a lot of this betting is done on the telephone and over the Overseas Telephone Service, and no money actually passes; but the bookmakers keep their books and they send a bill or a cheque depending on either if you owe them or if they owe you. There are telephone calls coming into this Island from Trinidad, St. Vincent, and other places and large amounts of money are staked on certain races, both in Barbados and abroad. Therefore it would be extremely difficult for us in these circumstances to put a tax on the stake money. It is not like instances where the dividends have to be computed. You may never get a person who keeps books on what odds he gets, and it is for this reason that I have considered the matter carefully.

In the neighbouring territory of Trinidad, a tax of \$25,000 per year is imposed — and some of the services which operate here operate in Trinidad — but we also have to take into account that this country is not as healthy and that the population of this country is approximately one-third or one-fourth that of Trinidad and, therefore, the organizations which carry on this betting may not be able to bear the high taxation or licence fee that that territory imposes; therefore, after considering the matter carefully, I have come to the conclusion that a licence fee of \$12,000 per year or \$1,000 a month would appropriate in our circumstances.

It is inevitable that one or two of these places which do not do much business would have to close down. Personally, I feel that a place which cannot pay the licence fee of \$1,000 a month which is \$30 a day should go out of business, because if they cannot pay that fee, if somebody really wins some money, you may have a certain amount of bloodshed if that place cannot pay the bet. You may therefore see that some of these people may go out of business.

Sir, we have given them a month from the 1st July, during which all those who are now in operation should consider whether to be registered or whether they are going to be a closed shop, as it were.

I do not intend to go through the Clauses of the Bill, but provision is made for regulations. If I may give you an instance, we do not want to encourage people to go into these shops. We may discourage young women from serving or going into these shops. We may prohibit people from going to these shops and staying longer than for the purpose of placing a bet and we may say that you should not have any sort of side attractions or games — dominoes and games of that kind — carried on there so as to lure the customer into staying there and betting away his week's earnings. I am not saying that those are the actual regulations, but I am saying that it is necessary to see that the immunity which you are granting to the operators of these shops will not be abused.

There is also provision that a reduced fee would be payable where a certificate is issued after the end of January in any year, the amount of the reduction to bear relation to the number of months in the year which have been expired, that is to say, that if a premises starts operation on the 1st July, that person will pay a licence fee of \$6,000 instead of \$12,000 and if a shop is opened in October, that person would only pay a fee of \$3,000.

Offences will go before a Magistrate.

I do not think that there are any other specific provisions which need to be explained and I, therefore, move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

7.10 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for one to have a Bill of this nature in his hand and be able to give an intelligent study to it. In this case you can only speak

In general terms. As to the general intention of this Bill, I agree with it even for different reasons than those which the hon. member who introduced the Bill has mentioned. He said that he has made some calculations and those calculations have led him to arrive at this figure of \$12,000. If you could not do this because something existed before, I would like to know what is this calculation which the hon. member has made and which has led him to arrive at this figure of \$12,000 and not \$24,000 or some other figure. These are some of the things which one should know; you cannot intelligently discuss this Clause in the Bill because you do not know on what these things impinge upon. I should like to enquire why it is that the Comptroller of Customs is the authority here.

My reason for supporting this Bill is different from the reason which the Hon. Introducer has given. I have already expressed my views in relation to pool betting. I am saying that these undeveloped and developing territories cannot afford to follow the example of industrialised and developed societies which have already created surpluses; some of them have been able to afford full employment. One of these places is the United Kingdom. In the United Kingdom nobody is really looking for a job, but in these other territories, all they have is some evil aspect of their colonial masters. We want to indulge, it would seem to me, in gambling in the same fantastic way as they indulge in it in the United Kingdom. The amount of gambling which takes place in the United Kingdom is astronomical, but at the same time, we are talking about a country in which there is full employment, and not a country where there is the provision of public assistance. That is why I agree with the African leaders who have cut out these things so as to create the right concept in the minds of the people of a developed country.

In these parts, we are too prone to follow whose outlook is different from ours, but which they have created in a society such as ours. This is one of the features which they have left with us. You have the ignorant people saying that you will not be able to get anything unless you win a sweepstake; but if you were to do any kind of multiplication, you will find that the community will still be poor no matter how many people may win a sweepstake occasionally. I do not subscribe to these large investments in these communities, and at the same time you hear of all of this backbending in relation to getting money. In the same breath you are giving people the freedom to impoverish themselves under some guise that they will become rich. If the collection of this \$12,000 is a means of putting a check on these things, then I agree with it. I am of the firm conviction that we will not get any real development in these countries unless we have a complete mental re-orientation in order to make the people understand that what we have copied from industrialised European countries, with a completely different background from our own, is not suitable for undeveloped countries and underdeveloped countries.

