

X

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 15th March, 1966.

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C. (*Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Health and Community Development*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A. (*Minister of Education*); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (*Minister of Communications and Works*); and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Trade and Labour*)

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret once again to inform hon. members that there are no Minutes ready.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I must apologise to the House for the fact that I am not ready to give notice of today's documents but I hope to do so later today.

QUESTIONS

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware of the dissatisfaction of housewives with regards recent increases in the price of Ribs, Beef, Snout and Bones?

If the answers to the above are in the affirmative; Will the Minister go into the matter with a view to scrutinising the justification for such increases?

Mr. WEEKES: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that two roads viz:- Marchfield and Cottage Vale, St. Philip were never repaired since they were built by the defunct Vestry approximately twenty years ago?

Will the Minister consider the possibility of repairs to them during the year 1966-67?

Mr. WEEKES: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that certain residents of Headings, St. Philip, find it almost impossible to leave their

homes in case of rains, owing to the bad condition of the road over which they must travel?

Will the Minister consider the possibility of alleviating the inconvenience and hardship of the residents of the district by repairing the said road during the year 1966-67?

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not quite approve of what has been done now. I plead guilty of not paying attention to the motion which the Hon. Minister moved.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, will you read the motion which has just been moved?

Mr. DEPUTY CLERK read the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Deputy Clerk continue to say what was the result?

Mr. DEPUTY CLERK said that the motion was put and carried nem com.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the first Order is proceeded with, I will just like to ask for what reason the Hon. Leader of the house asked that those Standing Orders be suspended. I did not hear at the time what the Hon. Minister was putting, but will he be courteous enough to say what are the reasons for the suspension of those Standing Orders and what does he propose to do today?

Mr. SPEAKER: Actually, I cannot see how that can be a point of privilege. I think that hon. members of different political parties should get together and discuss certain matters among themselves. I cannot allow discussion now on the motion which has just been passed: but of course, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition may have a word with the Hon. Leader of the House as to the position of today's sitting.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: With Your Honour's permission, I would just like to say a word. When I moved the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders just now, I did not think it was necessary to say anything. First of all, there is always the understanding, when I move the suspension of Standing Orders, that if hon. members desire to do Private Members' Business it is always acceded to. But I understand that the hon. member wants information further than that.

I think that I can make him wise. I propose to deal with the Appropriation Bill later today. The Hon. Minister of Finance will move the second reading, and if the House can go into Committee on the Bill tonight, it will do so, or it will go into Committee on the Bill on another date. At any rate the second reading of the Bill will be moved later today.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, ...

Mr. SPEAKER: I gave leave to the Hon. Leader of the House; so I will give similar leave to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, at the last meeting, the Hon. Minister of Health who was acting Leader of the House for that day gave notice of discussion on the Appropriation Bill today, and said that we will give consideration to it day after day until it is finished.
12.25 p.m.

When the Hon. Minister moved the suspension of the Standing Orders, what I really wanted to get from him is at what hour we should adjourn today or tonight. We would be glad to know that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to move the adjournment of the House at 10 o'clock tonight.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Health made a Statement in respect of our dealing with the Estimates this week, as to the days when we will be sitting. I have my own recollection of what was said.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, at the last sitting of this House I intimated to the House - and I asked for the co-operation of hon. members - that we will be considering the Estimates beginning from today and continuing each day until the consideration of the Estimates had been concluded. We will probably be sitting, as I said, today (Tuesday), Wednesday, Thursday and, if necessary, on Friday in order to complete the consideration of the Estimates. I did not make it clear as to what time the sitting will end; but normally if we start at 12 o'clock noon today, I presume that a reasonable hour for the adjournment in the circumstances would be 10 o'clock tonight. I think that that is what the Hon. Leader of the House had in mind when he spoke just now.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in addition to what the Hon. Minister has just said, I propose to take the ordinary, normal, mealtime adjournment at 2 o'clock and at 7 o'clock.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the Hon. Minister; that is what we wanted to know over here.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with the Orders of the day, I am wondering whether I would be given permission to lay the Documents now that they have arrived.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, I think it would be better to lay them now than at a later stage. Let the Hon. Leader of the House proceed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to lay the following:-

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for eleven months ended 28th February, 1966.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3 Order, 1966.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Report of the Sugar Factory Smoke Control Board for the year 1965.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

A Resolution to place the sum of \$8,638 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1965-66, Part 1 - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate No. 57 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1966.

A Bill to continue various expiring laws.

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

A Bill to amend the Midwives and Nurses Registration Act, 1932.

A Bill to make provision for the transfer to the Minister responsible for Health of certain functions of the Councils under the Public Health Act, 1954; for the transfer to the Director of Highways and Transport of the functions of the Southern District Council in relation to highways; for amending, in the light of the foregoing, the aforementioned Act, the Highways Act, 1945, the Local Government Act, 1958, the Local Government Authorities Miscellaneous Functions Act, 1950 and other Acts; and for other matters incidental thereto or connected therewith.

REPLIES LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Replies to the following Parliamentary Questions are ready:-

The Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 66/1964, asked by the hon. junior member for St. John.

The Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 74/1964, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Philip.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to continue various expiring Laws 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.

On motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON in each case, the following Bills were read a first time:-

A Bill to amend the Midwives and Nurses Registration Act, 1932.

A Bill to make provision for the transfer to the Minister responsible for Health of certain functions of the Councils under the Public Health Act, 1954; for the transfer to the Director of Highways and Transport of the functions of the Southern District Council in relation to highways; for amending, in the light of the foregoing, the aforementioned Act, the Highways Act, 1900, the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945, the Local Government Act, 1958, the Local Government authorities Miscellaneous Functions Act, 1950 and other Acts; and for other matters incidental thereto or connected therewith.
12.35 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the two Resolutions of which I have just given notice, it is my intention to proceed with both of them in all their stages today, and I believe that copies of them have been circulated.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the Orders of the Day, I should like to ask leave to deal

in all its stages, with the Bill of which I have just given notice, that is, a Bill to make provision for the transfer to the Minister responsible for Health of certain functions of the Council under the Public Health Act, 1954 etc. Copies of that Bill have been duly prepared and will be circulated to hon. members very shortly, and I am asking leave to deal with this Bill at the appropriate time at tomorrow's sitting, so that hon. members will have an opportunity of studying the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest that the application be made when copies are circulated?

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the House when in committee of supply to deal with the Resolution for \$8,638 of which notice was given earlier today.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1965-66 No. 56

Head 3 - Legislature - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, two sums are required here to supplement Items 18 and 25. The first requirement is for the sum of \$1,670 to supplement the refreshment vote. There has been an unexpectedly greater number of sittings than was anticipated, and this amount is required to cover bills to the end of the financial year.

The second requirement is to supplement the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association vote. There was provision of \$22,811 in the current Estimates and this included funds to meet the subscription to the General Council of the C.P.A. as well as the expenses of the Local Branch, expenses of Regional Conferences in Barbados and other Conferences and delegations overseas, and then there was the unscheduled representation of Barbados at the C.P.A. course in London last year and one which is going on now. The amount of \$3,000 is now required to meet all these unscheduled and extended commitments to the end of the current financial year.

I beg to move that Head 3 - Legislature - stand part.

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

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

Head 20 - Town and Country Planning - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this amount is required to supplement Item 1 under that Head. This amount is required to supplement the provision voted under this Item, as the sum available is insufficient to meet the salary of the Officer who has been appointed Town and Country Planning Officer from 18th February. This Officer, as you know, was until that date the Deputy Town and Country Planning Officer.

I beg to move that Head 20 - Town and Country Planning - Stand part.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I notice, Mr. Chairman, that this Officer who has been appointed in place of the former Town and Country Planning Officer is paid less than the Officer who held the post formerly. I am sure the Minister in charge can give us some reason, and I will make no further comments until I have been given that information. I understand from the Resolution that he is paid something like \$80 less, but I am sure the Minister will have some explanation to give with respect to his qualifications and what the reasons may be.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the retired Town and Country Planning Officer was an officer who came to us on contract, and under the special provisions of the Overseas Aid Scheme for Civil Servants recruited from certain territories and serving here by arrangement with the British Government. The Overseas Aid Scheme covers certain categories of officers not recruited locally; so the difference which the hon. member sees is the difference between the basic salary and what Mr. Stevens got from the Overseas Aid Scheme.
12.45 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I can assure the Hon. Minister that some people do not think that this is in keeping with the acquisition of Civil Servants and I hope it would be an admission in good faith by those in office. Under the circumstances, I understand that their qualifications are similar and their experience is about similar.

I thank the Hon. Minister for his explanation and I hope that explanation will be publicized.

The question that Head 20 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 25 - BARBADOS REGIMENT

Head 25 - Barbados Regiment - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, under this Head, there is supplementary provision for Item 30, Light and Water. This is a case of which provision for the sum of \$1,500 was made in the current Estimates and it appears to be inadequate due to the increased use of the Regiment Headquarters during the last six months. The amount of \$440 is required to meet commitments to the end of the current financial year.

I beg to move that Head 25 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 27 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES

Head 27 - Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this is for a supplementary provision under Item 78 - Labour - General, of this Head, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries. The provision of \$100,884 under this Item proved inadequate and the sum of \$4,734 is needed to meet the estimated expenditure to the end of the financial year.

I beg to move that Head 27 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 35- MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (5) SCHOOLS

Head 35 - Ministry of Education (5) Schools - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this is to supplement Item 15, Nutrition, under Head 35, Ministry of Education (5) Schools. The original provision was \$182,260 and

the supplementary provision required now is \$78,870. The explanation to this is that the original provision did not take into account the increased intake into primary schools and the Comprehensive Schools in the current financial year. Over 3,000 children entered the Primary Schools in September last year, and 1,200 or so in the Comprehensive Schools. In addition to this, the sum of nearly \$25,000 - to be accurate \$24,728 - is for outstanding claims from the previous year because the accounts were not rendered in time and these accounts were paid out of this year's provision. It is therefore estimated that the sum of \$78,870 will be required to meet the extra cost to the Nutrition Scheme to the end of the financial year.

I may say, lest there be any difficulty, that this has nothing to do with the School Meals Service. This is to do with the milk and biscuits given to children in the Primary Schools generally. In addition to this, I may say that since we established the School Meals Service, those who benefit now receive a glass of milk with their meals. We have expanded it to 17 schools.

I beg to move that Head 35 stand part.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter concerning nutrition in Primary Schools. I think it is about time that the Hon. Minister should tell us something at least about setting up canteens in Secondary and Comprehensive Schools for the purpose of supplying lunch to the number of children who attend schools. The Government should, in my opinion, think about setting up such canteens and put up a list of the prices of such things which would be suitable and which would not be out of the reach of such children who attend those schools.

There is a canteen at Combermere and there is also one, I think, at St. Michael's Girls' School. I am also told that one is at West St. Joseph. You should set up such canteens at all your secondary schools, your Comprehensive schools, and so on. The children at the Comprehensive schools who show promise are taking school leaving certificates, and it is my belief that you should do something in having canteens set up which would be able to supply the type of lunch within the reach of such children who attend those schools - something like twenty-five cents for a lunch.

This would not be a free scheme, but it is one which would relieve the situation at some of these schools which have something like 1,200, 1,500 and 1,900 children. It would mean a tremendous lot to you, and would prevent children having to run to this shop and to the other shop.

I would like to hear the Hon. Minister of Education on this. I would like to hear him state what can be done as regards this matter at the Comprehensive Schools at least. They are here to stay, and children are coming from the extreme end of the island to attend these schools. I think something should be done about it in this financial year.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am grateful to the hon. member for raising this point. It is a matter which has been engaging my attention for some time. However, I would prefer to deal with it quite fully and adequately in a day or two when we are dealing with the particular Head under the Estimates. I will let the hon. member know my thoughts on the matter in a day or two when I set out the Government's policy on education.

The question that Head 35 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 42 - LABOUR

Head 42 - Labour - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, under this Head, Item 22, Emigration, needs to be supplemented by \$130,000. The original provision, as hon. members know, is \$650,000. 12.55 p.m.

This has proved inadequate to meet expenses in connection with both temporary and permanent migration of Barbadians abroad. I do not know if the Hon. Minister of Trade and Labour wishes to say anything further, but I beg to move that Head 42 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.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of \$219,819 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1965-66 No. 57

A Resolution for the sum of \$8,638 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution to place the sum of \$8,638 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1965-66, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, No. 57 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution. There are three Heads of the Schedule to be supplemented and these will be taken separately.

HEAD 31 - PRINTING OFFICE

Head 31 - Printing Office - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Under this Head, Mr. Chairman, the item to be supplemented is Item 23 - Materials. The original provision for this item was \$68,000 and supplementary provision of \$3,655 is required. The explanation is that due to the increased freight charges on materials ordered from the United Kingdom and the use of air freight in connection with orders from the U.S.A., the provision in the current year's Estimates has proved to be inadequate. Accordingly, the supplementary provision of \$3,655 is required to meet the expenditure up to the end of the financial year. I beg to move that Head 31 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 32 - HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT

Head 32 - Highways and Transport - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, there are two items under this Head to be supplemented. The first item is Item 51 - Crushing and Stationary Plant and Equipment - and Item 52 - Road Construction Equipment. As hon. members will see, in the case of the former, supplementary provision of \$3,398 is required to meet the cost of installing a piece of equipment at the Mangrove Crushing Site, St. Philip and to meet other normal expenses in connection with the operation of the plant. In the second case, the cost of maintenance of the road construction equipment, including units taken over from the Northern District Council, has been higher than was estimated, and the additional sum of \$1,021 is required to meet commitments to the end of the financial year. I beg to move that Head 32 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 35 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (2) ERDISTON COLLEGE

Head 35 - Ministry of Education (2) Erdiston College - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the last Head is in connection with the Ministry of Education, Erdiston College, and the item to be supplemented is item 23 - Travelling. The original provision with respect to this item was \$2,000, and that is, of course, and as hon. members would know, used for the purpose of transporting staff and teachers to and from their teaching sessions. The amount voted in the Estimates has proved to be inadequate for a lot of reasons, largely because more of this work is being done and more staff is therefore required. Also the practice-teaching session which is now going on is the final one, and it is being assessed by four visitors from the Institute of Education of the University of the West Indies in association with the Erdiston Tutors. It is for the purpose of covering their expenses, as well as the normal expenses of the practice - teaching work, that this supplementary provision of \$564 is now required. I beg to move that Head 35 (2) 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.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of \$8,638 do now pass.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of two Resolutions 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. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agreed to.

1.05 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 6 be the next Order of the Day under Government Business.

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

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

THE IRRIGATION BOARD (VALIDATION)
(VESTING OF PROPERTY AND
TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS)
ACT, 1966

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, in 1953 the Irrigation Board was established by the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Labour Welfare and Irrigation) Act, 1953. The initial capital of the Board was provided from funds made available from Her Majesty's Government to sugar producing countries which accrued from the rate of exchange between Canadian dollars and the pound sterling in respect of the sales of sugar by the United Kingdom Ministry of Food to Canadian refiners in previous years.

It is proposed that the affairs of the Board be wound up and its assets and liabilities be transferred to the Crown in right of its government of this Island in view of the inability of the Board to meet the cost of another year's operation.

The Secretary of State, the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association and the Barbados Workers' Union have agreed to this proposal.

This Bill therefore, seeks to give effect to the above proposal. Certain functions of the Board will be transferred

to the Chief Agricultural Officer. Provision to this effect is contained in Clause 4 of the Bill.

Clause 3 seeks to regularise the Board's position since no appointments were made to the Board after the term of the members appointed under paragraph (c) of subsection (1) of section 4 expired on 28th April, 1965.

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1 to 7 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, 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. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded in each case by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

1.15 p.m.

THE WATERWORKS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Michael: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Waterworks Act, 1895.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, at present the Irrigation Board is authorised to investigate the availability and suitability of water supplies for the purpose of irrigating land, but it has been decided to wind up the affairs of that Board. In order to enable these investigations to continue after the Board has been wound up, however, it is considered desirable to authorise the Waterworks Department to carry them out. This Bill therefore seeks to amend the Waterworks Act, 1895 accordingly.

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

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

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:-

"The Waterworks Act, 1895, is hereby amended by adding immediately after section 11 thereof the following section to be numbered "11A" -

11A. The Department is hereby authorised to investigate or cause to be investigated the availability and suitability of any water supplies to be used in irrigating any land for increasing the production of sugar or other agricultural produce in this Island or otherwise for the benefit of the agricultural industries of this Island."

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I have only risen on this question because in Clause 2 it is stated that the Department is hereby authorised to investigate or cause to be investigated the availability and suitability of any water supplies to be used in irrigating any land for increasing the production of sugar or other agricultural produce in this island, or otherwise for the benefit of the agricultural industries of this Island. By that it means that only for agricultural purposes would they be empowered to investigate water resources. Now, suppose we have an instance where a brewery required large quantities of water that would need investigating for this purpose, would they be precluded from acting on that behalf? Let us say, if we develop industries or an industry that require large quantities of water and they asked to investigate, would this Bill give them the scope for this purpose?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Before the Hon. Minister answers the question, lest it be thought that my colleague is singing a solo, after the words "or other agricultural produce in this Island or otherwise for the benefit of the agricultural industries of this Island" I think the words "or other industries" would cover everything in this island.

If you read the foregoing part of the section which says:

"The Department is hereby authorised to investigate or cause to be investigated the availability and suitability of any water supplies to be used in irrigating any land for increasing the production of sugar or other agricultural produce in this Island", that covers everything as regards sugar. Then you have "or otherwise for the benefit of the agricultural industries of this Island." This can only be superfluous. I would like to hear the Hon. Minister on that.

It may be well to postpone this section.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: For the information of the hon. senior member for the City and the hon. junior member for Christ Church, we had an extensive survey of water carried out in this island by Dr. Tullstrom. We were told that there are various depths of water, and there is water suitable for agricultural purposes or irrigating. That contains a small amount of saline content which is not sufficient to interfere with irrigation nor would affect our normal supply.

We estimated that the amount of water suitable for human consumption is 29 million gallons per day. At present we are using between 15 1/2 and 16 million gallons per day, but we know definitely that our maximum supply is in the vicinity of 29 million gallons per day. Firms like Coca-Cola Ltd., can use any amount of water now as long as it is within the limit of our day-to-day use.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, apparently the point I raised escaped the attention of the Hon. Minister. This Bill talks of water used for agricultural purposes. You never know what will happen. In Jamaica there is an iron industry, but they have no iron there. I know that in certain private industries just like that they would require a large volume of water. In Jamaica they have rivers. If perchance we have some industry that would require a large volume of fresh water, I have only thrown it out if this authority, which is the Waterworks Department, would be given the authority to investigate.

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

Clause 3 was called and passed.

1.25 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: 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. G. G. FERGUSON seconded, by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in co-operation with some hon. members opposite, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3 p.m. of the clock.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, speaking on this motion for the suspension of the sitting until 3 o'clock, I would like to say that we were told last week that we would be expected to come in here today and deal with the Estimates right away. Sir, now that we are all geared up to deal with the Estimates, we have not yet started them and the sitting is going to be suspended until 3 o'clock. I would like the Government to be more serious about their business and I would like them to think of other hon. members who have business to look after, too. If they knew that they were not sure about having these Estimates ready to be started at noon today, they should have adjourned the House last Tuesday until 2.30 p.m., of the clock today, and in that case we would have been able to come in here and carry on with the Estimates. It is not that, because they can adjourn as they like, resume as they like and do as they please, they should be treating hon. members like children. Today you cannot even handle your children so because they are not going to stand for it. It is not fair for hon. members to call us away from our businesses and now they are setting us to be knocking about waiting until three o'clock. Where must we all go and what can we do? Valuable time is being wasted. It is all right for Government members because everything is okay as far as they are concerned, financially and otherwise; but there are business people who have something to do other than coming in here and walking up and down until 3 o'clock. It is just because Government members can do as they like and as they please. I say that it is not fair either to the representatives of the people or to the people themselves.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in defence of members on this side of the House I would say that it is difficult to please some people. Usually, if the House meets at 12 o'clock noon and we suspend the Standing Orders and go over for as much as a minute of what some hon. members feel is the time when the suspension of the sitting for lunch should be taken, we are accused of bad faith. What has happened today is that we have done in less than an hour what sometimes we do for a whole day. We have done two Money Resolutions and two Bills, and the reason for our getting through these matters so quickly is that the hon. member did not choose to make his contribution to these four matters today. If the hon. member had made his contribution to these matters, we should find that we would have finished very much later. Taking advantage of what has happened today, we finished half an hour before the normal luncheon adjournment; and before the last matter which was under discussion had been concluded I moved from my seat and acquainted the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to the effect that it looked as if we might be able to take a very long luncheon adjournment. As a matter of fact, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition asked me about it and I was able to give him the answer.

One of the reasons why we do not start the debate on the Appropriation Bill until after 2 o'clock is that we hope to lay copies of the Draft Independence Constitution later on today so that hon. members would have the Draft Con-

stitution from today for several weeks to study and we would like to put it in their hands today. The Hon. Premier will move a Resolution in that connection when he comes in. It is in order to get these things ready as well as to start the debate on the Appropriation Bill, that the Hon. Premier is not in his place yet. Mr. Speaker, there are good reasons why this time lag has taken place. We would not have had this time lag if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph had chosen to make his contribution to the debate today. Rather than bring hon. members back at 2.30 o'clock p.m., and then tell them: "I am sorry, we still have to wait for another half an hour", I suggest that we take a long luncheon suspension. I take it that hon. members will appreciate the reasons why we have arrived at this conclusion.

The question that this sitting be now suspended until 3 p.m. of the clock, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

1.35 p.m.

On Resumption:

QUESTION TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

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

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

QUESTION re PUBLIC MORTUARY

Mr. SPEAKER: Parliamentary Question No. 66 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to withdraw this Question.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. John is seeking the indulgence of the House to withdraw this question of which he gave notice in October, 1965, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted the hon. member.

There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. member. Accordingly I declare that question to have been withdrawn, and it will no longer appear on the Order Paper.

QUESTION re ERECTION OF PUBLIC BATHS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 74 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Will the appropriate Minister state when the programme of erecting public baths in each of the parishes served by the Southern District Council will be implemented?

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

"The programme has been put into operation and the construction of a bath at Ellerton, one of the sites chosen by the Southern District Council is in progress. The preliminary arrangements in respect of the other nine sites chosen are at varying stages of advancement."

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, will the Minister state of those nine how many are in Christ Church?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: There are two sites which have been recommended by the Southern District Council in

Christ Church; one at Sandy Ground and the other would be sited at St. David's, subject to certain new recommendations.

Mr. SMITH: As a supplementary, Sir, will the Minister state if there are any in his new programme for the parish of St. Joseph?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that cannot be a valid supplementary, because the substantive question is *apropos* of the Southern District Council.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As a supplementary, will the Minister state how many have been recommended for that part of the South which comes under the Local Government area which was removed from St. Michael, that is, Green Hill, Jackson, etc.?

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this anything to do with the Southern District Council?

