

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 2nd March, 1954

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3 p.m. to-day.

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Hon. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., C.M.G. Q.C., (*Premier*), Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*), Messrs. F. C. GODDARD, F. E. MILLER, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., J. C. MOTTLEY, V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture Lands and Fisheries*) and Mr. L. A. WILLIAMS, LL.B.

CHANGE OF SEATS BY PREMIER
AND MINISTERS

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—Before the business of the House begins, I would like to state that I have been a member of this Chamber for a number of years and without your informing me, I have seen that a re-arrangement of the seating in the House has taken place. I make no objection to the re-arrangement, but as a member of this Chamber I would expect to hear something from you or somebody else as to this matter. To-day a member goes to his seat, places his papers there and he is not treated with the courtesy of being told of the re-arrangement of the seating: It could have been stated that as from to-day it has been decided that this re-arrangement will take place. You will appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that if I or any group of members had occupied the seats which members of the Government occupy, that would have been regarded as a grave act of discourtesy; I think that at least honourable members should have been informed that this re-arrangement would take place; I regard this kind of treatment as being undemocratic.

Mr. SPEAKER: Since my courtesy has been called into question, I must state that this change-over has been a bit of a surprise to me; I have not had the slightest intimation of it therefore I do not think I have shown the House any discourtesy.

Somebody else must be responsible in this matter, not I.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: What blame there is to be accepted in this matter, I accept it. I do not know that this is one of the conventions which we follow; I do not know that any honourable member has any claim to any particular seat. As far as I know, the honourable member used to sit next to me when he was a member of the Government, but, frankly, I do not know where his seat is now. All this is just nonsense and I am not pursuing it. I endeavoured by telephone to get in touch with whoever was involved in this changeover, and the only honourable member I could get in touch with was the honourable member on my right, the honourable junior member for St. Joseph. I asked him to get in touch with the honourable junior member for St. George and the honourable junior member for St. Peter who would be affected, and I tried to get in touch with Your Honour both here and at the Barbados Workers' Union. I do not think I need say anything more on this matter; I regret that it has been raised.

Mr. LEWIS: I am one of the honourable members who have been affected; I had no intimation of the matter whatever. I would like to say, like the honourable junior member for St. Peter, that if I had walked into the House and took the seat I have taken now, I would not like to know what the speech of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph would have been. To get in touch with honourable members about this matter this very morning is not good enough; certainly some intimation of this change should have been given to honourable members before this morning. May I say that if the Ministers are occupying those seats, at least the seating accommodation of the Press should have been on the other side of the House so as to meet the objection taken by the Press; it would seem as if the Press is now ruling the House of Assembly. I sincerely hope that occupying seats over there will result in an increase in wisdom on the part of the Ministers.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meetings of the 5th and 12th January, 1954, respectively have been circulated to honourable members. If there is no objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and con-

firmed. (After a pause). There being no objection, those Minutes are taken as read and confirmed.

MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have the honour to present from His Excellency the Governor, Message No. 8/1954 as follows:—

Message No. 8/1954.

*His Excellency The Governor
To
The Honourable The House of Assembly*

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that its Address of the 8th December, on the subject of racial discrimination practised by certain hotel proprietors in Bermuda and the Bahamas, has been forwarded to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, who has noted its contents and has asked that the Honourable House may be reminded that Her Majesty's Government have always been strongly opposed to discrimination on grounds of colour, but consider that the discontinuance of these practices can only be effectively achieved by the development of a healthy public opinion against them, and not through legislative measures.

2. The Secretary of State has forwarded the attached copy of the record of the debate in the House of Commons on the 1st May, 1953, on a motion urging Her Majesty's Government to introduce legislation with a view to the progressive elimination of the colour bar in Colonial territories, which was defeated, and has suggested that it might be placed in the library of the House of Assembly for the information of members.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados.
25th February, 1954.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have the honour to present from His Excellency the Governor, Message No. 9/1954 as follows:—

Message No. 9/1954

*His Excellency The Governor
To
The Honourable The House of Assembly*

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to submit for the consideration of the Honourable the House of Assembly the Report of the Deep Water Harbour Committee.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown.
2nd March, 1954.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker,—At a later stage I shall move for the appointment of a Select Committee to reply to that Message.

PAPERS LAID

By command of His Excellency the Governor, Papers were laid as follows:—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for the nine months ended the 31st December, 1953.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for the ten months ended the 31st January, 1954.

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Bill to authorise the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association to construct and maintain one or more pipeline or pipelines for conveying vacuum pan molasses from a point ashore to vessels in the harbour.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year 1954 and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ending on the 31st March, 1955.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$629,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet expenditure during the financial year 1954-55 on Capital Works included in the Estimates 1954-55 Part II — Capital, A—Loan Funds.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to consider the money Resolution of which I have just given notice.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the Bill to authorise the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association to construct and maintain one or more pipeline or pipelines for conveying vacuum pan molasses from a point ashore to vessels in the harbour, was read a first time.

On motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the following Bills were read a first time:—

Bill to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year 1954 and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax.

Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ending on the 31st March, 1955.

APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that a Select Committee be appointed to reply to His Excellency the Governor's Message No. 9/1954 relating to the Report of the Deep Water Harbour Committee.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion, which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: Subject to the approval of the House, I have the honour to appoint the following honourable members to serve as members of that Select Committee:—The honourable senior member for St. Philip (Mr. CRAWFORD), the honourable junior member for St. John (Mr. VAUGHAN), the honourable junior member for Christ Church (Mr. GODDARD), the honourable junior member for St. George (Mr. MILLER), the honourable junior member for the City (Mr. LEWIS), the honourable junior member for St. Lucy (Mr. WILLIAMS) and the honourable senior member for St. Michael (Hon. M. E. Cox).

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas:—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE PAN AMERICAN
SANITARY ORGANISATION

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: The first Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution to place the sum of \$1,530 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953-54, Part I, — Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1953-54, No. 42, which form the Schedule to the Resolution relating to Contributions to the Pan American Sanitary Organisation.

This sum of \$1,530 is a contribution from Barbados to the Pan American Sanitary Organisation. This Organisation, as is well known, has to deal with sanitary matters in the Western Hemisphere. At the last meeting of the Regional Economic Committee it was agreed that a recommendation should be made to all British West Indian Governments that they should accept the proposal of the Secretary of State for the payment of annual contributions to the expenses of the Pan American Sanitary Organisation, and it was decided that the total contribution for the British West Indian Colonies should be \$15,000 United States currency. When the matter was put to Barbados, we thought that the contribution should be made on a population basis, and on that basis our contribution would be 6.4%, but on the basis as put up by Trinidad it would be 6% which represents \$1,530, British West Indian Currency. This sum represents our contribution for last year; the contribution as from this year will be included in the Estimates for 1954-55. I might add that there is evidence of the usefulness of this Organisation to Barbados; it is only just yesterday that a campaign to rid the Caribbean area of the mosquito *Aedes Egypti* which is responsible for the spread of yellow fever, was started and we hope that we will also have our B.C.G. Campaign which will be carried out under the auspices of this Organisation. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: The first thing that strikes me about this Resolution is that other colonies in this area have had the benefit of the eradication of this mosquito and the B. C. G. Campaign against tuberculosis and at that time we did not hear about their making any contribution; however, as a contribution has to be made, and as it is claimed that we are getting some benefit from this World Health Organisation, I am wondering if this Organisation does not intend to spend any money in this area. Is this money purely for paying somebody for their advice? Why should this amount be in American dollars? This will further reduce the American dollars which we have for the importation of goods from the hard currency areas. I would like a little further explanation of this matter; we have been told that Barbados put up a scheme by which our contribution would be 6%. Is this a matter of population, area, disease or what? On the last occasion when we started a percentage basis for calculating something, there was a very smart arrangement made by Trinidad by which the revenue which they got from oil was taken out of the calculation of their wealth as against the others; I am very glad to hear that on this occasion at least, the island of Trinidad has been so generous as to make a suggestion which has reduced our contribution to 6%. For the purpose of the record I would like to know why the contribution is to be in American dollars. I am very sorry that this Organisation has started

to collect money from the Government, but I hope they will get more than a fair share on their return. I would like to know why should the contribution be made in American currency and what was the arrangement which was put up which caused us to have to pay 6.4% and what was the alternative arrangement put up which reduced the contribution to 6%. I am not asking any unreasonable questions and I hope the honourable member will be able to answer me. I suppose that this matter will have to be regarded as a regional matter and in that respect I am glad to know that the Regional Economic Committee is undertaking regional matters; I sincerely hope I will hear that they have taken over the Oils and Fats Conferences which are regional and are still outside that Organisation.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Any Resolution which aims at improving the health of this colony deserves the support of this Chamber. Just a few days ago I spoke with the Honourable Minister of Health relative to the Yellow Fever Campaign. While we should support this Resolution, we should not support it unless we offer our criticisms despite the fact that they will be criticisms of the Health Department. I happened one morning to attend a lecture given by this Officer who is now in the island — I think he is a Sanitary Engineer—and I told him I do not think that the Health Department of the country was giving enough co-operation. I listened very carefully to the advice given to the Sanitary Department, in which it was said that the Inspectors would have to spray water barrels and other receptacles in houses and I made it clear that I thought that the Director of Medical Services and other Health Officers should offer more co-operation in this matter because Barbadians are suspicious by nature and if Inspectors went into people's houses and began to spray this white stuff—unless the people have some assurance from the medical fraternity that this stuff is not injurious to health I am sure that the people will not offer any co-operation in this matter. I suggest that the Health Officers who are drawing substantial salaries should get out of their wheel-chairs and go into the school houses with the Sanitary Inspectors and lecture not only in St. Michael but in parishes like St. Andrew and St. Joseph. I know that there is a bit of jealousy existing between the medical men and the Sanitary Inspectors. I am hoping that the Honourable Minister of Health will carry back this criticism—of course he has not got to carry back anything; he is now directing policy. I say it is the duty of the doctors to go into the school rooms and lecture to people and let them know that the spraying of this white substance in water barrels, etc., is not injurious to health. I was glad when the honourable Minister of Health gave a short talk over the radio, but that did not reach so far outside St. Michael.

The doctors know well enough that if families are just spoken to by laymen and are not given some assurance by the Health Authorities, they are not going to allow this spraying to take place. I hope that the honourable Minister of Health will direct the health policy of this colony and if what I have suggested is not done the householders will not offer any co-operation. It is all very well to say that the people are offering co-operation, but Sanitary Inspectors tell me that that is not so. I am therefore suggesting that you are wasting money and you will not have that co-operation which is necessary in eradicating this mosquito if the doctors do not pull their weight. Not only the Medical Officers of Health, but the Parochial Medical Officers should be asked to co-operate and speak to the people of this colony

letting them know what the position is. Somebody said to me that spraying this white stuff in water barrels might be a means of birth control; however, I hope the honourable Minister of Health will direct the health policy of this colony.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am wondering now that we are beginning to make our contribution to the annual expenditure of this regional branch of the World Health Organisation, why we should begin with the eradication of the Yellow Fever Mosquito. So far as I know, the work in this area has been confined mainly to the B.C.G. Campaign. It appears to me that tuberculosis in Barbados is more rampant than yellow fever caused by this mosquito. Trinidad has erected a T.B. sanatorium; other colonies have begun with the campaign to eradicate tuberculosis while we start with the campaign to eradicate yellow fever and say that we have had discussions as regards starting a campaign against tuberculosis. The incidence of tuberculosis is on the increase; so far, this Government has not seen fit to erect a T.B. Sanatorium and there is no proper means of controlling T.B. It appears to me that we will be well advised to start the B.C.G. Campaign and allow our attention to be directed later on to the eradication of yellow fever.

The honourable Minister of Health should have made some statement as to the unnecessary delay on the part of the Government in respect of the B.C.G. Campaign: almost the entire island of Trinidad has been inoculated by the same regional organisation and there has been some criticism as to the negligence of Barbados in not starting the B.C.G. Campaign; I am not at all sure that when other West Indian Governments got the World Health Organisation to start the B.C.G. Campaign in their areas, these Governments were called upon to make any subvention to the expenses of the Organisation. It should not be surprising if the participation of the World Health Organisation in the campaign in Trinidad and elsewhere was relatively free of expense to the colonies concerned; now that we are starting to provide funds for the Organisation, we are starting to deal with the eradication of yellow fever! Unless we want to give the impression that this colony is overrun by the Yellow Fever Mosquito and its eradication demands priority, it seems to me that the correct step for us to take would have been to begin to combat a disease which is taking an increasingly grave toll of the life and health of the community. The figures published monthly by the Medical Department show beyond the shadow of doubt that T.B. is on the increase; and the recent recommendation of the Hospital Planning Committee to erect a T.B. Sanatorium in the Hospital block must take time to be put into effect. So far as I know, no adequate steps are being taken or even contemplated by the Government to stop the advancing menace of tuberculosis. I think that the public is entitled to some further information on the part of the honourable introducer of the Resolution as to why other colonies in the West Indies have almost finished their B.C.G. Campaign and we have not yet begun ours but are still contemplating the introduction of this Campaign.

With regard to the payment of this subvention in American dollars, I should like to say that the few American dollars which we get in this island are insufficient for our necessities; we are getting less than almost any other colony in the West Indies. Almost every other colony in the West Indies has a better allocation of American dollars than we have; the allocation which we have is nothing short of criminal, judged by any standard. While none of us would deny the importance of health in the community or a contribution to an Organisation like

this, while we consider that the eradication of the Yellow Fever Mosquito will take place in Barbados, and the expenses incurred locally will be in sterling, it is difficult to understand why we should make our contribution to the expenses of this Organisation in American dollars. The equivalent in sterling is, in itself, a different matter, but it does appear to me as if the few American dollars we do get from the pool should be utilised for the necessary imports from areas which can supply them cheaper than the sterling areas, and not for a contribution towards a campaign like this which must take place locally and which will require local currency. The contribution to this campaign should not be allowed to make any inroads into our small dollar allocation.

Hon Dr. CUMMINS: To answer the honourable junior member for the City first as to why we are called upon to make a contribution to the expenses of this Organisation, I should like to say that the United Kingdom pays an annual contribution to the World Health Organisation and the United Kingdom felt that that contribution would also include the colonies; but since the Pan American Sanitary Organisation has been made a separate entity, the Governments in this area are called upon to make a contribution to this Organisation. The British Caribbean colonies are contributing as a whole to the Organisation and they are considered as one unit which will have the right of representation at the meetings of this Organisation. Previous to that, the British Caribbean Colonies had no right to be represented at these meetings; they were represented by an official specially nominated by the Colonial Office. Since this arrangement has been effected, the British Caribbean area will have the right to be represented and at the last meeting Dr. Peat of Trinidad represented the area.

As to the basis for arriving at the amount of this contribution, there was a suggestion made at one time that the matter should be dealt with on a population basis and there was also another suggestion that the matter should be dealt with on the basis of revenue. However, at the last meeting of the Regional Economic Committee, the sum of \$15,000 United States currency, was agreed upon and the contribution of 6% by Barbados was arrived at. As I see it, the Governments in the Caribbean area and in the South American area as well, contribute to the expenses of this Organisation and it seems to me that you must have some common denomination. It was therefore decided to have these contributions in United States currency and that is why this \$15,000 is in that currency.

The honourable senior member for St. Philip has talked about our trying to make out to the world that yellow fever is rampant here; but anybody who knows Barbados will know that we had an attack of yellow fever some years ago and the Yellow Fever Mosquito is rampant in Barbados. You will find it on the beaches, in crab holes—wherever water has been allowed to accumulate and become stagnant you will find this mosquito *Aedes Egypti* and we are liable to have another attack of yellow fever. This campaign is not in connection with Barbados alone; it embraces the whole Caribbean area and the South American area as well.

As to why we have not started the B.C.G. Campaign, I want to say that no Government carries out that campaign on its own back; a Government is assisted by this same Organisation in carrying out such a campaign. One of the conditions is that provision must be made for the treatment of tuberculosis; that is a prerequisite for carrying out a B.C.G. Campaign. Those who have read the Report which was laid last Tuesday in connection with the Planning Committee as to the Hospital will see that

at the Hospital provision will be made for a separate block where the treatment of tuberculosis will be carried out. When the Pan-American Sanitary Organisation is satisfied that we are making provision for the treatment of tuberculosis, then and only then will the B.C.G. Campaign be undertaken. As soon as the Legislature deals with that Report and decides to take action on it and that is reported to the Bureau, we feel sure that they will come to our assistance with the B.C.G. Campaign. I know it will be asked why we are making provision for the treatment of tuberculosis at the Hospital rather than erecting a sanatorium. (A MEMBER: That is out of order). Well if that is out of order I will take my seat. I thought I would explain to the honourable member just why we are carrying out the campaign against the Yellow Fever Mosquito and the reason for this contribution being in American dollars.

Mr. LEWIS: I thank the honourable member for his explanation and I am glad to know that we will have some form of representation for our money; that is a good feature in this matter. I suppose it is in order to get around some difficulties that they have chosen a common currency, but I am not entirely satisfied on that point. The honourable member has not answered the question as to how we came to be contributing this 6%; perhaps no lumpsum was decided upon before and the Regional Economic Committee decided on a lumpsum. The honourable member said that there was a suggestion made as to the contribution being put on a population basis and there was also a suggestion made that it should be put on a revenue basis; the Regional Economic Committee decided on a lumpsum and we are paying this 6%. That is all right; what I would like to know is this; what was the basis on which the Regional Economic Committee came to the conclusion that our contribution should be 6%? If we have present with us our representative on the Regional Economic Committee I cannot see why we cannot be given that information. The honourable member now says that this contribution of 6% is on the basis of population; he said that two suggestions had been put forward but he did not say which suggestion had been followed. He went on to say that they had decided on this amount of \$15,000 but did not say on what basis that our contribution was 6%.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTE RE EMPLOYEES AT SEAWELL AIRPORT

HON. M. E. COX: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution to place the sum of \$416.00 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953-54, Part I Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1953-54, No. 43, which form the Schedule to the Resolution in connection with staff at the Airport.

Honourable members will see the manner in which the Resolution has been broken down; the sum of \$325 is for the purpose of employing four Grade "B" Mechanics at Seawell, \$55 for the payment of a Cost of Living Allowance and \$36 for the provision of refreshments for a few persons who have to remain at the Airport for long hours as a result of the delay in the arrival and departure of aircraft. The Addendum to the Resolution explains everything as fully as could be done; I took particular pains to get it as explanatory as possible and I hardly think it necessary to say much on this

Resolution. I think it was some time in September last year when the Government Electrical Engineer paid a visit to the Airport and made a survey of the installations there and recommended that additional mechanics should be employed in order to keep these installations free from erosion and things of that sort. Since then the Director of Highways and Transport, the Electrical Engineer and the Director of Civil Aviation got together and decided that it was in the best interests of the efficient running of the Airport and as far as mechanics are concerned, that we should employ a larger number of mechanics than we now employ rather than have to spend enormous sums in paying firms to keep these installations in order. As a result of that recommendation, the House is being asked to vote this sum of \$416.

It is hoped to recoup these four mechanics before the end of the financial year. I say that because it might be said that in view of the fact that the Estimates for 1954-55 are before us, this matter could have been left over. This recommendation has been made by technical people who have pressed that the matter be dealt with immediately. As regards this \$36 for refreshment, I think honourable members will agree that the people concerned have made out a case for this provision; agents or representatives of airlines at Seawell give their employees this concession. When there is a delay in the arrival of aircraft they go for refreshment and the Government is asked to do the same thing for its officers, which we consider to be reasonable. That is why we have included this amount in this Resolution. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: In looking over this Resolution I want to make a few comments on the action taken by the hon. Minister of Communications. It is only two months ago that I made some strong criticism of the way in which the Government was operating the Airport and paying a lot of overtime to one mechanic, and I am glad to see that the Government has decided to employ four more Grade "B" Mechanics. I am indeed glad to notice this action which has been taken by the Government following the comments and criticism I made; that is an indication that if we, as the elected representatives of the people, attempt to perform our duty some notice will be taken of it. I am glad to see that the few feeble remarks I made that day have taken effect and I want to register a word of appreciation to the Government for having taken this immediate action to remedy the state of affairs at the Airport. I am in hearty agreement with this Resolution and it therefore has my whole-hearted support. I want to compliment the honourable Minister of Communications on having made this move which will give him credit in the position he occupies.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to draw the attention of the honourable Minister of Communications to note 2 of the addendum to this Resolution. That note says: "It is considered equitable to pay an allowance to cover the cost of meals to the Air Traffic Control Officers at Seawell Airport when they are required to remain on duty outside of normal hours due to late flights provided that they do not reside on the premises. These officers are not eligible for travelling allowance and do not receive overtime pay in respect of abnormal hours during which they are on duty and it is proposed to pay them out-of-pocket expenses to cover

actual cost of meals as and when the occasion arises."

I should like to ask the honourable Minister what are the conditions of employment of these technical officers and I should like to know why the Government has only decided on the provision of meals as out-of-pocket expenses. I will point out to the hon. Minister how illogical it is to pay technical officers a meal allowance on the basis of what is set out in the addendum to this Resolution. You say that these officers work outside of normal working hours, but you do not pay a meal allowance based on the fact that the officers are working out of the normal working hours; you give a meal allowance on the basis that people are working far away from their meals. You do not give a meal allowance *in lieu* of overtime; if a Customs Officer receives a dollar per hour for overtime work and he works eight hours overtime he will receive \$8.00 but if these Air Traffic Control Officers work for the same number of hours overtime, they will only get meals. I do not agree that you should pay these Air Traffic Control Officers a meal allowance for abnormal working hours; they are entitled to more generous treatment. If these officers were members of the Trade Union and I was asked to negotiate with the Government on their behalf, I would not accept for them any meal allowance in lieu of overtime wages. If you want to give these officers an allowance, give them an allowance which is appropriate to the amount of overtime work you want them to do. It is unscientific to say that you are giving these Officers a meal allowance; if these Officers are working outside of normal working hours and you are giving them an allowance I would suggest to the Government that it should not be based on meals because that is an unscientific approach to the matter, since these officers will get an allowance which is the equivalent of meals while others will get an allowance based on overtime work. I am not opposing this Resolution, but I am just throwing out that suggestion to the honourable Minister; this is a matter on which I can speak because it is a part of my duty to deal with such matters. You do not give an allowance for overtime based on meals because, except a person is a glutton, the actual meals would not be a fair allowance. I suggest that this matter should be regularised departmentally; honourable members will see that these Officers would not be placed on a proper footing. There is a Customs Officer who goes to Seawell and he is paid for overtime hours based on whatever the rate is: if the rate is a dollar per hour, I repeat, and he works for eight hours, he will receive \$8.00 while these technical Officers would be getting meals. Meals should not be the basis for the payment of an allowance for overtime hours as set out in this Resolution.

Mr. LEWIS: I am glad to hear the honourable junior member for St. Peter speak with authority like that, because this matter struck me as being peculiar. I do not know if outside of normal working hours would include the regular lunch hour for an employee, I do not know if this is a cheaper system as recommended by the Government: I know that when officers get overtime they are paid by the shift. As regards those who work with shipping, I think the warehouses have to pay for overtime work. From what I hear now, it is really not so much a question of working during meal time as working outside of normal working hours. Whatever the position is, I think the Government might find themselves in difficulty if they introduce this principle; they should try and discover how the average

works out and give these Officers an allowance based on that and let them look after their own meals. These Officers may be able to make that arrangement themselves.

The next thing is that this Resolution has no commencing date. If the Other Place is not sitting today and you cannot compel them to sit next Tuesday, on what is this Resolution based? Are you employing these people from the last week in March or have they been employed already and the Resolution has now come down to the House? This Resolution will have no effect until it has gone through the regular course and signed by the Head of the Administration. What is the provision here? Have they provided for three weeks or what? Have these people worked already and the Resolution has now come down? In my opinion, this state of affairs has been existing for so long that it might have been left and dealt with in the Estimates and a start could be made from the beginning of the financial year. I think it is incumbent on the honourable Minister to say exactly what the position is, because we have discovered that Resolutions have been brought here after money has been spent and that is something which is entirely wrong. There may be occasions on which such a thing can be excused, but this is something which has come before the House. Have they got one man to do the work of five people? I do not know if this man used to help with the mechanical side as well; I have to go by what the Resolution says; it may be that somebody else might be able to see something else. I think the Government should say how long they are providing for here by the salaries they are paying; I say that something should have been put in the Resolution as to when it will operate, whether this money is for one week and if it is only for one week why was it put in a separate Resolution to be dealt with by this House almost at the time when the Estimates are discussed? I would like to know whether this gentleman who is out here dealing with the organisation of departments has been asked whether this set-up will meet the needs of the Airport; whether there are too many people or too few. Has this gentleman's opinion been asked in connection with this subject?

Hon. M. E. COX: I will answer the last question first. Mr. Foster is dealing with the re-organisation of offices which, I presume is a clerical matter; but this is a technical matter. The Electrical Engineer, the Director of Highways and Transport and the Director of Civil Aviation—all technical men—recommended what has been set out in this Resolution and the Government agreed with it. I want to assure the honourable junior member for the City that nobody has been appointed to any of these posts as yet; I do not think that the Government would take the chance of appointing anybody before this Resolution is approved by the Legislature.