The leaders which we have in Barbados are still genuinely afraid of people in these societies, and they are not willing to tell the people that these things are not in the best interests of a developing society. You cannot in one breath talk about high taxation and about gambling in the other. The thing which should be done is to tax the gamblers. Why should I or other people be taxed on what we earn as a salary, but then you allow money to come in by betting and the people who receive this money do not pay one cent by way of taxation? Gambling has become another field of business, and people do not pay one cent by way of income tax on the money earned; but I will make the contribution to the State which I am making and that is taxed! The fool can risk a dollar and get \$10,000 on it, and that money is regarded as some capital gain and there is nothing to be taxed. I am submitting that all of our thinking has to be changed.

I am not making any personal reference, but a man owns a racehorse which eats oats; another man owns another horse on a plantation, which is also eating oats; but the \$10,000 which is won with the racehorse at a meeting is not subject to taxation, whereas taxation is paid in the other case. I believe in having a Senate investigation, an

investigation into the earnings of some of these things, and I believe that you will have a suicidal situation in the next couple of days. I understand from good sources that somebody died in Barbados and left something like \$6 million. Well, Sir, the national income of the colony is \$30 million and one person can die and leave assets amounting to \$6 million! (Mr. MOTTLEY: Who is that person?) The hon. member should know; it would be improper for me to say who the person is. (Mr. MOTTLEY: \$3 million). Well, the hon. member says \$3 million, not \$6 million, but \$1 million is a lot of money in Barbados. I am not suggesting that this person was a gambler or that he raised money from betting, but I feel that in Barbados our laws are a little loose. There is too much in the way of encouragement of these things and there is no Capital Gains Tax from gambling. We are allowing people to have an escape, whereas in a country like the United States of America, people cannot do that.

7.20 p.m.

If a man wins an Irish Sweepstake in the United States of America, it is subject to tax; but if he wins in Barbados, he does not pay a cent in taxes. Why is that? I know that some of the racehorse owners would say that if a man wins a first prize of \$30,000, you have already got taxes from the sale of the tickets, but I feel that the money should be subject to taxation because it is a positive gain, and if the community is not going to share bigger in gambling, the country cannot carry out the social requirements it needs. An analysis of how much money is deposited in gambling is likely to give an indication of whether you are doing the right thing in a community that can expend so much money on gambling, with so much high unemployment and so many other things to do. Is this community worth all these things you are projecting? If it is, then you should institute disciplines, financial and otherwise, on sectors of the community so that you can get more things for them.

Mr. Speaker, I read some time in an English newspaper or English magazine published by the National Council of Labour Colleges, that even in England the areas where these betting shops are are in the poorest and more dilapidated districts in England. The betting shops do not go to places like Chelsea where the judges and high income people live; they go in the corners where the poor people live and draw from them, and that is the same source that the social services impinge on. If this takes place in England where there is full employment, then we in Barbados should take stock. I have extremely revolutionary views about money received from betting. If I won a sweepstake tomorrow, I feel I should be called upon to pay on that prize money an additional taxation. People say they run horses for fun, but a lottery is carried on in Panama without a racehorse. There are no racehorses in these betting shops; they are in England, Australia and other places. There is a betting shop in Marhill Street, and that is why I said that if the Government acquired the land above this building, they are competing with betting shops. If you go across Marhill Street any Saturday, you will find men with motor cars parked there. I believe in a shorter working week; but instead of people going to the beach and getting relaxation, they are bursting their brains with these combinations and the men running the betting shops are making money.

It is said, Mr. Speaker, that everybody has the gambling urge and you cannot take it away; so if you have to live with it, my idea is that you should tax it. I am making these general remarks on this question of gambling because I too buy sweepstake tickets. I do not have any religious scruples about it, because I feel I am intelligent enough to buy tickets where they do not impinge my income, as I eat every day and it does not in any way reduce the standard of my living. I know there are people, as the Hon. Premier said last week — I do not put myself in that category — getting \$25 a week as an income and wants to set aside a fixed amount for sweepstake tickets every week as if he were investing in some bank and is going to get returns when the year comes. All it does is to reduce his income, and those are the men we have to save, because they hope to win. I do not believe that any of us, with the exception of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who may have had too much in his early days, do not buy tickets. It would be dif-

difficult to believe that the hon. member does not buy sweepstake tickets, but I would say that any of us with incomes which we can regard as being able to keep ourselves and families and keep us out of Court for debts, do not have to resort to gambling as a means of supporting our families.