Mr. MOTTLEY: That part of the Southern District Council that was formerly part of the parish of St. Michael I am sure the Minister will tell us how many have been recommended for that area as a result of the several recommendations made by the City Council before the takeover.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: To answer the hon. member's questions specifically, I will say that two sites have been recommended for that part of St. Michael which falls within the Southern District. One is proposed to be sited at Lodge Hill and the other at St. Barnabas; but in a general way, to allay the fears of hon. members who are all interested in seeing that the Government policy is implemented as far as the construction of communal baths is concerned, I will say that each parish will be provided with at least two, and arrangements relative to the acquisition of land are proceeding. But if any hon. member has a parcel of land which he may consider useful for this purpose or has any influential friends who are willing to assist him in providing facilities, he may follow the example of the Minister of Trade, Labour and Tourism who has already secured two sites in his constituency and has got the respective owners to convey them in fee simple, free and for nothing, and that will expedite the programme. The hon. junior member for St. Andrew the Minister of Trade, Labour and Tourism, has set the lead which others may do well to emulate.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. senior member for Christ Church is apparently answering a question not asked about St. Andrew, which is part of the Northern District Council.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I merely made that point in order to assist members in trying to secure sites or assisting generally, and to demonstrate that in the Northern District Parish of St. Andrew two sites of land have been made available for the construction of these communal baths and latrines, and it may well be that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who led the attack

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have not led any attack.

Mr. SPEAKER: I entirely agree. There was no attack made.
5.10 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: That is only for lack of a better word. But even assuming that the word "attack" is withdrawn, I want to allay the fears of the people by saying that community baths and latrines are being looked into on a large scale and that the money will be supplied from the Labour Welfare Fund. At present, there is money allocated for this purpose and we will see to it that each parish, including St. Joseph, will have at least two and will have them during the financial year.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Hon. Minister was talking of allaying the fears of people in all the parishes, I consider that he meant allaying the fears of the people, including the people of St. Lucy.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask another supplementary question, the Hon. Minister stated that the Government has been acquiring land with the greatest difficulty for providing communal baths. Now that the Government has acquired 100 acres of land in Christ Church, would he consider providing the same facilities for the large number of inhabitants around that area?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I would like to tell the hon. member that both Parish Land and Sandy Ground were recommended by the Southern District Council, but we have even greater plans for Parish Land. Government intends placing there a Comprehensive School. I speak subject to correction by the Hon. Minister of Education. We have plans for erecting Comprehensive Schools and for improving the area generally and providing all the necessary public conveniences and amenities.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no more replies to questions.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

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

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that Order No. 4 be the first Order of the day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will call them. The first Order stands under the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter who is not in his place.

The second order stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip. I understand that the Select Committee which has been appointed to go into this matter has not yet reported.

The next order stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, and I understand the same thing has happened in respect of that matter.

THE WEST INDIES HOSPITAL FUND LIMITED (REPEAL) BILL, 1965

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown: Second reading of a Bill to repeal the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited Act, 1964.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to repeal the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited Act, 1964. I do not think there is any necessity for me to remind hon. members that to err is human. I think that all of us in this Chamber, at least most of us, came to a unanimous decision when we voted to have this Hospital Funds Sweepstake operated in Barbados; but since that vote was carried and this Bill became the law of the land, I think everyone of us has realized the danger which we have done to the fair and good name of Barbados, and the harm which we have done abroad to our country as a result of the reckless misuse of the name of Barbados. I have received from people all over Canada the U.S.A. and even the United Kingdom letters relative to the harm which we have done to the good name of Barbados by the selling of these tickets for this Hospital fund.

Quite recently, you realised that people in business were carrying out the advertisement of the selling of this sweepstake for Hospital Fund and even at Seawall you will see a sign there. When we are seeking to bring more tourists to this country, we do not want them to feel that we are in any way selling sweepstake tickets for Hospital Funds as a means of extracting money from them. As a matter of fact, I know that quite a number of people thought that this sweepstake was for the purpose of building the new Hospital. This was told to me by quite a number of people in Canada, in the U.S.A. and in the United Kingdom.

I have said to err is human, and we all thought, when this thing was brought forward, that it was a very good thing. We hoped that we would have got the money - although there were many of us who doubted it very much so as to get the revenue which we agreed to; but we have found that this West Indies Hospital Fund, Ltd., has been a failure. Even the money by way of income tax which they agreed to pay, they have been unable to pay. It is now doing very little or no business at all, and from the replies which have been given to me from the questions which I asked, the only decent thing to do is to repeal this Bill and so cease the operation of this Sweepstake.

We have even found out that they have not been able to pay their bills, although we understand that this Fund had a capital of \$70 million. Leading businessmen and other people have bought tickets and won, and they are unable to collect their money.

This is doing this country a great deal of harm. We know, Sir, that this has been going on all over the world and creating a bad name for Barbados; therefore, I have much pleasure in moving that this Bill which seeks to repeal the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited Act be now read a second time. Every one of us would hold our heads high when we realise that we made a mistake and are now big enough to correct that mistake by repealing this Bill.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, all hon. members in the House at that time agreed unanimously to this Act, although many of us had our doubts that it was the best thing to do, 3.20 p.m.

I remember that we went into Select Committee on this Bill, and it was after cables had been exchanged between parties overseas and here and we had been assured of the financial ability of the backers of these schemes that we permitted it. I actually saw evidence of the fact that a large sum of money had been deposited to sustain the efforts of this Hospital Sweepstake. If it has done anything, it has given us, the people of Barbados and the Government, an indication of the future and an indication of what harm they can do to the good name of Barbados by embarking on such schemes. I do know that many of these islands in the Caribbean have been approached asking them to allow gambling casinos to come in. Up to now they have resisted them, and even to this day approaches are being made to some of our neighbouring islands to assist in their tourist development. They are told that in order to sustain large hotels in these small islands it would be a necessity to promote casinos in these hotels, and it is the only way in which funds will be available for this purpose. They are taking a second look; but whatever they do, if they should at all depart from the straight path which we have always trodden, a Clause would have to be written in to the effect that supervision by the Government is a "must", and any breaches of the orders or restrictions as laid down would be an infringement, and would make them liable to lose their licence. It should be done by way of a licence. If they cannot live up to certain standards, then that licence should disappear. It would not mean that a Bill would have to be brought in, as this Bill had to be brought in today, to remove a blot from Barbados. I am not at all happy standing here today to have to do this because we have seen evidence both at the Airport and at the Harbour, we have seen advertisements to the effect that large sums could be won for \$3.00 (American). We know that people have been told that their tickets have won certain prizes, and they are unable to get them. We were also told in the beginning that tickets will not be sold in Barbados. That was a change from what we were told. Some local people bought tickets and some won and some got stake money to the value of 3%; that is not good enough. If this were a local company set up, it would have disappeared long ago. This is not doing our name any good. I am therefore seconding the motion for the repeal of this Bill.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Good Book tells us that we should follow our leaders and fear no evil. That is what we have done in this case; we followed our Leader and what has happened? We butt up against all evil although the Good Book says that we should follow our leaders and fear no

evil. Now, Sir, we placed all confidence possible in our Leader at that time, when he told us all that he knew about this Company and about so much money they have and how much money the Government will receive. Sir, I can remember asking him if we allowed this Company to operate here if it would not interfere with our local Turf Club. He assured us that they will not even be selling tickets here in Barbados. I asked him at the time if they are not selling any tickets here, how are they going to pay the Government so much money? From then I believe I began to doubt my leader. I was a worried man as to how this Company is not going to stay with us, but it is still going to pay us so much money for a licence and pay so much in the profits. I just could not understand that, but I understand it now. Although the hon. introducer has brought forward this Bill, I feel he is a little bit on the late side because no living human being in Barbados would ever buy one of those tickets again. What has happened with this particular Company has gone all over the world, unless it changes its name, because everybody will be suspicious about it. When one gets on the floor of this House and leads, or shall I say, misleads us - in this case we were misled down the alley.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I think he has made use of a remark which is really unparliamentary in the sense that he tries to imply that whoever introduced the Act which is now under discussion, was misleading the House. I think the hon. member must know that that is an improper imputation to make against any hon. member. 3.30 p.m.

When measures are introduced by a Minister of Government, they are introduced in good faith and on the basis of what knowledge and judgment exist at that moment. I am not saying anything now with respect to the measure under consideration, but I think it is not quite fair to speak of the House as having been misled when, as I said, measures are introduced in this House on the basis of knowledge and opinion then existing, and on the basis of what judgment is brought to bear on the particular issue at a given time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I consider the phrase which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph used, when I understood him to say "when one gets up and tries to lead us or to mislead us", if the latter - "or mislead us" - applies to anything said or done by a member of this House, to be a transgression of Standing Order No. 26 (7). It would be an imputation of improper motives by another member of the House, implying that he might be trying to mislead us. I will ask the hon. member to withdraw the phrase "or mislead us".

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw, but I will still prove my case without using the word "mislead". The Hon. Premier on the floor of this House told us that no tickets would be sold to people in Barbados. What has caused the hon. member to bring this Bill? I do not know what to call it, and I did not go to school to define it. A little boy near my home would say that the Premier was telling fibs.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's objection to the Premier is well known, but at least he could be fair. He must remember that it was not the Premier who piloted the Bill through this House, but the hon. senior member for St. Philip who was then a Minister and Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret the expression and I deprecate the remark, if I heard the Hon. Leader of the House correctly, that the objection by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to the Premier is well known. I take it the Hon. Leader of the House is not imputing to him any improper motives when he makes the remark he has made.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, Sir, I rose to challenge him on a question of fact.

Mr. SMITH: Regardless of who piloted the Bill, the Hon. Premier replied to me because I was unhappy and stated that I hoped this Company would not come here and

kill our local Turf Club, and he assured the House that they would not be selling tickets locally. What must I say now? Anyhow, tickets have been sold in this country, and I understand that people have not been receiving what they should, and that is the trouble when you are trying to follow your Leader and fear no evil.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I was not in the House when this Bill was introduced, and I do not know if Your Honour has made any ruling on it, but this is a Bill which has financial implications, and is a Bill furthermore which is reflecting on a vote of the House made within the current session. As far as the Government is concerned, we do not want to enter into foolish debate with the uninitiated into matters financial or politic, and therefore we are going to take a vote on it; but I must draw to Your Honour's attention that the Bill which the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, his colleagues and associates now seek to introduce is definitely a Bill reflecting upon a vote of the House made during the current session. It is a Bill which affects the Treasury of the Island, and therefore I am respectfully submitting the matter for Your Honour's ruling. If Your Honour has not ruled upon it yet, and to save the hon. member the embarrassment of a ruling, we have already entered into debate upon the matter, and we will ask therefore that the question be put.

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter to which reference has been made by the hon. senior member for St. John is already engaging the attention, at my instance, of the Clerk at the Table. I am not disposed at the moment to allow the question to be put, because I propose to give a ruling in writing.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Did I understand that Your Honour has already ruled on the matter and has already made up your mind? We do not want a ruling in writing. If your Honour wants to safeguard yourself, the position of the Chair itself is sufficient safeguard, just like the position of a judge on the Bench. I suggest that this has been before the House a sufficiently long period of time from 5th October, and even, and I say "even" advisedly, the Learned Clerk at the Table could make up his mind as to the illegality or the legality of the measure which is now before us. I do not want to say any more. We know that the Clerk at the Table happens to be a very meticulous kind of person and would take longer to consider matters of importance and moment than any of the legally trained members of the House. 3.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have decided that I would give my ruling on the question; therefore it stands over until another time.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Safeguarding the rights of the Crown and the hon. senior member for St. John, I said - in other words, I have not spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have understood that the Hon. and Learned senior member for St. John rose on a point of order.

BARBADOS MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Barbados Mutual Life Assurance Society Act, 1851.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, this Bill was on the Order Paper for some time and it is to permit the Barbados Mutual Life Assurance Society to make a slight amendment to the Act of 1851.

In 1851, when this Society was incorporated \$10,000 was considered a lot of money, but it is so outmoded today that it has restricted this Society from holding property in any one year in excess of £10,000. It is so obvious, with the great change which is taking place as regards money, that that amount is considered very low as regards today's standards. Therefore, the society is seeking to amend this Bill so that they can invest out of the island as well as within the island. The Barbados Mutual Life Assurance

Society is investing more money today than it did in the past, and it is also lending more money to local persons. For that reason they have come to amend this Act and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be sent to Select Committee.

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the following members to serve on this Select Committee:-

The hon. junior member for Christ Church (Mr. Goddard); the hon. junior member for the City (Mr. Lynch); the hon. junior member for St. Andrew (Hon. A. DaC. Edwards); the hon. junior member for St. Lucy (Hon. J. C. Tudor); and the hon. junior member for St. James (Mr. Holder).

I hope that each of these hon. members is available to serve on this Select Committee. I therefore declare those hon. members duly selected to serve on this Committee.

ATTENTION CALLED TO CERTAIN SELECT COMMITTEES ON ORDER PAPER

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Before Your Honour resumes Government Business, I would like to draw the attention of Your Honour and hon. members of this House to the fact there are three items under Private Members' Business which cannot be proceeded with any further, and it is better for the Select Committees which were appointed to deal with those matters to meet and make an appropriate Report so that these matters can be taken off the Order Paper proper.

These matters are Item No. 1, Item No. 2 and Item No. 3.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have just received the assurance that these matters have arisen because of an Act.

Mr. GODDARD: Referring to the same matter - Item No. 3 - the Cabinet has been given power to deal with this matter; therefore we did not go any further into the matter.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: While that is true, these matters have all been sent to Select Committee; therefore the appropriate thing to do would be for the Select Committees to meet, have a formal meeting, and report, advising the House that the matter is not to be further proceeded with, and ask that it be taken off the Order Paper.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now resumed.

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

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

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 3) ORDER, 1966

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1966, of which notice was given earlier today be the next item under Government Business.

I am asking leave for the hon. senior member for Christ Church to take charge of the Resolution in the absence of the Hon. Premier.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is also asking leave for the hon. senior member for Christ Church to take charge of the resolution in the absence of the Hon. Premier. If there be no objection, leave will be granted. (A PAUSE)

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this is the first positive step which is being taken in the whole transfer of Public Health functions from the Councils to the Central Government.

Hon. members would remember that in the Local Government (Ordinary Election of Councillors) Act, 1965, provision was made, among other things, for the transfer of certain Public Health functions from the Councils to the Government on the 1st April, 1966.

Earlier today, I gave notice of a Bill to regularise and take care of the transfer of certain other functions, and that Bill I would like to deal with tomorrow. Hon. members will have their copies of that Bill today before they leave. 3.50 p.m.

At present there are 91 posts of Public Health Inspectors in the Councils as follows:- Three senior Public Health Inspectors - one in the City, one in the South and another in the North - seven Assistant Public Health Inspectors in the City and suburbs, and 81 District Public Health Inspectors in the three areas. There are also 17 Inspectors retained or employed by the Central Government to supervise some of the work, and there are regular Public Health Inspectors who see after the work done by the Councils and the general activities in the various areas. It is proposed, as the Order sets out, to make certain adjustments in the Staff structures of the Ministry of Health and Community Development and the Health Centres in order to effect the transfer of certain Public Health functions from the Councils to the Central Government in accordance with the Local Government (Ordinary Election of Councillors) Act, 1965. At the Headquarters of the Ministry of Health, in order to co-ordinate the work, it has been decided to upgrade the salary of the Chief Public Health Officer from \$4,632 - \$5,712 to \$4,632 - \$6,288; and the salary of the Chief Public Health Inspector from \$4,128 - \$5,136 to \$4,128 - \$5,712. The Chief Public Health Officer will co-ordinate the work and he will have an office at the Ministry. Then the Island will be divided into two areas and will have four Chief Public Health Inspectors, two in the parish of St. Michael and one each in the Southern and Northern Districts. Hon. members will also see from the Order that the salary of the Chief Public Health Inspector will be increased to a maximum of \$5,712. It is also proposed to abolish the following posts or that the abolition of the following posts should be made accordingly: Assistant to the Chief Public Health Inspector, \$3,096 - \$3,960; Public Health Inspector at the Port, \$3,096 - \$3,960 and the Public Health Inspector, holder of the R.S.I., \$1,872 - \$2,832. As I said, Sir, these posts will be abolished automatically on the coming into force of this Order, that is, from the 1st April, 1966.

It is proposed that the following additional posts will be created:- there will be an additional Chief Public Health Inspector, eight senior Public Health Inspectors, 71 Public Health Inspectors, one Clerk/Typist, one Long Grade Clerk and one Messenger. Hon. members will observe that the salaries are attractive; they have been regularised in keeping with the various grades in the Government Service; no officer stands to lose anything; and no officer will be demoted. At the Health Centres there will be four Junior Health Nurses at a salary of \$2,472 - \$2,952; one Long Grade Clerk, \$1,200 - \$2,832 and one Stenographer, \$1,440 - \$2,352 or \$1,260 - \$1,728. It may well be that I will continue to deal with the Order and then give any additional explanation afterwards. We come now to the creation of the following posts at the Waterworks Department and at the

Mental Hospital. At the Waterworks Department there will be one Inspector of Wells, \$3,096 - \$3,960 who will replace the temporary post which is attached to the Ministry of Agriculture. That post is being established and will fall in the Waterworks Department. With regard to the Mental Hospital, there will be the creation of the posts of one Gatekeeper, \$1,128 - \$1,416 and one Messenger, \$1,092 - \$1,704. The reason for that is that we have never had at the Mental Hospital a sufficient number of Gatekeepers in order to relieve each other, so that Messengers had to be brought in and there was some shortage in this respect.

At the District Hospital at Oistins, it is proposed to make that District Hospital self contained. Whereas the meals were provided by the Southern District Council and the Government gave a grant for that purpose, under the new arrangement the Hospital will be self contained. It is proposed to have the services of a Housekeeper, \$1,128 - \$1,704; two Orderlies, \$1,056 - \$1,200; three cooks, \$876 - \$1,020 and three Maids, \$876. As I have said, the Oistins District Hospital will be self contained and will be able to take care of the provision of meals for the patients of the Hospital. It is also proposed to upgrade the post of "Sister" District Hospital who has great responsibilities and her salary scale will be removed from \$2,472 - \$2,952 to \$3,096 - \$3,528. That post will be upgraded in that way in view of the recognition of the new and great responsibilities it carries. I should like to say that with regard to the terms and conditions of service under which these Public Health Officers and Public Health Inspectors will be employed, under the new arrangements, there will be a much more satisfactory state of affairs, their salaries will be regularised and it will not be possible for one Inspector to draw more than another Inspector when they have similar qualifications. The salaries will be regularised and there will be greater scope for the qualified Inspectors. They will also be entitled to greater facilities with regard to travelling.

4.00 p.m.

The Chief Public Health Officer will be attached to the Ministry to carry out the administrative division of the service, to control island-wide campaigns, to advise the Ministry generally and Public Health Inspectors and to initiate action on complaints, and the increase in his salary is in proportion to the responsibility which falls on him by way of transfer. There will be four posts of Chief Public Health Inspector who will be needed to take charge of the four areas into which the island will be divided for administrative purposes, the area of the City Council being divided into two because of the complexity of the problem which includes the high density of population, the seaport, large institutions and the major food centres. There will take direct control of the staff and be responsible for the executive powers in addition to existing functions. The holders of the post will be liable to transfer from one area to the other according to the exigencies of the service.

With regard to the Senior Public Health Inspector, each of the four Chief Public Health Inspectors will be assigned two senior Public Health Inspectors for the better control of his area. These will be liable to transfer according to the exigencies of the service.

There will be 71 posts of Public Health Inspector, and they will not be allocated to the districts into which the eight zones will be divided in any fixed proportion, since some administrative flexibility is desirable according to the exigencies of the service. The qualifying bars in the proposed scale are related to the possession of the R.S.I. Certificate with a maximum salary of \$1,776 and M. and F. Certificate to a maximum salary of \$2,832. It is proposed that the minimum additional requirements for recruitment into this grade should be the same as those prescribed from time to time as Clerk in the General Service.

In so far as travelling is concerned, at present the Council does not make provision for loans to officers to purchase motor cars, but certain officers, including Public Health Inspectors, are paid commuted travelling allowances at various rates. In central Government, the Chief

Public Health Officer, the Chief Public Health Inspectors and the Assistant to the Chief Public Health Inspector are already Scheduled travelling Officers. Our proposal is that the post of Senior Public Health Inspector be similarly scheduled, and that the Public Health Inspectors be placed on the same basis as postmen and be eligible at their option for loans to purchase motor cycles, motor scooters, auto-cycles or bicycles as they may think fit, and they would then be eligible for and entitled to the payment of fixed monthly allowances for the upkeep of the various vehicles, as postmen are entitled to at present. They will also be provided with uniforms so that there will be a standard uniform throughout the service.

In so far as the supernumeraries - if I may use that expression - are concerned; that is, those who are already apprentices and are not qualified as such, but who act from time to time when those qualified go on leave or during times of illness - I understand that there are at present thirteen who are employed - but who are really trainees in that some are studying a regular training scheme will be instituted on a larger scale to assist them. There are eight in the North and five in the South. The trainees in the City are not paid, but the thirteen in the North and South are paid. Many of them have been working for five or six years, and their services will be retained on the understanding that they will embrace the opportunity to receive training and to become qualified.

I hardly think I need say very much more, since the other points more or less speak for themselves.

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

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, as this affects the Department of which I am Head, I should like to make our position clear as a result of certain remarks made by the Minister who introduced this Resolution. When he takes over the Sanitary Inspectors or the section of public Health in general into the Central arrangement as recommended by the Jackson Report, he will find that from the City he will have well trained staff on which to build. We have given them every opportunity to improve themselves by going to lectures, and out of the 30 odd whom we have, only two are not qualified. They have been there a long time, and you know that not every one is prepared to study; but we have a good record which is through supervision, and once a week reviewing the working in the Municipality with regard to general health conditions, including scavenging and the problems that are reported to that Department.

4.10 p.m.

At those meetings, one of the Inspectors or even a doctor from the Central Government attends, and they are asked to talk freely on any observation that they may want to make, not only of the City but of the island generally. They are asked to mention anything, particularly, if we stand in fear of something approaching. This has been so for years.

We feel that we have a good record in respect of our health services in St. Michael, and many observers from overseas and observers in Public Health matters have complimented us for the manner in which we have conducted that service.

Now, we have always taken the lead from Central Government in respect of salary increases to our employees. We have never tried to adjust salaries in advance; we have always awaited the Government's salaries revision before we attempt to adjust the salaries of our employees. As a matter of fact, as a result of that, generally, we have to pay retroactive salaries for a year. At the last salaries Revision, when Government gave their salaries increases in 1961, we were not able to pay increases until 1962. Of course, the taxes for that year would skyrocket and give us difficulty in budgeting for that year, but we would see to it that our employees never lost as a result. That can

never be said of the Southern District Council or even of the North. That is the reason why the employees of those Councils have to be upgraded now.

Sir, we have a sense of responsibility in all matters. Not only do we protect our employees, but we also look out in the interest of the ratepayers. The taxes have risen higher than in the past. We have had to extend our services and it is for that reason that more money had to come in. What has caused our rates to have risen so heavily also is because of the acquisition by Government of some of our revenue-earning properties, and the Government not giving us a grant in return. It was recommended by Mr. Jackson, the last Commissioner, and even by Sir John Maude. He said that it would be difficult to continue until the Government realises what is done in other territories and give us a grant in lieu of taxes.

With the Government's activities in these fields, you find that the entire Garrison buildings, which used to be the Military buildings are now residences, and people are benefitting from the services which we render. They should be called on to contribute their full share so as to relieve others who are over-burdened.

Take also the Government housing estates. The Government has taken up all that land in housing estates. When I first heard of what was written in the Jackson Report, I thought that that section of his Report would have been implemented at the same time. If Government has seen fit not only this year, but long ago, to give us a grant in lieu of taxes for the taking over of all these properties and land, that sum would have gone a long way to have the rate of taxes reduced in the Municipality.

