
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Saturday, 14th December, 1968

A Special Meeting of the House of Assembly was held at 10.10 a.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (*Speaker*); Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, J.P.; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Leader of the House*); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries*); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (*Minister of Communications and Works*); Sir G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., D.C.L. (Hon.), (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P., and Mr. J. B. SPRINGER.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no Minutes for confirmation.

GREETINGS FROM THE BARBADOS REGIMENT

I have received, on behalf of hon. members, Christmas Greetings from the Barbados Regiment. They will be reciprocated by me on behalf of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR DEPUTY CLERK

I have been informed that the Deputy Clerk, Mr. H. Lisle Thomas, O.B.E., is ill and is, therefore, applying for leave of absence from his duties today.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Deputy Clerk be excused from attendance at the House today on account of his indisposition.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to second that.

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING DEPUTY CLERK

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Mr. G. W. Allen, Solicitor, be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for today's sitting.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. LYNCH entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members have, I am assured, been all notified of this Special Meeting today which was fixed at the request of a Minister of the Crown.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I am making mention of this Special Meeting summoned for today at the request of a Minister. I very well appreciate that Rule 5 (9) makes provision for Your Honour to summon such a meeting at the request of a Minister; but if one should take a look at what must be interpreted, according to Your Honour's summoning a meeting, to constitute matters of public interest, I am aghast, Sir, to find that Your Honour appears to be lending yourself and your high office to the Government to take advantage of the Minority Group in this House.

If Your Honour were to examine the items on the Order Paper you will find, amongst other things, that hon. members have been summoned here today - to do what? To upgrade the rank of an Office Messenger; to create a post for another Office Messenger, and to make an Office Messenger a Messenger/Driver and things of that sort. I am sure that those things could not have engaged Your Honour's attention before Your Honour - exercised your authority under Rule 5 (9). I am sure that line 5 of the same sub-Rule makes it abundantly clear that unless Your Honour is satisfied that there is some matter of grave public interest - and, to my mind, there is no item on the Order Paper today which, if examined by Your Honour, would lead Your Honour to feel and to

come to any conclusion that it is a matter of any public interest.

We have, Sir, the Provident Fund Bill. Let us admit that a Minister has stated that this matter was being toyed with for a period of three years. If it had been toyed with by the Government for a period of three years, and, as we have stated earlier, it was something that was in agitation since 1956, except for the case of the Government Party making politics and stunting, so to speak, on a matter of this sort, I cannot for the life of me see how, after toying with it for three years, it becomes a matter of any urgent public business, or anything of the sort, on a day like today.

Now, I should tell Your Honour this: I am very, very sorry that I arrived while Prayers were being said. It was my intention to rise and to address Your Honour on this very important matter before Prayers were said this morning. While I know the Government Party would have been urging Your Honour to stop me and so on, I came armed with my authority that would permit me to do such a thing.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. Speaker, my reason for doing this is that I feel that Your Honour is a bit too lenient; you are not protecting the rights of the minority in this particular matter of summoning meetings such as this, at the request of a Minister, on it being represented that the public interest requires this. What public interest is there this morning? My interpretation of the Rule - I feel Your Honour will some day come around to concluding that the Rule relates to matters of emergency to deal with such contingencies as could not have been dealt with during the normal sitting of this hon. House. But to tell me, Sir, that to create a post for a new Messenger; to promote another one; to arrange the transfer of another one; to promote a Records Clerk, or to provide money to continue the sinking of a well at Alleyndale, or to provide money for the Natural Gas Corporation - how could those things be emergencies, except we were told that every gas well had stopped functioning, or that the pipe lines could not last until next Tuesday, or that if the Records Officer had gone on strike the functions of the Public Service could not be carried on, or that if a Messenger were not promoted between today and next Tuesday the absence of his service would have created some situation that would have brought the functions of the Public Service to a halt? 10.20 a.m.

I am urging upon Your Honour to be prepared in matters of this sort to explain to Ministers, when they make representation, that Your Honour is facing mounting public criticism in the discharge of the functions of your office. I am appealing to you today. This hon. House is not meeting today to do matters of public interest. I am not going into the terms of any Bill or anything which is coming before this House, but this House is meeting today to give sugar workers \$3.60 a week when hon. members of the Government know that those workers should get \$5.00.

The Hon. Introducer of the particular Bill feels and knows and is satisfied that these workers should be given \$5.00, but we are meeting this morning to decide to give them \$3.60. Is this the public's interest we are serving?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member has made his point of order very clearly and very fully. I have noted what he has said; but having made his point, the meeting has been summoned for today by virtue of that Standing Order No. 5 (9). I can assure the hon. member that the remarks he has made have been noted by me and will be considered on any other occasion; but this meeting is validly summoned, in my Ruling, for today.

Mr. HINDS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to Your Honour for your Ruling on the matter, and I am merely urging upon Your Honour to take what I have said here today not lightly, because if this is allowed to continue like this, some other steps will have to be taken to bring it most forcibly to Your Honour's attention that the high functions of your office appear to be lending themselves to encroachment; and particularly in this Human Rights Week, it is an encroachment and infringement of the rights of the Minority Group in this House to have summoned a meeting under these circumstances.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS and Mr. HOPPIN rose.

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

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Speaker, it is a matter.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what is the hon. member speaking? Is it a point of order?

Mr. HOPPIN: On a point of order, I have heard the hon. member speaking about the meeting of this House and that it is of no importance. I can assure him that it is of much more importance than he thinks, because there are people who are awaiting the decisions made at this particular meeting. Only yesterday disaster nearly occurred at one of the Government Departments, the Housing Authority, because people were expecting loans, and if some of those members who were here in the precincts of the House yesterday had turned up and allowed us to have a meeting, these people would have been able to know what had taken place. Therefore I see the importance of this meeting.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, is that a point of order on which the hon. member has risen?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not deem the latter part of that a point of order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in view of what the hon. Mover of this, whether you call it a point of order or otherwise, has said, I am not suggesting he is out of order because I think it is most appropriate that at a special meeting you should call attention to the fact that it is unnecessary; but in view of the fact that I am being quoted as having suggested a change which

was agreed on, the original Rule that the request of a Minister depended on the discretion of the Speaker - it is said that when these Rules were revised - as Your Honour is aware, they were nothing compared with the vast amount of Rules that existed twenty-eight years or so ago - if I cut out "at the discretion of the Speaker", it could only have been that it was superfluous if the word "may" was in, which is the Standing Order at present. The Speaker may agree to summon a special meeting. That is the chief thing that caused me to rise to my feet.

The other point is that I agree with the hon. junior member of St. Peter. I used to attack the Leader of the House in very strong language, as hon. members know over and over again here on the floor of the House, but hon. members must have noticed that in recent sessions I have not been attacking him; but I do wish to add to what the member for St. Peter said. This special meeting should not take place, and some of those that have taken place, today's included, should not take place on two grounds. As the hon. member puts it, it should be something like an emergency that causes you, after the House has decided on a special date for its session, to have an earlier date. My second objection is this: anything that is pressing, God knows the Government should know before-hand and have had it before the House last Tuesday. We could sit until midnight and finish it. This is, to my mind, to draw attention to the fact that members may be opposed to a special session. It is pure politics - like what I call the nasty article that appeared in the *Advocate* this morning - the suggestion that the members of the Opposition did not have the interest of the country at heart and therefore did not cause a session yesterday.

I repeat, the Government knew it was necessary to get here, in an appropriate time for a Christmas bonus, what they were bringing today. The other things are just stupid. To suggest that you want a special meeting for the other things is sheer nonsense, and therefore it is not any point blaming the Opposition as the *Advocate* purports to do this morning, for the fact that there was an abortive meeting yesterday. I would like just to remind the *Advocate* that when there was something of extreme public interest when the Minister of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union were quarrelling over wages and the Opposition had a Resolution to be debated as to what should be done to appoint an arbitrator to have that settled, members of the Government stood up outside and prevented a quorum. They did not get here late; they were here and they purposely stood out. The *Advocate* does not mention that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, so far as the newspaper is concerned of which I have not yet seen a copy today, that does not seem to me to come within the point of order. That may well be dealt with in the Law Courts; I do not know.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I take it that this is not exactly a point of order. This is a comment by the hon. junior member for St. Peter on

the fact that we are meeting today when we should not be meeting, and that Your Honour allowed it on that ground. After all, I have not been in this House, as I had to remind the House before, for some thirty years without even learning; if I did not know beforehand, what is the proper procedure and what is not. But I do wish to point out that there is no necessity to bring the House back except in an emergency. I have to apologise. I did tell Your Honour one day - I do not remember who was present, but some other person was present - that Your Honour's hands were tied, and that if a Minister asked, you could not help yourself; but I did not then remember the actual wording of the Standing Order, and therefore I apologise if I have misled anybody; but Your Honour has a discretion. (ASIDES) The crude, bad manners of the hon. member opposite who constantly sits in his chair and interrupts hon. members is not going to stop me. Some day he may learn that his crude interruptions do not really matter.

10.30 a.m.

I have risen to support all that the hon. junior member for St. Peter has said, and I hope that in future we will not be called upon to attend a meeting to discuss matters which the Government could have brought down in the normal way in the week before.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I remind hon. members that the Standing Orders are now in process of revision by a Committee of this House?

PAPERS LAID

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 8) Order, 1968.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 8) Order, 1968.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$21,837 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, Part I-Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69, No. 52 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$35,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, Part I-Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69, No. 55 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$506,736 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, Part II-Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69, No. 51, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$2,547 at

the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, Part I-Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 54 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. junior member for St. Thomas risen on a point of order?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I was on a point of order - a legitimate point of order, too. I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

A Resolution to place the sum of \$95,949 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69 Part I-Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 53 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, using the phrase which was used by the hon. member who has just sat down, on a legitimate point of order. We have been summoned here today and told that it is for the transaction of the following Government Business. Why is the Government giving notice of Bills or reading Bills for the first time and they did not set it out here? We have come here thinking that what is set down here is going to be done, and then we hear these other Orders. What is wrong in setting them down here so that we may come here, knowing that notice is going to be given of certain Bills? It gives us more time for one thing, because we may not get the printed copies of the Orders which are being given for three or four days. It helps us.....

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out that there is ample precedent in this Chamber in respect of a Special Meeting, for Notices to be given on that day, but nothing may be discussed *apropos* to those Notices. For instance, I have on my Order Paper over a dozen Notices to be given by an hon. member of the Opposition, and that is entirely in order *(Laughter)*.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Those Notices have been handed in to the Clerk; they are not given for today.

Mr. SPEAKER: But they are on my Order Paper for today.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Because the Clerk puts them on the Order Paper.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Bills:-

A Bill to provide retiring allowances, on a contributory basis, to persons who have served as legislators, to provide allowances for the widows of such persons and to provide for matters connected with or incidental to the foregoing purposes.

A Bill to provide pensions for persons who have served as Prime Ministers and the widows and children of such persons, and to provide for matters connected with or incidental to such purposes.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to provide for the membership of Barbados in the Inter-American Development Bank.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the Money Resolutions of which notice has been given earlier today.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. and learned senior member for St. Thomas. I observe that the hon. member is not instantly in his place. I will give him leave, if he comes in later today, to give notice of those Questions.

REPORTS OF SELECT COMMITTEES PRESENTED

Mr. SPEAKER: I beg to present, as Chairman of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill respecting Income Taxes, the Report of that Select Committee.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill intituled an Act to provide for the establishment of a Provident Fund out of which prescribed benefits may be paid to sugar workers and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to provide for the membership of Barbados in the Inter-American Development Bank, be now read a first time.

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

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

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the following Bills were read a first time.

A Bill to provide retiring allowances, on a contributory basis, to persons who have served as legislators, to provide allowances for the widows of such persons and to provide for matters connected with or incidental to the foregoing purposes.

A Bill to provide pensions for persons who have served as Prime Ministers and the widows and children of such persons, and to provide for matters connected with or incidental to such purposes.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. George be appointed as Chairman of Committees (Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: for the remainder of the Session) - for this day's sitting.

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

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

10.40 a.m.

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.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: 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. HOPPIN in the Chair.