Any Socialist or any man interested in the community must be worried, Mr. Speaker, about the incessant, persistent and concentrated gambling done by the poorer sectors through a section in the community that is like vultures who would suck their blood, and all over the world it is like that. In England they had this problem of the betting shops in the East End, and there is some fantastic figure of something like £90 million per annum being invested in gambling in the United Kingdom, and it makes the Chancellor of the Exchequer feel that you can have that sort of money going down the drain.

I support this Bill, if for different reasons, Mr. Speaker; but the only thing I did not get from the Premier is some knowledge of the assessment just as in England where I said some £90 million is invested, I should like to have not the precise amount, but some information as to what is spent in gambling in Barbados, because the public should know that excessive money spent on gambling is inimical to the interest of the community.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of speaking on either one of these Bills, until the time came for me to speak on the Budgetary Proposals in the Financial Statement, but one thing with which I will agree with the hon. member who has just sat down is that I could hardly make a critical contribution to this Bill because it was just placed in our hands. I want to say in passing, however, that I wholeheartedly agree with this Bill. I am a realist and like to face facts. The hon. member who has just sat down looks at it from the point of view of what it is doing to the country, but let us face facts as we know and see them. You will always find the urge for gambling in the poorer sectors of the community. This urge for gambling will exist among those persons in the lower income bracket who have not got that sort of security — not that people in the higher income bracket do not gamble too, but they do it in a different way. I am 100 per cent in agreement with the Government in taxing these betting shops or "bookies" as we call them. The hon. member has asked how this figure was arrived at, but I think the Premier said that the licence fee in Trinidad is \$25,000, though I heard recently that it is \$40,000.
7.30 p.m.

It is true that a tremendous lot of them will have to close down. I would just like to draw to the attention of the hon. senior member for St. Peter that some forty years ago — (Mr. WALCOTT: I was not there then.) I know that you were not born yet.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown addressing the Chair?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was saying, Sir, that some forty years ago, as far as I remember, in the United States everything was done to outlaw this method of gambling within the Puerto Rican and Negro section. Actually, the law became very rigid and tight so as to close down on this business, but there was still that desire for gambling among the people. The United States Government has been trying to suppress this up to today instead of facing the issue as the English people have faced it. The English people have realised that although they have tried to stop it, it still goes on; therefore, they have decided that the only thing to do is to legalise it and tax it. This seems to be the policy which this Government is pursuing in this instance, and I say that I agree to it. Whatever you do about it, you cannot stop people from doing it.

The hon. member has his views on this matter. He referred to me. I have never liked to buy tickets. I will not say that I do not like taking chances in another way but, on the other hand, with the younger generation, they like this type of gambling. If you were to pass a law now and

say that you are going to close down these betting shops, all that you would be doing is to stop them from carrying on as they are now, but they would be carrying on in somebody's house where the Police could not go. Therefore, the best thing to do would be to get some taxation out of them.

I agree with the Hon. Premier. As I have said, I never liked the idea of buying sweepstake tickets; but if I won \$30,000 after I have paid fifty cents for a race ticket and you propose to take \$5,000 of it by way of taxation from me, there would be no grouse from me.

Sir, I intend to speak on the Statement by the Hon. Premier, but not of this proposal in the Financial Statement. In this matter, I must say that I wholeheartedly agree with this Bill. Those of us who move around and keep our ears to the ground know that there are people who would be on the way to church and would take a bet in this manner. As a matter of fact, to live is a gamble; life is a gamble; therefore, if people take to this form of gambling, what more must you do?

I know the hon. member feels strongly in this matter, but I still can understand the views of the Government and I am at one with them. I appreciate what is going on and that does not mean that I, myself, indulge in this form of sport or that I like to encourage anyone in doing it. But I must say that if you pass a law in here today saying: "Let us outlaw these places," what is going to happen is that they will be run in places where you cannot collect anything from them. Therefore, I agree with the imposition of a tax on them. I passed by one of these places, and when I saw the number of people patronising this form of entertainment which was going on, I went in to see what was happening. People were in there getting on as if you were giving away bank notes. It is just the urge of the younger generation, and you cannot change it.