I thank the honourable junior member for St. Peter for the remarks he has made, but I would like to tell him in the first place that this allowance will not be an allowance in the sense that they will get \$2.00 or \$3.00 but they will get their dinner or lunch at the canteen at the Airport. The Airport Manager will take charge and see that these meals are being paid for. As you know, Mr. Chairman, there are many jobs in Government Departments for which no overtime is paid; you have the Inspector and employees at the Waterworks Department and when they attend to a pipe which bursts in the middle of the night they do not get any overtime payment. These Officers were employed with the understanding that they would not receive any overtime pay, but this is just a gesture on the part of the Government who

realises that sometimes plane flights are delayed, these Officers are far from their homes and the Airport Manager has asked that consideration be given to them. The Government feels that it is a reasonable request and agreed to grant it; but there is absolutely no obligation on the part of the Government to do so. The arrangement was that these Officers would be paid so much per month and they would be present at the arrival or departure of aircraft; it was not stipulated in the terms of the agreement that they would be given any overtime pay. They have only asked for consideration in so far as meals are concerned.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: It was not a condition of employment to give these Officers overtime pay and it was not a condition of employment to give meals either. The argument that these Officers are not entitled to overtime pay because they are not required to do anything outside the condition of their employment does not arise; if they are entitled to a meal because they have to go to the Airport at 2 o'clock in the morning, that would apply to somebody else as well. What I want to stress is this; if a case has been made out for an allowance, it is a case for an allowance, not for a meal; you pay a man a meal allowance when you take him from his normal responsibility within his normal working hours. A meal allowance would be on the basis of whenever a man eats a meal and if there is a man who could not eat after 8 o'clock he would not get any meal allowance whereas another man who could eat three meals would get an allowance for three meals. The question of giving a meal allowance could not be regarded as a scientific approach to this matter; as soon as you start this business of giving a meal allowance you will find that you will have to give it to the other people as well. The Government started something at the General Hospital and the people at the Mental Hospital asked for the same thing because the door had been opened; when a door has been opened it is not so easy to close it; all these gentlemen who work in the Courts in the country would also ask for meals because they are not working in their territories. It is better for the Government to pay these Officers more than this \$36 and close the door to something which does not make any sense. The question of a meal allowance does not arise here.

The honourable introducer of this Resolution did not say what was the basis of the employment of these Officers; he said that they would not get any overtime pay. If you provide these Officers with meals then people at the Waterworks Department could claim the same thing: they will come along with a just case and ask; "If you can pay these technical officers at Seawell a meal allowance because they are called upon to work between 2 o'clock and 4 o'clock in the morning, what is the difference between them and people at the Waterworks Department who are called up to St. Andrew at 2 o'clock in the morning to attend to a burst main? I am giving the honourable member the benefit of my knowledge without the payment of a fee; this is something with which I deal every day. You never pay a meal allowance for working during abnormal hours; I would suggest that a proper allowance be paid these Officers even if you give them more money.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to know for how long in the current year has the Government arranged to employ these people. They must have a specific period which this Resolution must cover: does it cover a month? This Resolution was introduced on the 23rd February and I am asking how long does it cover? Certainly the honourable member could answer that question. According to what the honourable member has just said, they are providing for

a month's salary. I am suggesting that the honourable member should take to heart the advice which has just been given by a Trade Unionist and at least withdraw the last item in the Resolution, put it on a proper basis, introduce it in the Estimates and let a proper method of overtime pay be given to these people who are covered by this amount. I am not satisfied that what is proposed here is the proper way to deal with this matter: the honourable junior member for St. Peter not only has experience as a Trade Unionist and is therefore engaged in these matters, but he has been a member of the Government; he is therefore speaking with experience from both sides. I think it would be well to delete this item from the Resolution, get it re-considered in the light of what the honourable Minister has heard today and bring it down as a new proposition based on an allowance for overtime work. I will tell the honourable member that if he brings about any dissatisfaction in the Civil Service he will have to remedy it.

Mr. MILLER: I have had on several occasions to comment in this House on the tremendous cost of maintaining equipment at Seawell: two years ago some major overhauling was done to three of the units, which exceeded the cost of those units as new. I think the Government is wise in deciding to carry four additional mechanics at the Airport when they have 13 units to be serviced. I would like to say that this is the first time in the past five years that I have heard anything about trade unionism in this House at all; it is fortunate to be here today to hear the honourable junior member for St. Peter speak on this matter. As regards this Resolution, I am wondering if something went wrong that the honourable Minister of Communications decided to bring it down. There were three technical men who advised this change but the honourable member did not seem to assert his position at all; according to note 2 of the Addendum to this Resolution an allowance for meals is to be given in lieu of wages. Another point which I think the honourable member should be willing to accept is that these Officers could have an arrangement made to have their own meals sent to them and they would prefer to have such meals. The honourable member said that it was on the advice of three technical men——

Hon. M. E. COX: I said that the employment of these four additional Grade "B" Mechanics was the recommendation of the three technical men—the Director of Highways and Transport, the Government Electrical Engineer and the Controller of Civil Aviation.

Mr. MILLER: I understood that the honourable member acted on the recommendation of these technical men; all I am saying is that he did not see fit to assert his own position rather than have things appear to be abnormal. The honourable member has asked if I know how the machinery works; well, I happen to understand, and if that is going to be the attitude of the honourable member, I am simply asking that he should have the addendum to this Resolution changed to read that as a gesture the Government is supplying these Officers with a meal. I agree that these Officers should be paid an allowance, but what I dislike is that this allowance is going to be really and truly in lieu of wages. I think the honourable Minister should see fit to change this position since it will only cause the unpleasant insinuation that you are offering these Officers a meal in lieu of overtime; and the honourable Minister has hinted that if these Officers got their meals through any other channel they would not be paid for, which makes the position worse. I hope the honourable member will clarify that: it leaves one to think several things.

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

On the motion of Honourable Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Honourable Mr. COX, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Honourable Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Honourable M. E. COX in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

THE ESTIMATES FOR 1954-55

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—To move the consideration of the Estimates for the financial year 1954-55.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—In moving the consideration of the Estimates for the financial year 1954-55 I would first like to repeat for the benefit of those honourable members who were not here on the last occasion, what I said in reply to a statement made by an honourable member to the effect that the Government was, for my personal benefit, attempting to rush these Estimates through the House. I have never left this colony and never will leave this colony at a time when—in the old days as a member of the Executive Committee and now as Premier—my leaving the colony would be to the detriment of my duties. In proposing that the Estimates should be begun today, that is nothing which we have not done over and over again; last year they were started in the same week and they started in the same week in the year before and also in the year before that. When that honourable member went so far as to say that that was done either here or in Great Britain, I say again that in Great Britain the Chancellor of the Exchequer makes his Budget Speech, the Leader of the Opposition makes his reply and then the back benchers on both sides make their speeches. What I said was that while long speeches might be made on the Estimates, it was nonsense to say that immediately after the Estimates are introduced it is necessary to have an adjournment. There is no necessity whatever for that and it would be childish to adopt a practice which does not exist anywhere else. I suggest that we should not start a practice which has no justification for itself whatever; I suggest that after the Leader of the Government has introduced the Budget and then nothing else is done, is childish.

I appeal to honourable members, at least to save time, to follow the practice which this House has pursued from time immemorial, a practice which exists in every normal parliamentary Assembly, of making your second reading speeches on the Estimates even although you may not begin to discuss the Estimates in detail until a later date. It does not worry me, but I do hope that we will not have the spectacle of honourable members departing from a 300-year-old practice. It is not necessarily the best practice because it is 300 years old but it is a good practice although some honourable members are disappointed because they have not been made Ministers of the Government. Let me tell the House this; if I were to take honourable members seriously I would perhaps be flattered at the fact that they want to keep me in Barbados rather than that I should be away: when the cats are away the mice begin to play. Only yesterday I had an official invitation to attend a Commonwealth gathering at Lahore and I did not accept it because travelling alone would require a week and I have no intention of leaving Barbados

for so long a period as might possibly cause me to neglect my duties. I apologize to the House for making that personal reference, but only last Tuesday night it was suggested that the Estimates should not be begun to-day, and I must of necessity point out to honourable members what the position is. I would not go as far as Pelican Island if that would cause me to neglect my duties; I have often turned down opportunities to attend conferences in different parts of the world even although the House chose me to attend them because it would mean my being away for some time. I hope honourable members will see that what we are doing tonight is nothing to do with the personal convenience of any honourable member.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise at a point of order. I would like to find out if there is a motion before the House or if the honourable Premier is merely making an explanation.

His Honour THE SPEAKER: There is a motion before the House.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I moved the consideration of the Estimates for the financial year, 1954-55 and on behalf of the Government, I am telling the House that this is not the first occasion when consideration has begun on Estimates after they have been placed in honourable members' hands for just a week. I have taken the trouble to search the records and have found out that this has been actually the practice, year after year, since the Bushe Experiment started. I hope honourable members would therefore not think that this is anything unusual. In the House of Commons, when the Budget is presented, you sit down and listen to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. You have no Estimates in your hands; probably, you have something which corresponds to a little memorandum on the Estimates—something like our memorandum—and you are expected to be in a position to reply. The honourable junior member for St. James, for a number of years, has been in the position as I am in now. As the honourable member will remember, what we are doing today depends on the mood of the House. As a matter of fact, it is rather amusing to look over the things that have happened already in consideration of annual Estimates. There was an occasion when the late senior member for St. George, Mr. Springer, introduced one, and before consideration of it had been completed, the two of us left to attend a conference out of the Island. We left in the middle of the discussion on it and it was passed without any fuss. Discussion on the Annual Estimates depends purely on the mood of the House at the time; there is no question of any fixed time for discussion to take place after they have been presented. Of course, the *Advocate* writes all sorts of things. It has suggested that the members of the House should be given a month to peruse them before discussion. It forgets that the Other Place must get them after the House has considered them and in time to pass them before the beginning of April. I repeat, as far as this House is concerned, what is being done now, has been done last year and for three or four years gone by. If we believe in the necessity for an Upper Chamber—and it is necessary—it is not fair for us, year after year, to give it insufficient time to consider these Estimates. As long as the Upper Chamber exists, it is necessary not to ignore it. Year after year, the Other Place complains that this Place sends the Annual Estimates up, to give its members only one week to discuss them. If that is so, am I wrong in drawing that to the attention of the House and trying to get them up at least two weeks before the end of March? Mr. Speaker, I hope you will pardon me

for the length of time that I have taken in the explanation.

Having done that, I wish to say that I propose under ministerial system to follow the English practice in the presentation of the Budget. We are going to recount the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure of the previous year to show you how the revenue and expenditure may have existed or fallen short as the case may be. If there is a surplus, we propose to tell you what we are going to do with it and if there is a deficit how we propose to get it back. We are also going to let the public know as from this year on the presentation of the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure, what the Income Tax and general tax proposals are. It is a comparatively easy matter for us this year, as it was to some extent last year, because we are not budgeting from year to year, but budgeting on a five-year basis. As is known, Government has come before the House with a Five-Year Plan and has had it argued out what the Government proposes to be done during the years 1952-56. We have brought in a Five-Year Plan and told you that we are budgeting on a five-year basis; therefore, for the next three years the House will have before it in the Budget Speech the proposals which the Government has put before them as that year's implementation of the 1952-57 Plan.

I do not believe that it is necessary for me to speak at great length. Honourable members will bear in mind that I am taking it for granted that they have joined with the Government in agreeing to the Five-Year Plan. That is what has been done with the first and second year's budget of the Five-Year Plan. As I have pointed out previously, as is natural, with few exceptions, all of us are human beings, and every human plan has to be revised at a certain time. Not even the Russians of whom some people may speak with great praise have been able to stick completely to their Five-Year Plan.

(A VOICE: That could not be meant to any of us because we never had a Red Flag flying at our headquarters like that flown in Fairchild Street.)

I suggest to the honourable member who made that aside to read some books published by ex-Communists and read what they say of the British Premier, Sir Winston Churchill. Sir Winston Churchill himself said that he would make an alliance with the devil; and it will be remembered that the British War Premier was only too glad to praise Mr. Stalin for joining in an alliance with the Allies to fight against Nazism. At one time, Mr. Churchill, as he was then titled, wrapped himself up in a Russian flag. If that is so, I do not think this Labour Party has anything to be ashamed of.

Mr. Speaker, I shall again remind honourable members that this year's budget is only another instalment of what the Government proposed to do in the Five Year Plan. We have departed in one respect from our proposals in the Five-Year Plan by the spending of more money on the Water-works.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, Has the honourable member made a motion yet that he is beginning consideration on the 1954-55 Colonial Estimates?

(A VOICE: It is on the Order Paper.)

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: One of these days I am going to give the Opposition a few tips on parliamentary procedure.

(A VOICE: But you say that there is no Opposition.)

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: There is no Opposition because the Opposition agrees with the Government. —(Laughter).

Sir, there is general agreement that we in Barbados, unlike some of the other places, introduce our Budget before the end of the financial year and therefore, there is the disadvantage that every year you can only estimate what your revenue and expenditure are going to be; therefore, in your estimating, there can either be a deficit or a surplus. Luckily for us, it is what you would expect and that is there is a surplus. It is however unfortunate that is so because you will find some people saying that this Government is building up a surplus year after year through its raising on income tax and budgeting for less than it knows it would collect. However, when the honourable junior member for St. James was running this Government, I think he had that talk thrown at him also.

Sir, the Government is very glad that Customs and Excise produced more than it had budgeted for and that also applies to Income Tax. It is very easy to be wrong in your estimating but in our case while we may only be a bit wrong, there are conspicuous cases in the great metropolitan countries of vast differences between estimates and receipts.

(A VOICE: Barbados is not a metropolitan country).

That is quite true; but obviously, how can you estimate to the exact figure when you cannot tell who is going to die and what estate duties would come in. How can anybody tell until the canes are cut, how much money can be had from sales of the crop? How can you estimate accurately what income tax is going to be until you know what are the sales from the crop? How can you estimate properly what the Bridgetown merchants are going to do by way of bringing in goods when because some may think of a threat of war, they may think of stocking up a lot of goods? You cannot tell that. I would ask the House to believe, as I would believe the Opposition if by any mischance they had the opportunity of drafting the budget, that this Government has determined certain things and is sticking to them as regards rates of income tax and other taxes but while that is so, this Government has never failed to do its utmost to keep as close an approximation of expenditure with what it believes it should get in revenue. Members of this Government have always pointed out to Heads of Departments not to come back for Supplementary Estimates nor to over estimate their revenue. That is our cardinal principle and Heads of Departments are asked to co-operate. Mr. Speaker, I say again, that as long as we have this budget before the end of the financial year, we will always have this difference. Luckily for us, the difference is on the credit side.

Sir, If honourable members will refer to the Memorandum on the Estimates, they will see that the General Revenue Balance on the 1st April, 1953 was \$5,770,933 according to the revised estimate. The revised revenue amounted to \$14,155,478 while the revised current expenditure is \$12,543,583, so that on the year's working, we expect a gross surplus of \$1,611,895. Half of this amount, as honourable members are aware, will go to the General Revenue Balance, and that sum is \$805,947. But out of that General Revenue Balance, we estimate that we shall have to spend the sum of \$1,200,526 on Capital Works. The result, therefore, if you add and subtract those figures, is that at the beginning of April this year, our General Revenue Balance should be about \$5,376,354.

I have already said that generally it is not true to say that we underestimate and this is presenting

a surplus. Honourable members will remember — and I am sure that the honourable junior member for St. Andrew who is a planter will bear me out on this—that there was a lot of what I would call wild guessing as to the forecast of the crop. We were told at one time that it was estimated at 100,000 tons and then it was put at 140,000 tons, but now it can be taken to be 160,000 tons, so it is inevitable that as the crop having proved better than the general line of forecast, that a surplus would take place. Luckily for us again, this year's crop is likely to be very large and in budgeting, we are bearing in mind that the year's crop will be more than 160,000 tons and we are watching that, but I do remind honourable members of the fact that the reason why we got this big surplus on last year's budget was due to the fact that when we started budgeting, we did not expect a crop of 160,000 tons. The result has been that from all angles, especially from the income tax angle, we have had a very satisfactory revenue year.

The revised Estimates of Expenditure exceeded the approved Estimates as honourable members will see from the Memorandum by \$183,056, but the House will remember that there was during the past twelve months unforeseen expenditure which had been approved of, and that has caused this extra \$183,056 to be spent.

If honourable members will turn to paragraph 3 of the Memorandum on the Estimates, they will see what the capital expenditure from available funds is going to be. It will be seen that for the first two years of the Five Year Plan we would have spent little over two-fifths of the total of the allocated available funds. As we have pointed out at the time of the Five Year Plan it was our absolute endeavour not to spend only one-fifth, two-fifths or three-fifths of the allocated available funds as the years go by, but if as a matter of fact in our expenditure we did not jump well ahead or short of what we proposed to spend over the period that we would be less unlikely to get into trouble than if we spend the allocated amount in a quicker period than we intended. Some honourable members will say if you can accomplish what you have set out to do in the Five-Year-Plan in less time than you anticipated, why not have it finished in the quicker period, but I believe honourable members will appreciate that it is better if you are budgeting to keep in position with your Five-Year Plan, as it probably will lead you to less trouble as the years go by. I do ask honourable members who may be inclined to criticise—and it is your duty to point government to its mistakes such as they appear to you—to bear in mind always that this year's budget is merely the carrying out of this year's portion of the Five Year Plan both as regards to expenditure and taxation. The only excess in expenditure is in regard to water supply and that is probably due to the fact that we have in the Waterworks Department so good an expert as Mr. Garrod. Of course I shall say that the Minister for Communications, Housing and Works is better qualified than I to say this. Through the expert knowledge of Mr. Garrod the water supply programme has so well advanced that we have departed from the Five-Year Plan and are putting in this year's estimates the sum of \$150,000 above what we previously earmarked for additional mains and standpipes. The large mains having been established it would be a pity if we do not make provision to allow individuals to turn in water privately.

I pass on to our expenditure in anticipation of our raising of loans. It has not been so far great. Let me just say that if there are any special questions or

any information as to the Government's policy on future plans I will endeavour to give such information as is possible for me to give. I throw out the hint that the Government is endeavouring to go in for a huge programme of works which will mean engaging huge loans but it is a matter of delicacy as to what loans other than great loans we pay off or go in for. I am trying to pick my words carefully. In short, honourable members will see that it is a question of confidence with the money market. You have so to conduct your finances that they should appeal to lenders of money. You have so to conduct your finances that when money-lenders look to see what is the financial position of the Island as a whole, what is the public debt, what is the money spent in advance of loans and the loans that you have got and the loans that you are prepared to get, whether they would be free to lend you more money. I shall not deal with anything which we may have spent on loans and money advanced against the raising of loans, but I will remind honourable members that we have a successful start with Self-Aided Housing, and have also increased the capital of the Peasants Loan Bank in order to bring the benefits of that Bank to a greater number of people. The capital of that Bank has been increased by \$150,000. There are other schemes of which honourable members will hear something in due course.

Sir, I have just spoken of the huge loans which we propose to make. I am glad to state that the Committee appointed to consider the Deep Water Harbour Scheme was so representative, not only of the politicians but of the business brains of Bridgetown, and here and there of persons who were a combination of business brains and politicians, like the honourable junior member for the City that it was able to get through its work and lay a report. Let me tell honourable members that the Government purposes to start the Deep Water Harbour as soon as the Crown Agents say they are sure that this Government can raise the money. This is not to say that local people will not have the opportunity of subscribing to the loan also. The Government feels that the Deep Water Harbour scheme is so outstanding and so important that without any delay it should begin it. I should have said, provided this House agrees to it, but I do not think it is necessary to say that because the honourables senior member for the City and the senior member for St. Philip are signatories to the report and I have no doubt that their persuasion would make the honourable senior member for St. John see with the implementation of the scheme. I think honourable members know me too well to know that I am not flattering them when I say that I think the report of that Committee is an excellent one. I would say that along with one or two other recent reports, it is a very well written report and the suggestions are good and, obviously, it draws one into every aspect of the scheme. I would remind the House, as has been set out in the Memorandum of the Estimates of 1954-55, the expenditure on this Deep Water Harbour Scheme is so great that it is going to entail three or four times as much as has been raised by loans in the three hundred years of the history of Barbados, so that is an indication of the tremendous problem before us. As honourable members will also remember, the Deep Water Harbour Scheme was not put in the Five Year Plan and I hope when I come to deal with the question of taxation that honourable members will bear that in mind. I anticipate some honourable members might say why didn't we take the implementation of this scheme into account when we dealt with the Five-Year Plan.

Another honourable member might go as far as to say that the implementation of this scheme was not one of the Government proposals in the Five-Year Plan, therefore, on the grounds that we have so many things to provide, which we have not provided for in the Five-Year Plan that we should not embark on this scheme. I hope that I am an inaccurate prophet and no honourable member would say that we should not be committed to any new form of taxation. I do hope that this House will appreciate the absolute necessity for every section of the community, if this huge loan is to be raised, to pull its weight and make sure that this Deep Water Harbour Scheme will be a success, I mean not only in the raising of the loan, but also that they will see the necessity for such burdens as the community may have to bear if we are to carry out the scheme. The honourable senior member for St. Philip has written a Minority Report on the scheme saying that he does not agree with the levy of a port charge of 2% on the imports or exports. He may not have put it quite as strongly as that.

I may say, though I do not like to be a gloomy prophet, that apparently, there is no excessive reason to hope that we are going to find oil in commercial quantities. However, if we do find oil in commercial quantities, taxation of one form or the other will be remitted because of the money that would come in from oil royalties.

Mr. Speaker I propose to go from this point to the question of revenue. Perhaps, this is a point at which this House can take a break. Although, strictly speaking, I have made one motion to the House already, I believe you will permit me to move a motion for the adjournment of the House for a short interval. If I am in order, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for three-quarters of an hour.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling,

"BILL TO AUTHORISE ESSO OIL S. A. TO CONSTRUCT OIL STORAGE STATION

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave at this stage, as I earlier intimated, to deal with Item No. 1 of Private Members' Business standing under my name.

His Hon. The SPEAKER: The honourable junior member for Christ Church is asking for leave to deal with Item No. 1 of Private Members' Business: Second reading of a Bill to authorise the Esso Standard Oil S.A. to construct and maintain a Petroleum Oil Storage Station.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Sir, the Esso Standard Oil Company of South America which now operates here on the joint facilities of another Oil Company is desirous of putting down its own installations on lands at Mount Ararat, Black Rock, in the parish of St. Michael. The directors of the concern have already approached the Government on the matter and it has been given their blessing, but before the Oil Company can proceed with the installations, it is necessary for this House to agree to the company having the right to make the erections for the installations and to put down the pipelines running from Mount Ararat out to sea from where the company will receive its supplies.

The installation of this new project will mean an increase in labour for Barbados, both in the erection of this installation which I am told will be

equally as large as the present one belonging to the other company, and from the point of view of maintenance and servicing of their products, so I do not think any member of this House would do anything but give it their blessing. We are all conscious of the great necessity in this colony of finding more work for our people. Again, Sir, the installation of this project will not throw a single person out of work from the present installation at Spring Garden. As I have said, it will give a greater bulk of labour to our people. Our harbour dues should also increase because other steamers will be calling to fill their tanks with the company's products.

I anticipate that honourable members will agree to the second reading of this Bill and when the House go into Committee on it, there are some amendments which I wish to make to certain clauses. I also wish to insert the Preamble in its proper place in the Bill. Should any honourable member at this stage wish to ask me any questions on the Bill, I shall be pleased to answer them, but I think I have given as fully as possible the objects and reasons of this Bill. I will not detain this House any longer as I appreciate the opportunity which has been granted me for getting through with it at this stage and I now beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, As I have intimated to the honourable mover of the Bill already, I would like to ask him what is the reason for the introduction of another oil storage station in Barbados? I am very glad to know that another company wishes to erect such a station because I realise that another installation for storing and distributing oil would mean increased employment for our people however small it might be. However, it is good to know the reason though in dealing with oil companies you cannot know anything at all. I feel that at least some reason should be given for the installation of another oil storage station in Barbados, especially when we know that the same company has been storing its products here along with that of another company. I do not think that it would be on account of a break between the two companies because no breaks occur between oil companies. The other thing which I would like to know is whether because of the fact that we will be having two sets of pipe lines and buoys in the same vicinity whether it is likely to create any congestion or danger to navigation. That, Sir, would be my only objection.

With reference to a clause in the Bill, I do not like the Legislature giving someone authority to do something and the Executive Committee being allowed to transfer those rights, but I understand from the honourable mover of the Bill that he intends to make amendments to some of the Clauses when the House goes into Committee and I would like him to pay due regard to Clause 8 with reference to making transfer not valid unless approved by the Legislature. So far as the introduction of the Preamble is concerned, I think it would be a good idea to have the petition preceding the Bill. When the honourable member introduces the Preamble, he has to be very careful to introduce and postpone it at the same time.

Again, I have made some observations and if the honourable mover of the Bill can answer them let him say so. I would like to be assured that there would be no danger to navigation by the additional buoys and pipelines and that the installation would be no fire hazard. The other storage station is on the waterfront, but I understand that this new erection is going to be on the ledge of a hill. I wel-

come the news of this additional storage station as I believe it will be of help to a few more Barbadians. If I can be assured that there will be no danger in the manner I have suggested, I am willing to consider the Bill.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I only wish to say that from the Government's point of view, it has been represented to us that the erection of this new storage station will provide work for a substantial number of people. It has been suggested that one-quarter million dollars will be brought into this country as a result and for that reason, naturally, Government has approved of it. It is one of those things that some honourable members will be glad to hear was discussed in Executive Committee before coming on the floor of this House. I think at the meeting when it was discussed by the Executive, the question of the fire hazard was gone into by the technical officers concerned and Government was assured that it would not present that problem.

Mr. GODDARD: According to the information I have been given, the Esso Standard Oil S. A. is doing a similar thing in other West Indian colonies. As far as I know, there will be similar erections in Martinique, Trinidad and British Guiana. The company's reason, as far as I know would be for personal running of its own installations. I cannot see that it would be for any other reason.