A Resolution for \$2,741.00 was called.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69, No. 44

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, as the Addendum sets out, supplementary provision of \$2,741.00 is required under Head 34 - Ministry of Communications and Works, Item 125 (New) Transport Inspection Shed, to settle an outstanding debt in respect of a steel frame building which was purchased on 29th March for the purpose of extending and enclosing the Inspectors' shed at the Department of Highways and Transport. The steel frame was delivered to the Public Works Department in July, 1966.

Funds were provided for the purpose in the 1966-67 Estimates under Head 30 - Public Works, Item 43 - Highways and Transport Inspection Shed, but payment was not made to the suppliers during the financial year 1966-67.

The erection of the building has, however, been deferred as a result of the integration of the Works Departments and the Ministry and proposals under consideration to relocate the Inspectors' Office.

The reason for this, as I have said, Mr. Chairman, is that sometimes we get these tenders supplying us with the necessary things that we want, but at times the bills do not come in early enough. Sometimes things are purchased through the Crown Agents; they pay for them, and then we have to reimburse them. That is why we are now asking for this re-vote of \$2,741.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister will be willing to explain if in line 4 of the Addendum where it is stated that the building was purchased on the 29th March, 1966, if he really does not mean that it was ordered on that date, but that delivery was made in July, 1966. Undoubtedly, there should be some cost involved in the erection of the building. I feel the Minister will be able to let us know the cost of erecting this building.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I said, and I am sure it is in the Addendum, that the erection of the building has been deferred. If the hon. member would look at 3 of his Addendum he would see:

"As a result of the integration of the Works Department and the Ministry and proposals under consideration to relocate the Inspectors' Office...."

The building has not yet been erected; so there will be no cost.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister said at line 4 that the frame was purchased on the 29th March, but that delivery was made in July. Who did the purchasing? Do you mean that purchase was made in March, but that it was not delivered until July? If you had purchased it on the 29th March, 1966, you had ample time during the 1966-67 or 1967-68 Estimates to make provision for it.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, a steel-framed prefabricated building was ordered by the Public Works Department for a Vehicle Inspection Shed for £571 or \$2,740.80. A Bill of Lading and Warrant were sent for delivery ex "S. S. Novelist" from the Bridgetown Harbour in July, 1966, and was billed by us on the 4th July, 1966. It was ordered in March, Mr. Chairman.

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

A Resolution for \$3,000 was called.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69 No. 46

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, Resolution No. 46 stands in my name for the sum of \$3,000 in respect of office equipment and furniture for an Assistant Secretary in the Ministry of External Affairs. I am sorry; I meant furniture rather than office equipment. The item is Item 33 - Furniture and Office Equipment, but the request is in respect of furniture only for one of the Lettings at the Garrison.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

10.50 a.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69 No. 48

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution, No. 48, stands in my name and is for the sum of \$23,150. This is in respect of Overtime, Books and Stationery, Travelling and Refunds in the Customs Department.

The Addendum clearly sets out the reason for the request for the Supplementary Estimate. In so far as overtime is concerned, it is a result of the increase in the tourist traffic at Seawell which has demanded an increase of staff, and therefore we have to pay increased overtime to the staff. The books, stationery, travelling and refunds are all self-explanatory.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, some time ago I drew the attention of this House to a state of affairs that had been existing at the Customs Department where members of the Customs staff were required to travel out to Seawell, and were not being paid a travelling allowance for the travelling they did; but their payments were made up by giving the officer or officers concerned overtime pay instead of a payment for travelling, and the officers found out that income tax deductions were being made from their overtime, whereas they would have been exempted had they been paid travelling allowance for the travelling they were doing. I well remember the Leader of this House denying at that time the existence of such a state of affairs, but within less than forty-eight hours after I had made my statement on the floor of this House and the Minister denied it, the Comptroller of Customs received a directive that this state of affairs should be corrected forthwith. I am to enquire if this sum to pay travelling allowance is going to cover those officers for travelling, and I would like to be told if the overtime allowance is really for overtime work and not an attempt to perpetuate a system which has meant some loss to the officers involved in carrying out these duties. If they have been travelling, the officers want to be paid for travelling and not overtime, because they lose money out of overtime by way of income tax.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As Chairman, I have given ample time. There was no Minister of the Government Bench giving his intention to answer. Can we delay the House all the time awaiting answers when none is forthcoming?

Mr. HINDS: I feel, Mr. Chairman, that as a member of this House I am entitled to some sort of reply from a Minister. I am not here putting my own case; I am putting the case of Civil Servants who have been made to suffer through no fault of their own. They receive a telephone message directing them, after they go home, to go to Seawell. The officers comply, and in doing so they find that they work and lose money by doing it. The officers complained to me and I have brought the matter to the House. I feel it is a matter which, as I said, the Leader of the House denied was in existence when it did exist. I am sure he has since discovered that he was wrong on that occasion, and I am merely enquiring now if we are not being faced now with overtime money to pay for what—really and truly is not overtime, but involves travelling for these officers. I would also like to know if any steps have been taken, since this matter was drawn to the House's attention on a previous occasion, to correct the situation where these officers are concerned.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: What the hon. member who has just sat down has asked is whether overtime is overtime and travelling is travelling. The answer is "yes"; but I would like to suggest to public servants that if they have any complaints, the proper place to address their complaints is the Public Service Commission. What the Minister was pointing out on that occasion was that he had no knowledge. But the Minister is not in charge of Customs; he is the Leader of the House.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, on that occasion the Minister denied the existence of it, not that he did not have knowledge of it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: It depends on what you mean by "deny".

Mr. HINDS: Two hon. members are on their feet, Mr. Chairman. I rose on a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: But I was on my feet before you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us conduct this meeting properly. Please take it easy. The hon. member's point has been made.

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

Mr. CRAIG entered the Chamber and took his seat.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69 No. 47

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, this morning when I came in here, just as we were about to start, hon. members on the other side said they did not see any need to bring them back here today. I know all of us have something to do, today being Saturday, and all of us would like to get out to do our shopping and so on; but to prove the importance, as

you have pointed out, Mr. Chairman, in your reply, of this meeting, there may be thousands of people who would be dependent on the outcome of this Resolution. This is why we considered this to be a matter of public interest. A hungry man can be a desperate man, and I do not want to see people for Christmas not getting their Christmas loans and having to go without pork, because salt-fish is too expensive. I would like everybody to enjoy Christmas.

The Ministry's Approved Road Works Programme for 1968-69 is nearing completion, and it will be necessary to commence work on additional projects in the near future if the Ministry's labour force is not to be dislocated or displaced. What I am asking for, Mr. Chairman, I will read out so that hon. members on the opposite side will know that they will get a stroke off the pump, and therefore they would not be objecting to people from their constituencies getting a "berry", as the hon. senior member for St. Joseph always says, and they would not be giving out of their pockets the Christmas presents they would normally have to give out if the people are not working. Subsidiary Roads: St. Michael - Applegrove, Black Rock - \$11,679.68; Pine Gardens, East-West - \$11,026; Christ Church: Inch Marlowe - \$7,132.71; St. Philip: Content Cot - \$13,073.91; Sealy Hall, Merricks - \$9,089.99. This is how the money was spent. Industry Hall - \$10,236.58. I do not know if I must go right through for hon. members' benefit, but I am only trying to show the expenditure. In St. John: Four Roads, in the vicinity of lands owned by S.P.G. - \$13,177.60. I am sorry the hon. junior member for St. John is not here.

11.00 a.m.

In St. James, Church Gap, Orange Hill, \$12,434.19. So the hon. senior member for St. James will be almost living up in Orange Hill, I assume. (Asides) But he will be telling people that he did the road; but I will be in Orange Hill more often than he, and so I will be telling them "No". Highway 6, the Pine. Those of us who pass the Pine, East-West road - that is, the Pine Hill - will notice that we have moved back the wall which was really cumbersome to everybody who is passing there. It was treacherous, and we have made some improvements there. The junction of Rendezvous Corner, \$18,300, to complete the bridge. Highway 5, Waterford to Hothersal Turning \$17,900. Ellerton St. George, \$15,200, making a total of \$51,400. Cave Hill to White Hall junction - those who pass Cave Hill would realise what a bad state of disrepair it was in - \$30,000. Bryan Road to Welchman Hall, St. Thomas, Gamble Hill St. James - St. James comes in again. When the other people were in power, I know that Frank Walcott suffered disastrously to get anything done in St. Peter, but we do not run a Government like that. Whether you vote for us or not, you are a Barbadian and therefore you are entitled to some of the facilities of this country. That makes a total of \$53,458.83.

Construction of sidewalk along the Wharf opposite the Treasury Building; that will cost us \$4,300. Completion of Harte Street \$1,000. I notice that since we have done Harte Street and made it possible for

buses, everybody is parking even on top of the sidewalk. Therefore, we have made a sidewalk for parking too. Construction of sidewalks on Highway 6, that is, Collymore Rock from the Pine North-South junction to Brittons Hill junction. Those of us who pass Collymore Rock will see the workmen busy at work even today making somewhere for people to walk so that we would not be in the road of these mammoth buses, trucks and what have you, that traverse that area. That makes a total of \$35,300. Funds are available to meet the cost of projects to be undertaken under the Additional Works and the Highway Improvement Programme, but supplementary provision will be required to meet the cost of projects under the Subsidiary Roads and the Rehabilitation Programmes. The sum of \$149,500 is provided in the 1968-69 Estimates under Head 102 - Communications and Works - Item 6, Subsidiary Roads, to meet the cost of road construction and reconstruction of residential areas. The amount was a revote of the unexpended balance under this Item at the end of the financial year 1967-68. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that I need burden the Committee with any more of this information, but if there is anything which hon. members on the opposite side would like to know, I will be willing to answer them. I beg to move that this Resolution for \$111,400. do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69 No. 49

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER SOURCES ADDITIONAL MAINS AND STANDPOSTS

A Resolution for the sum of \$532,200 was called.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, as hon. members on the opposite side will see, there are two Items or two votes dealing with the Waterworks in this Resolution. I am going to make one statement covering the two Items, but if there are any questions which hon. members raise, I will answer them. The Addendum to the Resolution sets out that "It is essential that the work which has been going on in connection with the development of water resources at Applewhaites, Alleynedale and Hampton should be continued in order that the water shortages which are being experienced in the higher elevations of the Island may be relieved and the developments predicted for St. Philip and Christ Church may be commenced." Hon. members on the other side know, as well as I do, that the water which we use here and which is one of the best systems in the world, comes from underground. We are dependent on the rainfall. We sink wells in certain areas of the Island and those wells produce water. Then we pump the water from these wells into reservoirs. Why I am mentioning this is because the hon. junior member for St. Peter said before the House went into session today that he did not see that this matter is urgent. This is urgent because it means that if we do not have this money for these people, they will be out of work. As a matter of fact, I have been told that some people are out of work

now. Mr. Chairman, it was deplorable yesterday - I know that it is the duty of the Government to form a quorum. We all know that, but it is also the duty of the Opposition to help the Government, not to try for every little thing to think that they can bring down the Government. As I have told them already, they are not going to get the Government until election time, if the people so think fit. What you have done yesterday has caused us, or it has given us grist for the mill because we can always tell the people that you did not have their interest at heart. (Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Stick to the Resolution.) Here it was, we had eight people (Mr. HINDS: You are inviting trouble.) I know that you are inviting trouble. We will always invite trouble. I have come from Golgotha; I am not a Barbadian like you. (Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Stick to the Resolution.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Hon. Minister please continue?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You want me to stick to the Resolution? All right. As I was telling the hon. senior member for St. Thomas only last Tuesday about the water situation in Barbados, I went to the Virgin Islands and I will say that we, in Barbados, are rather fortunate at the moment, because we still have, despite the fact that it is becoming depleted, one of the best water systems in the world - at least the purest, if not the most. This money which we are asking hon. members to vote here today will enable us to bring in the pumps to Alleyndale, St. Lucy, to supply the reservoir at Warleigh, which is in St. Peter, and it will also allow us to bring in the pumps to Applewhaite to supply the reservoir at Cave Hill, because we will be pumping the water from there over to Cave Hill. We also have apparatus at Molyneux which we will be bringing in, so that we are expecting that when we get through with this Resolution, even if we will not have a Utopia in water, a lot of people, the majority, will be more contented than they are today. That is the reason why I consider this Resolution to be extremely urgent. It is extremely urgent for two good reasons. In the first place, it is finding work for people, and in the second place, it is putting water into people's homes. Water is a necessity today. It is not like twenty years ago, when bathing was something which was done once a month. Everybody is taking a bath twice a day and sometimes three times a day. We all know this and therefore I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.
11.10 a.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to detain the House very much longer on this matter. I know that it is regarded as a joke when a representative talks about water conditions in his parish, especially when he talks about them often on every Resolution. I feel that in many cases a representative has to talk about the water conditions in his parish often, because I do not believe that the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Communications and Works ever reads the *Official Gazette*. Unless you want to ask questions over and over again, the

only way you can get it home is by impressing it on the Minister constantly so that he can stir up his officials.

