
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 19th March, 1964.

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, J.C., (*Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade, Labour and Tourism*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret again, to inform the House, that the Minutes have not been printed for the past three meetings.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month ended 31st December, 1963.

I have the honour to inform the House that the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited Bill has been returned from the Other Place with an amendment.

QUESTIONS

Mr. COWARD: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Will Government, in view of the amazing rapidity with which cane fires spread, cause houses to be removed from secluded areas (where there is an inadequate supply of water for emergencies) to more suitable lands where there could be better protected in case of an emergency?

2. To give effect to the above, will Government consider the advisability of requiring Plantation owners of tenancies to request owners of houses to remove same to more suitable lands as provided by such Plantation owners for the purpose?

Mr. BOXILL: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that there is a number of schools throughout the Island, some of which have sugar canes planted so near to them as to constitute a fire hazard?

2. Is the Minister aware that many of these schools have been and still are for the past twenty (20) years without adequate playing fields to the detriment of the children attending these schools?

3. Will the Minister acquire such adjacent plots of land as would permit playing field extensions and at the same time the elimination of the fire hazard?

STANDING ORDERS POSTPONED

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18 and 45 be suspended for today's Sitting.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.
2.55 p.m.

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

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

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

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 40

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that Item No. 4 has not yet been gazetted; I am therefore asking the Hon. Leader of the House to move for the suspension of Standing Order 40 as well, so that the Item can be proceeded with today.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: With Your Honour's permission, I should like, at this stage, to move the suspension of Standing Order 40 for today's Sitting.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The First Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable and senior member for St. John:— To move the Second reading of a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ending on the 31st March, 1965.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, in moving the Second reading of the Appropriation Bill which will be cited as the Appropriation Act, 1964, when this Honourable House is pleased to grant approval of its passing, I should like to make certain points clear, to hon. members of this House and members of the general public, as to the procedure which is adopted and which was initiated from the introduction of the Estimates and the appropriations from the financial year 1962-63. The reason why I find it necessary to do so is that there appears to be a certain misunderstanding amongst members of the general public, and particularly the newspapers, as to the nature of the Appropriation Bill, the nature of the Estimates and the nature of the Budget. If I may deal with the Appropriation Bill first, we have Standing Orders of this House and under Standing Order 60 the procedure is as follows:—

"1 During each year there shall be introduced into the House an Appropriation Bill which shall contain the estimated financial requirements for expenditure on all services of the Government for the succeeding financial year. The details of these financial requirements shall be contained in the Estimates which shall be presented at the same time."

If I may deal with paragraph 1 of Standing Order 60 first, it is clear that the Appropriation Bill is the most important aspect of this exercise. The Estimates have to be given a certain prominence because of the length of the procedures which are suffered and endured by hon. members during the passage of the Estimates, because the opportunity is taken to investigate the workings of every Government Department and to pass comment legitimately thereon, and the prominence has been given to the Estimates for this reason. The Appropriation Bill, which is itself only a part of the total supplies, sets out the requirements of the Government for the ensuing financial year, is usually passed by this House without much debate or discussion. What I am doing now is to move the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill.

It is not correct to say that the Appropriation Bill is the same as the Estimates. You will see, Sir, that there is a wide discrepancy between the amount of the Appropriation Bill and the amount of expenditure projected in the Estimates for this territory for the financial year, 1964-65. The reason for that discrepancy is very simple; the Estimates deal with the total estimated requirements of Government for the financial year, but they are no more than Estimates. The Appropriation Bill, on the other side of the picture, deals only with those requirements which are not already provided by Law. You will notice under different headings of the Estimates that there are columns which are headed "Fixed by Law" and "To be voted". The Items which are fixed by law are not included in the Appropriation Bill, but the Items to be voted are all included in the Appropriation Bill. The Appropriation Bill, therefore, the second reading of which I have the honour to move, is for the sum of \$25,728,435 whilst the Estimates of Expenditure amount to \$32,483,642. As I have explained before, the difference between the two is that one is fixed by law and therefore it does not have to be appropriated for the use of the territory during the coming financial year; because whether we introduce this Appropriation Bill or not, that expenditure is already committed and therefore no positive act on the part of this Chamber is necessary to authorise expenditure of that additional \$8 million. I want to make that abundantly clear.

3.05 p.m.

Three things have been confused in times past, the Budget, the Appropriation and the Estimates. According to Standing Order No. 60 (2) "after the motion for the second reading of the Bill has been proposed and seconded, the debate thereon shall be confined to the general principles of Government policy and administration as indicated by the Bill and Estimates."

"When the Bill has been read a second time, it shall stand committed to a Committee of the whole House to be called the Committee of Supply to which the Estimates shall then also stand referred."

That is Rule 3 of Standing Order No. 60. Now the reason why I find it necessary to mention this is that there is a question of procedure being involved, because when we go into Committee of Supply, the Estimates will at that stage be referred to the Committee of Supply, and the Estimates are merely a sort of guide to the overall expenditure of Government. In my opinion it would not be appropriate to discuss those items which are fixed by law and therefore which do not appear in the Appropriation Bill, but which appear in the Estimates because that would be reflecting on a vote of the House. One would have to bring in amendments to Acts of Parliament in order to reflect on the items which are fixed by law. Of course this is not intended as an inhibition of the rights of hon. members to speak on any item of Government expenditure, but as there has always been this confusion, I should like to let us agree on procedure right away.

The other aspect of this exercise which I recommend to the Honourable House for investigation is the fact that certain sections of the Press have recently reported, after these Estimates of Expenditure were laid, that the Government is budgeting for a deficit for the financial year of \$750,401. Now the members of the Press certainly know something which up to this moment is beyond the consciousness of even members of the Cabinet and myself, because this is not a budgetary exercise at all. We are merely introducing the Appropriation Bill and asking the House to give its consent, and we are referring to the Committee of Supply the estimates of expenditure so that they will see the direction and ways in which the revenue which we hope to raise during the coming financial year will be spent. The question of whether there is a budgetary deficit or not can only be resolved after I or whoever may be acting in my place as Minister of Finance brings down the Finance Bill for the financial year, 1964-65. What used to happen before, of course, was that after the consideration and approval of the Estimates and the passing of the Appropriation Bill, nothing further was done by the previous Government. They made adjustments in taxation usually at the same time without the advantage of the out-turn figures of expenditure and revenue, and without the advantage of considering the economic position of the island as a whole.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that in 1962 I departed from that procedure and made it clear to hon. members that the introduction of the Estimates was not a budgetary exercise at all, because I did not consider that we were in a position to accurately assess whether deficit financing should be gone into to overcome any imbalance between the two sets of figures until we got the out-turn for the financial year which would not be available in normal circumstances until the close of the financial year. You cannot draw up a budget on estimates, because one may be doing injustice to the taxpayers by guessing at what your out-turn figures are going to be. I am very happy to disclose now, although I will say it at a later stage when I deal with the Budget, that you will remember that I budgeted last year for a deficit of I think \$133,000. We started off with a deficit of close on \$2 million or over \$2 million. I introduced certain fiscal measures and budgeted for a deficit because I was somewhat optimistic and did not want to introduce measures of taxation over the economic possibilities of the current financial year, and I am very happy to say that up to the present moment, we have managed to accumulate a surplus of over \$1 million. If therefore there appears to be a discrepancy between expenditure and revenue for the current financial year, it

does not necessarily mean that the Government is either going to budget for a deficit or that the Government is necessarily considering substantial increases in taxation or fiscal measures to bridge the gap. I am not making any promises, but it is not always necessary because your Estimates show a discrepancy between expenditure and revenue — if you know what you are doing — to get scared because of that deficit and introduce mathematical equations to reconcile the difference between expenditure and revenue.

When the newspapers therefore said that we have budgeted for a deficit or we are going to budget for a deficit, in the first instance they are making a misstatement of fact, because we are not indulging at this stage in a budgetary exercise at all. That will come some six weeks from now perhaps. If they say we are going to budget for a deficit, I can only say that they are gifted with prophesy which I myself do not possess. Having cleared that, Mr. Speaker, I think we are starting off fairly optimistic in that we know there has been some kind of surplus this year. I shall now deal with the Appropriation Bill, Sir, and move that the Bill be read a second time. I will confine myself to a few general remarks, because this is not a budget speech. A few notes in the memorandum have been already submitted and circulated to hon. members of the House, and I shall be asking in Committee for certain items to be moved in of additional expenditure which were unavoidably late. I apologise to hon. members for the lateness of the submission of the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure, but this was quite unavoidable as there was a tremendous amount of work to be done, and the Government Printery was somewhat overworked.

You will see, Sir, that the Estimates of Expenditure for the financial year is \$33,234,043, and the estimated Revenue falls short of this amount by the sum of \$750,401. I should like to issue a warning here to hon. members that we are only making estimates of known and committed expenditure at this stage. There are other matters which we have already sought the approval of the House on, not including of course those items which have not been finalised in detail and the financial implication of which has not been finalised, but I should like to warn hon. members that the expenditure in the coming financial year is going to be in excess, or I should say greatly in excess of \$33 million on current account.
3.15 p.m.

Let me give you an example. We are still working on the requirements of the new Barbados General Hospital. The rise in expenditure over and above that contained in the Estimates is anticipated to be in excess of \$1 million. In other words, instead of an estimated expenditure of \$33,234,043, it will be in excess of \$34 million and the Hospital alone is likely to account for an additional minimum of \$1 million recurrent expenditure. For the equipment for the Hospital alone, we have a Committee working on this and we are canvassing all sources of assistance in this matter. We have even canvassed private assistance in Chicago and New York. However, the minimum requirements for the equipment in the next six or eight weeks is likely to be \$3/4 million and it is not for the standard equipment such as the sterilisers, surgical equipment, vacuum cleaners and electrical equipment already installed. Over and above that, such as lifts and matters of that kind, portable equipment, the extent of that is likely to be over \$3/4 million.

Sir, what we have in Barbados is something which is equivalent to a free medical service in this Island because anyone who does not want to pay for medical service does not have to pay because you can have all of these facilities even from the Local Government Councils and from the Central Administration. This is a facility which is not enjoyed in even more advanced industrial countries such as the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom. It is true, that in the United Kingdom you have a Welfare State and you have free medical services but it is not free as in Barbados because every worker, even the Barbadian workers, has to make weekly contribution. When I say the Barbadian worker, I mean those workers in the United Kingdom.

They have to contribute for medical services under the National Insurance Act of 1946.

In the United States of America, the medical profession is bitterly resisting that there should be any kind of service such as that which we enjoy here. They have been resisting the idea of a free universal assistance which is the Blue Cross which is an insurance scheme. Anyone who wants medical service there has to pay for it, save emergency cases such as accidents on the road. There is no such thing as a public hospital which is free as in the sense of the Barbados General Hospital is free.

Sir, we must appreciate that we in Barbados not only enjoy a healthy climate, a free supply of water services, and so on, for those who do not want to avail themselves of a domestic supply; we do not only enjoy public assistance but we also enjoy a system of medical attention in the public sector, which in my opinion is much more generous than that which people in wealthier countries have at their disposal. Therefore, when you have these kind of facilities, it stands to reason that if visitors to the Island want medical treatment — and people come here from the Leeward and Windward Islands and as far as Venezuela — the maximum which they can be asked to pay in the present General Hospital for medical attention is \$4.80 a day and some of those people when they are convalescing would go to a club and pay \$45 (U.S.) a day and would not have the individual attention, expert and otherwise, which they enjoy in the General Hospital.

The reason why I have gone in for all of this is because Barbadians do not always realise how lucky they are. Barbadians grumble a lot because they have to pay three or four cents more for rum and they do not like to be taxed although it is true to say that nobody likes to pay taxes; they only pay it under duress. I myself, do not believe the Income Tax Commissioner is my friend. Barbadians and even visitors living in Barbados do not even appreciate the extent to which the national income is redistributed in the social services, education and medical attention. In addition to all the other bounties of nature which we enjoy, Sir, we are very fortunate that we do not have to support an army and a navy and I personally would hate to think what the level of taxation would be if because of having revenue which we could spend on the development of the Welfare State, we had to divert those funds towards what I would call useless and unprofitable expenditure such as the paraphernalia for defence.

We are lucky that we can devote so much of our revenue to these services and there are services which are enjoyed by the community at large but when it comes to the burden of taxation, it is true that in a way everyone does pay taxation but I would be very hypocritical if I said that the masses are burdened with taxation, because 93% of our taxation comes from a very small lot of people. The people who are in the highest income brackets are those who contribute a substantial amount to our taxation.

I am amazed to hear our political opponents say that we are giving free secondary education to rich people. Eighty-five per cent of the children entering secondary schools come from elementary schools now. The hon. senior member for the City or anyone who is connected with the Welfare services in this Island can tell you that for the first time now, some of these children before they gained entry did not know the advantage of being able to walk to school in a pair of shoes. But it would be obviously inequitable to take something like \$8 million or \$9 million from 2,000 or 3,000 people in this Island by way of direct taxation and take \$1/2 million or \$3/4 million from 70,000 or 80,000 people and suggest that the people who contributed the \$8 million or \$9 million are not entitled to have their children educated but only those people who contributed the small amount towards the support of Government expenditure.
3.25 p.m.

Let me put it in another way. There has been a lot of furore in this island about the Government not taking money from the employers, or that the Trade Union has not

suggested that the employers make any contribution towards the welfare of the territory. I do not want to go too deeply into this matter; the only reason why this House was invited to consider the matter, which we have already considered and on which I do not intend to reflect, is because the Government stood to lose a considerable amount of revenue from not being able to tax the same people on what justly be regarded as their legitimate profits and we have always done so particularly in 1957-58. I have made a calculation and hon. members will be astounded to know that, as a result of the action of the Sugar Producers' Federation in the distribution of the final percentage of what has been described as Windfall money, the total amount of taxation from the workers is only \$330 and the total amount will be less than \$2,100 for the whole island, whereas, if the Trade Union had not negotiated for a percentage of that extra profit, the Government expected to get \$2 million. Instead of \$2 1/2 million, all we have is \$1 1/2 million in the Treasury; that is the kind of nonsense I do not understand. The amount of \$330 is all the taxation we have got from the workers and we hope that all will be collected by the end of the financial year. We are receiving a total of \$2,100 instead of \$2 million and people are saying that the Government has not made its contribution to the community. Anybody would understand the exasperation of the Trade Union which feels that the Barbadians should be left to the kind of people whom we have. If we have only collected \$1 1/2 million, I do not mind because I have budgeted for a deficit.

The national average of taxation in this island is \$112 per capita, which is less than \$2 a week. Ninety per cent of the people pay nothing at all and the other ten per cent pay a substantial amount, probably in the vicinity of one and a half dozen. Let us look at the economic facts. Every citizen of Barbados whether White or Black, rich or poor, is entitled to consideration, but we do not want enforced snobbery set up in the island, that only the poor people are entitled to any consideration. We want to get away from that because, if we do not attract foreign investment in this island, the poor people will suffer even more than they have been suffering in the past. Let us recognize that we have to work together. When we tax the people who have money to invest, sometimes you may be doing a disservice; you either have to apply for expropriation of anybody who owns forty square feet of land or you believe in social justice and a re-distribution of the national income by way of the democratic procedures of taxation. You cannot have it both ways; you cannot say that you do not believe in chopping off anybody's head and at the same time say that the Government did not take money from the people. If I were to disclose what the Government Ministers have to pay away out of their money, hon. members will be shocked, because a lot of people think that the Government Ministers do not have to pay any taxes and they live in luxury. Mr. Bustamante was very shocked when I said this; I went away in 1962 for a couple of weeks and was not aware that my telephone bill had arrived. All the Secretaries of the Leeward Islands arrived in Barbados and when I should have been most busy on the telephone, I discovered that the Telephone Company had cut off my telephone. The Secretary of State for the Colonies was most astounded when I said that. The Telephone Company can cut off the telephone of the Premier of the island and there are many officers who have free telephones. The Premier does not get that. Mr. Bustamante said that he would have declared everybody in the Telephone Company a prohibited immigrant if they had done that to him. *(Laughter.)*

We are living in a democratic community. I said that the next time that I owe them \$13.25 and the Bill arrives and I am out of the island, just ring up my Secretary and say that there is a bill in. They cut off my telephone at a time when it was most necessary for me to have it. You have people living in Government houses in this island owing the Government \$500 and \$600 for house rent and the Government has to put up with that. If they are called in by the Housing Authority and it is suggested that they should pay forty dollars or fifty dollars, they want to object very strongly to the Housing Authority telling them how to spend their windfall money. We have to share our burdens if we want to be responsible citizens. Every Barbadian, before

he is entitled to speak with any authority as to the affairs of this island must demonstrate, whether he is a member of a Local Government Council or a man in a Housing Scheme, that he is responsible and he does not want to be dependent perpetually on the charity of people. Where charity is always a re-distribution of the national income, he must shoulder the burden which we are all expected to bear.

There has been a rise of \$23/4 million in current expenditure due to the increased activities of the Government. The increased recurrent expenditure has resulted from capital projects and expanding services to the public. Estimated receipts from taxation are \$3 million more than in the 1963-64 Estimates. The net receipts from taxation which are \$27 million, as I mentioned before, represent an average of \$112.8 per head, but the taxation per head varies widely according to the personal income and expenditure on all groups. Estimates capital expenditure, which we will also be undertaking amounts to \$10.6 million, making a total expenditure of \$43.8 million, the net figure, deducting departmental receipts, being \$40.3 million.
3.35 p.m.

The total expenditure in the public sector, that is, by Government, if we deduct our departmental receipts of approximately \$3.5 million, is \$40.3 million. We do expect, however, to meet part of the cost of certain capital projects from C.D. & W. funds. A further development plan to March, 1966, is being prepared for this purpose.

May I pause here to also mention that one other matter which I hinted just now is that shortly before the Financial Bill is introduced, I hope that we will have the economic survey for 1964-65 in circulation not only amongst the members of this House and the Other Place, but amongst the general public. You will remember that last year we had very little time and I prepared a short economic survey of the Island's possibilities. We intend this year to have a much more comprehensive economic survey of the Island so that the background of any fiscal proposals will be fully appreciated. The largest increase in expenditure is on education, which over the current year is in excess of \$1 million. This includes teachers salaries, school meals, free university education and a public records office.

The large increase under Highways and Transport is for increased staff, the taking over of the roads in the Northern District Council and for extra equipment. There are also substantial increase under Waterworks and Public Works. The increase in Social Service is to provide some of the extra money needed — and you will note I said "needed" — for running the new General Hospital, Health Centres and the Sports Section. The improvements made in regard to pensions and retirements of Government employees have added to the pension bill.

Charges of Debt will continue to increase as our borrowings are funded. At 10 o'clock last Thursday, as I informed the House, that is on 12th March, 1964, this Government offered for subscription on the London Market a loan of £1 1/2 million, that is \$7.2 million. It had to be closed at one minute past ten after having been oversubscribed fourteen times. The loan bears an interest at the rate of 6 1/2% and is redeemable not later than 1st May, 1977, but the Government has the option of redeeming it two years earlier. The loan was issued at 95% and is now at a premium, that is, within seven days the loan has appreciated and is now at a premium of 95 1/8%. The turnover was exceptionally good and there was considerable selling by stages which was fully absorbed by investment buyers. The whole operation, Mr. Speaker, if I may say so — and I am not claiming any credit for myself, but for the Government — shows the confidence in London in the competence of this Government and this Island's ability to meet its financial obligations. I do not think anyone will challenge that at all. This is the second loan which this Government has raised. We do not believe in taxing the present population of taxpayers of this island for capital expenditure as used to be done in the past. What we believe is that when anything is of enduring benefit to the community, posterity should also assist in payment for these projects.