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

On the motion of Mr. GODDARD, seconded by Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to put in the Preamble to this Bill at this stage and at the same time have it postponed.

The Preamble reads as follows:—

"WHEREAS Esso Standard Oil S.A. being a Company registered in this Island under the provision of the Company's Act, 1910 has by its humble petition to the Legislature set forth that it proposes to establish an Oil Station in this Island for the importation, storage and marketing of petroleum and its products; that a site for such installation had been selected and approved by the Executive Committee, but the petitioner had been advised that it is necessary to seek legislative sanction before providing for the construction and maintenance of certain works in or near the sea in the vicinity of the approved site;"

"AND WHEREAS the petitioner has prayed that the Legislature should pass an Act to carry out the objects of the petition, and it is deemed expedient that the prayer of the petition should be granted."

I beg to move that this be the Preamble and that it be postponed.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—

"Esso Standard Oil S.A. hereinafter referred to as the company is hereby authorised to construct and maintain a Petroleum Oil Storage Station and for that purpose to acquire and hold lands at a place at or near the shore of Mount Ararat in the Parish of St. Michael in this Island approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee and to construct and maintain thereon tanks or other receptacles for the storage of petroleum products, a pumping station for filling and emptying such tanks, with

all such buildings, works machinery, tanks, moorings, pontoons, buoys, barges, and appliances needful for such storage and pumping station."

Mr. GODDARD: I beg leave to make an amendment to Clause 2 by the deletion of the words "the shore of" occurring before the words "Mount Ararat" and also for the deletion of the words "moorings, pontoons, buoys, barges," which come at the end of the Clause.

I beg to move that the amended Clause do now stand part of the Bill.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Clauses 3, 4, 5 and 6 were called and passed. Clause 7 was called. It reads as follows:—

"The company may land in or import into the Island and store in the said tanks or other receptacles belonging to the company, petroleum and petroleum products and may sell the same and may pass the same through the submarine or pontoon pipes from such tanks to vessels or from vessels to the tanks, but subject nevertheless to the statutes for the time being relating to the importation storage and sale of petroleum and petroleum products and to any regulations made thereunder, and to any duty imposed by any Customs Tariff Act, for the time being in force."

Mr. GODDARD: I beg leave to make an amendment to Clause 7 by inserting after the word 'duty' occurring near the end of the Clause the words "tax or charge" and by deleting the word 'any' preceding the word 'Customs' and inserting in its place the word 'the' and by inserting after the word 'Act' the words "1921, or any Act amending that Act, or by any other Act." I beg to move that Clause 7 as amended stand part of the Bill.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Clause 8 was called. It reads as follows:—

"The company may from time to time with the consent of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, transfer their rights and liabilities under this Act to any person or company; and when such transfer has been made all the rights, authorities, obligations and liabilities of the company so transferring under this Act shall be transferred, to and vested and be exercised by and be attached to the person or company to whom the same shall have been transferred in like manner as if this Act had been made for the benefit of such person or company; provided that no such sale shall have any effect or validity until it shall have been approved by resolution of the Legislature, and shall have been made by deed and duly recorded in the Registration Office."

Mr. GODDARD: I beg leave to make an amendment to Clause 8 by the deletion of the word 'sale' which precedes the word 'shall' about three lines from the end of the Clause and inserting the word 'transfer' in its place and at the end of the Clause to insert the words "of this Island." I beg to move that Clause 8 as amended stand part of this Bill.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I really do not understand the amendment by the insertion of the word 'transfer' for 'sale'. I hope it is right. It seems to me that the word 'sale' was provided in the Act and the recording of the sale was provided after the word 'sale' was mentioned. Now it is merely a transfer of this right by the Legislature according to the amendment. The sale of the prop-

erty is something different. The Company can sell property but it cannot transfer this right. I cannot see how you can take out the word 'sale' and put in the word 'transfer' and feel that because it is moved and seconded that it is right. I maintain that the sale should be registered but not the transfer of the right. They can sell the property but cannot transfer the right. It only means when this Clause passes this House it is not complete.

The question that Clause 8 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 9 was called. It reads as follows:—

"Nothing in this Act declared or expressed shall affect the rights of Her Majesty the Queen, her heirs and successors or any person whomsoever except such as are mentioned in this Act and those claiming by, from or under them."

Mr. GODDARD: I beg leave to make an amendment to Clause 9 by the deletion of the words "person whomsoever" occurring before the word 'except' and inserting in their place "bodies politic or corporate." I beg to move that Clause 7 as amended stand part.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY seconded the motion which was agreed to.

The Preamble which was postponed was called and passed.

On motion of Mr. GODDARD, seconded by Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Mr. GODDARD seconded by Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, the Bill was read a third time and passed and the title agreed to.

RESUMPTION OF CONSIDERATION OF THE COLONIAL ESTIMATES, 1954-55.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, At the break, I was about to deal with the Estimates of Revenue for the coming financial year. As honourable members will see, the estimate of revenue for 1954-55 is put at \$13,672,184, derived from (a) Customs and Excise \$6,145,000, (b) Taxation \$5,730,000, and (c) Other Revenue \$1,797,184. The estimate for Customs and Excise takes account of the increased yields of the excise duty on rum and the tax on motor spirit. In calculating the income tax estimate, regard has been taken to the somewhat lower profits of last year. As honourable members will also see, the sum of \$14,155,478 is the revised estimate of revenue for the current financial year. I do not think honourable members need hardly to be reminded that the price paid for sugar ceased to rise and as a result, it will be necessary for us to do whatever we can to sell all that we can produce. I therefore throw out the suggestion to the sugar people that there are markets unexplored on the African continent which they may very well consider as worthy of exploration. This is not the sort of thing which primarily a government as a government does, but this Government wishes to think that everything is done to encourage the approach between local sugar growers and any African Colonial Government which may be a market for them to explore. Wherever there is specifically something which can be done to improve the island's economy, I suggest that the local sugar people should investigate it. We have for years folded our arms and said: "What is the good of trying to compete in selling rum in England with Jamaica?" We have also said that if we

tried to get better sales for it by advertising that it would cost a lot of money. I suggest that in the case of the prospects for the sale of sugar on the African continent, nobody has stepped in so far before us and may be, that erstwhile exploratory spirit of the local planter and exporter would think this suggestion worth considering.

Honourable members will see when it comes to taxation that the Government is prepared to forego a certain amount of it. May be, certain honourable members will criticise Government on that but this Government is very conscious of the necessity to preserve the sugar industry. We are very conscious of the fact that we have to fight against the mealy bug. We are also very conscious of the fact that our sugar crops depend on favourable weather, so, it is not to say that we are being rash in our expenditure or lax in circulating revenue. We are mindful of the fact that we have a one-crop economy and owing to that, it is not the safe sort of thing on which a community should depend,—if anything in business can be entirely safe. We are hoping that the experiments which are being continued in irrigation will give some useful data. Unfortunately, with the carrying out of the experiments in irrigation, the rainfall has been so constant that we are not yet able to say whether irrigation can be had at reasonable cost. We must bear in mind that with the service of irrigation, we will have to bring some of the water from depths of over 200 feet. We are, however, continuing these experiments from the funds which were allocated in the Five-Year Plan.

Mr. Speaker, the Government is also aware of the fact that although the external trade of the island has been steady, the retail trade is not quite all what it should be. We have no reason to disbelieve the information which we have got that the internal trade has been reduced somewhat, though at present, speaking generally, I think it is right to say that the level of retail prices has not changed appreciably. Here, I would like to repeat that this Government is utterly convinced, not for pure ideological reasons, but by using its judgment, that it is essential to watch most carefully the rising in the price of commodities that are retailed in the island. As I have said, it is not from ideology, but from the consciousness of our duty to the community that we insist as a general principle that prices on the necessities of life, particularly to those people of the lower income groups, should be controlled. I do hope that the agricultural proposals which are to come before the House, will come with greater details of schemes which Government would be able to put into execution in order to encourage local food production and so that people would be able to sell and grow vegetables at prices which will be remunerative on all sides. However, I think honourable members are aware of the difficulties for the keeping of farm products at a price which the average man can pay. I do think it is preposterous for one to pay 2/- per pound for a head of cabbage. I mention that as a simple illustration. Let me say that this Government is well aware of the necessity for carrying out its promise to the community to keep down the cost of living.

I am endeavouring to be as unprovocative as possible on this subject, but I will say that pressure has been attempted by some portions of the mercantile community for the release of all commodities from price control on the ground that they are no longer in short supply. That idea leaves me cold and I am forced at once to ask: "If they are not in short supply, has competition begun to bring down their prices?" The answer is "No." Why then press for abolition of price controls? Honourable members know very well that the Government had to re-

mind the merchants that if the prices of certain commodities go up, it would have to put them back under price control. Sir, it is no desire of the Government to provoke acrimonious debate on the part of the mercantile community but in order that its members may know quite clearly what is the policy of the Government on prices of the cheaper goods for the people in the lower brackets is the reason why I have mentioned this matter and because I do not intend to leave anybody in doubt.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the estimates of revenue for the coming financial year is \$13,672,184. As honourable members will see, under the head, Customs and Excise, the amount expected to be collected is \$6,145,000 as compared with \$5,858,000 for the current year. Next year's figure takes into account the increased yields of the excise duty on rum and the tax on motor spirits. The estimate of revenue for the coming year under the head, Taxation, is \$5,730,000 as against \$5,830,000 for the current financial year. I think I have said already that in calculating the income tax estimate, regard has been had to the somewhat lower profits last year. Honourable members will also note the increases in the current estimates under the Heads: Licences, Fines Rents and Royalties, Interest and Redemption, Net Revenue from Government commercial undertakings, and from Government Departments and Service. They are due to various causes; for instance, to the increase in water rates and to the surplus which we expected to get from the British Caribbean Currency Board. However, honourable members will also note that there is a fall in revenue and that is due to the increase in wages and other charges on ministerial services.

I will now proceed to deal with the estimate of expenditure for 1954-55. As will be seen, the expenditure is expected to be \$11,661,754 as recurrent and \$1,243,700 as non-recurrent for the coming year as against \$11,271,540 as recurrent and \$1,272,043 as non-recurrent for the current financial year. The decreases are under Head I, Governor; Head XXIX, Miscellaneous, Head XL Waterworks and Head XLIII Controls, Subsidies etc. The increases under the other heads are for one reason or the other, for instance, as increase in wages and salaries. Certain other increases to which I will draw specific attention are mainly due to the introduction of ministerial system of Government and also to the successful move made by the honourable junior member for St. John for increases of salaries for the members of this House. I am sorry that the honourable member is not in his place to listen to the tribute I have paid him. The largest increases as honourable members will see are under the Medical Services \$222,650; Education, \$171,450; Highways and Transport, \$140,198; Police, \$94,929; Airport, \$51,068; Legislature, \$50,066; Customs, \$41,253; Secretariat, \$40,105; Peasants Loan Bank, \$41,253; Agriculture, \$23,838; Old Age Pensions, \$19,000; Income Tax, \$18,474; and Public Works, \$33,751. I may say that the expenditure on medical departments has increased from \$1,580,208 to \$1,704,892 and this has been mainly due to increase in wages and salaries for nurses, and the X-Ray equipment at the General Hospital which was very much over aged and will be replaced. In addition, the Government also proposes to establish a Health Centre in St. Michael and provision has been made in the Estimates for the staff and running expenditure of that centre. The Education vote has been increased in order to provide for relief teachers the increase having been approved last year. In the case of the Police the increase in that department was due to some of the criticism of the Opposition. I am sure that the honourable senior member for St. Lucy, who

has devoted most of his attention to the running of this Department would be glad to know that the largest increase to this department was due to an increase in salaries. It is similarly the case with the increase which is set down against the Department of Highways and Transport. Largest of the increases goes to wages, then to the carrying out of certain drainage work and then to the proposal of bringing the equipment up to approved standard. With regard to the Airport, we have had to provide for maintenance, and for upkeep of roads and the runway.

I come now to capital expenditure. The draft estimates, as honourable members will see, provide for a capital expenditure of \$3,008,531. I have mentioned that there is an increase under the Head "Legislature", that increase being due to the efforts of the honourable junior member for St. John who succeeded in persuading honourable members against their better will in respect of increasing their salaries. To continue with capital expenditure, honourable members will see that a quarter million dollars has been included for a Barbados Development Board, as we foreshadowed in the Five Year Plan, to assist in the development of secondary industries. It is all very well for those who can go to a bank and get an overdraft of \$100,000, but a small man who wants to borrow \$2,000 for the purpose of starting a small business should equally be assisted by this so-called Socialist Government, as some honourable members would call it. I leave the Civil Service to the tender mercies of the honourable senior member for St. John; full details as to the constitution and function of the Development Board will, of course, be sent down to the House for its approval.

An honourable member has mentioned something about houses. He ought to feel that the Civil Servants are hardworking people and my belief in that has been strengthened since Ministerial Status started. Some of these Civil Servants may be able to go to their solicitors or their friends in the real estate business and get properties, but we have to consider other people who are not so fortunate and we are pushing the aided self-help schemes which have been started. I can anticipate the criticism that we are building only a couple of houses; I can make this revelation that the Government is considering schemes not for the 28 houses as appears in the Estimates and added to that is \$5,000,000 for an aided self-help loan scheme, but we are considering a much more elaborate scheme running into 600 houses a year. When that is taken into consideration I think it is only right to say that the Government, in this matter of housing, cannot be said to be neglecting its duty to the community. I say as a statement of fact that it is a very good thing for the Housing Board that the honourable senior member for the City, with his knowledge of the needs of the people and of land values, is a member of that Board; I hope he will remain there for many a year.

I have already mentioned the fact while we are sticking to a reasonable slice of the Five Year Plan, we have made a departure when it comes to water and I have already given the reason for that. Honourable members have before them the Hospital Committee's Report and although I know it is open to criticism by some honourable members, I would just like to remind them that it is not a Government proposal in the sense that the Government has accepted it and is coming down to the House with it. I am told that the Report is a first-class one, but it is merely the Report of a Committee which has been placed before the Government for discussion, and honourable members will have an opportunity of expressing their views on the Report just as they will have an opportunity of expressing their views

on the Report in connection with the Deep Water Harbour. I would like to say that it is the Government's intention to get help from C.D. & W. funds in connection with these schemes. The Secretary of State for the Colonies has intimated that C.D. & W. funds will not be stopped, but that we, with other colonies are entitled to put forward our requirements in the expectation that the Colonial Office will give us an allocation. Nowadays the colonies are asked to say what their requirements are and an allocation of funds will be made. The father of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew, a member of the Labour Party, was very forthright in putting to the Government the advantages of the East Coast Road. I assure honourable members that as far as the C.D. & W. Organisation is concerned, although it is true that when that Organisation was first started, Sir Frank Stockdale used to wonder why we did not ask for funds, no longer is that a reasonable accusation against the Government of Barbados.

As honourable members know, the work of building the Technical Institute is proceeding apace and we hope to get a competent Head for it; but I would like to warn honourable members that we cannot tell for what we will have to come down to the House.

As regards the Head "Education," at last something is being done for St. Joseph; it is proposed to build a new Elementary School in that parish. It is also proposed to erect a new Elementary School at Six Roads, St. Philip, making use of the buildings which we have bought from the Admiralty. The Pine Primary School has not yet been finished as honourable members ought to remember, we are getting a Colonial Development and Welfare grant as regards that School. We are providing for Combermere School to which, I am told, people from the vicinity of the Alleyne School gravitate, and, again at long last, the Boys' Department of Christ Church Foundation School is going to be built to accommodate 390 pupils. We have provided the sum of \$86,000 for that. The honourable member on my right (Mr. SMITH) will be pleased to hear that money has been included to assist peasants with tractors and for the re-organisation of the Mental Farm and to enable us to make a new start with the Abattoir and Cold Storage. As regards the Central Milk Depot Scheme, certain businessmen seem to think that that is a waste of money because the original scheme which the Government had put up would have fallen through; but we are hoping to get money from the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund to help us in this matter. The other schemes with regard to Agricultural and Fisheries Development including the extension of the Livestock Industry are part of the Five Year Plan, which we are carrying out in this financial year.

I presume that everybody will be glad to hear that the programme in connection with the tenantry roads is to be continued and the sum of \$132,000 has been included for that purpose. Provision has also been made for the continuation of the sinking of suck wells; the canalisation of the Constitution Swamp is going to be carried out (Cheers) and the construction of two dams is a part of the general programme of canalisation and damming towards which we have allocated the sum of \$30,000. I realise the difficulty which the Opposition will have in trying to discover something of which the Government has not thought. (Laughter).

Going through some of the revotes, honourable members will see amounts in connection with the renewal of the wharf piling and the Bar to the Careen-

age. I do not propose to say much in this connection because the honourable member on my left (Honourable M. E. Cox) will deal with these matters. There is much criticism about what we are doing as regards Seawell Airport; I hope that the honourable junior member for St. George will be in fine form and that the honourable senior member for St. George will be in his place so that honourable members can listen to these two experts ruling out each other. (Laughter). However, the matter of Seawell is a serious one and I am sure that the honourable junior member for St. George will not mind my being a bit funny; I repeat that the matter of Seawell is a serious one and the chances of Barbados having a better Airport than it has at present are extremely rosy and the runway should be as good as our buildings are up there.

I hope I will not crush anybody's corns in saying that I shudder to think of what might happen as to the question of the new Fire Station if honourable members were to begin to question the whole principle of having a single Fire Station as distinct from having more than one. We have been extremely fortunate when we consider what has happened in British Guiana and other places, but we should not play with fortune for much longer.

The honourable members for St. John must have discovered that they have not been forgotten; it is difficult to forget them. We are going to build a Post Office in St. John, not because we want to please the two honourable members but because we feel that the necessity for a Post Office up there is great.

When dealing with the Police I should have mentioned that after turning them down once or twice because of other necessities, we shall soon start to make the Hometown Station a place wherein human beings can live.

I hope that honourable members will find time soon after the Estimates are over, first in an informal way and then in a formal way, to make up their minds as to the site for the new Ministerial Buildings. The present arrangements for the Ministry and the Registry and other offices are temporary and we hope that they will be temporary for only a few months. It is proposed to build new Government Offices during the year and the sum of \$135,000 has been included as the estimated cost of these offices. The Government has been considering possible sites and as soon as the plans are ready, the Government will bring down the details to the House for consideration; we have, of course, taken notice of criticisms and suggestions made in this House. There are times when I am almost fearful of making remarks about the Opposition in this island; I think I have told honourable members that whether we agree with it or not there is no criticism or suggestion made here which is not considered by the Executive Committee if only to discard it because it is silly; but the criticism or suggestion is considered. Well might the slogan of the Opposition be; "They saved others, themselves they cannot save." They help us but they remain in the Opposition. I suggest seriously to honourable members to turn over in their minds and put up suggestions such as were put at the time of the Five Year Plan as to whether the Waterworks Department should be used for the Registry and so on. It is better to make suggestions before the Government comes down with proposals in respect of these offices; we invite the Opposition to put up suggestions. It is regrettable that the honourable senior member for the City cannot sell to the Government because of his position. You cannot expect people to be moved about and have inadequate accommodation and do efficient work; I refer, of course, to Civil Servants.

As honourable members will see, we will have a gross surplus of \$766,730 with the present rate of taxation; that figure is slightly less than what was budgeted for last year. As regards taxation generally, I will remind the House that our estimate of expenditure and taxation is based on a five-year period; we have constantly to remember that. We have had approval of the Five Year Plan; you know what has been done in the past financial year and we tell you what we are doing in the present financial year. The Government has no intention whatever, barring accidents, of departing from its policy in the Five Year Plan; if oil gushes or if we discover that we can sell all our surplus sugar, we may modify the Five Year Plan to the extent of more expenditure within the period; but I want it to be very clear that we are budgeting this year on the Five Year Plan. The changes in the Customs and Excise Duties in October, 1952, have been fully justified by the results; in the twelve months ended the 31st January, 1954, we have collected nearly \$390,000 more on rum than for the twelve months ended the 31st January 1953. We estimate that we are getting even more next year from that duty. Some people thought that the increased tax on motor spirit would have resulted in less consumption, but we have found out that the tax has had little effect on the consumption. The estimate for 1953-54 will be about \$900,000 and we estimate the same amount for the coming financial year; we will probably get the sum of \$900,000 from the tax on motor spirit.

I intend that this Budget Speech shall be of the nature of an English Budget Speech in which you not merely set out your expenditure and receipts for the past year and the proposed expenditure and the hope for revenue for the coming year, but you intimate what your taxation policy is. I do not propose to interfere with company tax or the present rates of income tax; during last year increases in the rates of depreciation were considered and as regards income tax the proposals are still being considered. If it is suggested that we should have hurried up with this matter and be ready for today I would state that one of the reasons for our not being ready was the illness of Mr. Finch and that of the Attorney General which caused some of our meetings in this connection to be adjourned. Until we have finished consideration of the matter we cannot say anything more than that if there is to be any change in the depreciation allowed, there will be a change in favour rather than against private enterprise putting more money into business. We have not been able to come to a conclusion with all those meetings of ours; if it is decided to have any change in respect of depreciation, we will come down with the proposals very early.

I promised that I would go into the question of allowances; we have gone into that question and we are proposing to increase the allowance for a married man from \$1,200 to \$1,300. (Cheers). I notice that the bachelors do not cheer; we also propose to increase the allowance for children from \$240 to \$270 which is the biggest allowance in the Caribbean area. We say that the allowance will be \$270 if you have 10 children or 40 children; but this allowance is limited to two or three children. That will entail a drop of \$71,000 which we will not try to recover. I believe that we must be the only place in the Caribbean which counts illegitimate along with legitimate children in this matter of allowances. The allowance in Trinidad is \$240 and in British Guiana it is \$240; in Trinidad, if a boy has to live in Port-of-Spain, the allowance is more; that is a variation which does not exist anywhere else. We have tried

many combinations and they have varied from \$165,000 to \$40,000 and the combination by which we will drop \$71,000 seems to be the fairest of all and we will not try to make up for it by taxation from any other source. I wish to assure honourable members that this matter caused us a lot of trouble; all the combinations were taken into account and we will not tax anything to make up for these allowances.

I end almost with the sentence with which I began with expenditure. The Government did not have to be driven to anything except to get the opinion of experts. I have not read what the Income Taxpayers Association has said; the Association sent me a copy of the Rules which I have not read. I made the promise last year that the Government would go carefully into the question of allowances especially those for children and the Government has decided to redeem that promise which was made at this time last year.

As regards the Deep Water Harbour, we have decided that for the sake of Barbados it is a good thing to have a Deep Water Harbour. We know that during the period of construction work will be found for people who might otherwise be displaced and we know it is our duty carefully to consider the question of possible displaced labour. I anticipate criticism as to what is not really on the Estimates, but inasmuch as it is conceivable that the criticism may be made before Your Honour has stopped it, I say that any scheme of importance which this Government has to initiate or has agreed to, and which will cause displacement of labour, is having the very careful attention of the Government. I shall say no more on that matter; I shall listen carefully to what is being said and what is being asked and in due time I shall reply. I do not think it would be fair for any honourable member to attack the honourable senior member for St. Thomas who has only now had an opportunity of giving his attention to any scheme affecting labour. In view of the fact that our proposals for this year's expenditure and our proposals for the collection of revenue have been put before the members of the mercantile community at the same time, they will no longer be in the insecure position of having to wait for months before they know what the company tax is likely to be. I hope we might all see how important it is for us now that we have got over the hurdle which Barbados has had with the B.U.O.C., that by investing and encouraging others to invest we will make the possibility of raising a big loan for the Deep Water Harbour a reality. There is the consideration of the work which will be provided in the period of construction and the benefits which will come to Barbados. I think that with favourable crops being granted us we can look forward to continued prosperity; I think that Barbados with becoming humility, can very well say it has kept its head above water for centuries; it has not only kept its head above water but it has stemmed against the tide of world conditions, held its own and kept its reputation for inspiring confidence among its neighbours and many people have heard of Barbados even if they do not know it. I do not want to seem to be rubbing it in or blowing our own trumpet: but the fact that at a time when a strong Imperialist element controls the destinies of these colonies, Barbados has been afforded a Ministerial system on the scale it enjoys, is some indication that there is confidence in the Government and the people of this colony.

I appeal to honourable members and the people of Barbados to see that we would not have any red blood in our bodies if we did not differ, but the good of Barbados is above the good of any Party

or section of a Party or any of us as individuals or small groups. If we go forward in the spirit of offering help by useful criticism and by co-operation, I feel sure that this island will maintain the reputation which it had for so long—the reputation of being one of the most stable portions of the British Commonwealth and Empire. I do not propose to ask honourable members to discuss any of the Heads of these Estimates tonight, but I do suggest that we should not depart from what is the absolutely normal practice which has not had any break for generations, that is, to have some other speeches on the proposals of the Government in these Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure. I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee in order to consider the Estimates for 1954-55. (Cheers).

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—When I move the postponement of the consideration of these Estimates, I am not echoing the sentiments of anybody. If you look back to the debates on the Estimates from the time I was here, you will observe that I have always claimed more time than a week to consider the Estimates; I have always felt that the Government has had some time to go carefully into the Estimates and at the same time these Estimates were placed in our hands they were given to members of the Other Place so that they could consider them until we passed them. I say that we cannot do justice to these Estimates in just one week after we have had them; if you want healthy criticism it is unreasonable to expect us in one week to be able to go through what the hon. Premier has had some months to go through. After all, the people of this colony lay great stress upon having a healthy Opposition and with the hon. Premier, just a few weeks ago, making it abundantly clear to the world that there was nothing like an Opposition in Barbados, I am more convinced to-day that we should be given an opportunity, by postponing the consideration of these Estimates, to analyse and study the Premier's speech.