The Minister mentioned that we had a conversation about water, and I would like to thank him for some very enlightening facts he gave me in general on Tuesday. I still want to impress that there are parts of St. Thomas for which the new reservoir at Lodge Hill was supposed to supply a better water service; but it has not improved the water service in those places at all. Clermont is an area being built up, and persons I know in Clermont who sought the advice of the Waterworks as to whether they should put in roof tanks because the water supply was so bad were then advised not to do it and to save the \$900.00, or whatever it was, because the water supply would soon be improved. They say that the supply is worse than ever now. I ask the Minister, particularly, to look at Clermont as a new area, and to look at the old suffering areas like Shop Hill, Christie Village, Grand View and even Redman's Village when he is organising these new water mains.

Mr. Chairman, before I sit down, I would just like to say this about the Minister's argument about the Opposition holding up the passage of this Resolution, and about how if it is not passed, the people would not get money. We can well remember, Mr. Chairman, the extremely stormy scene in this House in which the Prime Minister was introducing a Resolution and the two hon. members for St. Joseph asked if some of the money had not already been spent in advance of the Resolution. The Prime Minister, in the course of a speech at the very end, after some storms, admitted that some of the money had, indeed, been spent before the House had passed it.

Well, if what I take the Minister of Communications to be saying now is that the Resolution has to be passed or otherwise the people will be out of work, than I must congratulate him in putting the financial affairs of his Ministry in order so that the accountants have made their minds up that no money must be paid out until the House of Assembly says so. I must congratulate the Minister where that is concerned, if that really is the problem involved in this Resolution.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69 No. 50

A Resolution for \$285,362 was called.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, here I am again on the same subject like a recurring decimal. As I have mentioned all of this before and it is set out in the Addendum, I do not know if it is necessary for me to repeat myself like a record. In the Addendum, there is something which I should like hon. members to take note of and it is Item 32. I refer to Pumping - \$674,000. The Addendum states:-

"The rainfall during the year has been very sparse. Because the pumps have had to be in operation at maximum output for long periods, a

high consumption of electricity has resulted. Supplementary provision of \$200,000 is therefore required to meet the cost of electricity up to the end of the current financial year."

As I said before, I had a discussion on this matter with the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. We pump something like 16.5 million gallons of water per day. But to a population of 250,000 people, if you calculate it you will see that too much water is being used. Quite a number of people have pipes with faucets leaking, they do not report the matter, and they do not worry to turn the pipes off. Here is where the Opposition can help the Government by turning off the pipes when they see them leaking, by reporting the matter to the Waterworks or directly to me.

(Laughter)

I have known of an incident, Mr. Chairman, where a woman claimed that, because the Housing Authority asked her to pay her rent, she opens her pipe and allows the water to run into the sink every night. I am praying to God that one of these nights the sink will be blocked up and she will get drowned. This is a small community and we do not want to desalinate water for the consumption of the community. Let us try to conserve water. People laugh when I say these things, but a time will come when some of us will be glad to see a tin cup of water instead of the bucket full that we are now getting.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we are willing to admit that water services to homes are on the increase, and that the additional expenditure being asked for might be necessary. My main point is that, since we are now serving more people, some provision should be made by the Waterworks Department to remove the hardship created for people in the distant parts of the Island having to travel to Bridgetown to pay their water rates.

We feel that the time has come, since the services have increased throughout the Island, that some provision could be made in the North or South, or at the Post Offices, where the water rates could be paid so as to relieve people from having to travel to Bridgetown to the main office to pay their water rates. We are hoping that some consideration will be given to this.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On these two Resolutions, hon. members will notice that there is nearly \$1 million. I thought that someone would question why I came for a Supplementary Estimate of \$1 million half-way through the year. If members will reflect, they will remember that at the time we discussed the Capital Estimates I pointed out that, in order not to hold up the introduction of the Estimates into the House, I had given instructions that the Capital submissions should be on a caretaker basis, and that later on in the year, when we made a complete appraisal of the Capital requirements within the time

limit that we would have to carry out the programme, we would come here for the full Capital requirements for the financial year. That is why we have these Supplementary provisions.

I would not like any member either on this side or that side to say that, because I am giving back \$1 million income tax and we have \$1 1/2 million in Capital Estimates here today alone, it is a big lot of money and we can be careless and throw away the money. Particularly, I would like to suggest to the people in the Public Service that they should be a little more careful about the way they waste time, and money is being spent.

I just want to tell hon. members this, and I think this is an appropriate time to make the statement. Starting off the year with a deficit of \$5.6 million, and then introducing Budgetary Proposals to cover approximately half of this amount, members would want to know where I am going to get \$1 million out of the Current Estimates to give back to taxpayers this year. That is why I want the Bill which we are going to deal with next introduced.

I want to say that I have discovered that from time immemorial the Public Works Department have been purchasing goods in Bridgetown, and that the taxpayers in this Island as a collective body have not been given the concessions by the firms that you, as an individual, Mr. Chairman, or any visitor coming to this Island will get. Let me explain to you what is happening. We may be spending between \$15 and \$23 million a year in Bridgetown alone in purchases. Under ordinary circumstances, if you spend \$15 million you should get at least - I say "at least" advisedly - a 10% discount of \$1.5 million. I have discovered that only in Speightstown the firms - I do not know if this is due to the blandishments of the hon. junior member for St. Peter - have been giving the Government a discount. Now, this means that that is \$1 1/2 million that somebody is getting, or that the firms have been retaining what the Government should be getting. I have given instructions this week that no purchases should be made from any firm in Barbados unless a minimum discount of 10% is given.

11.20 a.m.

I want to say that for the quantities that we buy we ought to be getting between 25% and 30% discount and not 10% alone. Now this is a very serious matter. I think that the Chamber of Commerce is completely and utterly dishonest with the taxpayers of this Island.

Now when I queried the Accountant at the Public Works Department about this, the explanation that I was given was that the Government could not pay their bills in thirty days, and therefore discounts were only for people who paid bills within 30 days. This is so much eye-wash for this reason: first we come here to the House and approve the Estimates. That means you have legal authorisation to spend money. The Estimates are gone through by the Estimates Committee over a period of three or four months. Once the House has approved that that money can be spent, no Civil Servant or anybody else can say that it could not

be spent. The next thing is that you introduce a requisition to incur expenditure at the time when you are ready to carry out a project, whether it is building a school or repairing a road. That requisition to incur expenditure has to go through the Technical Officers, then through the Permanent Secretary, the Minister, and it has to be signed by the Financial Secretary and it has got to be signed by me as Minister of Finance.

If our cash position is such in any one week that we do not have, let us say, this \$1 1/2 million we are voting today, I would have to reserve the right not to sign the R.I.E. until I was satisfied that there was money in the Treasury which I check daily with the Accountant General. This is the position. Therefore, after my signature goes on an R.I.E., the next step is that a Local Purchase Order is made out for materials. My signatures indicate that you have approval to spend the money that the Legislature has voted, and that the money is there. You then make out your Local Purchase Order and that Local Purchase Order is taken to a firm. It is made out in more than one copy; it is made out in triplicate or quadruplicate. Immediately on receipt of the Local Purchase Order, the people who receive that L.P.O. have a right to go to the Treasury the same day, because the House has approved the expenditure, and I have certified that money is available, and cash that L.P.O.

Now if the firms do not do this, this is their fault; but I want to be brutally frank here today. We have inherited a lot of malpractices in this Government, and what is happening is that the firms may very well pay out 10% or 15% that they have not been paying out to the taxpayers, and I make a frank statement about that. So when they are instructing me that they could not pay their bills in 30 days, I say that Government bills must be paid in 30 days. There are some bills outstanding in the Ministry of Education for seven years, and that kind of nonsense - over \$20,000. When we came in, we found bills that have not been paid up to today. Why have they not been paid? The people have sent in these old-fashioned bills, and the Hon. Leader of the House, when he was in the Ministry of Education, asked them for particulars, and they said it was so long ago they could not remember what they were in respect of. Most of them, of course, are in respect of travel for Civil Servants to the United Kingdom. Now it is time that some of these people were told and the general public knew what was going on in this country. I say to the Chamber of Commerce that anyone from whom goods are ordered, the funds having been approved by the Legislature, approved by the Minister of Finance, certified by the Accountant General and everybody else, should be paid on the same day or the day after the goods have been ordered. There is no reason on earth at all why they should not be, because if there was no money in the Treasury, it is not the Public Works Department to say whether there is money in the Treasury; it is for the Minister of Finance acting on the Accountant General's advice. They do not know what the cash position in London or Barbados is. The Accountant General, the Finan-

cial Secretary and I are the only people in Government who know; therefore, if I put my signature on a R.I.E., the people should be paid - and they should be paid the same day.

If for reasons best known to these Bridgetown merchants and the Civil Servants concerned they do not want the bills paid in 30 days, I am saying they must be paid in 30 days; and whether you present a bill for payment in 30 days or not, we are not dealing with any people supplying goods and services in Barbados, goods particularly, unless the Government gets at least a cash discount that any member of the public in Broad Street would get. So if you want to know where I am going to get my \$1 1/2 million from, it is from that source, and who cannot accept those terms will be ceasing to do business with this Government. Too many bungalows have been built by foremen at Public Works out of this iniquitous system. I am making a statement. In your parish alone, Mr. Chairman, I can point out eleven between Flat Rock and Salters - nothing to do with those up by the quarry leading out to Todds. This is pure, unadulterated robbery with violence and I am accusing the Chamber of Commerce of robbing the taxpayers of this Island. I want to commend the Speightstown firms, and I hope the hon. junior member for St. Peter will convey the thanks of the public of Barbados - because the Speightstown firms alone are the people who have been giving the taxpayers of this Island their just due. We had a gentleman at Combermere School, a groundsman who used to come around and say "Christmas is over". I want to tell all the merchants in Bridgetown that that kind of Christmas has come to an end and the spree is over; the party is over; so let us get down to business.

Mr. CRAIG Mr. Chairman, there is only a small point which I would like to make out of the Prime Minister's speech. He said that the Speightstown firms give 10 per cent, but he feels that the Government should get 25 per cent or as much as 30 per cent.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: What I was explaining to the hon. member was this: that in the kind of quantities that the Government purchases, any private contractor buying in these quantities could get up to 25 per cent and 30 per cent. In the furniture trade, it is up to 40 per cent that architects and contractors get if they are furnishing a hotel or something like that. I have that down on paper. Mind you, I am not saying that if you sent into town and bought three gallons of paint that you should get more than 10%, 15% or 20% or 25% or 30%; but when we are spending \$2 million on steel for instance, I do not see any reason why we should not get 30 per cent, buying in bulk.

Mr. CRAIG: I thank the Prime Minister very much, but this brings me to this point: the Bridgetown merchants must have a very high mark-up on their goods overall. If they can give contractors as much as 25% and 30%, I think it is within the duty of Government to make sure that the Bridgetown merchants give it not only when they import goods for the purpose of building homes and so on; but the en-

tire cost of living of the country is too high and I firmly believe that this is due to the high mark-ups by many of these firms in Bridgetown. I hope that the Prime Minister will take into account when he is saying that the Christmas spree is over that it would not be only for paints and lumber, but for foodstuffs and everything else, the cost of which is crippling the entire community, because the cost of living is high. I am looking forward eagerly to the Prime Minister closing down these sprees which I myself know many of the Bridgetown firms get not only at Christmas time, but all through the year. That is the point I wanted to make.