Sir, I agree with the principle of this Bill. I agree with your taxing these places rather than outlawing them. When you outlaw them, they will only be carried on in places where you cannot reach them.

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

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

Clauses 1 to 11 inclusive were called separately and passed.

Clause 12 was called. It read as follows:—

"Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to apply in respect of any of the operations of the Barbados Turf Club at or in connection with a race meeting held under the auspices of such Club."

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that Clause 12 stand part.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, under Clause 12, in line two, I am asking that you insert the word "in" after the word "apply". The Clause will now read as follows:—

"Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to apply in respect of any of the operations of the Barbados Turf Club at or in connection with a race meeting held under the auspices of such Club."

I, therefore, beg to move that the Clause as amended stand part.

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

Clause 13 was called. It read as follows:—

"This Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on the 1st day of July, 1964."

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that Clause 13 stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not know how this Clause is going to operate. This is not an ordinary taxation proposal, but it is in respect of something which you are going to tax like an excise tax.

7.40 p.m.

You are now saying that persons should register their businesses as betting shops. You are passing a Bill to register my business for this betting, but nothing is known about it until today. If this law is to come into operation from tomorrow (A MEMBER: You have a month's grace.) Very well, Sir. That is all right because I was saying that it was difficult to tell a man that he must comply with this thing and then you come along and take the money from him. I thank the hon. member.

The question that Clause 13 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

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

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

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the House when in Committee to deal with two Money Resolutions, one for the sum of \$2,100 and the other for the sum of \$2,373,547.

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1964-65 NO. 11

MINISTRY OF HEALTH, LOCAL GOVERNMENT, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

MENTAL HEALTH

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, this is a Resolution to place the sum of \$2,100 at the disposal of the

Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65 Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1964-65 No. 11, which forms the Schedule to this Resolution. Sir, this is a very short Resolution. It seeks to provide this sum of \$2,100 for housing accommodation and the possible transportation expenses for four workers from the United States of America who will be visiting Barbados during the next three months for the purpose of assisting the island and advising in occupational therapy, school social work and research sociology. The four persons who will be visiting the island will be: Miss Nancy Stone and Miss Jane Reuter, Occupational Therapists; Miss Shirlee Hirschberg School Social worker, Dr. Lawrence Podell, Research Sociologist and Dr. Bertram Schaffner. Last year we had two of these voluntary social workers visiting our shores and they have done an excellent job. Other islands in the Caribbean area have been visited and they have benefitted from the visits of these experts. This has all emanated from the Mental Health Conference which was held in Curacao last year. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this is a very excellent thing, but I would like to say something to the Minister. When the hon. member's Party was in the Opposition they objected to these methods. I have paid some very close attention to these schemes from the United States of America. There are voluminous papers which have to go between Governments and Governments in these matters. Before one of these things ever sees the light of day, as much paper has to pass from Government to Government as would print the New Testament. I do not want the hon. member to feel that this is any rush matter. Nobody comes from the United States in any rush matter. In all these programmes, agreement must be reached a long time in advance so that people have to sign very many forms. In this connection, the only medical examination which I did not go through or go forward for was if I were going to become an astronaut.

7.50 p.m.

They carry you through a rigorous examination, and you fill out on forms everything from the day you were born, including who was your grandmother and grandfather, months before you land; and when you land, you do so with several papers in documentation. I would like to say to the hon. member that I agree with the whole basis of mental health, because I do not believe there are enough people in this island who are participating on a voluntary basis, and I feel that many organisations should be participating in this field of mental health and assistance; so what the Government is doing is very noble.

I would like to say to the hon. member, however, that I do not like these Resolutions being rushed through the House the same day they are laid, because sometimes they are important aspects of policy that might slip through. I do not feel that things of this nature should come before the House as a matter of urgency. These are matters which you know are going to take place, and you should come to the Legislature in the normal course of things.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I should like to point out to the hon. member that discussions on this were carried on as early as last year when Dr. Bertram Schaffner was here for a short stay. This meant that Dr. Schaffner had had to make certain contacts and certain applications to certain agencies in America if we were to have these people. The letter informing the Government that these people were available to us arrived in the Ministry on 22nd May this year. It was written on 19th May 1964; and there had to be a Cabinet decision as to whether the Government would be interested in accepting the four members of this team after scrutinising the reports given on them and their testimonials. It took at least two weeks before we could have a Cabinet decision, and I do not think the hon. member would expect that you could get it here before.