It is true that the Premier has intimated that he would prefer to hear our speeches on the Estimates now, but I am suggesting that there should be a postponement now and we can come back a week hence and go on from day to day and finish the Estimates. The speech which we have heard to-day is of great importance both financially and economically to the future of this country. Of course we had these Estimates a week ago but there are matters in these Estimates, more especially of Capital Expenditure, which we should like to consider carefully. If the hon. Premier were reasonable he would appreciate the fact that we do not claim to know everything, and we must come in contact with members of the general public, members of the general service and people who can enlighten us on many subjects in these Estimates. I think it is reasonable to postpone the consideration of these Estimates until next week when we can sit from day to day and every one will be able to make his contribution to the debate on the Estimates; it may be that some of the contributions might be falling on barren land, but you can always learn something from the Opposition.

I do not expect hon. members of the Government to agree with me, but I say it is unreasonable to put these Estimates in our hands last Tuesday and ask us to consider them today. From last Tuesday I have been going through every possible Head of the Estimates, but you must give honourable members an opportunity to go through the Estimates. There

is a Memorandum on these Estimates, it is true, but besides that there are many things which have to be gone through. It is much easier to go through the Estimates in Committee when you give honourable members an opportunity to go through them in the first place; if that is not done hon. members will make second-reading speeches on Heads on which they can make second-reading speeches. There is no question of any personal motive or anything like that; we of the Opposition should like to contribute in our humble way what we can so that the Government can work upon it. We suggest no improper motive of trying to get through the Estimates, but I say that we are entitled to more time to consider the Estimates and the members of the general public are entitled to hear the Opposition. I am appealing to the hon. Premier to give us more time to go through these Estimates because no member of the Opposition or of the back-benchers could honestly say that he went through these Estimates. We are making a plea for time so that we can make the criticisms which are necessary for the good running of this country, otherwise there is a dictatorship. Without any further ado, I beg to move that the further consideration of the Estimates be postponed until this day week.

Mr. HAYNES: I beg to second that motion and I will give my reason for doing so. If these Estimates had been introduced at 3 o'clock to-day we would have had some time to make our second reading speeches; but the Estimates were not introduced until late this afternoon. That is my reason for seconding this motion.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Before the question is put, I would like to bring to the attention of this Chamber the fact that what is before the House is the principle involved in the Estimates. I shall attempt to be as calm as possible and hope that I will be understood in the manner in which I would like to be understood. There is no new principle whatever involved in these Estimates; the principle involved is in the Memorandum which is not a big book, but just four sheets of paper which can be perused by hon. members of the Opposition, who have outstanding ability and experience, in probably half an hour. The principle involved is contained in old Estimates based on the Five Year Plan; it is the same old principle which can be read in four sheets; so it is not a question of taking hon. members by surprise. It is not a question of taking this big book containing the Estimates and going through it for a whole week or two weeks; it is a question of merely taking the Memorandum in which the principle of the Estimates has been clearly set out, and perusing it and that can be done in half an hour. If it is said that certain references will have to be made, if you spend a few hours in one night that object can be achieved. The whole point is that there is no innovation being brought before the House to-night; it is not that with Ministerial Government an innovation is being introduced; it is no new policy which has been formulated with a Ministerial set-up; it is the policy of a former Government which was in power prior to the introduction of the "Bushe Experiment". We are not attempting to create any innovation; we are merely coming before this hon. Chamber and saying that we have a definite and settled policy in the Five Year Plan of Development and Taxation. The new proposals are set out in the capital expenditure and they are not so numerous; Socialists as we are, we are anxious to see that Socialist measures are implemented without delay. This is all in connection with the Five Year Plan of Development and Taxation which has been considered here night after

night for about two weeks, of which hon. members are thoroughly aware and with which they have agreed in principle. But hon. members have come here at the beginning of the third year of the Five Year Plan and are saying that they are not aware of the terms and conditions and intricacies connected with the Five Year Plan and they must study this big book containing the Estimates week after week! They fail after having the Estimates for a week, to be able to make speeches on the Estimates when there is no new principle involved.

I do not care to elaborate on this matter, but I must impress upon this House that if it were that a new system of presenting the Estimates was before the House, then the speech made by the hon. senior member for the City would have appeared to be justifiable; but we are pursuing the same old principle and I do not see how a week for a perusal of the Estimates could not be considered reasonable in the circumstances. I do not care to be provocative, but I would like to remind hon. members of the Opposition that this Government under a Ministerial set-up is not attempting any innovation whatever; we are merely carrying out what a Conservative Government of a former age has taught us; we are not adopting any new policy as far as procedure is concerned. Our position is that we are attempting to present the Estimates according to a regular schedule; last year about this very time the Estimates were being considered by the House and we want to attempt to regularise matters to the best of our ability. This is another attempt to regularise things so that the community as a whole will feel more satisfied; we are adopting a fixed and settled policy. Never before has the hon. Premier or Leader of the House been called upon to make a speech in one night and then a whole week elapses for the Conservative brains of the Chamber and of Barbados to pool themselves together and see what criticisms can be made. I presume it is for that reason that the hon. senior member for the City is pressing for an adjournment for a whole week so that when a reply is made it will not necessarily be the reply of a particular member, but the reply of the best Conservative brains and the best experts and super-experts on financial policy. It seems to me that that is not a good thing and it should not be adopted at this stage.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I will speak very briefly. Let us take the last few years; the Estimates for 1951—52 were laid on the table of the House on the 27th February, 1951, and they were discussed on the 6th March—a week after—and they were passed on the 21st March. In the following year they were laid on the 26th February, 1952, discussion began on the 4th March and they were passed on the 6th March. The position was the same in the next year, and last year the Estimates were laid on the same date, discussion began on the 5th March and it ended on the 9th March. We have come to-night on the same date correspondingly and begun consideration of these Estimates. I am not speaking to hon. members who will always oppose; I am merely appealing to the House to show a sense of a realisation of its obligations. No budget is done in the way in which it is attempted to be done if the amendment is carried to-night, that is to say, the person who is handling Government Business makes his Budget Speech and then there is an adjournment for a week.

Some attempt was made to suggest that in the House of Commons some longer time is allowed but the convention in the House of Commons is that as soon as the Chancellor of the Exchequer sits down, the Leader of the Opposition makes his reply and the backbenchers make their speeches. I am address-

ing my remarks to the corporate sense of responsibility of the House; if we have reached the stage we have reached by observing the normal British practice, why should we depart from it? I have said to honourable members during the tea interval and I said it on my feet here, that there is no suggestion of starting the consideration of any Head of the Estimates to-night. I am not addressing my remarks to any honourable members who may have objected from year to year; I say that we should not create a precedent which is nowhere observed and which we ourselves have not observed. We are all ultimately responsible to the people of this country and I feel sure that however this vote goes to-night, the people of this country will not back a few wreckers who are smarting with disappointment and who would like to destroy this Government: as long as Barbados is Barbados, the people will not do that. Let us go to the vote; I accept any challenge. Whoever wants to destroy this Government, let them destroy it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, last week when this issue was raised I registered my objection and I stated my reason for so doing. There is an unfortunate statement which was made to-day on the question of postponement, that it was done because some members of this Party were disappointed. It is unfortunate to accuse any honourable member who made his objection, of being disappointed and rather than allow it to go outside that an honourable member's reason for objecting to anything is due to a personal motive, I would say, speaking quite plainly, that in my position I would not have any need to object on such grounds because three months before Ministerial Status was spoken of I had offered my resignation. I regard the truth as golden and it is most unworthy for anybody to come in this Chamber and make the statement for the public to read that the objection I made was due to a personal motive; it is a most uncharitable and unpardonable statement which anybody in his right senses could have made.

My proposal last week was that honourable members did not have time enough to peruse the Estimates so as to be able to deal with them intelligently. I still maintain that attitude, but since the House agreed to proceed with the Estimates I am quite prepared now to hear the second reading speeches with the assurance which has been given that the Government is not proceeding with any of the Heads of Estimates tonight. The other question is that there is no point in going on until midnight or one o'clock in the morning; I would say that the House should be adjourned until next Tuesday—I believe that an adjournment until Thursday would be a very good compromise—but at the same time I would not say that the debate should be postponed at this stage. I do not see why we could not go on until some time later; I have no objection to going on with the second reading debate on the Estimates.

I have said what I said because the question of motive has been brought into this issue and I think it is childish to bring in such a question in an issue where an objection is raised. Who is going to be the arbiter or the person who is so omnipotent as to begin to accuse people of motives? And if people begin to accuse each other of motives, where will it end? I am prepared to challenge anybody anywhere because the truth is not afraid of being told. I say that I can be accused of anything, but my accusers must be prepared to state their case. Do not accuse people of improper motives when for all these years those same people were your best people. It is most uncharitable to give the public the impression that somebody is against you; if you are speaking the truth, speak it to your friends and it will come

out. The members of the Party have to speak the truth at some time or other and they know what is the truth; it is not worthy of any person who is holding a high office to say that those honourable members who spoke as they did last week spoke because they were disappointed. That is not only slanderous but vicious because it seeks to get at the integrity because I have not yet done anything of which I am ashamed whether secretly or otherwise. Anything that I have said about anybody I am prepared to repeat; everybody cannot do that.

It is wrong to challenge the integrity of people; have we reached the stage of mob rule? That works like a boomerang at some time, if an honourable member differs from another, he has the fundamental right to do so. If our children differ from us are we going to say that they are the most vicious people because they do not want to do what we want them to do? All the members of any Government are not expected to agree to everything, but they owe each other collective responsibility. What is wrong with an honourable member saying that you should not begin the consideration of any matter to-day? But now that the consideration of the Estimates has been started, I propose that we go on with the second reading speeches. These Estimates cover 126 pages and I cannot say that I have been through all these pages because I have to work for a living other than being a member of the House of Assembly; I have to devote time to another Organisation. Is there anything wrong in saying that I have not been able to go through all these pages? As a member of the Government I was not forced to read through this document because, for instance, the Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour would not have to deal with anything for which the Minister for Social Services is responsible; but as an ordinary member of the House you have to go through each of these Heads of the Estimates; you cannot pick out certain Heads and say that you need not go through them. I repeat that it is uncharitable to attribute motives to people when they do not agree with you.

I am quite prepared to continue with the debate on the second reading, Mr. Speaker, but I am not asking for any discussion on the various heads tonight. The adjournment would give honourable members more time to consider the various heads of expenditure. I hope that my point is made clear because these debates are going to be recorded.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the motion for the adjournment moved by the honourable senior member for the City and in doing so, I know the accusation cannot be made against any of the four of us over here that we are attempting to wreck anything because it would not be believed in any sense of the word. Every year we have asked for more time. This is merely one week that we have been given to peruse the Estimates, but it used to be the custom before we had the equivalent of ministerial system that two weeks be given for perusal of the Estimates by honourable members of this House after they were laid, except certain circumstances occurred. We, on this side of the table, have not mentioned that we wanted the honourable Premier to make his speech today and then, for the Opposition to reply. The accusation to the effect that we wanted more time so that we could get together with our accumulated brains to answer what the honourable Premier said is out of the point. Our argument was that we would not like the Estimates begun today at all, and it would be a matter for the honourable Premier if he just wanted to make his speech on the Budget to make it. Well now, the honourable

Premier has said that this is the same old lady dressed up in a new dress. As honourable members can see, what would be the point of the honourable Premier making a speech if that is so?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I never said anything of the kind. I think the honourable member is referring to what the honourable senior member for Christ Church was trying to tell us and that is that the principle involved is the same old principle only wrapped up differently.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I rise at a point of explanation. The principle which I was referring to is the principle in the Five Year Plan relative to taxation, not the principle of a Conservative Government or any other principle.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: As it appeared to me, the argument which the honourable member seemed to be using was "Why cannot you go on because it is the same old principle which you knew before."

Now, the position with regard to the consideration of these Estimates today is two-fold. As the honourable junior member for St. Peter has said, not only do the Government's members need to have these Estimates divided into five parts for their particular attention, but they have the whole day to take and read and learn their particular parts. Added to that some of them,—those who belonged to the Government before ministerial status—had a matter of three or four months before to make it, to manufacture it, to put it into their own shape, and to see it put right. It is quite different with some of us on this side of the table. We have to make our living in another way to that of members of the Government. We do not even meet in this House early in the day. We are compelled to do our work early in the day and that leaves one only with the nights to devote to matters as this. Sir, because of these factors, it would be impossible to say that honourable members in one week would be able to comprehend every section of this 172-page document or to reply or deal with every head in the manner that is laid down here. Surely, if you have a bad example, you should not follow it. It does not mean that if there were a few years in which you had to push through the Estimates in one week that you should do so all the time. Do not quote that bad example and say that we have done it before.

Sir, all we on this side of the table are asking for is to make it two weeks instead of one in which to consider these Estimates. At the end of the two weeks—by next Tuesday—or even as an honourable member has suggested, let us come on Thursday next from three in the evening and give consideration to them. Do give us more time to study the implications. After that, I quite agree that we should meet day after day until they are completed. To say that you can deal with these Estimates in a day is to say that you can tell what is in a book by looking at the cover. You cannot deal with these Estimates in that way.

According to the honourable Premier, it has been found necessary to alter the way in which you set about to do things in the Five-Year Plan from time to time. As a matter of fact, when it comes to water supply, and housing, the honourable Premier said that he has already spent all the money that has been allocated under the Five-Year Plan on those projects. I think what has happened is that for the last four or five years, the Government does not want to hear any debate from members on this side of the table on these Estimates and that is the reason why with its number of members the Government is trying to force these Estimates through. We have heard it said that all the honourable Premier has to do is to make a big shout and the others will follow him tamely as if they were lambs and the famous story

which happens every year will be repeated. Of course, the members of the Government Party entitle the honourable Premier to do that. His numbers entitle him to force this matter through whether with or without proper discussion.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If I understand the honourable member correctly, he has misquoted me. What I have said is that I do not care if discussion on the Estimates lasts until the 31st March, but I am appealing to honourable members to make tonight one's budget speech and sit down; then the House can adjourn until next week when the various Heads of Departments will be dealt with.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I do not know what are the rules of this House now. I do not know if there are any new rules. We have distinctly said that we never wanted to deal with the Estimates today. It would be a farce to tell us to make a budget speech on these Estimates now when we do not know what is inside of the book and we have not digested what is inside of it. As I have said, it would be like criticising a book by looking at the cover. I say again, we have discussed thoroughly the Five-Year Plan on which these Estimates should be based, but the Five-Year Plan has been altered.

Again Sir, do not let us talk about getting them in time for the Other Place. As honourable members know, the Other Place cannot alter or affect in any way the minutest thing that we put in these Estimates. They cannot alter one thing in them. All that they can do is to say that we have seen it, but honourable members of this House have only one week to say so, yet the responsibility is ours. All that the Other Place can do with the Appropriation Bill which is the corollary of these Estimates, when this House sends it up is to agree with it or throw the whole Bill out if they disagree with it. It has happened on a few occasions before that the Estimates were not completed in March. There is nothing to say that they must be completed by March. It is true that money under them may be required by the 15th April following, but on occasions when it has been found that they could not be completed in March we appropriated certain sums of money under various Heads to carry on for a month more. Having done that, we then proceeded to deal with the Estimates.

Sir, this is the time and the only time when you can properly criticise, departments after departments of Government, on the allocations made against them. This is the only time when you can criticise the allocations made to the different schemes that Governments intends to carry out. When you are not giving us sufficient time to consider these Estimates, you are robbing us, as you have year after year, of the privilege given us by the people to go through the various heads of revenue and expenditure and criticise them.

One last point and it has been raised by one honourable member. It does not mean that if this House is given longer time that it will mean longer debate. The more time given, the more knowledge you would have gained of the particular subject and it would mean shorter debate because when you at first look at a certain figure and the principle and the allocation and have heard the explanation which may not necessary have appealed to you, on reflection, when you compare the figure with the money spent in previous years and the many other things that deal with it, you may side with the judgment of the Government and say that the figure was arrived at after it was given the most careful consideration.

I do agree that we have not sufficient members on this side of the table to change one figure in these

Estimates. All that we are asking is that we be allowed sufficient time to be able to criticise it and to say whether the Estimates, in our opinion need better regulating; to say whether the policy by the honourable Premier is a policy which we wish to object to and whether we can make criticism of it. It has been discovered when certain things crop up later in the year after dealing with the Estimates of the particular year that we have cause to make plenty criticism, which would have been unnecessary had we not passed it over when dealing with the Estimates.

In conclusion, let me again say that we never asked the honourable Premier to make his budget speech today. All that I say is that it would be more in his favour if he does not allow us to consider these Estimates hastily because, as far as you can understand from the jumble of figures which you have to peruse and from what he himself has said, most of the judgment and most of the ideas and matters put forward are of a nature which can be said to be other than socialistic or even approaching socialism but is the sort of judgment which you expect a good conservative government in power would do; therefore, I will compliment the honourable Premier for using his wisdom more and more along the lines of good conservative wisdom and less along that racial communistic doctrine which is practised by left wing socialists.

Mr. MILLER: I feel at this stage that this House should take some notice of the time. It is now quarter to nine and obviously, if we adjourn for dinner, we would not be resuming until ten o'clock and the speech of one honourable member after that would last until well over eleven o'clock. I am asking the honourable senior member for the City to amend his motion for a compromise and that is that this House do now adjourn until 12 (noon) on Thursday next. If the honourable member does so, I would agree to it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to amend my motion to read until next Thursday. In doing so I am appealing to the honourable Premier to accept the amendment. I am not suggesting the hour as that can be fixed by Government if the motion is accepted.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that further consideration of this debate be postponed until next Thursday.

Mr. HAYNES seconded the motion.

The question that further consideration of the debate be postponed until Thursday next was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. MILLER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD—12.

Noes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPF, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. BRYAN and Mr. F. L. WALCOTT—9.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until 12 o'clock (noon) on Thursday next, 4th March, 1954.

Hon. M. E. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 4th March, 1954

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met to-day at 12 (noon).

Present

His Honour, Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Hon. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., C.M.G., Q.C., (*Premier*), Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Hon. R. G. MAPP (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*), Hon. C. E. TALMA (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*), Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. L. E. SMITH, (*Chairman of Committees*), Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, Q.C., Mr. T. O. BRYAN, Mr. F. C. GODDARD, Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY and Mr. L. A. WILLIAMS, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last Meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Minister for Education:

Whether Government appreciates the inconvenience of the absence of a Headmaster's residence at the Coleridge-Parry School, particularly the hardship suffered by parents seeking to interview the Headmaster outside of school hours, and by the latter in being unable to reside on the premises?

2. Will Government, in view of the established practice of providing head teachers' residences on the premises of secondary schools, without further delay take the necessary steps for the erection of such a building this year?

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Minister for Communications and Works:

Will the Hon'ble Gentleman direct his attention to the long-standing need for a Government Printery in this Island, (not over-looking the Address which passed this House some years ago

recommending the establishment of such), and take such action as appears necessary in order to bring Barbados into line with the U.K., and other Caribbean Colonies?

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Premier: Does Government know it is the prevailing practice of the Police to demand statements from persons in connection with occurrences subject to their investigation, *misinforming* such persons that they are *legally* bound to give such statements, and threatening dire penalties for failure to sign such?

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Premier: Whether Government is aware that the Traffic Branch of the Police Department exercises unfair discrimination in regard to selection of cases for Prosecution, amongst the reports brought in by Policemen, when Senior Officers of the Force prohibit in many instances the bringing of cases against titled persons, departmental chiefs, and their personal friends, whilst requiring that the reports made against them be submitted to the arbitrament of Her Majesty's Court?

Mr. VAUGHAN entered the House and took his seat.

CONSIDERATION ON COLONIAL ESTIMATES, 1954-55 RESUMED

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume consideration on the Colonial Estimates, 1954-55.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—like unto the honourable Premier, this is the first opportunity for me to make a speech on the presentation of the Estimates under the new system of ministerial Government and as it was with the Government this is also an historic occasion for the Opposition. It is the first occasion on which the people of this colony have had the opportunity of listening to a Budget Speech delivered by its first Premier and because of that, they can really bind the policy of the Government on the ministers responsible for the various departments of Government. We have heard it often said in the past that when ministerial status has been achieved, then and only then, will the ministers be responsible to the electorate for the policy of the Government.

I will begin by saying that there is not that scope for criticism of these Estimates for 1954-55 by the Opposition as one would expect because of

the fact that this system of government has only been in operation for a few weeks. Listening carefully to the Budget Speech by the honourable Premier, I think I can say for the members of the Opposition that all of us appreciate his stand by taking shelter under the Five-Year-Plan for Development and Taxation. I must plead that we of the Opposition agreed in part to that Plan for the good of Barbados, we realising that in these days, you must plan and plan ahead. Nevertheless, at the outset I must say that although there is the Five-Year Plan in existence and although this is a new departure, so to speak, from our old system, taking into account the overall picture of the Estimates for the coming financial year and their presentation, we must admit that we are greatly disappointed at their presentation, and more especially when we take into consideration that the learned and honourable Premier has had experience in running the Government for the past six years. There would have been no disappointment had the Ministers been elected to their offices, just this year—say at a General Election—and there was some new policy of Government. Personally, I am disappointed because while the Opposition agreed in part to the Five-Year Plan, on carefully scrutinising by the Memorandum attached to the Estimates, I marvel at the honourable Premier's speech, because rather than deal with the general financial outlook of the colony at this time, the honourable Premier only just gave us a rambling view of the various Heads of Expenditure and made excuses for departure from some of the promises that were given at the time of the Five-Year Plan. Let me say here now that I urged for the postponement at the last meeting because I felt that this consideration on the Estimates should not merely be for looking into the various items of expenditure under the various heads of Departments but to state the financial implications and to say how such would affect the future of Barbados and how the picture is in relation to the Five Year Plan. We know that some of the things which are set down in the Five-Year Plan and which are set down in these Estimates are farcical and are only set down for the purpose of maintaining a high level of taxation. Although I say so, I will say now what I said when the Five Year Plan was discussed and that is the planning for any country is as necessary today as it is to plan for your household needs. You must do some sort of planning. Looking through the Five Year Plan, and taking it side by side with the Estimates for 1954-55, you still find those great sins of omission which we have been pinning for so long on the Government. There are many sins of omission which the Opposition can pin to the Government, but I shall endeavour in my little contribution to this debate to be as constructive as possible. I would say at the outset that if I want to be flamboyant and appear to be ultra-socialistic as some honourable members on the other side of the table whom I believe are tainted with communistic ideals, I can be flamboyant, but I shall endeavour to be as constructive as possible and to show the Government its sins of omission on this occasion. Seeing that the Ministers have only taken up their positions a month ago, when these Estimates could be said to be partly considered in Committee, and particularly in view of the fact that two of the ministers are new to the Government, it would be unwise to criticise them for their responsibility of Government Departments and for that reason, I feel most of the criticism should be done on a broad basis of the Estimates as a whole as it were our dealing with the general principle of a Bill on its second reading. Of course, here and there, when the

House goes into Committee, some honourable members must perforce offer criticism on the various heads of expenditure. However, I think this adjournment from our last meeting would prove to be of great value in expediting the passing of the various Heads of Expenditure.

I shall proceed to deal with paragraph 3 of the memorandum which shows the progress of capital expenditure from available funds generally. Under that expenditure, you have provision made for water supplies, housing, medical services, education, agriculture, communications and miscellaneous expenditure and side by side with your provision for 1954-55, you have shown what has been spent during the period 1st April 1952 to 31st March this year and what was your total allocation in the Five-Year Plan. I agree that you must do that because we actually binded the Government to the amounts in the Five-Year Plan of Development and Taxation. However, you must agree that to err is human and because of that you have to change at times any plan that has been made. Actually, the honourable Premier has suggested certain changes in the Plan already, therefore I do hope that when the Opposition makes suggestions for certain changes that the honourable Premier would not be pig-headed to say that such suggestion cannot be entertained because they were not in the Five-Year Plan.

I will deal with housing from the figures which are given in paragraph 3 of the memorandum. As is known and as has been pointed out by the honourable Premier, I am a member of the Housing Board. It will be observed that the amount expected to be spent to the end of March 1953 is \$232,928 which is more than the two-fifths allocation of the Five Year Plan and the amount of \$356,999 which is expected to be spent by the end of the next financial year will also be more than three-fifths of the allocated amount in the Five-Year Plan. Any reasonable person with the interest of Barbados at heart cannot find fault with expenditure in excess of what was originally intended to be spent on housing. Although that is something contrary to what was intended, as I have said, anybody with the interest of Barbados at heart and having a knowledge of local conditions will realise that housing is a major problem and will continue for the next twenty-five years to be a problem which must be tackled by this or any other Government. The only criticism which anyone can offer in this respect is to say that you are disappointed that the Government, especially as it is a Socialist Government, has not marched faster with its housing programme, rather than to offer criticism on its having spent \$9,000 over what was estimated to be spent to the end of this financial year.

The honourable Premier has explained that the reason for the extraordinary expenditure on water supplies which has actually doubled that which was estimated in the Plan, is because of the efficiency of the present Chief Engineer of that Department and his sincerity in doing his job. With that explanation, I am going to join with him wholeheartedly. It is something which I fear he cannot say about many other departments of Government. However, one wonders whether that explanation in itself is not an admission that there is incompetence or lack of administrative ability among the other Heads of Government Departments, otherwise, they too would have shown similar progress. I will say again if you have Barbados at heart, and you find that Government has expended more on its social services than what was allocated in the Five-Year Plan, nobody should offer any objection, nor should be in disagreement. Therefore, if one finds that be-

cause of the competence and ability of the Chief Engineer of Waterworks that our programme of water supplies has been bypassed, there should be no scruple. It must be borne in mind that a good water service is most essential to modern civilization.