Mr. HINDS: Just a small point, Mr. Chairman, I heard the Prime Minister say how merchants apparently are reluctant to have their bills paid and so on. Now I am satisfied, and I have had my own experience on this, that the processing of vouchers contribute in great measure to the long delay, and I would be glad if the Prime Minister as Minister of Finance would give instructions and increase perhaps his number of voucher clerks to make sure that you have the staff to cope with the demands from the merchants, as the case may be. I am satisfied that there are times when to get a small voucher you have to know some person in the Treasury or somewhere to attend to it; otherwise somebody cannot find it, though it was submitted for so many and so many days; it has come from the Ministry, and then they have to get their delivery book and check it and nobody can trace where vouchers are.

11.30 a.m.

This is something which needs to be looked into - the processing of vouchers to expedite the payment of these bills.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I will investigate the processing of the vouchers, but I should just like to point out to the hon. member something which he must know from his experience as a member of the House. He must know that the processing of vouchers is not really a matter to hold up the Accountant General's Department. We know from our experience here in the House that it is rather the servants or agents who hold up the processing of the vouchers. Once the vouchers get into the Treasury, you can get paid almost in five minutes, but the trouble is that they do not get into the Treasury.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to the Committee to sit again.

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

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

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

INCOME TAX BILL

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that Order No. 5 be taken as the next Order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. and Learned Prime Minister is asking leave to take Order No. 5 as the next Order of the Day, and unless there is any objection leave will be granted. *(After a Pause)* There being no objection, leave is granted.

The next Order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister: - To move the third reading of a Bill respecting Income taxes.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, a Select Committee was appointed by Your Honour on the 3rd December, this year, and that Select Committee has reported. I beg to move that the Report of the Select Committee which sat on the 5th and the 7th December, 1968, respectively, and whose Report has been signed by Your Honour as Chairman, be now adopted. There is one slight amendment which I hope hon. members will accept, and it is in respect of Clause 31 of the Bill. It was not really convenient to re-summon a meeting of the Select Committee on this matter since it was a very slight amendment. You will see in Clause 31 on page 40 Subsection (c) that in calculating the taxable income of an individual for an income year, premiums which the individual has paid in respect of insurance policies may be deducted from the assessable income of this individual. And then in Sub-Clause (a) they state that "in the case of any one policy an amount not exceeding 7% of the capital sum assured on death be in total, the amount equal" - this is the maximum which can be deducted - "an amount equal to one-sixth of the assessable income of that individual for that income year."

11.40 a.m.

or

- (c) in total, an amount that would cause the tax assessed on that individual for that income year to be reduced by more than 30 per cent....."

It reads "28 per cent in the original Bill, but the Select Committee recommended that it should be "30 per cent". The reason why that was done is that hon. members will see, from the new tax Schedule which I have introduced as a Christmas present to hon. members and the 23,000 other taxpayers of this Island on this year's assessment, we are giving back approximately \$1 million in tax relief, if I should call it so.

The rates have been adjusted to multiples of 5, with the exception of the lowest rate which is 3 per cent on assessable incomes up to \$500, and in the new Schedules which I could read out now, Sir, and which hon. members were given last week, the rates have been reduced in each successive grouping up the 75 per cent rate, or the people who are earning up to

\$24,000 per annum. The new rates are 5 per cent whereas it was 6 per cent from \$500 to \$1,000, and then 10 per cent from \$1,000 to \$2,000. Where it was 16 per cent before, it is now 15 per cent; where it was 22 per cent it is now 20 per cent; where it was 28 per cent it is now 25 per cent.

Now in Sub-Clause (c) of Clause 31 we did not bring it down to 25 per cent, because it would be against the interest of the taxpayer, but we pushed it up from 28 per cent to 30 per cent so that the taxpayer could actually deduct more. If you look again, Sir, at the way in which the Clause is worded, the computation would be rather difficult, if not strenuous, for the average taxpayer to work out 28 per cent or 30 per cent of the deductions. It gives a considerable amount of trouble, and some members of the Committee, including myself, had to confess that sometimes you would have to get an accountant to do this calculation for you; so any savings you may get you might probably have to pay over to the accountant.

What we have decided now, Sir - and I think that some members of the Committee have suggested it, and I looked into it and made some calculations to see how much money I would lose. I might gain otherwise if I had this kind of insurance. We considered that a figure of \$1,300 should be substituted instead of a percentage basis, which means that, since we now have self-assessment, the person making out his income tax return would not have to spend a long time making calculations on what 28 per cent or 30 per cent of his assessable income is, because his assessable income may be in dispute.

Administratively, this will relieve a lot of work in the Department of Inland Revenue, because the Clerical Officers there and the Inspectors would have to go and check back first the assessable income, and then calculate what 30 per cent of the assessable income would be to see the maximum deductions which should be made against that person's assessable income. You can see that this would involve nearly as much work as if people were not doing self-assessments, and if we were not accepting self-assessments for the purpose of paying in the first instalment of tax. We feel, if we have a flat figure, that a person is either paying this amount out in premiums or he is not. If he is paying out \$900 in premiums, he would not have to do any elaborate lot of calculations; he immediately takes off \$900 off the assessable income.

We are fixing now a maximum of \$1,300 under sub-Clause (c) of Clause 31. The amendment will now read as follows:

On page 41, Clause 31 (c) delete everything after the words "in total", delete five lines and the comma as well, and you insert the figures \$1,300."

It will now read:

"There shall be deducted from the assessable income of that individual the amount of premiums paid by that individual or paid by his wife during

a period when she was habitually living with him in respect of a policy of insurance on the life of that individual or his spouse not exceeding.....

(c) in total, \$1,300."

In other words, it is a straight deduction up to \$1,300, and it is alternative to (a) and (b), but in any case, in any event, it may not exceed \$1,300. I think that is a much more straightforward matter of dealing with this problem of insurance premiums than the percentage basis that we had before.

Mr. Speaker, if this is acceptable to the members of the Committee here present, I beg to move that it be inserted in the Report. On page 3 of the Report it should be: "delete all of the words after "total" in Clause 31 (c), in the first line, and add the figures "\$1,300."

I beg to move that the Report of the Select Committee be adopted with that amendment.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I beg to second that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is this the Third Reading of the Bill?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: No. It is a motion that the Report be adopted with an amendment by the insertion of \$1,300 in Clause 31 (c) and the deletion of certain words. It is the insertion of \$1,300 instead of a percentage basis for the deduction of premiums paid on insurance policies. It is easier and simpler.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is already seconded.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I think the Prime Minister knows that this is a point for which I pressed very hard in the Select Committee: that the computation involved in the old Section 31 (c) was so difficult that, as far as I can recall, nobody who was sitting around the table had been able to evolve a satisfactory method for himself in working it out. A member such as the hon. senior member for Christ Church, who had some idea how to do it, explained that he had to ring the Commissioner, after strenuously trying the first time he made out a return, to work it out, and the Commissioner had to explain exactly what the Section meant.

11.50 a.m.

Since we are having self-assessment, I could not agree more with the Prime Minister that you must make it simple for people to assess. You must make it possible for people to look at the form and understand what they are being asked to do, and the arithmetical computations under the old Section were much too difficult, Mr. Speaker, for people to appreciate. Even now I am not sure in my mind whether what we agreed at Select Committee in raising from 28% to 30% - was in fact an advantage to the taxpayer or not,

and I have been sitting down here for the last ten minutes trying to work out whether it is an advantage and I still have not been able to achieve it. I know there are some hon. members on this side who say that the Section was very simple to understand. I will give them all a little arithmetic problem in that Section, and if they can work it out before the end of the day, I will withdraw my seconding of this amendment. I know I cannot work it out, Mr. Speaker, and I am very happy indeed to second this amendment to the Report for the number of members on this side. (Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: That is not good enough.)

Mr. SPEAKER: May I say that I regard that seconding as irrevocable?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong the discussion, but the hon. member did raise the point and we all agreed with it, particularly those of us who had some nodding acquaintance with the law. I have had difficulty in not only interpreting the law, but actually constructing it; but the point is that I could not in Committee give the undertaking to change it, because I did not know the figure that I should change it to, as Your Honour will remember, and that is why I had to go and do some calculations to find out that we were not depriving the taxpayers or the Treasury of anything, and the figure of \$1,300 would represent what a person of the age of, say, 30 years with an insurance policy probably of \$50,000 or \$55,000, which I consider very generous, would pay in premiums on a life policy. I do not know if the hon. senior member for St. James can help me. I did not actually see any actuarial tables for this, but I calculated it based on my own experience; not that I have \$55,000 in insurance, but by simple process of multiplying by about 20 or 30, I was able to arrive at a figure of \$1,300.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I have to be very guarded in my language. For one thing, two of the most prominent members of the Barbados Labour Party, two barristers, were on this Select Committee, both probably having had in their professional.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would advise that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition at this stage of the motion, which has been moved by the Hon. Prime Minister and seconded by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, may speak with leave. Of course, there is always the third reading.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am sorry if I did not get up in time before the Hon. Prime Minister dealt with it. I say, Sir, I am being very guarded because here are two professional men both of whom doubtless at some time or other have had to advise on income tax. But I cannot appreciate.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that it is the feeling of the House that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has the leave of the House to speak at this stage. (PAUSE) Let the hon. member proceed.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: To tell the House that you cannot tell members whether 28 or 30 is the ap-

propriate figure leaves us where? What is the Commissioner's position? You cannot tell us which is more appropriate for the taxpayer; therefore you made it \$1,300!

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not think the hon. member understood. We have discarded the percentage basis, and we have substituted a flat figure.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On what is the hon. member speaking?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am sorry. On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member said on a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not think the hon. member understands what is going on. The Exhibition is up the road, not in here!

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The only exhibition is what the hon. member is doing. I have discussed it across the Table with the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. If you could not decide whether 28% or 30% is right, and then you fix an arbitrary figure of \$1,300, what are you doing? You are telling the public that you are guessing as far as that Section is concerned. And the hon. member has to jump up and interrupt as if I am the sort of village idiot he had to deal with among his colleagues every day! I say again I have to be guarded in my language. I was warm for a moment because, as I say, the hon. member was treating me as if he was treating one of his colleagues - low in the ranks of intelligence.

The hon. senior member for St. Thomas and the hon. senior member for Christ Church are members of the Barbados Labour Party and were members of the Select Committee. Both, as I am told - I cannot say I have seen them in practice - are eminent lawyers. (Laughter) I can well understand perhaps some laughter on the other side, but I cannot understand the Hon. Leader of the House laughing when he purported to have passed some Bar examination when he did not even join the Middle Temple. The point I am making, Sir, is this: it does not seem good enough, even though you may say I may be criticising members of the Select Committee from this Party, to say that you have not been able to decide whether 28% or 30% is good and therefore you fix it at \$1,300. That is a guess. All I intended to get up and say is that it would be far better to have postponed consideration of the Income Tax Bill and get the most expert advice on income tax outside of this Island - you could not get it here - and get that Section clarified. That is all I got up to say.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, by leave, I must explain because the hon. member did not appear to understand. Your Honour was Chairman of the Committee. I counted at one time seven barristers, and I presume they were all eminent, as the hon. member has said. I exclude myself because I

am not practising at the Bar. We all of us as Counsel did not like the way the section was drafted, but at the Committee we increased it from 28% to 30% to coincide with the new rate structure. I could not at that stage substitute a flat figure because I had no means in Committee of arriving at a figure which would do justice both to the taxpayer and would not deprive the Treasury of an unnecessary amount of revenue. I gave members the undertaking that I would look into it, which is exactly what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is accusing the Committee of not doing. We did not think of a number. The Committee appreciated my predicament and their own predicament, and allowed me to go away, and we did not convene a new meeting. I consulted the Canadian tax expert - which the hon. member has enjoined me to do, I consulted the Parliamentary draughtsman, I consulted my own mathematical wisdom, and I also had consultation with the Commissioner of Inland Revenue, and we all came up with approximately the same figure that \$1,300 would appear an equitable figure to substitute. There are no more experts to be consulted.

The question that the Report of the Select Committee as amended be now adopted was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not like to create any precedent on this, but I did not have the opportunity when we were reading the Bill the second time, and I am sure the Government will forgive me for just making this suggestion. I was going through the entire Civil Servants list together with the Bill, and I was worried about something. It might be too late now because all these things are done on a matter of computing figures, but not only with devaluation but with the cost of living today, it seems stupid to me now in the Bill to have an exemption of \$800 for a man - I do not know if the Prime Minister had thought of it - yet everybody working for \$60 a month must so make a return to the Income Tax Commissioner. It seems you could obviate a tremendous lot of work in the Income Tax office by having people working for \$60 a month in a day like today exempt from making a return, because they are liable to prosecution if they do not make it.