The other reason for rushing it this evening is because next week one of the Occupational Therapists will be arriving in Barbados to perform her duties; so I must

apologise for having brought it to the House this evening and asked for it to be dealt with in all its stages. As I said, it only arrived in the Ministry at the end of last month, and we only had a month between discussing it at Cabinet level and bringing it here.

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

RESOLUTION TO DEFRAY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, in the Capital Estimates Part II - 1964-65 the capital expenditure is placed at the level of \$8,451,492 which was to be defrayed from loan funds. I should mention that the total capital expenditure for the year is \$10.7 million, but we expect to use some \$2.3 million from available funds, that is, from the General Revenue Balance. The outturn figures at the end of the financial year, 1963-64 have disclosed that there is a surplus balance of \$4.6 million which will bring the General Revenue Balance up to \$6 1/4 million. It is therefore proposed that an amount of this should be appropriated for the purpose of the capital expenditure for this financial year so as to avoid having to raise the whole or an additional amount by way of loan funds. We will still need to raise \$4 million by way of loan funds in the current financial year, but the burden will be considerably easy. Of this amount we are therefore asking that in the Capital Estimates we approve of the advance from the Treasury of \$2,373,547 under Head 6 and under Head 7. Under Head 6 we will be underwriting the cost of extensions to Primary Schools, Technical Institute, Harrison College, New Secondary Schools and extensions to Secondary Schools, New Primary Schools and Replacements to Primary Schools, an amount for the Public Library, the complete purchase of book stock and equipment at the St. John's Branch of the Library, School Meals Service, The Public Records Office and the completion of laboratories, chiefly at Combermere School.

Under Head 7 - Agriculture, this amount will completely defray the cost of the Soil Conservation Scheme, Livestock Development, Abattoir and Fish Cold Storage, Beach Control and Development, Milk Marketing, Farming Incentive Scheme and Land Acquisition to the extent of \$1 1/2 million.

I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, in the Premier's Budgetary Proposals he said that "the Island's public debt is now over \$40 million. There are already advances pending the raising of loans of about \$7 million and interest rates are unusually high. Some re-assessment of the method of financing capital expenditure is therefore necessary. To reduce the amount which we shall have to raise on loans, I therefore propose that the surplus realised on current account in 1963-64 be allocated to defray part of the capital expenditure in the current year which would otherwise fail to be financed from loan funds. This will reduce the amount which we will require to raise on loan and will strengthen our position."

In what respect would it strengthen our position? Would it strengthen our position to go on the loan market, or strengthen our economic or fiscal position?
8.00 p.m.

I predicted on the last occasion that there would be a surplus and each time I do that, I am right. I predicted then that you were going to have a surplus. I am not worried about that. You are going to have a surplus this year too. The fact that the world price of sugar has dropped, and it is now on the same level as the negotiated price, yet when you have a price equivalent to the negotiated price, the sugar people cannot complain. It shows that your total crop is going to be sold at a favourable price, the same as what you are going to collect for the negotiated crop; therefore your relative position is better than what you anticipated.

I would like to say this. This is a theory enunciated by an expert that developing territories in preparing their programmes for development and loans should set out the difference between development and projects of a financial character which they are engaged in and development projects tied to that which imposes an infra-structure like education, roads and hospital, which you cannot get any returns from, and make a definite request to the powers-that-be. He was speaking of independent territories and the Government here should do it.

I do not see any reason why this Government cannot have grants from the British Government still at this stage for infra-structure development because this Government is not going to get any quick returns from it. Any school which you are going to build now, you are not going to benefit from; therefore, there is not going to be any return from that. I do not subscribe to the theory that any Government can say: "Look at the development Programme which we have! Look how it is working!" You cannot set up any development programme in three years and see full fruition from it. None of these schools which you have just started are you going to see any full fruition from. The Hon. Premier started a University recently. You cannot say that you are producing people of a University calibre from it. You may be producing University dunces. You will see that even one of the first students of the University College of the West Indies, Dr. Standard, is still pursuing a post-graduate course. He is one of the first students of that University, and he is still in pursuit of post-graduate work; therefore, you can say that he has not read all the books yet. Of course, I am saying something which the Hon. Premier is fully aware of. Despite what he said of elementary economics, I am here to deal with elementary economics. I do not believe you are right in taking up the \$4 million which you got as a surplus and utilise it in the way you suggested. I am prudent enough to say that the future generation has to pay for some of these things. They should pay for some of that. I will say that the Government has a programme of three years, and I will tell the Hon. Premier that no country, more so developing countries, can afford the luxury of any short term development planning. Therefore, of necessity you must train the people to understand that you must go on the long road for development. India had to go on a Seven Year Plan. That does not mean to say that they did not have an election for seven years. You cannot think in terms of a three year Development Plan.