However, Sir, the Government can be assured of one thing and that is full co-operation from our side. Unless there be full co-operation between Inspectors, there would be a breakdown in the service. We would therefore play our part, but the Government must play their part. The liaison must be a happy one. We will continue to remove stuff and attend to public conveniences and, of course, the dumping of stuff is always a sore point. Under these circumstances, the Public Health Inspectors would have to report to our Department any deficiencies which they may find. They will have under them some workers, and they would have to do a certain amount of cleaning or bringing out stuff as we have had to do from time to time for people who need assistance in their cleaning up. They would see that we have rendered assistance in this City to the poor people. We hope, therefore, that the Inspectors would investigate cases or hardship in which people, especially Old Age Pensioners, are unable to have their pits cleaned and do what we did; that is, to send and have their pits cleaned.

You are now taking over. Your resources are greater, but the Government is still taking from us part of our revenue. Three years ago, we spent a capital expenditure of £10,000 on the erection of latrines and digging of pits so as to eradicate sources of typhoid fever. I can go on and on at great length to speak on services which we have rendered and which you are now taking over. We pledge from our side full co-operation, but we wish to see what we had hoped. For these services which you are taking over, you are still calling on us to provide funds. You are not doing it out of funds from Central Government because I have just received communication whereby you are deducting from our sources of revenue, from trade tax, 27 percent of the money; so we are handing over the service to you, and the money to perform it is coming from the taxpayers of the City of Bridgetown. The other Councils are doing the same thing too. I think it is fair that the public should know. We have performed the service for many years, and you are now taking it over on the guise that we were doing it badly. You are taking it over today to do it more efficiently, and you have set out to say that you are increasing the salaries immediately of the people whom you are taking on. The taxpayers of the Municipality are still contributing for it out of their trade rates.

4.20 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have just heard my successor, the Chairman of the Sanitary Committee for the City of Bridgetown, and he has actually given us the details of what will take place with respect to this new Order. As far as we are concerned, no one could accuse us of not doing a proper and efficient job and, actually, I know that the Government must be surprised, or at least the Medical Officers must be surprised at some of the things which we carry on in the Municipality, which have not been carried on in other areas. I do not criticise them for this. As the hon. member has rightly told the House, such services we carried on were for the purpose of eradicating such diseases in Bridgetown which would eventually affect the entire island. I may pause here today that it is not within the knowledge of the people that with 28,000 houses in the Municipality and with the entire number of these houses, there are only about 8,000 with a water-borne system of sanitation. That leaves other people with earth-pits or the bucket system, and some with nothing at all. That was a question of preventing the incidence of typhoid fever and we provided the Public Assistance Service in the cause of sanitary services, and thereby getting superstructures and cleaning pits. You have many Old Age Pensioners in the City, and you know that very few of them would be able to provide a service which would contribute to the non-spreading of communicable diseases. We have dealt with this service which you are taking over today; there are services such as Sanitary Inspectors going around from house to house and making inspections. As far as we are concerned, what the hon. member who has just sat down has said is absolutely correct. After twenty odd years' membership of the Commissioners of Health, I can say that we have always tried to offer co-operation with the Government in that we have never tried to increase the salaries of our staff above those which the Government was paying. As to the salaries which we pay on the 25th March those are the salaries which the present Government is actually paying to its sanitary staff.

You will appreciate the fact that this change of salary rightly came about and people got their salary scale going to \$300 per month. We have deprecated the idea of having qualified men in the North on salaries of \$100 per month or \$150 per month and having the same qualifications as those in the City and in the South. I am happy to think that they have put salaries on the proper basis. A qualified man in St. Andrew should receive the same salary as a qualified man in Bridgetown. It would not mean that flies which are carrying communicable diseases cannot cross the border from the North to the South. It seems to me that you are jumping the gun in this matter. The Northern District Council can say that an Inspector who is coming up here is getting the same salary in Bridgetown. This is a question of jumping the gun; it is a question of expediency at the present moment. The Hon. Minister, whether it was for the purpose of publication or not, omitted to say, while they are taking over these people with these salaries in the City, the North and the South, what I said some days ago. What I said was that I was surprised that with the taking over, the Government has not carried the expenses thereby relieving the taxpayers of the burdens.

There are other matters which I have to discuss with the Ministry. If you take over assets, then you must also take over liabilities. The hon. member has rightly said that they are implementing the part of the Jackson Report which says that you should centralise Your Public Health services, but he also said something else. You cannot take up property after property, and the Councils are not getting one cent and people are expected to pay. Wherever the Government owns property, they make some sort of subvention to the Councils for the taxes which they have to pay. No one expects that a school owned by the Government should be taxed or things like that. As far as this matter is concerned, lest it be thought for a moment that the Government is coming along to say: "We are paying this salary because you are not paying it", we want to make it abundantly clear that the Government of Barbados and the City Council are paying similar salaries for public inspection; and lest anyone should think that the Government has dropped in and said that "We are paying salaries in excess

of these," I say it is not so. We have always said that we will follow the Government and give retrospective pay in this respect. Therefore, we are saying that we are surprised to think that while you are taking these things over - well, Sir, this document is certainly too voluminous to ask us to deal with the Estimates and with this document in the morning.
4.30 p.m.

We know that we must get these through before the end of the month, but I will say that as far as this is concerned, it must be universally known that the ratepayers in the particular areas have to pay for this, though you are removing them from the administration and authority of the Local Governments and centralising them, a thing which has been long abolished in England. The Ministry of Health must be responsible for the health of any Island, but surely the idea in England is to decentralise and not to centralise, and the fact that you are centralising means that you are going to pay these salaries from the money collected from the ratepayers of the Municipality, you are going to pay the Local Government Commissioner, and we are not going to get one cent for collecting the money. At least no provision has been made for that. You are asking us to collect \$485,000 for you, and you are not going to pay us one cent for stationery, service of clerks and so on.

Some members may stupidly think that this is something that offends us; but as far as the health of a community is concerned, it can be undermined, and from the end of this month you will inherit a service of which you can be justly proud. You will inherit the service of well-trained men. You will be in the position, as the hon. junior member for Christ Church has rightly said, where nearly all the men you are going to take over will possess not only the R.S.I. certificate, but the M. & F. Certificate, because I insisted some twenty years ago when I went to the Board that those who were looking for promotion must become qualified.

We wish you well in this, but there are a few matters we would like to see attended to. We would like the Minister under whose portfolio this comes to pay great attention not only to this service of house-to-house inspection, but to those services which we have been giving to avoid communicable diseases, as well as those services we have given to the underprivileged and poor who could not do anything for themselves in this respect. If in any tenantry or housing area such people do not have these facilities, they will endanger the health of those people who have. None of us can be above the danger of being affected by any of these communicable diseases if we do not see that those persons who live around us in this community and cannot provide these services are given assistance in these services.

Mr. SPEAKER: If no other hon. member desires to contribute to this debate, the Hon. Introducer may now exercise his right of final reply.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with rapt attention to the speeches of the hon. members who have just sat down. They are experienced Councillors and have performed the duties of City Fathers over the years, so that they are more conversant with the problems than probably any of us or most of us in the Ministry as such. I would however like to assure the hon. members that at no time was there any suggestion made or any aspersion cast as to the efficiency of the services which the City Council in particular and the other Councils have provided over the years. We feel very grateful and indebted to the hon. member and to the City Council for their services and their valuable contribution, but it may well be that the time has come when medical men or men specially trained in Public Health matters can make an even greater contribution towards the promotion of the health of the community. If these services become centralised as we are now proposing, the Chief Medical Officer and the Public Health Officers, along with the World Health Organisation and the assistance which we will receive from World Health Organisation all of whom are on the spot, will be in a position to assist us in training these Inspectors who are not yet qualified, and the service should normally be improved.

The health of the island is on a high standard, and the incidence of certain diseases, especially contagious ones, is non-existent - I refer to Tuberculosis, typhoid and other contagious diseases.

I noticed when hon. members spoke that there seemed to have been some inference that the Councils are being asked to give up these services because they have not performed them so well in the past, but it is simply that we have had the recommendations in the Jackson Report which have been lying there for some time, and we feel we should bring this first phase into operation at an early date.

Now the hon. member has said that there are lots of valuable Government property which do not pay taxes at present and for which they receive no grant from the Central Government. That may well be a matter to be considered at the right level and by the appropriate Minister. The Councils will be relieved of certain functions which they are now performing as a result of the transfer, for example, street lighting and standposts, at an estimated expenditure of \$457,846, which is 27% of the estimated revenue from trade taxes. We are asking that this amount be paid into the Treasury on behalf of these services which will now fall on the Central Government and which are now paid for by the District Councils and the City Council, so that the City Council with 66% of the trade tax would be relieved of certain responsibilities which they now have to bear. It would therefore appear equitable on the face of it. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Pay us for collecting it.) That will form the subject of negotiations.
4.40 p.m.

We have only heard about it for the first time now. Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the Central Government is not really doing anything iniquitous. It is merely taking over 27 per cent of the trade tax in order to assist us in meeting the expenses and paying the salaries and other conditions of service which the Officers are entitled to.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I rise on a point of order. We have never said anything such. We have never accused them of doing anything iniquitous.

Mr. SPEAKER: That seems to be a point of elucidation; not a point of order. But it is legitimately a point of interruption.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am grateful to the hon. member who has just spoken. I am now satisfied when he says that it is nothing iniquitous. Therefore, the question of 27 per cent of the estimated trade tax must not be misunderstood.

I think, Sir, that we have more or less covered all the points. I want to assure the hon. member that as far as the casual employees are concerned, their interest will be taken care of and all casual employees who are now employed under the Councils will be entitled under the Casual Employees Pension Act and there will be no demotion. In other words, no one stands to lose anything. There will be a Salaries Revision coming up shortly, and they will stand to benefit from any new salaries proposals. In reality, no one stands to lose anything and the interest of all the workers will be protected and in many cases enhanced. They will be entitled to any leave which they are already entitled to and they will be eligible, at least the Officers will become subject to Government's Leave Passages, Car and Housing Allowances, and other conditions of the Service as regards the Civil Servants. They will have the right to become subject to the rules of the Pension Act of 1947 if they are transferred to the Central Government. I think that I have explained quite fully all of that already, and I now beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

STATEMENT *re* CONSTITUTIONAL PROPOSALS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Health.

It is Order No. 4: Second reading of a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ending on the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven.

I am asking leave for the Hon. Minister of Finance to deal with this matter.

I may say that I think the Hon. Premier will wish to ask leave of the House to lay a document. I expect this will be done before he moves the second reading of the Appropriation Bill.

We are hoping that we will go into Committee tonight on the Bill and move certain Heads of the Estimates. I shall give the assurance which I have already given that we shall stop between 9.30 p.m. and 10.00 p.m. By the time the adjournment is taken, I would be able to advise hon. members what time tomorrow we will meet, but this will depend on how much of the Estimates we get through tonight.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I (will) like to ask for leave to lay a document which is the Draft Constitution for Independence of Barbados.

This document will now be circulated to hon. members and it was laid by command of the whole Cabinet.

The Cabinet has also approved of a Resolution which I shall introduce at a later stage, but I do not propose to discuss or debate this Resolution for a period at least four weeks, subject to the laying of this Draft Constitution for Independence for the Island of Barbados.

I shall like to inform hon. members that the Draft Constitution does not contain a preamble which is still under mature consideration by members of the Cabinet, but it contains provision for citizenship, for the recognition and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, for the establishment of the office of Governor-General, for the laws relating to the composition, powers and procedure of Parliament, summoning prorogation and dissolution thereof, for powers of the Executive, for the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeal, the Public Service and for Service Commissions and for Finance.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay this document.

I shall say also that there is in front of the document some pages of *corrigenda* and *errata* which hon. members would have to correct for themselves. This document was only a draft, and it was not printed by the Government Printer. 4.50 p.m.

I should also like to mention that a Bill will be circulated to hon. members sometime during the course of the week.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 4 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.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave for the Hon. Minister of Finance to take charge of this order standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Health and Community Development.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave for the hon. senior member for St. John to take charge of this Order standing in the name of the hon. senior member for Christ Church, and if there be no objection, leave is granted. (PAUSE) There being no objection, leave is granted.

The next Order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. John: - To move the second reading of a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ending on the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I usually introduce the consideration of the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the current year by explaining to hon. members that this is not a Budget Speech. I know that it has been the practice in the past, in the dim, dark days of Colonialism prior to 1961, to make comments which were referred to as a Budget Speech, on the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure. It has been the practice of this Government, ever since I became Minister of Finance, to introduce the Estimates as required by law before the end of the financial year in sufficient time that the Other Place would have the opportunity to approve of the passage of the Appropriation Bill. The Estimates are only Estimates, but the legal authority for the payment of the moneys out of the Public Treasury of this Island will be found in the Appropriation Bill which was given notice of last week by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, the Minister of Health and Community Development. The Appropriation Bill does not contain the same sum of expenditure as you will find in the Estimates of gross expenditure, copies of which were also laid in the House last Tuesday. In the Appropriation Bill, the Legislature is only asked to approve those items which are not fixed by law. You will remember, Sir, that I introduced - in fact, I laid on the Table of the House the Draft Constitution for the Independence of Barbados. In this Constitution hon. members will find that there will be no difficulty in understanding the kind of exercise which we are now going through. That is so because, like all other Commonwealth countries, we are making provision for a Consolidated Fund vote and, into the Consolidated Fund will be paid all revenue and all moneys receivable for and on account of the Government of this country. All of the Consolidated Fund votes will have the authority of the Legislature. For instance, the salaries of the Judges of the Supreme Court will become a charge on the Consolidated Fund, similarly in the same way that the Consolidated Fund vote for external affairs will go into the Consolidated Fund.

I will remind hon. members who may be confused by the former procedure, of what we are doing. We are not entitled to interfere in any way with the Consolidated Fund votes, as I should describe them; these were the ones outside of the Appropriation Bill introduced last week. The Appropriation Bill contains probably one-third of the total amount of the expenditure included in the Estimates, that is because the other two-thirds of the total estimated expenditure for the current financial year, or rather the coming financial year, will have already been fixed by law. It would not be competent for this House even to reduce or expect to secure an amendment to these various Orders, statutory instruments and Bills, to increase the Appropriation fund under this Head. When we pass the Appropriation Bill, we will be approving of items of expenditure which are not fixed by law and will have to be voted by this House as supplies for the running of the country.

There are certain amendments which have been made in the Draft Estimates and these have been circulated. There are several pages of them, probably about eight or nine pages. Several of them are in the form of "move-ins" and several are corrections, but most of them are "move-ins" in relation to matters which have been inadvertently omitted when the Draft was originally printed. You will also see in these Estimates a new Head called "External Affairs". That is, of course, in keeping with our present constitutional position and the approaching constitutional status of Barbados during the current financial year. We do not have a Ministry or Department of External Affairs to look after matters relating to our territory outside the Caribbean and outside of Barbados. Therefore, hon. members, I think, will not normally expect me to go through page by page the list of amendments which we have already circulated. I should invite hon. members, however, that when they are considering the Estimates in detail, to make sure that they read the list which will come before them. 5.00 p.m.

Now the Estimate of current expenditure for the financial year will amount to \$41,506,697, and the estimate of revenue is \$40,050,814, which means that there is a deficit in the Estimates of \$1,455,883. On Capital account, Sir, the estimated capital expenditure will be \$15,749,647 of which \$8,269,900 will be provided for by loans, and the sum of \$7,438,195 from surplus balances. From Colonial Development and Welfare Funds we expect the princely subvention of \$41,552. The fantastic thing about this is that there is a concept both in the United Kingdom Parliament, and I can only say for some obscure reason even existing amongst members of this House, that the Government of Barbados is in some way subsidised by the United Kingdom Government and cannot afford to pay its own way. A lot of people in the United Kingdom feel that they are underwriting the cost of Government in this country.

If you look at the interest charges, Mr. Chairman, you will see that the Government of Barbados is exporting a considerable amount of money to the United Kingdom every single year, and that we have an unfavourable balance of trade with the United Kingdom probably amounting to \$20 million or \$30 million. In return the United Kingdom in recognition of the way in which this country bolsters up the economy of that country is giving us \$41,552, which is somewhat less than a Public Works lorry wastes from one Friday afternoon to the next Friday afternoon and the amount of cement that is dropped off lorries weekly, and then you get people going about the country with this idea.

As far as Colonial Development Corporation is concerned, it has its headquarters in Barbados, and Barbados is the only Commonwealth country that colonial Development Corporation does not have one penny of investment in. When the Canadian National Power Company bought over the Barbados Light and Power Company, they handed back £300,000 worth of debentures that the Colonial Development Corporation had lent to the local and English shareholders of the Barbados Light and Power Company; but as a condition of lending them this £383,000, they made a condition that the Government of Barbados would have to raise the rate of interest from 6 per cent to 8 per cent, and we got the famous amendment to the Usury Act. How could anyone in the United Kingdom or in Barbados in these peculiar circumstances suggest that Barbados is not capable of managing its own affairs, when even Government-sponsored institutions of the United Kingdom try to impose unnecessary burdens on small shopkeepers, because a few capitalists in the then Light and Power Company wanted to borrow money from them? The only investment made by the United Kingdom in Barbados was made to the Light and Power Company and not to the Government of Barbados.

Anyhow for these and other tender mercies and the \$41,552 which we get from C.D. & W. this year, we are extremely thankful, and we are very grateful for it; but I would like to assure them that the Island would not sink in the Atlantic if we did not receive the money. So this Island will be spending \$41 million, some of which will go back to the United Kingdom, because we have to buy stationery from them and other items of a longstanding nature, though not of a capital nature; but we will be spending a substantial portion of the \$15.75 million which we have in the Capital Works programme for this year in the United Kingdom; so the total expenditure, therefore, Mr. Speaker, by Government is the public sector this year will be to the order of \$57 million.

A lot of people do not understand how it is that the Government Revenue goes on increasing without any additional taxation of any significance since 1962, but it is very simple. Here you have in the economic sense the difference between Conservatism in all its implications and the principles of Socialist planning. Conservatives, as I know them, are concerned with spending the minimum amount of money so that they would have to pay the least amount of taxes. This is the whole social and economic philosophy behind Conservatism. People who are students of Socialist planning are concerned with the moral issues as well as the

strictly financial arithmetic of Government handling, and we are concerned first with human beings, and then anything else must come from that concern. Every measure taken by the Government has got to be directed primarily to relieve unemployment and suffering, to remove the inequalities between one citizen of the country and another to as great an extent as humanly possible, and in order to provide opportunities for the younger people in the community to be able to hold their own and command the type of job and have the type of security to which everyone looks forward.

Mr. Speaker, if you ask some people why they are Conservatives, they say they are businessmen, but being a businessman is no part of Christian ethics at all. You have to be a human being before you are a businessman, and one of the paradoxes of a community like this is that the people who amass the wealth of the country and hold on to it and do not like to pay taxes, and it has to be wrung out of them, are the people who depend on the accumulation of this wealth not on people like themselves, because the people like themselves have already reached saturation point in their expenditure plans. They do not want seven radiograms or seven refrigerators or another suite of chairs. They already have a refrigerator, two motor cars and a radiogram; but their wealth is amassed out of aspiring masses of the people who are still striving to attain these materialistically desirable objectives, although spiritually they may be damaging to the development of human personality. That is the paradox of a society like this, a paradox inspired by acquisitiveness on the part of certain people and the lack of opportunity on the part of others.

Mr. Speaker, people wonder how this Government can take over with an estimated revenue of \$26 million, and at the end of four years be asking for the country an estimated revenue of \$40 million, with only one single year of tax adjustment in 1962 to raise only an additional \$2 million or \$3 million. The increment in Government revenue is not coming from taxation measures which were imposed three years ago, because those taxation measures were imposed at a time to make up for the deficit brought about by the increases in Civil Servants' salaries, and the general rises in cost of building construction and consumer goods, and these rises in cost have continued upwards; they have not gone down.
5.10 p.m.

If you want to see these exercises, you will have to look at Government's Development Plan. The main purpose of that development is not to erect monuments, but to provide for the development of the economy without which a country cannot go on developing - I would not like to say 'as we have been developing' - because there was a development from the point of view of development, but not from the gross domestic product. The national income *per capita* which is the net concept, not the gross concept like the gross national product, was actually on the decline when this Government took over and, Sir, you would remember that from October 1929 there was a decline, and the idea was that if the income was going down, the country could not afford to spend more money; it had to trim its expenditure and spend less money. So, we had this spiral downwards from 1929 to 1934 and we had that great pressure which was in the United States when 29 million people were employed. That was because of the false impression given that when a country was going down in its income, you could not afford to spend more money. The gross finding of Government's finance is that at the time you are earning less money than what you were earning before, that is the very time that you have to prime the economic pump in order to generate activity, and this thing initially was what this Government was doing.

We were faced in 1961 with exactly the same position that President Roosevelt was faced with in 1934 when things had reached rock bottom in the U.S.A. That was the time when everybody was talking about finding jobs for people overseas and nobody was talking of finding jobs for people within the islands. Nobody was talking about Government planning which at that time was nothing more than window

dressings. As regards the Deep Water Harbour which I advocated in 1952 and only succeeded in completely in 1962, ten years later, the last Government had no plans for generating anything within the economy of this island. Therefore when you look at the figures and see that the Government's revenue is \$40 million, you cannot say what the less enlightened members and even a section of the Press are saying when the Government's income is rising and yet no additional taxation was put on last year. I always remember when I was in infants' school we used to have a device which unfortunately has gone out of fashion and that is why my handwriting and yours may be more legible than some of the younger people. We had copy books and we practised to emulate the characteristics which we had in the copy books, some of which I remember and some of which I have forgotten. I remember one adage which says: "Two men went through prison bars. One saw smoke and one saw stars." I say that to say this. The newspapers of this country are always looking down, but the Government is always looking up. Therefore, our eyes can never make four because if one is looking down and the other is looking up, the person looking down cannot see the person looking up; therefore who is going to escape first?

The point is this. There is no point in saying that the Government's expenditure has risen because there is no country in this world in which the Government's expenditure has not risen. As people get more and more ambitious, Government's expenditure must necessarily rise. I hope that it would go on rising and rising. The more it rises, the happier I would be; but it would have to rise in all sectors and not necessarily by providing people with elaborate desks which are unproductive.

What we have to concern ourselves about is that Government's revenue rises commensurately with the rise in Government's expenditure. As long as Government's revenue rises in direct proportion with the expenditure and the gap between expenditure and revenue is not like the gap between the rich and the poor, then there is nothing to worry about. As long as we can maintain some measure of parity, we have nothing to worry about.

When you look at these Estimates, what you have to wonder - in the sense we say the word "admire" - what is the cause of wonderment is that we have got the Government's revenue to rise without the addition of further rates. If we did not have a Capital Works Programme which was self generated, which created additional jobs, which jobs in turn would add to the purchasing power in the pockets of the masses of the country - if we did not have this Capital Works Programme, then all that we are doing would be a lesson in simple arithmetic; and if we did not do any planning there would be no reason for the Government's existence, and just as the electorate did not vote for the perpetuation of the last Government in power, they would do the same thing with us.

We need a Government to do planning and to inject some kind of dynamism into the country because we have a growing population - and long may it continue to grow. We do not have too many people in Barbados. As a matter of fact, we do not have enough. If we did not have 240,000 people in Barbados, we would not have a revenue of \$40 million. The people who want us to have a low revenue say so because they want to have an expansive set of beaches to relax on. The presence of the masses here is an offence to a certain section of the people.