12.00

What domestic servant of any of us is not making \$60 a month, whether it is by way of salary and food, or whatever the case may be? I thought I would throw it out to the Prime Minister that to say that if you are earning \$60 a month you must make out a return - and if you are actually working under the P.A.Y.E. system, you are just hiring a man to do something that you know you are not getting anything out of. I am wondering if the Prime Minister ever thought that it would be better to raise that amount. To me it looks as if persons who are working for under \$100 a month in that walk of life, cannot live.

I do not want to hold up this matter, but I would just like to hear what the Prime Minister thinks about that. That has been represented to me by quite a lot of people - people like scavengers today are getting \$35 a week and the only reason why you are keeping this \$60 a month today is just to say that it is in there. I believe that domestic servants must earn more than that, and you know that they are not making any return. *(Asides)* I said that scavengers are making from \$35 to \$40 a week. I should just like to hear the views of the Prime Minister on the retaining of this \$60 a month.

I apologise for speaking on the third reading of this Bill because I am not accustomed to doing this; but I did not have the opportunity of speaking on the second reading and I just throw this out to hear how the Prime Minister would take it. I was going through the Civil List; you see a number of people in this office and the salaries they are working for, and what returns are you getting? It may be that if I had been here during the second reading of this Bill, I would have asked what it would cost us to raise this amount from \$60 a month to \$80 a month because today \$60 a month is nothing. In my opinion, nobody who is working for \$60 a month ought to make any return, but, according to the law, you can be prosecuted if you do not do it. I should like to hear the Prime Minister's views on that.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Before the Prime Minister replies, I should just like to place it on record, as so many people have asked me - I am not asking this because I am one of those who may be concerned. I have not made the slightest attempt to calculate whether it would profit me, whether it would be against me or otherwise; but so many persons have asked me why don't we agree to separate husbands' and wives' incomes that I am merely making this statement so that it would be on record and they would see that, at any rate, I have brought it to the attention of the House. Many people constantly ask this - they are at sea as to whether it would profit or not, and I repeat, lest it be thought that I am talking about myself, I have never for all of the years that I have been paying income tax, thought about it or asked anybody if it would pay me better in the present situation to have it changed; but I do want to put it on record.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the point raised by the hon. member who has just sat down was, of course, one of the criticisms which we, on this side of the House, have made of the Income Tax Laws of Barbados generally, and the criticism still stands. It is, of course, a political matter rather than a matter of mere obligation. I would certainly like to go on record with the political view. On one side the feeling is that there should continue to be a joint assessment of husband and wife whereas on the other side we feel that this matter should be reviewed. The present system places a premium on concubinage in that, after all, a man can live with a woman who is not his wife and both of them can live quite happily. He may, in fact, be drawing unknown to the Commissioner of In-

land Revenue a marriage allowance for a wife whom he does not live with. He and some other lady may be living together and both of them may have incomes in exactly the same position as a married couple, but they may be paying very substantially less tax. I do not think that there should be this financial penalty on the marriage state, but really most of what could be said was said, I think, in members' speeches on the second reading of the Bill.

This Act has made very few structural alterations to the Income Tax Law. It is only chipping - or it has only chipped - at the surface. It will be remembered, I suppose, chiefly for the fact that the rates were reduced so that the taxpayers who are earning a very great deal of money will get, I suppose, between \$900 and \$1,000 in rebates, but there has been no fundamental approach to the problem of tax collecting. That will have to wait, one hopes, for another day. In view of certain remarks which have been made in speeches on other matters during the course of the day, I am just going to say this. If, for seven years, the Government has known that it could save a million dollars or the Government should have known that it could save \$1 million in requiring discounts or obtaining discounts by paying its bills within thirty days, then these particular items of tax relief are long overdue for that reason as well as for the reason which I adduced on the second reading of the Bill.

In 1968, it is possible for the Prime Minister to give these concessions. He could have given them earlier by keeping a tighter hand on the Barbados Marketing Corporation and preventing them from throwing the taxpayers' money down the drain, and by preventing C.B.C. from wasting \$2 1/2 million of the taxpayers' money. If we think that we are getting something nice for Christmas in that those who have taxable incomes of more than \$20,000 a year will get \$900 in tax rebates, let us think of the tax rebates we could have got if the money had not been wasted in not paying the Government's bills in time and in wastage down at the B.M.C. - money thrown into the sea, and wastage out of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. This concession to taxpayers is long overdue and if the Government had kept a tighter financial rein on itself, if it had checked up on the accounts of the Ministry of Education, if it checked up on the Ministry of Communications and Works and if it checked up on all items of Government spending and not only the discount aspect of that, we could reasonably hope that next year we could see another \$1 million saved to taxpayers.

12.10 p.m.

Since the major part of the Bill seems to be to reduce taxes, that is our commentary on the reduction of taxes which is being effected.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I think that you have been very indulgent in allowing hon. members, on the Third Reading of the Bill, to start criticizing the Government on questions of policy. I only want to say this in reply to the hon. member: year after year, in my Budgetary Proposals, I have dealt

with the question of the joint assessment of husband and wife. What I have done from time to time is to increase the amount of the wife's earned income allowance which will be found under Section "(o)", and is now \$540.

The reason why we have not separated the wife's income from the husband's income is that there are several economic reasons for it. It could be argued that married women are keeping single women out of jobs. Quite apart from that, a wife does get an earned income allowance of \$540 which is added on to the \$1,400 that the husband and wife normally would be entitled to. What we have been trying to do from time to time is to grant more relief in this direction when we feel it is justified. Naturally, everyone would like to have the - including yourself now, I believe, Mr. Speaker - two things separated, but the cost to the Treasury would be really of a very high magnitude, indeed.

On the question raised by the hon. senior member for the City, under Division V - Returns of Income - everyone whose assessable income was over \$800 in the income year has to submit a return. There is nothing in the Act now that I can find about \$60 a month. (Mr. MOTTLEY: I am awfully sorry that I said \$60 a year. I just said that roughly.) There was a time when a man who worked for more than \$60 a month had to file a return. The reason why you do not file a return up to \$800 is that \$800 is the deduction which you are allowed as a single person. There is no point in anybody working for \$600 a year filing a return. Furthermore, if your tax works out - it is 3 percent in that bracket up to, say, \$1,300 - \$800 deduction and you had no other deductions; no children, dependents, insurance and so on, and you had \$500 above that, which would be \$1,300, you would then pay \$15 in tax. But there is a provision in this Bill that if your tax works out to less than \$1.50 you do not pay any tax at all. (ASIDES.) If you work for \$804.50 you will get off another \$1.50.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass and be cited as the Income Tax Act, 1968.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to ask leave that No. 2 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to proceed with No. 2 as the next Order of the Day. Unless there is any objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted and No. 2 becomes the instant Order of the Day. It stands in the name of the hon. and learned Prime Minister and it is to resume debate on a Resolution

to approve the lease to Sun Farms Limited of certain lands and buildings at Codrington, St. Michael.

When the debate on this matter was adjourned, the hon. senior member for the City had concluded his speech, and the hon. senior member for St. Andrew moved, seconded by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, that further consideration be postponed. The hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking at the moment of interruption. The hon. senior member for St. Peter may now continue.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LEASE OF LAND TO SUN FARMS LIMITED

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, at the moment of interruption I really had no new matter to inject into my speech at that stage. I should just like to recapitulate my contention that I was not convinced that this 74-acre plot of land which is supposed to be worked by Sun Farms Limited could employ 300 people, as we were told. We are very anxious to know if that is just a hazy promise held out by this Company, or if this Company has made a pledge to the Government, and that Government can guarantee that the number of 300 will really materialise.

As it is, we understand that this Company says it will employ 300 people on a 74-acre plot of land at Codrington. I want to know if the Government can give us more than ordinary assurance in this matter. In other words, is it put into the contract that this Company will be employing 300 people and not just in season? We feel that more than ordinary concessions already are proposed to be granted to this Company; so that the offer by the Company to employ 300 people - we believe that that offer convinced the Minister and put him in a position that he thought he could come here with confidence in order that we may pass this Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we would like to have it from the Minister's mouth that either the contract includes a guarantee of having 300 people employed, or we do not remain convinced if it is just in words, because we know that employers can come down here, hold out promises, carry on their affairs for a year or two, and if they think their business is not a paying one, they just depart from these shores, having got all the concessions they wanted. If there is a guarantee that there will be 300 people in continuous, gainful employment at the works of Sun Farms Limited, then we would be more than appreciative.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad the hon. member raised the point, because the complaint that we have had from the operators - Radcliffe Manor and the Commonwealth Development Corporation - is that we have been a bit too meticulous in dealing with this application when it should have got off the ground a long time ago.
12.20 p.m.

In the first place, I should point out that as far as Codrington is concerned, we have had complaints for years from the Technical Officers in the Ministry of

Agriculture that the land up there is highly unsuitable for propagation and cane-breeding purposes, and they are much happier now - both the sugar producers and the Department - with the land at Graeme Hall where they can conduct controlled experiments much more accurately because of the terrain and the lack of inconsistency in the depth of soil and so on, which was one of the big points about Codrington which made it unsuitable. You will remember the House released some 23 acres for the construction of the National Stadium. The first field that went out was approximately 100 acres, leaving approximately between 74 and 77 acres. I have not surveyed it; so I cannot tell you the precise acreage. Not only did we go into this matter meticulously and strike a very hard bargain as to the rental and so on; had we charged the normal agricultural rent, this would be in the vicinity of £1,000 a year instead of \$10,000 because agricultural land now fetches about \$50 per acre per annum; but we felt, since we were abandoning certain buildings and so on up there, that they could pay an additional amount in respect of the curtilage of the Chief Technical Officer's house.

Now when the hon. member asks if this is a spurious figure being advanced in order to induce the House to approve this Resolution, I would say that far from being spurious, the Minister of Home Affairs with the Financial Secretary went to Radcliffe Manor in September, after they had attended the Finance Ministers' Conference and we had concluded our deliberations on the state of the Commonwealth, and looked at the whole operation down there; and even then they both strongly urged the Government that this was such a good thing that the Government should get what the Americans describe as "a piece of the action", that is, that we could reduce the rent and get some equity. From my experience - I mean such as with the Milk Plant - I am not very happy about Government becoming involved in private operations too much because when anything goes wrong they always blame the Government; but when everything goes right, the private operators get the praise and say that this is how private industry is run. I have not completely abandoned the idea of, at a later stage when things get going, taking some equity and maybe coming back to the House and asking for a review of the terms of the lease so that we can get what is described as "piece of the action." (Mr. MOTTLEY: How are you going to do that?) I have added a rider to that effect, but we will approach them at a suitable time and look into the matter of taking a part of the equity.

Here you have an English firm which has experience working in Sardinia and in Buckinghamshire. You have the Commonwealth Development Corporation who since their "ground-nuts" experience do not throw away money in anything. You have their financial scrutiny and you have the experience of the operators of the firm in England with outlets, which is important. Now after the Financial Secretary and the Minister of Home Affairs went to Radcliffe Manor, their report stated that the project should employ a minimum of 200 persons in the first two years and thereafter 600 persons; so 300 is a very conserva-

tive estimate for us to have put in here as an average employment. I would say this too: the number of persons employed at Codrington now is only 30, and eight of these have been transferred to the Graeme Hall establishment; so if it was only 100 rather than 600 or 300, I still think from the employment factor that we would be better off.

The other things we have to consider in this scheme is that it is part of the Government's diversification programme, and the House, I believe, if it has not been already asked, will be asked very shortly to amend the Pioneer Industries and Approved Enterprise legislation to bring projects of this kind within the ambit of the legislation. This, I believe, has been approved by Cabinet, and I cannot remember whether the House has actually approved it yet. But the important thing is the income generated for the economy of Barbados, and it is not only the question of employment, but what income they will earn. In two years' time the income to be derived from the export of the products from Codrington - right now I do not think we get \$2,000 a year - is calculated at \$4.8 million. This is not their report; this is the confidential report submitted to me when I sent my scrutineers up to Buckinghamshire, that is, the Minister of Home Affairs and the Financial Secretary. This is the report they have come back with after inspecting the whole operation, and from my experience of both of these gentlemen, they tend to be very conservative and do not, like some people with whom we were formerly associated in this House, get a rush of blood to the head and talk about world affairs and that kind of thing. They tend to play down things and be very conservative in their approach on matters of this kind.