I should like to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that in our Estimates we include items of a certain capital nature which we do not consider to be of any prominence; but when it comes to construction for the future, to the building of schools, to finding of the capital for the hospital, the improvement of certain road services and so on, we feel that posterity should bear a considerable part of the cost, and in raising loans we do not do this because we are unable to pay for our salaries or anything like that, pay recurrent expenses or recurrent costs of running a Government. It is because we consider that posterity should make a substantial contribution, and even if we had all the money we needed for capital works in the bank, I myself would still advise this House that we should be permitted to raise loans, because this is the only way of making posterity pay for what they will benefit from. If we have surpluses, they were accumulated by the hard work of this generation, and there is no reason why this generation should be mulcted in order to provide facilities for future generations who will say these things are built already, let us go in for a few more race courses and matters of that kind. That is the whole theory behind loans. Loans are no indication that the Government is bankrupt. As a matter of fact, it is an indication that Government is interested in economic growth and in development.

In comparison with the London loan, Barbadians themselves have made little effort to respond to the offers of debentures in the Island. A 6 3/4% issue of \$1 million at 98% made in May has not yet been fully subscribed. We have got \$700,000 out of that, and we keep a loan of \$1 million available which I came to the House and gave notice of, because we feel that Barbadian investors should at no time be in a position to say that the Government raises all the money it needs in London, and it has not given them an opportunity here in Barbados to invest; so there is always a contribution which the Barbadian investor can make locally, because we have always over-capitalised the amount which we anticipate can be raised on the local market, say, on any given day by having an excess which will give the Barbadian investor an opportunity, any morning at all he wakes up and wants to invest \$50,000 without any formality, he can go to the Treasury and invest \$50,000, \$100,000 and up to \$300,000 at 6 3/4%, which I consider a very attractive investment indeed, because no Bank gives him an investment like that. I should like to make it clear that although it was not over-subscribed, it was put on the market by me four weeks after a previous issue had been over-subscribed, and the reason was because I wanted to mobilise the savings of Barbadians who had a little spare cash, and having put \$500,000 on the market, I think, in January last year, and that became over-subscribed in a very short space of time, I then went with an issue of \$1 million to make sure that there will always be an investment outlet available for Barbadians so that they would have no excuse whatsoever for taking up their money and sending it overseas to invest. If you raise a loan of \$1 1/2 million every two years, a Barbadian will ask what is he to invest his money in unless he goes through the exercise of getting a stockbroker in London to buy debentures for him, which is in itself sending some kind of money out of the country. I only serve notice on the Insurance Companies and everybody else that we will always keep a safety valve. There will always be an opportunity of mobilising for investment the savings of Barbadians here in this Island. Some large investors who want to buy and sell claim that with no stock market in the Island Government debentures, and in fact debenture stocks and shares generally, cannot be disposed easily.

We have been trying — and when I say "we" I mean the Ministry of Finance — to encourage local investors to facilitate dealings in debentures and stock, and the establishing of a Development Bank will enable a further step to be taken in this direction, and the Government Savings Bank will always be willing to buy Government debentures at the ruling price.

I think that inventors ought to know this too. Let me put it this way. A joint stock organisation the size of Government's requirements demands a large amount of capital

formation in the community. Now, one of the objections to investing in long term service is this. It is all right if you are in New York, Toronto or a big country because you have a Stock Exchange. You can ring to your broker and say "my wife is to have an emergency operation and I need \$5,000 immediately: will you sell so much stock for me or a block of shares." What happens is that according to the rules of the New York Exchange, within forty-eight hours that transaction is negotiated and the seller is notified. If a small investor needs money quickly, he can get it, if he had debentures or shares of stock in any private industrial concern or anything like that.

One of the difficulties in Barbados about investment is that and we would like to mobilise the savings of the small workers, like the agricultural workers. Government Ministers have little or no money to invest but people like some on the other side who have no obligations more than what they can enjoy in entertainment can afford to put by some. We recognise, Mr. Speaker, that even the man who is comfortable would like to have a certain amount of liquidity. If he has the exercise of going into a Solicitor's office and then has to advertise in the newspapers for somebody to buy shares and nobody turns up to buy, it does not encourage him to invest in Barbados. By liquidity, I mean the ability to cash in on your investments at short notice.

The actual savings in Barbados, as you will see in another part of the memorandum, have risen considerably. That is a remarkable achievement but what is happening with the money is that it is deposited in Banks where it is not put to work as it should be put. I will not say that it is not put to work because you can get money for short term loans on motor cars or for the purpose of making down payment on houses, but it is not put to work to give the wide democratic participation in the industrial activity which this Island so badly needs.

Why do we have such a remarkable rise in bank deposits? It is not only due to the frugality of Barbadians, but because there is no liquidity for them to invest it otherwise. The familiar pattern is that the firms in Barbados do not encourage a wider participation.

What I would like to see in Barbados is that the big commercial houses instead of going to the banks to borrow money when they need it or when they want to go in for further expansion, would issue shares to members of the general public. I personally cannot agree in a community like Barbados that the banks should be the first resort to which you should go to get money. I think that there should be the last resort to which you should have recourse and you should only go to the banks when the public is not able to absorb the issue. That is the only way to get loans for the small businessman when they feel that the commercial firms are there by themselves and they would never have the opportunity to participate in the commercial activity of this Island.

Therefore, Sir, one of the devices to which I have resorted is always to keep an issue on the open market so that any person can go and buy shares. But I recognise that before full opportunity is taken of that facility that we would have to develop in this Island the institutions which would allow interchange, alienation and transfer of stocks in the Island. I can only add to that that Government debentures is the safest form of investment and they are always accepted as collateral security and if the English people have such tremendous confidence in Barbados, I do not think it is necessary for any Barbadian to run down the financial stability of this Island like what some of my opponents are doing. Of course, my reputation does not depend on the monstrous ineptitude of the former Government. I would like to disabuse from anybody's mind that I make any comparison of any Minister of mine with any Minister of the former Government. My Ministers have to build confidence in themselves. When you compare what we have done with what the other Governments have done, you are not making any comparison at all.

During the past month, the world price for sugar has fallen from £80 per ton to £65 per ton. You will notice in the Digest of Statistics it is stated in paragraph 2 that the

present Free Market price is in the vicinity of £67 which is \$322 per ton. Yesterday's figures was £80 but today, it is £67 per ton. Therefore, those people who feel that the Island is well enough and we do not need to have a good sugar crop are deluding themselves. When you consider that the Commonwealth price of sugar is only £21 per ton, you can see what a drop of £15 means to the sugar industry. Therefore, we need every single ton of sugar that we have in this island now in order to ensure the high standard of living which we have achieved.

In 1963 the total at the credit of depositors in the Government Savings Bank was \$17.8 million as compared with \$17.2 in 1962 - an increase of \$0.6 million. That shows that Barbadians have confidence in the Government Savings Bank despite the activities of other institutions which have almost wrecked the confidence of the public in the safety of their money. Anyhow, we have had an increase in savings and I hope that we will never have a recurrence of that kind of finance unless of course this country is unfortunate to suffer under the leadership of any party other than my own.

3.55 p.m.

The only opportunity for that kind of situation to arise again is if another Government is in power; but you will never have any institution collecting \$800,000 in this island and people are unable to get back their money from a place where it has been deposited for safe keeping. The savings in Commercial houses I think you will find in the Memorandum to the Estimates or rather in the Digest of Statistics, have risen considerably of course, and you will see in paragraph 12 of the Digest of Statistics that the savings in the Commercial banks showed an increase of \$3.1 million over the figure for 1962, while time deposits rose by \$4.4 million. There again that demonstrates that the community is relatively prosperous, because when people can put their money in fixed time deposits, it means that that is money which they can put down for two years without being concerned about it at all. That is not confined to the wealthier people in the community; there are many people who are going in for fixed time deposits and, of course, this must be attributed, in a large degree, to the lessening of traders' credit facilities in this island. We have had a lessening of the hire purchase, a lessening of the conspicuous consumption of commodities which consumers do not necessarily need, the encouragement and inflation of credit in the island - we have had a lessening of that due to the control of the Government and, consequently, we have had an increase in time savings. Total deposits in the commercial banks rose by \$11.33 million to the record figure of \$60.25 million, whereas loans and advances fell from \$46.1 million in 1962 to \$42.3 million at the end of 1963. There again, there has been a drop in loans and advances as an indication that the economy of the country is very healthy. People are not calling for credit because they are now living at a standard superior to that which they have enjoyed before.

In conclusion, I should like to mention that the average of the retail price index for the year 1963 was 115.1. In 1962 the corresponding figure was 113.1. That is a rise of two points. A rise of two points in the cost of living index does not mean that the cost of living has risen by 2%. It means that the cost of living has risen by less than 2% because you have to take the two points of the previous index figure which was 1.1, which would give a rise of less than 2%. This rise is more of a wage induced inflation. Wages try to catch up with prices and in 1962-63 wages rose in the average of 38%. There was also a rise in wages of the Unestablished Staff and Key Scale workers during the same period. This, of course, may be another reason why the deposits in the Savings Bank and the Commercial Banks have risen, but there is no justification for any Government employee to say that the cost of living has risen and the Government is doing nothing to keep it down. We have a most difficult task to keep down the cost of living because of the tremendous demand which is being imposed on the resources of the country by the level of wages which we now enjoy.

There is difficulty which people experience in getting skilled artisans to do their work - all of these things send up the cost of living. Even if you have the money to pay, it is very difficult to get skilled workers to carry out certain works, and there are a few who are available who tend to demand what the market can bear. Some of them charge more than what the market can bear, but they do not last too long. The cost of living includes a lot of things, not only the things which are included in the basket but also rent is included in the cost of living. That is included in the cost of living because if the cost of construction goes up, then the rents will go up too. These things are inter-related. All I can say at this stage is that the economy of the island appears to be healthy. There has been a rise in Government expenditure of \$5 million because the Government is doing more than any other Government has done in the history of the island. We are doing more because the motto of this island should be "men at work". We do not build canals and bridges and schools merely because we want to see monuments to ourselves or anybody else; in the first place, there are requirements and the longer you postpone the construction of projects, the more expensive they will be in the long run, as we see in the case of the Harbour, the East Coast Road, and the Milk Plant, all of which we could have got erected for less than what we are spending on them now. We believe that an emergency in Barbados exists now and that men should be put to work on useful projects before there is a complete deterioration of living standards and a demoralisation of the working classes and other sectors of the community in this island.

Mr. Speaker, the Government expenditure has risen, but the money is being spent usefully both on capital and current account. The slogan "men at work" should apply to women as well and it would apply to people in the Civil Service. We cannot afford to have "men at sleep", not at this stage. That slogan should apply to all those who were formerly unemployed and who are now enjoying the benefit and the spiritual upliftment which they have got. I would enjoin people not to abuse the present privileged position which we have reached in this island. I am satisfied that the community can afford to pay for the work which is being done in this island, work which is for the benefit of this community. You will see that the Charges of Debt and Sinking Fund amount to approximately 10% of the island's revenue but that is quite safe. If you search the records of this Chamber you will find what I said away back in 1952.

4.05 p.m.

I said in this House that until a Government in an underdeveloped country was spending 20% of its annual revenue in interest payments and sinking fund charges, it could not consider that it was doing the maximum possible for development in the community, or that the Government was sufficiently extended, or that the community was having a realistic approach towards the problems of unemployment. If we are not spending 20% of our revenue which I consider is a safe upper limit on investment payments and sinking fund charges, it is not because we consider 10% the maximum that we can afford at the present moment, but it is because we do not consider that we could usefully inflate those charges of debt in such a short period of time from a period of stagnation to a period of full development. Something must be left for the future and for future expansion.

I therefore beg to move on this note that the Appropriation Bill for 1964-65 be now read a second time.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, from the speech of the Hon. Premier on the Estimates of revenue and expenditure for this year, it is evident that he has a good grasp of the economy of this island. I was pleased that he could bring out certain salient facts, and it is well for the community at large to know that taxation in this island is admitted to be very high, and when I say taxation I mean direct tax-

tion. We know only too well that Income Tax is paid by about ten percent of the working population. The economic growth of the island has been on the forward march. Although the Hon. Premier did not tell us what was the present gross national product as he did on the last occasion, he will probably let us know in his reply, because it is important to know the gross national product at the present moment to see how much further advanced it is from a year ago. From the available savings in the Commercial Banks there is an advance of \$10 million. Another remarkable thing is the reduction at the same time in the loans from these Banks and from business houses; and persons seeking loans show another healthy sign. It was becoming very alarming a couple of years ago when one of the Bank Managers told me that they were advancing sums far in excess of what good banking capitalists would have wished, but they did it at a moment when it was necessary, and apparently it is now taking a more healthy trend.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that this past year has been a boon for the economy with regard to agriculture. The figures show that our exports of sugar and molasses have jumped from \$24 million in 1962 to \$41 last year. That has been not only as a result of a much larger crop, but a much better price. We all know that the world price of sugar went to a record height during last year. It remained there for a short time and gradually decreased. The year before we had to sell our surplus sugar at reduced prices below the guaranteed price, and then in the following year it went to a record height, and that is where the difference was, and there was a boon and we felt it. The economy of the island has been strengthened and Barbadians are still known for their conservatism when a little money comes along. Some will make a flash as there are many things to be bought to make the home comfortable, but a lot of this money will be tucked away in savings somewhere, and it will provide for future years when the price of sugar starts to come down. This is a commendable feature in the nature of the Barbadian. Through the long years they have suffered, they have been trained as a result to put aside for a rainy day, and you only have to look around the country and see the number of business proprietors and people with small holdings in comparison with other West Indian islands to see that the average Barbadian is a homemaker, and given a chance will provide his home first and the other amenities will follow.

Last year, we had a slackening off in emigration to England as a result of emigration restrictions to the United Kingdom, but in spite of that 1,700 persons still took the opportunity of going overseas. The door has not been closed entirely, and given the slightest opportunity, Barbadians both men and women will emigrate to seek greener pastures where wages and conditions are better, as jobs remain very scarce in Barbados. There is still an element of unemployment although it has been reduced somewhat. It is still one of the worries of any Government or any Opposition, because if we can find greater employment locally for these people, that would tend to increase the economy here. We are glad to know that Barbadians who go overseas make remittances of substantial sums to their families, and that runs into millions of dollars. It is nothing new; it is from the Panama days when the Barbadian who sought work overseas remembered his family and relatives here; so we have always been able to depend on large sums of money being remitted through that source, which is another very commendable feature of the native Barbadian.

Mr. Speaker, if this year can be anything like last year, we will see a further advance in the economy of this island. If we can get for our sugar another \$40 million or \$45 million brought into this island, we will find that the Government will have no difficulty whatever in balancing its budget when the Budget Speech is made.
4.15 p.m.

I am throwing out a hint, and I am pretty sure that the Hon. Premier would be well aware of it, that with this increased revenue from sugar the income tax returns would be augmented and although he has given us the idea that \$750,000 is only a part of the expected deficit and we would have to find more money, we can see another million dol-

lars to be added to the current expenditure. He will find substantial sums coming in if we can sell our sugar at anything above the negotiated price. If the world conditions remain as they are above the average price, Government will find no difficulty whatever in finding this sum this year, and even the amount of expenditure envisaged for the Hospital this year. But we have to look to the future years and in the same way that it has risen, the price of sugar has to go down and that is my fears are for the future. It has been said by the speculators that the price of sugar will remain up for the next three or four years because world conditions are such that the demands for sugar are up and it is also because many of the sugar-producing countries, such as Cuba, have not been able to settle down. If we can have another three or four years when the price of sugar will be above the negotiated price, Government should be able without increasing any taxation, either direct or indirect, to meet the increasing demands for improvements in this Island.

There is one more year to come for the end of the Government's Development Programme. You can say that by next March the East Coast Road should be nearly completed. The Hospital would have been completed and the Government will be embarking this year on the construction of the Hilton Hotel and that would run for two years. However, Government will have to pay immediate attention to what programmes they have for the future and, as the Hon. Premier said earlier this afternoon, that he proposes to bring in another Development Programme in 1966 but there would be an interim one for a short period, I think it is time to look ahead because many of the major projects which are taking place today would be soon completed. The workmen who are employed would have to be usefully used in some gainful employment but that, Mr. Speaker, would be a subject of more detail for a speech when the time comes.

As I was saying, we must not think of this year alone. We have seen what has happened last year and we can expect a satisfactory result from the price of sugar this year. But we must look ahead and see what other avenues the Government can pursue to attract new capital. We can manufacture and do some thing for the export trade. It is not beyond the ability of a small country if proper incentives are offered and labour conditions are satisfactorily negotiated that foreign investors would make this place their home to satisfy certain markets in this region and even further afield.

Trinidad has been lucky in this respect because of their oil industry. They have attracted vast capital investments around their oil industry and by so doing has been able to build their economy. We have seen, only three years ago, that the sum of \$40 million was spent on a Fertiliser Plant there and no sooner than it had got off to start another company has come in with a \$20 million oil lubricating industry. Most of that oil is exported but the benefits of that remain in Trinidad. It is a big country and they have been fortunate.

We have one thing, we have a large labour market and manpower, but we need the skills that go with that. You cannot advance by technical school achievements alone, you have to put it into practice. That is why I say that the immediate necessity to attract industry is not only for what they would give us, and the development which may come here, but the skills which they would give to our people because if we get in one or two large industries that would be the beginning. As I have said, Trinidad is lucky to get new industries and because of that they have got engineers. The Hon. Premier said our capital works are limited by the number of trained personnel that they can find here. We find that in the industry here, I have heard small industrialists saying what difficulties they have had in establishing their work satisfactorily with one trained person. The few that are here have so many jobs in hand that you have to beg them and only by pleading can you get these things done. It not only is technical training which they should have but it is having some establishment to help them after they have been trained. After you have trained them, you are not finished, you have to put

them to work. They then have to go and get to work to get the skills they need.

The Hon. Premier was quite right when he said that the Health Services have got to the point where they are free but they have been always free. From the conservative days the Hospital gates were opened to all and it is on that basis that future Governments have worked. They have had more money to spend and they have improved it from time to time. Parochial Medical Officers are nothing new in the Island because long ago we have had Local Government in Barbados even if under another name. It is on that basis that all other Governments have developed. The basis of having Health Centres and public assistance, all of that is built on the same thing which was established centuries ago.

4.25 p.m.

Once you have established these customs, it is not easy for any Government to tamper with them. When it comes to the Pay Wards at the General Hospital - at the New Hospital - there is no earthly reason why we should keep the charges in the new Hospital at the same rates as they were at the old Hospital. The amount of \$4.80 a day to be in these wards at the Hospital is just a token payment. If the Hospital is to be opened to visitors as well, by all means, the prices should be in keeping with the standard of the economy today. These prices were fixed before the War; the price at the Tercentenary Wards was \$4.80 per day. I am a Barbadian, but today there is an opportunity for the Government to say that the General Wards should be as they have been. This is something which we have inherited, but where the pay wards are concerned, I think they should be in keeping with today's standards. I do not say that the prices should be unduly high and beyond the means of those who are seeking aid at the Hospital; but there are those who can afford to pay \$15 a day just as any individual pays in any clinic.