Sir, I am not going to subscribe to the view that Barbados can plan effectively on a three year basis. For one thing, you have to train your staff for the kind of development which you require. I feel that the future generation should also be called upon to bear some of the burden. Before I entered politics, I heard the Sugar people warning the people of the country that the economy of the country is only sugar, and if you went on with them you could not have gone past building one more school. Barbados has confounded the economists comparing it with the economic theory of the world. It has a heavy population with a one-crop economy, and yet our income per capita is higher than Dominica where you have a lower population per square mile. If you were to judge Dominica's on that basis, their per capita income should be higher than Barbados - and not only Dominica, but all of them. Antigua has about 80,000 people, and it has a lower population density than Barbados; yet Barbados with its higher density has a higher per capita income. (A VOICE: Do you know why?) I am not dealing with the "whys". I am dealing with the facts. Barbados has confounded all the economic theories laid down. Judging by those economic theories, Barbados should be poor and these other countries rich. That is why I say this is a question, which in my own financial judgment is that developing countries must invest in the future, and the community should be made to understand that the future generation must share in these things.

It has been stated by experts that developing countries should not be required to find all the capital for the infra-structure development, and these things should be invested in future generations. What would be a better thing would be to have some assistance in the Deep Water Harbour project. If you were expanding, United Nations or some of those countries would have given you assistance. The

United States of America, and even Russia, have given assistance to all of these developing countries. Russia has given assistance to Egypt by assisting them with the Aswan Dam. Despite all that has been talked of President Nkrumah, the United States lent more money to Ghana than anything the West Indies had put together. My view is that this Government cannot get any benefit from the money they spend on education during the next election. Some of the same people whom you have sent to school, you will not receive any benefit from.

I am very pleased to see that we have a surplus of \$4 million and I am very happy about it. As regards what the Hon. Premier has said, I do not think it is the appropriate thing to do, but, may be, the Hon. Premier may find it appropriate to do so at this time, but on another occasion he would not take it up and plough it back. There must always be a timing; but I would throw out this warning, if it needs to be a warning — and this is not to the Government, but to the nation — that things like education, hospital, roads and that kind of development are things which Government must undertake in a community like this because we have a lot of unemployed people, and you are doing these things in order that the community may benefit from them. Things like that are what the community should carry because you expect to get returns from them, and the experts feel that those things should be assisted with grants so that you would not have to burden yourself with the sort of thing envisaged in a private capacity.

8.10 p.m.

There is too much talk in these communities that you cannot get independence unless you are prepared to pay for these things. These are things which militate against proper planning. Great Britain owes Barbados as much as they could help us with a thing like Education; they could help us from grants as they own these territories. I do not think it is fair to these communities that they should not be supplied with all the expenses for education, roads, hospitals and all of the things which we have got in 1964 which should have been done a long time ago. I have no objection to the Resolution; but when it comes to education which is a part of this Resolution, I feel very grieved indeed to find that we are not getting the sort of assistance which we should get, so that the surpluses which we have to use cannot be used for the type of development which we should be going in for.

I say, finally, that no progress is going to take place until the Government is prepared to invest more of its money in its development. There is a type of economic leadership which must spring from the Government sector which is going to require it, whatever spending took place in Barbados 20 or 25 years ago. Any Government has to do something different from what was done before. If I, in a private capacity, or if in my own organization were in possession of any surplus, I would underwrite that surplus in the projects which would fructify in the next 25 years or so. I would put up some now. The community must wait for what it can afford to have, and no project of acceleration should be taken over unless we are prepared to go forward with it. The hon. senior member for the City says that he will speak on Budget Proposals, but that will be a post-operation since the Premier's Budget Speech was made today, and the speech of the hon. senior member for the City will be as dead as Lord Nelson. It will be ineffective. The Budget Speech is a comprehensive statement.