I would like to give the hon. senior member for St. Peter the assurance that, even if what we were calculating was only one-tenth correct, we would still be a measure better off than we are now. In any event wild horses could not drag the Department of Agriculture's Technical Division back to Codrington now after the results they have produced at Graeme Hall.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS and Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. and learned member for St. Thomas caught my eye first, but if he is willing to give way to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, he may do so. He has so done.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: He has not always been in other matters so inclined. Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised to hear the Prime Minister speak about this land as apparently having reached the stage of not being suitable for cane-breeding. If that is so, the previous Government, the Barbados Labour Party Government, was definitely to their faces deliberately fooled. We were told - I remember it most, not only because I had most to do with it - that it was the best spot in the whole Island for cane-breeding purposes. We were told that at the time. After all, I was not only interested because I was in charge of the Government at the time, but I was interested too because I live, as hon. members know, a couple of hundred yards

across the road from Codrington. I remember cane experts coming from Trinidad and British Guiana as it was in those days and advising. I remember asking Dr. Saint over and over again. I remember both as regards cane-breeding and as regards horticulture that there used to be an advertisement asking people to come and learn fertilising, making compost heaps and so on. The biggest cabbages I have seen in my life - at least in the West Indies - were grown there, and during the War many people came and got instruction as regards how to get land fertile and so on. If the hon. member is now being told that it was not suitable, all I can say is that we were told the exact reverse, and for a long number of years I have lived right next to the place. Next year will be forty years. I have land butting and bounding on Codrington.

I am saying that if the Hon. Prime Minister gets up and tells us this, we cannot tell him he is not speaking the truth; but all we can ask is: "Why didn't we know this before?" Why for thirty years has that Cane-breeding Station been boosted as an excellent site for cane-breeding? Why did cane people in the rest of the West Indies come up and approve of it? It was from the figures they were given and the statistical data handed to them. We have been living not just in a fool's paradise, but in a state of being completely deceived. I wish hon. members would get the old *Gazettes* and read what happened in those days. We were completely deceived if the present story is accurate as regards going there. When I first heard of the Stadium, I was shocked to think that the one place that was said to be so excellent for cane was going to be dug up, bearing in mind what I knew and was told all these years, not what I saw. I was in it in negotiations, and I know what I was told. Now to go on to the present matter.

12.30 p.m.

I am glad of what the Prime Minister has spoken about the possibility of revising this lease. Hon. members know my views; they know that what I am going to be vain enough to say should be the views of any man of commonsense. The price of land is rising and rising, and to give a ten-year lease at a fixed sum is just stupid. There should be inserted in the lease, as the Prime Minister has suggested, the means of revising the amount of payment above \$10,000, say, at the end of three years, at the end of six years, at the end of ten years - something of that nature.

Now, as regards the water, I have to agree with every word that the hon. senior member for the City has said about this whole transaction. It is a deal; on careful examination - it is more than a deal. The answer has not been given yet - at least it has been given officially to us in our seats about using these two existing wells. I hope hon. members will accept what I am saying now as something that I, personally up to last week, can give direct evidence on. When I first went to live there, the water could come up to my house, up to Codrington; it came up to Spooners Hill, and when you had one tap on, many-and-many a morning in the bath - incidentally I used to bathe more often than once a month - when you had the bath tap on, you had to lock off every other tap.

Then they started from above and brought the water down, but the person in the house just below me - our lands adjoin each other - occasionally sends over, just 20 or 30 yards, to get water from me because his water apparently comes up Spooners Hill to him, while mine comes down the hill to me. I remember that one person for the past six weeks or so, was asking for water, saying that something was wrong; he could not get water at the standpipe, and so on. You are giving these people a concession and I am still waiting for the answer as to whether it is these two wells or whether these people have to sink more wells. You are giving them a concession to use this great volume of water which will be a hardship at times; it is bound to be a hardship to people who are living in the neighbourhood. I ask hon. members; I know that some members of the Government will feel that the Opposition makes statements just for political purposes or just to make a debating point. Well, I ask them to check up on everything I have said. Check up on the people in the district; check up on people as regards what has been happening to them since the heavy rains have stopped. I suggest that whether this is a deal or not, the Government should give more thought to it, and not just rely on the fact that they have a majority of votes in this Place. I cannot help but noting that this is said to be a Democratic Labour Party Government; it is said to be a Socialist Government, and it is difficult to see one single step in the economic development of this Island in which they have not called in private enterprise. "Don't mind I say that I am a Socialist; you take care, private enterprise! We are diversifying our economy; we are helping people and encouraging people to grow more vegetables, but we will forget that. You come in and do the growing; you take the money out of the Island!"

This is a Socialist Government in name only, and it is getting worse and worse as time goes on. This is only another of those plans to help anybody from abroad who is coming in here to try and make money and take it out. We all know - it is not absolutely necessary to say, in fact, to those who know as well as we do - what is behind some of these things. It is not always necessary because we so often bring the fair name or the once fair name of Barbados into disrepute when we expose everything we know that is happening, and it is not to the credit either of the Government or the people of Barbados. I do not say more than that because again we know that, however wrong, we will be outnumbered by votes; but it is still our duty to the people of Barbados - everything lasts for a time. Every Dictator who has existed in modern times has been toppled over, and this Dictator will be toppled over too. As long as you live in a democracy and you act in anything but a democratic way, out you go. Our time will come.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS and Hon. E. W. BARROW rose to speak.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the hon. member who has just sat down.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas first caught my eye.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has given way.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, how anyone, in a Resolution to approve this lease, could introduce talk about a dictatorship and accuse the Commonwealth Development Corporation, DaCosta and Mussons and Co., and the Government together - three separate entities - of some hidden collusion and dishonesty, can only emanate from somebody who is doting. I honestly do not understand how he could - I wonder if he would go and tell the Directors of DaCosta to their faces that they are dishonest! When one of the Directors lost his seat here in 1951, he ran down and told him that he did not really mean to put him out; he meant to put out the Attorney General Mr. Walcott. Now he is saying that they are dishonest firms.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: That is a blunt, blunt lie.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that that is not a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: He telephoned first; he did not go down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will both hon. members take their seats?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member gave way and I would not worry to pursue that, but I would just like to correct one or two things. Seventy-five feet from the hon. member's kitchen is one of the largest pumps. How his neighbour could be suffering from a kettle full of water on morning to make tea only means that he did not pay the water rates. It could not be the lack of pressure.
12.40 p.m.

If the hon. member will go through that little gate 75 feet from his kitchen, he will see one of the largest pumps in the Island on a 20-inch main. The water does not come from any well at Codrington. One of these wells is capable of pumping 500,000 gallons for the use of the curtilage of Codrington. There is a reservoir at Warleigh, and there is the largest Pumping Station in the Island situate about three-quarters of a mile away at the Belle Pumping Station.

I will come back to the point the hon. member made that his Government was misled.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, this is on a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I had asked the hon. member to give way, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: He gave way, but he gave way for a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not ask him to give way on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot make another speech then.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: But this is my Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the House is the mover of this Resolution.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not think that is right, Sir. The Resolution was in my name originally, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the House was given leave to move the Resolution.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: But if the principal is present, how can the agent act, Sir?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I gave way because I thought the Prime Minister had a point to elucidate but, clearly, the Prime Minister got up for argument; therefore, I rise to interrupt him at this stage. If he cannot trust the hon. Leader of the House at the end of this debate to reply to it, he should not have him there at all. The hon. Leader of the House is the person to make all of these points. I am sure he would not have suggested that the late Mr. J. H. Wilkinson was ever a Director of DaCosta and Musson. The only lie that I have heard told in here is that a Director of DaCosta and Musson lost his seat in the 1951 elections. (ASIDES) I do not know of any. More than that, I know of only Mr. Wilkinson who ran in the same constituency as the Attorney-General. Anyway, the Prime Minister's regard for accuracy - I would not say fact or truth, because I regard today as a Saturday and therefore, we do not have to be quite so fair as we might have to be on another day - has again been challenged by himself, if he can suggest that anybody telephoned to a Director of DaCosta and Musson to say that he was sorry he lost his seat. In any case, I will tell you the truth, Mr. Speaker; I would have done it myself if the choice was between Mr. Wilkinson and Mr. Walcott, but that is only by the way.

Mr. Speaker, the interruption of the Prime Minister had some very emotive words in it. Apparently, he seeks to whip the hon. senior member for Bridgetown into line by mentioning DaCosta and Musson, and he is trying to whip us all into line by mentioning the question of employment. He is, however, throwing away what is, in fact, the most significant factor in the rent charged by talking about the Financial Secretary and Senator Greaves visiting Buckinghamshire and seeing that these people now find that they cannot make as much money as they would make in Barbados.

Now, a horticultural scheme is labour-intensive. Anybody knows this. I do not see the Minister of Agriculture in his seat, but I am sure he would readily agree that if you can get a horticultural scheme, and apply that to an acre of land, that is going to employ more persons than almost anything.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister, if not in his seat, is still on the Government Benches.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, it seems that this is a Saturday; so you are making a lot of remarks. I hope the hon. Minister does not take any suggestion in Your Honour's interjection that he might at some time be other than on the Government Benches. Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, it is known that a horticultural scheme is labour-intensive. The people who are employed even in the very minor horticultural operations there at Codrington occupy, I dare say, a large percentage of Codrington's permanent labour force - the ladies who fill the pots, Mr. Millar and the other persons who arrange for the sale of plants - and that is carried on on a few hundred square feet, far less an acre.

We know that the scheme is going to employ people. The only way it is not going to employ them is if it fails. We are not attacking the principle of the scheme. It is a very good idea if you can get somebody to come and use Codrington for horticulture. It is a good idea to bring horticulture here, anyhow. If C.D.C. is willing to do it, we should thank C.D.C. C.D.C. spent years and years here, not spending one penny of its money in Barbados. If C.D.C. is now at long last waking up to the fact that it should spend some of it, we should be glad. But we have to look at the terms and conditions under which it is offering to spend this money.

With regard to the question of water, I can bear out what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said, because there are numerous occasions that I can remember when persons who lived immediately to the west of the house to which the hon. member referred kept coming and asking for water. I can remember the standpipe not 50 years away from the western edge, south-west of the curtilage of the hon. member's house, running dry, and people coming into our yard and getting a bucket of water. If the Prime Minister thinks that is not so, I can only presume that he is extravagating from some entirely different place. This must be in another world when, perhaps, he lived in one of the trees in "Tyrol Cot" and nobody then came to draw water, if they lived next door at "Waverley".

I can assure hon. members that I remember people having to come from there, and the 20-inch main, the pump and the well have not always been there. Indeed, when I came back to reside in the same house, "Tyrol Cot", in 1962 or 1963, I remember hearing about a new pump and a new system which were responsible for the water supply being improved. Those are assurances which we should be asking for, Mr. Speaker. We should be asking for an assurance that this new arrangement by which 3 per cent of the water supply of Barbados, or 3 per cent of the water consumed in Barbados - that the abstraction of that from present distribution patterns is not going to affect those persons who, at present, draw their water from Codrington. Mr. Speaker, 3 per cent is not small. This is one industry seeking to use 3 per cent of the water supply of Barbados.

Point No. 2. We have to consider whether the value of that water, which is some \$150,000 a year is the value of the water which these people will be getting, and whether it is adequately compensated for by a payment of \$10,000 a year. These figures are incontrovertible. The cost of pumping all the water in Barbados is \$700,000 a year. We have heard the Minister say so this morning. The cost of the pumping of the 500,000 gallons a day cannot, Mr. Speaker, reasonably exceed 3 per cent of \$700,000 which is \$2,500. The cost of 500,000 gallons of water at 80¢ per thousand gallons is \$400 per day, which is getting on to \$150,000 a year. These people are not just getting the use of these water wells; they are getting a fully developed irrigation system - the best in Barbados. There is no irrigation system in Barbados comparable to Codrington's; so for a lease of \$10,000, they are getting access to what the Prime Minister himself has described as one of the finest water systems in Barbados. He talked about the powerful pumps and the 20-inch main. They are getting access to one of the finest water systems in Barbados that is worth \$400 a day, and all the Minister of Agriculture has talked about is that the great cost of getting water will fall on them. The cost of running those pumps, if it is the same as the average cost of pumping in Barbados, is between \$2,000 and \$3,000 a year. 12.50 p.m.

