THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday, 23 rd March, 1964.

A Special Meeting of the House of Assembly was held at 2.30 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., *(Speaker)*; Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, *(Minister of Development, Trade, Industry, Labour and Tourism)*; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Hon. C. E. TALMA, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries)*; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., *(Minister of Education)*; Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Communications, Works and Housing)*; Mr. E. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., *(Deputy Speaker)*; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, *(Chairman of Committees)*; Mr. N. W. BOXILL; and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to have to inform the House that the Minutes are not yet ready for the last and the four meetings previous to that.

I also apologise for the short notice in respect of this meeting summoned for 2.30 p.m. o'clock. Without intending to create a precedent, I sanctioned the calling of this meeting at this hour in view of the exceptional urgency to transmit matters to the Other Place within a reasonable time before the end of the current financial year.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for this 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

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

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

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

RECOMMITTAL OF HEAD 8 – COMMUNICATIONS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, you will recall that we had reached at our last meeting Part II – Capital, of the Estimates of Expenditure for the financial year 1964-65 and we had actually passed Head 8 – Communications.

I beg to move that Head 8 be recommitted for the purpose of moving in a small item.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I just want the situation regularised. If we are dealing with the Order Paper, the first Order is a Resolution for $8 million, and if I am not mistaken, the hon. member is now dealing with Order No. 4.

2.55 p.m.

The Order Paper has been set out, and if we are following the Order Paper we should postpone Order No. 1 and deal with Order No. 4, or let us regularise the position. According to the Order Paper, the first item is a Resolution to advance the sum of $8,361,212 from the public Treasury to be defrayed from Loan Funds to meet expenditure during the year 1964-65 under Estimates Part II – Capital. Unless that is postponed, you cannot deal with Order, No. 4, which is to resume Committee on the Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate same for the service of the Island for the year ending on the 31st March, 1965.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, when we adjourned last Friday, hon. members know that we were actually in Committee on the consideration of the Estimates and what we are doing now is to resume Committee of Supply and to ap-

propriate a sum of money for the year 1964-65. The item to which the hon. member refers as Order No. 1 is to meet the expenditure ensuing to Capital Works which is actually included in the Estimates under Part II – Capital. Therefore, it may well be that the hon. member has a point, but I do not think that we are out of order, Order No. 4 is to resume Committee on the Appropriation Bill to grant a sum of money and to appropriate the same to the service of the Island.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not think the hon member understands what I am saying.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am not finished.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not raising the point as regards which you should deal with first. Order No. 4 is the one which you are dealing with now, and I am saying that you cannot proceed to deal with that unless you make that the First Order of the Day. That has not yet been done.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: What I did, Sir, was to move the House into Committee of Supply before Your Honour left the Chair and this is for the purpose of resuming consideration of the Estimates.

Mr. WALCOTT: No, no, All these items are matters under Committee of Supply: but because you have Committee of Supply, you still have numbers to each item.

What I am saying is that you have an Order Paper which is printed for today which is a Special Meeting at 2.30 o'clock and the First Order is to move the House into Committee of Supply. Item 1 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House; Item 2 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing; Item No. 3 stands in the name of the same hon. member and Item No. 4 is the one which you propose to deal with now. I am saying that you cannot get down to Order No. 4 unless you are willing to make No. 4 the First Order under Committee of Supply. If you are going to have this raggy trousers manner that because you are in Committee of Supply you can deal with Item No. 10 first, that is wrong.

I do not like getting up and drawing these things to the notice of the House. This is the function of the Chair or the Clerk of the House. I am not paid for doing these duties, but I think the Order Paper should be proceeded with in its proper form.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The item is under my name. You will see that Order No. 1 is the Resolution to grant the sum of $8,361,212 out of the Public Treasury to be defrayed from Loan Funds and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet expenditure during 1964-65 on Capital Works.

I do not know how Order No. 1 Capital Estimates, came to be at the head of the Order Paper because the matter which was under consideration was Order No. 4, which was the Appropriation Bill and I have not moved any Resolution on Capital Estimates at all. Therefore, I do not understand how this became lifted. But the hon. member may be technically correct because I think that Order No. 4 should be Order No. 1.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not want to carry on with this any longer but the last Order Paper was printed the same way. However, if you want to move an order out of its place, there is one of your Rules which you can invoke to do so. If not, anybody could come in the House in the future and start off with Order No. 12.

I would say this. You do not need any person to say whatever is to be done so far as the Rules are concerned. The Rules are printed for the person occupying the Chair to interpret them and have them carried out. That is the function of the Chair, and one of the Rules is that the Order Paper is to be adhered to in its printed form unless special provision is asked for it to be done otherwise. If that is not done, you have to proceed with the Orders as set out on the Order Paper. It is the same thing with the Orders under Private Members' Business.

I do not like this because it gives a bad reflection outside. It gives the reflection that the spate of criticism which the House has come in for is through unnecessary obstinancy, and what we find is that the Chairman is not aware of what is before us: else he would have been able to save us from this unnecessary embarrassment which we are subjected to from Tuesday to Tuesday.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What I have discovered is that the Order Paper has been incorrectly printed.

Mr. WALCOTT: You are in Committee of Supply. This is the sort of bogus business which you are getting in here. The Hon. Leader of the House has been in here for the last twenty years. He should know that if you have four items under Committee of Supply, you just cannot get up and speak on Item No. 4 without asking leave to deal with that first. You do not have to go back in the House to get permission to take that as Order No. 1.

3.20 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the matter which is before the Committee is to resume Committee on the 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. The position is that this Item appears as Item No. 4 on today's Order Paper, but, as hon. members are fully aware, when we adjourned the House last Friday, this was the matter which was under consideration, and we had reached as far as Part II of the Capital Estimates. It is true to say that the manner in which the Order Paper for today is provided, in Committee of Supply there are two Resolutions, this being the second one and, technically speaking, we can ask, when we are in Committee, that Order No. 4 be taken as the first Order of the Day. But since this is the Item on which we adjourned at the last meeting, it was more or less understood that we would be resuming consideration of that item today. If it is the wish of the Committee, however, we will ask that Order No. 4 be taken as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. WALCOTT: What has happened, Sir, is that the first Order of the Day is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grants of sums of money for the Service of the Island. That is what we are in now; it is not that we are to go into Committee of Supply to deal with the Estimates, but to go into Committee of Supply to grant sums of money for the service of the Colony, which include a Resolution for the advance of the sum of $8,361,212, the passing of the Estimates for the Port Department, and so on. What the hon. member is at liberty to do is to ask that Order No. 4, which will be dealt with in Committee, be taken as Order No. 1. It is not the first Order of the Day but the Order which you are taking in Committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take Order No. 4 as the First Order of the Day in Committee of Supply. If there is no objection, leave will be granted. *(After a pause).* There being no objection, leave is granted.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I really do not understand the difficulty of the hon. member. I have carefully itemised three matters which are supposed to be dealt with in Committee of Supply in the order in which he gave them. He referred to the Capital Estimates and to the Estimates of Current Expenditure, but there is one thing which he did not mention, and it is that the Appropriation Bill also has to be dealt with in Committee of Supply. I do not see the hon. member's difficulty because Standing Order 60 (2) says this:-

"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."

And paragraph 3 of that Standing Order says this:-

"3. 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 the first notice or reference which the House takes of the fact that the Estimates are there. It is during the consideration of the Estimates which are both Capital and Re-current expenditure and revenue — all of these things are in Committee of Supply. I do not see what the business of Order No. I or Order No. 4 has to do with the matter at all. In my humble opinion, Order No. 1 should not have been on the Order Paper at all; what we are really doing is to resume Committee of Supply. In the way in which Order No. 4 is worded, that refers to the Appropriation Bill and to the Appropriation Bill alone. It refers to the appropriations which are fixed by law, which do not necessarily have to be voted and what are considered in the Capital Estimates. Having to deal with the Schedule of the Appropriation Bill, we ask that the Bill be passed in Committee and then we go back to the House and report the passing of the Appropriation Bill and the passing of the Resolution for the Capital Estimates which we normally would have dealt with at the time when we got to the end of the deliberations.

We have to report the passage of the Appropriation Bill and the passage of a Resolution which would be the Capital Estimates, but since no special reference is made to Capital Estimates in the Standing Orders, we have to take it that both the territorial estimates and the Capital estimates are still to be considered in the same manner although one has to be dealt with by Resolution, and we have to report the passing of the Estimates and the passing of the Appropriation Bill. We do not have to pass in Committee those Items which are already fixed by law, as I explained at the time of the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, because the procedure was somewhat off the track in former times. At times we did not really deal with the Appropriation Bill at all. I do not see that there is any procedural difficulty, although I would prefer not to see Order No. I on the Order Paper. Some place will have to be found for the Capital Estimates either in our deliberations or on the Order Paper. We are in Committee to consider all of these Estimates and it is not a matter of dotting the "I's" and crossing the "T's".