Today when we embark on capital works, we are doing it mostly on loan money, which is today costing the Government a sizeable sum, because the rates have risen from 3 1/2% before the War to 6 1/2% and at 95. That is a lot of money to pay for services alone. That only goes to show that the burden which the Government faces to service these loans is the same thing which private industry has to face. Gone are the days when any businessman would be interested in a dividend like 10%; the amount of 10% is nothing because he can invest his money otherwise. For a businessman to risk his money to get 10% is nothing. Businessmen must be allowed a certain amount of thinking. It is not a question of exploiting anybody, but to get around from the idea of this 10% being a proper dividend. That is why the shares are so low in price and nobody wants them. You cannot sell shares when you want to do so and then get this 10%. People must be realistic and allow others to make a reasonable sum on their return.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to know that the Hon. Premier has a grasp of the economy of this island as he has said. He has had the courage to say it so that everyone would realise that there are really no wealthy people in Barbados judging by outside standards. If this money is to be found, it will have to be found, or the most of it, from outside. In order to attract people you must give the incentives with a knowledge of the capital which they are prepared to bring here. As I have said for many years now, this little island cannot continue for long to live on sugar and on sugar alone. We must explore other avenues so as to augment the economy of this island, if we are to achieve and to get the standard of living which we are wishing for all.

Mr. WALCOTT and Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition caught my eye first.

Mr. WALCOTT: But he did not address you.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that I caught your eye first although I did not address you. I have only

risen lest it be thought that, as Leader of the Opposition, I make no contribution to the Estimates for the year 1964-65. It is not given to us to waste time; as I pointed out last year, there are those of us in this Party, although our numbers are small, who must marshal particular portfolios, and the hon. junior member for Christ Church is the hon. member to whom is allocated the handling of figures. Therefore, Sir, I am happy that the hon. member has been able to reply to the very illuminating speech of the Hon. Premier and that has not fallen to be my task. Lest it be said that I would not be offering any congratulatory remarks or throwing any encomiums or getting any favours, I say that we have listened very carefully to the Hon. Premier and, as the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said, we are happy to listen to someone with so sound a knowledge of the economy of this island.

Sir, in going through this Appropriation Bill and making his speech, there are a number of things to which the Hon. Premier has referred, things which we had for many years as planks in our platform in relation to this Chamber, and we listened to them very carefully. I do not want to go over them, but I must say that, at this stage, I would like to disabuse from the mind of anyone anything lest it be thought that we of this Party in the Official Opposition have changed our policy. We note today that the present Socialist Government, by way of their economic policy, are offering sound and constructive development along the lines which we have advocated for some time.

It will be remembered, Sir, that as far back as 1946 or 1948 we advocated the building of a new Hospital, the construction of the East Coast Road and we suggested incentives for industrial development. We advocated hotel development and many other things; but in those days we were laughed at; we were ridiculed and we were told that our only interest in these matters was to get money to be placed into the pockets of the people who are in business.

4.35 p.m.

I was happy to think that there was someone courageous enough to say what the true state of affairs in this country was with regard to taxation, although politically we differ as conservatives from them as socialists. I have often said that whereas 90% of people make a direct contribution of 10% to income tax collections, 10% of the people make the other 90% of the collections, but that does not necessarily mean from the socialist point of view that it is possibly the best distribution of wealth in a country. It has nevertheless been so, and up to the present, no dishonesty has been found among those persons who have had the opportunity of carrying on business and running industries in this country. They have been doing what every businessman has been doing, that is, investing in business with the hope of making money.

I merely stood up, Mr. Speaker, to let it be known that it is not my duty as Leader of the Opposition when a speech is made by the Leader of the House or the Minister of Finance in respect of his budget, to stand up and oppose. I was glad when he made mention of what seemed confusing to me, of a deficit as reported in the Press. I was wondering how the newspapers knew what would be the position when the Budget Speech would be made, as to whether or not there would be this deficiency, because most of us recall that this Government had departed from the old tradition of bringing in the Estimates and making the Budget Speech at the same time, allowing us to know what the position was. It seems to me from the Rules which the Premier has read that the present procedure is the correct one, if not I am sure Your Honour would not have allowed it and would have ruled it out of order. I looked it up myself and it does seem to me that what we were doing all along was incorrect. It is correct that the Estimates and the Appropriation Bill should be laid at the same time. I remember when I sat on the other side of the Table that the now Premier criticised the last Government for not bringing in the Appropriation Bill for many years at the correct time and in fact for not having brought quite a number of them at all.

My colleague, Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, has dealt with the basic economy of the

island, that is, the sugar industry, and without reflecting on any vote of this House, I should like to say what our position as conservatives is relative to savings and the like. After listening to the facts given by the Premier on savings both in the commercial banks and the Government Savings Bank, to me it leaves much to be desired, and the Government must do more to encourage more people to invest and save in the Government Savings Bank. We all appreciate, as the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said, that we have nearly doubled the revenue from sugar sold by this island on the open market, because of the high price it brought during this year, and by getting that price there was a greater distribution of money among the masses. I should like to make it clear without reflecting upon any vote of this House that as far as we are concerned as conservatives, we feel that when money is knocking around some should be saved for rainy days. If we did not stick to that policy, we would not be true to our calling, and that is why a few weeks ago in here we agreed to a motion which was put before this House, and though we have not been airing ourselves on the housetops and getting into the limelight, we want to make it abundantly clear that we still heartily agree that any Government whether socialist or otherwise which suggests to somebody to save money for a rainy day is acting wisely and giving sound and good advice. This is advice which I would give to my son or family, my constituents, and the electorate any part of this Island, and I hope that if we are spared the ravishes of the fire bug during this year that there will be enough money to put aside, and that there will be a greater understanding among the people this year, especially since they did not expect to receive it.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who walk and talk with the wise and associate ourselves with persons connected with agriculture for years dating back from 1898, realise what happened in this country and how people suffered in this country. I am mindful of what happened even during my time in the parish of St. Lucy when sugar went down, when there was no rain, and things went so bad that people in St. Lucy had to pick young slips and cook them. I feel that if people are brought to their senses and stop this stupid burning of canes in this country, and allow us to get the maximum from the crop and make money by selling our sugar on the open market, that they should be encouraged to put some of that money away for a rainy day, because however much the market price is for sugar, we in this country must depend upon rain for our crop; so no matter what the price is and we do not get a good crop, we are no wiser. Lest people think that the Leader of the Opposition is silent on this matter, I want to make it abundantly clear that we do not propose to waste time. On matters of education my colleague the hon. junior member for Bridgetown will speak, and I will let the hon. junior member for Christ Church speak on matters of finance, because I do not think a better person can deal with that Head, since I do not think that anybody can accuse him of trying to seek favours when he made the speech he did today.

4.45 p.m.

I do not think anybody would accuse him of curry-favouring anything. We sat and listened with great attention to him and we really felt that he had to admit, though not directly, that some of the things which they have inherited today, they inherited not from the last Government but from Governments of which I happen to be a member of the existing party at the time.

The Hon. Premier is absolutely correct. There is nobody in the State of New York, except in the case of an accident, who can go into any Hospital free of charge. There is the Blue Cross but you must pay. In case of an accident that is a different matter. As long as you are working you have to pay.

I will not waste the time of the House on this matter and I hope we will be able to get along with consideration of the Estimates after hon. members make their contribution. We do hope that by the time the Hon. Premier is able to make his Budget Speech he would have a greater grasp of the financial position of this Island from his knowledge of what the crop has produced. It seems to us that it will be far below 194,000 tons if destruction goes on at this rate.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am a harsh parliamentarian. I would really like to know what sort of system we have evolved in here because it seems so strange for me to hear a very prominent member of a party who is designated as the Shadow Minister of Finance or the Deputy Leader can speak after the Hon. Premier makes his opening speech on the Budget and that hon. member is speaking for his party and then we get the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who is Head of the Party getting up to underwrite what that hon. member said. I think if I were the leader of the party and my colleague made a speech in reply for the party, well then, I would hold back to wind up for my party or in defence of my colleague if anything was said on which I thought there should be some comment from me.

But what do we find? We are getting this explosion now, these tamborine speeches or testimony speeches where I get up and make my testimony of how glad I am my soul is saved tonight and your getting up after and saying praise God that your soul is saved. I cannot understand this talk of party politics. It really makes me look upon a party and its institutions very reluctant.

Sir, I think I should attempt to deal with something. At the beginning I would say that if I say anything which would appear harsh to what the hon. junior member for Christ Church or what the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown have said, it is because I am diametrically opposed to his party's philosophy and if I inject anything, it is because I am opposed to his political philosophy. The hon. junior member for Christ Church said that he was glad to see that the Hon. Premier has a grasp of the economic position of this Island. The Hon. Premier has a right to have such a grasp. It is not that you are pleased to see him have a grasp. At what stage is the hon. member sitting to determine what the economic grasp of the Premier should be? Is that an indication that businessmen, *ipso facto*, know the economic position and knowing the economic position is synonymous to having a business? Is it because you do business that you are walking with the wise? That is the sort of old hackneyed idea you have because you run a business in Broad Street and people looking like ourselves do not and because we have never reached the higher echelons it now gives the appearance that people like Your Honour and the Hon. Premier should have a grasp of the economic position of the Island.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When I said that the Hon. Premier had a grasp of the economy that was how I saw it. There was no thought of discrimination which entered my mind at any time, therefore, I hope the hon. member will not read that into it. As my party saw it, I said that he had a grasp of the economic position of the Island and I was pleased that the Minister in charge of finance had it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, what point of order is that?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a valid point of elucidation, not a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I drew my conclusion from what the hon. member said. I think what hon. members of this Chamber must learn is that the significance one draws of what an hon. member says is purely one's opinion. I agree with the hon. member; he may not have meant what he said to have been taken in the way I took it. You might have the purest motives. I did not accuse the hon. member of anything but so far as discrimination in business is so engrained in people like the hon. junior member for Christ Church, they do it unconsciously because to some of them it looks like a legacy handed down that certain people are to be in control of the financial riches of this country.

I make no apology for repeating it. It would not be in the Premier's place to reply to it. If the Minister of Finance cannot have a grasp of the economic position of the Island, who is to have the grasp? (A VOICE: Did Dr. Cummins have one?) But you praised him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I said was that he was a genial man.

Mr. WALCOTT: He was a genial idiot.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member addressing the Chair?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the hon. junior member for Christ Church means. But all I say is that a man who has a degree in economics should be able to grasp economic situations although I do not subscribe to the idea that all who have such a degree can deal with the matter as they should but to grasp the significance of the economy of the country should be easy to them. The hon. junior member for Christ Church should not take offence because I have not taken offence by it. I intend to proceed to show that what is part and parcel of the thinking of the community has to be eradicated and removed if we are to make the progress which we should make.
4.55 p.m.

Like the hon. junior member for Christ Church, I would like to compliment the Hon. Premier on his speech. The Hon. Premier has always made forthright speeches on finance. I think that I happened to be one of the only members in this House who, when the Premier made these forthright speeches on taxation was willing to support him. I am not looking through the window of taxation; when the Hon. Premier made his speech on the removal of the subsidy on rice, I supported him because I was saying so before he became Premier. Lots of people are afraid to say so, because there are people who believe that when it comes to a taxation policy, they want to hide their heads in the sand like the ostrich; they want to tell the people that they can give them more out of less and it takes a conundrum to do that. We have a lot of people who want to be covered when a crisis arises; they will say "I told you so" after the event, but there are those who have absolutely no knowledge of the serious implications of running a country. At one stage, they are on the side of evil and at another stage they are on the side of right; but this is a day when you should choose, according to the biblical injunction, Hon. members have to choose on which side they will stand in running a country, otherwise the country will be run by the anarchists.

Mr. Speaker, I do not subscribe to the projection which the hon. member has made about taxation and savings. I refer now to the hon. junior member for Christ Church in relation to dividends; he only sees dividends at the rate of 10% but we see savings in what we can utilise the finances of a country to provide. A 10% or an 8% dividends is not indicative of the wealth of a society, but it is how the money is utilised. My own Organization took the trouble to have an economist to prepare a table on economic planning and development and that is one of the serious things he pointed out. The Government must come face to face with economic and financial planning by means of which it can give marching orders at one stage and at another stage it should be encouraged with the private sector to plan economic development.

I am of the opinion that a whole Government Ministry should be removed and a Ministry of Development should be planned at the highest point because you cannot have it at a stage lower than that. I am not referring to the Planning Unit force; the main responsibility for planning and development must not be at a point at which there is no complete integration with the whole Cabinet system. I say that, not based on my own knowledge, but on the basis of an excellent paper which was prepared by the Economic Planning and Development Department and one says that in so far as Barbados is concerned.

I do not want the hon. member to feel that as to anything he says there is a serious criticism which one would make of it; but what he says has given the Government a pointer as to what is just a simple calculation as to how you arrive at a dividend. It is not the difference between what you borrow and what you make as a dividend, because some of the companies in Barbados borrow money and the money is regarded as an operational charge on the money

which they will pay back. I would like to say that those of us who are Socialists must ignore this blandishment about the Hospital and do not fall into that trap about the fees at the Tercentenary Wards being \$2.40 a day when the hon. junior member for Christ Church went there and \$4.80 is what it is today, because in any case, the amount of money which he will receive from the Tercentenary Wards would be like a snowball in the Sahara, if you are talking in the context of \$32 million.

If we were to say that the Conservatives were giving people a free Hospital and now it is the Socialists who want them to pay, it would be said that the Socialists are making the community as a whole pay for these services. Our *infra-structure* in Barbados is so relatively high, so much of your income is devoted to health services, so much to educational services and so much is devoted to water services that when you think of the *infra-structure* in Barbados the Government's standards may be higher than what the situation is either in British Guiana or in Trinidad. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that it was as far back as the year 1945 when I went to the neighbouring territory of Jamaica and I found that the percentage of income which we, in Barbados, were spending was much higher than it was in either the territory of Jamaica or that of Trinidad.
5.05 p.m.

The Government should always be prepared to answer the stupid and ignorant idea about the cost of living. You cannot get reflected in our cost of living indices in Barbados the amount of money that you spend in those services, that will not be reflected. Government expenditure is not reflected in the cost of living budget; food items and clothing items are reflected. How much the Government spends in education is not reflected; so when in Barbados you say that the cost of living index has risen by so many points, sometimes it is not a true indication of what has taken place in the community, because some communities can spend more in their *infra-structure* and create a better society for the people, and that would not be reflected in your cost of living arrangement. People can only value that when they take a serious view of the economic position and fiscal policies of the country in which they live. I am satisfied and would underwrite the approach which the Premier and the Government is taking in financial matters, because it is a vigorous one and one that Barbadians are not accustomed to. It is an approach that will take some time to assimilate, because we still have in our midst, even among those who sympathise with us, a preponderance of ignorance of some of the requirements of the community. There are some who follow us and are in the same organisations to which we belong who do not really appreciate long-range thinking and projections that things like a bold, fiscal policy can provide, and we have the majority of politicians and people in roles of leadership still at the level of parish pump politicians looking for a postbox, stand pipe or the nearest thing around a village to check, and have not gone out into the atmosphere where they can create new thinking for the people. If those of us who have a little foresight cannot be bold enough to come out and say these things we will continue to have a community after 200 years of manufacturing sugar, and after 300 years of a House of Assembly with a *per capita* income of what it is, because they want to be wedded to sugar only and can see no further than when we had sugar on a plantation system that could only operate on the basis of slavery and free labour. You could never have had a plantation system 300 years ago if you had to pay labour. The system that was raised and nurtured in slavery is still the system today that wants to be the prop of a community that is looking forward to independence. I want to give the warning that if you think about independence, you have to think about defence whether it is in a direct way or indirect way. All of the independent countries in the world have been called upon to make a contribution to their own defence. You have had the example in Africa, in Zanzibar, Tanganyika, Uganda. They all have to make arrangements with the United Kingdom as to what contribution they are going to make towards defence which the British Government is going to offer to them. It is an inescapable responsibility, and we were faced with it when the West Indies Federation was about to be inaugurated. We were told that the time would come when we would have to make a financial contribution towards the alliance we have

10
2170

with some of the powers that be, and I think that is something which the Premier knows is an inescapable concomitant to independence.

Mr. Speaker, when a comparison is made of what the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said, though I agree with some of the things he has expressed, I feel that we should not be mistaken that the hospital as an institution has got to be matched against this exorbitant expenditure and we must go wild now in our thinking and look into the hospital for all the beds on which we can begin to increase prices, because that is going to lead the way to another aspect of political jugglery. I am not saying that, Mr. Speaker, from the point of view of viciousness in politics, but I am saying it from the point of view of our indebtedness to the socialist philosophy, and if we have to make the community pay to maintain a social service like the Hospital it will have to pay, bearing in mind that Barbados is still a low income community, bearing in mind that Barbados still has something like 20% or 25% unemployed, and bearing in mind that this is not like the United States, I heard the Hon. Leader of the Opposition talk about the United States but if they have anything approximating to 10% far less 25% unemployed in the United States, it would become a national crisis and worse than what the situation was in 1929. When the unemployment situation rises in the United States or any of the countries of the Western world above 7%, they regard that as very serious. If we can get ours down there, paying in the hospital would never become a problem, because what I find is that the average Barbadian glories in doing something different from the rest in the sense of what is called in Barbadian colloquialism "showing off". If you ask a Barbadian who feels he is in a good position and becomes ill whether he has been to the hospital, he would reply "no man, to the Clinic!" We have that example in many things. When I was a boy the number of people who went into the 5/- ward could be counted on your hands. The concept of the hospital was to show poverty, because they was a time when they called upon you for wearing your clothes in the hospital, and it was a relief to the hospital if you wore your clothes. In order to relegate you to some pauperism, as the hon. member said, they provided a free hospital, and you were called upon to pay 7/- a week if your family could take your provisions; but to stigmatise you that you were a pauper, you had to be in a pink gown, if you wanted to be there without paying. That has been removed by the socialists concept and there is no more calling on you to pay to wear your own pajamas.

Mr. Speaker, the charge of the 5/- ward would have to be increased since more people go there today because the economy has changed. I can see that the people from the 5/- wards will take over the \$4.80 wards, and people who used to pay \$4.80 in those days will now want to pay a little more, because they want a little more exclusiveness. The number of people who played cricket in my days now play golf in order to get a little further away from us; and you will find people owning boats and aeroplanes for the same reason; so you must find this sort of social distinction - I would not say social inequalities, I do not feel, Mr. Speaker, that the Government should embark on a taxation policy that would impinge on the prices prevailing under social services unless there is an absolute necessity; and unless they have scraped the bottom of the bucket and there is nothing else to touch.

5.15 p.m.

I am not saying that on any low political basis; I am saying it on an economic basis and I am saying it on a basis of not to give the evil ones the opportunity for exploitation.

The Hon. Premier when he spoke on education made a very important point. I have heard it said in this community. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many members of the Hon. Premier's party believe in it, but you will be amazed to know what sort of society this is that we are spending so much money on education and we are begrudging, because I have heard it out of too many people's mouths, the fact that Government has granted secondary education on a free basis; some of them saying that this is only a means of helping the big people and they do not need it. That is the sort of ignorant statement which you get in this community. It is like one of those statements which

you have heard that the Barbados Labour Party got more votes in the last election than the other parties though they lost the election. You add up my votes with your votes and you say you come out having more votes than I. That is the sort of dunces you have. You get people continually repeating that statement. You vote for me and you vote for the other fellow and somebody votes for me and they say they got two and I got one, therefore, the man with the least got the more votes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member is not dealing with the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am dealing with the analogy in people's minds when they say that free secondary education is only for the benefit of the big people. That is an analogy to show that although we are spending a lot of money on education, the most of which we are getting from the few people at top, just like how people count votes and say that though you won the election the Barbados Labour Party got the most votes, you get them saying because some of the rich people's sons or daughters are going to Government-aided secondary schools that you are giving them free secondary education. That thinking is not beyond the members of the Premier's party. That is why a conspiracy of silence among people who should speak out is always a source of danger in this community. Because you are not giving to all the children at private secondary schools free education and because you are providing free secondary education at the Government-aided schools, they say that you must provide free education at the private secondary schools also. It is the sort of idiotic statement which you get that because Jesus was born in a manger he is a cow. Because a rich man has a son going to Harrison College as against ninety-nine poor people's children going there, you should not give the rich man's son his education there free. That is nonsense in the extreme because in any state where you provide something, the state provides it in the manner in which it sees fit. Because the Government sees fit to grant free secondary education at Government-aided schools, and because every child is entitled to free education it does not mean that because you give it to this one you have to give it to all free. I have heard some people say that the education in primary schools today is not as good as it was. They say that the private school teaching is best. I know it balances out itself both ways. There are some children who are going to private secondary schools who cannot spell Ada backwards. It is due sometimes to the aptitude of the child and not the school.