Talking about agricultural land at \$15 an acre, it is not the value of land that C.D.C. and DaCosta and Musson are after in this case; it is the value of the water. The value of the land over the entire period of this lease will be not equivalent to the value of the water over, say, three or four months. The land is nothing; even the house is nothing compared with \$150,000 worth of water in the course of a year for which they would have to pay. All that the Minister said about the fact that anybody who has land can drill a well and pump up the water does not apply to this, because there is no question of their drilling a well and having the capital cost of doing that and of installing pumps and installing an irrigation system; at least we have not heard yet, if there is. As far as we can judge, the Government is prepared to let them use what pumps already exist. At least this is what the Minister said. If that is wrong, I will sit down and have a legitimate interruption right now.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Could I correct the hon. member on just two points?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has given way.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: He said I could interrupt him, Sir. In the first place \$150,000 are the rates that are charged by the Waterworks Department. I have not made the calculations. *(Interruptions.)*

If we could have a little order, Sir, I would be very glad.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I can only control inside here. Even inside here at times gives me a little trouble.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The point is that water is not pumped from these wells for general distribution. The capacity of these wells certified by the two senior Engineers at the Waterworks Department is 500,000 gallons a day from one, and they have undertaken to supply the National Stadium with up to 30,000 gallons a day if they require it. They require about 15,000 gallons for the purpose of the Stadium which will be free of cost. The irrigation system which is there is of no value to the new project at all. These are wells purely with water. I think one of the pumps has already gone to Graeme Hall, and they will be introducing new pumps of a much greater capacity to pump the water; so it is not \$150,000 in water. Water is free in Barbados; it is the cost of pumping that is important, and we are not pumping the water for them; they will be pumping the water for us.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: All right, Sir. The Minister of Agriculture's words were capable of being misunderstood during his speech, or obviously I misunderstood him. An amount of 1,600,000 gallons of water a day is pumped in Barbados and the yearly cost of doing that is \$700,000. Water is free in Barbados in the sense that you only have to pump it out, but irrigation water for horticulture purposes costs 80 cents a thousand gallons. Do not let us have any doubt about that. Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister cannot flannel his way through this by trying to blind us with science. It is the cost if the Waterworks pumps it out, and therefore unless you can make alternative arrangements to pump it out, that is the cost.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member would give way very briefly, the Waterworks Department does not supply Codrington at the moment, or when it was an Agricultural Station, with water; they had their own pumps. I have the figures actually in working out the cost of the Stadium. It would have cost us something like \$400 a month to buy water. That is an additional benefit from the Belle Pumping Station. The point I have been trying to emphasise is that if the Corporation was asking the Government to supply them with water, then I would agree with the hon. member's - I would not like to say arithmetic because I have not checked it - contention that they would be getting the benefit of \$150,000 a year since we would be supplying them with something that would cost somebody else \$150,000, but in this case they are buying pumps to pump the water out. They are not depriving the Waterworks Department of revenue, because the Waterworks Department never pumped this water at all. There are just three wells, and the Government was not buying water from the Waterworks Department. We were pumping it and we have now transferred one of the pumps to Graeme Hall, and when they move out entirely, then the other pumps will be moved.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on what the Prime Minister said about the 15,000 thousand gallons a day and talking about the arithmetic, the deductions, so to speak, will bring it down to, say, \$140,000 a year. I do not want to be unfair and I will bring it down to \$140,000 for the benefit which they

are getting. Now if the Government was not concerned with Codrington's water and the water in those wells it would not have to be concerned with how much water these people pumped out of the wells. Once Government has entered into a consideration at all with the people and their water arrangements - in other words, once the Government is preparing to lease water rights at a well which it has dug - it could quite easily reserve that in law - to these people, the Government must be involved in the value of that water well to this group.

Mr. Speaker, it is conceded that if the group had to pay for the water it would cost them \$140,000 a year. Is anybody going to suggest that the water is not worth more than \$10,000 a year to this group, more than the rent they are paying? Half million gallons of water is not a trickle, as the Minister of Communications will agree. Wells that draw half million gallons of water do not exist too easily on private property. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a private well in Barbados that yields half million gallons of water without knowing anything about it. Half million gallons of water is a great deal of water. I would have been glad to hear the Hon. Minister of Communications on this. This is a valuable well. The Minister alone perhaps knows how valuable it is. I think it unfair to the House that only his Cabinet colleague should have had the benefit of the arguments.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, I did not want to get into this thing because today is Saturday and I want to go home; but there are two wells at Codrington that the Waterworks Department used for supplying the reservoir at Lodge Hill. We do not use the water from the third well for human consumption. I can only say it is probably not potable water.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: How is this a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is making his point. I have to determine it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: What breach of a Standing Order has been made that he is on a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member rose on a point of order and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas gave way. The hon. member is making his point.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: You do not have to give way on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: He did not have to give way, but he gave way.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. member should not be worried about this well, because the people are going to pump this water with their own pumps. We are not sure that this water would ever be used for potable purposes, and that is why we put in this stipulation, because we do not know if this well will

be drawn down, since it is the catchment area, as I explained, of the Belle. We do not know if by pumping over half million gallons it might cause a drain on the other well, and therefore we decided in this case that they would pay for it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. senior member for St. Thomas resume.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad indeed we have now heard from the Minister that when you get down to it, perhaps one of the reasons for Government having to concern themselves about the water at all is that the pumping of this half million gallons of water could even be a threat to the water supply to that part of Barbados, because the Minister has said that he does not know if it will draw down on the water supply at the Belle because it draws from the same catchment area. They are getting all this for \$10,000 a year. Apparently we are going to concede some threat to the water supply.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only water that Codrington has. Codrington has a big house that is worth to the C.D.C., at the rents they pay, \$500 a month as it is now. The C.D.C. would pay that or more for Codrington House just as it is, and I have put it, I believe, low, because I have seen houses and been into houses that C.D.C. officials live in at their rental allowance of \$475 a month that were puny, and that could shake around in Codrington's drawing room practically. They rent little houses in housing developments in Christ Church at \$500 a month. As it is Codrington is worth them..... (A VOICE: Who would like to live there? The Director of C.D.C. lives in a plantation house in St. George which he has made very nice, but it is not as good a house as Codrington. So don't you see who would like to live there? His house is not as nice as Codrington; so there can be no suggestion that Codrington house is unrentable. It is a valuable proposition there.

What else has Codrington got that is valuable for this purpose? It has an area under netting that obscures the sun and so on to keep shade plants under. We talk about the 300 people they are going to employ. They are not going to be employing persons merely for the benefit of those persons. Codrington has the largest concentration of persons familiar with horticulture in Barbados. It has a labour staff of people who understand the necessities of pot plants, who know how to grow pot plants, who know something about the work. There are not many places you can go in Barbados and put your hand on 30 people with previous experience of this sort of work; so they are not doing us a favour by saying they are going to employ 300 people.
1.00 p.m.

If they want their work done at all, they have to employ that number of people and, therefore, they are equally not doing us a favour by taking over the old Codrington labourers; really, it would be inequitable to tell some of them to go to Graeme Hall. It is no favour, I repeat, being done to us. These people should be glad to get the skilled persons who live in

the Old Bow Road, in Bush Hall, Storey's Gap, Lewis Gap and other places, who have some familiarity with the work. I am sick and tired of hearing Government Ministers come here and on public platforms and Press interviews and explain to us the favour which is being done to us by some manufacturer or somebody who is coming down here to make money. The C.D.C. and DaCosta and Mussons are not out for doing a favour to the people of Barbados; DaCosta and Mussons want to make a profit for their shareholders and the C.D.C. want to make a profit too. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Everybody.) Everybody wants to make a profit. People do not come here and go to Grazettes Housing Estate because they like Barbados or because the Prime Minister permits them to entertain him, or whatever the case may be. They do not come here to pepper up the Ministers because they like the Ministers. Some Ministers should hear what they think about them behind their backs. They come here to make money, and something like this should be introduced in this House on the basis of money making. The sum of \$10,000 a year and water rights on that scale is not a money-making proposition. If C.D.C. feels that we should have got by with this earlier, and there has been a long time coming, it shows that they wanted it. If they are prepared to wait for two years, I imagine that the negotiations for this have been going on for longer than that.

I have been going to Codrington over the last few years, and I am sure that it is more than two years that I have heard about the people coming here to look after this scheme. If they are prepared to wait that long, it shows that it is a desirable something that they are after.

On the question of hearing about the Financial Secretary and the Minister of Home Affairs going to look at a horticultural place in England and making their estimates of \$4 million, I would like to know what either Senator Greaves or the Financial Secretary knows about the export of pot plants or what they know about the market for pot plants in Britain. I can guarantee that if they came in here and I said to them: "What is the average price of a small Philodendron in a flower shop" they cannot tell me, and that is what you have to know about if you are really going to work out an export market or the theory of an export business. You have to find out what they are planning to export and what these things sell at in England. You have to find all of that out. That is the only basis upon which I can expect that Mr. Osbourne and Senator Greaves have suddenly become experts on the pot plant business. This sum of \$10,000 a year is for a business which is talking in terms of millions of dollars in export, and their capital is the land which they must use. That is their capital. This is one of the cases where you can see that all the factors of production are combined; the entrepreneurial skill we cannot provide because, truthfully, what the Prime Minister said about the two gentlemen notwithstanding, I really do not believe that there is anybody in Barbados who would be prepared to undertake to start a business exporting domestic plants to Britain or the United States. I really do not think that anybody knows about that. The vegetable part we are now prov-

ing in Barbados, that even the mighty DaCosta and Mussons not only cannot get anybody locally who really understands about growing plants, but they have even brought down Mr. Calvin Sides who is reviled on all sides - no fun is intended - who is reviled in all quarters by the same DaCosta and Mussons, by the Barbados Marketing Corporation, by the Minister of Agriculture, by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, and I would include myself.

My associations with Mr. Sides have been professional on the other side, so to speak, and therefore I cannot go into it; but DaCosta and Mussons are apparently the giants; the association of DaCosta and Mussons is supposed to run this enterprise. DaCosta and Mussons are the mark of quality, and because of that, the Conservative part of the Opposition in this Hon. House feels it necessary to support this scheme - through thick and thin; but DaCosta and Mussons have been involved in things which have gone wrong in this House before. (*Asides*) The hour being what it is, I beg to move that the further consideration of this matter be postponed for the purpose of a luncheon interval.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it has already been moved that this matter be postponed, and what is this now?

Mr. SPEAKER: The further consideration be again postponed. That is perfectly in order; it was done for many weeks with the West Indies Hospital Sweep.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I just want to draw your attention to the fact that you just would not remember what I spoke on, but I am entitled to speak on.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may proceed now to speak.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On what?

Mr. SPEAKER: To second the motion of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, but I am drawing to your attention that I spoke on the postponement, and not that original motion before. You had the original motion, then I spoke on the postponement and now you are giving me a chance to run away like a racehorse.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member second the motion?

Mr. HINDS: I beg to second the motion for the postponement.

Mr. SPEAKER: But I am afraid that I cannot accept that because the hon. senior member for Bridgetown is still on his feet. (*Asides*)

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second the motion for the postponement of the further consideration of this Resolution.

The question that further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed 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 2.15 p.m. of the clock.

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

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

1.10 p.m.

On Resumption:

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I should like to vary the order somewhat so that the House could go back into Committee of Supply and pass the Resolutions which have been dealt with this morning. If there is no objection, I should like to move.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Just before the hon. member so moves, I promised the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, who was not present when notices were given today, that he may put his notices. Probably this is a convenient time for him to do so. Do you have a copy of your notices?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, a number of them were handed in manuscript to the Clerk, and therefore it will be necessary for me, since that is the only copy, to ask the Clerk for a copy.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will lend the hon. member my copy with the full assurance that he will read it actually *verbatim*.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I will read *verbatim*. Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Communications & Works:

1. On what day were the recent Human Rights stamps received by Post Office authorities in Bridgetown?

2. Why were no official first-day covers made available at the Post Office Philatelic Bureau?

2. To enquire of the Minister of Communications & Works:-

Will the Minister publish the names of the members of the Stamp Advisory Committee who now advise the Post Office on stamp issues?