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am a stickler for these things. The Order Paper is prepared with the approval of the Government because, before the House is adjourned, His Honour the Speaker asks for the preparation of the Order Paper for the next meeting, and that is done by the Hon. Leader of the House. The Order Paper is prepared which the House has to go by; it is the Agenda of the House. Whether the Hon. Premier agrees with the Resolution being on the Order Paper or not, we are bound to deal with that Resolution for $8 million because it was on the Order Paper and because it is a Resolution.
3.15 p.m.

What the hon. member has said about the Estimates is correct. I am not opposing dealing with the Estimates, but I am opposing the idea of changing the Order Paper and not working in proper form. The Order Paper has been printed. If I wanted to be difficult or technical, I could have been technical and difficult from the time the Speaker spoke about meeting at 2.30 p.m. because the House was adjourned to meet at 12 noon today and there was no quorum, and the Speaker has summoned the House for a special meeting on the same day to which it was adjourned. I believe that it is a precedent which you cannot find anywhere in the annals of history. Some of us felt that the House had been adjourned until 1 o'clock and the Leader of the House said he thought it was adjourned until 1 o'clock, while the Speaker felt it was adjourned until Noon. What I am pointing out is that you have an Order Paper and the first Order is to go into Committee of Supply. When you are in Committee of Supply, are you not bound to ask for the Order that you want to take to be stated? The hon. member gets up and starts off dealing with Order No. 4, and I am saying that if he wants to deal with that Order he has to ask permission that it be the first Order in Committee of Supply, and I see no problems in doing that. You must have technicalities in a Legislative Assembly, or you would have nothing at all.

As I said before, I can see where all of this is going to lead. If something is brought to the notice of the Chair, it is either in order or out of order, and I have all the precedent to support me that an Order Paper is for the guidance of members, and when you depart from it, you do so by special leave and permission of the House being granted. Let it be quite clear that when you adjourn from one day to another, you do not automatically adjourn with the idea that the matter on which you adjourned becomes the first Order of the Day; so let us cast that completely from our minds. You could have adjourned last week dealing with Estimates and meet today with the first Order being to shave all the men in Barbados over the age of 21 years. If you look at the Order Paper for last week, you will see that it is copied in the same way for this week; so you must have asked for these things to go on. Order No. 4 is the one dealing with the Estimates; so do not say that you do not have to deal with the items in that form, because that is the only way in which they can be dealt with. So far as the other Resolution is concerned, it must be drawn to the Hon. Premier's attention that that was introduced in his name, and that is to be dealt with in Committee of Supply, because it is really in Committee that you are going to provide the authority to raise this loan, because it is not in the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Leave is granted the Hon. Minister to proceed with Order No. 4 in Committee of Supply.

RECOMMITTAL OF PART 11 — CAPITAL

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Part 11 — Capital — Available Funds — be recommitted for the purpose of making an addition under Head — Communications, of $68,000.

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $326,000 under Development and Industry as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of $326,000 under Development and Industry, as amended, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

3.25 p.m.

HEAD 4 — WATER SUPPLIES

Head 4 — Water Supplies — was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to move that the sum of $12,000 under Head 4, Water Supplies 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 5, HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES

Head 5 — Health and Social Services — was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that the sum of $464,650 under Head 5, Health and Social Services stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 6 — EDUCATION

Head 6 — Education — was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that the sum of $373,320 under Head 6, Education, stand part of the Schedule. This has been amended to include $5,000 to which the new Item would read Item 15, Combermere School, and the note would read: Revote of $5,000 to complete construction of Science Laboratory.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I wonder if the Hon. Minister can tell us where the Arts and Science College would be sited, how much land there is, and how soon do you expect to get off to a start with this matter. The Item is No. 3 and the note says: Revote of $215,000 including cost of site for College of Arts and Science. Additional provision towards purchase of sites for educational buildings."

Quite recently, we understood that the Chancellor was taken to the site and all of us were not given the opportunity to accompany the Minister; but surely he would be able to tell us something of the site and how much land it is and how much is required for this purpose.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I hope the hon. member would pardon me if I say that the matter is under active and urgent consideration. I am not in a position to answer him and I hope to answer him in a matter of weeks.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the Hon. Minister for his information.

The question that the sum of $373,320 under Head 6, Education, as amended, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 7 — AGRICULTURE

Head 7 — Agriculture — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that the sum of $23,900 under Head 7, Agriculture, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 8 — COMMUNICATIONS

Head 8 — Communications — was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to move that the sum of $179,128 under Head 8, Communications, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. SEALY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing and his other Ministers for the good sense he has shown for the continuation of the programme for repairs of tenantry roads.

I would also like to draw his attention to certain tenantry roads in St. Michael, especially roads like Baycroft Road and Chadderton's Road in Carringtons Village without proper drainage which makes it rather difficult for the people there to get out and into their homes during rainy days. There are other tenantry roads in the parish which need putting in order and which were taken over from estates sold out like Brittons. There is also one at the corner of Chapel Gap which is rather difficult and the people of that district cannot get out of their homes.

I would like to draw attention to the parish of St. Michael where there is a population of 85,000 who suffer materially in certain of the tenantries. I commend you on continuing your programme on tenantry roads and the care which you have devoted to it.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I would like to reply to the hon. senior member for St. Michael to let him know that the problem with tenantries is under serious consideration, and if he will take notice, he will see that the amount has been increased in this year's vote and great consideration will be given towards the improvement and the drainage thereof.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of speaking on this matter, but while I sat and listened, I was moved to give some expression on it. I had a lot to do with tenantries in my first early days in this House. I am sure the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing will not follow the bad example by the ex-Minister who was Minister of Works in the last Government and feel because he did not get support in certain areas or if he repaired a road halfway, as soon as he found that there was one person who did not support him, he would refuse to repair the road further onward.

3.35 p.m.

It is a fact, as the colleague of the hon. junior member for St. Michael has said, that you collect the greater part of your highway taxes from the Metropolitan area. More than one-half of the population of Barbados is within this area, and it is fortunate that we have the Minister of Communications and Works as the junior representative in this area. There are a tremendous number of the roads in this very densely populated area which the Hon. Minister knows about. One Minister of Communications and Works did a part of those roads and expressed the view that as long as Mottley got votes in such areas, he would not have anything more to do with them. Mr. Chairman, I will still get votes; from what I know of the present Minister of Communications and Works, I know that he will not adopt that parsimonious principle adopted by other people who were in positions which they were not even worthy of occupying. In Country Road, a lot of this land has been sold and so in the case of Haggatt Hall and other places; but do not let anybody feel that because Mr. So-and-So did not get votes in such-and-such areas, he should not repair the roads in these areas. You must pay great attention to the population density. There are many of these roads in Cave Hill and in other areas.

Mr. Chairman, I have had something to do with having a survey made of these roads and giving priority to them in accordance with how the lands were sold out. When these tenantries were sold out, the roads became roads in common, and I may say that quite a number of these lands have been sold out just four or five years ago as against lands which have been sold out some twenty years ago. I should say that the list of priorities which we sent in was not taken any notice of, and anybody who asks me to do something like this again, and then repairs the roads for their friends only, I will tell him what he is getting off at. I am glad, Sir, that we will have a Public Accounts Committee and we will be able to see why some people repaired some roads and why some other people repaired cul-de-sacs and the like; we will be able to find that out. Let us make no mistake about that; we will find that out.

I commend the Hon. Minister in asking us to agree to an increase over last year's vote, which has been effected. We have had people coming to this country and commending us for our handiwork on the roads. Your colleague, Mr. Chairman, took a great interest in the roads of St. Lucy and he was able to get many roads repaired in that parish. In the area which you have the honour to represent and where you have some 92,000 houses, that density of population must call upon you to give greater consideration to the urgency for having these roads repaired.

I commend the Minister for what he has done and I am sure that he will not take that sort of interest which I see demonstrated by other people.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking in connection with Item 11, "Car Park, $50,000." I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister again that the lot on the Deep Water Harbour, where people usually park their taxis when a tourist boat is in, is still in a dilapidated state. I notice that the sum of $50,000 has been allocated for the car park.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I should like to draw to the attention of the hon. member that Items 1, 2 and 10 are the items which are being considered right now.

