

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1961 - 66

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT) SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66 HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17th August, 1965.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met 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, Labour and Social Security); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. SUC. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. N. W. BOXILL and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

prayers were read.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. S. E. SEALY entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

I regret to have to inform the House that there are no Minutes available for confirmation.

Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the

following papers-

Quarterly Digest Statistics No. 33, March, 1965.

Report of the Standing Insurance Committee and Statement of Accounts of the General Insurance Fund for the year 1962-63.

An Account of the transactions in Rum in the several Districts of the Island for the Quarter ended 30th June 1965.

The Rules of the Supreme Court, (Amendment), 1965.

The Federal Negotiations, 1962-65 and Constitutional Proposals for Barbados.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following-

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.5) Order, 1965.

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1965.

A Resolution to approve the Compulsory acquisition by the Crown of certain parcels of land situate at Black Rock - Cave Hill, St. Michael.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Development, I beg to give notice of the following-

A Resolution to place the sum of \$2,561 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1965-66. Part I - Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1965-66, No. 13, which forms the schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$733 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1965-66, Part II - Capital as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1965-66, No. 14, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital Bill, 1965. REPLIES LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I also beg to give notice of the fact that the following Replies to Parliamentary Questions are ready - The Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 25/1964 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael.

The Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 38/1964 asked by the hon. senior member for St. James.

The Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 40/1964 also asked by the hon. senior member for St. James.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is a Question standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip re the Government Industrial School at Dodds. I see that the hon. member is not in his place.

There is also a Question standing in the name of the hon. Junior for St. John re the post of Student Nurse at the Hospital.

Mr. YEARWOD:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister

Is the Minister aware that persons who have applied for the first time for the post of Student Nurse at the Hospital and who have been unsuccessful in the examinations for the said post have in some cases been requested by the Matron not to apply again?

. Will the Minister cause this most unsatisfactory state of affairs to cease?

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

I observe that the hon. junior member for St. Philip is now in his place. The hon. member may put his question re the Government Industrial School at Dodds.

Mr. WEEKES Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister.

Will Government state whether juvenile delinquents detained at the Government Industrial School at Dodds, St. Philip who have committed petty offences during such detention are blacklisted after the period of detention by reason of such offences?

2. If the answer is in the negative, will Government state why such offences are taken into consideration in the selection of (a) candidates for work with the London Transport Executive, and (b) persons applying for entry into the United Kingdom generally?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the money Resolutions of which notice was given earlier today.

INDISPOSITION OF HON. C. E. TALMA

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Weaker, I want to apologise to the House for the absence of the hon. senior member for Christ Church, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, who is indisposed and unable to attend today\'s sitting of the House.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. W. A CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Bill, 1965, be now read a first time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAXER:

It is now Question Time. I have been advised that the answer is ready to Question No. 25/1964, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael. That is the first Question ready to be dealt with.

WATER SERVICE AT ST. STEPHENS - CLEVE-DALE HOUSING AREA

Mr. SEALEY:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister

Is Government aware that water mains have been laid throughout the St. Stephen\'s Hill - Clevedale Housing Area in the parish of St. Michael for nearly two years but no water service by way of public stand-pipes or in private dwellings have yet been connected?

2. Is Government aware that as a result the residents of the said district are put to great hardship and have to travel long distances in order to obtain water?

3.

4. Will Government take immediate steps to have the said water service connected and the said hardship alleviated?

5.

2.55 p.m.

Mr. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows-

"Yes, Sir. It is desired to point out however that as an interim measure two standpipes have been installed.

2.Does not now arise.

3.Negotiations are in progress with the owner of the land under which a water main must be laid to enable the Housing Authority's Estate at Cleverdale to obtain a water supply."

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next answers are to Questions Nos. 38 and 40, both of which are in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. James, who, I observe, is not presently in his place.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, in respect of the White Paper which has just been laid in the House, I would like to raise a question. I am fully aware Sir, that the Other Place is entitled to have this or any matter laid before it either before, after or simultaneously with this Chamber as part of (the Legislature of this colony. I am also aware that the Government in presenting any White Paper which they are producing are entitled to have the Press, and I am fully aware that they are entitled to have this White Paper sold by the Government Printery, but I do think myself, Sir

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the Hon. Leader of the Opposition direct my attention to the Point which, he desires to bring to my notice?

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I am going to do so, but I am just trying to draw to Your Honour's attention the fact that I am aware that the Leader of the Government is entitled to have a Press Conference on this matter; but I do feel that as Leader of the Opposition, I must express that it is rather scant courtesy with which to treat this House. As a matter of fact, I consider that the Government's attitude in ignoring the House, if I can use that term, by making us the last persons to be given copies to be a very ruinous and ignominious situation.

Mr. SPEAKER:

May I draw to the attention of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that it is competent for a matter to be laid in either Chamber of Parliament before the other? And may I remind the Hon. member that in 1935 at the instance of the late Henry Walter Reece, K. C., the Real Property Devolution Act was laid first in the Legislative Council and passed also in that Chamber before it was laid here.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I am quite aware of that, Sir, because I said that in my remarks; but I feel that as far as this White Paper is concerned, it has placed hon. members in a rather difficult situation, and I think it is a violation of democratic propriety, because although this right exists, it would seem to me a departure from traditional policy. I agree with what Your Honour has said, but as an elected member of this House, I

feel very strongly on this matter, and I consider the attitude of the Government on this matter as such that I am going to be very strong.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member may not comment on a point of order on the White Paper unless he directs Attention to a point of order connected thereto.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I am not commenting on the White Paper at all. I feel very strongly on the matter and I would like to have my protest registered very strongly against the Government in this matter. I repeat that from my experience I know that it is right to have a Press Conference on the White Paper, or for the public to buy it and everything else, and although Your Honour referred to Mr. H. Walter Reece, I still say that it is a departure from democratic traditional policy to have done it. I do feel that this House has been treated with scant courtesy. I do not know how hon. members feel, but it is my duty as Leader of the Opposition to bring this question of the Presentation of the White Paper to your attention.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, if I may give a personal explanation, I do not really understand why the member for the City rose to his feet at all on this matter, because it was certainly not a point of order, because