I shall deal now with medical services which are regarded as the pet portfolio of the honourable and genial Minister of Social Services. I have in the past withheld my criticism to other than that which was constructive when it comes to medical services. If you look at the figures in paragraph 3 of the Memorandum, you will see that the allocation for water supplies to the end of the present financial year was \$524,800, but that the estimated expenditure is expected to be \$1,114,109 and with the allocated amount for 1954-55, it will reach \$1,394,109 or more than the \$1,312,000 which was the amount allocated to be spent on water supplies in the Five-Year Plan. As I have pointed out already, the amount spent on housing already is more than the allocated amount in the Five Year Plan. I therefore must point to what I would call the single omission of Government and that is the lag in proceeding with its medical services. If you look at the figures, you will see that the sum of \$426,800 was allocated to be spent up to the end of the present financial year, but only \$131,458 of that amount is expected to be spent. If you were before a Bar of Justice you would be publicly condemned.

His Honour THE SPEAKER: Will the honourable member address the Chair?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Yes Sir,—I meant to say that if the honourable Premier and the Minister of Social Services had to appear before a Bar of Justice on what was done in respect of medical services public opinion would condemn the honourable Minister of Social Services as genial as he is and the honourable Premier as skilful as he is in getting out of tight corners. They would be condemned and would not find one single human being to beg for them. Sir, when you realise that of the amount of \$1,067,000 which was allocated for medical services under the Five-year Plan, \$426,800 was allocated to be spent up to the end of this financial year and that only \$131,458 is expected to be spent, it is appalling and pathetic. It shows that the Government does not realise that first things should come first. It shows that inside of the Government Service, there is bankruptcy of ideas and lack of ability to get things done. The honourable Premier himself admitted that the reason why Government had proceeded so fast with water supplies was because of the ability of the Chief Engineer. I have no bouquets to offer to any Government official because I know that with my criticisms of Government Departments when I feel that they are in need of criticism, coupled with what members of the Government may tell Heads of those Departments about me, I am one of the most disliked. That however does not bother me because none of them has elected me to this Chamber. It is my contention that whether it was because of the advice and ability which may be outstanding in the Head of the Waterworks Department, that Government gave so much attention to that Department, the Government should have given greater attention to Health Departments than it has done. Sir, imagine that you have money allocated to be spent on medical services and spending just over a quarter of it. Who would not say that Government should pay greater interest than it is paying to the General Hospital and other departments of health?

The honourable Premier in his really statesman-like speech on the Five-Year Plan got the Opposition to agree with the Plan. We of the Opposition did hope that after a year or so, something would have been done to alleviate the appalling conditions at the General Hospital, but up to now nothing has been done in that respect. It is true that you have a Health Clinic established at Speightstown, but while I do realise that, you must also realise that first things must come first. I am sure that you will agree with me when I say that although you have established a Health Clinic at Speightstown that it would be infinitely better to know that that scandal of having a woman delivered of a child at the General Hospital when another person was sharing the same bed should have been blotted out from the history of this country before your having a Health Clinic at Speightstown. I throw out this to the Government. We all who are in politics are moving on despite the threats and accusations and formations of other political parties and the like. At the same time, I realise my own limitations in a democratic set up though I for one moment would not bow to anything which reeks of communism. Again, I would say that spending \$131,458 out of \$426,800 that was earmarked to be spent on medical services is definitely a sin of omission. I would not say more than that on this occasion, but on the next occasion, when we would have the opportunity of pinning the question to the minister, the criticisms would not be so mild.

I will now direct attention of the House to the other question of education. I can remember being once told on the floor of this House that none of us can possibly talk with any import on the question of education; however, I am going to talk on it, although it may be said that I can barely read and write. Education is the next item in that paragraph on which a progress report has been given. Let me digress to say that I am amused at times when I see people who get the greater part of their education overseas at the expense of this country come back here and look down and make nasty remarks on people of this island. When I look around this Chamber and see that the people of this country, despite what those higher educational students may think, rather elect people like the majority in this Chamber who cannot boast of having those great educational gifts,—

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: Will the honourable member continue his address to the Chair?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am doing that.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The honourable member has just deflected.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That happens sometimes.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The honourable member must check that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, if you look at the figures in paragraph 3, you will see that the amount of \$551,200 was allocated to be spent to the end of the present financial year, on education and of that amount, \$234,966 is expected to be spent. Going through the Five-Year Plan and looking at the whole setup of education and comparing the amounts granted to Harrison College, Queen's College and the Lodge School with that granted to the University College of the West Indies and with what is spent on elementary education, and then taking the number of pupils at those higher schools and comparing them with the number which cannot proceed further than at elementary schools, I will only say that you free people, not when you grant ministerial status to the colony which they belong, or manhood suffrage and freedom to vote as they choose, but when you

make sure that every soul born in the community can read and write. That is my opinion of what education should be. Since I have offered myself for political honours to proceed to this Chamber, I have never compromised with my greatest friend on this subject of compulsory education and especially so, when I look around this Chamber and see with the exception of the few who had the opportunity to adorn great universities abroad and one or two others who by the financial position of their parents or their own skill were able to get a smattering of secondary education, that the majority are those who have had only elementary education, that is, they have come through the channel which I came through, which is the university life at an elementary school. As I have said, I have never compromised with my greatest friend on this subject of compulsory education. I have always said despite the stupid flamboyant reckless promises made by members of the Labour Party which now comprises the Government that before you give free secondary education to every child in the island, especially when you know that the economy of the island cannot afford it, that the first thing that should be aimed at is compulsory education. In my line of business, I meet every day people whom I look at with pity, because I know that through no fault of theirs, they have been denied the opportunity of learning just sufficient as would enable them to read and write. I think the honourable Premier would not deny the fact that while he has attained that great height by virtue of his education and scholastic attainments, he like all of us, with the exception of one or two, has had the slave background, and knowing that must groan when he meets with the one or two who cannot read or write. I say most emphatically, although it can be argued that Barbados has the highest standard of literacy in the British West Indies, which is no compliment to the Socialist Government in power but which was due to the Conservatives of the past, we should still implement compulsory education. The honourable Premier in his budget speech said that the school for technical education at Richmond would soon be completed and they will soon be appointing a head to that school. No one can deny that is an absolute necessity but I still say first things should come first. The first thing that is needed is compulsory education. Recount on what each Minister and other members of the Labour Party told the electorate at the last elections, and you will remember that they promised the electorate compulsory education and that was not only part of the policy of the Labour Party but was also the individual policy of each member. I am strongly stressing these remarks because on the next occasion, the honourable Premier who is responsible for the policy of education would be fully aware of my feelings. Sir, the honourable Premier was the son of a schoolmaster, whose father was an agricultural labourer. Would the honourable Premier in the unique position which he now finds himself, like to pass to the Great Beyond without knowing that he enacted some form of compulsory education in this island? I say, God forbid that I shall grudge anyone who has attained the position of getting his degrees in the arts or the sciences, but what I would like to see is that every man in the community attain as much education as to enable him to read and write. Therefore, Sir, when you take side by side the Estimates of what is proposed to be spent on education at the various secondary schools and at the University College of the West Indies, and on the various things, it is pathetic, and more so for any Socialist Government, when

you find that it has not made provision for spending if it were only two per cent of its expenditure on providing some form of compulsory education. It is a pity to see that the Government has only spent \$234,966 of the \$551,200 which it had allocated to spend on education to the end of this financial year. It is not true to say that you did not have the materials, because you have all the high-grade officers that are necessary. If the honourable Premier or any of the other Ministers said that they could not get teachers they should be cast into outer damnation. Sir, this is a time when you cannot say that you cannot get teachers or building materials or mechanics. Before you make that excuse, you had better plead that you do not have the people at the top with the interest or the ideas. As you are aware, Sir, you do not want any genius to teach a child how to read and write.

Mr. Speaker, it is shameful that with the presentation of the 1954-55 Estimates there is no provision for compulsory education particularly in view of the fact that this Socialist Government in power, in every parish, at every political meeting, promised it to the people. I would not say anything against this Government not implementing its policy of nationalization because I knew that the honourable Premier and other members of the Labour Party when they said so did not mean it. I knew they could not do it. This criticism which I make to-day is from the depth of my heart. I know that figures can prove almost anything but no Director of Education, nor any expert on education can come here and tell me that a teacher has to go to Oxford or Cambridge University or Erdiston or even Combermere to teach a child how to read and write. My statement can be borne out by looking across the table at the professional men. None of them had teachers with B.A. degrees to teach them the elementary precepts in education. I well remember attending a political meeting in St. Joseph during the last elections and hearing the honourable junior member for St. Joseph in his clamour for compulsory education saying: "We could not even read a letter when it came to us from America," and the people saying: "That is true." I need not tell honourable members that the honourable member captivated every vote in that parish by that speech. You too, Mr. Speaker, I have heard on several occasions clamouring for compulsory education.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: Although there is no direct rule for it, I do not think the honourable member should take advantage of my position by making such reference of me.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I was not referring to Your Honour in any derogatory manner. I have heard Your Honour several times before you became a member of this House advocating for compulsory education, and I recall that you have never compromised on it.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking the honourable Premier who is responsible for the policy of education to review most carefully what is happening with the whole system of education. I do not want to touch on the old hardy annuals of whether there should be age-grouping and the like. What I do want to suggest is that the honourable Premier should review the whole system of education in the light of how best the man in the street who really elevated him to power, can along with his family get just sufficient education to learn to read and write. I do not mean how that person can get university education.

I will deal now with Agriculture, communications and miscellaneous. It would hardly be fair

for me to take the Minister for Communications, Works and Housing or the Minister for Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries to task over these matters to-day. I believe I was on lawful grounds when I took the Minister for Social Services to task on the medical services and the honourable Premier to task on education. Those two ministers should have known what they are doing and what is their policy. I do not mean to say that the other ministers do not know what they are doing, but those ministers have just taken up their portfolios and in view of that, they have to take advice from the honourable Premier as to what should be done. With regard to the Minister for Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries and the Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour, I feel these two new ministers should be given some opportunity to be acquainted with their portfolios.

Now, Sir, in my view the most important thing to the Budget is what is contained in paragraph 4 of the Memorandum. It reads as follows:—

"An important factor which the Government has now to take into consideration is that the price paid by the British Government for sugar exported from the Island has ceased to rise: for the first time for many years it has fallen. It is possible that, in the future, there may have to be some restriction on production, and the crop is, in any event, dependent on the weather. Further, although the Government has at once taken steps to fight the mealy bug pest the danger has not yet been overcome. This budget has to be viewed in the light of these considerations."

Now, Sir, if the four of us from my party were to offer congratulations to the Government on that statement, it might prejudice the minds of certain members of the Barbados public and certain members of this House, but I must say that it is a rather sound, honest and wise statement. In fact, it is a statement with which every Barbadian should be acquainted. We all, of course, view matters in a different light, and from that statement, I conclude that the honourable Premier failed in not presenting a high and lofty speech instead of making a speech which was just rambling, giving a little information here and there on a few heads and just making promises. All of us have a different approach on certain matters. When the honourable Premier presented that statement in his memorandum on the Budget, of all the things that are in it, I consider that as the one thing that matters. We on this side of the table made our position very clear when the British West Indian Sugar Association was asked to present its case to the Ministry of Food. We made it clear that the Association should ask the honourable Premier to attend that Conference. We felt that no matter how the honourable Premier felt about the Sugar Producers' Association this country could only exist if it got a fair price for its sugar. I felt that nobody could have done as successfully as the Honourable Premier to make the appeal on behalf of Barbados to the Ministry of Food for a fair price for our sugar. I made it clear at the time that it would not be an appeal of a few merchants or a few planters but that it was an appeal on behalf of Barbados. It is for this reason that I say he has failed in his Budget Speech and because of the fact that we are associated with the Five-Year Plan. As long as you are human there is that possibility of having to change and because of that the Five-Year Plan would have to be changed because of that statement and what it means to every individual. I understand that the Honourable Premier has no flair for figures but I believe he has

people in his party from whom he can get proper advice and who have the necessary brains for handling matters relating to sugar. The hon. Premier has failed miserably in not living up to what I consider should be the most important point he should have made in his Budget Speech. The honourable member should have brought forcibly to the people of this country what they may have to expect as a result of this fall in the price of sugar. I say that for the reason that in the Five-Year Plan the honourable Premier stated many things and the people are led to expect many things as a result of that Plan. Reading that paragraph carefully, especially where it says "there may have to be some restriction of production," it does appear as if Barbados would have to limit its production of sugar. No matter what the honourable member would say or what I would say dealing with this paragraph, does the honourable Premier appreciate that the sugar production for this year is estimated at 132,000 tons?

(A VOICE: No; 180,000 tons).

I beg your pardon. What I meant to say was that of the 181,000 tons that were expected to be produced, 132,000 tons of that amount or some figure in that vicinity is what we expect to sell at the negotiable price to the Ministry of Food. Of the remainder, we expect to keep 10,000 tons for local consumption, 4,000 tons for the candy and confectionery industry, 12,000 tons for molasses, 19,000 tons to be sold in open market at the free price and 4,000 tons unsaleable. As I have said, the honourable Premier should not have compared the economy of the island with what is expected to be received from Customs and Excise and Taxation. He should have or could have kept his speech on that high and lofty level by mentioning this fact. But this is not all. I am afraid that the indices which I just gave, are going to put nearly a half million dollars out of circulation for sugar in this country. I do not want to pin my quotations down to a few dollars but from the calculations, it is something between \$500,000 and \$700,000 that this island would be collecting less from Income Tax. It must be obvious to honourable members what the position would be next year.

The honourable Premier referred to the fact that he threw it out to merchants and exporters of the colony of the possibilities of selling sugar on the African continent. I never offer criticisms on anything with which I am not conversant unless I am able to discover that information from the persons who have technical knowledge on the subject. I was at pains to make enquiries. I am told that this is just a suggestion thrown out by London as it is the clearing house for that continent; but that the whole thing is a question of sale and it would be threshed out in London. Again, why I said that the honourable Premier failed to take the opportunity to acquaint the people of this colony on the situation is because of other facts which I have from Jamaica. As I understand it, that colony has now 36,000 tons of surplus sugar. If we are limited in our output of sugar we are limited in our import of commodities and if we are limited in such ways we would be limited in what we would collect by way of Customs and Excise and Taxation. Of course, some honourable members might raise the question of our having eight million dollars put down to the Equalization Fund. I do feel that the honourable Premier has failed when he did not give an important pronouncement on this matter. I feel that the honourable Premier failed in not presenting his Budget along that line espec-

ially as he really brought it out so forcibly in the Memorandum.

Because of these fluctuations you must revise and change your Five-Year Plan. When one sees that the price of sugar is going down, one visualises that you must limit your entire plan for irrigation. The question is: what is the future on the question of irrigation in connection with agriculture? What are you really contemplating in this respect? It will be remembered that in the Five-Year Plan it was not merely a question of research and experimental work in methods of irrigation for peasants and plantations, it was also a question of providing money for the granting of loans for the purchase of equipment for irrigation, so that these people would be able to produce more.

Now, Sir, Paragraph 17 reads as follows:—"The draft recurrent expenditure for 1954-55 is \$539,780 greater than that in the approved estimate for 1953-54." If you meditate on the budget speech of the honourable Premier with the revenue this year and with the statement in Paragraph 4 that "it is possible in the future that there may have to be some restriction in the production of sugar," you must wonder where is the sanity in the presentation of the Budget.

I have a few criticisms to make on the expenditure of 1954-55 which I think not even my colleagues would agree with me in making. I am going to deal with the question of your over-expenditure of \$51,068 on the Airport. I do appreciate our having an Airport comparable with any international airport in the world. However, I am going to say something which unless somebody says it, it might go down with the honourable Premier and members of the Government that this House agrees with every suggestion made by Colonial Office. While it is true that much of the expenditure on the Airport has been provided out of C.D. & W. funds, yet we cannot afford, nor can we agree to sit down and take it lightly with our Airport only catering to a limited service. No matter what may be the international agreement, we must protest because we want to know that our Airport is open and free to all. I think the honourable Premier would go as far as to say it should be open to all, even to those behind the Iron Curtain. I venture to say that the Seawell Airport should be open to all airlines is the feeling of all honourable members in this House. As a matter of fact, that view was expressed when this House passed an Address for the operation of a direct service between New York and this colony. I know that there are international regulations governing airline services, but be that as it may, the members of this Chamber feel—I do not mean only the four of us—that we should not keep our Airport closed to but the few to suit our rulers in Downing Street.

I now come to the matter which I think few honourable members would agree with me on. It is our over-expenditure of \$49,826 on that of last year, under the head,—Legislature. I am going to be very frank on this matter, and in doing that, I am going to throw out a suggestion. As is well known, I have never compromised on the principle of paying legislators, although I believe that the secret of the good working of any democratic setup is by way of compromise. At any rate, Sir you are aware of the stand which the four of us from the party to which I belong took relative to remuneration of members of this Assembly. What I am going to suggest today has nothing to do with the increase in the remuneration of honourable members as a result of ministerial status. I am going to suggest from the depth of my heart that owing to the increase we

are getting in remuneration for our services, that we should have a canteen from which we can pay for anything we require. We should not continue to take public funds to provide for the food we eat and the other things we get. We are no longer in here giving our services free and as an honour; we are being paid for it and since we are being paid, it is my honest opinion that we cease asking the public to pay the expenditure of over \$3,000 a year for our lunches and dinners. I would like to see attached to this Chamber a canteen as is done in England where members can go and buy whatever they require. As I understand, it is not run to make any profit. The canteen in the House of Commons is run by a Committee. No profit is made from it and the Committee is only allowed to pay the running expenses of it. I say this for the reason that hundred and hundreds of people in this colony are out of work and cannot even get a meal some days and I do not consider that we are doing ourselves honour to draw \$160 per month and then come in here and get refreshments free. I am not commenting on Your Honour's salary which is merely \$240 per month. As is known, I have always expressed the view that it is nothing much. As I was saying, it is not an honour for us to get refreshments free and I think the least which this House can do to show some decency to the general public is to have a canteen run, probably by the same caterer, so that any honourable member can go and buy what refreshments he may require and from where he can treat a friend at his own expense if he so desires. I consider honourable members might smile at what I have said, but out of sheer decency, considering that Ministers are getting entertainment and travelling allowance and members are getting a salary, it is our duty if we want lunch to take a dollar out of our pockets and spend it. I daresay, all honourable members will not agree with me. At any rate, Sir, I hope the honourable Premier will take this suggestion in good faith and as he has said, whatever happens in the House of Commons would happen here, I hope he will see to it that we like members of that august Chamber will uphold this tradition and do not continue as we are to receive refreshments free.

I come to the Secretariat and I notice that you have also over spent there. I will just drop this as a hint. While you have overspent there, we, who want to conserve a little money because of what is happening in paragraph 4, are hoping and begging that you do nothing more to increase on what we consider is an over-burdened Civil Service with highly paid officials and secretaries. We notice that you have brought in even more secretaries, or assistant secretaries, or assistant colonial secretaries whom we consider, in many instances, are not necessary.

As I have said, I can be flamboyant or can make a most appealing speech, but I shall adopt the attitude of a statesman. You state here that you are preparing to overspend \$19,000 on Old Age Pensions. When you compare with other over-spending, any Socialist Government should feel ashamed to say that it is only overspending \$19,000 on Old Age Pensions while it is overspending \$49,000 on Legislature. I would be ashamed to state that if I were a Socialist. We all know what were the promises made up and down this country of what would be done for old age pensioners: I still feel that the age for persons to draw pensions from this country should be 65 and not 68. There is no point in my trying to stress this because I have heard the same opinion expressed by members of the Government Party and by other members of the Opposition. That like the system of compulsory

education is something which I consider should be placed in the category of first things first. When you come to people who need old age pensions they are people who have worked in this country from morning until they reach that age. Many of them are worn out with heart disease and I do not consider that they should wait another three years to qualify for receipt of old age pensions. As it is now, some only have the opportunity of drawing it for a few months. Sir, you are of the Government in power; you have made a promise to the people; do you want that promise observed in the breach? If it were a Conservative Government in power it would have observed that promise in the fulfilment.

I will conclude by saying that whatever criticisms I have offered, whatever suggestions I have made, I have made them because I feel that this Government has an obligation and duty to the people of this country. I also feel that the Opposition has a duty and an obligation to the people of this country and because of that it is our duty, we who are in the Opposition, to criticise Government so as to bring it to its senses and to remind it of the promises that it has made to the people and of its sins of omission. As I have said I feel that the honourable Premier has failed miserably in the presentation of the Budget, particularly in view of what is contained in Paragraph 4 of the Memorandum. The body of that Paragraph states that the crop is in any event dependent on the weather. I remember when we were campaigning, the honourable Premier said that the Electors Association copied the policy of the Labour Party. I would, however, remind the honourable Premier that when they were paying the 19% bonus to sugar workers and the Labour Party was making it known that that was what they got for those workers, the members of the Electors Association told them that whatever might be said, the crops in Barbados were dependent on the weather. Now for the first time, the honourable Premier has admitted that the crops depend on the weather. I have quoted a few items to show where the Government has failed miserably in its Budget for 1954-55. There are other items which I can also point out to establish my point more fully but there are other members of this Chamber whom I see are eager to speak, therefore I do not think it is fair for me to monopolise the speaking on the various items; I leave some for other honourable members to cover.

I counsel the Premier in his reply to let it be known what is expected to be the deficit as a result of the fall in the price of sugar. I would be very glad if the hon. Premier would tell us what Government expects it is going to lose in Income Tax as a result of what is contained in Paragraph 4 of the Memorandum and what it would mean in relation to our imports. If he is unable of himself to work out those figures he has capable and competent men in his Party who can give him those figures. I am sure my colleague, who belongs to his Party, can work out those figures. While members of the Party to which I belong and I have associated ourselves with the Five Year Plan—not in every detail—and while these Estimates for 1954-55 are part of the carrying out of what was proposed in the Five-Year Plan, I find that the Government has omitted to do the first things first. I have already mentioned two things and those are medical services and the question of compulsory education. With regard to education let me say again that you should not only provide for the few at the top but you should also see that the majority at the bottom get that little bit which would enable them to read and

write. In other words, we should not forget the bridge over which we passed. Mr. Speaker, we of the Opposition with our responsibility to the people are prepared to offer our co-operation to Government wheresoever it is necessary for the expenditure of funds for the social development and improvement of this colony.

Sir, in view of the hour I beg to move at this stage the adjournment of this House for three quarters of an hour.

Mr. ALLDER and Mr. CRAWFORD entered the Committee and took their seats while Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY was speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD seconded the motion which was agreed to and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was debating the motion that I do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply on the Estimates for the financial year, 1954-55.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker,—When the Estimates were first laid in this House I happened to be one of those honourable members who took a certain amount of objection along with the honourable junior member for St. Peter and the objection which I took was—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of order. Is it that the honourable member who seconded the motion for the adjournment does not want to speak? It is immaterial to me when the honourable member speaks but it is customary for an honourable member who moves or seconds the motion for adjournment to speak on the resumption.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have discovered that, as a matter of fact, a member can speak at any time whether he has moved or seconded the motion for adjournment.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: It may be that the Rule in the old "May" has been changed; I am merely asking that there should be an established ruling here.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the most up-to-date Standing Orders.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am merely asking that a ruling be made so that everybody will know in future.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am going by the most modern usage. The honourable member may proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, when the Estimates were laid in the House I took a certain amount of objection and I should like to say that the warning which I threw out to the Premier then, was thrown out in good honesty and in all good sense of purpose. It seems to me that the honourable member inculcates a sort of feeling that whatever is said to him is said out of some malice. The reason for my objection was that we are reaching the stage where it could be said that the Estimates are put before the House and there is not much time allowed before they are discussed: I was not attempting to do any harm but merely to give a more careful examination of the Estimates than we have been wont to do in past years. It has been said that the members of the Other Place have always complained that they do not get the Estimates in time: as far as I am concerned, there could not be any serious contention in that matter, because, as far as I know, the Lords always await the pleasure of the Commons in these matters. The members of the Other Place have a much longer time, relatively speaking, than we to consider the Estimates, because the Estimates are laid up there at the same time as they are laid here. I have not heard that complaint

made by the Learned President of the Other Place and I was up there on two or three occasions.

I should like to say that, to my mind, the Budget Speech was disappointing and the reason why I think it was disappointing is this; just to say that we have had a Five Year Plan and the Budget Speech is a general review of that Plan is a little poor. I would have preferred to hear about some consideration of matters like the effect of the fall of the price of sugar, the effect on income tax, the effect of this statement in the Memorandum on the Estimates that for the first time for many years the price paid by the British Government for sugar has fallen and what will be the various repercussions. I would have liked to hear a discourse along that line.

When the Five Year Plan was introduced, Professor Beasley's level of the island's economic productivity was 130,000 tons of sugar a year, and the honourable Premier said that the Government was not paying strict attention to Professor Beasley's figure, that they were advised to take the economic productivity of the island at 150,000 tons. Therefore we have to interpret paragraph 2 of the Memorandum on the Estimates in that light. Paragraph 2 of the Memorandum says this:—

"The Government has been reluctant to increase any of the capital expenditure allocations under the Plan, but has felt justified, having regard to the surpluses in the first two years, and the prospect of a good crop in 1954, in increasing the allocation for additional mains and standposts. The progress in carrying out the water supply scheme has been more rapid than was anticipated, and an additional sum of \$150,000 has been included in the capital estimates in order that distribution to the community of the benefits of the re-organisation of the system may continue."