Mr. BOXILL: Very well.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: In reply to the remarks of the hon. senior member of the City of Bridgetown, I should like to say that no Minister of this Government is either the Minister of a constituency or the Minister of a Party; he is a Minister of the Government of Barbados. Our works are being carried out like the rain from heaven which falleth on the just and on the unjust.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown and those of the hon. senior member for St. Michael. We in the Southern District Council, are very pleased to know that the amount to be spent on tenantry roads has been increased. We do hope, however, that something will be done to increase the amount for the Southern District Council. Daily people are complaining about these tenantry roads. As you will remember, Sir, I brought a Resolution before this House during last year and I thought best to withdraw it afterwards, owing to the fact that I felt that this Government would do its utmost on behalf of the people when it comes to the question to tenantry roads. Again, Sir, I would like to say how very pleased I am to know that the amount for the tenantry roads has been increased. On behalf of the Southern District Council, I am now appealing to the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works to grant us a bigger amount for the purpose of repairing or building tenantry roads in the area of the Southern District Council.
3.45 p.m.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, speaking on tenantry roads, I must say that there has been a great improvement throughout the Island. I see that there is a great increase of money, and I can assure you that since the parish of St. Thomas has just been handed over to the Central Government, about ten times more work is going ahead than before. I would be pleased if all the roads could come under the Ministry of Communications and Works, because the roads done by Highways and Transport stand up better than the others. They have the equipment necessary for the construction and repair of roads, and I hope that the other Council will see it possible to hand over its roads also to Highways and Transport. I sat here last week and heard that there is more money in the Savings Bank since 1961 than there has ever been. That is a sign that the poor people are saving more money. The reason for that is because they do not have to spend so much money repairing their houses, because people are putting up wall structures which last longer and need little repairs.

Mr. Chairman, from what I have seen, there are more roads in this Island than throughout the other West Indian Islands, and I am very glad to see the work that Government is doing in the construction of roads. Today there is no partiality. The Government of the day is taking steps to improve the roads, and I hope that better will be done, because there is a greater amount of money granted for the construction of tenantry roads.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I usually make visits to all the tenantry roads, but the money unfortunately is not sufficient to do all that we would like to do. However, we spend that money in a way to give the best service to the greater number of people. In other words, if there is a road of one mile serving 120 houses and there is one of a mile serving 40 houses, the road serving 120 houses would have priority. Although some people might feel we have left them out, gradually in time they too will come on the high priority list. We have just got a new Barber Green resurfacing machine and asphalt mixing plant, and I am sure that in a short time in this Island we will be able to cover and resurface most of our roads, including tenantry roads, and have them in very good condition. I myself must compliment the Director of Highways and Transport for trying out the Barber Green machine although it is still in its infancy. We have tried it on the East Coast Road and at present we are working on other roads, and I am very satisfied with the service given by that machine and the asphalt mixing plant and the quality of the roads. One can tell distinctly by driving on them the difference between the normal handmade road and one which has been surfaced by the Barber Green paving machine.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I did not ask the Hon. Minister to do it before, but I am sure he will unreservedly withdraw the remarks directed to me when I draw to his attention that it was not the hon. senior member for St. Peter who asked the question.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I meant the hon. senior member for St. Andrew and not the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

The question that the sum of $179,128 under Head 8 – Communications – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SH HEAD 9 - MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS

Head 9 – Miscellaneous Projects – was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $808,458 under Head 9 - Miscellaneous Projects - stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of $808,458 under Head 9 – Miscellaneous Projects – 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 the passing of the Appropriation Bill in Committee.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, we have to pass the Appropriation Bill in Committee, because you will not be reporting that we passed the Appropriation Bill but the Estimates, and the Schedule was dealt with first because the Standing Orders say the Schedule should be dealt with before the Bill itself. We cannot go back to the House unless we pass the Appropriation Bill in Committee itself.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Schedule stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: We are running through these things. What I would like to know is if the Clerk has not done it as it should be done. This Appropriation Bill should have the correct amounts.

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Mr. WALCOTT: What is Clause 2? Are you moving that the amount which has been set out here stand part? I see the amount in the Schedule to this Bill is $25,728,435. I do not

think that can be correct with all the amendments which you have been making. Therefore what is Clause 2?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir the alterations in the figures bring the amount to twenty-five million, seven hundred and ninety-four thousand, five hundred and seventy-two dollars. Therefore I beg to move that the amount in Clause two be amended from twenty-five million, seven hundred and twenty-eight thousand, four hundred and twenty-five to twenty-five million seven hundred and ninety-four thousand, five hundred and seventy-two dollars.

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

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

Clauses 3 to 6 inclusive were called separately and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ORDER NO. 1 TAKEN NEXT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 1 of Government Business be the next Order of the day.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

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

RESOLUTION re ADVANCES FROM PUBLIC TREASURY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the amount needed for expenditure during the ensuing financial year to be advanced from the Public Treasury to be defrayed from Loan Funds. The amount asked for in the Resolution is amended to $8,451,492.

There is a number of amendments which I want to make to the various items in the Addendum. Under Head, Education, the amount is $999,392 and the amended total is $1,012,147. Similarly, Sir, the amount of $2,525,000 under Communications is increased to $2,593,000. The amount under Miscellaneous Projects is $206,000, and that is amended to $215,245.

These amounts are to finance the items under Part 11 of the Capital Estimates to be paid from Loan Funds as against those to be paid from Public Revenue or Colonial Development and Welfare Funds.
4.05 p.m.

I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of $8,451,212 do now pass.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE ANNUAL ESTIMATES FOR THE PORT DEPARTMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the Annual Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1964-65.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the passing of a Resolution to approve, under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the Annual Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1964-65. The Resolution is to approve a total expenditure of $2,233,770 and the amount is made up as follows:-

Total operating expenses,	$781,080;
Capital Charges,	$1,388,882;
Maintenance,	$63,808;

That makes a total expenditure of $2,233,770. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, in some of these things I consider it appropriate that sometimes the Government should take the opportunity of allowing this House and the Public to know something more about these matters, so that when questions are asked about Departments and how they are being operated, proper answers can be given. I feel that it would not be a bad thing if, annually, the Hon. Minister would tell us something about the Port so as to allay the misconceptions about it and give the public some better idea of the situation. I have been seeing and reading that some people in Barbados are linking up the general with the specific, and because the Port is functioning as a new Port reasonably well, some people regard it as if you can look upon the cost of living as being responsible for the increase in the Port charges.

I am not speaking for the Government, but I would like to say that the Trade Union has been able to get better wages for fewer men at the expense of the change which has taken place, but these better wages have not been obtained at the expense of the landing charges being increased in Barbados.
4.15 p.m.

The landing charges have remained as they were from 1961, Mr. Speaker, and they compare favourably with landing charges elsewhere; so the community is not being called upon to pay higher costs for goods coming into Barbados as a result of this change. Moreover, I should like to say to people who are not aware that it is extremely difficult

even if you reduce the landing charges by $1.00 to show it in your goods, because with 2,240 pounds to the ton, when you begin to percolate it down through stockings, handkerchiefs or toilet paper to see how much cheaper the item is going to be, it cannot be worked out. I feel that at some time there may be some charges on certain specific items that may be looked into.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw the Minister's attention to this aspect. When the Harbour was built, a compound was created as a workers' compound, and it is our intention as the workers' representatives to make that workers' compound into a decent canteen or restaurant. It is a Government building, and the Government turned it over to the workers to put into good shape. I should like to draw to the Minister's attention that an amount of $6,000 was put in the original Estimates for capital equipment, and my feeling is that the Port Contractors involved will have to bear the cost of renovation of that building, because we are satisfied that the employers as such owe a responsibility to provide some of the facilities on the spot for the workers. I feel that the original $6,000 that had been put in the Estimates to be utilised in that part of the building should be revoted or reinserted as a capital expenditure, because in the final analysis it is the Government's property. I am not cheeseparing in my view. The Government has provided certain basic equipment and facilities for the caterers at Seawell Airport, and I feel that the same should be done at the Harbour. If these facilities are provided, we are hoping to extend the service to the public, because it is outside the Customs area, and since taxi drivers may be down there all day, there should be facilities for them to have drinks and lunch. We have already addressed this matter to the Hon. Minister. Apart from being a specific workers' need, a canteen in that area would also serve a public need, and I should like to say that my organisation feels that it should be run by a Joint Committee. We will be responsible for the maintenance of it, but we feel that the capital expenditure involved and certain basic things should be provided by the Government, and if a charge is to be made on us by anybody, let us know what it is.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, $6,000 were provided by the former Government, but we did not feel we could call for Government funds unless we were clear in our minds how they should be utilised. I do not believe in calling for money until your plans are prepared, cut and dried and you can use it to the best interest of the community that you are serving. For that reason I advised my organisation not to embark on asking Government to do anything untill all the plans had been made by both sides. The employers and ourselves have reached an agreement on the fundamentals, and I would be happy if the Minister would resurrect this idea and not be obstinate and say that the building is there already. We cannot walk into the building and put a kitchen anywhere where it would be inconvenient. It was originally agreed that the kitchen should go to the north outside the compound, and we feel that would be an excellent thing. Government should have no fear that this would not be a contribution in the right direction. We should like this to be a model from which any benefit gained can go into welfare services for persons concerned. In this Island there are not enough welfare services conducted by employers in a general way. A canteen service is a good service for a place like that because it is outside the Customs and would create no problems, and with proper control we feel we can make that a very suitable place.