there is nothing before the House, and I would think that probably it may have been better for him to rise on a point of privilege if a privilege had been involved. But Your Honour has been at pains to point out to the hon. member that it is no breach of the ancient privileges of this House for a Bill, Resolution, White Paper or anything else to be laid in either Place before the other. The position is this in as much as I think the hon. member may be entitled to an explanation as the hon. member has been advised, obviously because he must have, done a certain amount of research on this matter; I saw the Paper of the West Indies Federation in January 1948 before any member of the House of Commons in the United Kingdom, the House of Lords in that country or any member of any of the Legislatures in this, Country for the simple reason that the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee under the Chairmanship of Sir Hubert Rance was on sale at Her Majesty's Stationery Office before it was actually laid on even before the knowledge that it had been published had reached the West Indies. It is common practice in the United Kingdom for people who are students of Parliamentary Procedure and political matters to go into the Stationery Office in London and buy any White Paper unless it is specifically ordered to be laid in a particular Chamber of Her Majesty the Queen, and then it becomes a Command Paper, and the Secretary of State for the appropriate Department is commanded by Her Majesty to lay it before the House of Commons on such-and-such a date.

The Government merely promised to publish a White Paper; the Government did not say which Chamber of the Legislature it was going to be laid before, or whether it was going to be laid at all, although inferentially by informing the Legislature that such a White Paper would be published, it would in the normal course of events be brought to the attention of hon. members. Now some of the hon. members on the other side went so far in their political meetings to suggest there was no White Paper at all, but some sections of the Press were saying that the White Paper was late, although an explanation was given here, None of them assisted in its preparation, not the members of the Civil Service, and when the White Paper was ready, had there been a meeting of the House on Tuesday of last week, when members were enjoying some kind of respite from their labours, it would have been laid in this Chamber

first. The White Paper being ready last week, it was not considered either by the Cabinet or by me, which is one and the same thing, because we all think alike on these matters, that there should be any further delay in its presentation to the general public. If there had been a meeting of the House at the time when the Paper was ready, and the Government had then elected to hold it back and lay it before the Senate as a deliberate act of contempt, there would have been some justification for the hon. member rising to his feet today. 3.05 p.m.

I think what he has done today is purely an academic exercise, certainly of no major constitutional interest to me or any member of Parliament. I think the hon. member should be satisfied that in this Chamber, it could not have been laid any time before now and in this particular instance it would have been laid in the House if the House was in session.

Mr. SPEAKER:

May I add that it could not constitute any breach of the privileges, of this Chamber if the document was laid first in the other Chamber, because neither our Standing Orders nor anything else which may bear any relation to this question, states that it must be laid in this Chamber first.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I would like to say this in explanation. The hon. senior member for St. John spoke on a point of explanation. I should have brought this in on a point of privilege. I wanted this matter further clarified. I realized that the Government was absolutely correct. I realized that the Government had power to do it.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGETARY PROPOSALS

Mr. SPEAKER:

The first Order of the day under Private Member's Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church To resume debate on the passing of a Resolution relating to the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals made by the Hon. Premier on the 1st July, 1965.

When this debate was last adjourned, the hon. junior member for St. George was addressing the House. Actually a motion was moved by the hon. Leader of the House, seconded by the hon. junior member for St. Michael that Government business be now taken. If the hon. junior member for St. George chooses to continue his address, this is now his opportunity.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, again dissatisfaction was registered by hon. members of this Chamber Tuesday before last with regard to the deliberate act of denial of the use of the recording equipment for broadcasting of the speeches of Opposition members. One would have imagined today that one would have had some excuse to offer, either that something went wrong and they could not get the equipment here, despite the fact that we were told that the speech which was recorded of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would be relegated to the wastepaper basket. Whenever you seek to deny a section of the House elected on the same grounds as someone else the right to the same opportunity, and whenever you deny that section the use of equipment to broadcast their speeches, that Sir, is certainly denying those members an important process of democracy.

Sir, you might decide to do so by your numbers or plurality of numbers.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to know whether the hon. junior member for St. George proposes to speak or does not propose to speak on the motion before the House, because, according to the Rules of this House, he has the right of making one speech and he has already spoken on the motion. If he is not speaking on the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals he should sit down. When the hon. member has made up his mind, Mr. Speaker, I hope you would allow me the opportunity to make a statement, I shall ask Your Honour now to call on the hon. junior member for St. George to decide whether he is speaking on the Budgetary Proposals. He cannot now make a speech on Broadcasting Policy.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I intended drawing to the attention of the hon. junior member for St. George as soon as he had completed the sentence which he was uttering that, when he last spoke, Tuesday before last, he made the point about broadcasting and I made it quite clear, (speaking without intended offence to the hon. member) over and over again, that the subject under discussion on which he is only entitled to speak is a motion by the hon. junior member for Christ Church that this House note the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals for the Fiscal Year 1965-66 contained in a Statement made in this Honourable House on 1st July, 1965, by the Minister of Finance. If the hon. jun-IOF number for St. George has to be reminded of it again too....., now exhort him to make his comments on the motion which is presently before the House.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker. I am absolutely aware of the Orders of this House and i take my direction in this House from you and the Chair and only you and the Chair. What I would like to know now as regards all that has been said Tuesday before last, with regard to the attitude of the House denying a section of the Opposition the use of the recording equipment, why is it that it was not made available to members of the Opposition? If the answer is \"no\" that it would not be made available to us, well then, I decline to speak on the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER:

May I point out to the hon. junior member for St. George that that is a matter which is not within the control of the Chair in any shape or form. It is a matter for the hon. junior member for St. George to make his speech on the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals, and if any Government spokesman (who may elect to speak) decides to answer the point on broadcasting made by the hon. junior member for St. George, he would have the same latitude as the hon. junior member for St. George has been allowed to deal with such. I cannot give the hon. member any more latitude on that matter.