I am talking economics. Let us go back to the rise in Government's revenue. That can only come about if we continue to have a dynamic approach to economic growth. We have projected the expenditure of \$15 3/4 million in this year on Capital Estimates alone which incidentally was the total Government's expenditure ten years ago. 5.20 p.m.

If you look at the ten-year review on page four of the Estimates, you will find that in 1955-56 the total revenue of the country was \$17 million and the total expenditure of the country was \$14 million. They had in that year a surplus

of \$3.8 million and there was little or no expenditure on Capital Account. As a matter of fact, the expenditure on Capital Account was slightly less than the surplus they had; so that the total expenditure of the country ten years ago was about the same as our expenditure on new Capital Works in this island in 1966-67. In 1961 when this Government took over, you will find that the total expenditure in that year was only \$22 million and this Government has doubled Government spending in four short years, and at the same time nearly doubled Government revenue in those four short years. I do not know of any other country in the world that can boast of a rate of growth of over 22% per annum; I know of no other Government doing that, not even the most backward days of the Five Year Plans of the Soviet Union when if they spent 1% it would be 100% in Government spending. When you have reached a certain level of development and you are continuing to develop the economy, where the Government not only spends but collects 22% more per annum, you can see that we have the justification in saying that the programme for the economic development of this country has exceeded our wildest expectation.

At the same time let us go to the comparative table in performance. In four years this Government has built three times as many schools as the previous Government built in the last ten years. So that if you apply the factor of 2.5 of the approved schools which we have built, you will find that it will work out to something like 750% in the performance of this Government. If anyone has any doubt about it, he only has to look around him. I do not want to talk about the obvious things because I am really not making a speech; I am just explaining to hon. members things which may confuse them. The hon. member for St. Joseph says that the public debt is \$62 million and the country is bankrupt. I am not.....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Premier mentions the hon. member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: I have never said that the public debt was \$62 million and the country is in bankruptcy.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I mean the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member objects and it is proved that he said so by sworn statements made from persons who are not members of the House, will the hon. member promise me that he will not come back in the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that that promise will not be made in the House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: But the hon. member promised that he would.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am more concerned with the Appropriation Bill at the moment.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member said that I have put the country into bankruptcy, that I had a public debt of \$62 million. I am just trying to set the hon. member's mind at rest.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest that that be done in private and not here as a result of something said by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I can assure you that the country is very far from bankruptcy. Every single time that I, in my Ministry - I do not like to use the personal pronoun "I"; I should say that every time that we have, and that "we" includes everybody, gone to London to raise a loan, that loan has been over-subscribed. At least 20 or 30 times the loan has been over-subscribed in five minutes. Even now - days, subsequent to the hon. member's speech, we raised a loan of \$1 million and it was over-subscribed in a country where people have been running down and trying to commit breaches of promise. Trinidad and Tobago went to the London Market just before Christmas, and they have not raised the money yet - and the amount of the loan was smaller than the amount of money that we have raised on the Finan-

cial Market in London. We are so developed that we have not had to try to raise any money during the past 18 months on the External Market because our position is so favourable that we do not want to raise any loans until the last moment when the projects we are dealing with will bring in money.

The fact that we have not rushed to the London Market or to New York is not an indication that we cannot get money. The fact is that we do not need it. I do not intend to saddle the taxpayers of Barbados when we can use our available surpluses which the last Government did not do. The people who were keeping Africans from getting their Independence were said to be Barbadians, and that was told to the Minister of Finance in Kenya itself. It all shows how the newspapers in this island can distort a picture.
5.30 p.m.

You will remember that eight or nine years ago when they had the unfortunate troubles with the people fighting for liberation, you got the impression that scores of European farmers used to be destroyed every single evening, the way you read the newspaper. The Commissioner of Police who was in charge of the Police Force told me that in all the trouble in Kenya 29 Europeans were killed and 31,000 Africans were killed in reprisals for that. Go back and read the local newspapers. This is nothing to do with the burnings and torturing to death. This is how the whole life blood of a country can be sapped away and then a distorted picture given to the world outside as has happened in Barbados. The Government's expenditure is rising, but the Government has not asked the country to make any further sacrifice since 1962 in order to bring this state of affairs about. To whom then should the credit go? Not to the newspapers or members of the Opposition whose main ambition is to see this country go to bankruptcy so that they can say that the Government is no good. It has got to go to the people who despite all the opposition, all the obstacles put in their way, all the sabotage and all the treason, and I say "treason" advisedly, manage to maintain the respect which the outside world always had towards this country.

I only want to tell those people on the opposite side that unless they really believe in little translations of the hymn "Wash me and I shall be whiter than snow" and they are going to escape to South Africa or some other country, not to think that if the Government allows them to be successful in pulling the country down, they would not be in the ruins when the ruins collapse on their heads. You know you cannot warn some people, because they are so bound up in old fashioned politics, abuse, saving money and not paying taxes, and trying to see that Government expenditure does not rise and that kind of thing. Platforms have been used for saying that they were going to see that the Government did not spend another cent. They even went so far as to say that the next thing we would want to do would be to give people false teeth. That is what used to be said in here. What an alarming prospect! If you told them about social security or the fact that the Government does not only provide teeth but glasses as well, they would think the world was coming to an end; but they did not realise that by creating this kind of atmosphere, people feel they have a reasonable opportunity of living like human beings, and that they are at the same time by the expenditure of public funds giving the country the necessary impetus with which it should go forward, apart from providing spiritual, physical and material comforts for the people in the country. As long as we continue to have people in this community who do not have extra savings to buy the basic essentials of life, and *a fortiori* they do not have the kind of capital put by from which extraordinary expenditure can be met, but on the other hand you have people who do not know what to do with their money and waste it in buying shares in newspapers and matters of that kind, you are bound to get dissatisfaction in a country. When you are prepared to re-distribute the national income in the way this Government has done, naturally you bring about maximum satisfaction and maximum social advantage, which is the principle I enunciated eight or nine years ago in here on the question of Government finances, because you bring

about fresh impetus for the economy to go forward since you are generating within the economy the necessary purchasing power and the ability to go forward and do greater things.

We have not been satisfied, Mr. Speaker, with reaching the platform and then sitting back and looking at the view and patting ourselves on the back. We are going forward. The rate of economic growth in this country is absolutely fantastic. People go away from this country as visitors from one year to another, and by the time they return in ten or twelve months, they are flabbergasted when they see what has happened in the year before.

There is in this country today a shortage of skilled workers; there is unemployment, it is true, among the unskilled labour force; but I should like to say that I am not satisfied in my own mind that every person who has serious intention to work in Barbados and really wants to look for a job and hold a job does not have a job in this country, and I particularly refer to the male adult population. I am satisfied that there is a lot of room for improvement in so far as the female population is concerned, and that we should be providing more jobs for them. The Government itself has plans to create more employment for the female adult population or to put it in a more scientific way, the female population of working age - which is over the age of fifteen years. A lot of them do not even consider themselves as being unemployed, but we know they are unemployed, because when they say they are seamstresses and hairdressers, that is a form of concealed unemployment. I am not saying that all hairdressers are indulging in a form of concealed unemployment, but a lot of people who claim to be hairdressers doing what we call "cooking hair", are people who are the concealed unemployed. They do that because they are no other avenues open for them. At one time it used to be needleworkers. We have to do something about this; but it is not a matter that can be settled in the twinkling of an eye, and I am satisfied that there is no other Government in the West Indies that has done as much in the time available and with the means at its disposal.

It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to go through the Estimates Item by Item because this is done in Committee of Supply. I am merely trying to explain to hon. members that they must not be misled by statements in the daily Press that Government expenditure is rising, because this is not a scientific discovery. It has been rising all the time, just as they say that the human race fell with Adam and it has been falling ever since. It has reached the bottom with some ex-members and some present members of the House. When you say the human race has fallen, you have not said anything because you start off in a position of innocence and then go on accumulating iniquities, and so you must be falling. To say that Government expenditure has risen does not display any great economic knowledge on the part of the person who says that, because we want it to rise.
5.40 p.m.

We want it to continue to rise because it means something is done in the community, provided that the Works Department and other sectors of the Government do not squander the money that we put at their disposal.

I am in a position to say that there is considerably less amount of wastage today than there was years ago. Much to the disappointment of several people both in the business community and Government, we have had to tighten up. The regrettable thing about the Works Department is that the kind of wastage - the kind of malicious wastage - that goes on - and I do not mean like spilling water and throwing away cement; I mean the materials ordered - is still a little bit evident, and that is why apparently they are not prepared themselves to exert any effort in order to encourage people to support this effort by this Government. However, we cannot sit by and allow the taxpayers' money to go into private people's pockets because it would mean in the long run that we would be defeating ourselves.

But there are other considerations - certain moral issues - involved in practices which we took up in the past and which have not been completely rejected; and the only way we can get rid of it is if we get the business community to corroborate. Sir, they do not mind going in for bribery and corruption in order to enrich themselves, and therefore, they create dangers because they encourage people in the Public Service of this island to do things which normally they should not do. These people are living at a different level altogether and naturally, everybody wants to get on in life as quickly as possible.

I do not want to go any further now into the matter. I am satisfied that the amount of wastage is at least 15 per cent on the money spent in this country on Capital Expenditure. That is the amount of money which goes down the drain because of the practices which were the order of the day in the last Government, and which we are tightening up on now. The thing about Barbados is that everybody knows it, but it now becomes the order. It has now for so long become the order of the day that nobody wants to say anything about it. We have to tighten up on this practice because we have to spend more money; but we can save more money if we can be assured that every penny spent is spent in the direction in which we want it to be spent. Let me put it this way, Mr. Speaker. If out of the Public purse we are spending \$15 million on capital expenditure, if you were out 15 per cent of that, which is probably 1/7 of \$15 million, therefore, the amount is about 2.4 million; and if you can only tighten up on this we would have a surplus of half million dollars instead. That is why I said that I have not been able to understand until quite recently the performances of certain members of the Opposition. Before that, I could really understand when you look at the performance of the masses of people of this country over a long period of years in the face of great difficulty - and I would even say tribulation - the performance of scholars whom we produce, the legislators, the professional people, how you managed to conserve what little we have, how a small section of the community can still continue to look down on and despise the masses of the people is a peculiar thing. We have a lot of saboteurs in our ranks who are prepared to exploit bribes. We have a lot of people who bribe people themselves in our community; but it was not until October last year when people came out flying the red flag that we knew what the set up was. Every man had then his badge and his club tie on; but before that, it was all concealed.

Mr. Speaker, this has a lot to do with these Estimates because I would like to see an improvement. The Government has gone up, but it has not gone up that much. If we were able to get people to recognise their responsibility to the community, well then. After all, we have 700 policemen in the community, and the detectives have to concern themselves with a variety of things in the community; so they cannot be expected to spend their time in the Audit Office. This percentage of money - 15 per cent - amounts to a lot of money out of \$15 million. It is over \$2 million.

On the other side of the picture we have now been engaged in payments of income tax. The House has recently passed a vote for these exercises and we hope to get the Chancellor of McGill University, Mr. Rolston, to come out here and do the job for us. We have been engaged in this whole question of tax equation, and everybody who ought to pay taxes should pay taxes. It would be unlikely that we would increase the rate of taxes if we could collect all the money; but we cannot collect every single penny because we always have \$200,000 or \$300,000 left over. Certainly taxes should be collected from all the people in the country who should be paying taxes, and there should be no loopholes for them to make a laughing stock of the Government. There are lots of means by which people get around paying taxes; but at the same time this is not a question of squeezing the last drop out of the taxpayer. We are investigating the way and means of making the taxes more equitable and payable from the point of view of your ability to pay.

5.50 p.m.

I do not want anybody to mistake us at all. When we talk about the incidence of taxation, it is not a question of allow-

ing the tax to fall where it may at all. It is a question of getting from each according to his ability to pay, and I am quite sure that the people in the upper brackets are not making their legitimate payment of taxation. There are several ways of equating increasing expenditure with which the taxation level is not inordinately high, or increase your revenue by collecting money from year to year, and, thirdly, you can stop wastage in the expenditure of Government funds. Therefore, Sir, there are three different ways in which you can grapple with this problem. I can assure hon. members that they need not be alarmed because there is an estimated deficit of \$1.45 million because if you are alarmed at that, a couple of years ago when it was \$2.6 million, then you would have reason for despair. No additional taxation was imposed because I was satisfied that the state of the economy was such that it could absorb this estimated deficit without literally turning a hair. We turned it into a surplus of \$5.9 million; with a better standard of Government Buildings and more staff to provide for and everything else, we terminated with a surplus of \$7.2 million. There again we obviated the necessity for borrowing. In normal circumstances, if these Estimates were works of precision, we would have had to borrow, I think we need to operate a surplus fund of \$7.8 million this year, and we will borrow \$8 million. There is no limited factor of Government expenditure which hon. members may not be conscious of, and this ability of the colony to absorb a certain amount of capital from time to time does not mean that the country does not need better roads or that sort of thing. It is a question of the availability or unavailability of skilled people. It is not in the professional grade, but in the intermediate grade and people like that. We have to be very careful about going into large-scale shipment of carpenters, masons and skilled people out of the country. We have to provide work for natives and citizens of this country. Unfortunately, people have not equipped themselves to do the skilled work in this country. There are few unemployed lawyers, and the ones who are unemployed are those who busy themselves on the political platforms. There are no unemployed dentists or school teachers or druggists in this island. There are no unemployed masons or carpenters who are not graduates of the 1955 storm. There are no unemployed plumbers or welders in this island. You have to look amongst the people who have not been able to do a skilled job. (Mr. SMITH: There are unemployed politicians). Oh! There are plenty of them and their number is likely to be increased.

Mr. SPEAKER: No other member has spoken other than the hon. senior member for St. John.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, we are working towards this object that there should be no unemployed politicians in Barbados because we think their services could be more usefully employed. (ASIDES)

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking hon. members to keep quiet unless an hon. member catches my eye.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, if you are going to run the economy of Barbados, you will find that amongst the skilled occupations, apart from the legal profession and the political people, there is very little or virtually no unemployment at all. Furthermore, you will find that the more developed countries themselves are suffering from a shortage of skilled people so that the countries which have rigid immigration barriers are still willing to admit - almost without restriction - people who have skills, thereby impoverishing the developed countries like Barbados, which need these people, and creating a further strain on the artisans and skilled people. The Ministry of Education will have to come in. We have one and a quarter million dollars for the erection of a trade School somewhere in the metropolitan parish. We welcome the allocation of nearly \$2 million for the construction of the University at Cave Hill. All of these things are significant when we consider the economy of this country, because the solution of unemployment problem is neither the use of birth control nor emigration. The position is that everybody should secure some sort of skill so that he can use the ability to which his skill is related. (Cheers) This Gov-

ernment is slightly sceptical of this propensity to create an export market and let Barbados be any kind of Barbuda or stud farm for the production of menials. If anybody thinks so, he is not in consonance with the thinking of this Government. This Government is not the stud farm for menial workers. Whenever people move from Barbados, they must move from Barbados not to go abroad to be hewers of wood or drawers of water; on the contrary, they must move to places where every one will be an ambassador from this country.
6.00 p.m.

Now this is the new economics and the new politics in Barbados that they cannot understand. We are not going to get high blood pressure, rushing about looking for work for domestic servants, because it is hard enough to get a domestic servant properly trained in Barbados, anyhow. Why should we be exporting people to a country to work as domestic workers? Why should we be exporting people to be nurses when we need them here? We must create the conditions in this country where these people can find work. I am satisfied that this is a task which is not beyond the people whom I am fortunate to have around me, and I am satisfied that in a very short time this country will be in the happy position of having gone a long way towards the solution of the problem of unemployment, without dependence on large scale schemes of deportation of the citizens of Barbados to live in alien countries doing menial jobs. If we do not have that kind of ambition for our people, we have not got ambition for ourselves, and we are merely satisfied to occupy chairs in this Chamber to say that we are members of Parliament, the "Colonial" now having been taken out of the designation of this Honourable House; but we have not yet succeeded in taking the "Colonial" out of the mentality of some of the members on the opposite side.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Appropriation Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Hon. Premier when he said that things have changed, and that this is not a time for a Budget Speech, but for observations generally on the presentation of the Annual Estimates. This gives us a guide as to where we are going, and how much money will be available for Current but more particularly for Capital expenditure. As the hon. member rightly said, the sum fixed by law is about two-thirds of the Estimates, which amounts we have fixed over the years by Civil Establishment Orders; so we need not concern ourselves about that. We come then to certain other items of expenditure which are necessary and have from year to year to be voted.

When we come to Capital expenditure under which will come the large buildings and new buildings that will be replacing some of the old ones like the Post Office, we will have an opportunity to investigate more closely where these buildings are going to be, what type of building, environment and the suitability of these places.

I will speak generally, Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Premier did. He spoke of conditions as they are today as compared with what they were when he first took over the Government. We are spending larger sums today than at that time, but this is a world of progress. All countries are planning more today than they did in the past. Now the Hon. Premier has claimed that our economy is rising 22 per cent per year. I have no knowledge of that figure, but I do know that it is a substantial increase, and as long as we have the reserves to back up our national debt, we need have no fear. The point I wish to emphasise, however, is that we are embarking on nationhood and we will be a small nation; (*Cheers*) one of the smallest in the Commonwealth; and we hope to stand on our own feet as we have done all along. We have to have the confidence of the outside world, and for that reason we have to show a sense of responsibility greater than we have ever shown before. This is no time for Parties to fight each other on matters unless they have very strong reasons to believe that they are going the wrong road. There can be very damaging statements made

not only by the members of the Opposition, but by the Government spokesmen themselves.

You would be alarmed to know that I have recently heard from foreign investors about their attitude of "wait and see." They are going to wait and see what happens to Barbados after independence before they embark on any large scale expenditure here. Only today I met someone who said that the only reason why he did not sell his property was because of this. Some foreign investor wanted it as a residence, but he was told that taxation was on the increase and some people would be taxed out of existence. I told him that I did not know about that. Statements like that will not do us any good. Those of us who want to remain and live here.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think it is rather absurd for the hon. junior member for Christ Church to say what somebody told somebody else. Is he suggesting that some member of the Government said that taxes would be increased and somebody would be taxed out of existence? If he is saying that, he should call the name of the Government member who would be able to answer. But for him to indulge in hear-say is giving an atmosphere of distress which he is fulminating against. Nobody on this side has said anything like that. Certainly the Government does not have any such plans for taxing anybody out of existence. We would like to tax them so that they go on paying taxes from year to year.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I have not said that anyone in the Government or the Opposition has said that, but I am speaking in a general way which I think I am entitled to do, because I commenced my speech by saying that this is not the time for Parties to try to disrupt the economy of this Island. I know that this is an election year and that all sorts of statements, some very wild, will be made. These may be understood by Barbadians who are living here. I am not afraid of them because they know that during an election these things are going to be said; but we have to depend on foreign investors to continue to come here if our rate of growth is to continue. Anyone who wants to refute that statement can do so, but as I say, we need an infusion of new capital all the time. I am not covering up anything; I am saying it to you.
6.10 p.m.

You have said that it is not the intention of this Government to tax the people out of existence. It is well that you have got up and said that, because these things need clarifying. Let them remain unsaid and let them go around as rumours, and we will see what they will do for Barbados!

We have to remember that we are classified under the emerging nations. Whatever is happening in Africa today as regards these revolutions and so on is of effect to us. Why do you think that we are enjoying at the present moment a measure of tourism? It is not on account of the amount of money which we are spending because whether we spend it or not, it does not matter. It is because of the fact that in places like Cuba and Santa Domingo, where Americans used to go before, they are not going; but they are going further afield, and we are benefitting as a result.

I have always been an outspoken exponent of that. Do not let it be said that we will always have tourism. If tomorrow, by some means, Cuba becomes a friendly nation, you will see Americans flocking back to Cuba again. Cuba is nearer to them, and they will go there in droves as they have done before. What is of importance today is bringing to the outside world, whether it be to the tourist or the investor, that there is stability of the country and that we always had a good name. People come to Barbados and they tell us: "We like your place." They say that we have a very friendly people here and there are people who would go out of their way to do things for you. We had a little excitement a few months ago when a few youngsters got out of hand, but those are things which you have to take and nip in the bud. I believe the Hon. Premier himself has been confronted by some foreign investors who have spoken to him in the same vein. Surely, it has been drawn to his attention.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am speaking generally, because it has been drawn to my attention that we have saboteurs in Barbados and we are dealing with them.

Mr. SPEAKER: What has the hon. and learned member risen on?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order.

Mr. GODDARD: I believe the Hon. Premier was clearing up a point, I know that this is election year and he may want to have things cleared up.

The sum of \$15 million is not as large an amount for Capital Works programme as it was last year, and I agree that it will be conditioned by our ability to carry out the projects. We had in our Estimates last year a large sum for the same reason. These are limitations which are put on us. It is a very large programme. It has been put there to provide work for a large number of people this year. This is important because this is election year when we should have the maximum of employment. The people will be called on to vote.

It is not included here and it cannot be included in here yet, but a sum of about \$3 million is required when the Commissioner of the Salaries Revision reports. I presume that salaries would be back-dated from the 1st April because that is one of the terms of reference of the Commissioner. I presume that he is now going into the matter as to your ability to give the increases because that is also one of the terms of reference. He is going into the economy of the country and your ability to pay the increased salaries. This is what he is working on now. When he is satisfied that you can pay, he is going to recommend increases probably to the tune of \$3 million or \$4 million and he will go into it and divide it up.

Sir, as regards to many of the capital projects, I do not think that this Government can take the claim for all of them. Take, for instance, the Deep Water Harbour; I would say that we all had a hand in that. Not only did the Hon. Premier advocate this in 1950, but this was advocated since the last century. I was one who sat on the Committee, and there were even some other businessmen of the Conservative element along with myself who were on it. We were all pushing it and now that is paying for itself. As a matter of fact, it is now paying a substantial part of the Sinking Fund of \$30 million.

The development at the Seawall Airport started with the last Government, and it would be folly that this Government should try to take the credit for all. They are spending additional sums at the Airport. I am not disclosing any secrets, but we are on the crossroads between North America and South America. There is a great price for Barbados if we would put up a hangar for the servicing of planes, but it all depends on the suitability of our people. If we can do like Puerto Rico and what is done in Trinidad at the Piarco Airport, we will attract many of those airlines to come here in a much bigger way than they are doing now. Trinidad has a terminus, we have not got one; but if we were to show a real interest - and I am speaking from the Government's level - in these airlines, there is every likelihood that you would attract to Barbados, to the great advantage of our workers, highly skilled work which is done at Piarco in the servicing of those planes.

I repeat, the Airport and the Deep Water Harbour are two national things which people exploit. I would not worry the House with other things, but when the Hon. Premier comes down with his Budget proposals in May or June next, we would be prepared to go into that in greater detail. At present, I think that we can do more when the House goes into Committee on these Estimates than my standing here and addressing Your Honour.
6.20 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, as we all know, we have departed from the Budget Speech to which we were accustomed, as the Hon. Premier has said; but he has made a

speech which I can term as being a pat on the back, and at another time it can be very damaging to our little country. We may accuse other people of using damaging remarks, but surely when the Hon. Premier gets on the floor of this House and says that the businessmen encourage slackness, in other words, he accused them of being dishonest along with some Department or Departments of the Government and said that if everything was working well, we would not have to be budgeting for a deficit today. That is very damaging to the Government, to Heads of Departments and employees of the business service. I take a very serious view of those remarks. Imagine that a Premier of this country has a Department with an Attorney General and other lawyers and such people, and he is so sure that over two million dollars is being wasted and they did not make a check even to save at least one million dollars out of it!