I can tell the Hon. Minister that my organisation will be calling upon employers to provide certain things, but in this matter we feel we are not asking the Government too much if we ask them to assist with some of the capital to make the building suitable for the purposes we have in mind.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who proposes to speak on this Resolution before the Hon. Minister replies?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the building at the Harbour was furnished by the Port Authorities for the actual convenience of Port workers, and at present negotiations are still underway as to who should run the canteen, whether it should be given out by tender, and who would furnish the necessary equipment for putting this canteen into operation. I have had several meetings already with the Barbados Workers' Union, the Port Contractors and the Port Department in connection with furnishing and equipping the entire building, and I can assure the hon. senior member for St. Peter that we would be quite prepared to do anything in our power to make it a self-supporting unit for the convenience of the workers.

With regard to the complaints made about the cost of living and no reduction since the coming into operation of the Harbour, it must be borne in mind that we have to compete against Trinidad and several other islands and be able to keep Port rates to such an extent to induce shipping into our island, and even if $2.00 per ton were taken off cargo, the amount per pound by which such commodities would be reduced would be negligible, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said.

4.25 p.m.

It is 2,240 pounds per ton or as in some places, where it is calculated at 4 cubic feet per ton. For the actual consumer to see some margin of profit, you will have to consider a price in the vicinity of $22 a ton where you will be able to offer one cent per pound to the average consumer. But the country on a whole must feel a sense of satisfaction if we can keep rates and charges at the Port at a position where we can compete against the neighbouring islands. We have Trinidad not far away. Due to the geographical position of Barbados, fortunately, that has added a lot to the good name which the Port of Barbados holds. St. Vincent has just built a new Deep Water Harbour. The public of Barbados should not expect to see a reduction unless there is a reduction of rates in the vicinity of $20 per ton, which is practically impossible.

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

RESOLUTION *re* ACQUISITION OF LAND AT ST. PETER

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands against the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing: Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of a parcel of land at Ashton Hall, St. Peter, for providing a new pumping station for the development of water services.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks the approval of the House for the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land for a pumping station at Ashton Hall, St. Peter.

As set out in the Addendum, negotiations with the owner of this parcel of land were successfully concluded, but he is unable to give a good and marketable title for the full period required by Law. It is necessary therefore to use the Land Acquisition Act in order that Government may get an indefeasible title.

The amount of land affected is 1 rood, 2 1/2 perches or thereabouts. Two and a half perches are contained in the area of the road hereinafter mentioned abutting and abounding on lands now or late of C. Newsam on lands now or late of Leon Scantlebury and on lands of Dudley Jordan and on a road 14 feet wide or however else the same may abut and bound.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

S.H. FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION AND AUDIT BILL, 1964

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the hon. and learned Premier: Second reading of a Bill to provide for the control and management of the public finances of the Island; to regulate the receipt, control and issue of public moneys; to provide for the audit of public and other accounts and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Bill which we are now considering is a comprehensive one and it deals with the finances, and administration of finances, and the audit of the financial accounts of this Island. It seeks to repeal the Public Accounts Act of 1955 and to make better and more detailed provision for the control and management of the public finances of this Island.

This is one of the measures, of course, in which this Government is sweeping the dusty cobweb corners from our midst. I do not think a democracy can function well unless the financial accounts come under continuous review and unless the duties of people who have to deal with public business are clearly set out so that there can be no evasion of public responsibility.
4.35 p.m.

You will remember, Sir, that earlier in this Session, we, as a matter of domestic procedure, made certain amendments to the Standing Orders of this House whereby provision will be made for a Public Accounts Committee which will have supreme powers for the control over the expenditure of public funds. We are now coming towards the close of this Session after two years and three months; we hope to start off, in a few weeks' time, a new financial year with the meeting of the new Legislature, and it is therefore only fitting and proper that all the groundwork for the proper administration of finance should be laid before the new Legislature reconvenes in a re-constituted way. The Bill is divided into five parts, and I do not think I need go into any detail.

Part IIA deals with the preparation of the annual estimates of revenue and expenditure and includes those provisions related thereto which are included in the Executive Committee Act, 1891, which was recently repealed. Part IIB provides for the appointment of accounting officers and collectors of revenue, and for the control of expenditure and revenue, Clauses 7 and 9. This Part of the Bill also sets out the powers of the Minister of Finance, the Financial Secretary and the Accountant General in relation to the keeping and management of and the accounting for public monies.

Clause 10 sets out and deals with the financial statements which the Accountant General and other accounting officers are to prepare annually and which the Minister of Finance is also required to lay annually before the General Assembly. Part IIB also vests in the Financial Secretary the power of surcharge in respect of such matters as the failure to collect monies owing to the Government or the improper payment of public monies. It also provides for the notification of and the withdrawal by the Financial Secretary of any surcharge and gives any person dissatisfied with a surcharge made against him a right of appeal to the Officer administering the Government of the territory where an officer has been charged for failure to discharge his duty, and the Officer administering the Government of the territory will act on the advice of the Privy Council.

Part III of the Bill deals generally with the collection, issue and payment of public monies. It also provides for the establishment of a Treasury Account and for the withdrawal of public monies from the Treasury Account, prescribes the times at which payments in respect of salaries, pensions and allowances may be made, and it includes a provision which will enable the Legislature to authorise the Minister of Finance to borrow, by means of temporary advances from any bank or banks, sums not exceeding an amount determined by the Legislature to meet the current requirements of the Government. I do not want anybody to have the idea that I can replenish my supplies from any bank, but provision is made to enable the Minister of Finance to make a temporary borrowing from any bank or banks of an amount to meet the current requirements of the Government.

Part IV provides for the audit of the public accounts and certain other accounts; it also sets out the duties of the Auditor General and provides for his annual report to the General Assembly, on his examination of the public accounts. Part V of the Bill, of course, has consequential provisions such as those relating to the repeal of the Executive Committee Act, 1891.

As I said, Sir, this is a rather comprehensive Bill and I am very pleased that we have at long last got all these procedures straightened out and embodied into a Statute such as this Bill, which the ordinary citizen, as well as the public officers, will be able to understand without having to look all over the place to find what their duties are; and in some cases not being able to find what their duties are at all. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time. I should mention that when we are in Committee on this Bill, the Honourable Leader of the House has already suspended the appropriate Standing Orders, and I intend to deal with this Bill in parts and not in Clauses, as I gave notice of that some seven or eight days ago. Again, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Part I of the Bill was called and passed.

Part II was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Part II stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, in this part of the Bill, Clause 9, Subclause (2) says this:-

> "(2) The Minister may in his discretion limit or suspend any expenditure charged under any Appropriation Act or under any resolution of the Legislature if in his opinion the exigencies of the financial situation make such limitation or suspension necessary."

This strikes me as somewhat peculiar. If the Legislature makes a vote on any matter, it can only do so at the instigation of the Government and the Minister of Finance. If the Minister of Finance brings down a Bill to expend an amount of money, it cannot reach the House unless it comes through the Government, because a private member cannot do that. At what stage then does the Minister of Finance want to have further powers? As I say, Sir, this seems to me to be somewhat peculiar, because the power to deal with finance originates with the Government, and the Government would have given full consideration to the matter. The power of dealing with finance should origin-

ate with the Minister of Finance who is going to be in charge of it. I do not think that, if the Legislature has done what is set out here, this power and control will be any longer necessary.
4.45 p.m.

This will make the Legislature a mockery, because if you bring something to the Legislature as a financial matter and it reaches approval thereof, the Legislature should then be in a supreme capacity to grant the sums of money to be expended. I do not like this Clause because it seems to me to be redundant and to savour of something that takes place from another source. If the source is the Government itself that rejects it, I cannot see what safeguard the Minister wants to safeguard something he himself has rejected. I do not know if this has been copied from some other law which has no application to Barbados, because the only thing the Legislature can deal with is increasing the salaries of the members of the Staff. I therefore do not see the logic in it for this reservation of power. This Clause reads: "The Minister may in his discretion limit or suspend any expenditure charged under any Appropriation Act or under any resolution of the Legislature if in his opinion the exigencies of the financial situation make such limitation or suspension necessary. Does this mean that you can decide to come for money and then realise you do not have enough in the Treasury? I do not see, if this is going to originate with the Cabinet, why the Minister wants powers to withhold things that the House passes.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if any other hon. member wishes to speak on Part II, but I will refrain from replying until other hon. members might have had an opportunity to express their opinions. The hon. member was speaking on Part II - Clause 9.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, sub-Clause 3 of Clause 9 reads as follows: "Save as may otherwise be provided by this or any other Act, no sums due to the Government by way of revenue and other public moneys may be remitted without the authority of the Cabinet and a statement showing all amounts so remitted shall be submitted by the Auditor General to the General Assembly, in the manner provided in section 26."