Mr. MILLER:

I have not said one word on the Budget Speech and I do not know if Your Honour would deny me the right to speak on it. Your Honour will remember that when I first rose, I said that I had risen on a point of order because I wanted to be very careful. I repeat, I would not say one word on the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals until members of the Opposition are permitted the same facilities as was given to the Hon. Premier and the hon. junior member for Christ Church.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do not like to interrupt an hon. member, but the hon. junior member for St. George, when he rose Tuesday before last, he rose, as I understood him, to make his speech on the Budgetary Proposals which he was as perfectly entitled to make as any other hon. member. 3.15 p.m.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, with your kind permission, Sir, last Tuesday you probably did not hear me when I rose on a point of order and requested from you to be informed whether we would be provided with the facility of the Broadcasting equipment or not. I said that I would not make my speech on the Budget until some form of democracy was provided.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I did not have the disadvantage and the suffering on the last occasion when the hon. member was speaking, but the hon. member ought to be reminded that he can only rise on a point of order when there is a motion before the House and some hon. member is speaking at the time. When the hon. member rises to make what he calls his contribution to the debate, he cannot at this stage, raise matters which are extraneous to the debate and say that he is not exercising his right of discussion. He cannot go all around and say that he will return to the point of his speech because that would be a violation of the established principles of parliamentary procedure. The hon. member has to go on with his speech now or sit down and forever thereafter hold his peace.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is only in so far as this matter is concerned, of course. The matter is quite simple. May I just refer to the printed record? This is what it says On the 3rd August, 1965, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew spoke. The hon. junior member for St. George was speaking when, on the motion of the Hon. Leader of the House, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, Government business was taken. There is no question of speaking on a point of order. The junior member for St. George was addressing the Chamber on a motion which was under discussion, a motion in respect of the passing of a Resolution relative to the Financial Statement and Budgetary proposals made by the Hon. Premier on the 1st July, 1965.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me at this stage, you will remember that I am simply seeking your opinion and advice as to whether we will be permitted to use the recording equipment or not. Your Honour said that you gave your permission for the use of this recording equipment in this Parliament, and I said that I would be not prepared to make my contribution to the Budget Speech until permission was granted me for the use of the facilities for recording it. Your Honour was reminded that it was a precedent until last year when all hon. members of this House were permitted to use the facilities for the recording of their speeches. I was at pains to point out that I would not make any speech on the Budget until Your Honour could tell me whether we would be accorded that privilege of the use of the recording equipment.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member saying that, inasmuch as he does not see the Broadcasting equipment, which may or may not appear in this House again, he does not propose to continue with this debate?

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, all I am doing is seeking to remind Your Honour that there being no recording equipment in this House to broadcast my speech, I will not attempt to make my speech and that does not deny me the right of speaking. Whenever the broadcasting equipment is available, I will be making my speech.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let us get this matter quite clear. The hon. member has taken his seat because I am speaking, but if he does not rise immediately again, he loses all right to speak on this particular matter. There is no question of speaking if and when some apparatus is here, which apparatus may never reappear here again. Let the hon. member decide now whether he will continue his address instantly or whether he is not prepared to speak on this motion, because this is the hon. member's only opportunity for speaking on this motion.

Mr. MILLER:

I accept that; but I expected that the least you would be able to say is that I would be able to continue my speech. Your Honour has ruled, whether that is right or not. I have been trained to respect the ruling of the Chair, but it is not proper to say that I should continue to speak because I have not yet started to speak. If it is your desire to deny me the right to speak, then I accept that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Does any other hon. member seek to speak on this motion which has been moved by the hon. junior member for Christ Church? If there is no other hon. member who wishes to contribute

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for Christ Church has asked some questions which directly concern my Ministry. One question was in

relation to the uncertainty of the prices relating to the Sugar Industry and another question was in connection with the Fishing Industry in Barbados. I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. member that the worry and anxiety about the sugar Industry does not only concern him, because the Government is very much concerned as well about the prices of sugar. At the present time, the negotiated price of sugar for 1965 is \$233. 56 f.o.b. stowed bulk. This figure is made up of the basic price of \$223.60 per ton paid to all the territories participating in the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement plus the supplementary payment to all less

developed territories, that is, to Australia the payment of 21.96 per ton f.o.b. stowed bulk, of which \$6.36 is in recognition of the loss since 1962 of benefits which used to accrue to Colonial sugar exporters by virtue of the operation of the Colonial Certificated preference and \$15.60 per ton f.o.b. stowed bulk in recognition of difficulties caused to the less developed territories by the seriously depressed price of sugar far below the cost of production of efficient producers.

Mr. Speaker, the cost of production in Barbados today is more than twice the amount of the world market price for sugar. 3.25 p.m.

The greater the amount produced in this country at present, the less the over-all price will be when you calculate the surplus over 139,000 tons allocated by the negotiated price as compared with the 195,000

tons produced in this country. The entire country, therefore, is concerned, and it is because of this concern that the Government is considering the following measures, Mr. Speaker: the establishment of a milk plant; the importation of cattle from Canada and Puerto Rico with a view to securing a quick increase in the cattle population; artificial insemination; animal nutrition unit for carrying out feeding research; the expansion of the Central Live-stock Station to include the Pine Plantation; the removal of the price control on pork and the proposed use of the Barbados Marketing Corporation for purchasing pigs and marketing carcasses by wholesale and retail; incentives

to establish grasslands by grants and by loans for planting and fencing; Land Use Survey Report, with map done by the Regional Research Centre; research in food crop production; the establishment of an Agricultural Development Corporation to set an example in diversification through the operation of Government estates; the operation of the Barbados Marketing Corporation to ensure that all the marketing arrangements for the increased production are adequate; compulsory food planting legislation; and the removal of price control on ground provisions.