I would say that by the Government making secondary education free to such an extent to all the Government-aided schools, it has done something of a far reaching nature in the education of this country and we cannot see education being reflected in a year or two. It is just like sometimes when I look over the other side and see the hon. junior member for the City and hear his views about the Conservative Party. How can I truly believe that the hon. junior member for the City is a Conservative if we understand what conservatism means. According to his views on education, he is a radical because if he were a conservative, he would be sitting down waiting for a call and not breaking the pace and setting the pace for larger private secondary schools. What he has done by the establishment of this school is indicative of a man who is radical and progressive and not conservative. I believe it would be easier with his many duties to be in the Conservative Party. I believe, may be, when he was moved politically he did not find the area which he wanted to fit in with his radical outlook, therefore, he took that course. It must be said that he has made an outstanding contribution to our education on the basis of his break through in establishing large secondary private schools.

Sir, I feel as I have been hearing and reading that may be some day the policy of education in a community like ours with the advancement of knowledge and understanding, you may find that these private secondary schools may be so absorbed and integrated into your educational system as to take care of the thousands of children who have to be educated and instead of asking the Government in each instance to undertake the very expensive task of providing a school building, your having an integrated sys-

tem where you can have educational control on a basis that you give the community the best for the money which you have.

I would say that you cannot develop a community without people and the basis of the development of any community depends on the pace of the development of your education. If the development of the people is slow the development of the country must of necessity be slow.

Now, Sir, the Hon. Premier made a statement in relation to analysing the situation of what the Government was doing and I hope the people will appreciate it. I go further and I think that this is where I agree and where the hon. junior member for Christ Church and all of us would agree. One of the things in any community when you are going to have development is that you cannot have development unless you have savings. That is why I say when it comes to budgeting the Hon. Premier has to be prudent. I would like to see in this community a situation where you have the private sector existing and you also have the populace existing through the Government. You cannot treat the private sector as if by something which they are doing they are contracting out, therefore I would like to see a National Development Council of an advisory character giving its attention to some of the sort of things of the quality in so far as development goes.
5.25 p.m.

I would like to see a National Development Council of an advisory character paying its attention to some of the serious things in the community in so far as development goes. I would like to see the day come when on your Tourist Board or on your Development Board you have a top-level adviser. I do not mean that you should take away the functions independently that those Boards have to perform today. I say that this new development must come from new thinking. The hon. junior member for Christ Church talked about 10% dividends; there are enterprises which a 10% dividend can suffice but you will have to know what these enterprises are. The Indian Five Year Plan was projected on a basis where it was realised that they could evolve an economy in some sectors on a basis where you could propel the sort of economic projection on which a dividend of 10% or 12% is not a criterion of developing a business or enterprise. I feel that there must be a break through in the dampness of economic thinking and planning. We cannot have one system by next week; there must be an integration of the different systems so that we can have the benefit of that. We want to have a cooperative investment. In any community where we have to spend so much on education, so much on health services and so much on other things, you cannot have the savings to project these things if you want to pay high dividends, because the savings would not be there. This development can only take place if you have made a saving. That cannot project the amount of money you want.

The Hospital serves the purpose of helping your economy, but a hospital in itself is not an economic unit. A school provides the economy for knowledge and power but you have to provide something, you have to make some projection in order to get the school going. Therefore your whole concept must be changed in order to suit the economy in which you are. I cannot be a conservative because I cannot see any Conservative planning meeting the needs of an under-developed community. I believe that any self-respecting citizen must look towards independence because independence in itself an innate quality, is something to which all of us look forward. We all look forward to going into our own home and not continuing under our mother's apron string or our father's coat tail. We, in the community, must look forward to going into our own home; if the Hon. Premier is looking towards taxation and a development policy, he has to look for a policy which is in consonance with all of these requirements. From what the Hon. Premier has said, we have to examine these things very carefully. I am not usually a cautious person but I feel that if your finances are running at the pace at which we are running, then we have to look at the finances and do not be afraid to say that you want the maximum productivity in the things you are doing.

For those who want to look for a cheap vote you will find that your community will be expensive. I do not charge the Civil Servants in a general way with any misdemeanours. The community cannot exist without an efficient Civil Service and a good Civil Service is a *sine qua non* in our development. France is a country which has always boasted of an excellent Civil Service, despite the things which take place. What I am saying cannot be implemented by the Ministers; it can only be implemented by having an efficient Civil Service. A great deal must be done in order to make the Civil Service an efficient, proficient and a loyal one because those are the essential ingredients of any Civil Service; at the same time the Leaders must be told not to look for any scape goats and look to attach blame here and there. It is not a question of the Permanent Secretaries or the Assistant Secretaries or the people in the Clerical Grade, and in saying that, it is not that because your father had put you in a collar and tie that you feel great. We need to say: "This country cannot progress if that is the way in which you want to work for Government funds." You must not be afraid to say that to the lowest level, just because people are your canvassers.

There is an attitude of mind which was all right during the time of the Colonial masters but now you say that you will allow a man to drain the Treasury, not by way of carrying home money or by way of getting a higher salary, but by way of his deciding that he will not shoot the right kind of labour for the money which he has been paid. Such a person is standing up in the road over the work and if that man were to threaten you, you will say to him: "Go and do as you please". Mr. Speaker, I join with the hon. junior member for Christ Church in complimenting the Hon. Premier for analysing the taxation situation, although I still feel that you have not scraped the bottom of the income tax bucket as yet.
5.35 p.m.

I still feel, Mr. Speaker, that you have not scraped the bottom of the income tax bucket, and it is a matter of how you go about it. I agree with the hon. junior member for Christ Church that you can collect more money in income tax. I still see that your deficit will be wiped out not only for next year, because as the Premier has said, the value of sugar this year was something like \$45 million as compared with \$30 million odd last year. When I analyse the amount of income tax you received last year or the year before when the value was \$32 million, and what you can receive now, I feel as an ordinary estimate that you should receive \$4 million more. I believe that I am one of those people who only work for a salary. I get no fees and all my income is known, notwithstanding what you hear people say on platforms to the effect that I have an unknown income, that the employers of this country are so gullible and soft that I only have to appear at their doorsteps and they come out with their money and put it in my hands.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that no man or woman has any right leaving this country unless he or she has satisfied the Income Tax Commissioner of having paid his or her income tax for the year in which he or she is leaving. When the hon. member talks about the hospital, I remember some time in this Assembly that there was some talk of people who went to the hospital and went away owing money, and they were not in a low income bracket either. If a person can have these services in this community, he should pay for them. If a man gets a loan from the Housing Authority, we must have laws which make it obligatory for the place at which he works to deduct the money at that source. A house is a capital venture and something you can own, and no man in any bracket has any right to expect that he can own a house as a gift to pass on to his generation without paying for it. If any man expects that, every man should have it. If I have to pay taxes to provide housing for those who are not able to do it initially, and you lend a man money to buy a house, you must be prepared to make him understand that he has to pay for it, and laws must be passed to that effect. There is no point in belly-aching that he is in debt and cannot pay it. This community, Mr. Speaker, cannot advance on the basis of some people feeling that they have a right not to pay and they expect the big people must pay. The big people control the economy

of this Island and I feel that is where we have to break through. I do not subscribe to the view that the economy of any country should rest solely in the hands of a narrow minority who are not motivated by the same thing by which the majority of people are motivated, because it means that the lives of the community are controlled by the minority. I have no inhibitions and do no soft footing about that, because you cannot get the best out of a community if it is going to be controlled in the economic sector by a narrow minority. You would not have got a Weekes and a Worrell in cricket if cricket was confined only to the Challenors and the Tariltons, because you would not have gone to the B.C.L. and there would be no Charles Griffith.

Mr. SPEAKER: I just wanted to remind the hon. member that Charles Griffith is from St. Lucy.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, St. Lucy must produce something. You would not have been able to get that situation if you did not go in the byways and hedges and garner the people in. If you were still confined to the pre-1923 days, you would still be waiting for more George Challenors and Tariltons; but you have gone the other way and produced Sir Frank Worrell. Do not tell us that the brains in this community are only confined to a narrow ethnic group in Broad Street. Do not tell us that the ability to know what is good for this country can only be found in a few people who have inherited wealth and for that reason the economy must rest in that group. That is where you get stultification, because they are not motivated by what the masses have in mind; they do not possess the same inspirations, and therefore it means that their economic outlook is going to be different from that of the masses of people which exist in the community. That is where I make the broad challenge that the economic formation residing in the hands of a narrow ethnic group is not good for the health of the community. That does not mean that there is any racial antagonism so far as I am concerned. It does not mean as the Premier has said that it is my intention to expropriate those people's wealth and property, but what it does mean is that people and the Government must be made to understand that we can live with them. Many systems can exist together, but for the health and benefit of the community in which they play an important part, it is necessary for them to have a completely different outlook and see that the economic formation cannot be something like a deed of gift or something left in a Will. I do not subscribe to the view that you have to take away a man's wealth, but as the Hon. Premier has said, I agree that the re-distribution of the finances by your fiscal policy can level some of these things, and can alleviate some of these hardships. I do not subscribe to the view that because a rich man's son goes to Harrison College he should not have free education, because you asked the rich man who pays a higher rate of income tax, and makes a higher independent contribution by providing his own medical services. Very rarely does a man in that high group go to the hospital and accept free medical services, because his pride prevents that. We do not want to stultify people who have knowledge and business acumen for the utilisation of money by precluding them from the exercise of this contribution they can make to society. Nothing I say is an indication that these persons should not be allowed or encouraged to make a contribution to society.

As the Hon. Premier has said, Mr. Speaker, I have to issue the warning too that the mere fact that they are looking for capital from outside is one of the things we have to be careful about at this stage in our economy. We have to look for capital from outside, but that is natural because enough savings do not reside inside.

5.45 p.m.

Sugar is produced in British Guiana and the economy is not indigenous to British Guiana's economy. It is Bookers's economy which is an expatriate economy. It can leave British Guiana any day. The economy of Jamaica is not a basic indigenous economy although I will read something which was in The Times last month which has come as a result of the higher prices of sugar in 1963. They received £7 million as a result of the higher price for sugar in 1963 although they sold more sugar at the lower prices. Tate and Lyle control Jamaica and Trinidad. Barbados is the

only sugar producing area in these parts which is being run by individuals. If anything happens to sugar tomorrow these people will have to seek aid from the Government because neither Tate and Lyle nor Bookers would come in here on any 25% control. The sugar owners in this country function in such a way that your economy resides in your own community because they have to live and abide with this situation; they do not leave here and take that money and invest it in Tanganyika, Swaziland, Mozambique or places like that where that money would have a better return.

For that reason, I know that you would have to look for outside money but be conscious of the man outside Russia. You do not mortgage your whole life to an expatriate community so that you become an alien to the society in which you are born. That is why I plea with people in Barbados that it is for the good for us to join together in a movement to create the economic conditions in Barbados for the economic projection of the country in which you will be in control. When you attract people to come to the Island to invest, you attract those people to participate with you and not to participate for themselves. If we continue with the idea of getting people to come and do something for us, that is a colonial concept; it is not the concept of one aiming after independence.

We have to get every penny from every source. I feel that the Government should embark on a particular economic planning which would take into account every sector in the community and would help to give new stimulus to certain sectors of the community. I feel that the private section should be encouraged to invest and reinvest. If I have diverted from the thinking of the hon. junior member for Christ Church it is more in detail than it is in context. I agree that a businessman should have adequate facilities to make a savings and to make a reasonable profit because without that there can be no incentive to do business. I feel that good wages must be the core of a community like ours. I am not making any adverse comments on it but when I saw the other day what was published as the wage for a skilled worker in the garments factory, -- \$10 a week -- I say that it would be better that we underwrite \$500 per annum to provide an industry in Barbados rather than competing with Hong Kong or Japan. That is one of the serious things, so we have to say to some people if you have to underwrite poverty by bringing in an industry, let us look for the industries which would help us. We have to stop this idea of the *laissez faire* which existed one hundred years ago. Some people want to get rich at the expense of poverty. Some people want to get rich at the expense of having cheap servants - servants who cannot get a proper meal or live in a proper home, servants who cannot really educate their children, people who are exposed to all vicious aspects of life such as the alarming high rate of illegitimacy, poor education and disease and by that, it impinges on your social services and it works in a vicious circle around you in such a way that you will have to get a plan which embraces all these aspects of our life and not one.

I am a member of an organisation which says that we lend encouragement to the formation of proper enterprises which would advance the whole level of this community and improve the standard of living in the country.

It is not for me to say when the Hon. Premier introduces his Budget what sort of fiscal and taxation policy he should project, but it is for me to say, and it is my privilege to say it now, that with the trends which are taking place in the country, it does seem to me that the economic position of Barbados at this stage does not need added taxation to get the country through. It is not that I believe that there should be a finality in taxation. There is not such a thing as finality in taxation. As soon as you reach the final stage, the community is ready for an earthquake but as long as you are going to survive on this planet and human beings are going to live on this planet, then it is inevitable that new means of taxation must be found because the very nature of your financing required that.

The Hon. Premier mentioned just now that the new Hospital requires more expenditure. So too, with the schools. If you were to advance your school meals programme it is going to cost \$260,000. That is because of the projection which you have made and you know what that means. I think the Government should be complimented for this. What they are doing in this respect has nullified the critics that it was going to bring the country into disaster and that members of the Government were a bunch of wild boys and did not know what they were doing. And what seems more ungracious is to find that they have been caught up with a viciousness which knows no quarter.
5.55 p.m.

What is most ungracious at this moment is to find that they have been caught up with a viciousness which knows no quarter, and it is purely because the Government itself was somewhat timid to answer some of these things in a positive way. I can very well understand some of the difficulties of a Prime Minister. Apart from the glamour of the office, I do not think that for a Prime Minister in an emergent territory or in a place like Barbados where subterfuge and deceit are the hall mark of the politician's life, it must be difficult to maintain a Party system in the face of so many looking for office, in the face of what I heard some years ago, when I heard the Hon. Leader of the Opposition speak about so many people who were looking for jobs. In this connection, you are told "I want a job or I will fight and vote against you." (*ASIDES*). I am sorry, Sir, that you did not hear the remark which was addressed to the person who was speaking, I say all this because it is time that you realise that you have these problems to face. What a Prime Minister has to face is a national situation and see that he is a person who simply is not afraid to stand up against whatever forces there are without challenging the life and security of the State itself. When a Government is afraid to stand up to the forces which challenge the security of the State itself, then I say that such a Government is not fit to be a Government. Mr. Speaker, I am saying that this Government has allowed the forces of subversion to reach a stage in this country that openly and in Parliament, statements can be used to the effect that a country's economy can be destroyed, an economy on which you base your budget. Your budget is mainly a sugar budget. I want to say, Sir, that a Government which can stand up in the face of a Resolution passed unanimously by Parliament and allow the forces in a country to so destroy the economy and reduce Parliament to a point, by creating the forces outside of Parliament, is underwriting a revolution without firing a shot.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I witnessed some months ago in this Chamber that Parliament could pass something and the image of Parliament has been reduced to a mock-house, because the Government has allowed the country to be taken up by the worse elements in a community to reduce parliament to nothing on the basis of fear. The conspiracy of silence which was perpetuated at which people allowed these subversive elements to take over is the price which you will pay dearly for. That is the type of cowardice on which the country cannot make any progress; that is the sort of thing which you have allowed to take root and which is being underwritten by a sector of a community to which you had once looked upon with integrity. The employers, who say that they used to rule before, have shown an absolute lack of integrity in matters of a national character. You find that because a Government agrees to something which strikes at the root of our economic system, some Parliamentarians took fright on the basis of the lowest and cheapest elements and the types of whom none could take our place in Parliament. We say that we will redeem the country and some of them can come in here and they dare you to speak because you have spoken in a manner in which you want to underwrite the situation in this country for betterment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if that is the state of affairs which is going to obtain, then the Premier has his problems. If

that is the object you are producing in the country like this, you have to take serious significance as to the steps which you are taking when the community is not prepared to regard savings. Are you going to look through the window for people to come and save you from your troubles? I want to say, Sir, that where the rulers rule men are free. We want to understand and the sooner we understand the better, that Barbados, is but an outpost of the Colonial Empire. Each time I go to Brussels and send back a telegram, I have to help the people there; I have to say to the Frenchmen: "This is where you will find Barbados" Barbados is not an important part of the world.

We produce 192,000 tons of sugar and if we do not produce one ton, there is nobody who is going to drink his tea without sugar in it other than the Barbadian himself. Prices are not going to move because we are not producing sugar; and we will be a memory in so far as we are concerned as a sugar-producing colony. As soon as we realise that we are not as important as what we think we are, then we will realise what is happening. Next Monday a Conference sponsored by the United Nations will be taking place in Geneva, and the main business of that Conference is that of emergent territories. There has been a big struggle for many years of Great Britain maintaining prices for the Commonwealth; the Commonwealth is becoming independent and Britain's obligation to the Commonwealth will not be the same as it was when they were colonies.
6.05 p.m.

Africa had become independent, and the more independent action nations begin to take, the less metropolitan Governments feel they have to be involved, and it is going to be every man for himself and the devil takes the hindmost. That is going to be the economic reality of the second half of the Twentieth Century. The economists have done their best to accommodate these things. If we do not get independence and get into the United Nations, but are only depending on getting through the Colonial Office's back door, our situation will be a very unhappy one.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, both Jamaica and Trinidad will be exposed to what is taking place in Geneva next Monday, but not Barbados; and that is why in my closing remarks, — and I compliment the Premier on his speech and on his projections — I should like to draw to his attention that he should not perpetuate this idea that Barbados can go it all alone and the world is waiting for us. The only thing that Barbados still has a right even as an observer to do is to expose the country to the International Labour Conference every year. The Government has repeatedly refused this invitation on the grounds of finance. You cannot measure \$10,000 in the exposure you are making for your country by elevating employers, Government and workers to an international level. Perhaps if your employers had reached a stage of the international level of the I.L.O. what took place here a couple of months ago could not have taken place, because they would have been courageous enough to know what the attitude of employers should be even in a crisis and they would not have to look for holes to shelter.