We do know that the Cabinet should be given the ultimate decision in money matters. In saying this, I do not wish to say it will apply to this Government, but we are making legislation for all time, and we do know that in the hands of other Governments or in the hands of an unscrupulous Government, this Clause could be utilised to the benefit of persons in the Cabinet and their friends. They would have the ultimate power to remit their own taxes. Suppose taxes are unpaid for a length of time as often happens, what safeguard would we have that this would not apply to members directly concerned or their immediate relatives and friends? It is true it would have to be submitted to the Auditor General who would then report to the General Assembly and you may say that members would have an opportunity of seeing it, but it would have already been done. Is there not some other precaution which could be included so as to prevent such practice? In Local Government over a period of years remission of taxes never took place. We know we have bad debts, but they remain there, and it is bad accounting to have to carry forward a lot of bad debts over a period of years. In any business you have bad and doubtful accounts which you can put aside; you can try to collect or leave them there. But it is also said that taxes can at any time be collected no matter how long they remain unpaid. If they are once written off, they are not collected after that. A person may be in bad waters and could have his taxes remitted on the grounds of inability to pay, but he may come in for a windfall after that, and then he could be eligible for the payment of those taxes.

There are times, Mr. Chairman, when it would be expedient and permissible to write off accounts that you know to be lost, in cases where a man has died or has left the Island, but this should not be put in the hands of persons who can utilise it to remit their own taxes and the taxes of those very close to them. I thought I would draw that to the Committee's attention and hear from the Minister of Finance what he thinks about it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, it does not appear as if any other hon. member wishes to make any comments on this part of the Bill, and therefore I will reply now to the comments which have been made. The first one was in relation to Sub-clause 2 of Clause 9 in Part II of the Bill found on page 9, a comment made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter querying the propriety of the provision which is contained therein. This provision, as you will see from the Table of comparative legislation, is one which is found in Section 19 of the Jamaica Financial Administration and Audit Law, 1959. That in itself does not, of course, absolve me or any other person from having to justify its inclusion in a Bill before this House, but if I may deal with the Clause, sub-clause 2, wherein the Minister is given the discretion to limit or suspend any expenditure charged under any Appropriation Act or under any resolution of the Legislature if in his opinion the exigencies of the financial situation make such limitation or suspension necessary, just today, Mr. Chairman, we passed the Appropriation Bill of 1964-65, and we also had two Resolutions relating to appropriations for the Port Department and the other one for Capital Estimates of 1964-65; so in all these sittings we have dealt with the type of legislation over which this discretion may be exercised. I personally can see nothing wrong with the provision at all, because if there were not this provision it may very well be argued that, the House of Assembly, having approved of the expenditure of nearly $8 1/2 million on capital account, whether the money was available or not, if conditions changed or whether the personnel and necessary materials were available or not, the Public Works Department and any other Departments involved in this expenditure would be under a compulsion, as it were, to spend that amount of money.
4.55 p.m.

This is not any Minister in authority as Minister of Finance, because the Minister of Finance is one in whom finance is vested; but it certainly gives the Minister in his discretion the power to curtail expenditure if the financial situation demanded it, and he can demand it, if there were a startling decrease in revenue or if the Minister found it inadvisable to raise loans at a particular time, Let us say that the Minister may decide that if he waited until the end of the financial year, it would be a better position to raise a loan at a reasonable rate and for a longer time than if he had pressed it during that financial year. That is all that the provision seeks to do as far as I am concerned.

I see nothing wrong with that at all and I do not see how one can fetter a discretion of the Minister of Finance when members are always at liberty to come back and ask question.

My difficulty is not to get people to spend money; my difficulty is to prevent people from coming back to get more money. Having approved of a particular programme, there is the tendency for Departments who spend the money to say that the money is not enough.

As far as sub-clause 3 is concerned, as regards the question of remission by the Cabinet, I do not know if the hon. junior member for Christ Church feels that the Cabinet should have the power of remitting payments; but under the Income Tax Act there is a provision, to give you an illustration, that if the P.A.Y.E. tax is not submitted to the Department of Inland Revenue at a certain time, automatically there is a penalty and the people who submit the tax - the employers - can apply to the Minister of Finance directly. It used to be the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The Executive Committee has delegated that authority to the Ministry of Finance. What happens is that some firms send in their tax too late and in some cases there are mitigating circumstances. The Commissioner of Inland Revenue sets out a report on the cases, but that

report does not go any longer to the Executive Committee; it goes to the Ministry of Finance and after examination by us in the Ministry of Finance, I then instruct the Commissioner that he can remit certain fines as a result of late payments. That is not actually the tax which is due. It is more in the nature of a fine or penalty. That is the standard procedure. It goes on almost every week or every month. We have submissions for remissions, which are granted in some cases, and in other cases, they are not granted.

The submission of all amounts remitted must be submitted to the House under Section 26 to the Speaker himself by the Auditor General, and it is the duty of the Speaker to draw it to the Public Accounts Committee which is a Committee of this House.

Now, Sir, the remissions would not cover things like drawbacks and refunds of income tax. You will remember in the 1961-62 Estimates provision was made for drawbacks, and on the introduction of the Estimates for 1962-63 I pointed out to members of the House that things like drawbacks and refund or income tax overpaid, and so on, were inflated in the Estimates by at least $1 million a year and this was, so to speak, a balancing item; that is, the money was paid in and taken back out.

The people are entitled to drawbacks on goods which are re-exported. Similarly, some people may have overpaid their income tax and they are entitled to refunds.

The Estimates for 1964-65, as you will see, do not really represent the real increase in Government Revenue — the increase as appeared in the 1960-61 Estimates — because you would have to add another $1 million this year to get a comparative figure between the 1961-62 Estimates and the 1964-65 Estimates. You will find figures of the Revenue and Expenditure over the ten-year period in the Estimates. The Revenue for the period 1961-62 is stated as $26,209,360. In that figure would be included $1 million which would not appear in the 1962-63 Estimates.

This is a matter puzzling to a lot of people because I have recently explained that between December 1961 and March 1962 that this Government was faced with increased expenditure of $3 million. If you look at the Comparative Table on page iv of the Estimates, it would appear only as $2 million. In other words, if you put back in the amount which I expunged or delted, whatever you may term it, the figure would be more in the vicinity of $29.3 million rather than $28.3 million. Therefore, if I put it this way, despite the fact that I took out that $1 million and it does not appear any longer the expenditure would be of the order of $3 million. That was largely due to the recommendation of the Jacobs Commission on Civil Servants' salaries.

I think that I should go on record on outlining some of the checks and balances which are now in the constitution of this Island. I think that I should prepare a White Paper on this because it would be of interest to those who have to study Government's procedure, the Law and Customs of Parliament on constitutional matters.
5.05 p.m.

The principles on which the system of financial control is founded are as follows: This is a statement which I have prepared. The Legislature is the supreme authority for the imposition of taxation, the creation of debt and the expenditure of money so collected and expresses its will on this as on other matters by the enactment of laws. The first instrument of control is the Treasury which is responsible for public revenues and borrowings and from which no money can be withdrawn except in accordance with the will of the Legislature as expressed by law. Law in this case does not mean a Bill, but it is a Bill or Resolution for the expenditure of public funds.

The second instrument of control of public funds is the Auditor General. He is answerable to the Legislature on whose behalf he checks all withdrawals from the Accountant General to ensure that the declared purpose of the transactions is in accordance with legislative approval; he examines the accounts to see that, as far as possible, all amounts receivable are deposited with the Accountant General and that the sums withdrawn from the Treasury have been applied solely for the purposes approved by the Legislature, and he reports the results of his examination to the Speaker of the House and places the report with the accounts before the House which refers them to a Standing Committee of Public Accounts for examination and report.

The first line of control, the first authority, is the Auditor General and secondly, the Legislature. Then you have the Public Accounts Committee. That is the third instrument of legislative control over public expenditure. In the management of public finance, the Legislature recognises the responsibility of the Minister of Finance for proposing taxation to meet public expenditure by assigning to his Ministry and the Accountant General's Department, the duty of ensuring, as far as possible, the regularity and propriety of the conduct of public business. Secondly, there is economy and efficiency in the preparation of the Estimates of Expenditure submitted to the Legislature and a continual responsibility to see that excesses are avoided and that, in any event, the arrangements made by the Ministries and Departments for expending substantial amounts which have been voted are financially sound and economical. All of this exercise is started all the way back in the Ministry from September and in the Departments, a little earlier; that is, the preparation of the Estimates of Expenditure.