All these, Mr. Speaker, are incentives that the Government is taking steps on, so that in case diversification is to take place, we would know exactly what to move in on, and have at our finger-tips which of these incentives would be the next to supplement the sugar Industry.

With regard to the fishing industry, it is a recognized fact, Mr. Speaker, that all over the world there are two types of fishing carried out. One is inshore fishing which is done by practically every country, and offshore fishing. This Island has never had any experience or carried out any development on offshore fishing, and in a short space of time the United Nations will be carrying out a programme with Barbados as Headquarters in offshore fishing.

Mr. Speaker, the amount of money required in this type of fishing far exceeds what we would normally spend per boat in small inshore fishing, and we would have to take every step to consider the economics of offshore fishing and not plunge headlong as was done with the conversion of the fishing fleet which today is causing not only the Government, but boat owners in this country a headache. In 1945 the Government built and launched the "Investigator", the Government's experimental fishing boat. It is sad to say, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot find any of the experiments carried out by this boat. It was operated at commercially as any fishing boat in this country. In 1952 when this industry was completely changed over from the sailing boats for the preservation of lives, this was not done actually through the Government, because they operated the first fishing launch from 1945 to 1951, and up to that time there would have had sufficient experience to know what was the value of a powered boat as against a sailing boat; yet on the 3rd December, 1952 when on the west coast of this island over thirty boats were lost, they did not see the wisdom in converting the fleet into a powered fleet, but had a so-called Calvert designed which the so-called designer refused to accept any responsibility for. That was designed with a steel keel, but the architects in Barbados knew more about ship construction than anybody else and substituted concrete with iron scrapings in the keel instead of having a solid steel keel, and thus the boats were required to carry more ballast than the average fishing boat which normally operated in this island. Three years after that the percentage of sinkings in this country with that particular type of boat was greater than it ever was in the history of Barbados.

It was only in defiance of the Calvert design that I decided that sail had seen its best days if we wanted to preserve the lives of our fishermen, and I designed and built the first powered launch in this island.

The Government had experimented from 1945 to 1951 with the experimental boat, and they should have known whether it was suitable for conversion or not. It was after this that loans were made for the fishing industry, and these loans were calculated on such a basis that fishermen were not in a position to use them to their advantage, and all types of people who never had any interest in the fishing industry came in and used those loans to good advantage. It was a free-for-all and whosoever will may come. I regret to say that the fishermen in this country were not in any financial position to produce a hull that would have put them in position to qualify for a loan; but by the time they realised what was happening, the entire industry was over-built, and any industry can only stand so much. Nobody made a study of the economics of the industry and how many boats would be required; so that half of the boats at present operating would have been sufficient to satisfy inshore fishing; We therefore have a fleet of over 400 boats doing the work that half that amount can do.

Mr. Speaker, in 1955 I realized what was happening and I wrote an article to the newspapers because I realized that the industry was being over-built. A boat that in 1951 would have cost \$600 with an earning power of \$800 and an over-head of \$150 per boat was then changed over to a boat costing \$5,000 with the same earning power of \$800 and a maintenance of \$800. I wrote, Mr. Speaker, that if an estate of 500 acres was operated with 100 donkeys costing \$10 each and it could pay the operator, but the estate owner decided to buy 100 trucks costing \$10,000 each to do the work of the 100 donkeys on the 500 acre estate, it would be well to keep the donkeys in the business.

Nobody who had any knowledge of construction was called in; not one ship carpenter who knew about construction or engineering was called in; nobody who had any knowledge of the fishing industry was called in. Some time after this, an Advisory Committee was called in, but none of the ideas or recommendations put forward by the Advisory Committee that would have helped the industry was used by the last Government. 3.35 p.m.

This is the unfortunate position, Mr. Speaker, that we are in today. Boats are costing \$5,000, and the loans cannot be repaid because they cannot earn sufficient. That is because the entire fleet today is competing against itself. It is as simple as this. It is just like a certain man in a certain locality begins operating a self service and is attracting all the people, and then the second person to whom you lend capital to open the same kind of business opens one and finds out that he is not receiving any business at all. He is competing against the first fellow and finds out that he is not receiving sufficient money to pay the loan.

I agree with the hon. junior member for Christ Church that off-shore fishing is our only salvation, but the capital investment is very high; therefore, I am taking every opportunity to check the whole thing thoroughly.

As regards the experimental boat, \"Investigator\", it is earning about \$300 per year when the capital cost is in the vicinity of \$18,000 and it is of no benefit to the community* I have looked into that matter very carefully and I have recommended to the Cabinet to dispose of it. If the boat was of any benefit, let us say, that you could teach men anything by it, then the taxpayers would be satisfied to pay for its operations; but it is operating just as anything commercial is in business, and it is of no benefit to the community of Barbados. We are considering the economics of off-shore fishing and what it entails before the Government enters into any capital for changing over to these large boats. It is going to cost \$200,000 per ship, and besides that I would have to make sure that there are markets for the catches of

fish equally as well.

Sir, I would like to assure the hon. junior member for Christ Church that the Japanese are not the only people who have got their eyes on this matter of deep sea fishing and that we are looking into the question also. I hope that within the next six months with better experience and better mathematical knowledge our people would be able to go for this kind of fishing. The present fishermen would not be able to operate these boats. We will require people of higher mentality if we are to carry out this type of fishing because there are such things as range finders and very expensive equipment which will require people with some knowledge of mathematics to operate them. I hope that we will find some young fellows with a knowledge of mathematics who would like to go in for this type of fishing and then we will be in a position to carry it out.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I had taken half of the time to introduce the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals as that which was taken by the hon. junior member for Christ Church to initiate this debate on it. However, it was his privilege as shadow Minister to the Minister of Finance. I was rather surprised that the Honourable Minister who has just sat down took the hon. junior member for St. George so seriously because he does not seem to understand the hon. member.