I say to the Premier, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this idea that the Government cannot participate in I.L.O. because it cost \$10,000 is infinitesimal when you think in terms of the kind of exposure you are creating for your community as distinct from the saving you are making, and the saving is not real at all. It would be no different than in making a saving by chopping off one of your educational votes. My warning to the Premier is that I cannot subscribe to any introduction of additional fees at the hospital. If we have reached the stage where we can provide this as part of our *infra structure*, let people have it, and let us look to something else. I agree with him that the wage level has increased, but I would say to him that he should not say all the time that the wages for the whole service are \$X million. He must still remember that \$20 a week does not move, and if a man is getting \$20 a week he should not regard that we can freeze it at that point. What we have to tell the men is that if we move them from \$20 a week to \$25 a week, we do not want them to go back five steps when they are working, but to come forward 10 steps. I appreciate that in a large voting area, politicians are going to

be afraid to speak up, and the ones who will speak out are the ones who are here now. The ones who want to take our places are the ones who are going to give encouragement to indifference that would reduce the community to nothing. That is where I say that it comes to attitudes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we cannot become an independent country if the workers in Barbados try to see how easily they can work for the greatest amount of money. When you put a site up, everybody wants to see how much he can get out of it. If we are not to pay supervisors and foremen, we must begin to make people's attitude to work change, if not we cannot succeed. Let us take the East Coast Road where you now have workers. I know that somebody will go to the East Coast Road and say that Walcott got in the House of Assembly and said that the people employed on the East Coast Road do not work. Cheap votes are easy to come by, but cheap votes do not build a country. You can only build a country by thinking. I represent workers in an organisation and I make no plea for the workers that I represent that they should get the easiest work and get the best wages. I am not going to create any economic inflation by calling for wages when they do not intend to work anymore, nor am I going to allow the employers to have a profit inflation. I saw an employer on one occasion in this community who was willing to plug back, not for re-investment purposes, in the company a considerable amount of money which would increase the dividend factor in the community, which would make you believe it had gone up. I told him that if he could do that to the company, I must share in some of it, and I was fortunate to have information from London and when I came back to Barbados I was able to reveal it. That is why I say I am not going to plea with the Premier to increase taxation, as he rightly said, to balance the budget.

When it comes to the budget, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will speak more on that, but I can say for myself that the position in Barbados is not an unfavourable one, and there must always be room for improvement. I have given warning to people who are borrowing money from the Government whether from the Housing Board or from the Education Department, and I know that many of the Civil Servants borrow money for motor cars. When they borrow money for education, there is a system through which they repay the money, and I do not feel that we should make any distinction if a man borrows money to build a house, because that is his house and his family's house, and there must be the inalienable right for Government to get back that money. I understand that for political purposes the last Government had people living in houses in this country as if they were owned by them, and some of these people though working for \$30 or \$40 a week owed large sums of money. Is that fair? What justice is there in that, where a man is not unemployed or not hard-pressed? We know there may be cases in which a man loses his job and cannot pay his rent; so we do not chuck him into the street, but see what we can do. There are, however, some people who have inbedded in them that they have no right to pay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I support the Government on this. I feel that the criticisms made against the Government for embarking on Education were unfair, and if the opponents could not praise them, they should say nothing. When a Government has the foresight and courage to do a thing like this in a small community like ours, it is something on which we should compliment them.
6.15 p.m.

The Government has the courage and the foresight. If you cannot bring this marketing person to Barbados something is wrong with our economy and do not fool the people by telling them that if ours have reached a certain market price, what you want for your sugar. We are living in clover but that is the factory's price. That is not going to be the level which you are going to reach all the time, therefore, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said, when money is knocking around, hold some. The Government unfortunately cannot always hold money when it is knocking around. What the Government sometimes is forced to do when money is knocking around is not to tax you too heavily. The Government holds money in trust for the community.

Your budget has risen to \$32 million and it is going up to \$36 million and I am sure before the next five years it is going to \$40 million. You must not encourage people in every obligation that they owe the State. I think all of us who are members of this Chamber and all citizens of the community owe it to the community to encourage everyone to do his best. I feel every person in this community owes a duty to his country - not to the Government in power because the Government in power does not pay taxes as such, the community pays the taxes. Too many of us are afraid of the elements that we have to think of. The man who works in the road and does not do his job but stand up is not at the point of creating jobs, he is looking for a job, and those whose task it is to create jobs know that if a person's action is inimical to the creation of jobs that we have to get somebody else. If the savings are not there, a profit cannot come about.

One hears people saying that the cost of living has risen. One of the biggest indications in the rise of the cost of living is low productivity. If a man has to make a bat or a book and he is going to take ten man days to do it when four can do it, the cost to the person who buys it is more and he is depriving that person of more money.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I congratulate the Hon. Premier for the projection which he has made. I agree with some of the points which the hon. junior member for Christ Church has made. We are not bad friends by our fundamental philosophical differences. We share the same views about national savings, about the right of the private sector to have full facility and to make savings, although we do not agree on the size of the dividends which they should retain because that is always going to be a difference between a person of a socialist concept and a person of a conservative concept. Where the social democrat feels that his system is better than the conservative system is that we do not feel that the redistribution of wealth should be shared amongst the one sector in predominance but we feel the redistribution of the wealth should be shared by the whole community and those who have made the greatest effort should be rewarded accordingly. We do not subscribe to the idea that the manager should not get a higher reward than the man who is the messenger but we feel if the messenger is making a contribution he should be able to live decently. For that reason, I think the hon. member and myself will always differ but we are not violently opposed to each other. I believe it would be more difficult for him to have my views than it is for me to share his views. With a poor man, if he gets money, nobody worries if he does not get on with his money, but with a man who has money and he does not get on, people regard him as an outcast and we have a classic example in the Leader of the Opposition. He is a conservative. You can only be a conservative if you have money. You cannot be a poor man and be a conservative. Conservatism and poverty seem to be like fuel and matches. As I have said, we have a perfect example of that in the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member would just give way, I would just like to remind the hon. member that the conservative party has just called a meeting and at that meeting, four out of every ten members were socialists. The hon. member has known me long enough to know that I always held conservative views. He has known me from the time that we did Pond-side debating.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I never knew the hon. member when there was nothing in the kitty. From the time I knew him, there was something in the kitty. Therefore, it would not be difficult for him to be a member of the conservative party from all that time. It would be difficult for me because I did not have anything in the kitty. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is my friend, I believe he would be one of my best friends if I were in trouble because he is a man to whom I could go and get anything which I want and I believe he would give it to me easier than if I went to anybody else. I am sure about that so I do not have to make any boast about it. The other hon. member apart from the hon. junior member for Christ Church, that is to say, the hon. senior member for St. Michael and the hon. junior

member for the City are all affluent members of the society in which we live. We do not begrudge them. They are welcome in this Chamber because they have their contribution to make but where we differ is purely as regards our political philosophy. The hon. junior member for Christ Church has shown what I would regard as a remarkable change in outlook in keeping with the times. I would say that he is not one of those hardheaded conservatives who see that things are changing and says "not with me". That is why his presence in this Chamber must be unique. I say this without any question of discrimination. It is remarkable that in a society like this which has changed so completely to find that as a man apart from being a politician the hon. member finds it easy to mix. I agree with him, even if I do not put it the same way, that the Hon. Premier has shown and has demonstrated that the economic projections which he has are in keeping with any progressive thinking and no one should oppose or minimise these things. Any person who does not see it that way is not doing justice to reality. 6.25 p.m.

I would like to compliment the Government for making these things so clear to us and, like the ones who spoke, I give this Appropriation Bill my unqualified support.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is now my turn to speak on the Estimates for the year 1964-65. Due to a change in policy in the past years, the speech made by the Hon. Premier is not to be regarded as a Budget Speech and therefore questions of finance, policy and taxation must be deferred until, it may be, June this year, until some knowledge of what the economic needs of the country would be. This Bill deals exclusively with the Estimates; it is more or less a Memorandum on the Estimates for 1964-65. We could probably take this to bits Head by Head, and spend a lot of time on the discussion which would be lost unless we are aware of what the Hon. Premier's taxation policy will be.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is revealing is this Digest of Statistics. If I may be permitted to look quickly at the Memorandum, one is somewhat lost in timidity in the approach towards the country's finances or its financial position, changed as it has been in the past five years. As regards Income Tax, Death Duties and Stamp Duties there has been an increase from \$8,900,000 to \$10,090,000, an increase of roughly \$1 million. The recent trend of the last two or three years would indicate that this could stand an increase. There is an increase over and above \$1 million in Customs and Excise and I should like to say that there are a lot of companies in this country which could stand an increase of an excess tax over and above what you would tax the small man making a profit on the basis of 40%. When we are dealing with Customs and Excise, there is a lack in the breakdown. Excise Duties on rum and beer and other things all add up to a total receipt of \$27,072 million and that is roughly an increase of \$3 million this year as compared with what it was last year although you anticipated a consumption tax this year.

As I say, Sir, you cannot make a speech on the Estimates unless you are bound up in some way with what your taxation policy will be. On the other side of the sheet, there is the expenditure. You have Interest and Sinking Fund Charges, \$3,021 million which represents one tenth of your takings. That is nothing to be afraid of. I am thinking of the Public Debt as we know it. If you were to look at the Harbour, and compare it with 1963-64, there will be something considerable as to what you anticipated. When we look at the very intriguing Digest of Statistics, the estimate of the Island's population is something to concern ourselves with, as we think of the school-leaving population, and there is a net migration loss of 1,701. We want to be very careful as to where we are going, whether it is not possible to take something more from what you can give. We are now in 1964 and what is to be noted is that there is an increase in the free sugar market. You are taking more in the Harbour and you are saving; the free market price at present is in the vicinity of £67 per ton.

The fall in the local consumption of rum of some thirty-seven thousand gallons is abnormal; in spite of the fact

that there was an increase in your exports, you were still down by some 25,000 gallons. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will agree with me that these are things which indicate that there is a lack of confidence, enthusiasm and vitality which are required to carry the country forward. The statistics are revealing. These are the domestic imports. The total value of domestic imports in 1963 was \$53.6 million and that was provisional, as compared with \$37.1 million in 1962. If you were to look quickly at these figures or at these things, they will frighten you. You are committed to an expenditure of \$33,234,043 as against an estimated revenue of \$32,483,642, which represents a deficit of \$750,401.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, all of these things confirm the examination and belief that there is a lacking in interest and that there is a timidity in carrying forward your country to progress. The total value of re-exports in 1963 was \$16.3 million as compared with \$13.2 million in 1962. The total value of imports was \$98.9 million in 1963 as compared with \$89.1 million in 1962. That gives a differential of \$10 million. 6.35 p.m.

The total value of imports was \$98.9 million in 1963 as compared with \$89.1 million in 1962. That gives a differential of \$10 million, and all these things leave one to imagine that there must have been some reason. Your visible trade balance was less favourable in the attempt to close the trade gap of \$38.7 million in 1962 as against \$29 million in 1963. These things lead one to believe that you are either lacking in enthusiasm or there is a basic human fear, something that obsesses the thinkers in modern and emerging societies. The question of emigration is one that we need to examine. I do not know what has happened, because we could have gone much further.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, last year we started with a deficit, and there was no reason to fear or doubt whether money would be forthcoming. You are planning a capital expenditure of \$10,598,698. All this money you are hoping to borrow from loan funds. For development and industry you are spending \$2 million; this is coming from your surplus balances. Last year at the end of the Estimates we were worried about taxation and as to whether we could cover the deficit. From surplus balances you are going to spend \$2,187,000 towards capital expenditure which is fixed at \$10 1/2 million. You are worried as to whether or not you can get \$50,000 from C.D. & W. Funds, and it is expected that more money will become available from the C.D. & W. allocation of \$2.8 million probably up to March 31st, 1966. The percentage for this year and what it will reveal is probably still unknown, but this will reduce the loan Fund fixed at \$8 million. There is very much to be done, and it is a pity that with the number of organisations and institutions, that the breakdown is not as revealing as it should be, because it is not as detailed. For instance, the second largest collection after income tax is from Import Duties to the tune of \$10 million, but on the other side there has been nothing tremendous except the sudden change in education, and there is a number of ways you can save money in order to carry forward capital development which we need so very much.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I said earlier this is not a budget and you cannot think in terms of a budget speech. If you think in terms of a budget speech, it must be bound up with financial policy, and you want to be concerned with taxation which cannot be revealed until June or some time this year when the Premier will give his Budget Speech. We are at the moment toying with what may appear to be a colossal sum of \$33 million expenditure as against \$32 million revenue. I am sorry if this should bring any pain or hurt to anyone, but I am unhappy and to some extent frightened to think that with the Harbour project and what it yields and from the many other things as indicated in your digest you have hesitated to use money especially from your excess taxation. I am still convinced, Sir, that after a third or fourth study, and having listened to every single word the Premier had to say on the Estimates today and a quick analysis of the memorandum on the Estimates for 1964-65 together with the very revealing facts set out in

the Statistical Digest, this budget is sadly lacking in enthusiasm and the vitality necessary to carry the country forward.

We can spend hours talking on the various heads, and the debate on the hospital can take three or four hours alone, but the various Heads will provide a lovely opportunity for a wonderful chat as we go into the various Ministries to see how this money is going to be spent. In a growing society, all we have is the speculation of spending \$10 1/2 million in capital expenditure, and it is going to be a question of where we are going, but you can understand that we are going for \$8 million on the outside, because we will be utilising surplus balances to the tune of \$2 million. I do not think I need to say more on this. I can elaborate and spend hours on agriculture with all the flannel and fuzz of that department till the cows come home. I regret that my view of this is that it is gravely lacking in enthusiasm, the energy and vitality required to take the country another step in its prosperity. Since it is unnecessary to attempt to discuss the other departments in the absence of any knowledge of what the taxation policy will be, and it would be farcical to speculate on something we have no idea of, and in order to avoid saying one word more than is at all necessary on the Estimates, I shall close my remarks and resort to the Committee as we attempt to debate the Estimates.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will not be very long on this because quite a lot has been said and I would not term this a budget speech. I do not see the black box before the Premier; so I have no fear. I am, however, going to comment on one point made by the Hon. Premier that the large business houses should be made to encourage the small people when they are borrowing money for expansion. Mr. Deputy Speaker, only 10% of the people of this country pay taxes, because they earn the money; so you cannot make 20% pay. Let me show how seriously the Government takes this 10%. I know at the Customs that they are trying to safeguard themselves, but a private individual cannot get a cheque redeemed there after banking hours unless he gets the O.K. from the bank, but in the case of a company, this can be done after closing hours without an O.K. from the bank; so that alone will tell you that even the Government is afraid of the small man.
6.45 p.m.

That person, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has no chance whatsoever of drawing up or lining up himself with the big shots of this country and the bank managers are not going to deal with one individual who cannot show securities and collateral of this sort, but you get a few joining together in a company and running all the businesses, therefore, at that rate, you will never be able to get a small man in between. He will be completely squeezed outside the banks.

Sir, I feel the Hon. Premier would like to see the small fellow doing something with the big fellow. I would not say it is possible but he will always have to tax ten per cent of the people because the small fellows have no chance at all. Every ten of the people who are doing business within that ten percent should pay the taxes. It is plain to be seen.

The Hon. Premier said that he is glad to see that the people have confidence in the Barbados Savings Bank and that they are using the Bank depositing colossal sums. I believe he has forgotten the statement which he made in here when he had to come back the next week and try to allay the fears of the people. If they had lost confidence in the banks, it was because of what came from the Hon. Premier's mouth.

You will notice from the Digest of Statistics, paragraph 4, that there was a fall in local consumption of rum. In 1963, the quantity on which duty was paid totalled 342,250 proof wine gallons as compared with 379,384 wine gallons in 1962.

He also said today that there are some people who are shouting at paying the four cents levy on a half gill of rum. He has also told us here that there was a drop in the sales. The additional levy of four cents is responsible for it and

if he does not know it, I am saying it now. The people shouted and stopped shouting but they also stopped drinking too and I am sure that if the increase was not so high, we would have collected more taxes from that source. That levy has caused the reduction. I told him so when he put it on and here it is he has come back to me and admitted that there is a fall in the sales. The people have shown their disapproval by not drinking rum.

I know, Sir, that you must get money to run the country. I am not so foolish as to think otherwise. There again, you would like to see small people doing business with the big people. What has happened with Banks Breweries? You will notice that the local beer has made an increase in sales and the sales of the imported beer have dropped. What is responsible for that? It is because he has reduced the tax on Banks and if he did not do that, he would have crippled Banks altogether. The Hon. Premier still wants to see small people in business. One side of his mouth he says that he wants to see the small people in business and the other side he is pushing them out.

I am glad to see that Banks has made a handsome increase in the sale of their beer. There are various people who have showered bouquets on the Hon. Premier for his speech. I do not have to shower any bouquets on him because whatever he does is his duty. Here it is I find myself in trouble and I want the best barrister to help me out. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I find myself in your office because I feel that you are the best. No sooner than I have put my money in your hands, I feel that I am in safe hands. I can get the job done by another barrister but I want the best. After you have succeeded in getting me off, must I come and shower bouquets on you when I paid you for what you have done? Would it be right for you to come and say "Smithie boy, I have done all I could for you". Oh no, I have paid you and you have done your job. I know that the hon. junior member for Christ Church has a good cook and he is paying her \$12 a week. I want a good cook so I pay her \$15 a week. I expect when I pay her that money, I will not have to go down in the kitchen to thank her for putting a good meal; I have done that already because I have paid her and increased her wages.

Here it is, everybody is praising the Hon. Premier for doing his job. I would not want him as Premier if he could not do his job. There is a lot of people from whom we could have chosen a Premier, but the way the Hon. Premier went to the people and told them that he is one of the best economists, one of the best which walked in leather, they elected him, therefore, now that he has come and displayed it on the floor of the House, must we shower bouquets on him when he got in here on that and we are paying him for that? Oh no, he is doing his job; if not, he would not be deserving of being called the Premier. It is the duty of the Government to do all it possibly can for the people. In other words, I take it that it is the duty of the Premier to think widely, lengthily and strongly, and however he moves off, whenever he is saying his prayers at night, he must mention the people of this country as well as whenever he walks because he is responsible for them and he should do everything which lies in his power for them.
6.55 p.m.

Whatever a Premier does for his country, it is not his own money which he is taking out of his pocket; it is the people's money and therefore I do not see why he or any other Premier should be praising himself for what he has done for the people. It is his duty to do that, but on top of that today, the Premier has also tried to show that the last Government was the worse Government in the world, and that he could not compare his Ministers with those of the last Government. He is the genius; all of his Ministers are genuises and still he has to throw a tax on that commodity which people like to drink and cause the sales to drop. He nearly had Banks down to his feet in the way he put on the taxation and he and his Ministers are still working such great wonders.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is getting late and I really do not want to go on for too much longer because we are not dealing with a Budget Speech. The Hon. Premier has re-

ferred to the money which was collected from the "Wind-fall", as I believe he was referring to; the people who had the money spent it and it will soon be coming back to him by way of income tax. If the people have put all the money into the Bank, they will take it out sometime and I may say that the Banks have to pay interest too.

As far as the Hospital rates are concerned, from the way in which the Premier and the hon. junior member for Christ Church have spoken, it would appear that they would be in favour of increasing the cost a little more now that we have a new Hospital. I would say, Sir, that we have to be very careful in doing a thing like that, because if you are doing a small business and you are expanding it, you are doing so because you want to get the profits. The individual profits will be lost but the over-all turnover will be more. I would not like the Hon. Premier to think about increasing the Hospital rates at the moment because you are still dealing with the same people with whom you have been dealing all along. The same people who are going into the new Hospital will be the same ones who are now in the old Hospital. I believe that you made the rates so as to suit the people. I do not think it would be a wise thing to increase the rates no sooner than you have moved into the new Hospital because, after all, it is the people's money which has built the Hospital and, as the Hon. Premier says, posterity will have to pay for it.