The Permanent Secretaries in the Ministries and any other officers who head Departments which are not subject to the control of the Minister, have charge of votes granted by the House and are held to be personally responsible for expenditure charged to those votes. They are required to certify the correctness of the appropriation amounts to their respective Ministries and Departments. By correctness I mean that they have to certify that the amounts voted have been used only for the purposes for which they are intended by the House that the actual payments were in accordance with the Laws, Rules and Regulations governing them; that the charges were on a fair and a reasonable basis and were incurred without waste and extravagance and that the accounts rendered are accurate.

Mr. Chairman, I thought it necessary, since this is a new exercise, that I should outline — and this would probably save a lot of questions — the way in which the public finances of the island are now going to be organized as a result of this Bill. (Mr. WALCOTT: All of that is not Clause 9 Sub-section (2) of this Bill.) I have given the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill and I am also giving a sort of constitutional background behind the Bill, which I am entitled to do. I will not worry to go into any further detail as I think I should publish a White Paper on this matter, so that hon. members will see that, despite the provisions of the part of the Bill which we are discussing, the provision of checks, balances and controls are all there. It is true that what used to be called the Executive Committee has delegated certain powers to the Ministry of Finance, the power to remit funds and penalties for certain things on the Public Accounts Committee and the Auditor General, and the Legislature in the final analysis will have that control over these remittances because Permanent Secretaries and the Minister of Finance himself is amenable to the discipline of the Public Accounts Committee. That was never done before, and therefore I think it is appropriate that hon. members should know what the procedures are going to be.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I must thank the Hon. Minister for what he has said, but I did not think that the Public Accounts Committee would have any power to do what I asked for in this Sub-clause (2). The Public Accounts Committee would not have any power to deal with that. The point which has been raised by the hon. junior member for Christ Church is something which you could not do anything much about because they were empowered under the Executive Committee before. The Executive Committee has the same powers, and this is the price you have to pay

for independence and Ministers of Government. *(Asides)* I am not rambling all over this Clause; I am only dealing with Part 2 and I am saying that nothing which the Hon. Minister has said has answered the point which I raised. You want to maintain this sort of Crown Colony Legislation and you are inserting this thing, but in Barbados we have never been accustomed to this. Here in Barbados, only the Minister or the Cabinet can prepare Estimates. The Minister has got general powers; he has not got to have to borrow money. The Civil Servants are not those who are borrowing money; you have to get the approval of the proper authorities. The succeeding Government gets the same opportuntiy too. You have come in at a time when something happens, so that the last Government could not borrow, but you have come in at a time when it is easier for you to borrow. What I say is that no expenditure can be made without the same Minister. This is not anything which has originated from outside the Minister; this is something which has originated from the Cabinet. This Clause is written as if this thing starts in the Legislature, but we can come down here and pass money and force the Government to do something which the Government does not want to do. Therefore, that is one of the limitations. 5.15 p.m.

With these appropriations, you have committed the Legislature to the spending of these amounts; but if there is a tidal wave or hurricane, you would limit the expenditure. You do not need specific powers for that, because there are general powers in a Government. You do not have to specify doing this or doing that, because in any case the money is issued on the warrant of the Government. We passed the Appropriation Bill and the money goes to the various Ministries; so the appropriate Ministers have general control over it, how fast it is spent and how it is utilised; this specific control of suspending any money passed means that something can be agreed upon and the Minister of Finance for his own reason can decide that this should not be done. For instance, I remember on one occasion that this Chamber agreed to increase the salary of one of the staff, but the then Ministers did not agree. Some of the backbenchers agreed and voted in a general way, and the salary was given. In a case like that, can we see the Minister of Finance trying to use this Clause? I do not like test cases. I do not want to have this idea about Ministers being fettered, but in these colonies and territories, unfettered power sometimes leads to disaster. We had an example four or five years ago of seeing the Government, the same Barbadians, give an interpretation, and it was one of the most outrageous things you could find in which one of their political opponents succeeded in an election, and they were using some of these words in the Constitution, and some of the lawyers agreed with them. This was the occasion on which you were appointing the first set of Aldermen. Nothing they did was illegal because you could not sue them, but they had discretion and it was that so far as they were concerned they were going to appoint enough members to nullify the election which had taken place. If you had somebody doing that in the face of an election, what do you believe would take place when there is not an election? I say that because in these outposts in the world we create our own orders, and that is why I say I do not see the necessity for this Clause in this Bill because in my view it is redundant and unnecessary, and there is no need to write in unnecessary superlative powers unless you want to have power for the sake of having it. The Minister brought the Appropriation Bill, and if he says that we should go easy on the East Coast Road, all he has to do is to give directions on how the work should proceed. What more general control do you want? The idea of what you are going to spend on the East Coast Road is what the Minister had agreed to, not what the House says. Spending $1 million or $2 million or a half cent is what the Minister and the Cabinet agree to.

I said in here, Mr. Chairman, that the Government can send a delegation to Geneva to the I.L.O. The Government said they are not sending anyone; so it is not a question of what power you have. We believe that you must send someone to Conferences; but what we want to know is what more power than the general powers you possess do you want by writing into a clause that anything the Legislature passes, you must still have the right to be able to withhold. All I say is that any bogus argument can be used. In these colonies I do not like writing in these Colonial titbits which have Colonial connotation, because I am sure if you read the Financial Bill, you will see that the Prime Minister as Prime Minister has general power. The Prime Minister of Great Britain is the Minister of the Treasury although he has a Chancellor of the Exchequer; and if the Chancellor of the Exchequer wants the bank rate to go up tomorrow, he cannot put up the rates although he has more power than the Ministers in Barbados possess. The Prime Minister is the Prime Minister, and if he says "no", the Chancellor of the Exchequer will either have to agree or resign. I feel that in our Constitution it is unnecessary to write in these titbits, because the discretion here is different from the discretion which the hon. member raised in sub-clause (33). I can understand what is operating in the hon. member's mind because the power is relating to an individual about the remission of taxes; but persumably no sensible Minister of Finance would undertake this to mean that, because the power to remit taxes would not be a Cabinet decision or an Executive Committee's decision that he should do that. You can very well understand why the hon. member raised this point. I was a member of the Executive when this operated, and I can tell him that some people will get a remission of taxes and others will not. That is going to happen whether it is a Committee or a person. If the hon. member does not have a cast iron case, I have known of cases where people have been remitted. I do not have to call names, but I am sure that you will remember.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member may be thinking of politics at Local Government level, but there is no remission of personal income tax or anything like that, as far as the Government is concerned. Drawbacks in the Customs are given on the fixed basis that you have to qualify for a drawback, and any member in commerce would be able to tell the hon. member that, not that he does not know already, because I believe he has something to do with the Customs Department; and as far as the Commissioner of Inland Revenue is concerned, in order to make remittances of the nature of over payment or remittances of fines or penalties, mitigating circumstances have to be demonstrated before the fine or penalty is remitted, like being late by one day. 5.25 p.m.

I have not known of a single case that we have had to deal with when the tax was not paid within seven days of when it was due. I wish I could say the same thing of income tax. You do not owe that amount. If so, the Legislature would have to pass a Bill declaring a moratorium.

Mr. WALCOTT: I can speak *ex-cathedra* on that. I have had experience on that. I will not call names, but there are cases which you have to remit, and it is for the Executive Committee to remit income tax if the Commissioner of Inland Revenue says that it should be done. I know of a case of a person who was an extremely meticulous person and the Post Office stamp was dated on his letter. It proved that the duty so far was wrong and in those circumstances the person made an appeal to the Executive Committee who felt that the person was right and they said that they could not charge that at the interest rate which was applicable on what he was rated.

The Commissioner of Inland Revenue does not regard this as the law. It was not done on a narrow basis because the Commissioner puts up his case. I say that you have to live with people, and my only view is that where you are living with people, whether they are groups or individuals, you will get that. Let us not fool ourselves. I hear that the Hon. Minister in charge allows for certain improprieties. You have to use your discretion. We do not pass laws for whoever takes over. If the people elect such persons who are not fit to be put into authority, that is the price which you have to pay. I am prepared to pay that price if you elect people who are going to act with a certain measure of spite.

I do not see any cause why the Minister should have any reservation for the continuation of more reserve

power to withhold the money which the Legislature passed when there is general provision for this to be under their control. If this is the Act now, what is the position? All the Ministers now control the money in the Island. With Ministerial Government, can you say that the head of the Government is the Financial Secretary? You vote money now for Conferences. Which of the Civil Servants can really tell you to send somebody to a Conference? If there is an emergency, you are not going to spend any money anyhow. If there is a hurricane, you are not going to spend any money then; you will wait until the hurricane is over.