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the remarks which the hon. member has just made are completely at variance with anything which the Hon. Minister of Finance has said on that issue. The Hon. Premier drew the attention of the House to the fact that it is within the knowledge of the Government that there are certain practices which are being carried on in some sections of the Works Department and the business community, which the Government deplores, and he estimated that the Government loses nearly \$2 million a year in this way. The Hon. Premier did not say that the Heads of Departments were wrong and the Government did nothing about it. The truth of the matter is that the situation is now very much better than it was some years ago. The hon. member must quote the Hon. Minister of Finance correctly.

Mr. SMITH: If the Hon. Minister is going to indulge in this sort of behaviour - I want to be very brief: but if he is going to do that sort of thing, then I will change my mind. The Hon. Minister said today that I am not in my usual form or words to that effect. Well, Sir, he is accustomed to my being in my usual form and he likes me to be in my usual form. I can be like that. If I am in charge of a Works Department, and slackness is going on in this particular Department, I am the Head of it. What would one think? Slackness is going on in my Department; as much as \$2 million could be saved - the Minister of Education can try to polish it as much as he likes, but I know that the people will not take it as he takes it or as the Premier takes it. It is not fair to the business people. If the Hon. Premier wants to clear the Heads of the Departments, then what about the Heads of the business places? What about them? As I say, Sir, those remarks can be very damaging. I call the Premier's Speech a pat on the back, but I will have to end up by saying that it is a pure, undiluted milk-and-water speech when you are finished with it. The Hon. Premier said how the Government did this, and the economy was that, and he did not increase any taxation. As I have already said, the Premier hit the people very hard already, and do you mean to tell me that he wants to hit them again? Since he struck the people, the lashes were so hard that they have cooled off. What is the Hon. Premier trying to do? Is he trying to tell the people that he is such a miraculous man, that he can increase the economy by 22% and he is not increasing the taxes? Who is going to believe the Premier? No one of his supporters will believe him. I do not believe that he believes himself. Do you think that it is a little bit of money going into the till when you collect an extra four cents on a half gill of rum? Do you think \$2 bills go into the Treasury with that infliction? No, Sir, money - and money enough - goes into the Treasury; but the Premier is trying to tell us that he is working miracles without increased taxation when he has taxed the people already. Things which were the cheapest were taxed already; the package could be as small as a needle; there was an extra 13 cents and that is a lot of money. Yet the Hon. Premier is saying that without increased taxation he got this money, but where did he get this money from? He said that when they took over the Government in 1961 there was no money in the till; therefore, where did he get this money from? He still worked miracles in spending this money and there was no increase in taxation. Whom does he think is going to believe him? Well, Sir, I can say that he has given me some good ammunition for the platform which I will to the people. This is first class ammunition for me to put to the people.
6.30 p.m.

The Hon. Premier said that no carpenters or masons are unemployed; but about a month or two ago one of his Ministers said, speaking under correction, that there were over 20,000 people unemployed, and now today the Hon. Premier said that there are no persons unemployed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making a misrepresentation of what was said, and I consider it a reckless misstatement.

Mr. SPEAKER: A point of order does not permit one to comment.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, what was said is that there were 18,000 people in Barbados unemployed. What the hon. member is trying to say now is that the Premier said no one is unemployed. The Premier said that no skilled person, whether he be a mason or carpenter, is unemployed, except those who graduated in the 1955 storm, who are not carpenters at all.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Premier spoke about the unemployed, and the hon. member now gets up and admits that there are 18,000 unemployed. (Mr. CORBIN: You said there were 20,000.) Shut up, you idiot!

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Andrew rose and I heard him, as he rose, say "on a point of order"; but before that point is made, I would ask the hon. member, in reference to something which sounded to me rather strange, to assure me that he was not referring to any member of this House, and that the word just slipped him which he had no intention of using or referring to any hon. member of this House. Does the hon. member give me that assurance.

Mr. SMITH: I was not referring to any member. (Laughter)

Mr. SPEAKER: I am well aware that there is no member to whom that could be applicable. Now I will hear the point of order of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I sat down here and heard the hon. junior member for St. Joseph say that the Premier said there were 20,000 unemployed. I understood him to say those words, and I say it is not true. He did not say 20,000.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is making a fool of himself. (Laughter).

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask hon. members to maintain the high standard of this Parliament in a debate of this importance. Neither one of the words used recently is strictly unparliamentary, but I only ask hon. members not to use such words. It does not raise the tone of debate; it does not even keep it to a reasonable level. Let the hon. member proceed with the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. SMITH: I will go on with the Appropriation Bill, Sir. I cannot remember the last year I went into the "Old City."

Mr. SPEAKER: Bridgetown is 200 years old, not quite as old as Parliament yet.

Mr. SMITH: And we have a nice Parliament here. I do not know if it sells J. & R. Now, Sir, the hon. member admits that there are 18,000 unemployed but the Hon. Premier said that was no "this" or "that". How could anyone believe that all could have graduated from the 1955 storm?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order

Mr. SMITH: On what point of order is he rising?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to hear it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is trying to give the impression that what the Hon. Premier said was that all the people who are unemployed in Barbados are graduates of the 1955 storm. The Premier did not say this. He said that no skilled workers are unemployed, and those carpenters who are unemployed are graduates of the 1955 storm who are not carpenters in the true sense of the word. He said that there are people in Barbados unemployed and that something is being done to equip them for employment.

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

Mr. SMITH: Sir, the Premier has a lot of boys to defend him. We are not so foolish over here as to expect that the people would elect a Government to power to sit back and not try to do something in the interest of the people. Now what the Government has done and what the Hon. Premier is patting himself on the back for is expected of him or any Government. It is the Government's duty to find employment for its people, so if the Government has erected a few buildings and a few schools, that is their duty. As I have said, before, when you employ someone to cook your food and when you sit at your table the only thing you do not enjoy is the knife, fork and spoon, are you going into the kitchen to pat her on the back to tell her she is a first-class servant? You are paying her to cook good food. If she cooks bad food, you are going to instruct the mistress to get another cook.
6.40 p.m.

When the Hon. Premier is putting a road here and road there and something yonder, that is Government's duty. That is what the electors are paying members of the Government for. That is why they are paid such nice monthly handsome salaries and decent travelling allowances. Do they still want praise?

Now, they are building schools. That is so. The last Government did nothing. However, the Hon. Premier fails to let us know what is the national debt now to what it was before. You have raised the income by 22 per cent. You have spent the money alright, and you are doing all of these things; but you are still further in debt. A good businessman does not do business like this. He is bringing in this; he is putting in a steel desk; he is doing everything and he looks right. Before this, he was \$1,000 in debt; but now he has done everything he is 10,000 in debt and the interest is eating out everything.

The Hon. Premier should not get up in here and try to throw stuff in the eyes of the people. He is planning. Yes, that is so; but how is he doing it? He has raised the economy. Yes, that is so. But is the national debt going down? Now, Sir, here it is, everything is going up. In other words, the national debt may be going up faster than the economy; so you are doing nothing after all. If you are going into figures and the right figures - and an auditor has to do this for the businessman - and you find that you are creating too much debt, surely the auditor would tell the businessman to go easy because he is spending too high and he is undertaking too much debt and his income cannot offset this. This is what the accountant would tell the businessman: "Go easy, you are spending too much because if at any time everything does not go according to plans and the business does not go according to plans and the business does not make the turnover to offset the debt, you are bound to go under." The Hon. Premier ought not to get up in here and tell us all these nice, sweet things. I do not think he is telling any of us over here that. He is trying his best and I sincerely hope that he would succeed.

Sir, I would not like the Hon. Premier to fail in what he is doing because if he fails, all of us would go overboard. I would do everything possible to help him because if he fails, it would be only the few who would gain; but look how many hundred thousand would have to bear the squeeze! Therefore, it is no wish of mine that he should fail, but do not try to tell us things which you know you cannot do.

The Hon. Premier says that when he took over the income of the country, it was going down. Where was the national debt then? The income is going up now, but where is the national debt now? Therefore, it is the same thing. The Hon. Premier says now that the Government's income is rising. He should be fair to us and tell us what is the condition of the national debt now. Do not tell us one thing and not the other, because it would create doubt in the minds of intelligent, thinking people. If you tell us one thing and not the other, we are bound to be suspicious.

The Hon. Premier also said that he would be glad if Government's expenditure would always rise. It is alright because when it is rising, he feels that he is doing a good job. But when it rises, is it keeping tune with the national debt? I know that he is a good worker, and a good worker deserves his hire. He says that with all that the Government is doing, he has not increased any taxes. What does he want to do now? Does he want to take the last piece of garment off the person's back? You have taken off the blouse; do you want to take off the pants too? I wonder if the Hon. Premier is thinking of taxing the people higher.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Here again, the hon. member must at least be fair to the Hon. Premier. At no point of the Hon. Premier's speech did he talk of taxing people. As a matter of fact, in the course of his speech, the Hon. Premier said he is not making any promises but at the moment, it appeared unlikely that we would have to increase taxes. When did the Hon. Premier say that he proposed to tax people?

Mr. SMITH: I did not say that he was out to tax the people, but he said that forasmuch as Government's expenditure has risen, he has not put on any additional taxes. Therefore, I said I only hope that he is not thinking of doing so. What is wrong with that? I have not misquoted the Hon. Premier. What is wrong with the Hon. Minister of Education? I have not troubled him, I do not know. The Hon. Premier is not in his seat, and I am not prepared to say one thing objectionable of him behind his back. I am quoting what he said. If the Hon. Premier was in his seat, I would have attacked him, but he is not there. I like to get into the ropes with him.

I said that I hope he is not thinking about it because the collar and tie are off, the blouse is off and everything is off already. The poor fellow must fire one or two sometimes, but he has to pay an extra four cents on a half gill of rum. Do you think that is sport?
6.50 p.m.

He cannot do anything more than he has done already. As to the school buildings, he would not have to build the schools and he still wants more schools. Now that he has mentioned schools, I would be glad if he would stop doing anything more and try and get the people's children in Government-aided Schools. Sir, from what I have heard going on in these Private Secondary Schools, I think we had better try and get these children in the Government Schools. Something serious is taking place, and I hope that the Hon. Premier will work quickly and get every one of these children under the roofs of our Government-aided Schools. He could never spend too much money in this direction. Mr. Speaker, you may not hear or you may not know, but serious things are happening at these Private Secondary Schools.

The Hon. Premier is not here, but he has accused me of saying in St. Joseph that the country was \$62 million in debt and it was in bankruptcy. He challenged me that if he brought any person who could prove that I made that statement I should leave the House. I would agree with him in that matter. I would not come back in here if he found anybody else to come in here and say what he has said. The Hon. Premier would like to get me out of here in a very cheap way.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the hon. member should say that an hon. member would like to get another hon. member out of this House, because that may be imputing an improper motive.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member made that statement and I promised him that if he found anybody else to say what he said I said, I would not come back in here. But I know that whenever he comes back with the person, that person will be himself. I would like to see him back in here as Mr. "Lonely" without any supporter so that when I jump at him it will be he and I. That is my reply to him. It is the duty of every Government to support trade and to do everything possible and necessary to help trade in this country. In any part of the world everything is hinged on trade so that by attacking trade or businessmen you are not doing the country any good. You cannot get on very far without trade. You may have statistics or whatever you care to call them, but you will find that the country depends on trade. If you do not have hard-headed men to run their businesses efficiently where is the Government going to get money from? The Government is just like a housewife who is only waiting until her husband goes out to work and brings in the money. In some cases, she may work harder in order to get the money spent than how the husband had to work for it. For the hon. member to say hard things about the business community, I feel that that is a sad thing. What is a Government without money? If money is not paid into the Treasury, what can the Government do? If the business people did not try to sprain their brains and carry on these things, where would the Government be? From the time that this Government was in power, it was attacking businessmen. The businessmen have been attacked; but what would you do if no money was put into the Treasury? I do not think that they should get so great and pig-headed and think that they are too much without the businessmen putting money into the Treasury. I am not saying that you should stand by and let the businessmen do whatever they like. I am not saying that at all; I would not say that.

As the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said, no mention was made about what is likely to happen relative to the increases of salary as a result of the recommendations of the Salaries Commissioner. I have never heard that, but we will wait and see. Here it is; the Government is saying that they are budgeting for a deficit, but what deficit? They are budgeting for money which they cannot spend in any one year. The money which they expect to spend in these Estimates for this year cannot be spent. They are only trying to make things look bright and pretty, but if you look into these Estimates you will quite clearly see that there is a lot of money which is going to lapse. I can say that this money is going to lapse because you will find in these Estimates that there is money which has not been spent during last year.
7.00 p.m.

If the Government does not get a chance to spend the money, it will not be a deficit in the true sense of the word; it will only be a deficit in figures. If you budget to spend \$100 and you spend \$60, then \$40 will be there either in figures or in money; so the Hon. Premier can afford to tell us not to be alarmed about this deficit, because he cannot spend that money. If I am not mistaken, in the School Meals Programme you have budgeted for \$150,000, but I notice that you spent \$62,000. Why put all this money on paper when you know you cannot spend it? You can only spend a certain amount of money in any one year, and by now your financial experts ought to be in a position to tell the Government that it can only spend so much under Capital Estimates or under Current Estimates; so it is no sense putting it down here. If you put down \$175,000 last year and only spent \$62,000, you should budget for \$75,000 this year.

Now I want the Premier to understand that I still have some kind of commonsense when it comes to these figures, and he cannot pull a fast one on me; so when he cannot pull one on me, he cannot pull it on the people, because I will talk the talk that the people understand. I am not going to say one word on the platform in Latin, French or Greek; because I do not know it; but I will talk what I was taught in school. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You certainly cannot say it in English!) Now, Mr. Speaker, I will have to appeal to you if the hon. junior member interrupts me.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. junior member for St. Thomas not to interrupt the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, no matter how you dress a monkey, he will still run up a tree.

I am warning the Government to be careful with their expenditure, because it is the people's money, not the Ministers'. It is not fair to the taxpayers to put in these big figures in the Estimates and ask us to pass them when you know you cannot spend the money. Anyhow, Sir, this is an election year, and this year anything can happen; so I will go no further.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 8 o'clock.

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

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

7.08 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum and I ask that the bell be rung.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member for drawing that to my attention. Let the bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: 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.

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

HEAD 1 - GOVERNOR

Head 1 - Governor - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$34,829 under Head 1 - Governor - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I would just like to ask the Hon. Leader of the House if you are going to take the entire Head or if you are only going to take it by the Items to be voted.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am taking the whole Head.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am glad that you are doing that. I will suggest that before the Hon. Chairman put the question that he gives hon. members a chance just to turn the pages.

The question that the sum of \$34,829 under Head 1 - Governor - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 2 - SERVICE COMMISSIONS

Head 2 - Service Commissions - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$701,515 under Head 2 - Service Commissions - 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 3 - LEGISLATURE

Head 3 - Legislature - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$41,905 under Head 3 - Legislature - 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 4 - AUDITOR GENERAL

Head 4 - Auditor General - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$5,210 under Head 4 - Auditor General - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.....

Mr. SMITH: The hon. senior member for the City appealed to you just now not to be so fast in putting the question and to give us time to turn the pages. I am appealing to you also. Do not be so fast.

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

HEAD 5 - JUDICIARY

Head 5 - Judiciary - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$53,494 under Head 5 - Judiciary - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Item 13, Jurors and Marshals at Criminal Assizes. Mr. Chairman, would the Hon. Minister in charge be able to tell me what is the position today as regards paying Jurors? I understand that there is an increase. What is the increase? I know that there has been some difficulty in some jurors getting compensation if they are self-employed. I would like to know if this has been settled.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I take it that it has been settled; I do not know exactly.

The question that the sum of \$53,494 under Head 5 - Judiciary - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 6 - LEGAL

Head 6 - Legal - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$6,415 under Head 6 - Legal - 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 7 - REGISTRATION

Head 7 - Registration - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$39,357 under Head 7 - Registration - 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 8 - CROWN SOLICITOR

Head 8 - Crown Solicitor - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$5,635 under Head 8 - Crown Solicitor - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE

Head 9 - Ministry of Finance - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. Chairman, there is a move-in under this Head. After Item 3, insert Item 3A, 3 Permanent Secretaries (F). The Note to read: "The holders of these posts have been seconded to Government Boards."

On page 18, Item 22, Salaries Revision, and the sum to be voted, \$11,566. The note to read: "To meet expenses in connection with Salaries Revision."

I beg to move that the sum of \$223,159 under Head 9 - Ministry of Finance - as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. Chairman, turn to Page 17, Item 16, Expenses of Technical Assistance. The amount to be voted is \$73,000. I would like to know if the Hon. Minister can tell us anything on this. The amount has gone up something like \$33,000. Why is that?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR; I do not know if the hon. member finds that the explanatory note is not sufficient.

Mr. MOTTLEY; It reads: "Provision to meet all expenses to Technical Assistance Personnel in accordance with terms of agreements governing their engagements. Increased to provide for additional officers." What is this technical expenditure?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR; I think the hon. member should know that the Government engages assistance in various technical fields, from W.H.O., U.N.E.S.C.O., experts on taxations and on education and on planning, and on agriculture. Therefore, we have to make provision for these, and in view of the fact that these programmes are expanded, there is need for more expenditure.

The question that the sum of \$223,159 under Head 9 - Ministry of Finance - as amended, stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 10 - ACCOUNTANT GENERAL

Head 10 - Accountant General - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$63,376 under Head 10 - Accountant General - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 11 - PENSIONS

Head 11 - Pensions - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. Chairman, there is another move-in under this Head, Item 17, (New) Ex Gratia Gratuities and the sum to be added \$82,285, and the note to read: "To meet the cost of Ex Gratia Awards to Casual Employees."

I beg to move that the sum of \$2,589,721 under Head 11 - Pensions - as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

8.10 p.m.

HEAD 12 - CHARGES OF DEBT

Head 12 - Charges of Debt - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. Chairman, under this Head we have several amendments to make. We are asking leave to insert Item 8A, Bridgetown City Council Capital Loan 1959-60, \$5,625. The Note against that Item reads as follows: "Proportion of principal sum of \$10,000 outstanding at 31/3/66. Instalment of \$2,500 payable. Proportion of principal sum of \$12,500 outstanding at 31/3/66. Instalment of \$3,125 payable."

The next amendment is to insert Item 8B Bridgetown City Council Capital Loan 1961-62, \$1,250. Note to read: "Proportion of principal sum of \$7,500 outstanding at 31/3/66. Instalment of \$1,250 payable." The next amendment is to insert Item 8C Bridgetown City Council capital loan 1964-65, \$5,000. Note to read "Proportion of principal sum of \$45,000 outstanding at 31/3/66. Instalment of \$5,000 payable."

The next amendment is to insert Item 8D Southern District Council Christ Church Parish Loan Act, 1950-53 \$256. Note to read: "Proportion of principal sum of \$512 outstanding at 31/3/66. Instalment of \$256 payable."

The next amendment is to insert Item 8E Southern District Council, St. George Parish (Highways) Loan Act, 1948-53, \$480. Note to read: "Proportion of principal sum of \$1,440 outstanding at 31/3/66. Instalment of \$480 payable."

The next amendment is to insert Item 8F Southern District Council, Capital Loan, 1959-60, \$2,000. Note to read: "Proportion of principal sum of \$10,000 outstanding at 31/3/66. Instalment of \$2,000 payable."

The next amendment is to insert Item 8G Northern District Council, Capital Loan 1963-64, \$3,200. Note to read: "Proportion of principal sum of \$25,600 outstanding at 31/3/66. Instalment of \$3,200 payable."

The next amendment is to insert Item 19 Bridgetown City Council, Capital Loan 1959-60, \$1,537. Note to read: "Interest at 6% on balance of loan outstanding at 31/3/66, amounting to \$10,000 - \$600; and at 7 1/2% on balance of Loan amounting to \$12,500 outstanding at 31/3/66, \$937."

The next amendment is to insert Item 20, Bridgetown City Council Capital Loan 1961-62, \$563. Note to read: "Interest at 7 1/2% on balance of Loan outstanding at 31/3/66 amounting to \$7,500."

The next amendment is to insert Item 21, Bridgetown City Council, Capital Loan 1964-65 \$3,600. Note to read: "Interest at 8% on balance of Loan outstanding at 31/3/66 amounting to \$45,000."

The next amendment is to insert Item 22, Christ Church Parish Loan Act, 1950-53, \$20. Note to read: "Interest at 3 3/4% on balance of loan outstanding at 31/3/66 amounting to \$512."

The next amendment is to insert Item 23, St. George Parish (Highways) Loan Act 1948-33, \$54. Note to read: "Interest at 3 3/4% on balance of Loan outstanding at 31/3/66 amounting to \$1,440."

The next amendment is to insert Item 24, Southern District Council, Capital Loan 1959-60, \$600. Note to read: "Interest at 6% on balance of Loan outstanding at 31/3/66 amounting to \$10,000.
8.20 p.m.

Insert Item 25- Northern District Council, Capital Loan 1963-64 \$2,048; and the note is to read: "Interest at 8% on balance of Loan outstanding at 31/3/66 amounting to \$25,600."

I beg to move that the sum of \$4,423,846 under Head 12 - Charges of Debt - as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 13 - CUSTOMS

Head 13 - Customs - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, under this Head there are Items to be moved in.

On page 25, Item 25 - Furniture - is to be increased by \$1,139 to \$1,289.

Insert Item 26 (New) \$4,048 and the note is to read: "To replace unserviceable furniture and to purchase additional items of furniture."

I beg to move that the sum of \$77,030 under Head 13 - Customs - as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 14 - INLAND REVENUE

Head 14 - Inland Revenue - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to this Head. On page 27, Item 32 - Equipment and Furniture - is to be increased by \$2,044 to \$2,514, and the note is to read: "To purchase two typewriters, one cupboard, nine mahogany desks, fifteen mahogany chairs, one typist desk, one typist chair, ten stapling machines."

I beg to move that the sum of \$24,856 under Head 14 - Inland Revenue - as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 15 - STATISTICAL SERVICE

Head 15 - Statistical Service - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$36,671 under Head 15 - Statistical Service - 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 16 - EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Head 16 - External Affairs - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$700,000 under Head 16 - External Affairs - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, lest my remarks on this be misunderstood, I will preface my remarks by saying that the debate on Independence is now history, and therefore what I say here today is not with a view to resurrecting any such debate; but if you look at Item 1 - External Affairs - you will see that the amount is \$500,000, and the note says "Expenses connected with external relations aspects of independence."

Now this is contrary to the policy which we should pursue in this House. The Resolutions on Independence has been passed in the Legislatures of this country, and the matter has now reached the stage where all parties have been invited to London; so that Independence in whatever form will be a *fait accompli*. To ask us to vote \$500,000, however, and only put in the note "Expenses connected with external relations aspects of Independence" is not in my view what should be in the Estimates of what is done in respect of other items. The custom is to bind ourselves to the principle of voting such sums as will be necessary by voting \$1.00 as a token vote, thus signifying our agreement with the principle, and that we will vote the money when the Government brings down a Resolution setting out whether it is going to set up embassies in Canada, Panama or Washington. The Government cannot expect us to vote money in this Chamber in this manner. We are prepared to vote \$1.00 as a token vote binding ourselves to the principle of Independence in 1966-67, until the Resolution comes before us enabling us to know whether you are going to have a charge D'Affaire in Panama, in the United Kingdom, in Trinidad, in Jamaica, or wherever it may be.