3. To enquire of the Minister of Communications & Works:-

1. Is it a fact that a stamp of \$5.00 denomination is shortly to be issued for Barbados?

2. Will the Minister make arrangements for the issue of a 10 cent stamp as soon as possible?

3. Should it prove impossible to prepare a separate 10 cent definitive stamp before the next regular issue of definitive stamps, will the Minister ensure that a 10 cent stamp forms part of some or all of Barbados' commemorative issues?

4. To enquire of the Minister of Community Development:-

1. What, if any, negotiations are currently in progress which may result in an increase in the number of playing fields in the parish of St. Thomas?

Mr. Speaker, it reads "St. James" in your copy but it should be "St. Thomas".

Mr. SPEAKER: I should be glad if the hon. member would change the word, as this will go into the Official record.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have done so, Sir.

2. Will the Minister make strenuous efforts to acquire land at Welchman Hall, St. Thomas, for the creation of a playing field?

5. To enquire of the Minister of Community Development:-

1. Will the Minister state whether there is any objection to the continuance or whether there was any lack of support for handicraft and other classes at the St. James Social Centre?

2. If the answers to No. 1 above are "No". Will the Minister direct that the classes be restarted?

6. To enquire of the Minister responsible for security:-

Will the Minister stage whether the Government Security Officer received any reports of the activities of one Clarke which indicate that the said Mr. Clarke has recently made public speeches tending to incite feeling of ill will and hostility between different classes of Her Majesty's subjects?

7. To enquire of the Minister of Communications & Works:-

1. Is there a waiting list for car parking space in the Government car parks on the Wharf?

2. Will the Government consider increasing the charges for long term parking in any car park for which there is a waiting list?

3. Will the Government make a certain number of lots available in all Government car parks for daily parking rentals and not only for weekly, monthly or longer rental periods?

8. To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Has the Barbados Development Board repaid to the Government of Barbados the sum of \$24,073.81 shown to be due and owing by it in respect of moneys advanced to the Board in connection with Barbados' participation in Expo' 67; and if so, on what date?

9. To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Will the Minister amplify the Financial Statements relating to the Barbados/Guyana participation in Expo'67 by publishing a full list of the accounts payable and accounts receivable as at March 31st, 1968, and bring the same up to date by indicating what accounts have been paid or received since that date?

10. To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Does the Government intend to pass legislation amending the Representation of the People Act 1957 so as to bring it into line with other statutory provision laying down that the next General Election will be based on single member constituencies; and if so, how soon?

11. To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Does the Government intend to publish the customary Report by the Supervisor of Elections on the General Election of 1966?

12. To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Will the Government take early steps to provide machinery for the validation of an up-to-date electoral list and for the continuing registration of electors?

13. To enquire of the Minister of Community Development:-

Will the Minister take early steps to produce a more level overall surface at the playing field at Bagatelle Housing Area in the parish of St. Thomas.

14. To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

When will the New Edition of the Laws of Barbados be published?

15. To enquire of the Minister of Communications & Works:-

Will the Minister forthwith take action to clean, put in order, and pave the gutters and drains in Alkins Road and other roads in Carrington's Village in the parish of St. Michael?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House resume Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: 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. HOPPIN in the Chair.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of 6 Resolutions in Committee of Supply and the postponement of one.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these Resolutions be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these Resolutions be now read a second time.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these Resolutions be now agreed to.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think we could, perhaps, resume Item No. 2, if hon. members think that we can finish it within half an hour.
2.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to take Order No. 2 as the next Order of the Day. When discussion on that was adjourned, the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas was addressing the Chamber. He may or may not resume now, as he thinks fit.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I was about to make a new point, but I think that since I have undertaken to close my speech relatively early, I will return to the question of water at this stage rather than revert to it at a later stage. The Minister of Communications and Works made a very valuable interjection, I think, when he indicated that one of the things that is worrying the Government is that the Waterworks cannot say what the effect of pumping water from these two wells at Codrington will be on the level of the water in Belle catchment area. As I understand it, there are three wells at Codrington, two of which are used by the Waterworks, and one was formerly used by Codrington itself. Now apparently the Waterworks are going to give up one well. (Interruptions) I understood that these people are going to use two wells; so either the Waterworks are going to give up one, or else there are four wells.

The Waterworks are, in fact, going to give up a well, and this other well is going to be used.

Now, Mr. Speaker, members, especially the Prime Minister perhaps inadvertently, on the other side have may given the impression that you can do as you like with water on your land. This is simply not true. You cannot drill wells for irrigation purposes and use water as you like. You have to have the permission of the Irrigation Board which will limit the amount of water you can use. I believe, for example, at the moment you do not get permission to irrigate sugar cane, certainly not from a well. I believe that is a matter of practice. I dare say there are other ways of achieving it, but I think it is a matter of practice; but the point is that you have to apply in each and every circumstance for permission to irrigate. So in effect, Mr. Speaker, these persons by leasing Government property will not have to apply for permission to drill a well. In defence of any question of the Irrigation Board, because we have not heard of this matter being referred to the Irrigation Board, who, if they exist, must be the people responsible for collating irrigation policy through Barbados, we have not heard of this matter being referred. I am very glad that I can hear an aside from the Minister indicating that the Chief Engineer at the Waterworks is Chairman of the Irrigation Board.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should know better than to notice asides.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am very glad for this aside and that is why I have noticed it, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Johnson can give the figure of \$500,000 gallons and so on, because in his experience as Chief Engineer he has some idea about the conditions of the Belle catchment area; but they are not the only things to be worried about when you are talking about irrigation, and most important of all, it does not seem from anything we have heard on that side that the financial aspect of the value, the actual dollars and cents value, of 500,000 gallons of water to these people has been estimated by the Government. I am sorry the hon. senior member for Bridgetown is not in his seat from one point of view because I know he is going to vote for this Resolution; but nonetheless I would be him to be here to see if he could be made to end exactly what is involved in this. The hon. member for Bridgetown has been saying: "Look at the land paid for Society Plantation; you sell agricultural land at £300 an acre; you are renting it at so much per acre." But that is agricultural land being used for sugar cane purposes where no question of irrigation comes in.

The Government is in a position - don't forget, Mr. Speaker - to stop these people using any water at all by means of the Irrigation Board legislation; so by giving them this permission, they are giving them something of the value of \$140,000 a year and all they are being asked to pay for it is \$10,000 a year. Mr. Speaker, it seems that with the best will in the world the Financial Secretary and the Minister of Home Affairs may have overlooked this aspect of it. I am sure that the Minister of Communications has not over-

looked it. If we had a taperecorder of the Cabinet proceedings, it might be interesting to hear what was said in that direction. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, this is something to be considered. I have heard other things during the interval. I do know as a matter of interest that, although Barbados may be thought to be a tropical country, there are certain large-scale operations in the growing of tropical plants that require even greater heat than we have in Barbados. For instance, I believe that to raise rubber plants from seeds requires a temperature of around 90 degrees; to raise bromelias from seed requires a temperature of 95 degrees, and that apparently would necessitate hot-houses and things like that. I do not know if this is what these people are planning, but we can understand that it is an operation of some size and value. All the more reason, Mr. Speaker, if they want to come down here and put down hot-houses for raising exotic plants which, although tropical, perhaps have a habitat better in the Amazon than in Barbados, if they are prepared to spend that money, they must be prepared to pay for the capital resources which they are looking for, and that is the land. I was dealing with different aspects of the economic factors that they will need. This is an instance which, as I said, will need entrepreneurship; it will need land; it will need labour and it will need capital, and all we in Barbados have to offer to these particular people is the land and the water, and we seem to be giving that away to them. In effect, we are giving it away to them. In effect, we are giving it away to them for \$10,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to see is how the Inland Revenue Commissioner is going to rate Codrington when he is finished, because I sincerely hope he is not going to look at Codrington as cane land. He has to rate this as an intensive building operation and see that the people put a few thousand dollars, indeed I should say a few hundred thousand dollars, every year into the Local Government Commissioner's pocket in trade tax. If they do not pay it in rent, let the Minister responsible - I am sorry the Minister of Community Development is not here, but I am sure the acting Minister will bear this in mind - let the Commissioner send some people up there and look at the hot-houses, the well with 500,000 gallons of water, the expensive plants growing under glass and being carefully irrigated, and put a rating on Codrington that will make them appreciate that they have something of value there. So even if the Government is committed at the moment to \$10,000, at least, at some stage we in the House can be satisfied by having the Minister of Community Development come and say that it is true they only pay that in rent, but they have been rated on the basis of a turnover of so many million dollars a year in work, and they are paying trade tax on that. Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, they are not going to get out of it by a lot of pioneer status and income tax holidays and so on, because we could as well, if we are going to do that, not worry to rent out Codrington at all, but just vote a sum of money to be paid to DaCosta and Musson and C.D.C. and some amount to the workers, because this is a money-making business, and \$10,000 a year is a joke rent when the water rights are considered.

Two very small points in closing, Mr. Speaker. There is a quarry at Codrington. I did not hear the hon. senior member for Bridgetown mention it. He tells me that he mentioned it in his speech. I can see no reason why they should have quarry rights. You do not have to lease quarry rights in a lease of land, and I very much hope that before everything is finalised, this point will be taken note of, and the draughtsmen who are drawing up the lease - because if the lease was in existence I believe it would be in the House by now - make sure that these people do not, in addition to everything else they make, start a quarry at Codrington or if they do, make sure that they pay royalties to the Government on the proper basis.

2.35 p.m.

They cannot just go and dig out all of the stones at Codrington and sell it so as to cover the \$10,000 a year, because I believe that the Codrington quarry can make that if you are content to work it into nothing. Also, Mr. Speaker, some years ago when the Waterworks were putting a new pump into Codrington, they knocked down some of the very attractive Codrington wall at a corner immediately facing the lands of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and put up a piece of old galvanised iron which rattles to open. This is a road which is used by tourists as well as by citizens of Barbados including the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, and, really, a better gate should be put up there and you could make the place which you would view through the gate a little more attractive. This is a very run-down, rackety corner at Codrington, just at the corner where it meets Spooners Hill. Really, the Government should not have a property with a few pieces of old galvanised iron keeping out the public any more. (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that at the moment I am hearing both hon. members for St. Thomas.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I wish I could hear the other hon. member because I am sure he is making a joke and this for once might be one I will laugh at.

Mr. Speaker, there is another point. I do not know if any Minister can give me a re-assurance on this, but if an industry on this scale is to produce pot plants, and I am assured by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture that pot plants will at least, equal, if not exceed, the vegetable side of the business - if they

are really producing pot plants in this number, I would be glad to hear from the Minister that these plants will be available to Barbadians and that they will not all be for export; they will not just be only bonded pot plants. If they are for Barbadians, I would ask the Minister to make representations to the proprietors not to sell to us at prices which are higher than what you will have to pay in London or in New York for them. It is well known that the shrimps which you get in Barbados, are of worse quality and they cost more than the same shrimps sold in Florida. The same shrimps leave here and go to Florida, and they are sold more cheaply there than they are sold in Barbados. (Mr. LOWE: That is not true.)

Mr. SPEAKER: I am still listening to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Whether it is now true or not, let us hope that these people will continue to keep Codrington as a place where you can still get some plants. They have the machinery there, the sheds and so on, where they can have a public display of plants for sale.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:-

AYES: Hon'bles J. C. TUDOR, G. G. FERGUSON, N. W. BOXILL, Messrs. HOPPIN, LOWE, SPRINGER, SARGEANT, WEEKES and LYNCH - 9.

NOES: Messrs. CRAIG, HINDS, J. M. G. M. ADAMS, HUSBANDS and Sir GRANT, J. V. ADAMS: -5.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 17th December, 1968.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that there is ~~no~~ to move the adjournment because this House has already been adjourned until Tuesday of next week. I can assure hon. members that they will not be summoned for a special meeting either for tomorrow or the day after.

2.45 p.m.