I say that that is a political clause: it is not a legal clause. It is dealing purely with the politics of today. The Hon. Premier said that your trouble here is spending money. Sometimes, it may be that you need to stop people from spending money. I have been in the House of Assembly long enough to see that certain things are not done in certain constituencies at all. You forget those constituencies, but you see things taking place in other constituencies. At one stage, you would have thought that St. Philip was Barbados, but it was because the installation of water was part of the new Government's policy. You could not believe that there were other parishes than St. Philip; therefore, you got that situation going on. That is why I say that I am not happy about this clause. To give you my idea. If you come down with a Resolution to spend $10,000, is it not something which the Minister beforehand can control to spend? What do you find? When Ministers bring down legislation which is copied from somewhere else, you get all sorts of arguments to justify it.

Our audit system has been regarded as slow, but it is more worthy because you get these double checks by the Audit Office and the Accountant-General. The Barbados system of accounting is so run that you find what is taking place in the other islands are not taking place here. Over here, you do not pay out and check after. The pre-audit system is so rigid that your money stays in the Treasury weeks and weeks before you get it. The Accountant-General does not approve of something which this House has not approved of and in the same form as it has been approved. Politicians have been so worried about our system that they felt that the Auditor General had more power than sometimes members of the Government. They felt so because the Governor cannot send down an order to tell the Auditor General how to do his job. When you have a strong and independent Auditor General, it means that any person whom he has to pay he must approve of the matter first.

I do not see anything wrong from the restricting of power, but I do not understand creating power for the sake of creating power. The circumstances which would lead Jamaica to do something I would say would not be the same circumstances to make me agree to it in Barbados.

I regard this as unnecessary and, as I have said already, anything that the Government sees or proposes in any of these Bills, they regard as something against the canons of the Divine to change it; but I have lived long enough to see that when legislation of this nature passes in here, it operates generally against some of the people who passed it. I am satisfied in my mind that there are people in Barbados who feel that Barbadians are different: but we have as many people in Barbados similar to what you find anywhere else with a bad side; therefore, do not think that Barbados has a new brand.
5.35 p.m.

I have had enough to make me feel satisfied that this Clause is unnecessary in order that the Minister may be given this power, because he is the Minister. This is giving the Minister power, which, in my opinion, he does not deserve to be given, because there are general powers, and you do not need any specific power to deal with any money which is voted by the Legislature. The money which is to be voted is dealt with by the Cabinet as a whole, and this Clause only gives the Minister specific power to withhold money which he, in his discretion, can limit. I do not think that any single person should have any power to withhold this money other than the Legislature as a whole.

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

Part III to V of the Bill inclusive were called and passed.

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

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

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

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

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

ANGLICAN CLERGY (PENSIONABLE EMOLUMENTS AND SERVICE) BILL

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 15 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. John:- To move the Second Reading of a Bill relating to the pensionable emoluments and service of the Anglican Clergy.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple enactment arising out of the Partial Suspension Act of the Anglican Church Act, 1955, Chapter 49. Under that Act, increased salaries were given in non-pensionable posts provided for by Resolutions of the Legislature. It has been recently decided that, in the computation of the pension of any person who holds or held a post after the commencement of the Act, actual account should be taken of any increase in salary which has been granted since 1955. It has also been decided that the persons who held office on the coming into operation of the Act should not be prejudiced by the fact that these offices ceased to be pensionable on the coming into operation of the Pensions (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1957.

The reference which I can make to this whole protracted affair is that we hope shortly to introduce legislation which will regularise the position of the Anglican Community in this island *vis-a-vis* the Public Treasury of this island. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the Government has seen fit to bring down Legislation in order to regularise the pensions of the set Curates and Vicars. What I would like to ask the Hon. Minister is this: Does this Bill mean that Clergymen who held office at the time of the passing of this Act and who were promoted to Rectors would be entitled to pensions when they resign as Rectors? I think I read that into this Bill; all holders of offices, Rectors and Vicars who remain in the service and who are promoted afterwards will receive their pensions on the basis of the posts which they are holding today. If, for instance, a person who was a Vicar in 1955 is a Rector today and he resigns as a Rector, he would benefit by the receipt of his pension as a Rector under this Bill. If that is the only point, I would like the Hon. Minister to make the position abundantly clear.

Again, Sir, I say that I am very glad to see that this Bill will regularise the pensions of the existing Clergy in the Anglican Church.
5.45 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I too would say that this is one of the few occasions that I have found in which the general administration has taken nine years to realise something. It is positively unfair to the incumbents of these offices to have kept them waiting nine years and then not to have regularise their pension. It is a decision that has been taken that is reasonable; it is logical, and I feel that this matter of nine years waiting has induced in this island what I would regard as a slackening off in the quality of persons who could have been or would have been appointed to the Ministry, because when you get a situation like this, it means that the Ministry would not really attract the best people. I hope I am not making any indictment on the persons who are doing this very good work in Barbados; but from what I have been seeing, there has been a dereliction in some of their duties and what is regarded as the quality the Church can really get. I am very pleased to see that this situation has now been rectified.

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

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

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 4 was called. It reads as follows:-

4. If any person to whom this Act applies was, after the coming into operation of the Pensions (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1957 appointed to any office of Rector, Vicar or Curate other than the office which he held on that date, or is appointed to any such office, then any pension, gratuity or other allowance payable to or in respect of the service of that person under any provision of the Pensions Legislation shall be computed, and the qualification therefor determined, as if the office to which he was or is appointed had continued to be a pensionable office.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, the question I posed was in relation to this Clause, that it does not matter from which office he retires.

The question that Clause 4 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 5 was called and passed.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded in each case by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION *re* QUARRY PRODUCTS LIMITED

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: That Order stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee of a parcel of land, known as the Bagatelle Quarry, to Quarry Products Limited.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks the approval of the House to lease to Quarry Products Limited for a period of five years, in the first instance at an annual rental of $2,400 plus a royalty of 20 cents per ton of all material extracted, an area of land known as the Bagatelle Quarry, situate in the parish of Saint Thomas and containing approximately 20 acres, 3 roods, 12 3/10 perches. The lease will contain the usual general provisions having regard to the provisions of the Quarries Act, 1951-9.

When we came into office in December, 1961, Mr. Speaker, Quarry Products was already occupying the premises we are now asking to be leased to them. There was no approval of the Legislature. The Government had allowed Quarry Products to occupy the premises without coming to the Legislature for any lease to operate. Since then, Sir, we have discussed with no less than 60 owners of small quarries in this island how its operation will affect their business. At a meeting most of the quarry owners said that they did not mind Bagatelle operating, and others said the quarry should be closed down completely. Others said that if the Government gave them funds from the Development Board to operate, that would be the only condition on which they would be able to operate, and Quarry Products offered the small quarry operators shares which they also refused.
5.55 p.m.

It took a considerable time to negotiate with the small quarry owners as regards the effect it will have on their trade. It will be impossible for the Government just to close down the quarry after investing that amount of money in it when the Government can receive a royalty of 20 cents per ton for all material extracted from this quarry as well as $240 a year. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, and the consideration paid to the small quarry owners who say that they are not interested in it, I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that what is being done now is an improvement of the past, and it cannot be denied that this Resolution seeks to put the land to a constructive use, because this quarry would be able to supply the material at probably a comparatively good price and at which price any of the small quarry owners would not be able to supply it. In addition, it will not preclude the small quarry owners from carrying on their trade.

However, I must mention this and I have no doubt that the Hon. Minister would give attention to it, as it is his custom not to take his responsibility lightly. Between 1956 and 1961 a considerable amount of damage was done to certain houses in the district nearby the quarry. The Bagatelle Quarry may be in St. Thomas, but I am sure that the place of operation is in St. James and in that Hoyte's district, there is a small area of land on which houses are placed and there are at least twelve houses directly within the ambit of the quarry's operations.

I can assure this Honourable House that the effect of the operation there is not only causing considerable damage to those few houses, but the comfort and the health of the people residing in them. Anyone who takes a car in that area of Hoyte's Village during the day when the quarry is operating will soon see that the whole car is covered with dust and that is having a serious effect on the health and comfort of those people there. It is useless to clean the dust out of the houses. To clean the dust is just like trying to blow sands away.