I do not think you should try to get back this money out of the people in a year; if you make the fees too high up there, the private hospitals will still get their full share of business. The five shillings a day Ward is always crowded; people only go into the \$4.80 a day Ward if they cannot get into the five shillings a day Ward. I would suggest, Sir, that we allow the rates to remain just where they are because you are dealing with the same poor people. If you are going to change these rates you have to be very careful about that. You may have a man who has his wife and six children and he is the only breadwinner; you may have another man who only has his wife but you have the other man with his wife and six or eight children and he has to pay for the education of his children; in that case you are looking for trouble. I would not encourage any increase in the rates at the Hospital and then when you do it you say that you should not have done it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, relative to the matter of housing, people are allowed to live in the Government houses for nothing. I happened to be listening at one of the meetings which was held in Grazettes and one of the speakers told the people that the houses are theirs and they should not pay one cent for them. One of the speakers, a member of this particular Government, told the people not to pay one cent for these houses and now they are talking about cheap politics and cheap votes. I do not know who is the cheap Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have made a lot of notes here, notes on which I could speak, but I feel that it is time that we should have the suspension of this sitting now. This is not the time for me to say anything more; I will wait until the Black Box comes down.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to add my voice to the voices of hon. members who have spoken in support of this Appropriation Bill. I would like, first of all, to compliment the Hon. Premier on the manner in which he has introduced this Bill and on his knowledge of the finances of this Island. As you know, Sir, from the very first day on which I entered this House, I said that I would not come in here to waste time. I am an independent socialist. This Appropriation Bill was introduced by the Hon. Minister of Finance who is also a socialist and who is the Head of a Party. I feel, Sir, that the majority of us in this Chamber are socialists and if we are able to unite for the benefit of the people of this island, that would make it much easier for us to reach the goal.

7.05 p.m.

The conservatives in this House, Sir, are in the minority, and today there was no criticism levelled by any member of the Conservative Party against this Appropriation

Bill, therefore I do not feel that any member who claims to be a socialist should make any criticisms. There are a few questions I have to ask, but that can be done when we are in Committee. I have always read that the best man makes a mistake, and a mistake could be in this Bill. However, I see no reason why it should be criticised. I do not subscribe to my colleague's view that because a person is being paid, he should not be praised, because sometimes your servants do not all work alike; some work willingly and put all their interest in the job, and for that reason not only should you think of paying them, but you should give them a word of praise. I am therefore saying a word of praise today to the Premier who as Minister of Finance has handled his job very carefully for the benefit of not only the members of this House, but for the people whom all of us are here to serve.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the House while in Committee to deal with the Appropriation Bill.

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

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

HEAD 1 - GOVERNOR

Head 1 - Governor - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, under Head 1 - Item 4, - Private Secretary - I want to insert the sum of \$240, and the note is to read "remuneration at the rate of \$20 a month in respect of Cypher duties done at Government House outside of normal official working hours. Under Item 5 - Cypher Officer - I want to insert the sum of \$240, and the note is to read "remuneration at the rate of \$20 a month in respect of Cypher duties done at Government House outside of normal official working hours.

I beg to move that the sum of \$35,048 under Head 1 - Governor - as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. SMITH: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I should like to know from the Hon. Minister what he is going to do relative to the suspension, because we were here from 2.30 p.m., and it is now 7.05 p.m. I should like to know how much longer he is going to work. We have been here from 2.30 p.m. and it is after 7 p.m., and we have not been told anything at all. After all we are men and not children.

The question that the sum of \$35,048 under Head 1 - Governor, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who has just spoken is perfectly entitled to ask the question he did, but certainly not in the manner he did. There is no reason for being offensive in a simple matter like this. We have been in here for four hours. Is he suggesting we have never worked for four hours before? We have done it dozens of times, but the point is that there must be a certain amount of technique in controlling these matters. The hon. member is aware that if we had gone for dinner before we go into Committee, some of them would come back well fortified and talk for two hours on the second reading, and the position is that we have the obligation to get this matter through with all expedition, and while we want to see members have an oppor-

tunity of a break, we do not want them to take advantage of the House and therefore we started Committee of Supply in order to do two items and then to report progress. After we have finished these items, we are going to suspend the Sitting.

HEAD 2 — SERVICE COMMISSIONS

Head 2 — Service Commissions — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, there is a slight amendment to the note under Head 2 — Service Commissions. Under Item 4, we want the note to read "bracketed and interchangeable with Administrative Assistants a total of eleven posts."

I beg to move that the sum of \$586,546 under Head 2 — Service Commissions — as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$586,546 under Head 2 — Service Commissions — stand part of the schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 8.00 p.m.

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

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

7.15 p.m.

On resumption,

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee.

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

HEAD 3 — LEGISLATURE

Head 3 — Legislature — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that the sum of \$63,879 under Head 3 — Legislature — stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, under Head 3 — Legislature, Item 19 (a), Refreshments, I am pleased to see this Item has been re-introduced again. I was never in favour of the removal of this Item because if it is handled judiciously, it is but right that members should have some form of refreshments at intervals. Early in this Government's Session, when there was no such thing, you could have just shut off that refreshment room entirely. There was no opportunity to meet members such as when you used to go in that room and although it is not considered as a club, I think that opportunity should be given to members to meet one another around that Table, because a lot of useful discussions can take place. For that reason, I am very pleased to see under this Head the re-introduction of this Item again.

I take this opportunity to say that certain of the meals can be somewhat in keeping with the meals for that time. If you have lunch and tea, there is no reason why you should have lunch, tea and dinner. If we are going to have lunch, you certainly do not want tea if you are going to meet until after dinner time. It depends on the time of the meeting. I am sure the Speaker can interview members and find the best way of using this vote.

The question that the sum of \$63,879 under Head 3, Legislature, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 4 — AUDITOR GENERAL

Head 4 — Auditor General — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that the sum of \$5,206 Head 4, Auditor General, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 5 — JUDICIARY

Head 5 — Judiciary — was called

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that the sum of \$52,512 under Head 5, Judiciary, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 6 — LEGAL

Head 6 — Legal — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that the sum of \$4,133 under Head 6, Legal, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 7 — REGISTRATION

Head 7 — Registration — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that the sum of \$37,894 under Head 7, Registration, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Chairman, I will again draw to the notice of the Government the suffering of the general public who have to go to the Registration Office to obtain certificates and other documents. I brought this matter to the notice of the Government some time last year and nothing has been done. If people require certificates or other documents they have to go to the Department and give the information which they want and return another day. I feel that is not good enough; I feel the masses should be taken into consideration. I am sure somewhere down the line there must be some suffering caused through it. The Government should introduce a scheme whereby the loss of one bus fare would ensure a person receiving a certificate. He should not be made to lose two or three bus fares.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the last speaker. I know that

several persons have suffered under the same conditions. Hitherto, when deaths were registered by the Police, you could have taken in the doctor's certificate and you could have had any number of certificates from the Police Headquarters, District A, or any of the Police Stations. Sometimes you are placed in difficulty in shipping corpses and the present situation today is that you will have to carry in a certificate whether it is from the General Hospital or any of the other institutions and then you are told to come back in three days and when you go back you have to make application.

I feel that is a loss of paper and time. On several occasions I have known that the death of a person has been registered from one of these institutions and when you call on the Registrar's Office, there you are told that the death has not been registered. I can tell you of the case of a gentleman from College Savannah who lost six consecutive days in trying to get a Death Certificate and that run him up to approximately six months before he got it. He was awaiting the receipt of that death certificate to collect a few dollars from one of the banks in this Island. I, myself, made enquiries for him and I, too, was told that the death was not registered. I went to the General Hospital and a lady there showed me where it was registered six months ago. I went back to the Registrar's Office and they told me that it was not registered. They telephoned the Barbados General Hospital and they found it.

I feel all that is a loss of time and creates a hardship on the poor people of this Island. People from far out districts, such as St. Joseph and St. Lucy, go to the General Hospital when they want to get the death certificate of some relative. It must be registered at the Registration Office, and when you go there you are told it is not registered. I would like the Hon. Minister in charge to come to the rescue of these people because they are solely depending on your help.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, lest you think that a member of my party is singing any solo, I rise to draw to the Hon. Minister's attention to something which is happening. You are dealing with this Department, the Registry, and I will tell you that something has gone wrong. I seldom like to make these complaints but it is becoming a habit. Once may be called an accident, twice may be called a coincidence but the third time is a habit. As a matter of fact, speaking about the Registry, there seems to be some conflict of opinion between the Medical Officer and the Registry as to who is in charge of the Government Mortuary at the Hospital. It is a separate and distinct building although the same building is in the General Hospital.

My honourable friend who has just sat down, can also bear me out on this. He may have forgotten to speak about it. Somebody must speak to the man in charge of this Mortuary. I am addressing my remarks to the Hon. Minister of Health and Social Services. Where persons die in this country suddenly and have not seen a doctor for some time — I think it is three months — it becomes necessary to perform a *post mortem* examination and, as the law states, the Magistrate of the particular area or district who is the coroner must so order it. I speak of these things because of the extraordinary expense one has to go through because of lack of interest or because someone is disinterested in doing his duty. The Coroner orders a *post-mortem* and we have had cases where three days after, and, as long as four days after, the body of a person was in the Mortuary and then when they sent for the porters or those persons who worked doing this job, they refused to handle the body. We have registered many complaints about this matter and they seem to be at loggerheads as to whose duty it is to do this work.

Quite recently, an old man or old woman was found dead in a house and the coroner ordered an autopsy and when the medical practitioner got there he found conditions so shocking that he could not do it. Let me tell you that there is nothing in this country which binds or can compel any medical practitioner to do it. All the law says is that he should be paid to do it. You cannot insist, therefore,

you get private medical practitioners refusing to do it because of the insanitary conditions which exist because of the mortuary being left open and flies swarming around the body and because they do not tell you until two days after.
8.15 p.m.

When you ask the Director of Medical Services, well, does it not seem to you that the Police Sergeant should be the person to do this? Are we going to be faced with what we were faced with at the Leprosarium when a Matron had to do the work? There are those of us who would not say things in this Chamber because they think they would offend a doctor. However, Sir, something has gone wrong at this Mortuary. Occasionally when you ask the Public Assistance Committee of St. Michael to remove these dead people, it costs you something between \$80 and \$100. I would say, Sir, that recently they had to shovel up one of these dead people — it was a most unsatisfactory state of affairs.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. The Hospital is not responsible for the Public Mortuary, if the hon. member is referring to that. I do not hold any responsibility for the Public Mortuary nor is any employee under my administration responsible for it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the Hon. Minister very much. I may tell the hon. member that we had cases from the Hospital — let the doctor deny this. If he is liar, I will say that he is a liar. I agree with the Hon. Minister that, in the majority of cases, these are not Hospital cases, but, some are Hospital cases. I am saying, Sir, that we had one case quite recently in such a bad state that we had to pay \$120 so as to shovel up the person who had been dead apparently for four days. The Director of Medical Services says that it is the Registrar who is responsible, somebody else says that it is the Chief Clerk of the Magistrate's Court, but we must bring the matter before this House. The doctor said that he was prepared to perform this postmortem examination but there was nobody whom he could find in charge.

I do not believe that the Hon. Minister of Social Services will take any umbrage at this, but we must respect the feelings of the relatives of those who have departed. There is feeling in this country amongst some people that they will never like, if they can help it, a *post mortem* examination performed on any of their relatives when they die. There is that feeling which exists among people; where a man has attended the General Hospital and has had an operation less than three months ago and his case is diagnosed to be one of a malignant nature, then he dies and you go to a doctor in that connection, under no circumstances will these gentlemen give these poor people a certificate for the burial. I do not know if it is the idea of getting three guineas or what, but there are people who complain that they do not want to have such and such a deceased person opened and the doctor has refused to give them a certificate for burial. Will the Hon. Minister help us in this matter? You have some dead person at the Mortuary at the Hospital; you cannot tell a porter that he must lift or assist in lifting that person and because he refuses — it may be somebody who had died some three or four days ago. This sort of thing has been going on for too long and I hope the Hon. Minister or the person who is responsible for the Public Mortuary and the one who is responsible for the Mortuary at the General Hospital will handle this matter in the appropriate manner so as to allay the fears of people in this direction.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, while we are dealing with the Mortuary at the General Hospital I want to know what is happening up there. I understand that the Secretary or the Governor-General up there would not allow the Porters to help bear any corpse from the Mortuary to the hearse. I think it is the duty of the Orderlies, I think they are called, to assist in bearing out the dead people. In the same way that the Orderlies can bear in the people who are living, they should be there to help bear out those who are dead. You cannot expect merely the people who are sent with the hearse to bear the dead; but, as I say, Sir, you

have a Governor-General up there who would interfere in the matter because an undertaker will send along a little berry for the porter when he assists in these matters, I hope, Sir, that the matter will be taken up in the proper quarter.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I should like to inform the hon. member that the Orderlies at the Hospital are not paid for bearing the corpse from the Mortuary to the funeral coach. If the hon. junior member for St. Joseph had a corpse at his home and I was an undertaker and he gave me the turnout, as it is called, he would expect me to have the corpse borne from the home to the funeral coach.
8.25 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, it is the duty of the undertaker to get out the corpse. That is what he is paid for, and not the Porters at the Hospital; therefore both hon. members are branding the Porters or the Orderlies at the Hospital with something they are not responsible for.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I do not know which two members the Hon. Minister is talking about. I will tell the hon. member that I would do what I did two weeks ago, that is, leave the corpse there and let them eat it if they want to. If we are paying the Porters from public funds, do you mean to say that they should not assist at the death room?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would give way, I should like to tell him that I am talking about the public mortuary. It is not the duty of the Porters at the Hospital to assist in the removal of corpses from the public mortuary. To the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, I would say that when a person is given a turnout, it is not the duty of the Orderlies at the Hospital to take the corpse to the coach.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I never said it was the duty of the Porters at the Hospital. As a matter of fact, I said I do not think the Hospital has anything to do with the public mortuary. There is a man in charge there, and all I am asking is that when a *post-mortem* has been performed on Monday, do not wait until Wednesday to ask for the corpse to be buried. When the Police find somebody who has died, the corpse is taken to the public mortuary and a doctor performs a *post-mortem*. What I am pointing out to the Hon. Minister is that after the *post-mortem* is performed, the body remains there. Nobody notifies the appropriate people to come and bury the body until the place is full of flies and the whole of Bay Street stinks. This is not a criticism of the Minister; I am only asking him to see that the person responsible for the mortuary does his duty. The Minister must find out why they would not give people the certificate within a certain time.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On that score, Mr. Chairman, I will investigate the question of the issuing of the certificate. The hon. member mentioned in his address that the Orderlies at the Hospital did not lend a hand.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I never mentioned anything about the Orderlies at the General Hospital. I was referring to the Registry, but if he wants me to say something about the Orderlies at the Hospital, I can say it now.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I simply drew attention to what is happening at the Hospital mortuary, and the Minister replied asking if I had a job at my home whether I wanted the Orderlies to come there and bear it out.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I did not say so.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I can clearly see that the Minister is encouraging the people up there with what they are doing, because that is what used to happen before. The Orderlies used to assist in bearing out the corpse, and I have told the Minister that they used to get a "berry", but the Governor-general up there stopped that. All the

Minister has to do is to instruct the Porters to assist, but he has told me about what a person would do if he had a corpse at home. What I want him to understand is that if an undertaker from St. Lucy or St. Joseph had a corpse at the Hospital, he would have to employ four men to send for the corpse for which they would be paid, but the family would have to pay and they would be very poor people. This is an institution which is run with the taxpayers' money, and the Governor-General up there is paid with taxpayers' money, and I cannot see why they have stopped the practice. All the Minister has to do is to instruct the Governor-General there to allow the Porters to assist. If it is not the Orderlies' duty, is it mine or yours? The Orderlies bear the corpse inside; why can't they bear it out?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I did not want to get into this, but I am getting into it from a workers' representative's point of view. The people in this Assembly seem to be going crazy. If people insist that the delivering of deads is a matter of Orderlies, I will become extremely difficult. It is no part of any workman's duty anywhere to make the delivery of such things. It is the duty of the employer to undertake all the necessities to carry out his function in this respect. There are cases where deliveries are made by people, and there are others where no deliveries are made, but you send for the articles. In normal circumstances, do you believe that if you go to the Port that any of the Port workers is going to deliver something to you beyond the point at which you are to expect delivery? If you have to go to the Hospital for a corpse, you have to accept it from where it is going to be given to you, and nobody has to provide you with assistance. The point raised about whether the undertaker comes from St. Lucy or Timbuctu makes no difference, because he should charge for it. When the hon. member talks about poor people, does he mean that only poor people die? When an undertaker charges for a job, he makes that charge including all the things involved in the job, no matter what they are. If he is running a business, he has to make a charge appropriate to what he has to perform, and if part of the performance is putting an announcement over Rediffusion, or carrying an additional man to do something, those are charges made for doing the job as an ordinary business arrangement. What is the point of saying that the Orderlies are paid from public funds? Is it the Orderlies' job to be part and parcel of the undertaker's establishment. If you say they used to assist before, all well and good; but do not say that the Minister should give orders that the Orderlies should assist, because if it comes to that, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown should be the last....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I never raised one word about the Orderlies.

Mr. WALCOTT: What did I say the hon. member said?

Mr. MOTTLEY: You said I should be the last.

Mr. WALCOTT: To do what?

Mr. MOTTLEY: All I asked for people to be notified as soon as the *post-mortem* is performed, but I can appreciate my colleague's point of view about the Orderlies; not that they are pressing for Orderlies to do it, but that the Orderlies want to get a piece of change.
8.35 p.m.

It is just that the Orderlies want to do it to get a piece of change.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am dealing with the remarks which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has made, because sitting here as a workers' representative and not only as a member of this Chamber, I would not like it to go out that I am sitting here and the hon. member insisting on what he has said. I would not like you to go and tell a grave digger to do some job which is not his job. I am sure that he will look at the Undertaker and just laugh. It is not the job of a grave digger to help an undertaker to bear a corpse out of the hearse. If you ask him to give you some assistance in a nice way, he may do it. I could not

sit here and hear this insistence that a man who is an Orderly should be ordered to give assistance with a corpse.

Mr. SMITH: I did not say that the Orderlies could be ordered, I said that the Orderlies were quite willing but that the gentlemen up there was stopping Orderlies from doing it. I am not asking the Hon. Minister to order the Orderlies, I do not know what is wrong with the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I said that the Orderlies are willing to do it but the gentleman up there was stopping them from getting a berry. The Governor-General up there was stopping the Orderlies from doing it.

Mr. SEALEY: I am not making any complaint. When I ring to say that I am sending for a corpse, you get four or five fellows coming to assist but what I would like to draw to the hon. member's attention is, that about a year before we have been getting trouble with people. I think that I have met the Minister and talked to him about it. I get no trouble at all. Of course, I give them a Christmas present the same as anybody else.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I would like to reply to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, I would just like to point out to him that everybody in the Public Service or Civil Service has certain terms of employment. The hon. member said that he did not ask me to call on the Orderlies to remove a corpse. That is an untruth because he did say that I should call on them. I just want to say they have certain terms of employment.

Mr. SMITH: I never said the Orderlies. I said that you should give instructions to the Governor-General.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Sir, the hon. member said that I must give instructions to the Orderlies.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw to the members' attention to Rule 28, "No member shall interrupt another member except — by rising to a point of order..."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am not going to stand here and allow any hon. member to criticise any employee in any of my departments unwarrantedly. The person whom the hon. member may be referring to as the Governor-General has certain duties to perform and part of his duties is to see that the Orderlies carry out the functions which they are employed to carry out and it is not his duty to see that they fight to get a berry. There is a lot of unemployment in the Island and if undertakers want people to bring corpses from the Mortuary to their hearse, they can employ someone to do it. The reason why they call on the Orderlies and just give them a berry is only a means of having cheap labour. This Government does not subscribe to that.

The question that the sum of \$37,894 under Head 7, Registration, stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 8 — CROWN SOLICITOR

Head 8 — Crown Solicitor — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the sum of \$6,174 under Head 8, Crown Solicitor, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 — MINISTRY OF FINANCE

Head 9 — Ministry of Finance — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a change under this Head. On Page 17, Item 8,

Senior Clerks, delete two Senior Clerks (Fixed by Law) \$7,164, and substitute three Senior Clerks, \$10,260.