We would like to see a token vote here, and in due course I think this should be amended to read "\$1.00" as has been done in the Estimates on other occasions when you did not know what the full cost of an item would be. This has been the practice every since I learnt anything about the Estimates, and has been done since this Government has been in power. When you cannot give a breakdown to the Legislature of what you are going to spend, you always ask members to agree to the principle by making a token vote of \$1.00. You cannot tell us if \$100,000 of the amount will be for an embassy or the High Commissioner in London, for one in Jamaica, Tokyo or any place else, and unless you can tell us that, we are not prepared to issue a blank cheque to do this.
8.30 p.m.

We have accepted the fact that you have passed on to Independence, and we do agree that we would have Independence this year. That being so, we were being prepared to vote a token vote of \$1 so that you may carry on, but I think you are asking too much now.

Mr. SMITH: Now, the hon. senior member for the City has said that the Government always asks for \$1 as a token vote when they want to spend large sums of money, but I take it that this \$500,000 is a token vote. Independence is going to cost us so much that \$500,000 is only a token. I believe that this amount is just for the Conference because that is all that would be done during this financial year, as far as I know.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is quite out of order not only because he is inaccurate, but what he is imputing is improper

members of the Government, I am not dealing with the argument; I will speak about that when the time comes.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I said that if it is not for a token vote, it will be for the Conference. That is what I am saying because the note reads: "Expenses connected with external relations aspects of Independence." In respect of that, they are asking us to vote \$500,000 without giving us a breakdown or telling us anything. How can the Government expect us to act in a thing like that? The Hon. Premier says that he does not consider us to be anything. I am a representative of the people. How on earth can they ask us to say "yes" to a vote of \$500,000 in connection with Independence? We do not know what type of Independence; we do not know what you are going to establish. It is only Independence. The \$500,000 is only for Independence. You have to do something relative to Independence; therefore, you should have a breakdown.

Tell us what you are going to do. The hon. member tells us that a delegation is going up. I do not believe that because an hon. member of the Other Place told us that we would have to buy our own tickets if we want to go up. An hon. member of that Party said so and nobody said one word against it; so it is true. What is the \$500,000 for? Do you mean that only because you can bring it down that you brought it down? If you do not tell us anything, I am going to vote "No" loudly. I would not be a party to that.

If you start off with \$500,000, when you get a little further it would be a few hundred million dollars. You generally ask for \$1 as a token vote. Now you are asking us for \$500,000 and I say that that is a token too. Nothing has been said about it, no release given or anything at all. The only thing which I have read is that the Hon. Premier has said the "boys" up there will have to come to us. I have heard whenever you are going in for Independence that the British Government asks you to come up. The Hon. Premier has said that they would have to come down. Is this money put here to bring them down? I am not going to vote for this until the Hon. Minister can satisfy us about this.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who has just sat down apparently is a bit confused. He referred to this item as a token vote. It is not a token item because it is making provision for something which is in progress. In the process of time an explanation will be given. There are certain expenses which we have been involved in already in this connection; and after independence, when things are set out, there will be money to start with. It does not mean that the House will be ignored. On that, the Hon. Leader of the House will probably explain further.

When the Hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that this provision was for sending delegates away -

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I have not said that this money is for sending delegates away. I said that if it is not a token, it is for the Conference. I asked if it was to bring down members of the British Government to talk Independence with us. That is what I said.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member would look on page 49, Head 24, Item 10, Conferences and Delegations, he would see that the amount of \$75,000 is voted under this Head and the note to it reads: "Passages and other expenses of delegates." That is a separate and distinct vote for conferences and delegations; so the hon. member would see that this large amount will be spent not only for Government delegations, but all official expenses will be paid. What the hon. member refers to is a different matter.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, surely the sum of \$500,000 must have been arrived at by the Cabinet in some form. It is not purely expenses connected with external relations. How have they arrived at half million dollars? Why not \$1 million or \$1/4 million? We are only asking you how you arrive at that figure.
8.40 p.m.

How did they arrive at half a million dollars? Why not one million dollars or a quarter of a million dollars? We are only asking for a breakdown as to how they have arrived at that figure. Surely somebody over there could tell us that. Should we sit here and just allow this to go through? This is the financial year, but let us know; we have no means of finding out what it is. We are not members of the Party over there. Some of us think that more than half a million dollars are required and, as I say, we are entitled to have some more information.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Chairman, speaking on this Head, External Affairs, for which the sum of \$500,000 is to be voted, hon. member have been asking for a breakdown. I fall into that category as well, but what I am saying is this. In these cases, a token vote of \$1.00 is always brought before the House and that is a principle. We will soon come to another item in connection with which there is a token vote, and I will say that this is the first time that I have seen a thing like this. Is that a good way of showing us what Independence will be? You may go from \$1.00 to half a million dollars, but that is not the point. What I am concerned about is why has there been such a sudden change. It is customary to put a token vote in the Estimates in the first instance. Is this showing what is going to take place? The principle of the matter is what I am thinking about. I had this item marked off before now; I had it marked off since Sunday night. As I say, Sir, the principle of the thing is what I am talking about.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I can well understand why a matter like this would be engaging the attention of hon. members opposite. Not only is this admittedly a new Head in the Estimates, but it is something to do with a new ideal. I know that the date around the question of Independence is quite fashionable nowadays, and then there are people who, so far as you can gather from their pronouncements, are still critical of the whole ideal of Independence, and people who are not necessarily interested in that date are involved in the exercise. This Government has to do its work on as nearly a scientific basis as it possibly can. Whenever it takes action on any matter, it makes quite sure that the action taken bears some relation to some policy which has already been laid down or enunciated. If the two Houses of the Legislature in this Island did not pronounce themselves in a positive way in this matter, the Government of Barbados would not have sought to introduce this Head in the Estimates. The whole basis of this lies in the declared judgment in this House and in the Senate. Both Houses of the Legislature have expressed the desire that a Conference should be arranged on Independence and that Independence should take effect sometime in 1966. Are we asking quite seriously that a Government having already seen the intention of the Legislature as it has been expressed in the two Houses - are we asking the House not to take action on the intention of the Legislature as has been expressed? The Resolution asked for a Conference to supply the details incidental to the assumption by the people of Barbados of Sovereign Nationhood in 1966. We are now starting the financial year, nine months of which will run in 1966 and three months in 1967. I ask, Mr. Chairman, is there anything improper in the Government, during the consideration of the Estimates for 1966-67, not following the declared intention of the Legislature? Not only have we passed the Resolution and we have acted on that Resolution, but the Secretary of State for the Colonies has proposed a date and an invitation has been extended to the Government and to the Opposition Party. Without any prompting by anybody, the Government of Barbados set to work to have the Draft Constitution and to settle the issues before the delegates go to the London Conference. Do you tell me that we initiate the things which have been done and we should not do other things as well?

This expenditure is properly connected with external affairs. When Independence comes, are we to wait until one flag has been hauled down and another flag is put up before we can settle certain matters which are connected with external relations? I am saying, Sir, that in the same way as we have exercised foresight in trying to get the Constitu-

tion ready as well as other things in connection with this exercise, we have also to take the House to make provision for Independence. Obviously, Sir, if there must be a Ministry of External Affairs, then the machinery for that will have to be got together. It is now being assembled. Very soon from now the House will be advised and asked to pass a series of Civil Establishment Orders connected with the Ministry of External Affairs.
8.50 p.m.

The hon. member has asked us to say we have not put in a token vote, but the answer is that the principle of independence has been accepted. We are not buying a traxcavator; this is not a piece of machinery we are importing from the United Kingdom at prices which have not yet been determined because we do not know either the price, the insurance or the freight where we put in \$1.00 so that when it comes we can pay for it. This is something which the whole Legislature has committed itself to not only by inference but in truth and in fact, because from the time you ask the Secretary of State to fix a date for a Conference on Independence which you say in that Resolution you wish to assume in 1966, the Government which happens to be in power, no matter which one it is, has to do certain things, and it would be careless budgeting, apart from dereliction of duty, on the part of the Minister of Finance, to put in only \$1.00, because not only would it throw the Estimates out of alignment, but the Government would expose itself to the charge in a short time of false, inadequate and inaccurate budgeting. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Oh, no!) The hon. member say "Oh, no" now because he is arguing a different point, but if it were the other way around, we would be accused of not doing our business.

There is no question, Mr. Chairman, of the hon. member being given a breakdown now. The whole point of this, Mr. Chairman, is that the country is going to be independent in this year. We assume that at any rate in this financial year there will be certain expenditure connected with the external relations aspects of Independence. The point is that the Government has to take this and do it as an exercise in budgeting. This is nothing now to do with what the country's foreign policy will be or how many embassies will be here, there or anywhere. As a matter of fact, the hon. members opposite may not know this, but I will understand that for certain reasons of their own this is the kind of issue of which they would like to make some capital. I do not propose to provide them with that sort of opening, because I have nothing to hide and therefore no low dodges to execute. I am only saying that the contention that we could have put in a token vote is not acceptable, because we could not on this important matter budget this way. At the same time, I will say that asking for this sum of money for the purposes for which we ask it does not in any way imply that the Government will not at some future time take the House completely into its confidence or will not explain to or put before the House all these issues connected with external relations; but I am only emphasising that the basis for this is two-fold, first of all from the point of view of as accurate budgeting as we can make, and secondly from the point of view that the basis for this Head lies in the Resolution passed by the House of Assembly and by the Senate. The whole groundwork and justification for it lies there, and the House cannot in one breath pass a Resolution from which certain consequences flow, and in another breath try to chastise the Government from taking, because it takes, certain logical steps arising out of the decision of the same House in the same matter.

Mr. Chairman, if hon. members want to continue the debate, I am quite willing to engage with them on it, but I will say this at this stage: if they wish to go further, they may do so.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, so far I have refrained from entering into this debate today because I believe in keeping my powder dry, and so many occasions will occur in the future for saying what I have to say that it is unnecessary to say it today; but having listened to what I can only characterise as the unadulterated balderdash of which the hon. junior member for St. Lucy had delivered

himself, I really could not refrain from entering this particular debate.

My interpretation of what the hon. senior member for Bridgetown has asked for is a breakdown of the manner in which the Government reached the approximation of \$1/2 million for the cost of external aspects in relation to Independence for the purpose of estimating the expenditure between 1st April, 1966, and 31st March 1967. In reply the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has treated the Committee to a meaningless exposition of what you may refer to as the debate on Independence which took place in the Legislature this year.

Now if the hon. member really wanted to be factual, what he would tell the Committee is this: he would say that the Government told the public that Independence would cost \$1/2 million a year. The Premier during the Independence debate in this Chamber said most decidedly that their estimation of the cost of Independence was around \$1/2 million a year. He said he was spending \$225,000 on external affairs, and he said there would be another \$280,000 a year on other aspects. I pointed out that this was not true, because merely to join the United Nations alone - nothing to do with the annual contribution - is \$1/2 million, and the annual contribution is nearly \$1/2 million a year; so that when he came in here and said that Independence would cost \$1/2 million a year, he was merely fooling the public.
9.00 p.m.

On the face of it, there must be some time table to this approach on this whole question. If you are going to spend half million dollars on the External Relations aspects alone during this financial year, it means that Independence is going to cost this country nearly \$3 million. For instance, you should have your Independence conference in June. Your election is supposed to be some time in December; therefore, Independence in itself cannot be a fact until after elections because you are not getting Independence before elections. Therefore, in the normal course of events if you are going to get Independence after elections, there would be only a month or two in this financial year for any expenditure to be undertaken under this Head. All it means is if you are voting half million dollars, well then you are going to spend \$3 million on Independence.

This is just an exercise fooling the public. It is only after Independence that you have complete control of external affairs; it is only after you get Independence that you have any control. It is quite true that you have to plan for what will happen in the future; but to put in the Estimates half million dollars and try to fool the Legislature that this is for expenses connected with the external relations aspects of Independence, what the devil does that mean? You cannot have any embassy, any consular affairs, any external missions, until after Independence. You may do some exploratory work and some estimatory work. The only accurate remark made by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was when he said that this explanation has nothing to do with the Conference on Independence. That is quite true. That money must come from the Conference vote. Perhaps again, the reasons for the increase this year may not be necessarily for the expenditure on the Conference for this year, but on the face of this vote for \$500,000, if Independence as told by the hon. Premier was only going to cost half million dollars, you cannot spend half million dollars on this exercise alone. The second thing is that the hon. member is not in a position to give a break-down of this money here.

Sir, how have you arrived at \$500,000? Why not \$700,000? Why not \$400,000? Do you mean that you just put some figures in the Estimates at random? If the Hon. Minister does not know how the half million dollars has been arrived at, say so. I do agree, because the Legislature agreed to Independence in principle, that the Government is permitted to certain exploratory work. That is expected; but how have you arrived at a half million dollars? If the Hon. Premier has said that Independence is going to cost half million dollars, how have you arrived at this half million dollars? Of course, according to hon. members over

on the other side, you are independent already. Months ago we were told that you do not even have to go to London for a Conference; we have sat the examination already. This sum here is just put to fool a gullible public.

Sir, now that they have been put in their proper place, now that they have been told that they have to send up the Opposition, not as they thought about it but in the proper strength, let us see what they are doing. They could not come in here with an amount for the entire year because provision for Independence must be less than one-sixth of the year for which you are contributing. Of course, hon. members on my right are quite justified in their manner to obtain some proper breakdown of the manner in which this was arrived at or else that they reduce the vote. You can reduce it by any amount.

We have been told that Independence would cost half million dollars. It is much more than that naturally. However, certainly I cannot sit in here and allow a statement made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy to be regarded as the explanation which hon. members asked for on this side of the table. I doubt very much too if he himself knows the explanation. You put in \$500,000 for Independence just like that! You budget on this basis! You cannot specifically spend this money on the external relations aspects of Independence between now and March next year; and if you can, then this House and the public have been grossly misled on the financial cost of Independence when the Hon. Premier spoke in here on the Independence debate.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I know that the hon. member who has just sat down is enjoying this position in which he is the self-appointed spokesman for members on that side - and on matters now on which it is thought that he and he alone can confound and confuse this Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am no self-appointed anything. As a matter of fact, I refrained from saying one word for the entire day. This is completely different from performing the role of being a spokesman.
9,10 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I also know that it is thought in some quarters that if he did not join the debate particularly when the Government is under attack, the Opposition point of view is not properly put. I would like the hon. member to know that he strikes no terror in our hearts. We are not afraid of anything he says. (Mr. CRAWFORD: You can strike a lot in mine!) It would be much better for the hon. member if he had remained silent. The hon. member got up here in the course of a speech, in order to make an argument against the Government, and said that half a million dollars would not even suffice for any part of the year because you have to pay half a million dollars so as to join the United Nations. That is absolutely untrue. The entrance fee for joining the United Nations is based on the national income of the particular territory. There are some territories who have paid \$14,000 or \$15,000 in order to join the United Nations.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I object to the statement that my remark that it would cost this country half a million dollars to join the United Nations is untrue. Anybody who says that that is untrue, is completely ignorant of what he is saying. My figure is based on the figure which was given to the Government by the person who prepared the Report for them, as to what it would cost to be independent in this country. To say that your entrance is based on your income does not mean one thing. All it would mean is that \$60,000 represents your contribution to joining the United Nations for a colony like this.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Of course the person who showed the hon. member the figures knew that he was leaving the Government and the person did not want him to go out with accuracy.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I was in a position to see the Report and to read it, which is more than what

the hon. member has done. Let the hon. member bring the Report and prove me to be inaccurate.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The acid test is taking what I know to be the basis of countries which join the United Nations. What the hon. member has said is not the case.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am not denying that there must be some basis for a contribution. That contribution can be 2%, 33% or 70% of your revenue; but I say that this half a million dollars represents our contribution based on the proportion of our revenue.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Indeed the hon. member never said that. His whole argument was that it would cost us half a million dollars alone to join the United Nations. I say, that is not so.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is obviously implied in what I said, I am not talking about comity or dignity.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think that we had better come to some decision at this point. The Hon. Minister has refuted the statement and he should be in a position to know what he is saying.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am saying that the contribution of Barbados would be half a million dollars according to the figures given to them, and the annual subscription would be probably around that figure too.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, we have now gone into the realm of probability. The hon. member was stating categorically the time in which what they are asking for would be spent, and now he has gone into the realm of probability. You cannot conduct public affairs like this. Everybody who has spoken on that side has assumed that, because I have not chosen, nor am I called upon in the circumstances to give a breakdown of this amount - let us assume that the estimate was arrived at in a harum-scarum way; the hon. member has said that it was just pushed in there because half a million dollars sounded well.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I did not say so. The hon. Premier said, in the course of the debate on Independence, that the actual cost of Independence will be half a million dollars, and that there was estimated expenditure of \$223,000 on external affairs and something else which I do not remember. I said that the statement then, as the statement tonight, is completely unfounded.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the hon. member speaking on?

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister has said that everybody who spoke here said that the estimate had been arrived at in a harum-scarum way. However, Sir, we did not assume that; otherwise we would not have asked for a breakdown. We did not think that they arrived at the estimate in that way.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, hon. members on the opposite side of the House must be given some credit, but it must not be taken in all of this prominence. The hon. senior member for St. Philip carried this debate to a region where he thought I should follow him. I do not propose to go into any argument as to how long and what periods this money covers. I will say that it covers the financial year 1966-67. I have already given the House the assurance that when arrangements are complete for the setting up of external affairs, extra Civil Establishment Orders will have to be promulgated and brought before the House for its approval. Our financial advisers have recommended this figure on a basis which we have accepted and the basis is a very simple one. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Well, let us hear.....) If you want you will hear.
9,20 p.m.

The basis is quite a simple one. Looking around countries of comparable size as well as other countries who have in recent years set up External Affairs Departments, we have noted what proportion of their total budgets they

spend on external affairs, and have put in, in relation to our own Budget, an Estimate of the proportion so far as we are concerned. I want to emphasise that this is only an estimate, and therefore it would be wrong for me to give the House the impression that this thing will cost \$500,000 and not \$80,000 plus \$100,000, but for the purpose of getting as close as we could by a comparative study of other countries having the same problems, we have decided on the basis of that study that the nearest estimate we could make in relation to our own budget would be \$1/2 million for this financial year.

This is what we have done, Mr. Chairman, and I think it is fair, and I do not want to leave the House in any doubt for make the House believe that this is necessarily the last word. Hon. members should remember also that this was of course only done for budgeting purposes, because in making a budget, you obviously must find sources of revenue to meet your expenditure.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, this is pure guess work. All the hon. member has done is to get to his feet, think of something to say and say it as he goes along with no basis at all of fact. Every country, Mr. Chairman, must pursue its external relations set-up according to what it can afford. There are lots of things that Trinidad and Jamaica do which we could never afford to do. We could not do what Liberia does. The way the Liberian delegation threw money around in New York or Washington with a \$20 million a year revenue at the time of which I am speaking, you would wonder if they were growing money in New York; but since we were told by the Premier in here that the external relations aspects of independence would cost \$223,000 a year, and since we cannot start assuming responsibility for our external affairs until after we are independent, therefore no expenditure can actually be incurred on the external relations aspects. What are expenses connected with external relations aspects of Independence? Have you ever heard anything more stupid than that? I do not know what it means. In preparation for this assumption, certain expenditure must be involved, but does it mean that in preparation you are going to spend more than you are supposed to spend in an entire year on it when you get it? We were told it would not cost \$1/2 million a year.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, you are not having an Independence conference until June. If even you had an election immediately after, you could not have Independence for more than three or four months in this financial year; so how are you going to spend all this money in external relations alone? If this is right therefore, the Premier was misleading us in December when he did in three-quarters of his entire speech; and if he was right then, then this is a fabrication, I would say, Sir, that the entire reasons for pushing this in here is because the country has been told by the Government that Independence would cost \$1/2 million a year. In other words, we would be spending \$1 million less than we were told then we would do if we had gone into a federation; so in order to maintain this false impression, you throw this \$1/2 million in your budget for a whole year, forgetting the fact that you are not independent yet and cannot be independent for the entire period for which you are budgeting. It is just the idea of fixing in the public's mind the fact that for Independence you are going to spend \$1/2 million, but when we get Independence next year and they have to budget for it, then we will see that it will cost probably \$2 million or \$3 million a year, because there are at least two other international organisations we will have to join; one is the World Bank and the other is the International Monetary Fund. We will have to at least join the two of them, and the initial cost of joining them, apart from the annual subscription, will carry us far over this mythical \$1/2 million we were told Independence would cost.

When it comes to your Consular Missions, Embassies or Commissioners' Offices or whatever you are going to call them, none of the expenditure can be undertaken actually before you have Independence, and I am sure that the Government has gone carefully into this matter and worked out some estimate of the expected expenditure both before

and after Independence. The hon. member should have before him now these figures which he can give the Committee. It would have been far better for him to say that he himself knows nothing about this, he has not got with him the details of the proposed estimate and that he would get them before consideration of the Estimates is finished. To come here and say that this is estimated on the basis of the annual cost of Independence for other countries presumably with similar revenues or something like that is not good enough. You do not pull figures out of a hat when you are preparing figures of estimates in a country like this, and based on what we were told by the Minister of Finance himself, it would be inconceivable to expect we could sit down here and vote the entire cost of Independence for a year before we are independent.

My idea, Mr. Chairman, would be, since we were told by the Premier that external relations would cost \$22,000 odd a year after Independence, and since conceivably we cannot have independence at the moment for more than three months of this financial year, to divide \$223,000 by four, and include about \$50,000 in the Estimates, and I am therefore going to move that the amount be reduced to \$50,000.
9.30 p.m.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, we on this side of the Table feel ourselves entitled to have a breakdown on this arbitrary figure of half million dollars of which mention has been made that it is for expenses connected with external relations aspects of Independence. We are well aware that with the coming of Independence, there will be certain subscriptions which will have to be paid to certain organizations, such as the World Health Organization, World Monetary Fund, and other things of that nature.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I would just like to state that the Government has already made provision to the World Health Organization. The hon. member said that we will have to contribute to World Health Organization. The hon. member is ignorant of the fact that we contribute to W.H.O. under another Head.

Mr. LYNCH: I am not ignorant of how the money is spent. I know that \$70,000 is spent on W.H.O. I believe this figure was plumped for in the same way.

However, I will continue. It has been exercising hon. members' minds that small impoverished nations have been spending more than their national budget on these trappings of Independence. There is an article on the same subject to which I drew your attention which would be of great interest to you. You have small nomadic tribes who have fleeting capitals who spend great expenditure on Independence. You have places like the Upper Volta and certain countries in Africa which have gained their Independence that cannot even take their seats in United Nations.

We who sit on this side of the House are scrutineers of the public purse. We consider this figure of \$500,000 to which the note reads "expenses connected with external relations aspects of independence" as an arbitrary figure. We entirely disagree as to how this arbitrary figure of half million dollars, a sum which we cannot regard as a token figure, has been arrived at.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Philip has said that the amount be reduced to \$50,000. I feel that the principle to which we of my Party would agree to is that this be made a token vote of \$1 as we have agreed to the principle of Independence.

Mr. Chairman, I am moving that this sum be reduced to \$1, that is to say by 499,999 on the principle that we realise that the Legislature has passed this matter.