I merely rose to say that there is no dispute among the more intelligent members of the House as to the applicability of the provisions which we have implemented into our Budget Proposals. I have ascertained from the honourable proposer of the motion which is being discussed that there is no provision of which he is not sufficiently seized and therefore that needs no reply from this side of the Table.

My reason, Mr. Speaker, of rising was to arrest the remarks made by hon. members who are not fully acquainted with parliamentary procedure. I say, it does not sound good coming from any member of the former Government that he is not given the opportunity to express his views over the air. When we come into this Chamber, it is not closed, and therefore any member of the public sufficiently interested in hearing what his representatives say, has access to the Chamber. I have never known Your Honour to exercise your prerogative of excluding any member of the public, although I personally thought that you would have done so at least on one occasion when we were discussing the salaries of Officers of the House. I personally felt that this was a domestic matter, and any such matters we should normally discuss in camera rather than pro bono publico.

The second method which the general public has of knowing the activities of their representatives is that the Government Printery be ordered to circulate the debates of this Chamber, either by giving them away or by the members disposing of them among their constituents. That is the second method.

The third method is one which unfortunately we have no control over, although it is easier, and that is by the dissemination of the debates by the General Press. Unfortunately, the General Press considers itself more important to this community to report fully some dissatisfaction among postmen or anything like that than the debates which take place in this Chamber.

I agree wholeheartedly that we can deny the Press coming in here and it appears that it is a deliberate act on the eve of our becoming independent that the "Daily Mirror" should try to confuse the people.

That has happened in West Africa and East Africa before countries in that part of Africa became independent, and they have recently moved into the West Indies section.

Now, Sir, I return to my main topic on the question of broadcasting. I have said that the dissemination of the debates of this Chamber is, firstly, by accessibility of members, of the public to this Chamber; secondly, by the printing of the debates and thirdly, 3.45 p.m.

We recognize the rather inexperienced though not impartial press of this Island. That is all we rely on. It does not sound well, coming out of the mouth of a member of the former Government Party, that they are not allowed to be heard over the air. It has never happened in the regime of the former Government, that the general public should be given a general idea of matters of general import which take place in this House. The institution of broadcasting was the direct act of this Government. The terms and conditions under which these broadcasts are made have not been ordained by the Debates Committee, although I have invited them to do so on more than one occasion. Every time I make a Financial Statement, that Financial Statement has been broadcast, but every single part of that debate was not broadcast. What we did on this occasion was this; it was our experience in 1962 when hon. members realized that the debates were being broadcast, they used the facility which was vouchsafed to them by this Government, as was the case in an important topic like the White Paper C.M.D. 256 laid by the House of Commons in 1962. But here the debates took eight months before the general public were again afforded the opportunity of the facility of the Government Information Service.

We have half an hour allocated to us; and when we accorded people this facility some of them completely discredited themselves with their elementary innocence

of the English Language. Therefore, I thought that I was doing them a service not to allow their speeches to be broadcast on this occasion. The Government said that in view of the fact that we have important business to deal with, we would not be kept off for eight months with speeches made by members on the other side. The plan which applies to this side applies equally to the members of the other side. The Lord giveth and the Lord also taketh away. The idea was that one speech should be broadcast on the Government side and the Opposition should be given an equal amount of time. If my speech lasted for two and a half hours, then the Opposition would be entitled, to have two and one half hours of debate. My speech was the only one which would be broadcast from this side. The position was that my speech lasted for thirty-five or thirty-seven minutes, as far as I can remember (Mr. MOTTLEY: It lasted for longer than that.) and the hon. junior member for Christ Church replied on behalf of the Official Opposition. I want to make this clear. This Government recognizes the two-party system, the system of Parliamentary democracy to which we are accustomed. The presence of nuisances or amorphous organizations does not make us recognize anything more than the two-Party system. It is a question of Her Majesty's Opposition; it is not a question of Her Majesty's minority. It may be a question of Her Majesty's headaches or nuisances, but that is nothing to do with Parliament. If the hon. junior member for Christ Church, who led off the debate on this Resolution had spoken for shorter time, the balance of the time would have been distributed to whoever came first until the time had expired. That is the only way in which we could do justice to public opinion so that the public could hear equally the amount of opinion of the Opposition as they heard from the Government. From that principle we have not departed; but it would have been obviously a complete denial of the principle of Parliamentary Government that the Leader of the Government was speaking for thirty-five minutes on a financial matter and the members of the minority Opposition could occupy the stage for eight and one half

months as they did on the last occasion. We cannot afford that either financially or from the point of view of fore-going the Programme of Education which we have allocated to us on the Radio.

Mr. Speaker, we are allotted half an hour each night for four nights a week on the Radio, and the debate in 1962 took eight and a half months. I may say that everybody was fed up with the ranting, and vilification and abuse which emanated from that side of the House. Therefore, Sir, do not let us hear any more of this nonsense of our denying anybody else of the right to speak. The hon. junior member for St. George can speak, filibuster, vilify or do whatever he likes; but I say that when we are granting you a privilege you have to be grateful that we have granted you that privilege which the former Government never granted.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. You were at pains to point out that, unless I am discussing the Budget, I may not continue my speech. Is the hon. member making a political speech?

Mr. SPEAKER:

My answer to the hon. member is that at our meeting of a fortnight ago today, the hon. member occupied a considerable period of time in dealing with the question of broadcasting his speech. As I understood it now, the hon. senior member for St. John is now replying to those remarks which were made by the hon. junior member for St. George. I allowed the hon. junior member for St. George a considerable time on that occasion to make his point, and I am now allowing the hon. senior member for St. John to reply to what the hon. junior member for St. George discussed a fortnight ago.

Mr. MILLER:

The hon. member made it clear that he was not allocating any time to the recording of the speeches from over here. That is not the position in any English Parliament.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order. Mr. MILLER On a point of order. 3.55 p.m. Hon. E. W. BARROW On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member asking about the broadcast? He has not got any right to do so, and you. Sir,...