I beg to move that the sum of \$56,590 under Head 9, Ministry of Finance, as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 10 — ACCOUNTANT GENERAL

Head 10 — Accountant General — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the sum of \$64,568 under Head 10, Accountant General, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 11 — PENSIONS

Head 11 — Pensions — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the sum of \$1,994,369 under Head 11, Pensions, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, what is this: Item 15, Local Government Compensation, \$2,500? What is it for?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I will get the information for the hon. member tomorrow.
8.45 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, in connection with item 4, I should like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister that since April last year there were a few workers who were compelled to resign from the highways employment in St. Joseph, and up to this present day they are not in receipt of their pension. They were compelled to resign since April last year and they were refused work because they had reached their age limit. Up to now they cannot get their pension. I think it was as early as last week that they were told that a separate Act will have to be brought down so as to pay them. These people have been waiting from April last year until now and they are now being told or they have been told by the Department of Highways and Transport that a special Act has to be brought down before they can receive their pension. These people would be willing to work until the authorities could arrive at something for them. The Department would not employ them and they would not give them a pension.

There was a man called Hazlewood who was turned around until he died or was getting ready to die, and then they told him that there was no pension for him. The same thing is now being done with the Highways and Transport, that is to say, they are keeping people who are entitled to pension until they fizzle out. Sometimes these people go out on their pre-retirement leave and it is not because nothing can happen to these people. These people were turned over from the Highway Commissioners to the Department of Highways and Transport. I am asking the authorities to hurry up and give these people their pension.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I understand from the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that he is speaking under Item 4 which is "Allowances, Gratuities and Pensions to B.W.I. Soldiers and their dependants." Those are the people which this item deals with, and I do not see what that has to do with the Public Works at all. I would like to know under what item the individuals to whom he is referring as those who are waiting for their pension? Is it the veterans of the British West Indies Regiment or what?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister understands who I mean. The Hon. Minister of Communications and Works understands me, and therefore the Premier does not have to understand me in this case.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member were to look back to the page immediately after page 16, he will see that, for the purpose of clarification, we have set out our authority under the various Heads. This has never happened before so that the hon. member does not know what Minister is responsible for this matter. The payment of pensions is not in charge of the Minister of Communications and Works; the procedure for the payment of pensions to the Un-established Staff is that which we have set up for the payment of members of such Staff. Some of these people, when they go home, are employed casually as watchmen until their claims are searched out. We do not allow any hiatus between the receipt of the last pay package and the receipt of the pension. We try to keep them on until the payment entitlement is searched out in the Ministry but it just has to go to the Highways Department, the Public Works Department or whatever is the appropriate Department.

I would not expect the hon. member to know the procedure, but I would expect him to know under which Head the matter falls. This procedure is new; it is less than two years' vintage and the accounting in the Works Department does not admit of the easy settlement of these claims. That has been described to the hon. member and other hon. members on several occasions. In many cases there are no records at all. Some of these people work on the agricultural estates and then they work as cantoniers during the out of crop season. There are records in some cases and ten years is the normal period of entitlement. I am not criticising the last Government, because no one was keeping any proper accounting in any department except the Treasury.

You have people coming up who, periodically, would drop a load of stones with his donkey-cart or his mule-cart, or he would draw a load of marl within a mile or so, which was as far as the old animal could go, and he would say that he was working in the Department for 31 years; at the same time he would be carrying on his job as a watchman. There was a gentleman who was in here today and his entitlement was that he would draw a solitary load of stones or marl for the Department. The first procedure, Mr. Chairman, is that the records are searched in the Waterworks Department, the Public Works Department or the Highways and Transport Department which are the three Departments in which these claims arise. I want to say, Sir, that this Government did not initiate the system whereby the records would be discarded so that no checks could be made.

8.55 p.m.

The procedure at present is to get two affidavits proving his period of employment, and if he can swear to the number of days and the number of years, he would normally qualify. We try to accommodate all the people who have put in claims, and if the hon. member can refer either to the Ministry of Communications, the Ministry of Home Affairs or the Establishment Section the names of those persons whom he considers to be entitled, and who have not had their claims settled, we would be glad to settle them. But we have to protect public funds.

A person may feel that because he has worked for ten years and is now sixty years old, he should be paid a pension like that. Now in the case which the hon. member referred, the unfortunate person who is now deceased, as it turned out was not entitled to a pension at all; so you cannot say that we turned him around. What was probably happening was that we were trying to strain the matter and find a way of accommodating him, and he thought he was being turned around when normally he could have been dismissed and told he was not entitled. They do not like to turn people away, but there is the difficulty of getting records. Once the applicants can satisfy the Ministry by affidavit evidence, I am sure the matter will be settled. I am sure the hon. member for St. Joseph, being so autho-

ritative on the entitlement of these persons, would not be reluctant and would be better able to swear to a particular constituent of his who has been living in the parish for a long time; so that the matter would be facilitated if he would give them an affidavit. Nobody is trying to deprive these people of a pension, and we have recently amended the law to make it possible for casual workers to elect to take part of the money in a lump sum and a diminished pension. I hope one of these days I will qualify under Item 4.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Hon. Premier, all these affidavits have been signed and were in the office for some time. I can remember such names as Daniel Franklyn, Cassie Small and one Browne; I do not have the names in my pocket. These affidavits were signed by the former employees.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I raised this matter in the House previously, but have not done so on subsequent occasions, and I gave the Government an example of what they could do. I think the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was under the impression that he could not speak on this because it is authorised by law; but it is not only authorised by law, but fixed by law, and the amount fixed by law varies from year to year. The amount this year is \$50,000 and last year it was \$65,000. I would say, however, that you should not call on these persons to resign until you have all the information about their pension, but should allow them to continue working on a non-pensionable basis until the amount is computed. I told the Government on the last occasion that I think it is unfair to call upon a man to retire when it is not in a position to give him his money when he retires. I should like to see that system inaugurated, and I would say that a man should be able to swear to his own affidavit.

The question that the sum of \$356,819 under Head 11 — Pensions — stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 12 — CHARGES OF DEBT

Head 12 — Charges of Debt — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$3,021,031 under Head 12 — Charges of Debt — stand part.

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

The question that the sum of \$3,021,031 under Head 12 — Charges of Debt — Stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 13 — CUSTOMS

Head 13 — Customs — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$44,961 under Head 13 — Customs — stand part.

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

The question that the sum of \$44,961 under Head 13 — Customs — stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 14 — INLAND REVENUE

Head 14 — Inland Revenue — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$21,932 under Head 14 — Inland Revenue — stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on the whole Head, and I am going to join the general criticism that I think it is a bad policy to have certain important

Government Departments without their constituted Heads of Department for many years. It is a bad image. This Department of Inland Revenue has been without a Head of Department for nearly four years, and I do not think the Government is going to get the maximum efficiency in an important Department like this without a Head of Department. I believe I am echoing the feeling of every responsible member of this community that everything should be done and the Public Service Commission should do its best to have this vacancy filled. The last person to hold this office has now been substantively appointed as Assistant Financial Secretary, and the person who was acting died. I think it is one of the most important financial posts in Barbados in many respects, the other being the Controller of Supplies, and if I am not mistaken the Commissioner of Inland Revenue is on a higher scale. For what it means to the Ministry of Finance and what it means to the country as a whole, I think I would be echoing the feeling of all responsible people in this community that we would like to see a substantive Commissioner of Inland Revenue, and I hope that everything will be done to expedite that appointment.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the position with the post of Commissioner of Inland Revenue is more or less as the hon. member has said, that no appointment has been made for a period of four years. It is unfortunate that Mr. Cobham who was a very able officer passed away at a very relatively tender age, just on the eve of his appointment. Since then we have been trying to recruit a Commissioner, and I should explain that the persons who are now acting in the senior posts in this Department themselves are reluctant at this stage to take on the responsibility, although we feel that with further training under a person with great experience, in another couple of years the first two or three people in the Department will be able and probably willing, which will be the most important aspect of the matter, to assume the responsibility.

9.05 p.m.

It is not that we are reluctant to fill this post but before the Assistant Financial Secretary was confirmed in his appointment as Assistant Financial Secretary we could not appoint a Commissioner of Inland Revenue and the reason why the Assistant Financial Secretary was not appointed was that I was personally having a look at the whole organisation of the Ministry of Finance in order to decide whether the senior officers in the Ministry of Finance should not be of Permanent Secretary level, but after discussing the matter with the establishment both here and in Trinidad, I found out that all of them have retained the post of Financial Secretary. It was eventually decided to retain the present establishment and when that decision was made, the substantive holder of the post of Assistant Financial Secretary was appointed Assistant Financial Secretary and the late Mr. Cobham was acting as Commissioner of Inland Revenue.

I think the Public Service had every intention of appointing Mr. Cobham as Commissioner of Inland Revenue. The present position is that the Senior Officers who have left there have come up rather rapidly from the ranks. These are very responsible jobs. You cannot take a person from the Waterworks Department and put him in the post of Commissioner of Inland Revenue because it is an extremely important post and the person holding that office must have a wide experience of the Income Tax Law. He has to be very particular with members of the business community and politicians. I believe that I have had more arguments with the Income Tax Commissioner than anybody else in this House. I have one or two appeals pending in that office, not of my own, but on behalf of people who were my clients and I know that it takes a very extremely tough person to argue against Counsel or some of the business people because Income Tax Law is a very intricate matter. The Commissioner of Inland Revenue has not only to hear appeals by himself, but when they go to the Courts, he has to advise the Attorney General.

We have been very lucky in having people like the late Mr. F. A. C. Clairmonte and Mr. N. D. Osbourne to hold

down this job and when we did not have them, we had to send outside and get other persons. Some of them were actually run out of the Island by the campaign against them. As I have said, nobody likes paying income tax and they make all sorts of charges against the Commissioner of Inland Revenue.

What steps are taken to fill the post? We had a very promising offer of assistance from the former Assistant of Inland Revenue of British Guiana who was strongly recommended in the person of Mr. George Stow. Mr. Stow has been promising to come and he has recently declined, despite the fact that I asked the then Governor of British Guiana, Sir Ralph Grey to persuade him to take up the job. The only thing which we can do now is to advertise and we have advertised for one. I must emphasise that you cannot transfer anybody if you do not have people willing or capable of performing the job. In this chaos, it is the reluctance of the officers in the particular department to take on this job. I believe if either one of the two assistants were willing, he could be appointed, but they do not want to take on the responsibility.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thank the Hon. Premier for his information. Do not get the impression that I was making any plea for any of the officers but I was only dealing with it as a post which was one that should be filled. I agree with the Hon. Premier that he cannot just push people in a Department like that.

The question that the sum of \$21,932 under Head 14, Inland Revenue, stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 15 — STATISTICAL SERVICE

Head 15 — Statistical Service — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the sum of \$30,621 under Head 15, Statistical Service, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, under Head 15, Item 15, Rent of Machines, I would like to know why they have to rent machines. I see that the sum \$14,000 is to be voted and the Note says:

"Rental of Accounting machines, punches and verifiers. Increased rental payable for machines."

I want to know if it would be too expensive to buy these machines and if it is cheaper to rent them.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: As soon as we get through the Estimates, I intend to have some conducted tours of Government offices for members of the Legislature because I think it would be an edifying experience for them. And I hope when I ask hon. members, they would turn up.

One of the most interesting departments of the Government is the Statistical Office. The position is that there are three or four firms which manufacture these machines and they are all electronic machines. They have all kinds of machines for sorting and filing statistical information. One of the producers of them is I.B.M. and they have a servicing department in Puerto Rico. The position is that these firms do not sell these machines. They are very expensive and if they sold them, I doubt whether we will find the staff to service them. They have a person for servicing these electronic machines. We have one of our Government Servants in the Statistical Office who has been trained in Puerto Rico to set up the machines depending on the type of information which you want to get, but he is not qualified to repair them if we get a breakdown. It is cheaper to get one of their engineers to service them and it is the only thing which the Government can do. That is the reason why we rent them and do not buy them.

Mr. SMITH: I thank the Hon. Premier for his reply.

The question that the sum of \$30,621, under Head 15, Statistical Service, stand part of the Resolution was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 16 - FEDERATION

Head 16 - Federation - was called.

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

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

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

HEAD 17 - PREMIER - HOME AFFAIRS

Head 17 - Premier - Home Affairs - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, under Head 17, there are certain amendments to be made. Under Item 16, we want to delete the amount to be voted, \$5,100 and substitute \$3,840. Then there is Item 16A which is new. It is for Electricity and the amount to be voted is \$5,000. The Note is to read: "To meet the cost of electricity for Government Headquarters, Town and Country Planning, Printing Office and Ministry of Education - General Administration and Visual Aids Section."

I beg to move that the sum of \$78,673, under Head 17 - Premier - Home Affairs - as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, in connection with Item 27, "Revision of Laws", I would like the appropriate Minister to state how far advanced have they got with regard to the printing of the Laws and how soon can this House expect to have a Progress Report.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: My information is that there are going to be about five or six volumes in all, and the first volume should be out later on this year.

Mr. GODDARD: I thank the hon. member.

The question that the sum of \$78,673 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 18 - POLICE

Head 18 - Police - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Under this Head, Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to be made. In Item 65 "Regional Police Training Centre", the amount to be voted, \$39,206, is to be deleted, and the amount \$39,453 is to be substituted therefor. That represents an increase of \$247. With that amendment, I beg to move that the sum of \$388,368 under Head 18 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. BOXILL: Speaking under this Head, I should like to say that I am not completely satisfied with this whole issue. Let us get down to real business and become more serious about this Head with which we are now dealing. Everybody knows that when we are at rest, the Police have to be on their duty; and when anything happens, you do not call on your father or on your mother, but you call on the Police. These men have been doing a wonderful job, although some of them have been over-zealous in the pursuit of the requirements of the law. Nevertheless, I would like to bring to the attention of the Hon. Minister that the Policemen have not been getting a square deal especially when they are ill. I know of a case where a Policeman went to a

doctor and that Policeman was told that there was nothing wrong with him. He went to the Hospital instead of going back home, and the result was that he was so ill that he had to lie on his back for several weeks. I have been informed, and I know, that sometimes you go to these doctors and for some reason or other you are never sick for them. I know, Sir, that there are those who have the tendency to play the fool and at the slightest intimation they will run to a doctor. There are complaints which have been reaching me to the effect that when Policemen go to the Hospital they are left in the Wards for a week sometimes and they get no proper medical attention.

Mr. Chairman, that is not good enough for the community. Let us realise that the day the Policemen get it into their heads that they will not go out on duty, the Island will be in a very serious state. I remember that Jimmy Hoffa was trying to unionize the Police. (*Asides*). He is in jail now. In the case of a prisoner, if he complains that he is not feeling well, he is taken to a doctor and is given medical attention, and in the case of a Volunteer, if he has bad teeth or bad eyes he is given dental treatment and he is given glasses.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I should like to correct the hon. member. It is only those members of the Regiment who work in the establishment and in the motor transport division who receive free medical attention. Those persons receive free medical and dental attention. They would get that in any overseas service.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, let us be more realistic than that. If these people can get this treatment, why should we try to deny the Policemen of such treatment? It is about time that we view this matter a little more seriously. (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to inform hon. members that if they do not want to listen to what the hon. member is saying, they may go outside.

Mr. BOXILL: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, some of these hon. members who are making these asides do not care about the Policemen. However, Sir, as I was saying, it is time that something be done for the Policemen. They are not at all satisfied, although I believe that this is a matter which the Government is looking into.
9.25 p.m.

It is ironical, Mr. Chairman, speaking under correction, that a prisoner can get glasses and false teeth, while a policeman who must keep the peace when anything goes wrong is denied these amenities. While in town the other day I saw a body floating in the carenage. People did not ask to call the Parson, the Magistrate or the porters; the first thing they said was to call the Police, and it was then that it struck me forcibly that I could not be a Police, because I was not going for that corpse. No one knew how long the woman was in the water, but despite that it was the Police who must remove it. If a man takes up a cutlass and takes off a person's head, it is not expected that the Police who is on the scene should run as the normal person would; he must try to disarm this man though he himself is unarmed and in danger.

I am therefore appealing to the powers that be to give the Police a bit more consideration. I should also like to state that it is time somebody let the Commissioner of Police know that the Policemen are not his personal domain. He must have respect for his men if he expects the men to have respect for him. Only recently I was told that he has some Policemen on some charge, and while I was not trying to discourage discipline, yet it must not be done in a tyrannical manner. I have heard on more than one occasion that if a Policeman does not make a certain amount of reports and arrests in a certain given time, he is called up and threatened. This is encouraging them to report people indiscriminately, and there are several trivial cases where a Police reports people, which when they come before the

Magistrate are thrown out. While agreeing that there should be discipline in the Police Force, I would not like it to be felt by anyone that he can take the people with whom he happens to work and have a complete disregard for their feelings, and over-run his authority in administering punishment. By all means, if a Policeman breaks the Rules, he should be disciplined, because to have a Force without discipline would be no good. On the other hand, if you have a Force in which Policemen are afraid of their Officers, then something needs to be done. There should be love - I am not saying there is none - among both Officers and men. There should never be two factions in the Police Force, with one faction gaining certain privileges while the other is not.

If you look around, Mr. Chairman, you will see that in the past ten or fifteen years a number of young Policemen have been promoted over the older ones. If you do a thing like this you are not encouraging the old policeman to do his best; you are causing him to do his duty in a lackadaisical way, and I would not blame him, because if I were working anywhere and I saw promotion going to people who came in after me and did not know the job as well as I did, I would not take as much interest as I did; so if you do not want the Force to break down, then you should have a more serious approach to these things. I am not saying that every old Policeman is entitled to promotion, because some of the old ones do not deserve to be Policemen, but there is a lot who have been doing a wonderful job. I am not telling the Commissioner whom he must promote, that is a matter for him; but one cannot help noticing these things, and it is true that if you get people in such an important section as the Police Force being disgruntled, you are likely to have law and order in this country breaking down.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has not been in this House long enough to set himself up as a one man commission. He has undertaken the role today of a man who knows the complaints of the Police Force. If the hon. member had been a member of this Assembly long enough, he would know that in a disciplined organisation like the Police Force you cannot be too quick in making broad pronouncements about discipline and promotion, because you are sitting as an enquiry into 600 people, and you have to analyse the information that comes to you. Because we sit here in this House and may have friends in the Police Force, does not make us competent to know.

The hon. member spoke about promotion of young men as against older men, but it is difficult for any one person from the outside to be able to analyse a situation like that within the Force. Police come under the Head of the Premier, and what we ought to be concerned with in Parliament would be broad statements about the Police that come to public attention. The Police Force has an organisation, and the idea of giving the Policemen an Association is for them to be able to voice their discontents within their Association without fear or favour, and to remove the Police Force and Policemen from public interference. The main duty of the Police Force is to maintain law and order impartially. I will not enter into any discussion, and I hope the day will come when we will only discuss things like the Army and the Navy on the broad basis of calling for an investigation into these things by a substantive Resolution; but I do not like the idea of roping them into a general debate on the grounds that a person is not treated well.

The point the hon. member made about their medical attention can be drawn to the attention of the Police Association. I have heard of an incident where a man seriously ill was put back on the beat, and had to be taken up and sent to Hospital to have an emergency operation performed. 9.35 p.m.

He took ill and he was taken to the Barbados General Hospital and they had to perform some emergency operation. But that is a thing that may happen to a doctor other than a Police doctor. Look how many of us in our private capacity do not accept the opinion of one doctor. I have known a case where a doctor used to examine his wife and the wife told me that she stopped letting her husband pay any

medical attention to her. She told me that she was in England and her feet got very cold and she thought that she had chilblains and her husband just brushed her aside and she went to another doctor. When the other doctor examined her he found that she was suffering from that and her husband felt very guilty. You get these things happening even with a doctor and his wife.