In connection with this \$2 million the Hon. Premier says that he is utilising all the surplus. It is a fact that you have a public debt of \$40 million, and I say that when the going is good, that is the time when you should hold back something against the time when the going gets rough. You have relief works and problems of unemployment. When your balances and repayments are good and a lot of money is coming in, the Government is not forced to spend as much as otherwise on relief issues because money is coming in. When your loan situation is on a long-term basis, then you have to be very careful with your surpluses. It may not be a question of \$40 million all the time; you have to be careful as to the way in which you use your surpluses in any one objective or even at the risk of your loan policy which you have to meet.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee.

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

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

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

On motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agreed to.

8.20 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Next Order of the Day stands in the name

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may at this stage...

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition about to address the Chair?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am, Sir, but the Hon. Leader of the House has not said that he is going to conclude Government Business.

At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to give notice of the following Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the intimation which I received from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition earlier, I give him such leave.

RESOLUTION re FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGETARY PROPOSALS

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution reads as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED that this House view with anxiety the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals for the Fiscal year 1964-65 contained in a Statement laid in this Honourable House on Tuesday, 30th June, 1964, by the Honourable Premier."

As is customary, this is the only means by which we can discuss the Statement made by the Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: Notice has been duly given and there can be no discussion on it now. I take it that a copy has been handed in to the Clerk at the Table.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I would like to know if the hon. member proposes to move this at the next meeting of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was going to ask that it be placed as the first Order under Private Members' Business at the next meeting, so that the Government could set aside a day for discussion on this matter.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, we have two small items which will not be concluded today and which will not take any time next Tuesday. I therefore propose that we deal with the two small items which remain on the Order Paper, and then, Sir, to devote the remainder of the day to the Budget. We will adjourn the House until 12 noon next Tuesday, and then I propose that we get through with Government Business by 2 o'clock, and immediately on returning at 2.30 p.m. deal with the discussion on the Budgetary Proposals.

Mr. SPEAKER: And if the discussion concludes either before or does not conclude by 2 o'clock ...

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am afraid that if it is to be broadcast, we have to have a specific time for the broadcast people to make arrangements. They are bound to be told beforehand precisely what time they must earmark.

Mr. SPEAKER: In any event, this debate for next Tuesday will take place from what hour?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I would say from 2.45 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If I may at this stage, on a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it a genuine point of order in accordance with the Standing Order of this Chamber?

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the Hon. Leader of the House sets aside a day, may I suggest that he make similar arrangements as were made today to start at 4.30 p.m. so that we can come in and get through with any business which is not controversial. It may suit the broadcast people better at 4.30 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Is the hon. member seriously suggesting that with almost every member on the Opposition benches rearing to go next Tuesday, we could begin at that time and get through? It would take more than a day and we will have to start earlier. Today we only had one speech, but next Tuesday we will have many, and therefore I think that 2.45 p.m. is the appropriate time to start.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the motion for the Adjournment has not been moved.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member for St. Lucy do so.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 7th July at 12 o'clock noon.

While I am on my feet, Sir, perhaps I could clarify the situation which seems to be arising out of the notice which the hon. member has just given. I had thought that quite frankly hon. members in debating next week would wish to enjoy identical privileges as those enjoyed by the Hon. Premier, and that therefore they would wish their speeches broadcast alive. Through you, I must tell the House this. For that to be done, the Broadcast authorities must know with precision when they are going to start, and also they would be happier if we could conclude the debate on the same day. It means therefore that if every hon. member is going to speak, we shall have to put into the four-hour spell as many speeches representative of the whole House that can comfortably be got in. Hon. members would therefore know that it would be wrong for any single member to monopolise more than his proportionate part of the four-hour period. I do not want to offend hon. members in this respect, but I would suggest that if members confined their speeches to fifteen or twenty minutes - if it were possible for them to do that - several members if not all who wish to speak could possibly be accommodated. I think this is a matter of accommodating one another. If on the other hand there is no likelihood of the debate being concluded on one day, and therefore the possibility arises of a carry over to another week, then different arrangements would have to be made, because we could not monopolise the radio time on two successive Tuesdays to carry a live broadcast. 8.30 p.m.