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order, and you must rule and be Speaker of this House, and ask the member to sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will ask both members to sit. Mr. MILLER I am not giving way.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid the hon. junior member for St. George must give way. (Mr. SPEAKER rose, and both members took their seats).

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member says that he has allocated the same time to the Opposition, and if he spoke for thirty-five minutes, does it mean that the rest of the Opposition must take that time?

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order, the hon. member is not entitled to debate. I am speaking on the Budget, and I will make a statement on my part of the Budget Speech.

Mr. MILLER:

The hon. member said he was not re-plying

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I said that he was not entitled to speak on the Budget Speech.

Mr. SPEAKER rose, and both members sat.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker. I was on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. Junior member for St. George rose and said \"on a point of order\". It did not appear to me that he was then making a point of order, but in fairness to the hon. member and other hon. members, will the hon. member for St. George state concisely the point of order that he was proposing to make, and I will decide whether or not it is a point of order?

Mr. MILLER:

Unless you are laying new rules and new Standing Orders for the conduct and behaviour of Parliament

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am not the occupant of a Chair in this House who is preparing any new Rules or Standing Orders for Parliamentary Procedure.

Mr. MILLER:

Well then, no member of Parliament should be told that time will be allocated in accordance with the time used by the Government. Every member in here has a right to speak as long as he likes, and it is time you will have to protect Parliament; it is your responsibility.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I did not understand the hon. and Learned member for St. John to suggest that there would be any attempt - by him or the Government or me - to allocate the time for hon. members to speak in this Chamber. All hon. members can speak so long as they like, provided they do not indulge in what the Standing Orders call \"tedious repetition.\"

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I want to listen to you, but I am on a point of order, and if you are making a speech, I

will be happy to sit and listen to you.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Time so spent will not be wasted.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order, and I must specifically,

Mr. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. Junior member for St. George completed making what he intended to be a point of Order?

Mr. MILLER:

Until then, the hon. member must sit.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. junior member for St. George was apparently replying to something said by the hon. senior member for St. John, and was not making a point of order.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, two members are on their feet.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I rose on a point of order

Mr. MILLER:

Are you going to water down the Rules of Parliament or re-write the Constitution?

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. Junior member for St. George who stated \"on a point of order\" did not make what is in my view a point of order, and is apparently replying or attempting to reply to something which the hon. senior member for St. John has said; but the hon. Junior member for St. George has no right to reply, he having already spoken.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, that is my point of order, and that is strictly the point of order.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order. I am on my feet and you must tell me what to do. You must rule in this House and satisfy me*

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I will not sit down and I am not giving way.

Mr. MILLER:

I am on a point of order, and he must learn to behave sometimes.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

What kind of nonsense this is at all?

Mr. MILLER:

I have a right in here like anybody else; do not fool yourselves. I have a right to speak as long as like and even longer.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. Junior member for St. George rose and said \"on a point of order\" and made a remark which I do not regard as a point of order. Then the hon. senior member for St. John rose, on a point of order. I will now hear that, and determine whether that is a point of order. Let the hon. senior member for St. John proceed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated what my point of order was; that is, that the hon. member has already spoken on this motion. I am not exercising the right of reply; I am making a contribution to the debate initiated on a motion, as far as I can remember, by the hon. Junior member for Christ Church. The hon. member has had his opportunity. During the course of his remarks, apart from his other effusions, Mr. Speaker, - \"effusions\" is not unparliamentary; if it were \"effluvia\" it would be - he attempted to criticise the Government and to suggest there was something unparliamentary, something unconstitutional and undemocratic in the debates of all the members on the other side or on this side not being broadcast, and I was in the course of my preliminary remarks pointing out that it might be well at this Juncture, since he had raised this debate. This is no attempt to prevent any hon. member from speaking for three years, but merely that the Government has to regard the taxpayers' money which is being spent on making transmissions over the radio station. The Government has to consider the interest of the educational programme, and the Minister of Education and I have decided, in the absence of any definitive rules laid down by the Debates Committee, to limit the Opposition's contribution to the same length of time as the Government which has a majority in this House. All I was asking was how could that be undemocratic. To give the impression to the general public that we are curtailing some hon. members' speech, I think the hon. member is not even doing Justice to people of intelligence. I did not have to be on a point of order, because when I realised that this point of

order was making a second or third speech on a substantive motion, I felt myself constrained to rise on a point of order to draw this to Your Honour's attention. That is all there is to it and there is no further argument.

I was pointing out, Mr. Speaker, in the course of my speech that this is no debate on the Estimates at all, and it is clear that some hon. members mistook this for a debate on the Estimates. If they did not understand, the best thing would be to keep quiet, so that the general public would not really fathom the depth of their lack of knowledge on these matters. I have not heard from the other side of the House a single proposal, particularly from those Opposition members to the right, as to what they would do if they were in a similar position. They are the sort of people, as I have said in a different context, who, if

mankind has been unfortunate enough to have them in existence at the time of the emancipation of the slaves, would have fought against it and told the people that they were being misled, and would have said: \"You now have to buy your own house; you have to look for your own cook; do not mind the licks you were getting; forget all those blows; forget you do not have a chattel; but remember we are going to show you the true light, and the true light is for you to buy your own food and look for a job, and you would have to look for a shelter or rent a house.\" That is the kind of mentality you have on the other side. 4.05 p.m.

We have financial proposals here. We have never in my thirteen or fourteen years in this Chamber heard them say one thing on the economic structure or the infrastructure on which we live. This is the kind of contribution which we expect from representatives. I am very pleased that the hon. junior member for Christ Church who introduced this Resolution does show some appreciation of the economic facts of life in this country and I hope that all the people in this Island, particularly their representatives, would stop wasting time tearing me society apart without making any constructive contributions. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the sooner they go home and do a little bit of reading - not of the comic strips - the sooner that they abandon abuse on their political platforms, the better contribution they would be able to make on debates of this kind.