Sir, I will caution my honourable friend to recognise that the Police Force in a small community like this is a very important organisation but more so if we are sympathetic towards any case which we have to put for them, let us be very careful if we have heard only one side. I am not in a position to say that the young man promoted was not entitled to promotion because I do not know if the hon. member knows that in the Police Force, it is only a limited number of promotions which can be made.

You can have eight policemen qualified to be sergeants. If the Establishment calls for five and you have three more, you cannot make all eight sergeants. You can only have the promotion according to the number of vacancies. You cannot have more than what has been gazetted. If more is necessary, Government has to agree to it because it is a question of increasing the money under the vote. The more sergeants you have, the more money you must pay out.

Any Police Force which has 600 people in it is an organisation in which you are not going to get complete satisfaction. Let us be quite frank. I would say what I have heard but I think the hon. member would remember that we passed a Bill giving policeman the right to have their own organisation and if any policemen were to come to me, I would advise him to go to his organisation. See that the Police Association take up such cases as are necessary for them to do. Do not act otherwise because it is a disciplinary organisation and I would not like to do anything to undermine the discipline of any organisation. What is always well meaning is not always well done by implication. I have had more experience in this matter than the hon. member and I am sure that the more he goes on in parliament the more he will learn that you have to be very careful because you might be seeking all that is good but the wicked has soft spots.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is true that we had a sort of premature debate which crept in on this particular item, which is Item 70, on page 37, Cane Fires (Prevention) Act to which I see the small amount of \$50 is to be voted and the note to it says:

"The Cane Fire Prevention Act, 1949, section 6. Provision of rewards payable for information leading to conviction for arson."

However, I just want to say a word or two more on this matter. It is true that we have had a premature debate which crept in relative to the burning of canes in Barbados and we have noticed recently that the leave of all members of the constabulary has been cancelled and it seems as if the Police apparently have been doing every possible thing to try and keep up with the conditions as they are. I notice from the note that this is for provision of rewards payable for information leading to conviction for arson. It is not for me to suggest, but, I am asking the Hon. Premier if he does not think it would be in keeping with the present conditions not merely to offer a reward as is set out here because the reward can cut both ways but to suggest that a number of well meaning citizens as many as you can possibly get, be sworn in as special constables under the circumstances? It seems to me that with mass meetings around and with all that we have been hearing and with all that we heard yesterday and what we have listened very carefully to that the Hon. Premier can give us some information on this particular matter because the situation today is so touchy that the mere fact of voting \$50 here would seem as if the Government was not paying enough interest to this very important matter. I am not saying that it is so but all the note to this item says is: "Provision of rewards payable for information leading to conviction for arson."

All policemen, as I understand, have had their leave cancelled. That does not seem enough. It seems as if all the appeals which have been made have been of no avail and it seems to me that we are having an industry which is the main industry of our economy actually ruined by vandalism or whatever it might be. I wonder if the Hon. Premier can tell us whether he does not think it would be better to make an appeal to all responsible law abiding people to be sworn in as special constables. In that case, I mean people from members of the House right down the line. (A VOICE: Surely you do not mean members of the House). How can I mean anybody in here?

This matter is of great importance. It comes under the portfolio of the Hon. Premier and I do not like to see that we are voting estimates and the public seeing that we only have \$50 under the item "Cane Fires Prevention Act, 1949." I know that the Commissioner of Police is rather concerned about the matter and what I would like to know, too, is what else is being done and whether the Hon. Premier thinks it is a good thing to have special constables sworn in. All citizens who really and truly are out to support good Government should see to it that we are getting the best benefit from this very good crop which we have without having it destroyed by fires, which we are satisfied is now not being destroyed by accident.
9.45 p.m.

I do not think I should say anything more in this matter. I hope the Hon. Premier will tell us something about it since it falls within his portfolio.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, before the Hon. Premier replies, relative to the cane fires the hon. senior member for the City has suggested that we should have special Constables employed, but they should not be paid.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I did not say that we should have special constables and that we should not pay them. I asked whether it would not be a good idea to appeal to all well-meaning citizens to be special constables. Look at the size of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. Would he not make a good special constable? (Laughter). And so would the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. I could be sworn in as a special constable so that if anything should happen I would be able to come to your assistance.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, it would appear to me as if the hon. senior member for the City is making sport: I do not think that he could be serious at all. I thought that he wanted to stamp out these cane fires. Would the hon. member expect me or the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to become special constables to walk about and try to catch people? Why did the hon. member not say that the Hon. Premier should be a special constable too?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was suggesting that hon. members of this House should become special constables. Is the Hon. Premier not a member of this House too? You may be driving around and talking about the business of the Fix-it-right garage and you might try to help in this matter.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I should like to throw some light in this debate. There is no need for special constables because under the Act of 1901, any member of the public has the authority to arrest, without any warrant, any person who even is lighting a match in a cane field, although he may be doing that innocently. Any constable who arrests a person who is committing an offence under the Act is immune from prosecution. Any member of the public has the authority to be a special constable when it comes to the question of cane fires.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I must thank the Hon. Premier for that. Mr. Chairman, if it is universally known that any member of the public is a special constable and can make an arrest in the circumstances, you may very well get a lessening in the number of cane fires. The Hon. Premier's answer to us tonight should be given prominence; any person, whether male or female, can be a special constable and can arrest people in the matter of cane fires and be immune from prosecution. We do think that that answer, coming from the

Hon. Premier, should be given special front-page prominence in the newspapers of this island. Now we will see what will happen.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Government has a duty to perform. Now that the incidence of cane fires this year has reached an alarming proportion, I think that it is the duty of the Government not to allow this situation to pass just as a normal situation, but I think that an investigation of the highest order should be set up immediately to investigate this matter of cane fires and you will be able to deal with something. The number of cane fires which have taken place in Barbados in this year 1964, is of an unprecedented nature. If this were a question of bush fires or a gold mine disaster, in America, for instance, this is something which would call for an investigation. If the Government is spending public funds in order to meet a national disaster, I think the Government has a duty to the community to carry out an investigation into this matter. I do not feel, that with the destruction of over 3,000 acres of canes, things should be allowed to continue like that and nothing is done in the matter of an investigation. I feel that the time has come when an investigation should be instituted into this matter.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I, like the hon. member who has just sat down, also feel that it is time that the Government should try to do something more tangible in this matter. We can never tell where things will end if they go on like this, but I feel that the Government should go into this matter with members of the public. I see it noted here that we have a Cane Fire Board and that Board should move into high gear and get prominent members of the public to go into this matter and see if there are any means of controlling these cane fires. I feel, Sir, that the time has come when we should have special constables in respect of these cane fires, and these constables should be paid. The Hon. Premier has allowed it to be known that every one of us can be a special constable, but that does not go far enough. I may be a special constable when I am awake, but when I go to bed I am no more any special constable. I think that we should have people to patrol these canefields where the canes are standing now, and then the real fire bug will not take such a chance. When the fire bug knows that you have special constables patrolling the canefields he will not try to take any chance because he will never know when he will come across a constable. We have a lot of unemployed people now, and the Fire Insurance Companies would be only too glad to throw in their weight in this matter.
9.55 p.m.

You should have these people changing off with the Policemen, and when the fire bugs see that you have the whole country policed by special constables, I am sure they will not take any more chances. I think we should go into high gear right away and place these people along the cane fields both day and night, rather than stop a Policeman's leave, because he is only human and has to sleep, and every Policeman is not going to patrol a cane field all night; he may find himself picking up a snooze in one of the cane bunches and the fire may be lit with him in it. You need men to patrol along with the Police, so that if the fire bug is in a motor car he will be seen, or if he is walking he will walk into the hands of one of these men. I do not see why in a lonesome cart road where there are no houses and a man is seen he should not be arrested, because those roads are only for the purpose of getting out the canes, and if you find a man on one of these roads, he is out for doing something wrong. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Suppose he has a woman with him!) Both should be carried in, because we are trying to prevent fires and we do not know who is who. I dare say when you do catch up with someone you might be surprised to know who it is. (Cheers). Is that something to cheer at? The public is baffled to know who is responsible for these cane fires that are more prevalent than ever, and I would do everything possible to bring the culprit to justice.

Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Premier made a broadcast and drew to public attention the penalty if caught, but people know they will be hung if they commit murder and they still

do murder; so what is the point of telling people they will be locked up? The thing to do is to set up your Cane Fire Board and call on the Insurance Companies, the Plantation owners and the Policemen to go into this thing thoroughly and see what can be done to save the remainder of the crop.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the last hon. member who spoke. I think the time has come for the Government to make a thorough investigation into the burning of the canes. I sat here patiently on Tuesday and heard that if the Government does not resign the fires will continue. When they finish with the canes they may turn to my house. I think this Government has stood too much too long and it is time they stop shaking the whip and use it. I have never in my life seen so many cane fires in Barbados. As a Policeman I had to deal with cane fires, but 1964 is a record year for fires which started from the time the Premier gave his speech. I did a lot of work depending on this crop to get in some of the money. The one they got at Christmas made them feel very happy, and I know they are not ungrateful and are looking forward to a heavy windfall in the coming year. I am sure that with the snowfall in Europe Barbados would be in the happy position of having another windfall, and a lot of workers are depending on it; so I definitely feel it is not them. From what you heard on Tuesday, there is nothing hidden now, and if you are going to use the whip, use it. The whole debate on Tuesday was on cane fires, and certain members had no fear in issuing certain warnings.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, there are two matters on which I should like to speak and the first is the Police. I agree entirely with the hon. senior member for St. Peter when he replies to the statements made by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. When one is running any organisation or is a member of a large organisation where you have personality problems day after day, where people particularly are restricted in their movements, — it is all right with the Civil Service who will grumble until they get a little extra pay and then they are happy — where people have constricting hours of work and conditions of employment, no matter what you do you will get a certain amount of dissatisfaction.

Some time last year, Mr. Chairman, I was asked by the Police Association to have a Commission of Enquiry into the Police Force. A few months before that they had asked for a review of the Salary Commissioner's recommendations and these were reviewed, and as soon as that happened then they asked for a Commission of Enquiry into the conditions of the Police Force. I went so far as to interview members of the Police Association in addition to the procedure which is outlined in the Police Act that they make representations through the Commissioner of Police to the Governor. I interviewed then because as Minister in charge of Police I have to answer questions, and they were complaining that they had made application through the normal channels and had not been heard, and this raised some constitutional difficulty because the Commissioner of Police felt that they should only see me if he was present and that kind of thing, and we soon had that cleared up on a very high legal level. If I am in charge of the Ministry, I am not going to cut any corners or discourage people from using the normal channels of communications when they want to make representation about their conditions of service. At the same time if I have to be responsible to the Legislature and I hear from an Association, whether it is the Civil Service Association or the Police Association, that they cannot get through, then they have a right to come to me like any other Civil Servant; and so I am besieged with them — I do not mean the Police — from 6 o'clock in the morning until certainly 4.30 in the afternoon by people who have various complaints to make, and it is part of my duty to sit down and listen to people when I have time to do so, or when I am not interviewing somebody else. I have investigated these complaints and have given to the Police Association my views and observations on the long list of complaints they made, and I have not received any reply from them; so I think that to a very large extent the observations which I made may have satisfactorily cleared the air on the variety of complaints which they had to make.

On the question of promotion and so on, we have an Establishment. We have to keep down expenditure and the Police Force is one of the Departments which does consume a large portion of public revenue, necessarily so.
10.05 p.m.

There are over 600 members in the Police Force and in any organisation like that, you cannot have too many officers and too few people carrying out the work of members in the line.

What we have recently done is to approve a Civil Establishment Order which would give opportunities for promotion. We intend to have two Assistant Commissioners of Police and we also intend to increase the number of inspectors and the number of Corporals. That Civil Establishment Order may be before the House next week, therefore, that has been a substantial improvement in the establishment and the chance of promotion. I also want to say that in any organisation if we are looking particularly for leadership, you cannot base promotion on longevity or length of service in the particular establishment or institution. We cannot base promotion on the length of time served or the faithfulness of the particular policeman. When I was 23 years or 24 years of age, I was commissioned in the Royal Air Force and I was the only West Indian in about 3,000 and the most of them were older than I was and were of different nationality. I was commissioned and put over people who had been in the squadron long before I was.

Sometimes, the very vital reason that a person has been in an organisation for a long time and has not got promotion is an indication that he may not display leadership. You may have an occasion where a person may be victimised but these cases may be rare. However, where there is a Police Force or an organisation where you have a large number of people working, you cannot base promotion on length of service. In the British Army, if you reach the age of 40 years and have not attained a certain rank, and you are not a commissioned officer, out you go. You may be lieutenant until you are 48 years but you have to resign after that.

Unfortunately, you cannot have that in the Police Force because we would have to spend a great deal of money on training recruits. It is something like over \$2,000 for six months' training. You cannot resign the people over a certain age. Actually, when this country should be able to cut down the time of a man serving in the Police Force, say, if he reaches 20 years' service, I would be pleased to give him pension and say to him, "you can go; I hope you get your pension at 40 years," and then you may get more encouragement from younger people to join the Force. This is not something which you can solve overnight. We always get a man stating that he has been in the Force for 34 years and is still a private. As I have said, the fact that he has been in 34 years and is still a private may be very good reason why he should not be made a corporal. Look at the hon. senior member for St. Michael who held the rank of non-commissioned officer in the Police Force before resigning voluntarily and since then has been able to amass millions.

Mr. SEALEY: If the Hon. Premier would just give way, I just want to say that I am not a pensioner.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is what I mean to say. The hon. member could still have been in the Police Force. It is now sixteen years since he has resigned voluntarily but before he resigned he had attained a high rank and there are some who joined before him who are still privates. The hon. member retired voluntarily at an early age without a pension and is now a millionaire. You cannot say then that there is something wrong with the system. The system of promotion is one which provides the best people to do the job and there are still people who go out of the Force and make better because they had the qualifications. Some of them who joined long ago did not even hope to be sergeants because at the time when they joined, even if they had expectations of being sergeants or inspectors, at that time, they did not hope to get the salary even as inspectors as what they are getting now as privates. Sir,

what I am concerned about is that they get a sufficient amount to meet their family responsibility.

When it comes to the cane fires, I just want to make my position quite clear. It is my recollection that there has been an amendment to the Act since 1949. I have a correction to make on that point because I have been looking for the amendment and I cannot find it. It was my recollection that under the Cane Fires (Prevention) Act, every citizen had the right to arrest without a warrant anyone found lighting a match or taking part in any form of incendiarism.

Sir, I will make a further check on this but Police and Special Constables have the authority as well as Firemen have this authority under the Fire Service Act. Therefore, I think the hon. member had a point when he said that people should be made into special constables. An ordinary citizen does not have the power to arrest, but he has the power to assist the Police Force or a special constable if a person is found committing an offence.

I would just like that correction made before people get themselves in trouble. I was looking at it as recently as last week but I would not like anybody leaving here thinking that they have that power.

Sir, if I may give some statistics on cane fires, from the 1st January, to 2.00 p.m. on Thursday, that is today, the number of fire calls which we had were 450, of which 315 were cane fires.

10.15 p.m.
A total of 3,501 acres of cane were burned. Between midnight on Tuesday and today we have only had three cane fires. One cane fire occurred between midnight and two o'clock today. There has been a dropping off of cane fires but, of course, it is too early accurately to draw any conclusions since the debate which we had here on Tuesday. Some hon. members are not now present, so that I cannot give any indication of what the statistics will be like tomorrow. Some hon. members have been absent from the House from about 7 o'clock this afternoon; it is therefore too early to make any predictions on the statistics tomorrow. (Laughter.) However, Sir, since the disclosures which were made in this House, some kind of investigation may be necessary. As far as the Crown Law Officers and the Police are concerned, I have no authority to direct either the Police or the Crown Law Officers to carry out any prosecution against any person. As the Minister in charge of Security and Home Affairs, I am entitled to ask for information and I do get information from time to time in a situation like this.

Mr. Chairman, I have my own views as a lawyer, but I am only the Minister of Finance now, and therefore I cannot give any legal opinion as a lawyer as to whether certain people should be prosecuted or not. I am not writing any minute in any file directing any Crown Law Officer or any Police Officer to institute any prosecution against any person. In any case, therefore, no one will be able to accuse any Minister of locking up or prosecuting or persecuting anybody; that has all got to be done on a strictly legal basis and I have advised the Crown Law Officers not to ask my opinion on anything, but to get it from the United Kingdom. The Civil Service is therefore protected and the members of the Government are protected and no one can say that this Government is prosecuting anyone, especially when there are political implications; but I do say that I have to get information as to what is going on in the line of security, because I have the authority or the portfolio for internal security. I do not direct any prosecutions; I am not in a position to carry out any prosecutions although some prosecutions should have been instituted long ago.

I am not in a position to disclose even a part of the information which I have, except to say that people make statements and vouchsafe things from time to time.

The question that the sum of \$388,368 under Head 18 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 19 - FIRE SERVICE

Head 19 - Fire Service - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the sum of \$37,414 under Head 19 stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$37,414 under Head 19 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 20 - LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Head 20 - Local Government - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$31,419 under Head 20 stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$31,419 under Head 20 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 21 - PRISONS

Head 21 - Prisons - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the sum of \$66,800 under Head 21 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, there is just a comment which I would like to make under this Head in reply to the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. I should like to inform him that prisoners are supplied with dentures and spectacles.

The question that the sum of \$66,800 under Head 21 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 22 - PREMIER - CABINET AND GENERAL

Head 22 - Premier Cabinet and General - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Head, there are some amendments which I would like to make. In relation to Item 12, "Furniture and Equipment", the amount to be voted, \$100, is to be deleted, and the amount, \$375, is to be substituted therefor. The note is to read: "To purchase two filing cabinets and one desk Chair." In connection with Item 8, "Ex gratia payment for compensation", the amount to be voted, \$1,000, is to be deleted and the amount, \$4,300, is to be substituted therefor. There is also to be an addition to the existing note as follows: "Includes a special provision of \$3,300 for payment of compensation to persons whose houses or furniture were damaged by blasting operations of Bagatelle quarry."

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am appealing to the hon. member that this is taking advantage of the members of this House.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: This is the last Head with which we are dealing tonight.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I do not quite understand the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. Prior to the assumption of office of the present Government, we used to be kept in here until 2.00 o'clock or 3.00 o'clock in the morning with Estimates. The position now is that we have the Estimates organized and the first

twenty-three Heads happen to fall under my portfolio. We intend to finish these twenty-three Heads tonight and to start with other Heads tomorrow.
10.25 p.m.

We are two or three Heads from the end under my Ministry, and there is no point in bring me back just to answer questions on two Heads; so if the hon. member will have a little patience for another five minutes and allow me to finish my Ministry, then he can attack the Minister of Agriculture tomorrow.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, there are further amendments to Head 22.

Under Item 11 — Constitutional Changes — I want to delete the sum of \$1 and substitute therefor the sum of \$1,000, and the note is to read "Implementation of constitutional changes".

Under Item 12 — Furniture and Equipment — I want to delete the sum of \$100 and substitute the sum of \$375, and the note is to read "to purchase two filing cabinets and one desk chair".

I beg to move that the sum of \$68,335 Head 22 — Premier — Cabinet and General — as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$68,335 under Head 22 — Premier — Cabinet and General — stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 23 — BARBADOS REGIMENT

Head 23 — Barbados Regiment — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$87,547 under Head 23 — Barbados Regiment — stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$87,547 under Head 23, — Barbados Regiment — stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that your Honour do now report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that brings to a close the items with which we propose to deal at this Sitting.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, 20th March, at 1.00 p.m.

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

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

10.30 p.m.