I am fully aware that this has nothing to do with the Conference at all, as has been said by the Hon. Minister of Community Development. As the Note says, these expenses are connected with the external relations aspects of Independence. We agree with the principle, but I do not agree that you need all this money for this purpose.

I have had to sit over on that side with some of those hon. members when they were in the Opposition. I would like to know if the last Government had brought these figures in here without giving us some sort of breakdown, what they would say. They would say: "Bring in a token vote."

Mr. Chairman, I am moving that the sum of \$500,000 be reduced by \$499,999, leaving a token vote of \$1. We are supporting the principle, but we are not voting for this amount until you can explain to us how you are spending it.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I am seconding that motion. Here again, I appeal to the Hon. Minister. We are entitled to know what you are going to do. To come here with an abstract sum of half million dollars just like that is not the way.

Within a few weeks, we will be discussing the Draft Constitution of Barbados. There should be a non-partisan approach to that question. But if at the very outset we are denied information which is very necessary, I can only see difficulties at these talks from the other side. They should welcome co-operation from this side. We should go with a unified principle. We do not want to be divided on this issue.

We are not asking for information to make capital out of it. We have been elected on this side too; therefore, we are entitled to know their thinking on this subject. If you prefer to keep that information to yourself, I can only say that it is going to be very staggering as to what Independence would cost.

I know that we have a difficult year ahead. We know that there are elections in the air, but do not let us have elections on this subject. I believe that the Ministers meticulously worked out this. If that is so, they must know how they arrived at half million dollars. They have worked it out; therefore, all I can say is: "Let us postpone this item until they get the information for us." In the absence of that, we will have to vote against it.

I am seconding the motion for the reduction by \$499,999. In principle we accept it; but we cannot vote blindly for something which may cost one million dollars or three million dollars or something else.
9.40 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Item I "External Affairs, \$500,000" be reduced by \$499,999. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", (MEMBERS: Aye). Those against will please say "No" (MEMBERS: No.) I think the "Noes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:-

AYES: Messrs. CRAWFORD, HOLDER, SMITH, SEALEY, LYNCH, GODDARD AND MOTTLEY - 7.

NOES: Hon'bles J. C. TUDOR, A. DaC, EDWARDS; C. E. TALMA, N. W. BOXILL, Messrs. LOWE, YEARWOOD COWARD and WEEKES - 8.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question has been resolved in the negative, seven hon. members voting "AYE" and eight hon. members voting "No". I now declare that the "NOES" have it.

The question that the sum of \$700,000 under Head 16 - External Affairs - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 17 - PREMIER - HOME AFFAIRS

Head 17 - Premier - Home Affairs - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$236,604 under Head 17 - Premier - Home Affairs - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on Item 28 "Registration of Electors." The amount to be voted there is \$101,180 and the Note states: "To meet expenditure for registration of Electors. Formerly Item 180 of Head 37." Will the Hon. Minister tell us what changes have been made and what they propose to pay enumerators and the like? Is this Item dealing with matters of preparing photographs and so on?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am at a disadvantage here; I really do not have that information, but I will get it for the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Very well. In connection with Item 34 "Elections" the sum of \$44,000 is to be voted and the note states: "to meet cost of election of members to the General Assembly of the Legislature, Payment to Returning Officers transferred to the vote for Registration of Electors." Can the hon. member tell us something about this item, or, does what the Hon. Minister say with respect to the other Item also apply to this Item?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, may I ask what is the specific question the hon. member was asking with regard to this Item?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Note to Item 28 says this: "To meet expenditure for Registration of Electors. Formerly Item 180 of Head 37." Now you come on here to Item 34 "Elections," the amount to be voted is \$4,000 and you will notice that last year what you had in here was \$52,550. You have divided something and you have left us somewhat confused. We would like to have some explanation of this. There is a new method of registration which is taking place and, presumably, that is in connection with the coming elections. I see that hon. members are laughing and they may think that I am groping in the dark. Sir, I am not groping in the dark. If the hon. member thinks that because I am outside the pale of Government I do not understand things, he is mistaken. I know that we had an hon. member who used to say "Boy, you do not understand."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member asked his question I did tell him that I shall have to get the information for him, but the hon. member has since linked Item 28 with Item 34. The payment which was formerly done under Item 34 will now be done under Item 28. The hon. member quite well realises that an Election is due in the course of the next financial year and therefore provision will have to be made for it.

Mr. GODDARD: Will it be possibly in connection with the rent of machines which you have not yet been paying for? Have you rented these machines in advance of the work? I know you have machines for registering electors. I understand that the machines are here, but the other work has not yet begun. These machines are rented, I am told, and is it that the rent for these machines is more than what was anticipated because the machines have been in the island for some time?

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I should like to know why is it that the cost of elections for the year 1965 is more than the cost of elections for the election year 1966? We should just like to be clear on that point.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I would have had to be given notice of the question asked by the hon. junior member for Christ Church, but this is nothing to do with the machines. The item is "Registration of Electors". Everybody knows that there is an enumeration which is due to start at any moment from now. It is only about two or three weeks ago in this House that we passed a Bill which would enroll 15-year-olds for social security purposes to be registered. I do not know the rate at which the enumerators are being paid, but I can safely say that we would want to offer proper remuneration to enumerators.
9.50 p.m.

When we come to the second part on which a question was asked both by the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, I will draw their attention again to the explanatory note to Item 34. The hon. junior member for Bridgetown has asked why in 1955 we put in \$52,550 for elections and in this year when it seems obvious there must be an election we have only put in \$44,000, and we drew his attention to the fact that the payment of Returning Officers.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member saying that \$52,000 voted last year were spent?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: We did not have an election; so I do not see how it could have been spent.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Maybe the hon. member would say whether this was spent in the rental of machines, because we were informed that registration for elections to the General Assembly would be done by machines. We know that the machines were in the island and we would like to know what has happened with them. You are voting \$101,180 for registration of electors and \$44,000 for elections, and you should be able to tell us why this money has been put in like this. If the hon. member cannot give us the information but promises to get it for us, I will sit down.

The question that the sum of \$236,604 under Head 17 - Premier - Home Affairs - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 18 - POLICE

Head 18 - Police - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to this Head. On page 35, insert Item 30 A "Allowance in lieu of Quarters" - \$432; and the note is to read: "To enable payment of an allowance to be made to the Commissioner of Police until quarters are available."

I beg to move that the sum of \$497,212 under Head 18 - Police - as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Now, Mr. Chairman, when the youngest of the Ministers makes a promise, he always keeps it, and I hope that the Leader of the House will follow that example. Under Item 32 - Arms and Ammunition - quite recently I read in two sections of the Local Press that it was reported in London that a Mr. Sydney Alleyne had received a cable saying that an Arms cache was found in Barbados. I understand that this was withheld from publication in other papers but we saw it in Barbados and it must cause much alarm. I am sure, Sir, that the Hon. Leader of the House must be as alarmed about that as I am, and I would like the hon. member to deny that any arms cache has been found in Barbados. I say this because this matter has gone about and people at hotels and so on have been discussing it, and it would be well if the Minister gave this the lie. However much we might like to shirk away from it, this is not a good thing to spread about, and although Mr. Smithers telephones the Premier when he got this information, the Government has not said anything about it. The Leader of the House should therefore tell us if this is true, and if it is not, give the lie to the whole thing.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, before the Leader of the House replies, I should like to ask the Leader of the Opposition through you whether he can tell the House in what periodicals he read this article.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I read it in both the papers in which the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works read it, because I presume he reads every paper in this country. I am addressing my remarks to the Leader of the House whom, I am sure, with his colleagues must have been alarmed at this article. We must clear the air on this matter, and now that we are dealing with the Esti-

mates and have come to the Item "Arms and Ammunition", this is the appropriate time to say whether or not these arms have been found in the country.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I believe that if the hon. member would address his remarks to the Chair, he would be quite in order.
10,00 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: To whom do you think I addressed my remarks?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Address your remarks to me; to the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You are really not so bad looking. However, Sir, this is a matter which should not be glossed over lightly. This is a very important matter; and even if the Press tried to suppress this, you should issue a statement. It is not something which you heard whispering, there were headlines in the Press. I want the Government to deny that such arms are in Barbados, or, so to speak, have come to Barbados.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Again, the Hon. Leader of the House replied and asked the Hon. Leader of the Opposition if he could state which newspaper or newspapers he read this thing in. If the hon. member is so determined, say that it was written in the *Daily Advocate*, the *Daily News*, the *Beacon*, the *Truth* or the *Torch*. Let him say which of these newspapers he read it in.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is the *Torch* published here?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Yes.

Mr. MOTTLEY: When?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I do not know.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It does not matter what paper I read it in, but the hon. member knows that he read it.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I do not know.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Well, somebody read it for you. Are you really capable of dealing with me?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Yes; because I speak English just like you.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I asked a simple straightforward question. It would be well for the Hon. Minister to say. What I want to pin them down to is, if they knew nothing like that is coming to Barbados, it would be well that they issue a statement. Somebody is lying on this matter.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: If what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said is true, he is a leading citizen, and if he has read that arms are coming into Barbados - I do not know if it is true, but if it is true - it is his duty to say that he has seen this in the *Torch*. He says that there is no *Torch*. Well say the *Beacon*, the *Truth*, the *Advocate* or the *News*. What is he hiding? The hon. member has come in here and made a statement that he has read of some arms cache. Since he is making an emphatic statement, why cannot he say that he has read it in the *Daily News*, or which newspaper? Did you read it in the *Beacon*, the *Truth*, or the *Observer*? Which of these newspapers have you read it in? This is another way of how they wrote articles in Canadian newspapers to bring the country down. If the hon. member knows anything of this, it is his duty to come to the House like a man and make a statement that he has read this defamatory article in a particular newspaper and name the newspaper. There must be some reason why he has raised this.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I consider the hon. member a most incompetent and irresponsible member. No man who is a Minister should tell you that he has not read all of the three newspapers in this Island in which the article which I have mentioned here is written. No man who is worthy to hold the position which the hon. member holds

or no man who is a Minister and is in this Island should say so. It appeared in three newspapers.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Well, name them. You subscribe to them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: And then to suggest that I subscribe to the newspaper. I subscribe to every newspaper in this Island.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to contain himself.

Mr. MOTTLEY: How can he contain himself when he displays that blackguardish attitude?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I am asking that the hon. member withdraw the word "blackguardish".

Mr. MOTTLEY: I take that back and say that white-guardish attitude. There is no member who would say that, Sir, I cannot ask you any question, but I am absolutely certain that because you are in politics, it is in your interest to see the news in every newspaper.

I am not one of those who say that I do not read every newspaper in this Island. If I say that I saw it written in three newspapers, the Hon. Minister is telling me that I must say which newspaper.

I addressed my remarks to the Hon. Leader of the House and if the hon. junior member for St. Thomas thinks that attitude makes him a Minister, he is wrong; he has a lot to learn first.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You are talking nonsense.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If those two hon. members continue like that, I think that I would have to name both of them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As I was saying, Sir, I addressed my remarks to the Hon. Leader of the House. If the Hon. Minister of Communications was in the island and he has said that I have not seen this at all, I tactfully drew it to his attention what newspapers I had read it in.

The Hon. Minister has asked me if I subscribe to these newspapers. I subscribe to every newspaper sold in this Island. This is a very important matter. It is so important that I am absolutely certain the hon. member would not go outside and say: "I have not read it." If that is so, you do not deserve to be a Minister.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I do not read filth.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Before the Hon. Leader of the House replies, I would like to make it clear that I have been in this House for nineteen years and certainly I would not sit here and be a party to anything which is of an elusive nature. I have read the articles to which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has referred in three newspapers. All of them are in opposition to this Government. At least one of them has assumed that role recently. It appeared in the *Beacon*, the *Truth* and the *Observer*. On this occasion, I read them all.

To say that arms and ammunition is coming into this Island from Mexico, I would certainly say that it is totally an invention and fabrication as such which has no truth whatsoever.
10.10 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There was an editorial on this thing which I thought was bad for the entire island. All you have to say is that it is not true.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I was not in here when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition introduced this matter, but I should like to make a statement. It came to the knowledge of the Government some eight or nine weeks ago that certain members of the Opposition had sent a cable to London in my name. The Government, in order to obviate

any possibility of any member of the Opposition or the members of Benevolent Society perpetuating this kind of dastardly act again, gave instructions that no telephone message will be received by cable before a check is made as to the source. We suspected for a long time that there were certain members of this House who were guilty of sending cables to London in my name, but we did not have any proof until they jumped the gun and came out with editorials in the newspapers more or less confessing that they were aware that this cable was sent. Prior to that only a few people in London knew about the cable being sent, namely, the British Intelligence Service, His Excellency the Governor and three members of the Government. None of the other two members of the Government made any disclosure because we were setting a trap. This is a systematic attempt on the Opposition side. And the Leader of the Opposition should be so shamefaced as to try to initiate a debate on a matter of which he had full cognizance long before any member of the Government, and he could state that there was an arms cache in Barbados and he wants a statement on it! This was something perpetrated by them as part of a systematic design and intent to run down the credit of Barbados in the outside world in an attempt to overthrow the Government. As to some of the members who are guilty of this act, nobody has ever seen the colour of their eyes. They have never looked anybody in Barbados in the face. They used the occasion of Her Majesty the Queen's Visit to interview members of the newspapers press to make all kinds of accusations against the Government, but they have no idea of whom they have to deal with in matters of this kind. Let not the hon. member feel because he has all the newspapers in the Bridgetown City Council - we know that things we say and which we can prove in any Court of law will not be published in the Press and he will get away with it. The hon. member took up arms against this Government some months ago because he was afraid that his cohorts would lose money. He does not know the kind of conflict that he is now engaged in. There is absolutely no truth that any such cable was sent on behalf of this Government. There is absolutely no truth that there has been any arms cache in this country or in any other country. I invite them to join battle with this Government and they will find out what will happen to them. All I can call them is Benevolent Brethren. In no country of the world would you find delegates with the ulterior motive of throwing out the Government by such unconstitutional means as those of the members of the Opposition.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I raised this question as Leader of the Opposition in very good faith. I am only replying to the Hon. Premier who said that I am so shamefaced as to raise this question in here because I knew about it before it took place.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, if hon. members know about something before it takes place, then he is an accessory before the fact.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If you say you know about it before it takes place.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member says that he knew about it before it took place and I say that that is a classic definition of an accessory before the fact. That is a classic definition of an accessory before the fact. I say it three times and I say that he is deserving of punishment in the same way as a principal in the first degree.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member thinks that I am afraid. Where did I say that I knew about it before it happened? You are telling an untruth. That is a reckless untruth. I will ask the Reporter to read back what he wrote down. I will resign my seat here now.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: He has just said that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I did not say that. I will resign my seat if I said it. (*ASIDES*). Mr. Chairman, let me have the report. Where did I say that? You cannot speak the truth. Do you think you can frighten me? You have made the biggest mistake in your life. I would like you to have the Reporter read it back. I said that it was not in the interest of Barbados, neither was it in my personal interest.
10.20 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, when has the hon. member been concerned about what was in the interest of Barbados as distinct from what was in his personal interest? I would like to know when in all his political life he has been concerned about the interest of Barbados - he or any of his associates, the strange political bed-fellows he is now lying with, the people who cannot look other people in the face.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have always looked people in the face, but the hon. member seems worried about something. He said that I took up arms against him because my Party was going to lose some money, but the hon. members knows it is not true. The hon. member took up arms against me for his own ulterior motives. Is the hon. member saying that I took up arms against him because we wanted something done in a particular way and we said so? The hon. member wants the Reporter and the Press to bring out that I said I knew about it before it happened, but I never said such a thing.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member prepared to say in the presence of all the people around here that he has never discussed with anybody in Barbados, not outside of Barbados, the possibility of eliminating by force of arms members of the Government on this side?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have discussed nothing any place. The hon. member is suffering from mental confusion. What are you afraid of?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Not you, because you have never seen a shot fired in anger.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is pitiable that the hon. member should adopt this attitude. The hon. member has withdrawn himself from me, but I am the same as I was five or six years ago both inside and outside this House. You are asking whether I have discussed with somebody the elimination of members of this Government by arms. You sit down and let a lot of pimps and touts bring a lot of stupidity to you. Are you suggesting that I would want to eliminate by force the members of this Government with whom I sit down and have a drink and talk? I asked a legitimate question to have the air cleared, because this was published in three papers, and there was actually an editorial in one paper about it, and some statement should be made by the Government denying that there is any truth in the article.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I would like to tell the hon. member that there is some truth in it. It is true that members on that side sent a cable to London signed "Premier, Barbados", and we have checked the record and found that it was signed by members of the Opposition. The whole thing was fabricated, and they could not wait back, but jumped the gun and the three editorials appeared simultaneously. This is another subterfuge introduced in this debate to get something splashed over the world that Barbados is like a South American Republic.

We over here are not hotel owners, real estate agents, chain store owners or anything like that, and they are the people who are going to lose by the attempt they are making to denigrate the country. I would warn those who would do that on the introduction of the Estimates that they can start any time they like.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member seems not to be able to say what he wants to say. Why is he trying to associate us.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, if the hon. senior member for Bridgetown would give way, the hon. senior member for St. Philip is coming to brief him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member must not bring sarcasm into this thing. Why is the hon. member trying to associate the members of my Party, who have got so much interest in this community and so much to lose, with these articles which appeared and with having sent a cable to England.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I am prepared to prove it to the hon. member by the fact that no newspaper in this country is going to bring out the fact that I made a statement tonight that a cable was sent by the members of the Opposition. There is no newspaper which is prepared to bring that out, because all the newspapers have been manipulated and managed by members of the Opposition.

Mr. MOTTLEY: No newspaper would refuse to bring out that I raised this question and the Premier of Barbados said there was no truth in it, but that he said it was within his knowledge that a member or members of the Opposition sent such a cable in his name to London. I am sure that a report like that would clear the air.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like to ask the hon. member if he remembers that the Editor of a newspaper sitting in this House at the present moment published an editorial saying that the Queen should not come to Barbados. We keep files, and we also have the facilities of several agencies in the world in order to process these things. When the same member was a member of the Cabinet, he was not aware of it, but I would not allow him to go into my office when I was absent and see any of these files, but he published that the Queen should not come to Barbados because there was going to be unrest in Barbados. Certain members are agitated, and you will see who will rise to their feet.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am saying now that it is absolutely true that I read it in the *Observer* Newspaper and we discussed it and I thought it was most unwarranted and uncalled for. I read all the newspapers and I was bringing this matter to the attention of the Leader of the House, but the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works has asked me where I saw it. Why should anyone associate us with seeking arms or sending any cable to England in this matter? Now that the air has been cleared, I hope that two things will be cleared: (a) that it has been made clear that no such arms have been found in Barbados, and (b) the Premier has explained what he knows about this. As a matter of fact, in my considered opinion, this was so important to the business community that the Government should have issued a Press release the next day.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that since I said I did not read this article, I was not fit to be a Minister. Well, he cannot say that I am not fit to become a Minister because I cannot read or write, but what I can say for the Hon. Leader of the Opposition tonight is that I am very sorry for him, because if at his age he indulges in pornography, which means lewd and obscene writing and pictures, that is naked pictures, I do not; therefore I did not read that kind of stuff, because I consider the two papers which he named to be nothing more than filth.
1.30 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. senior member for the City has said now that the atmosphere is clear. Really, I am amazed. The hon. senior member for St. John who pulled a lot of legalistic bull over his eyes and talked all around.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said that somebody, because I knew who was the instigator of this movement. He was one of the persons, but he does not look into the mirror. The hon. senior member for St. Philip is the most shame-faced member of this House because he knows more about this than anybody else.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I challenge the hon. senior member for St. John to go to any Cable Office in this island on any matter and ask them to produce any copy sent to them by any member of the Opposition. The hon. member is the most shame-faced person I know.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Talking about legalistic, unfortunately as a lawyer we have a term which we call "sand-side" which applies to the hon. member because he has always wanted to study law. He says that I produced a letter. We knew nothing about it and I can say so because we have a procedure whereby we can check back.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is not fooling anybody in here.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Is the hon. member suggesting that a member of the Government sent it? You can get a certain person to telephone the Cable Office.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Something is really wrong with him. He has completely lost his mind. I challenge him to go to any Cable Office in any part of the world and produce a telegram sent by me or by any member of the Opposition. This is an infernal fabrication.

Let me tell you what happened. What happened was this. There is a seaman, a man called Seibert Alleyne, who went to two newspapers in London a few months ago and tried to plant an article to the effect that an arms cache has been discovered in Barbados and that these arms and ammunition had been imported by the Opposition for the purpose of overthrowing the Government. That man is a staunch member of the D.L.P.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: How could the hon. member know all of this if he did not send this cable?

Mr. CRAWFORD: This talk of arms cache is only trying to confuse the issue.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I hope the next time the hon. member would engage a competent lawyer, and do not get money from the Development Board to pay the damages. Do not try to run down lawyers because His Honour the Speaker is a lawyer, the Honourable Deputy Speaker is a lawyer and when Mr. Keith Walcott and other members of the leading profession were in here, he was not going to get up in here and make that kind of statement. He is making a statement about Chief Justices. He is making a statement about the Chief Justice of Trinidad and also Mr. Douglas, the Chief Justice of Barbados. The hon. member should not vent his frustration on this House of Assembly and talk of lawyers.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I will say how they kept you on the Roll of barristers. If the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. senior member for the City did not go to the Court, you would not even have been a lawyer now because you would have been disrobed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Is the hon. member suggesting that the hon. senior member for the City and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph went into Court and committed perjury in order to keep me as a lawyer? He has this abominable conceit that he thinks he is more intelligent than anybody else.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have enough conceit to put him where he is now. The hon. senior member for the City, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. senior member for St. Peter know that if they did not defend him, he would not have been a barrister now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I object to all of that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like to know when the hon. senior member for the City and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph had to defend me. I would like to know on what occasion. I have never defended any one of them. I would like to know when the occasion arose that they were even witnesses in a case that they would have to defend me. I would like to know when they appeared as witnesses or even as Counsel in a case to defend me. The hon. member is the most shamefaced person that had ever sat in this House in the history of this island. I would call him a liar to his face. On what occasion did they have to defend me?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am closing the matter on that now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Oh no; no! I will answer him. When the hon. junior member for St. Peter was complainant in a case in which he accused the hon. member of cuffing him,

Hon. E. W. BARROW: When the hon. junior member for St. Peter was Speaker of this House, he was never a complainant in a case against me. At any time I appear in Court, I appear as plaintiff or Counsel. To show you, Sir, that the hon. member is a shameless person, he is asking the hon. junior member for St. Joseph right there what really happened. Neither one of them appeared in any Court -

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am on my feet. What the hon. member has risen on?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am on a point of order. The hon. senior member for St. Philip is so shameless and bare-faced that he is getting up and telling lie after lie. I never knew the nature of the hon. member until I had to associate with him.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have never drunk poison; I have never had to take injections for lunacy.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I wish to hear no more about that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Would the hon. member like to publish that in his newspaper on Saturday and find out that there is no more money he can have from the Development Board?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I repeat, I am not going to hear any more about that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, under Head 18, you allowed the Hon. Premier to come in and twist the debate completely. The hon. senior member for the City made a statement. He never said anything.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member jumped up and I said that I know who jumped up.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I never said so.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Why don't the hon. member take off his glasses and let hon. members see the colour of his eyes? Are you freezing, or are you suffering from St. Vitus dance or something else?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I was saying that a prominent member of his Party tried to plant an article in the London press.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is to show that he knows something about it.
10.40 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member said that the article appeared in three newspapers about finding an arms cache in Barbados. The hon. member never said anything about any cable being sent. The first time I heard about a cable being sent in the name of the Government is tonight. That is one of those tricks to which lawyers are accustomed in Court in order to draw a red herring across the trail. The hon. member cannot get away with me at all. I can prove it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I can prove it. We proved it. On Saturday morning last the hon. member rang Mr. David Smithers who is a member of the London Overseas Intelligence and said that he regretted that he did not publish the cable which only the hon. member knew about. The hon. member knows that is true, but he now says, and how can he say it, that the first time he knew about it is tonight? How can he say that when he saw the cable? Mr. Chairman, he is the most vicious person who has ever come into public life in this island. (*Asides*) (Mr. CRAWFORD: I sent you in St. John). I have never sent anybody to Brazil nor have I sent anybody to gaol! He thinks that he is a European, and that is why he does not want anybody to see the colour of his eyes. (*Asides*). He will say he consorts with Europeans at Paradise Beach Club.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have never telephoned Mr. Smithers about any cable at all. Mr. Smithers is a friend of mine, and whenever he comes to Barbados he comes to see me. Nobody has said anything about any cable being sent anywhere in the name of the Government. Mr. Chairman, I will tell you something more.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Let the hon. member read the same article he wrote and he will find it. Why should the hon. member be writing in the same newspaper if he did not know anything about it? On Saturday before last, the hon. member published. (*Asides*) When I am finished with the hon. member.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: When you are finished with me? You mean when I am finished with you. That is the biggest joke I have ever heard. I carried this man by the skin of his teeth in two by-elections in St. John, and now he speaks about when he is finished with me! No cable has ever been sent by any member of this House to London in this matter. I challenge him to support his contention by getting the cable office to publish a copy of this cable. This is the most confounded fabrication that I have ever heard. There is no record of any cable being sent by any member of the Opposition.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member has only heard about the cable tonight, how is he so sure that there is no record of any cable being sent? Unless he thinks he has taken steps about security arrangements to eradicate any trace of that cable, how can he be so positive that there is no record of the cable? How can he be so positive about that if he does not know about the cable?