Everyone will be in agreement that if you have started something of this nature, you should continue with it, but I am not in agreement with the first part of that paragraph. Professor Beasley says that the island's economic productivity could be taken care of with a crop of 130,000 tons, the Government fixed the figure at 150,000 tons and there was some fear that the crop would fall. I had no fear about that; we found that we got a crop of more than 150,000 tons—we got 165,000 tons, so that the reasons given in the first part of the paragraph do not seem to go to their logical conclusion.

I will move on to paragraph 3 of the Memorandum and compare it with paragraph 22 which deals with capital expenditure. In paragraph 3 you will see the progress of capital expenditure from available funds and in paragraph 22 you will see the capital expenditure contemplated under available funds; you will see Water Supplies, \$280,000, Housing, \$124,071, and the other items which are set out there. If you look at the Estimates, it is not correct to say that you are really spending \$3,008,531; what you are really spending this year is \$1,788,816 and the rest happen to be old-re-votes. I should like to know why has so much money had to be re-voted? Is it because you are not getting deliveries and you can only operate in the case of water supplies? I repeat that it is not correct to say that you are really spending \$3,008,531 and people can accuse you of collecting money and not really spending it; you will either have to spend the money very quickly before the period of the Five Year Plan elapses or you will be piling up money to make the General Revenue Balance much more rosy than it is at present. You have a good revenue balance and you also have a Revenue Equal-

isation Fund which has to take care of any cyclical depressions which you may have; therefore you do not have to incur any loans and even in respect of the loans you have incurred, they are all self-recoverable in the sense that they are all housing loans. That seems to me to be the cardinal objection to the way in which the Budget has been set out.

Before I move from that point, I want to show the implication of my reasoning there. In paragraph 3 of the Memorandum it is set out that the estimated expenditure from 1st April, 1952, to 31st March, 1954, was \$2,696,478; deducting the amount of \$1,788,816 from \$3,008,531 you have an unexpended balance of \$1,219,715, so that you have only spent \$1,476,763 in capital works. The cardinal objection is that your capital works are behind time; therefore you can be accused of piling up all the money and you will not get through with the Plan. You will have a bigger General Revenue Balance which should not be the case. That point might sound stupid, but it is a point which has to be carefully watched; when you approach people for loans, they can tell you that there is no need for you to borrow any money.

I think Professor Beasley said that our loans abroad were something in the nature of \$1.9 million. I have taken the opportunity to examine the position of our loan funds; if you look at the Estimates at page 158 you will see that the loan funds are not redeemable in this period but from 1964, 1966 and onwards. The Sinking Fund is adequate to cover them so that the loan position is good and, as I have already pointed out, the loans which have been incurred recently are self-recoverable. The only charges which the Government is carrying are the administrative charges on loans. The reason why I have taken the opportunity to speak along these lines is that when we have the opportunity to discuss the matter of the Deep Water Harbour, I do not think anyone could suggest that our revenue position is not sound and that we cannot get a large loan.

If you look at paragraph 4 of the Memorandum you will see that this is what it says:—

"An important factor which the Government has now to take into consideration is that the price paid by the British Government for sugar exported from the Island has ceased to rise; for the first time for many years it has fallen. It is possible that, in the future, there may have to be some restriction of production, and the crop is, in any event, dependent on the weather"

Here is where I part company with the honourable senior member for the City; the only really valid statement which should worry us in this paragraph is that in respect of the price of sugar. When the last sugar agreement was being negotiated, as soon as the British Government decided to give South Africa and Australia—countries with diversified economies—larger quotas, then we were restricted; the question of restricting our production has long been reached. However, provided that the guarantee which we have is not limited, it does not follow that we will have to restrict our production; our production was settled once and for all with the Commonwealth countries having been given larger quotas and the West Indies not being given any larger quotas. As far as this matter of production is concerned, the weather has always been one of our problems; when Professor Beasley calculated the level of our economy and based it on 130,000 tons of sugar he must have carried his mind back to 1946 when we had a crop of as low as 78,000 tons, and we still got home. The revenue showed a slight fall, but two years afterwards we became buoyant again. If we allow a

2% fall for the mealy bug pest we must still come back to what is Professor Beasley's limit of our productivity, namely, 130,000 tons. What, to my mind, carries a certain amount of cardinal weight is the question of the price of sugar; it seems to me that you must look at the matter from the point of view of its effect on income tax and therefore its effect on wages; and if it has a certain effect on wages what will be the effect on customs and excise?

It also has to be borne in mind that during the debate on the Five Year Plan the honourable Premier said that he hoped the British people out of shame or justice would see that at least we got some good price for our sugar. I am not that hopeful. I would say that as far as Government circles in Great Britain are concerned, they could be somewhat more mindful of the colonies; but at the same time Great Britain is an industrial country and she has always been trying to find cheap food with which to feed her industrial population on a jam-packed island of fifty-two million people; therefore this cardinal factor has to be borne in mind. Even if you try to think in terms of Imperial preference and so on, there is still the old argument as to the manufacturing classes on the one hand and the agriculturists on the other coming to a clash; it has paid Britain to import from the cheapest source and sell in the dearest market. We have to bear in mind the fact that the beet root sugar-producing countries are having surpluses; Germany, Australia, Czechoslovakia, Poland and the United States of America are all in full production; there is the question of the sort of trade which Great Britain does with our sugar and it seems to me that all these matters have to be taken into account.

If you look casually at these figures in paragraph 5 of the Memorandum as to the approved and revised estimates for this year, you will see that our Gross Surplus is about twice over what it was expected to be; it will also be seen that our General Revenue Balance is about twice over. Therefore one can see that as far as the higher taxation rates which were brought down in the Five Year Plan are concerned, and with which I have been in agreement, they have achieved their object. I think the danger is in the fact that we have been increasing taxation but we have not been moving ahead fast enough with our projects. We can be accused of hoarding up money while a lot of our capital works have not been completed, and the danger is that at the end of this year or next year, having regard to the Five Year Plan, we will have to adopt some means of getting the money spent. I can understand the honourable Minister for Communications telling us that he cannot get sufficient pipes, but the honourable Minister for Social Services cannot say that he has ordered X-ray equipment and cannot get it.

As regards the various items which the Government hopes to undertake, there is the Industrial Development Board which has my blessing, but I am very pessimistic about our setting up an Industrial Development Board in Barbados. As far as we are concerned, I think we have missed the boat for industrial development long ago. We have to bear in mind that at present there are other countries in the Caribbean area, which are competing for capital; economic development has been going on in Jamaica and British Guiana, thus raising the standard of living in both those countries and they have got off to a much better start than we have made. Their pioneer legislation has been much more liberal than ours, and furthermore, one has only got to read the Report of the four Industrialists who visited these parts and it will be seen that that

Report does not favour us as a very healthy area for industries. I cannot imagine that it suits a metropolitan country to industrialise a colonial area; it may be said that the position has been changed, but there has always been the tendency for metropolitan countries not wanting areas such as these to be developed. The Report of the Industrialists is a piecemeal document which does not reach any conclusion; no man in the City who has read that Report could come to any conclusion either in one way or in the other. He might probably be better off if he goes into the office of the Trade Commissioner in London.

With regard to the provision of Government Offices and Ministerial Buildings, I would first prefer to see a Board of Survey set up to go into the question of having these offices and buildings, and see what is wanted and the Government could bring down to the House something which we can understand and vote on. We have also got to bear in mind that it might be cheaper for us to rent Government buildings for a number of years, provided that the efficiency of people is not impaired, rather than incur a loan at 4% interest to erect these buildings. I do not think that we should regard Ministerial Buildings as something apart from other Government Buildings; we should take stock of all Government Buildings including Ministerial Buildings, but we should not look at Ministerial Buildings as apart from other buildings.

When we come to housing, I do not think we can be happy about the position; the Government has only touched the fringe of the housing problem so far. The Government said that they are building 60 houses in the City and 28 in the urban areas; the housing position has not been correlated with the information at the disposal of the Government at present. I feel that the Government were babes in arms when they started and they had to try and find their feet; but for the last five or six years they should be in a much better position to have a better housing programme. A housing loan is always recoverable and whenever it is over the country has a capital asset. The Government has more or less linked the Labour Welfare Funds with other housing funds so as to make the position look rosy; but if they had no Labour Welfare Funds, or if they removed these funds from other housing funds, the amount spent on housing is still, in my opinion, a very small amount and it only touches the fringe of the problem at the end of five years. I do not say that we can hope to tackle the housing position in the space of five years, but I would like to see a bolder housing policy put forward altogether.

Much has always been made of the question of subsidisation. I think the people who have always been willing to flog this question of subsidisation have completely forgotten that there are many people who have not got any incomes. It is all right to say that subsidisation is unproductive, but if you wanted to wind up subsidisation you would have to ask on what items you should take it off; if you took the subsidy off pickled pork tomorrow, you could not hope to produce the required amount of pickled pork at home. The cardinal point behind subsidisation is that in Barbados where you have much unemployment more generally the rule than the exception, there are many people without incomes. I think that as long as the cost of living presses on the income earners who have to keep the non-income earners alive, subsidisation should be approached from that standpoint.

As to the question of tenantry roads, I think the Government is making a cardinal mistake as regards the tenantry road programme. I have always indi-

cated that it is better to deal with a few roads at a time and construct them properly; I have seen tenantry roads go into disrepair because they have not been surfaced. It has always been my contention that it is better to deal with fewer roads and deal with them properly than merely appeal to popular clamour, so that you will not have any expenses recurring at too soon a period. I hope that the Government will take the advice I have given.

In respect of the Agricultural programme, I sincerely hope that the Government will see its way at some future date to consider what might be done to encourage more pig breeding. I have not been able to discover the reasons for the shortage of pork, whether it is just a seasonal matter owing to the Christmas trade or whether there has been a greater general demand all along the line, but I think it would be very worth while to put as much money as you can possibly put into this scheme for the time being.

As regards the question of District Markets, I think the Government should continue its policy of erecting these markets rather than have one general market. As far as the Speightstown market is concerned, like most of the jobs done by the Public Works Department, it is a good job and I hope one will see many more markets like that one.

I shall not detain the House for very much longer, but I would like to issue a warning to the Government. I am not pulling any punches; I took the opportunity to say that this Budget happens to be an extremely healthy one, but it also happens to be a very conservative Budget, as far as I am concerned. We are not in the red as people would want to make us believe; the trouble is that the Government Bench is being scared by what has been thought, that is, that if they get hold of the Treasury they will run it dry. I think that factor is always scaring the daylight out of them. An important point which I have been able to elicit from the Memorandum is the fact that the Government will raise all their loans during this year; but deducing from the various figures which I have quoted and putting my own conclusions on them, you do not really need to go to the public for loans unless you are really going to spend the money. The danger is always that at the third year of the Five Year Plan you will have tons of money piled up in the Treasury and in the fifth year of the Plan you will be rushing like a meteor or jet fighter in order to get rid of it. You are not justified in borrowing any more money at present; you do not want to give the impression, having brought forward increased taxation, that you oppress people and then you do not want to spend the money. You have not taken the money because you want to have a better general revenue balance or because you want to pile up money; you want to put forward your plans for capital development. You do not want to incur any loans at present; your programme of taxation has brought in more than what you really need.

Mr. CRAWFORD: May I be permitted merely in passing to refer to the little imbroglio which has taken place with reference to the request for a little longer time to consider the Estimates before we begin to discuss them? It should be perfectly understood that this habit of beginning to discuss the Estimates a week after they are presented came into vogue with the present regime and will probably go out with the present regime. Nobody accuses the Premier of attempting to do anything detrimental to the colony's interests; he claimed that it was alleged he wanted to go away and that is why he wanted to rush through the Estimates. The point really is

that if he left the colony immediately after he rushed through the Estimates, it would not be the first time that he did so; but it would certainly lend colour to the fact that he wanted to rush the Estimates through because he wanted to get away. It is not giving the correct impression to suggest that this opposition arose because two disappointed members of the Party wanted to become Ministers; those two hon. members can answer for themselves; the hon. junior member for St. Peter has already answered for himself. Neither the hon. junior member for St. Peter nor the hon. junior member for St. Lucy seems to have been interested in any Ministry and it is really incorrect to give the impression that their opposition to going on with the Estimates within a week was merely because they were disappointed in not being made Ministers. That is sheer nonsense; we felt that one week was not sufficient time for us to consider the Estimates. It has happened before and it will probably happen again that as soon as we finished the Estimates the hon. senior member for St. Joseph rushed away; if next year he attempts to rush through the Estimates not for his personal interest but for the benefit of the colony, he will have to find another reason for trying to push them through in a week.

These Estimates have been described as being conservative by more than one speaker. What has amazed me is that the honourable introducer of the Budget made a statement to the effect that it is a matter for gratification that the revenue from Customs and Excise is more than the estimate. The total estimated revenue is over \$13 million and the estimated revenue from Customs and Excise is over \$6 million—nearly one half of that amount. It amazes me that a Government which calls itself Socialist should consider as a cause for gratification the fact that Customs revenue is producing nearly one-half of the total revenue of the colony; if that is Socialism, then the correct place for all such Socialists is the Lunatic Asylum. It is well known that Customs revenue is provided in the main from Customs duties and Package Tax which falls heavily on the general working population. It should be the aim of Socialists to consider the means of diminishing Customs Revenue.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable member is misquoting me. I said it is a cause for gratification that more than one-half of our revenue comes from Customs and Income tax, because we got a crop of 160,000 tons instead of 130,000 tons.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Income tax was not mentioned in that connection; I heard the honourable member say that Customs and Excise revenue produced more than what was estimated and I wrote that down. The position is this: there are several factors which contribute to this increase in Customs revenue. To begin with, thanks to the subservience of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to the Colonial Office, and thanks to his desire for reasons best known to himself to get on the best side of the United Kingdom, the dollar allocation for Barbados in proportion to its earnings is the lowest in the entire British Caribbean. The honourable member sits down every year and permits a colony like this which has to import almost all its necessities, to be content with the smallest dollar allocation of any colony in the West Indies. He gets his personal reward for it, but the colony suffers.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of order. I do not mind the honourable member making his slanderous remarks, but if he is telling the House that what he has said is a fact, I ask him to quote the figures.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If he knows it is not a fact why does he not quote the figures to show that it is not a fact. If he wants the figures I will give them to him; I have here the Year Book for 1952 and these are the latest figures available. The dollar earnings in respect of Trinidad for the year given here were \$25 million and the amount spent was \$18 million; in other words, they had a dollar allocation of 74% of their dollar earnings. The Windwards and Leewards earned a little more than \$2½ million and they spent over \$6 million. They had a dollar allocation of 231% of their dollar earnings. That is a fact which can easily be found out from any commission agent in Bridgetown; what you can do in hard currency areas in some colonies in three months you cannot do in Barbados in a whole year because our importers do not get the dollars. In Barbados, our earnings were \$13 million and we had an allocation of \$6 million, which is 44.75% of our earnings, less than one-half of what we earned. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph knows that the position is highly unsatisfactory but because it pleases him not to offend the Colonial Office, he says nothing about it and he compels this colony to import nearly all its necessities from the highest market in the world—Great Britain. If it were not for our high tariff rates Britain could not compete in this market with almost any other country to-day; but the honourable senior member for St. Joseph allows us to bring in all these high-priced articles, pay high Customs duty and then says that it is a source of gratification that we get all this Customs revenue. Not only does the honourable member sit there and allow us to be compelled to import items from the highest-priced markets in the world, but when you want an import licence to get necessities from soft currency areas, the Control Board gives the greatest amount of trouble in granting a licence to get cheap goods in the colony.

The honourable junior member for St. Lucy said that subsidisation is important because in every house there is only one man working and the other members of the family are unemployed. We are spending nearly half a million dollars in subsidising rice and pickled pork, but we need not spend one single cent in subsidising pickled pork; if they would issue licences for imports in sterling you could import pickled pork at such a price in Barbados that it could be sold at the current price without subsidisation. The Colonial Office says that we must be careful about imports from non-Commonwealth areas, and therefore Barbados must toe the line, despite the fact that you use your revenue to subsidise people outside. You tell the Colonial Office to do what they like; the honourable senior member for St. Joseph knows what the position is, and yet the Control Authorities in Barbados are more keen to carry out the directions of the Colonial Office in that respect than any other body in the British West Indies. The merchants in Trinidad, in the Leeward and Windwards Islands and in British Guiana get all the licences they want from soft currency areas whether outside the Commonwealth or not. There is a human cry in respect of the Control Office—no dollars and no licences; if the honourable member wants to keep down the cost of living, the steps he should take would be, firstly, to see that the amount of dollars we get bear a better relation to the amount of dollars we earn, and also see that licences are granted more freely for importing articles from soft currency areas whether those articles are obtainable from within the Commonwealth or not.

That is only one aspect of this question of the evils of collecting high Customs duties; high revenue

from Customs duties in any country must necessarily mean that the country is undeveloped if you are importing almost everything you need. In other words, you are impoverishing the colony and bleeding it white. It is a fallacy to congratulate yourself on the fact that Customs revenue is providing a large slice of your revenue; we are doing nothing to encourage industrial development or provide the atmosphere in which industries might be started. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy claims that we have missed the industrial bus; he might have said that the colony has been wilfully prevented from becoming industrialised. For years the Government refused to pass legislation to offer concessions to new industries which we could get in the West Indies; and now that we have passed some sort of legislation, it is useless. The legislation which we have passed does not offer the same concessions which other colonies offer and there is not a single minute when we do not hear of some company who would establish an industry here if the atmosphere for industrial development were more sympathetic to industries; but we gloat over the fact that we have got all the money we want from Customs revenue as if that can go on for ever. All we are doing is lowering the standard of living and increasing its cost, because the cost of living in Barbados is higher than it is in British Guiana, Trinidad, Canada, the United States of America or England. You take up any newspaper and compare the prices of clothing and of foodstuffs in any of those countries and you will find that they are cheaper than they are in Barbados. When it comes to Canada and America, the prices of foodstuffs are almost one-half of what we pay for them here; our aim should be to make the colony as self-sufficient as possible, not to flatter ourselves because we are collecting money on goods, because that will come to an end. The Government does not appreciate the position because it went further last year and clapped on an increase in Customs duties by putting tariff rates on C.I.F. costs; since we have done that, I have made it my business to compare the tariff rates in all the other islands and we have higher rates here than any other colony in the West Indies. If we had the same tariff rates as Trinidad or British Guiana has, you could hardly sell any British-manufactured stuff in this market at all. In spite of the fact that you have this exchange on American imported goods, yet the difference in our tariff rates is so great that it would make items imported from the United Kingdom market unsaleable.

The honourable senior member for St. Joseph used as an argument for increasing the Customs duties last year that it was done in other islands, and that the Customs duties were paid on c.i.f. costs; but he failed sensibly to tell the House that the tariff rates in those islands are much lower than ours, and the total cost of imported goods is less, proportionately speaking, than what we would have to pay for the same articles. You can see all around how this colony is being impoverished; there is the little dollar allocation, you buy in high-priced markets, there is increased Customs duties, the difficulty in getting import licences—all you are doing is to provide a splendid market for the import trade. It is a paradise for merchants and traders, but it cannot last long; it cannot go on indefinitely. I have purposely replied to the statement about Customs revenue because I think the time has come when this House should concern itself with this aspect of our economy; it is our business to try and expand our economy, not to contract it by increasing our imports. All we are doing is to levy an unfair tribute on the

masses of the people, and then what do we do?—We squander our ill-gotten gains. Imagine a Budget with an estimate like this! Not one cent has been provided for increasing the accommodation in secondary schools or for increasing the amount of the Old Age Pension or for any increase in social services; but it is proposed to spend the sum of \$275,000 on new Government Offices and Ministerial Buildings. I do not know what rent is paid for the buildings which we will no longer have to rent if we erect the buildings proposed in these Estimates, but I do know this; the interest and sinking fund on the money which it is proposed to spend on the erection of new Government buildings would pay rent for a number of years at the present rate at which we are going. When it comes to the question of Ministerial Buildings, is it that the Ministers are not satisfied with their offices? It might be that they picture themselves pompously stepping up marble steps between Ionic arches while masses of hungry, unemployed people bow themselves humbly down in abject homage. I cannot see how spending this vast amount of money on Ministerial Buildings could assist in the expansion of the country's economy—a country which is dependent upon such a large slice of its revenue from Customs duties. The spending of this money might provide work for a few weeks for some people, but can anybody tell me that new Government Offices or Ministerial Buildings are imperatively urgent? If the Ministers regard their present offices as being incompatible with their dignity and inferior to their position, I cannot see any of us objecting to their wanting to provide more palatial offices for themselves out of their own pockets; but we should certainly refuse to expend the amount proposed in this Budget for that purpose. That is farcical; numbers of important things which should be done are omitted and with the air of a hen which has just laid an egg or of some conjurer who has made a white rabbit out of a top hat, you are told that the colony's finances are sound, the surplus balance is over \$8 million and you would have had by some magic wand to provide this surplus balance within the last three or four years.

It is not only that this surplus was accumulated from years of maladministration which it is the duty of the Government to correct, but they regard it as their solemn duty to accumulate surplus balances and make them bigger and brighter every year regardless of what sins of omission have to be committed so to do. And the revenue which they get from penalising the community, they squander! I was amused to hear the honourable senior member for St. Joseph talking about keeping down the cost of living and of price control and saying that the price of cabbage should be less than 54 cents a pound; if he is really looking after price control let him attend to the things which we have to import. We want to concern ourselves with getting as much industrial expansion as we can; we want to protect the industries we have and do not let them be forced to go out of existence. Of course, if you allow the textile plant and the shirt plant to be closed down and we have to import more textiles and more shirts, certainly we will get more Customs revenue; but we will have more unemployment and more of the country's national income will be sent abroad and we will go on until we come to the point that we will have few, if any, local industries. If we were not so minded to gloat over the fact that we are getting this healthy balance, we would concern ourselves with getting industries so as to employ more people who are now faced with extinction. What is Jamaica and Trinidad and British Guiana doing? Every industry which is developing they are pro-

testing immediately; you cannot import shoes in Jamaica as you like because the Government has a ban on the importation of shoes. Of course they will not get as much Customs revenue from shoes as we get, but they figure they will gain more by making shoes than by importing them; everything that can be manufactured in the colony is being protected but we are talking about the price of cabbage; all we can talk about is price control.

You will search vainly in these Estimates for any appreciable recognition of the importance of tourism to the colony. If you look at the West Indian or American or European Press you will see that all other colonies are making the best possible bid to expand the tourist industry, but we are still trying to fool ourselves and others too that a big tourist industry would be inimical to the best interests of Barbados. If we are not careful at the rate at which we are going, in a short time what tourist industry we bid for will be one of our main sources of support. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy referred to the position of sugar and nobody in his right senses will believe that the position will become increasingly better under present world conditions; it is wise to expect deterioration and that being the case, every possible avenue for assisting the colony's economic expansion should be considered; tourism is one which will bring an appreciable reward.

I want, at this stage, to refer to one or two of the proposals for positive action in these Estimates. The hon. introducer has said that the Opposition will find it difficult to discover something which the Government has not done; because there are a few things which the Opposition has suggested and which are being attended to, the hon. member is congratulating himself that we will find it difficult to discover something which is not being done. I mentioned a while ago that no provision has been made for an increase in the amount of the Old Age Pension; I do not know the respective figures for the subsidisation of rice and pickled pork—we have been given the total amount for subsidisation in bulk—but I am suggesting to the Minister for Trade and Industry to busy himself with the position as regards pickled pork, find out what the facts are and he will discover that we need not spend a cent on subsidising pickled pork; and the money which he saves there he can spend on an increase in the amount of the Old Age Pension.

Although we have this healthy surplus balance of over \$8 million, there is no attempt made even at introducing a scheme of compulsory education; it is high time that we begin to save some of the money which is spent on the Anglican Church and put that money into a scheme of compulsory education. If we can afford the luxury of a State-paid Church, we can afford the luxury of compulsory education for the masses of people in this colony. I do not suggest that the Government is really interested in education because it is not; search these Estimates and present one single case in which it is proposed to spend any money on providing additional secondary education! In St. Philip there are 48 acres of land which the British Admiralty utilised during the War; that land has now been released for acquisition by the local Government. It is fully six years since it was suggested in this House that we should endeavour to acquire this property but we have now acquired it. There you have beautiful buildings which can be converted into secondary school buildings with hardly any expenditure, but what does the Government propose to do? As far as the Government is concerned, there are only two

types of education — Elementary education and Higher education. We have increased entirely out of proportion the amount we are spending on Higher education, but no such provision for secondary education has been made and these Admiralty buildings in St. Philip could be utilised as they are to provide one of the finest secondary schools in the island. However, the Government proposes to utilise these buildings for an elementary school.

So far as I know,—and I know a great deal of the parish of St. Philip—there is no need for more elementary educational facilities in that area. Less than a mile to the north of the former Admiralty possession, there are two big elementary schools of the Church Village Boys' and Girls; and to the south of the same place are two big schools St. Martin's Junior and Senior. In the middle and just to the east of the same place are Beulah Girls' and Boys'. Anyone with a knowledge of the parish will tell you that where the Admiralty buildings east for fully a mile, you will hardly find a house. I do think that the parish is very well served with elementary schools. Yet in keeping with its policy of not providing more secondary schools, the Government proposes to put another elementary school on the Admiralty site and is making no provision at all for secondary education in the parish. Some pupils of secondary schools in the parish have to travel 18 miles—from one end of the parish to Bridgetown—to get a secondary school in Bridgetown. The other day, I began to compute the monthly cost of a child's travelling bill by bus to a secondary school in Bridgetown.

(Mr. Speaker left the Chair and Mr. Smith in the absence of Mr. Deputy Speaker took the Chair).