I noted that some comments were made by the hon. junior member for Christ Church as regards the lowering of income tax. I am in sympathy with his proposals for more liberal concessions on the part of taxpayers. We all would like to pay less taxes. On the other hand, I think, considering the services which we get in this island free, that we are extremely lucky. It is not quite fair - fair perhaps is not the correct word - to really equate the rates of taxation in the U.S.A., or the rates of taxation in the United Kingdom or the rates of taxation, if it exists, in the Soviet Union with the rates of taxation in this country because in all of those countries there are other factors entering into the Infrastructure and the social structure causing these disequalities in the taxation and the level of taxation when compared with that in this country.

I give you an example. Here in Barbados, we have virtually a free medical service. We have free primary school education. I was shocked and horrified when I went to Kenya to find in that country with eight million people, there were only two grammar schools, and that there was not up to six months ago a single primary school at which you did not have to pay fees. Kenya is a very rich country, but you have people who live in quite a different way from us. People there live without spending money; therefore, it is quite difficult to compare the gross domestic income with the gross domestic product and the national income per capita with the national income per capita in Barbados. As I have said, you have people there living outside of a money economy. There are about six and one half million people living there who have not seen a bank note, and it is because they exchange sufficiently enough in their villages on which they can live.

Therefore, when you go into statistics, you have to be very careful. We have certain contributors to the local Press who are erupting in this kind of exercise at certain

times of the year. They erupt into this exercise by saying that Barbados has a higher tax system than Trinidad, and so on. They erupt into this useless kind of exercise because what is not disclosed in these figures is the infrastructure of the country. Such questions as what are your water rates, what do your children have to pay for education, are not included. We have altogether 130 odd primary schools, 10

Government Aided Secondary Schools and even University education free. We also have free water service, free medical service and judging from the Transport Board returns, a free bus service; therefore anyone without any sense of proportion comparing the rates of income tax of this country with other countries, will give an almost total irrelevant picture when they do not know what is the purchasing power and what is the residual income. As I have said, you do not have to pay for medical services here. Who, unfortunately, if they live in the United States of America, does not have to pay \$50 or \$60 (U.S.) a day before they can even guarantee that a doctor would look at them in hospital? People in St. Lucia and St. Vincent think themselves lucky when they get 6,000 miles out of a set of motor tyres before changing them. People in Barbados get 38,000 and 40,000 miles out of motor tyres, and someone was telling me that with this Barber-Green equipment surfacing the roads now, he is looking forward to getting 155,000 miles wear out of a tyre. Therefore, how can you compare the roads in St. Lucia and St. Vincent with the roads in Barbados? In Antigua they tell you that they get 3,000 miles out of new tyres and 2,000 miles with a retracted tyre.

Sir, I would say that I do not know of a single business undertaking or a single retail shopkeeper who had to close down business because the rate of Company tax was 40%. I have always informed one gentleman who is a high priest of the Income Tax Society here - I think he actually formed an association at one time - that when they complain of the rate of Company of they should not complain because they only pay the rate on the profits they make. You pay Company tax purely on your profits. That is different from personal income tax where you start paying from the time you begin to earn £200 per annum. Certainly, companies have nothing to complain about when they have to pay Company tax.

Sir, I see no Justification of interfering with the rates of income tax in the immediate future. As a matter of fact; I should say that I see no justification for reducing the rate because if I come back and put it up next year you will not be able to say that I said I was not going to interfere with it. As far as personal income tax is concerned. we said three months before I presented the Financial Statement that we are having a comprehensive review of the tax structure of the island.

Mr. Speaker, you will be pleased to know that on my instructions, with the Premier of British Guiana, we have decided to share the services of a tax expert; When we were discussing the matter, he asked whether we should get somebody from the University of the West Indies to make a start, and I said to him that I honestly do not think there was anybody at the University who was qualified to do an exercise of this kind. That does not mean that you do not have people who have not made a good study in medicine, but I still do not entertain the idea that an academician can do Justice to the work which the Government would be appointing him or her to do. Therefore; me Premier of British Guiana and I decided in pursuance of our desire, and our statements in the Development Plan which was made in June of this year, that a tax consultant working between the two countries should be obtained and I hope to have Professor Arthur Lewis here shortly again to give us some more information as regards the Free Trade Area of the three or more countries which will be involved. 4.15 p.m.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for Christ Church who initiated this debate, did make some comments on the tax structure and that, of course, is a perennial thing. We want to get something done about personal income tax. We have already made tremendous concessions in this Chamber by passing legislation for wftar

we described as offshore trading companies or international business companies, and we know that the

establishment of the international business companies legislation, or the passing of such legislation, will induce a large number of companies of the kind which we seek to establish here, to come to Barbados, As far as the existing companies are concerned, it seems to me that as to the large amount of money which we have left over, we will have to invest it in Barbados, recapitalise our enterprises and so on. Unfortunately, this may be a pure offer to capitalist organisations, but it does not work in that way at all. Because of our liberal policy in allowing foreign business benefits to be repatriated in one case and allowing export on the part of local companies, we still have people who are not publicspirited enough or who do not have the national interest at heart, people who are taking money and investing it in Jamiaca, and the New York Stock Exchange, in London and Toronto. The money which they make as profit they do not plough back in the Island. Over 90 per cent of those people who have set up the new industries which have come into Barbados, have not given any serious thought to the investment of their surplus profits or local undertakings, but by the inducement of the Development Board, we are bringing income from outside so as to establish factories. If we were to reduce the rate of Companies tax, we would be encouraging a more unfavourable balance of payment. The most of that money would be exported and, of course, in a country like Barbados although in our direct investment we like to be liberal in matters of this kind, yet we have to reserve to ourselves the right of tightening up our controls and saying to companies: \"You must invest such and such a proportion of your profits of your business in the Island.\" We have been adopting a policy of setting up inducements which will persuade them to do so. We show businessmen the benefits which are to be derived and the securities which are to be gained by keeping surplus profits in this territory; but you will still have a lot of people in this society, people who are living in this society who are reaping the benefits of the society but who do not want to plough back into the society anything like 50 per cent of that which the society has contributed to their personal well being. This seeme to be a matter of morality; it is a question as to whether people have consciences or not; and in the final analysis the community becomes alive to what is going on and the community does protest by boycotting people who are carrying on this kind of principle.