Mr. CRAWFORD: The answer is that I have no control over the files of the cable office. If I sent a cable, the cable office should have a copy of it. I know that the hon. member has deliberately lied, and he has fabricated this story.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement; otherwise I will have the words taken down.

Mr. CRAWFORD: He said that the cable was sent by a member of the Opposition and then he said that it was sent by me. That is a figment of the imagination. He fabricated that when he came in here.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would not be so naive that the cable was written in his handwriting. I said that it was instigated on that side. I am saying that it was instigated by the members of the Opposition. The hon. senior member for St. Philip certainly knew about it before tonight because he is positive that you cannot find any trace of it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: No cable was sent.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Will the hon. member withdraw his statement? He has said that I am a liar, that no cable was sent or that it was not in his handwriting.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am saying that I sent no cable, that I wrote no cable, exchanged no cable and that no member of the Opposition sent this cable. This is only a figment of the imagination.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am still on my feet, Mr. Chairman. If the hon. member does not withdraw the words, I will ask that they be taken down and that the appropriate action be taken. I am still on my feet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member withdrawing the words which the Hon. Premier has objected to?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Yes.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member cannot withdraw the statement by sitting in his seat and using "Yankeeism" and saying "yah", "yah".
10.50 p.m.

All I can say is that I am not accepting that as a withdrawal, and I am not sitting down unless a proper withdrawal is tendered to the Chair, because we will meet steel with steel on this occasion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. Philip in a parliamentary manner assure the Chair that he has withdrawn the words?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am saying that it is unparliamentary, I know.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member said "it is unparliamentary, I know". I want that taken down. Is the hon. member going to withdraw the words unreservedly?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I withdrew the words "deliberately lied".

Hon. E. W. BARROW: And all the associated words as well? If not I will ask for the whole sentence to be taken down since the hon. member confessed - the only confession I have ever heard him make. He confessed that the words were unparliamentary, and I would like all the words withdrawn.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I had not finished the sentence.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like the words to be taken down since the hon. member is not withdrawing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, you asked me to withdraw the words "deliberately lied" which I have done, and now Sir, I am going on. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown under Head 18, Item 32 - Arms and Ammunition.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like the Reporter who has the words complained of recalled to the House so that he can give to the House the proper words asked to be withdrawn. I would not like him to leave because I am cognisant of everything that is going on in this House, and I want him brought back here.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, you are in the Chair and I suggest that you.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I should like the Reporter who was responsible for reporting the offending words to be recalled. I am not going to let anybody go outside and then say that the words were put in outside or anything like this; so let him come back here to protect his reputation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not have to edit my speech. I did not spend four hours on mine after the Independence debate. I have never seen it after I said it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Independence debate is not published yet; but he has spent four hours on it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said I never edited my speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member give the words which he is asking the hon. senior member for St. Philip to withdraw?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I asked that the remarks be taken down and for the Reporter to come back. I am not having any partial withdrawal with any qualifications or any innuendo subsequent to that withdrawal. The hon. member said he is not finished. I know him well enough. I would like you, Mr. Chairman, to ask the Reporter to read the words and have him withdraw all of them without any reservation, because the House can break up in disorder before I leave. He said he had withdrawn the two words, and when I asked that he withdraw all the words, there was a loud cacophony of laughter from the members on the other side.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. senior member for St. John like to read the sentence?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I said that the Reporter should be recalled to read the offending words, and those are the words which should be withdrawn. And I am not sitting down either.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You do not want to hear the truth to-night.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not edit "The Truth".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clerk, would you mind reading the words complained of?

Mr. CLERK: "The answer is that I have no control over the files of the Cable Office. If I sent a cable, I would have a copy of it, I know he has deliberately lied and has fabricated the story."

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I ask the hon. member to withdraw the statement that I have deliberately lied; otherwise I will have the words taken down.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. senior member for St. Philip desirous of withdrawing the words complained of by the hon. senior member for St. John?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, you know the Rules of this House. You know that objection has to be taken at the time the words are said.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Objection was not only taken but as the Clerk read it, I reminded the House that the hon. member had risen six times, never on a point of order, and I never sat down since I took objection. Let us get the record straight. Immediately after he used the words "fabricated the story", I took objection and asked that the words be taken down.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, would the Clerk read the words again?

Mr. CLERK: "The answer is that I have no control over the files of the Cable Office. If I sent a Cable I would have a copy of it....."

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said "If I sent a cable, the Cable Office would have a copy of it".

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Is the hon. member challenging the words of the Official Report?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said the Cable Office would have a copy of it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am objecting to the hon. member saying that I have deliberately lied and fabricated the story, and I ask that he withdraw those words; otherwise I will have the words taken down, 11.10 p.m.

Mr. CHIRMAN: I will ask the hon. senior member for St. Philip to withdraw those words.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Under the Rules of this House, you have to protest against a statement which you allege is offensive at the time it was made. The Rules distinctly lay down the manner in which objection must be taken.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Up to now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Philip has not withdrawn the statement. He has not risen on a point of order and he has not withdrawn the words.

It is very simple and I am not sitting down until he withdraws the remarks. If you want to adjourn the House, I am not sitting down because I am not giving way on my rights. Other members in Barbados may not know their rights, but I know my rights. You have your choice, Mr. Chairman. Up to now I have not heard the hon. member withdraw those words.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will just ask the hon. senior member for St. Philip to recite those words again.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Clerk has to do that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member does not know with whom he is dealing. He has only aspired to be a member of the Bar, but despite what he says about the hon. senior member for the City committing a perjury for me, he has never yet appeared in the Courts for me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are still waiting on the hon. senior member for St. Philip to withdraw those words. Now, for the last time I will ask the Clerk to read the words. Now, for the last time I will ask the Clerk to read the words which have been objected to.

Mr. CLERK: "The answer is that I have no control over the files of the Cable Office. If I sent a Cable, I would have a copy of it, I know he has deliberately lied and has fabricated the story."

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I ask the hon. member to withdraw the statement that I have deliberately lied; otherwise I would have the words taken down.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have withdrawn the statement.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I ask that the hon. senior member for St. Philip stand and say that he withdraws the statement.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have withdrawn that statement.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: You cannot say that "I have withdrawn that statement." I regret, that is not the correct procedure, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member has to say "I have withdrawn the words complained of." That is what he has to say. Do not let him bamboozle you that he does not have to say that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is trying now to make a ruling.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Why is the honourable member afraid to say so?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not think it is anything for the hon. senior member for St. Philip to get up and say that he has withdrawn the words complained of. I am waiting on him to say so. This is the last time.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, adjourn the House because of disorder.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like it to go on record that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is not on a point of order, but he invited the Chair to adjourn because of disorder so that you can have an advertisement on Saturday. I would like that to go on record that L. E. Smith has said that you should adjourn the House in disorder when there is no disorder.

Mr. CRAWFORD: When one of them over there ran with the Mace, that was not disorder.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. John sit so that the hon. senior member for St. Philip can get up and withdraw the remarks?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will sit down when the hon. member withdraws the remarks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is willing to withdraw the remarks now.

Hon. E. W. BARROW sat.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, you said that I must withdraw the remarks. Do you mean the whole thing which the Clerk read out?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Only the words which the hon. senior member for St. John objected to.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I did not hear; anyway, I would withdraw the remarks.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: He has not withdrawn them yet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Philip said he did not hear.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I rise on a point of order. The hon. member said "I withdraw the remarks" and he said that "I would withdraw the remarks", but I am not finished. If you check back I will tell you what the hon. member said in here fourteen years ago, far less fourteen minutes ago. I am telling you that he has not withdrawn the remarks yet. I have expressed how you must make a withdrawal and I refuse to accept anything short of that. To say that "I have withdrawn the remarks" is not a withdrawal. He ought to say that "I do withdraw the remarks of which I said so-and-so."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I inform the hon. senior member for St. Philip that objection has been taken against that withdrawal. I would like him to express "the words objected to" instead of saying: "I withdraw the remarks."

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member has said "I withdraw" "I would withdraw." He has not said "I withdraw the particular words complained of." The hon. member may not be aware of that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. senior member for St. Philip desirous of expressing the words objected to?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of my expressing the words objected to. You are in the Chair and you rule. You made a statement that the words objected to must be withdrawn. Do not sit there and allow somebody to bamboozle you.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I object to the hon. member imputing improper motives to the Chair. He has two things to withdraw now. They have been assassinated before, and somebody has got to protect them.

I intend to move a motion on a point of privilege. I am objecting to the suggestion to the Chair by the hon. senior member for St. Philip that he is allowing himself to be bamboozled. He also has to withdraw the specific words which were written down saying that I was deliberately lying. It is not sufficient for an hon. member to say "I withdraw the remarks." He has confessed already that he knows they are unparliamentary.
11.10 p.m.

The hon. member said he knew that it was unparliamentary and I would like to know what is preventing him from withdrawing the words which he has confessed already to be unparliamentary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In order to get on with the debate, will the hon. senior member for St. Philip just mention the words objected to by the hon. senior member for St. John? Instead of saying that he has withdrawn the words, let him just mention the words and let us get on with the Estimates.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, in view of the behaviour of the hon. member and his not complying with the direction of the Chair, I beg to move that the words be taken down. I have given the hon. member no less than 29 1/2 minutes to withdraw the remarks. He cannot come in here and abuse people. I have made a formal motion and he cannot speak on this motion. According to the Standing Order, I have asked that the words be taken down. I should like to draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the Standing Order of this House which says that when words have been objected to, without any further debate those words must be taken down and the matter referred to His Honour the Speaker.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, you are in the Chair. (ASIDES) You are in the Chair and you have asked me a question. Would you be so kind as to let me know what the words are?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The words are "he has deliberately lied". The hon. member must withdraw those words; otherwise I will have them taken down.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, that is what I said I objected to. The words complained of are not what I reported he said but what he actually said. The Clerk is there and if he were interested impartially in the matter he would tell the Chair what the words are.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I know what the words are. They are: "He has deliberately lied and has fabricated the story". Will the hon. senior member for St. Philip withdraw those words?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have withdrawn the words.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like it to go on the record that I made a motion which is not subject to debate. The proper procedure was for the hon. member to be named, but I am not pressing that matter. I am not forcing the Chair to do anything which is not in the interest of the successful conclusion of the debate. The position now is that His Honour the Speaker should be in the Chair and the hon. member should be named. He is resisting what is parliamentary and what he himself knows is the proper parliamentary procedure.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, you have heard the hon. member accuse me of instigating or inspiring a cable to be sent in the name of the Government to the effect that an arms cache has been found in this country. I have never sent any cable and I know nothing about any cable being sent. If the Premier knows that the cable was sent, then he is morally bound in the face of my deliberate denial of it, to prove to this House and to the country that such a cable was sent. I challenge him to get a copy of this cable from the Cable Office and have it published anywhere. If the Cable Office finds a copy of any such cable sent by me, then I will leave this House immediately. I am almost one hundred per cent sure that there was no such cable sent by any member of the Opposition either. What the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said is that there was an attempt to plant a statement in the London Press to the effect that an arms cache had been found in Barbados, to overthrow the Government by force. Well, Sir, the first time that anybody heard about any cable being sent was when the Premier came in here.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member does not read his own newspaper, but he certainly did discuss this matter with Mr. David Smithers on Saturday before last. (PAUSE) The hon. member is right; he discussed the matter on the Friday night before last, which would be the 4th March. The hon. member did not discuss it on the Saturday because he said that he would publish it on the next day which was the Saturday. He told Mr. Smithers he did not publish the cable which was sent from Barbados. How did the hon. member know about that if he did not know anything about it? It was not sent by the Premier of Barbados. I did not say that he signed his own name. The hon. member did not succeed in eradicating all traces of the origin of the Cable. That is all I want to warn the hon. member of.
11.20 p.m.

I challenge you to take off your glasses?

Mr. CRAWFORD: You have a pair of dark glasses also..

Mr. CHAIRMAN rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get on with Head 18.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, Head 18 deals with Arms and Ammunition, and I have been accused on the floor of this House of sending a cable to England, and the hon. member has just repeated that I have discussed this with Mr. Smithers. Long before Mr. Smithers came here, the Editor of one of the daily newspapers said that he had been

told about this by a man called Sydney Alleyne who was a prominent member of the Democratic Labour Party, and he telephoned the Premier from London to tell him what was going on. Now there was a plot behind all this. The plot had been concocted with Mr. Alleyne while he was here to put this in the newspaper, and then the Government would be able to say that the Opposition has arms and arrest them.
(Laughter from Government side)

If you read the articles in *The Observer*, *The News*, *The Beacon* or *The Truth*, you will not see one single word about any cable being sent from Barbados. I know nothing about any cable, nor was there a single word in *The Observer* about any cable, and what I would ask your permission to do, Mr. Chairman, is to bring a copy of *The Observer* article before the House at the next meeting and read it and have it put on record that there was not a single word in *The Observer* articles about this mythical cable which is a pure concoction and a figment of the imagination. To my mind only a disordered imagination can concoct something like that, because if it is not a disordered imagination to come on the floor of this House with a sense of responsibility and get up and say that I or some member of the Opposition sent a cable in the name of the Government of Barbados to London to get this story planted, it is a very, very serious thing, because I could not concoct something like that in 100 years. It may sound like a joke to him, but I do not know how the other members take it. It is a matter for them, but I totally dissociate myself from any allegation that I have seen, far less sent a cable to Britain in the name of the Government which had the Premier's name signed. If I want to send a cable somewhere, I send it. I would leave this Assembly the next day if any such cable could be traced to me, and I am sure that it cannot be traced to them either. Mr. Alleyne's plot failed; it backfired. The newspapers had it set for printing when the story was killed.

In so far as the hon. member bringing Mr. Smithers' name into this debate, Mr. Smithers is what I regard as a personal friend of mine. When Mr. Smithers was here last time, a personal friend of ours telephoned me and told me that Mr. Smithers was here and asked if I had any time to see him. I said "of course;" and we had a sea bath in the presence of about twelve people; so we had no time to discuss anything at all.

This is a dangerous concoction, Sir. It is all well if you have a case in Court and you want to confuse the lawyers and draw a red herring across the trail, but nobody, so long as I am alive - and there are a lot of people who would like to see me die - either on this side or opposite, and least of all the hon. senior member for St. John is going to fabricate any of these things about me.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I think the hon. member forgets that he himself rang Mr. Smithers and told Mr. Smithers that he congratulated him...

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is a deliberate lie. I never rang Mr. Smithers any time in my life.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister of Education has not completed his statement.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I rise on a point of order. I did not know he was in the Island. He ought to be ashamed of himself. The one who is telling you that is even worse than you.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am saying that he should disclose to the House that he rang Mr. Smithers and told Mr. Smithers he congratulated him on warning the Premier about the cable, and that he would like Mr. Smithers to come and have lunch with him.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I should just like to say on a point of order that Mr. Smithers left my office to go and have the mythical sea bath with the hon. senior member for St. Philip. The hon. member is surprised, but he has a lot more coming. We have a lot more for him. We have the whole set of international agencies working on you; so you can go on and get yourself deeper and deeper in this thing.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You are the most vicious super-international space crook. Let me tell you something, Mr. Chairman. He says he has the Central International Agency working on me, but I was going to New York all my life. I was never banned from New York; I had a visa all the time, but I had to go to the American Consulate and ask them to give him a visa.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Which Consulate was that? What was the name of the Consul General he asked to give me a visa?

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member knows that an American in Barbados asked certain people in this Island and members of this House opposite me - the hon. senior member for Bridgetown was one - whether he should have a visa for the United States after a certain allegation he made.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I should like the hon. member to say which Consul asked him whether I should have a visa. My two children, my wife and my father-in-law are all American citizens, and I would like the hon. member to state the name of the Consul, because I would ask the State Department, and I would ask the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to go and telephone to the Secretary of State now and ask him which Consul asked him whether I should have a visa for the United States of America. The hon. member has invoked the corroboration of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown; let him get up and tell me which Consul.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Let me give you the facts.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not want the facts from you, Mr. Chairman, unless the hon. member is going to desist from this sort of stupid behaviour. I will go and put through an overseas call to Washington if the hon. member would give me the name of the Consul so that I can get in touch with him now. Let us settle the matter right now. (Mr. LOWE: This is childish.) You think it is childish. You do not know what is operating in this country.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not know what is operating in this country!

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not talking to you, I am talking to the hon. senior member for St. George, because he does not know the evil generated in this country. I am asking the hon. senior member for Bridgetown to tell me the name of the Consul, or he can go on the telephone if he does not want to tell me which Consul it was. The hon. member has made a statement in the House of Assembly; let him come out now and say something about it.
11.30 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I did not say that I got a visa for him. Sir Grantley Adams on the floor of the House made an allegation against the hon. member and as a result of a letter which came into this country from Britain,....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am asking the hon. senior member for the City to tell the Chair and this House the Consul who asked him that question so that we can corroborate the hon. senior member for St. Philip right now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the hon. member wants it, I will give him the whole story.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am inviting the hon. senior member for the City to whom he referred to name the Consul who asked him that question. I will leave the House of Assembly immediately after and telephone the Secretary of State.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Ever since twelve o'clock today the Hon. Leader of the House assured this House that he would adjourn the House between 9.30 o'clock and ten o'clock tonight. Very soon it will be midnight. The hon. senior member for Christ Church circulated to hon. members a very voluminous Bill saying that he would like us to peruse it in order to deal with it

tomorrow. How on earth can he expect us to peruse this Bill when we go home in the wee hours of the morning and do justice to it? It is not fair to us. The Hon. Leader of the House is always making these promises. He made it on the Independence debate and failed to carry out his promise. If he made a promise, he should carry it out. By my watch it is twenty-five minutes to twelve o'clock.

It is time to adjourn. From ten o'clock we have not passed, up to now, one Head.

Mr. CRAWFORD: While I agree with the hon. member, I was accused just now of some international agent following me.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am asking the hon. senior member for the City, since he has been invited, to corroborate the story by the hon. senior member for St. Philip in order to allow us within a matter of minutes to send a telephone message to the Secretary of State. It is very, very simple. Otherwise, I would be wasting time.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member said that some international people were following me and that a man came to my house for lunch. Every time Mr. Smithers comes to this country, he comes to my home. What I am saying is this. Mr. Smithers rang me on the Friday for lunch but I told him that I was too busy.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member has just said that Mr. Smithers rang him on the Friday for lunch. He said not long ago that he had no conversation with Mr. Smithers.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is the biggest joke I know about.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I never was refused a visa to the United States. I have heard that the hon. senior member for the City has had to solicit a visa on my behalf. I would like to know the name of the American Consul who committed this breach of International Law. I would like to know the name of the Consul. You cannot make a statement like that unless you can corroborate that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for the City is not concerned; so let us get on.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not going to have it said in here that I have any international agency following me. I have been in here for years, and I have never been like somebody coming in and jumping out.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member making his speech or is he on a point of order?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am replying to the speech that some international agency is following me. I have never had anybody checking on me.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not refer to the hon. member.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member got up distinctly and said that I have somebody following me.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Did I call his name?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the Hon. Premier. Let us get on with the debate on the Head.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I take it that the hon. senior member for the City admits that the statement made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip is incorrect.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Let me get this thing clear about Mr. Smithers. It has nothing to do with the debate. I am accused about Mr. Smithers, as if he has been in some collusion with me.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I spoke personally with the gentleman or some person speaking for him on the telephone.

Mr. CRAWFORD: When? Mr. Smithers did not call me first. He first had me called. Then he and I spoke. He just said to me that he was in the island. I could not see him on the Friday, but I saw him on Saturday, with about twelve people.

11.40 p.m.

This story about arms and ammunition was brought to my attention by the Editor of the Newspaper. A leading politician in London wrote a letter to Barbados repeating the whole story long before Mr. Smithers came here. As a matter of fact, the Editorial in the "Daily News" to which the hon. senior member for the City referred, said that this story had been drawn to their attention. We knew that before Mr. Smithers came here. We knew that this was arranged before he left Barbados. Now this has been twisted to the effect that a member of the Opposition sent a cable to London. Well, Sir, I have heard a lot of things in my life, but this certainly takes the cake. Anybody who concocts a story like that - fortunately we do know what we are dealing with, but if the hon. member thinks that he is dealing with children, he is just misleading himself. He has warned.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I know whom I am dealing with. I did not know about two years ago, but I know now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I know too.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The whole island of Barbados knows whom we have to deal with.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The whole island knows. The people know whom they are dealing with and we know how we have had to deal with him. Let the hon. member take this from me. As far as I am concerned, you have found your match any morning or night you can think of. It is true that I cannot sink into certain depths, but you have met your match.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Is the hon. member addressing the Chair? I have spent seven years in the Law Courts and I would say that anybody who wears dark glasses. (A MEMBER: Dr. Eric Williams wears them too.) but he does not wear them all the time. Anybody would have to be on even terms with me so that I would know when he is looking in my direction. Do not let the hon. member talk any nonsense. The hon. member has been in politics long enough: so what is he talking about?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I will be in here for longer than you. I have never lost my seat in here; I have never been kicked out.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not wish to hear any more cross talk. Let hon. members get on with the debate on this Head.

The question that the sum of \$497,212 under Head 18 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

CHAIRMAN REPORTS PROGRESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

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.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow (Wednesday) 16th March, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow (Wednesday) 16th March, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

11.50 p.m.