Sir, this Resolution is a good one not only to the Government but the community as a whole. The land is owned by the Government. This is not a case which you must seek redress by the Courts. I will support the Resolution because it is a good one, but I am saying that the responsibility is on the Government that those twelve houses so near are within the ambit of the operation of the quarry, and I am suggesting that at least these twelve houses should be re-

sited if the operation of the quarry is to go on. I know what I am speaking about and I challenge any hon. member to deny what I am sayingunless that hon. member is a man who has not been on the spot and has not seen what is happening.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Nobody is denying the allegations made by the hon. senior member for St. James. But the statement that the Government is responsible is incorrect. The operators are liable. We cannot operate it oursleves.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I would just say this and I know that the Hon. Minister would not take the matter lightly. I am particularly concerned as regards the damage which has been done to those few residents in that area. A promise was made to them between 1956 and 1961 and even up to this date. The promise is that something will be done by way of compensation.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am not quite clear about what the hon. member means. I think he means the damage done to current residents of that district. He is talking of the damage done during the time when Messrs Costain operated the quarry. Due to the fault of the last Government, Messrs Costain who should have paid compensation to the people did not do so and they have left this Government committed to paying this compensation and we have agreed to pay it.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I will ask the Hon. Minister, if it is not beneath him, just to go to the spot while the quarry is in operation and he will see for himself. I will tell him that he will be invited by certain residents, and he must not think that he will be condescending if he enters certain people's houses.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I have not risen to oppose the Resolution because I know that the Government has good intentions towards the workers. I am speaking on behalf of the workers in St. Thomas. I am again appealing to the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing to see to it, now that the Executive Committee is leasing this land to Quarry Products Limited to operate that quarry, that a directive be issued to that company instructing them to give priority of employment to workers from St. Thomas.

What is more, Mr. Speaker, there are some quarry owners in St. Thomas who might have to close their business as a result of the operation of this company. It is true that the Hon. Minister has said that a certain amount of provision is made for their protection and that Quarry Products Limited was trying to coerce these small quarry owners to take shares. I do not know how far they went, but I am thinking of the rockblasters in St. Thomas who may be thrown out of work as a result; therefore I am appealing to the Hon. Minister to make provision for workers in St. Thomas, especially the small quarry owners and rockblasters when the Concrete Mixing Plant and the two subsidiary plants are established.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons for not coming to this House before with this Resolution to grant this lease was due to awaiting the passing of certain regulations under the Quarry Act which in my absence during the last two weeks were passed. I think hon. members are acquainted with these regulations which among other things make provision for the placing of a sign around the quarry, and in cases of injury as a result of the operation of a quarry, the owners would be directly responsible.

6.05 p.m.

Certain provisions also have been required under the Act such as fencing off and giving certain protection to the area from people falling into the quarries, as well as protection from dust. As the hon. senior member for St. James would know, and as a Barrister-at-Law he would understand, no person in this country can run any business to the detriment or inconvenience of any other person. That would be a matter of the law. What we have done is to make the necessary provision to throw the onus and the responsibility actually on the people who are operating these quarries. In this Resolution, the responsibility is directly in the hands of the operator of this quarry. When Messrs. Contain Ltd. operated this quarry, certain residents in the vicinity had their houses damaged and no compensation has been given to them. The Housing Authority estimated what the damage would amount to, and Messrs. Costain Ltd. had agreed to pay this compensation: but no payment has been made. However, this House has agreed to grant a sum of money for the payment of compensation to these people for the damage which was done to their houses by Messrs. Richard Costain Ltd.

With regard to the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, I suppose the hon. member, and one of the representatives of the people of St. Thomas, feels that it is his duty to see that the people from the parish of St. Thomas get work. I cannot see that the Government could set aside work for people from any particular part of the island. I would say that Barbadians are employed at this quarry. If these Quarry Products people were bringing workers from outside of Barbados, then I could see the Government stopping people from outside. However, owing to the lease to these people, I cannot see how we could tell them to employ workmen from any one particular parish. I do not agree with the hon. member; it would be a matter for the people in that area to try to obtain the work. I really do not see that people from a particular parish could be employed where these Quarry Products people have a lease of this sort.

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

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE WEST INDIES HOSPITAL FUND BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:- To move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to provide for the operation in the Island of a Company to be known as The West Indies Hospital Funds Limited and for various matters connected therewith.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour is aware, there is an amendment made by the Other Place to this Bill which interferes, to some extent, with one of the provisions as was passed by this House, and then there are two other consequential amendments. The main amendment, Sir, is that the Other Place has suggested that there should be inserted in the Bill a Clause to be numbered 17. As a matter of fact, when the Bill was before the House, it was our intention to insert this Clause in the Bill, and therefore it was through an error that that was not done. The error has been corrected by the Other Place, and we are now asking the House to endorse the amendment. The Clause which it is suggested to be inserted in the Bill reads as follows:-

"17. The Governor-in-Executive Committee may by order published in the *Official Gazette* prescribe a price as the minimum price at which any ticket or chance in any lottery or sweepstake organised, controlled or conducted by the Company may be sold and any person who sells or offers or exposes for sale any ticket or chance in any such lottery or sweepstake at a price below such prescribed minimum price shall be guilty of an offence under this Act.'

In other words, the Governor-in-Executive Committee will prescribe by Order the minimum price at which sweepstakes may be sold in this operation. The Governor-in-Executive fixes the minimum rate below which the Company cannot expose for sale or sell sweepstakes or chances to be operated under this lottery.

I think that hon. members will readily appreciate why this is so; this is for the purpose of protecting our own establishment at the Barbados Turf Club, and therefore I feel that every hon. member in this Chamber will readily support the amendment which has been made by the Other Place. As a matter of fact, we have to protect our own local Turf Club.

The existing Clause 17 in the Bill will now become Clause 18 and the existing Clause 18 will become Clause 19. I beg to move that these amendments of the Other Place be now read a first time.

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

The question that these amendments be now read a first time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

6.15 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately when we met this morning, as Your Honour will recall, there were no Notices ready, but a few items have subsequently come down, and I am asking for leave to give them at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is permissible, even though this is a Special Meeting, and the hon. member has leave to give these as intimated.

DOCUMENTS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1964.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1964.

And on behalf of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Annual Report of the Director of Medical Services for the year 1961-62.

The Report on the treatment of Offenders for the year 1961.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1964.

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1964.

A Resolution to vary the conditions governing the payment of gratuities to officers appointed on contract as set out in Schedule 11 to Resolution No. 78/1959.

A Bill to amend Savings Bank Act, 1914.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914, be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members are aware, Prorogation is imminent, and the relative documents to these Notices which we have just given have been, I understand, or are being, circulated to hon. members. There is no need for us to move the adjournment of the House at this stage, because the House already stands adjourned, having not sat today for lack of a quorum earlier. This is a Special Meeting and my understanding of the Standing Orders is that if you have no quorum, the House automatically is adjourned....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I do not know who are the legal pundits that say that. Under the rules, the House stand adjourned and Your Honour can call a special meeting. The House is meeting again; therefore the time that the House meets again is not automatic. That is the sort of conundrum we hear all the time.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am sure Your Honour will support my contention. There are legal pundits and legal pundits. The position is this; automatocally when we had no quorum today the House adjourned until midday tomorrow; therefore I have not got to call for the adjournment now.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member says that, you should not have allowed Notices to be given. You gave out Notices showing that you were doing specific business; so how could you accept the Notices now to be part of the Order Paper? If you were summoning a Special Meeting, it could only deal with the business that we were called upon to do and nothing more.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I want to inform hon. members that those items which were circulated just now we propose to ask hon. members to deal with at tomorrow's meeting. We have to come at 12 o'clock, and we hope to deal with all the matters of which notice was given today and for which the papers have been circulated.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to you the Rules of the House, because I do not understand this playing-by-ear business where someone will say you tacitly agreed to what the hon. member says.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member risen on a point of order?

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, Sir. A notice was circulated asking us to meet at 2.30 p.m. today, and it was drawn to Your Honour's attention that this was a Special Meeting. There can be one thing or the other, that if it is a Special Meeting, nothing else than the items on the Order Paper can be dealth with today, and if you permit anything other than what was done today, that is *ultra vires*, and that means that we might meet automatically tomorrow and not by a vote of the House today. You have to decide on two things because we met today to deal with the Orders on the Order Paper.

6.25 p.m.

If you are meeting only for the purpose of dealing with the business on this Order Paper, it being a Special Meeting, no new Orders can be given notice of. I just want to have this thing regularised.

Mr. SPEAKER: In so far as a Special Meeting is concerned, such a meeting may deal with any number of matters irrespective of quality, so long as they appear on the Agenda of the day of that Special Meeting.

At the present time, there is a Special Meeting in progress, consequently, with respect to tomorrow's meeting, there was an automatic adjournment by the Deputy Speaker which stated that as there was no quorum, according to the relative Standing Orders, the meeting stands adjourned until 12 o'clock (noon) tomorrow.

In respect of the other points raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, there is precedent for the giving of Notices at a Special Meeting. There may be differences of opinion as to validity of even doing that at a Special Meeting, but there is precedent as to the giving of Notices. No motion for the adjournment can be entertained because automatically, after all of the special business has been concluded, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, 24th March, 1964, at 12 o'clock (noon).