I was saying, Sir, that sometime ago, I computed the monthly cost of a child's travelling and maintenance bill by bus to a secondary school in Bridgetown from some of the remote parts of St. Philip and it came to \$30. That amount included a hot meal in Bridgetown because many of them have to leave their homes at 7.30 o'clock in the morning to catch a bus and they do not get back until 6 o'clock in the evening. Some parents have to find this amount for more than one child. You can imagine what it means to the parents of those children that have to travel those distances to get to school. The Government has eight million dollars lying in the Treasury and yet is unconscionable and indifferent to the welfare of the people in the community that it proposes to spend \$330,000 on new public buildings and ministerial buildings rather than to spend a few thousand dollars on an already existing building in the parish of St. Philip to convert it into a comfortable secondary school building large enough to house pupils from the parish, part of St. John and part of Christ Church. The Government thinks it is far more in conformity with the importance of ministerial status to have the ministers stepping every morning into beautiful new buildings than to earmark some of that money to provide a secondary school in the parish of St. Philip. I can tell the Government that so far as the people of St. Philip are concerned, they do not want another elementary school in the parish. If this Government can boast that the colony's finances are so sound and it has a good surplus accumulated over a period of years, and is yet adding to that, and it can find money for every nonsense like leave passages and the like, I feel it is not fair to penalise the poor working people of St. Philip and thereabouts to the extent of \$60 per month to send two children to secondary schools in Bridgetown. If a secondary school were to be erected in St. Philip, it would be self supporting. The people of that parish are not asking Government

to finance that school, they are only asking to erect the school. They are saying that the money which they now have to pay for transport and maintenance of their children while in Bridgetown attending secondary schools would be available to spend in keeping that school in St. Philip running without any cost of the Government.

It seems to me that the Minister of Education is mainly concerned with the spending of as much money as he can on providing a certain type of scholarship. If you look at the cost of Barbados Scholarships to-day to what it was five years ago, you will find that it is five times the number of scholarships and on top of that there is an appreciable increase in the value of each scholarship. Why? Well you know why. But with all that, the Government cannot find one cent to spend on building a secondary school in St. Philip. I think my colleague would support me in saying that it is the general consensus of opinion in the parish that there is a sufficient number of elementary schools scattered all over the parish to serve its needs.

Sir, the people who have been given the responsibility to allocate this revenue to expend on education, more is expected of them than to allocate money to build an elementary school in a parish where it is not wanted. Rather than build an elementary school with that money on the site proposed, it would be far better if it were spent on providing a health centre until such time as Government intends to build a secondary school. The Admiralty site in St. Philip is centrally situated and would be the ideal spot for a health centre. But to show you the indifference of Government, it has acquired that land which is about 48 acres, getting close on a year and has done nothing with it.

(A VOICE: Oh no; not so long).

Well, even say six months.

(A VOICE: Come down; not so long either).

Whatever may be the period, at the time, Government proposed to put an elementary school there. It cannot use all that 48 acres for a school along with a playing field and we were told that some part would be used for agricultural development. You have decreased the prospects for food production elsewhere in the colony by allowing the planters, in order to eradicate the mealy bug pest, to plant thrown out land in canes — land that normally would be planted in food crops. You have land lying fallow but expect cabbages cheaper than 48 cents per pound. There is nothing in any part of these Estimates for the Minister of Agriculture or any other Minister to put land that is lying fallow into cultivation. I suggested in this House a few months ago that Government look all over the Island and where it found land lying fallow to ensure that it would be utilised without any delay for food production. If you want to bring the price of cabbages down you must expand production. The more land you plant up, the cheaper would be your prices for vegetables. Sir, as far as the provision for an elementary school in the parish of St. Philip is concerned, it is not wanted. The people are clamouring for a secondary school. That is what they deserve and if they cannot be given that, give them a health centre. They can get along with the existing elementary schools because there is a sufficient number in the parish. Give them a secondary school or a health centre; either is of more necessity.

I will go back to one or two of the other points which were raised in introducing the Budget. We see in these Estimates the sum of \$20,000 for the canalisation of the Constitution Swamp and the construction of two dams. Honourable members will recall how members of the Government got on the floor of this House and said that the expenditure

on the canalisation of the Constitution swamp would not be compensated for by the land reclaimed. Members of the Government have also said from time to time that the Opposition does not suggest anything. From whom did the continuous demand for canalisation come? Although the Opposition does not suggest anything we see in the Capital Expenditure of the Estimates the sum of \$20,000 as a revote of the provision made last year for the sinking of such wells and for the canalisation of the Constitution swamp and the construction of two dams. If I understand the English language Government has now proposed to canalise the Constitution swamp. Government was so indifferent to this matter some years ago that the equipment which was ordered to do this work would have been allowed to rot and would not be of any use now if it were not for the Opposition getting on the floor of this House and compelling Government to take it up from where it was lying and put it under shelter. We also see that the producers of these Estimates are now making provision for the construction of the East Coast Road. Well, it does not need a good memory to recall the stand taken in this House a few years ago by the present Government when it was suggested that this road should be constructed. I said on Tuesday last, and I repeat to-day, that for a long time the present Government sheltered behind the allegation that if they repaired the East Coast Road they would be enhancing the land adjoining it. In 1948, the House was so amazed over the Government's attitude that it told the Government it was prepared to pass legislation that when Government constructed the road and the land value was increased as a result, any increase in value would accrue to Government. Since 1944 a resolution was passed by this House and the Other Place that work be started on the East Coast Road and equipment was actually ordered. We actually were offered a grant from C.D. & W. to do it. It is nearly eight years now that Mr. George Seel — he later became Sir George Seel — was taken over the proposed road and shown around in order to enlist the support of the Colonial Office for the purpose. It could have been done years ago if this Government were so willing. In 1947, we had the Commissioners of Highways for St. Joseph offering to do their portion of the road if they got the money to do it from the Government but the Government was indifferent to the construction of it. Now that Government proposes to do it, it is going to cost twice as much.

I pass on to another item. Perhaps honourable members may have noticed that we are spending \$124,000 on the nutrition scheme for school children. I want to suggest to the appropriate minister that it is high time that we get on with the scheme for a milk pasteurisation plant. If we begin with our plant for our milk pasteurisation, we should find that the plant itself could supply the milk for the nutrition scheme at greatly reduced cost to what we are paying now. There would also be a market for the milk on Sundays and school holidays. This amount of money that we are voting for the nutrition scheme could provide the interest and sinking fund for the pasteurisation plant.

In these Estimates, we are told that the waterworks scheme is progressing favourably and it is actually proposed to plan for more expenditure on it this year than was allocated in the Five Year Plan.

(Mr. SMITH acting as DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair).

Sir, I am speaking on the Waterworks scheme. It is well known that the parochial authorities in every parish had submitted to the Government plans for waterworks extension throughout the respective

parishes. This House urged in 1948 — six years ago — that Government raise a loan and start an island-wide scheme to provide water in every home and a public standpost in every district. That has been our repeated clamour. As a matter of fact, I have on more than one occasion compared the Colony's position with that of Trinidad, where you can not find a public stand-post in the City of Port-of-Spain because every house in the City has its own water system.

So far as our housing programme is concerned, we are doing nothing from our revenue in regard to it. We are using the Labour Welfare Fund primarily for our housing expenditure and as can be seen that fund is carrying the main burden of our expenditure on housing throughout the island. One would have thought that with the Labour Welfare Fund to take care of housing requirements in the greater portion of the rural areas, the opportunity would have been seized to pay more attention and to spend more money from our revenue on centrally aided housing schemes. It is amusing to see the amount of money which is earmarked for housing under the Estimates for 1954—55. From an estimated revenue of \$13,000,000, the amount allocated to spend on housing is \$37,000, and this amount seems to be earmarked for only administrative purposes because under Capital Expenditure, as far as can be seen, there is no provision for any housing programme. The only thing in the building programme that can be seen is new government and ministerial buildings; no housing scheme is seen for the people.

Sir, what I would like the Government to consider carefully is the necessity for making a beginning in Barbados of some sort of Social Security Scheme. It is not beyond our resources but if we do not start on it now that it is opportune to do so, heaven knows when we will be able to do so. Whether the Government intends to do so or not, it will have to spend more money on Old Age Pensions as the cost of living increase has compelled us to do so. The estimated expenditure on Old Age Pensions for the coming year is roughly half million dollars. With regard to the implementation of a Social Security Scheme, there are other sources from which additional revenue for this purpose can be obtained. You would be able to collect contributions, from individuals themselves and from employers and from workers.

It has been estimated that we can start a fairly sound scheme to benefit the greater part of the population with a sum of three million dollars per year as a beginning. As I have said, three million dollars is not beyond the capacity of this colony to spend on such a scheme of social service and social security. I have already suggested the implementation of this scheme on the floor of this House and will continue to suggest it until such time as the Government feels that the country deserves it and that the country can afford to finance it.

Sir, this is all I want to say at this stage on the estimates for the coming year. In so far as the various Heads of Expenditure are concerned, promotion and what not, ample opportunity would be provided when the House goes into Committee on the Estimates. In closing, I do want to express the hope that when the time comes again for this House to consider the Annual Budget of Expenditure, I hope some real attempt would have been made to extend the national income and that our Industrial Development Board which is eight years overdue would have been established and would have made some substantial contribution to the industrial development of the country and for the simple reason that only by endeavouring

to make the country more self-sufficient can we really maintain this healthy financial position which is our boast today, even although it may appear to some of us to be unsound because it is thought to be based on a ruinous structure, and that it cannot be expected to maintain it at the rate we are doing now. As it appears to me, what is of far more importance even than the majority of things which I see under Capital Works, is the necessity to establish the Industrial Development Board and it is sincerely to be hoped that immediately after the consideration and passing of these estimates the appropriate legislation would be presented for the creation of this Board.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, the speech by the first Premier of Barbados on the introduction of the first estimates under the new regime has been described as disappointing and I would like to add that it really was a lamentable display and was equalled for ramblings only by some of the subsequent speakers. We know that the honourable Premier boasts that he does not prepare speeches, but at least he could have made a speech that was coherent and worthwhile listening to. As a matter of fact, it was just a speech of somebody trying to explain something that happened and looking around for asides to make points on. As far as I can remember, every time that consideration of estimates has been started the week after their presentation, that practice has been deplored and it is regrettable that such a bad precedent should be taken by the honourable Premier as an example and especially so, when he has continued to consider them in spite of the many requests to the contrary.

Sir, the presentation of the Annual Estimates in this House reached such a stage when the colony had its first Financial Secretary that we could not get through them at all by the end of March one year and we had to provide in some slipshod and mysterious way money to carry on the Government for the month of April, so that we could have time to consider the Estimates. Now I hear much of conventions that we are supposed to follow, but if we are setting up conventions where the Chancellor of the Exchequer or his equal in this House after he has delivered his Budget Speech should be followed by a speech by the Leader of the Opposition, then we should recognise such a post and pay him as is done in England. We must be able to identify the person who is Leader of the Opposition before the carrying out of such a convention can be expected. It seems to me as if the very foundations on which we are basing our ministerial system are very lacking and that is a very dangerous thing. We have heard on many occasions from the honourable Premier that there is a great liaison between the Prime Minister of England and the Leader of the Opposition and it was his intention to follow that same principle but until we know who is the Leader of the Opposition or until that position is recognised, nothing can be done properly.

Mr. Speaker, as far as this House being asked to rush through the Estimates in order to get them to the Other Place in time is concerned, it is besides the point. The people who are asking this House to consider the Other Place are the very people who are bringing the Estimates late to this House. If we are to recognise the Other Place, let us recognise it by bringing in the Estimates earlier so that they can get them earlier. Sir, we do not send the Annual Estimates up to the Other Place. The Annual Estimates are laid in the Other Place at the same time as they were laid on the table of this House. I do not know of any procedure to prevent the Other Place from discussing them at the same time or before we do because what we send up to them is the Appropriation Bill and not the Estimates; let us in

this Chamber have the advantage of hearing what they have to say about the Estimates too. Sir, when we send up the Appropriation Bill, they can deal with it then.

Sir, I would like to draw one matter to your attention in consideration of these Estimates. I have been asking all along and especially recently that with the extension of the life of the House that annual sessions be decided on either by statute or by convention. I am appealing to Your Honour to take on this appeal yourself. I would also like to draw to Your Honour's attention that an honourable member who wished when speaking on these Estimates to remind the Government Bench of something that was said on the previous occasion if even he had an official copy of what was said on the last Estimates, Your Honour would be obliged to say that could not be done because we cannot reach from the debates of the current session. In any case, on this occasion it would be a physical impossibility because the debates on last year's Estimates have not yet been printed, but even if those debates were printed, Your Honour could not allow that honourable member or any other to refer to them because of the rules of this House, so there would be that handicap. No matter what the Government said on that occasion, you cannot quote it because there has been no break in the Session; I therefore make that appeal so that there should be some break between the presentation of Estimates in this House if we are to regularise it and carry on the English practice.

Now, Sir, there is a slight alteration in the make-up of these Estimates and I would like to refer to that at this early stage. I notice that in making up some of the heads of the Estimates there is a change in some columns from "Fixed by Law" to "Authorised by Law". It is noticeable that what appeared in the Estimates of last year under the Head "Charges of Debt" does not appear under the same column this year. I am wondering what is going to happen when this Head is to be discussed in Committee. Will the Chairman of Committees prevent honourable members from discussing the items marked with an asterisk under the particular column? I am glad that the honourable member is in his place because I am giving notice that I intend to put it to the test.

Sir, it is refreshing to hear the Government referring to the Five-Year Plan and the fact that they had to make a change in it in some way, because I am aware that Your Honour or the Chairman of Committees has been appealed to by members of this House on several occasions in reference to certain matters and there has been the ruling that since the House has agreed to the Five-Year Plan, it should not criticise certain things in this plan when they are being implemented by legislation of the House. Sir, if Government can alter the Five-Year Plan, is the Plan binding on the House and not on the Government? Can the Government do as it likes with the Five-Year Plan? How can it be said that this House must stick to it because we passed a resolution or an address to say that we agreed to it in principle? I pose those questions to Your Honour so that you will know how to deal with the matter in the future.

Now, one of the things that strike me about the Estimates for 1954-55 is that at long last we have the revenue derived from direct and indirect taxation almost equal. While it is good to know that indirect taxation is not now producing the bulk of the revenue, the manner in which it has been equalised is disappointing and in my opinion wrong. There has been no shifting of the indirect taxation to direct taxation but what has happened is that indirect taxation has been going up and up and direct taxation has been made so heavy that it equalises the heavy

and heavier indirect taxation. I do not think that Government should continue to have it both ways. I have been told that we cannot interfere with the taxation from Customs. As that is out of our reach, it means that half of the money which we collect is controlled by international agreement and trade conventions.

(A VOICE: Why?)

The honourable senior member for St. Philip enquires, why. I wonder why when we were dealing with tariffs, he did not enquire why of somebody whom he may have believed.

Another point that strikes me about the revenue of the island is the surplus that has been collected over the revised estimates. Even the revised estimates justified the criticism that the Government had no right to increase taxation at the time after introducing the Five-Year Plan. Government should have given the people of the colony the opportunity of enjoying the facility of duty on F.O.B. value of goods imported into the island and other things at least until the end of the financial year. The surplus which Government collected for that period really justified that criticism. Government really could have left that money in the pockets of the taxpayers.

I believe it must have been a slip of the tongue on the part of the honourable Premier when he said that in budgeting the Government had to bear in mind the crop when thinking of the collection of income tax. As far as the crop is concerned with the collection of income tax, the crop is reaped, manufactured and shipped and probably the money for it received before the Estimates are made up. As far as income tax is concerned, the reaping of the crop does not matter with the Budget as there can be no gambling about it then. You know what the crop is before you prepare your Estimates and it is probably paid for by that time. I hope that that part of the honourable Premier's speech was only a slip of the tongue; it obviously is so, because the honourable member could not in one breath say what he did about income tax and also say that it was known that the retail business would not be as good in the future and from that angle they were not expecting as much as they got in the previous year. So far as our revenue is concerned, even although we are passing our Budget on the Five-Year Plan, we have always, so far, got a crop above the average mentioned in that Plan, therefore, the revenue that Government is expecting should always be over that which was estimated; it should not fall beneath. Even in the present crop they should get more than is the estimated average in the Five-Year Plan; therefore, there can be no hesitancy on the part of the Government in budgeting of not looking forward to a crop of 150,000 tons or not collecting accordingly the average crop of 150,000 tons.

Mr. Speaker, I am coming to the point of spending the revenue of this colony in relation to the spending capacity of the Government. I am saying that the Government is not spending the revenue which it is collecting. Evidently, Government is not geared to spend the amount that it is collecting, therefore, I join with other honourable members in saying that it is wrong to be contemplating those loans which the Government has mentioned in the Five-Year Plan. The truth of that is no more clearly borne out than by the action of the Government itself. There was money to the extent of two million dollars borrowed from the Treasury and as far as the Five-Year Plan is concerned, in 1953 that two million dollars should have been put back into the Treasury for Government to get ready to advance money against the proposed loan of six million dollars that was proposed to be raised for the carrying out of the Plan. As is known,

1954 has come and Government has only raised \$500,000, not even half of the first two million dollars which it set out to get. Sir, when Government raised the \$500,000 it raised that amount at a time when it was expensive to raise a loan. I am therefore counselling Government to abandon that idea altogether especially now that it has in mind the building of a Deep Water Harbour and is hoping to make it a reality. It is no use budgeting to justify taxes or anything of that sort. If Government really intends to get a big loan for the purpose of implementing the Deep Water Harbour scheme, I would strongly advise Government not to be borrowing money and at the same time lending out money as well. I consider that a stupid thing to do, especially when you are borrowing it at a high rate of interest and lending it out at a low rate. I am saying that the loans that were proposed in the Five-Year Plan are unnecessary.

The interest in the 1953 loan, which I claim the Government can do without, is put in the Estimates as \$90,000 and the sinking fund as \$30,000 and yet all the money raised so far is \$500,000, or one quarter of the amount of the loan. How is it that you will end up with twice the surplus that you budgeted for and yet you are still borrowing money? Let us bear in mind that that is not the actual figure because it is only a revised estimate; the actual figure cannot be known until after the 31st March. Is Government really budgeting for a surplus of \$800,000 over its expenditure and yet have borrowed \$500,000 on which it will have to pay a rate of interest between 4 and 5 per cent? That is absolutely ludicrous.

Mr. Speaker I notice that it was recommended that a Government institution like the Government Savings Bank should take up part of the loan and I understand that this Bank has taken up a good part of it. I am one who thinks that the monies in the Government Savings Bank are trust funds and if there is any body which should not borrow them it is the trustees. It may be all right for the sake of convenience as has been said but in principle it is wrong. If the Government has to guarantee the funds of the Savings Bank and then turns round and borrows them,—bear in mind that Government is the trustee of the Government Savings Bank—it is wrong in principle and I am only throwing out the hint that it is not a good thing for the Bank to do.

Well, the Revenue Equalisation Fund has reached a sum of over \$3,000,000. It started three years ago and in that short space of time, it has reached the colossal sum of \$3,000,000 and so far as the present budgeting is concerned, the Government is putting back in \$90,000 to raise a loan and has stated that it took part of 50% of the surplus and put it to the Equalisation Fund again. Well Sir, because of this style of book-keeping, I feel that Government needs some more expert advice than what it has. Undoubtedly, Government has as good financial experts as it can get but the experts financial ability might have lost some of its genius when it is exercised on behalf of the Government. Because of that, I think Government should be very chary about accepting advice in such matters. Government advisers in financial matters may have advised it to raise loans whether or not it requires them, so that the advisers money friends should get back some of their taxes in interest. That might be a method of getting around it. I think it will be well for Government to bear that in mind and to also bear in mind that it has not cut down on customs duties. The little adjustments that were done amounted to nothing in comparison to what have been added. One of the things that have been cut down on is animal feed but the price for feeding animals in every other department has gone up, so from Government's own experience,

it should know that is purely superficial and specious, therefore it is not worth while saying. I hope Government will see its way to bring in a Bill to cut that amount in the Revenue Equalisation Fund in half or by 25 per cent or even by 10 per cent and if Government feels it will satisfy their housekeepers' mentality, let us give them five or ten per cent of it.

Before I leave the revenue, I would like to draw some attention to the annexed Estimates with respect to the Post Office. I understand from the honourable Premier that the revenue of the Post Office has gone down. We all know that this is a fictitious thing. It is absolutely fictitious. The Post Office is in the unfortunate position of collecting a considerable amount for the Customs and getting nothing for it. The Parcel Post Branch of the Post Office collects money and hands it over to the Customs. Now, it is stated that the Post Office has made a loss on its working. I do not know what is the deficit but I believe if you charge the Customs something for the Post Office collecting money on the Customs' behalf, it will cover the deficit. I will also say that it is not sufficient for the honourable Premier to mention an item like that as a fact. It is something that Government should take to heart. Government has also to bear in mind that it has raised the postal rates in certain directions and in doing so, might have prevented certain people from using the Post Office as they did formerly; therefore, causing the revenue to go down. I do know that the Post Office used to thrive on sentiment. When stamps were issued to commemorate some occasion, they would catch a certain lot of people who like to buy them and put them down in the hope of getting a bigger price for them at a future date. I would like to find out how many occasions have been commemorated since the introduction of the Five-Year Plan. I do know that there has been an issue of stamps to commemorate Her Majesty's Coronation and I think that new issues have come out more often since the introduction of the Plan than formerly. What I think has happened is that the Post Office used to get their stamps fairly cheaply from a certain firm of printers, but as Government has charged more for postal rates, the firm of printers has charged the Post Office 800% and in some cases 1,000% increases on the prices formerly charged. I well remember that in one instance the increase was so much that it would take a mathematician to work it out. Sir, the Post Office is paying a great deal more for printing postage stamps and on top of that, the paper on which stamps are now printed is inferior to what it was before. I do think that it will be well for the Government to say whether in pushing up its postal rates it has not lowered the revenue of the Post Office. Sir, let us really get an idea of the proper working of the Post Office. Sir, I think that there is everything in its favour for making money.

Mr. Speaker, I am having very little to say on the expenditure side of the Estimates because we are going to deal with the various Heads of Expenditure separately and I shall have something to say on quite a number of them. However, it may be well if I mention something now on a certain item in order to get the necessary answer when the House goes into Committee. The Head of the Administration sometime ago got a motor car from the taxpayers and at the time it was said that travelling allowance would be cut out, but on looking into the Estimates, I see that it has not been cut out. That is something which needs explaining. This House had assurances that it would not have been put in.

I see under the Capital Expenditure, provision is made for \$200,000 for the purpose of erecting a new Fire Station. I do not know if that has been put in by mistake, because the honourable Junior member for St. Thomas assured me that it was not put in the Estimates. I think before it was put in the Select Committee should report and the House ought to tell the Government whether they agree with it or not. I do not see the sense of anything being sent to Select Committee if things like this happen.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a regular appeal to the populace of this country that they should bear increased taxation on their rum, cigarettes and many other things because there was the sentimental appeal that there were three in a bed at the General Hospital and because the Government wanted to cure a condition of that sort. I understand this is a condition which exists all over the world except in England where the law overrules it and I would not mind telling you, because that is the law of England, when hospitals are full, those who take ill and cannot be admitted are allowed to die at the gate. Do not let us get away with the idea that more than one person in a hospital bed exists only in Barbados. It exists in many countries. When we tell people that they should pay more taxes so that Government can remedy such conditions at the Hospital, it really does not speak so well for us if we then decided to enlarge the hospital by a vote from C.D. & W. funds. All along it has been said that if somebody votes against Government taxation policy, that person wants people to die at the gate of the General Hospital. But one wonders if that is not said to bring in money for the diverse things on which Government wants to spend money.

Mr. Speaker, the big thing about the improvements to be carried out at the General Hospital is that at one time this House approved plans for the improvement of the Hospital and one would have expected that the Director of Public Works was consulted before those plans came to this place. Nobody expected that the plans would have to be taken back to the Director of Public Works for him to say that there were no proper foundations. It is good to speak well of the dead but perhaps, it is a good thing that the Government has a new Director of Public Works, otherwise, Government would not have been able to come back and say that it is now able to build on the same place where it was said that there were no foundations. It seems to me to have been the policy of the previous head of the Public Works that wheresoever the Government bought land they could not build on it, and he would repair any old building rather than build a new one. Certainly that former head of Government has prevented Government from spending some of the money that it had put aside for improvements to the Hospital and I think that it is most regrettable that such a thing should have happened. Now, Government is going into the General Hospital proper to remodel and build new buildings.

Sir, with this Capital Expenditure, we are giving the Government a blank cheque because the Government has not submitted any of the plans to the public or even to this House of Assembly. Government has submitted no plans at all to this House. Government came to the House and asked for money to build a Post Office and Library in Christ Church and when the plans were put into the hands of the new Director of Public Works, he altered them in some way. The Director may be the best Director of Public Works, but we are the representatives of the people, and he should not be allowed to decide on taking money out of the Treasury to

spend unless we let him do it. For the short time that he has been here, he has remodelled an entire plan and we have had to accept the principle that a Government official can spend money out of the Treasury owing to this House of Assembly giving up its rights. By the way, I have heard that a Report on the recommendations for the General Hospital is in the hands of honourable members but if that is so, I have not yet received my copy. I know that it has been laid on the table of this House, but I do not know whether it is printed. At any rate, I do hope that some sort of plans would be exhibited on what is going to be done there and that we would have the opportunity of showing them to people in the island who can read plans and who can help us in that respect.