If it is going to last longer, the speeches will have to be recorded and then put out in a leisurely fashion and I do not think hon. members would like that. What I am trying to say is if hon. members are willing to accommodate one another and confine their speeches to a certain set time, it would be possible to carry several speeches within the four-hour period. I assume that they will get the same privilege which was accorded to the Hon. Premier: but to do that, certain things will have to be known before. I would like to get this matter clear.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the motion for the adjournment being seconded?

Mr. WALCOTT: I beg to second that, and in so doing -

(A VOICE: A Minister has to second it.)

Mr. WALCOTT: If I rise to second it, there is no rule to say that a Minister would have to do it. It seems to me that we have some fancy rules in here. (A VOICE: This is a motion for the adjournment of the House.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Rule 15, Adjournment of the House says:

"A Minister may move 'That this House do now adjourn' at any time after the conclusion of questions at any sitting, but any other member may only move such a motion under the provisions of Standing Order No. 16 (Adjournment - Definite Matter of Urgent Public Importance)."

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, but it does not mean that another person cannot do it. (A VOICE: It cannot be so.) Does it mean that another person cannot second it?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Rule is silent as to whom may second it.

Mr. WALCOTT: If a Minister is going to second it, it does not matter to me because I am going to speak on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand it that the hon. senior member for St. Peter has seconded the motion?

Mr. WALCOTT: What I want to point out is this. It may be more a matter for the Hon. Leader of the Opposition than it is for me because I have no points to score; but from what I have heard from the Hon. Minister of Education and the Hon. Leader of the House, if you are going to set aside a day to deal with the Budget Speech, do not regard it as Private Members' Business, because it is not a motion on any private issue; it is more or less just put under Private Members' Business in order to get it on the Order Paper. Far from it being there, the Government should, when the Hon. Premier makes his Budget Speech, be prepared to make a motion subsequently that this is going to be the First Order of the Day at a previous meeting and you should set aside a day for it to be debated. Be that as it may, that does not seem to be the procedure which this Government is practising.

I feel there should be no question of whether you are going to do it or if you are going to do two small Bills or two big Bills and then turn to that. It should be a question of your setting aside a day, and the two small Bills or two big Bills would be dealt with in due course. If the Bills are not important matters, well then, you can dispose of them first; but on this question of broadcast at the time, I should like to point out to the Hon. Minister of Education that where the Premier has initiated a debate and if it is a live programme specifying the time, that same Order cannot be given to a debate which is an open debate.

I have no control over the C.B.C., but it may be asking too much to ask the Broadcasting Corporation to expect a continuous debate to come live for four hours. This idea of a programme going live for four hours - I cannot see C.B.C. starting a programme at 3.00 o'clock and that programme lasting until 7.00 p.m.

I do not like the idea of your telling members that their speeches will be accorded the same length of time as that of the Hon. Premier which was only a half hour debate because you have no right telling hon. members how long they must carry a debate. If the idea is that you are going to make this a broadcast, then I would say that the debate would have to be recorded and then broadcast. Let us be quite frank. I heard the Hon. Premier's speech while it was being broadcast, and it was also recorded because I heard excerpts from it again in the 6.00 o'clock News. Therefore, you got it as a live broadcast and then you got excerpts of it after; therefore, there was a recording of it also.

I would say that it is not a matter of your bringing a live broadcast of what hon. members have to say as regards the Budget. The idea is if the debates of hon. members are going to be recorded for broadcast purposes afterwards, You should also put them over at such time as when the people would listen to them. You can start a broadcast of them at 1.00, 2.00, 3.00, 4.00 or 5.00 p.m; it does not mean that it would have to be a live broadcast.

What the Hon. Minister should agree to is that any broadcast which cannot come off in one day should be left over and broadcast another day. You should also start broadcasting these speeches in the evening because nobody would be at home in the day. That is why I say that it would not matter now what time the debate in this House on this matter starts or ends because the C.B.C. would not be required to put out a live programme of it.
8.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: If no other hon. member wants to speak on this matter for the adjournment, I invite the Hon. Minister to avail himself of the last word.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the points which have been made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter are well taken. For my part, I will make provision to put him on the tape. What I really want to avoid is the charge that I was quite willing to accommodate hon. members with less than what I was prepared to do for the Hon. Premier. We will record the speeches, including the hon. member's speech, and bring them out from time to time until they are finished. On the last occasion it took about two weeks and a half. I will therefore be instructing the Information Officer to seek Your Honour's permission for the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation to be brought in so as to undertake this service.

The question that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 7th July, 1964, at 12.00 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.45 p.m.