For their own sake, I hope we do not get to the stage where the masses of the people have to boycott the people of this country who really control the strings of commerce and industry. I think, Mr. Speaker, that a word to the wise is sufficient. I am not issuing any threats, but I think we have exhausted our patience. If you need to make sure of their neglect of industrial expansion, you only have to look around and see the United States firms, the Trinidad and Jamaica firms who are investing in Barbados, and the people who are responsible for capital accumulations do not have the propensity to invest although they have the propensity to save. All the propensity which they have to save is directed to external sources rather than to internal investment. That is my answer to the hon. junior member for Christ Church who has initiated this debate and who made observations as to the tax structure from the point of view of savings. From the point of view of getting an undertaking from the Government that we agree that the rate of tax in Barbados is too high, this is something to which I do not subscribe, and I do not think that any rational person would subscribe to it either.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there is any other hon. member who wishes to contribute to this debate which has been initiated by the hon. junior member for Christ Church, he may do so now; otherwise the hon. junior member for Christ Church may exercise his right of final reply.

Mr. GODDARD:

Mr. Speaker, the comments on the Government side only go to show that we are still very conscious

that the sugar industry is still the mainstay of this economy. Even since I initiated this debate, we have seen a further fall in the World market price for sugar. We

are more concerned than ever before as to our future effort. The largest markets have been built up in these sugar- producing countries, and even with new markets, this state of affairs will continue to our detriment. We are fortunate that we have negotiated with the United Kingdom for a large amount of sugar for which we have a settled agreement. We will, of course, need a further basis for our sugar, and I hope that the United Kingdom Government will recognise our plight to maintain our standard of living and keep that negotiated. price, as high as possible.

As to the other point which has been raised by the Hon. Premier about the companies tax, and it is relatively high, when I initiated this debate, I said that by some means the Government should see fit to reduce the companies tax by ten per cent and that money would be reinvested in industries. It is not fair to say that existing companies or businesses here just take out the money and send it away. I know that they are so unfortunate, nearly all of them, with the banks, that the first charge is to pay off the banks. There is a certain amount of expansion of local business. You may not see a new business opened, but you will see an expansion. 4.25 p.m.

If you have not seen a new business opened, at least you have seen an expansion. Take the Rum Refinery and what it is today as compared with twenty years ago. Take the Ice Factories in this Island. They have expanded sufficiently and met the requirements of the special interests; they have put in new equipment, and it could only come from earnings. As a matter of fact, one Ice Factory I know has approached Government for a lease of land at the Deep Water Harbour for further expansion which will redound to the increased economy of this Island, because what is needed more now than ever at that Harbour are cold storage facilities nearby to meet the expanding trans-shipment trade. Boats come here and more would come to drop cargo for the smaller islands if we had adequate cold storage; therefore ships drop the cargo in Trinidad and trans-shipment remains in Trinidad. That is one of the handicaps of the Harbour. The Ice Company has foreseen that and they are prepared to use not only their own resources, but to borrow from Banks to put up adequate cold storage facilities to meet that need.

Now that is a matter for Government; but expansion along these lines has really been met by local capital, and I would say that if an exercise could have been made into the feasibility of a reduction of Companies tax by X percent, you could make it a condition that that money should be invested for the expansion of the industry, and therefore the provision of more jobs. That was a point I made, and I am glad the Hon. Premier is in his seat because he will understand what I meant.

I also mentioned that medical expenses allowance could have been increased, and I do hope that a note of this will be made for the next Budget. However, the general comments of the House have been favourable to the proposals I made. They were general proposals and were really meant for Government to take note of, and realise that the commercial community is playing its part. We are fortunate to know that the dividends remain in Barbados and are sent outside like in the neighbouring islands of Trinidad and Jamaica, There are some industries which have come in, but they have brought the knowhow which Barbados did not have , and that is why we have willingly admitted them

free of tax.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks I shall now ask leave to withdraw this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER; The hon. junior member for Christ Church is asking leave of this House to withdraw this Resolution, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted the hon. member.

There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. member to withdraw this Resolution.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER; It now being exactly 4.30 p.m. o'clock, the time for Private Members' Business has expired, and

we proceed to Government Business, and the first Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name of the Hon. Learned member for St. John: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled "The Pensions (Amendment) Regulations, 1965".

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PENSIONS (AMEND-MENT) REGULATIONS 1965

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Resolution known as the Pensions (Amendment) Regulations, 1965, is to confer benefits and remove disabilities from officers. In accordance with subsection (2A) of section 3 of the Pensions Act, 1947, in order to give retroactive effect to the proposals, the amending Regulations must be approved by a Resolution of both Houses of the Legislature before being made by the Governor.

The Regulations seek to safeguard the pensionable service of officers who served under the Government of the now dissolved Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland; clarify the position regarding the calculation of aggregate pensionable emoluments for the purposes of determining the amount of a transferred officer's "scheduled" retiring award. The Ministry of Overseas Development is anxious to establish a uniform practice in this matter among administrations whose pensions legislation is based on the Model Pensions Ordinance; and then the third purpose of the Regulations will be to add the words "British Antarctic Territory" to the Schedule of the Pensions Regulations, 1947.

I do not think hon. members will need any further explanation than that. These are matters, and a question of tidying up certain deficiencies which may exist in our Regulations so that the individual public officer does not suffer any detriment.

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

Hon. A. DaG. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in concluding Government Business, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until next Tuesday, 24th August 1965 at 2.30 p.m.

Hon. A. DaG. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 24th August, 1965, at 2.30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly,

4.35 p.m.