Owing to the Five-Year Plan, Government can come to this House and get a block vote for capital expenditure, and use it as it likes, but it is wrong in my opinion. It is only through an intervention by the Other Place that the building of a new Fire Station was not commenced. Although, we, the people's representatives made criticisms in like manner as those which were made in the Other Place, we were not considered important enough, but the members of the Other Place were considered important enough as to stop operations. We have reached a stage in this country when the two or three members on the Executive Committee from the Other Place can get things they want done and can get better explanations on any thing than members of this House. We are told every time that we must pass such and such a thing and must pass it quickly. As I have said, because of the Five-Year Plan, no details of Capital Expenditure are put before this House. We are giving the Government a blank cheque.

By way of expenditure again, I must say that I am very glad that the Government is having an investigation into the structure of the Civil Service and other Government Departments and I sincerely hope that it will not end in a disappointing way. I do hope that Government will get the maximum of efficiency from all its departments as a result. It is thought by many that these multiplicity of Government Departments and top heavy staff are not necessary and it is time that we get our Civil Service in proper shape without going on adding to it particularly now that we have stuck on ministerial system as a superstructure. In my saying so, I am not asking Government to be cheeseparing and parsimonious but it is time that Government see to it that it does not overburden the colony with taxation to provide a Civil Service out of keeping with the size of this colony and the work to be done. Government will also have to see that it does not import people to tell it things to make jobs for others to come. Let us insist that we want an honest and intelligent report from this gentleman who is now carrying on the investigations irrespective of who it cuts against or who it favours.

Mr. Speaker, I come to my last point. The Government for the second time is supplying the House of Assembly in its Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure with a breakdown of its grant for Grant-Aided Secondary Schools. It is a bit surprising to me, and I do not know if there is any explanation, but I see there is a drop in the revenue from these schools. I think last year it was in the vicinity of \$150,000 but it is now only \$141,217. I am asking Government to consider this proposition. It had budgeted in 1953-4 for an excess of revenue over expenditure of \$834,000 and has ended up with double that amount. As it seems to me, \$150,000 would give free secondary education, but it does not seem to me as if members

of the Government and other honourable members of the House of Assembly realise it. Here it is, according to the break-down, the revenue collected last year by the secondary schools is \$141,000 and Government is giving them more than \$510,000.

I make bold to say that if we claim to be leaders in the Caribbean in almost everything, that we take one million dollars from the Revenue Equalisation Fund and put it aside so as to give us free secondary education for at least eight years. I think it would be something that the whole Caribbean would look up to us for doing and I think we can afford to do it. Here it is, we are collecting a ridiculously small sum of money from these schools and certain people are using this as an argument for increasing the school fees. If this Government abolish fee-paying at secondary schools for at least eight years, it would abolish a great deal of anxiety from people as well as a great deal of patronage by the Vestries. It would also prevent a lot of people who have to pay income tax and pay fees for two or three children from complaining. To my mind, \$141,000 is a small amount of money to spend annually on a project of that sort. I think the Labour Government would become extremely popular with all classes for a move of this kind. I was told by someone whom I believe knows much about secondary education that the reason why Government was collecting school fees from pupils at secondary schools was for the purpose of building schools. I say, Sir, secondary education is not compulsory education, nor is compulsory education a form of education. It is a form of compulsion but it is not a system of education. I again say that this Government can afford for a period of ten years from now to take one-third of the present amount of the Revenue Equalisation Fund and set it aside to provide free secondary education. It would also be enough to give an extra \$50,000 so as to aid private secondary schools in the island that are doing an excellent job in the absence of Government schools. This Government can do that immediately without asking the people to pay one brass farthing more in taxes. I know that many people would not believe that \$150,000 annually can provide free secondary education at Government secondary schools, but if this is not a fact, well then, Government has supplied fictitious figures.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker,— the Premier in presenting his first Ministerial Budget has truly said that there has not been any great departure from the last Budget and he warned us that the Government was following as closely as possible for the next three years what is known as the Five Year Plan. We are now embarking on the third year of the Plan. The Premier also said when we were dealing with the Estimates a year ago, that no one knew for certain what the sugar crop would have brought forth; in that I can say he was correct. We had estimated a crop of 120,000 to 140,000 tons of sugar, but the crop ended at between 160,000 and 165,000 tons of sugar—a great achievement due, I am told, to the good quality juice which was obtained from the canes last year. The one departure which the Government is taking this year is in respect of capital works with which we are mainly concerned; in his Fiscal Survey Professor Beasley warned us that recurrent expenditure will continue to climb until 1959 when it will become very dangerous for us to budget on our one industry—sugar. Professor Beasley warned us that we have not paid sufficient regard to the diversification of industries or even looked out for something other than sugar to which we pay so much attention. I do not wish the public to feel that I am not in sympathy with the sugar

industry when I say that, because sugar is our only means of obtaining a livelihood today; but the income which we derive from tourism is becoming greater every year and I regret to say that after listening very carefully to the honourable Premier, he never mentioned the question of tourism in his speech. No honourable member other than the honourable senior member for St. Philip, has so far mentioned tourism, but if we continue to neglect tourism, the day is not far off when we will realise our mistake.

We are embarking on capital expenditure mostly for the comfort and education of our people and all of this we are only too glad to have; there is not a single member of this Chamber who would not willingly do more, if we could afford it. I am pleading for the diversion of some of the energy of the Government to other industries which would be productive. In the Five Year Plan the sum of \$1 million has been earmarked for a Development Board and this year for the first time we are putting aside the sum of \$250,000 in this connection. A Secretary with the necessary industrial training will be appointed to the Board and I throw out the suggestion to the Government that whenever this Board is being nominated or appointed, it will be a grave mistake if they do not put on the Board somebody who knows something about the tourist industry. It might be that the Government has that in mind, but I am throwing out a warning. We have seen that Trinidad, Jamaica and even the small colonies throughout the Caribbean area are trying to get minor industries; they have given all sorts of attractive concessions as regards income tax, duty on machinery and in Trinidad they are thinking of erecting buildings and inviting people to use those buildings for carrying on industries. We are not as fortunate as Trinidad; we were too late, we have missed the bus. Our electricity and power of heating is so inadequate that the only thing with which we could attract industries would be the huge manpower we have, and also our wonderful water supply. If we could put those two things to work, it would be a wonderful thing for Barbados; we might yet be able to do something about that. When all is said and done we have to get some industries other than the sugar industry here. A few years ago we had at the Agricultural Department an Officer, Mr. Halcrow, who interested himself in market gardening and he was doing a good job; but I regret to say that what he has built up has apparently fallen into misuse. There are irrigation schemes for small plots but we are now paying from 1/- to 2/- a pound for cabbages; we have imported articles from Holland and sold them more cheaply than we could produce them. We have the land, we leave these things undone and eventually it will be to our regret.

The Government is to be complimented on embarking on a scheme for a Deep Water Harbour. That will cost a lot of money, something like \$20 million and the Premier has said that as soon as the House replies to the Governor's Message in that connection, they will investigate the possibilities of being able to borrow that large sum of money in England—the only source from which we can expect it. As the honourable member knows, the local money market has dried up; last year they tried to raise \$1½ million and if they had been successful in doing so they would have raised another \$1½ million. The Government cannot tax people as they are taxing them and expect to find money for capital works when that money is needed. Our finances are very healthy and the Premier and his Government must be very gratified indeed that the legacy of past Conservative Governments has been passed on to them,

thus giving them an opportunity to go into the money market and say: "We have no debts; we want to borrow some money for carrying out capital works and for expansion." For that, the Premier must be grateful to past Conservative Governments. The scheme for husbanding our resources especially when they are embarking on such large capital expenditure is sound indeed whether it is of their own making or whether they have followed the advice of others; whichever it is, I commend them for having done so well.

Much has been heard about the irrigation scheme; Professor Beasley says that we are on very precarious ground if we depend upon the vagaries of the weather, and he suggests that irrigation should be used when bad years befall us. It is too early to say whether the experiment will be economic or not; we have to see the results of the irrigation scheme.

The Premier in his speech referred to the expeditious manner in which the Waterworks scheme has gone through so that the allocation in the Five Year Plan has almost been expended; he remarked that possibly it was the result of having so capable an expert as Mr. Garrod. When the Premier said that, I wondered if he implied that the two schemes in respect of medical services and education which fall so short of their target did not have efficient experts at the head of them. I cannot blame the Director of Education if the schools are not built, because the building of schools comes under the scope of the Public Works Department, but I say that the schemes in connection with education and medical services are very far short of their target.

As he has done for the four years since I have been a member of this House, the Premier has again threatened the merchants, and he says that he is watching prices most carefully and that price controls are not coming off in a hurry. Well, I am yet to see any method of control which can keep prices down more effectively than healthy competition. If the Premier had been out of the island, he might have been accused of not knowing that, but he has been here all the time. If you walk down Broad Street you will see business houses having sales and the reductions are as much as 50%; you therefore will realise that income tax returns will fall short. I repeat that healthy competition will keep prices down better than any control you can institute. It is a hardy annual to say that the bugbear is in Broad Street, that the merchant is the villain and he is the fellow whom you have to watch; but the merchant is doing a good job. Price controls will eventually come off whether the honourable Premier likes it or not; I will remind him that the agreed price of rice ends this year and the Government will soon have to make up their minds as to whether they will go on controlling the price of rice or subsidising it or put it into the open market. The sooner the Government come to what is the normal commercial practice, the better it will be for everybody concerned.

As regards the Housing Scheme the Premier made a remark which I would like him to clarify or explain at some later date. I have looked through the Estimates most carefully and I do not see any large increase in the matter of housing. The Premier mentioned that far from 30 houses per year he intended to build as many as 600 houses annually; that seems to me to be a very big extension quite suddenly. We hear of these schemes at election time, but we do not expect any election as yet. I would like to know for how many years these houses will be built and when they will be started.

I am glad to know that at long last the Government has condescended to come to Christ Church and erect a proper school which is so sadly needed. The Foundation Boys' School will offer accommodation for 390 boys and I do hope it will not be long before they will provide the Girls' School with adequate accommodation such as that provided for the Boys' School.

In conclusion I want to draw the Premier's attention to the urgent need for diversification of industries other than the sugar industry. I should like to say that with the carrying out of the Harbour Scheme, he will find himself with about 100 acres of land and this colony might be a suitable site for the Federal Parliament of the West Indies. The experts from England have valued this land which will be reclaimed from the Harbour Scheme at 10/- a foot; some four or five acres might be sold at that price, but not more. However, we are still hoping that Barbados will be the Federal Capital of the West Indies.

Mr. HAYNES: I suppose I should say a few words in connection with these Estimates. We are told that we do not produce any constructive ideas or anything of that sort. I am not wasting any time in going over current expenditure in respect of salaries because it is of no use crying over continuous increases; if you do not pay a man properly you cannot get proper service; therefore you have to swallow that for what it is worth.

As regards Capital Expenditure, I was looking for some grant in respect of refrigerating plants. The honourable Premier has mentioned that cabbage is sold at 54 cents a pound, and that state of affairs would be cured by having a proper refrigerating system; when cabbage and other articles are plentiful they could be put in refrigeration and kept at a normal price. When huge catches of fish are brought in they are sold at an uneconomical price because there is no proper refrigeration; if the fishermen cannot get an economic price for their fish they make nothing out of their catches. If we had properly run refrigerating plants in Bridgetown and at Oistin's the present difficulties would disappear overnight; I say that these refrigerating plants must be properly run because if they are not properly run there will be an absolute waste of money. With a proper refrigerating system everybody would pay a normal price for his foodstuffs and the producers would be assured of a proper return for their labour.

Another thing which I do not see under Capital Expenditure is my old topic—and it is getting beard now—the East Coast Road; we want to have this road constructed. Not even a cent has been put down for a survey of this Road; years ago money used to be put in the Estimates for this survey, but nothing has been put down in that connection this year. Has the Government forgotten that? Do they realise what an important matter it is? I have had a private conversation with two of the Ministers and they seem now to realise that the construction of this road is not of any personal benefit to anybody; it is to the benefit of the whole island. I am hoping that now each Minister has the power to do what he thinks is right, some action will be taken in this matter. It is really tiresome to talk about this road year after year.

When I made a few remarks in connection with the Five Year Plan, I said what would have happened and it has happened. We are having increased taxation, we are borrowing money and I do not see any material development for this money. If that state of affairs continues it will cause apathy; if you subscribe privately to charity and you do not see some development from that charity you feel disap-

pointed. If that is so in the case of charity, what do you think of a big thing like taxation? I hope that a feeble remark like that will soften the hearts of those who are in authority and cause them to open their hands and spend money on development. It is the feeling of the majority of the people in this island that if we are paying taxation we should see something tangible for our money.

Another point about Capital Expenditure is the proposed expenditure of \$20,000 for canalising the Constitution Swamp; the explanation has been so poor that one does not quite understand it, and the money is so small that one wonders what is to be done. We want to know what will be done with \$20,000 in these days when there is such a large area of waste land to be dealt with. If a note had been put in the Estimates in connection with this canalisation, I would not have to wonder about it, but this \$20,000 seems to be a very small amount of money to be spent for the development of such a large and probably useful stretch of land.

There are other things to which I could refer but one refrains from doing so because time passes and perhaps what one says is taken as a joke and is forgotten. In that way you waste time and everything else. However, I sincerely hope that the few remarks I have made will have some result.

Mr. ALLDER: I want to make a few points in connection with these Estimates. No one who knows the difficult conditions which obtain in this island at present could view these Estimates with any optimism; they certainly do not offer any hope for the future of the colony and the only people who do not seem to appreciate that are those in the Government. I was rather disappointed in not hearing any mention made by the Premier about emigration; I am well aware of the difficulties which confront the colony as regards getting some of its surplus population outside, but I am also aware of the relationship which this colony has with the British Government. I feel that we cannot be silent in this matter because when you remain silent on an issue like this, the position becomes worse. The British Government has rallied to other members of the Commonwealth. If you take Canada, for instance, while certain Barbadians are permitted by paying their passage to enter that country, yet people of colour cannot attempt to make any application to enter there although it is a known fact that there are possibilities of employment in that vast country. I feel that sufficient has not been done to bring forcibly to the mind of the British Government the necessity for us to have our over-population question solved. I am sure as many others are sure, that with good intention, this island can be assisted along that line.

I have noticed that only a token vote of \$100,000 has been put down in this year's Estimates in respect of emigration; that is only to remind us that the Government still intends to satisfy our feeling that it is thinking of emigration, but that is not sufficient. If it becomes necessary to make a noise even to the point of being considered to be a bad boy, I feel that the Government should do something in this matter so as to attract attention from the proper quarters in Downing Street. It becomes more necessary to do something now that many of our emigrants are returning from Curacao and Aruba and I can envisage the great dissatisfaction which will arise not long from now when all the emigrants have returned and will contribute to the further congestion of the colony.

In reading the newspaper a week or so ago I noticed the reproduction of statements made in Canada by the honourable Premier and those statements conveyed the idea that the Premier said that in a short

while every house in Barbados will have a pig or a couple of pigs free. It was set out that the Premier said that every peasant will be given chickens free if he is willing to feed them. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is very surprising to see that only a provision of \$6,000 has been made for pig-breeding and the greater part of that allocation has already been spent thereby leaving a re-vote of \$1,000. The only peasants who I know have been able to get pigs through Government channels are those who, some time last month, in a competitive way paid high prices for small pigs which were sold out at auction. For peasants to pay from \$12 to \$14 for a pig three months old is definite robbery especially from a Government Department when the promise was made not to Barbadians but to strangers that Barbadians would be given free pigs and chickens. It is now about four years that in the discussion of the Estimates, not only I myself but many other honourable members including the honourable Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour, have been pressing upon the Government the necessity for following other colonies in the West Indies in bringing about an intensive scheme for local food production. On the last occasion when I raised that question it was shortly after Trinidad had allocated \$2½ million for the purpose of making Trinidad non-dependent on imported food for the population, and with all the agitation which has taken place in this Chamber, the Government, in these Estimates, has only provided the sum of \$389,000 in respect of food production. It has been said that that is the provision in the Five Year Plan, which means that the food scarcities which are being experienced now will continue to be experienced for an indefinite period until the Government has been brought to its senses and does something which will relieve the situation.

It is a known fact that in the administration of a country one of the first essentials is the security of the necessities of life on which the population must depend. Even although one can go without a house, he cannot afford to go without that morsel of food which keeps body and soul together. The Government has no excuse in this matter; it could not be any question of the shortage of funds because there is a balance of over \$8 million in the Treasury and there could not be any shortage of labour because we have rampant unemployment in this colony. Further, it could not be any question of a shortage of land because two months ago because of the attack of the mealy bug the Government has given permission for the percentage of land which was formerly allocated to the production of food, to be reduced for the purpose of growing more canes. The Government should only do that if it feels that the population has the food it wants, otherwise it would be nonsensical to permit a reduction of the land which produces food for the population.

There is another thing which the Government does not seem to realise and it is the question of maintaining the control of prices as applied to local food production. Controls are good but if they are carried too far they bring about an evil reaction, and so the present control of locally-produced food is causing the peasants and the large land-owners not to be interested in the planting of food. I feel that in the same way that we can subsidise imported food and thereby subsidise labour in other countries at our expense, we could remove the controls off locally-produced food and the production when speeded up would take care of the prices and distribution. There is no use in having inspectors running around driving hawkers before the Courts for selling bananas at a cent a-piece when it is felt that they should be sold at three for a penny; in that way you are terrorising those who have something to do with the distri-

bution of food. A peasant proprietor has to wait for a year before a banana crops up, it takes six months to ripen and a bunch only contains about 75 to 100 bananas: then the Government comes along and says: "Your bananas must be sold at three for a penny regardless of the size of them." A peasant in St. Joseph or St. Andrew sells bananas to a hawker who travels to Bridgetown so as to dispose of those bananas and unless that hawker takes a chance of getting a half cent more profit on a banana, she must lose her labour in getting those bananas to the consumer. The same thing applies to potatoes, yams, eddoes, peas and such things; while we permit peas to be brought into this colony and be sold at 18 to 20 cents a pint, we limit the price at which a hawker can sell hers. That is taking advantage of the people in this colony for the benefit of people in other colonies, whose standard of living is higher than ours. That is what the Government does not realise and seems not to be willing to consider; there are many bits of land in this island and the owners of this land are quite willing to get something out of it; but due to the high cost of labour and the absence of the means of getting this land cultivated, these land-owners prefer to allow the land to lie fallow.

If the Government were really interested in maintaining a reasonable balance with regard to the production of food in this colony, they would have extended the scope of the Peasants' Loan Bank. I know it will be said that this has already been done, but I want the Government to know that it is very difficult for every man or woman who has a bit of land to get consideration at the Peasants' Loan Bank. Our population increases so rapidly every year and the difficulty of acquiring supplies for its existence is becoming so acute, that it might be necessary for the Government to compel every householder to plant as many fruit trees as possible. In the same way you can tell a man to get those old tins from the back of his yard because they breed mosquitoes or in the same way you send out inspectors to see that people's yards are swept every morning, it would not be extraordinary if the Government says that every householder should plant fruit trees according to the amount of land there is around his house. Some benefit must accrue from such a scheme; even if a house-spot produces just the amount of fruit which the occupiers of the house will consume, that would still be to the economic advantage of a poverty-stricken colony such as this; but instead of that, I notice that in recent years the Government, through its lethargy, has permitted wealthy strangers to come here and take productive land and convert it into swimming pools, flower gardens and things of that sort because it is very easy for the wealthy people to pay a shilling for an orange and therefore they do not have to worry about planting anything. However, the majority of people in this island cannot compete with the wealthy classes in paying high prices for the necessities of life; therefore legislation must be brought in so as to solve these problems. The St. James's coast is an example of what I am saying: because people can pay for land they should not be permitted to take that land and put it out of production. That is where legislation can solve this question.

Another matter which I would like to deal with is the matter of subsidisation. Nobody was more interested in the subsidisation of foodstuffs during the War and shortly afterwards than I; today the Government still continues to subsidise to a large tune certain items of foodstuffs which are imported into this colony.

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

Mr. ALLDER: I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we still continue to subsidise items of foodstuffs which are imported into this colony; I think the amount allocated for subsidisation is somewhere in the vicinity of \$1½ million. If that amount of money were spent in subsidising the peasants, what a good supply of ground provisions would be sent to the markets of Bridgetown! Not only would competition cause prices to go down, but employment would be provided for many who desire it.

In making provision to institute the Five Year Plan, the Government has not attempted anything along the lines of an employment scheme; the Government seems to be devoid of the knowledge as to how to plan for the successful running of the colony. The Leader of the Government glories in the fact that the Treasury is in a healthy position because it has over \$8 million in surplus balances; but there is nothing in that to glory about. I remember that that same thing caused a former Churchwarden of St. Michael to get a lot of abuse; he began to sing his praise of being able to save money. It is a negative policy if a parochial authority or government talks about saving money when there are thousands of unemployed people begging their bread and, in some instances, stealing because they cannot get necessities. With that \$8 million in the Treasury, why can't the Government start one of those projects in connection with which there has been so much agitation? What excuse has the Government got that it cannot see its way to start the Deep Water Harbour? If it is because of the large sum of money which would be entailed in such a project, you cannot excuse yourself for the failure to start the East Coast Road. It is not a healthy sign to be boastful of having \$5 in the bank, but you can boast if you have invested that \$5 and it will bring you \$6 in return. If only to relieve the present unemployment situation the Deep Water Harbour could have been started, if the Government really intends to start that project, until they have succeeded in getting a big loan through the Crown Agents as they envisage they will get when the fair name of Barbados is restored since it has been muddled.

I share the views expressed by the honourable senior member for St. Philip as regards the disendowment of the Anglican Church. I think we spend around \$100,000 per annum on the Anglican Church; there are many denominations which have set up numerous branches about the island and which draw the greater portion of our population, and to disendow the Anglican Church would definitely release a tangible sum of money which could be spent in more beneficial channels. As regards catering to the spiritual needs of the people, the Church of England cannot boast of their doing the greater part of that service. Inasmuch as every individual should be free to follow whatever religion he likes, in the same way should he be free to contribute to the maintenance of whichever religious organisation he prefers to follow; it is of no use compelling me to contribute to the maintenance of a Church in which I have no interest. Not only would the disendowment of the Anglican Church release over \$100 thousand per annum to be beneficial to the colony, but it would free people from being compelled to do something which they dislike.

I must differ from you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as regards the point you made about free secondary education. I feel that while that is something good, it all depends upon the means of the community to pay for such education; and it is my conviction that the island cannot afford that. I am not willing to suggest anything like that when I know it is definitely impossible to carry it out, and when I know

that there are other important things which should be given priority over the granting of free secondary education.

I do not agree with the Government in making provision for the setting up of a Health Centre at "Enmore" at all. About a quarter of a mile from "Enmore" you have the St. Michael's Infirmary which gives free medical services to the people whose position forces them there. Then you have the Maternity Hospital at Bank Hall plus the one for which provision has been made in the Report of the Hospital Planning Committee. You have the Casualty Department catering to the needs of the public although not fully, and to place a Health Centre just a couple of yards away from the Hospital proper is an overlapping of services which should not be encouraged. Besides what I have mentioned, the parochial authority of St. Michael has a Health Centre just down there in Cumberland Street, and that gives free services to people and there are numerous medical practitioners located in the metropolitan parish. To put a Health Centre at "Enmore" is to think in terms of captivating the minds of the potential voters who live in the metropolitan parish; that could only be considered as being done for political reasons. You have ten parishes far from the Hospital and you have three medical centres existing in St. Michael and in the City. I am told that the people in St. Andrew can get the services of the Health Centre in Speightstown; but what about the people who live in St. John, St. Philip, Christ Church and St. George? Must they join hand in hand and come to Bridgetown in droves and cause further congestion in St. Michael? Would it not be better to place that Health Centre in a district to serve the people who cannot get to Bridgetown so easily? Does the Government know that it costs people \$8.00 to come from St. John to the General Hospital? I repeat that it would be better to carry these Health Centres to country districts instead of duplicating them in the metropolitan area. It is not a question of saying how many of these Health Centres you have; it is a question of how beneficial they are to the people.

Another point is this; the income taxpayers in the lower brackets in this island should appreciate the existence of Mr. George Hunte and the relationship which he has with the leading newspaper in the island; the other courageous members of the Income Taxpayers' Association should band themselves together and create an influential body. I am grateful for the agitation which they carried on during the past number of months because the results will permit me to be able to educate myself to a greater extent than I was able to do last year and the year before. It only shows you how—I do not want to say—pig headed the Government is, but how stubborn the Government is, because on many occasions in the past when we discussed the Estimates, I, too, suggested to the Government the necessity for considering a reduction for those in the lower income brackets; I also suggested that there was the necessity for granting allowances in respect of illegitimate children. I reminded the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that the Court held a man responsible for the maintenance of children who have been born out of wedlock and the Government should act similarly with regard to income tax, but it took the continuous writings of Mr. George Hunte and the agitation of the Income Taxpayers' Association to add to the allowances \$30 in respect of a child and \$100 in respect of a married man. I appreciate that, but why should this Government think that suggestions should only be considered when they come from certain quarters? History can prove that the Government has refused all along to give consideration to the suggestions

which have been made as to increasing the allowances, but as soon as the Income Taxpayers' Association and Mr. George Hunte with his continuous writings came along, the Government gives an increase of \$100 in one way and \$30 in another way. That is the only conclusion to which one can come; honourable members know that Mr. George Hunte is placed on such a pinnacle in respect of the dissemination of news and the wielding of influence on the minds of the public as to be in the position of making a weakling a hero and a hero a weakling.

As to the question of housing, it has always been a condition that in a country the poor areas, which are always agricultural areas, suffer more acutely from bad housing than the wealthy areas which are in the town. You have small areas called slums, but in all agricultural districts there is a certainty that 75% of the people in such districts suffer badly from the shortage of housing. In Barbados, I have no prejudice against St. Michael because I live in this parish; but I know that there are areas where people are more depressed and more unable to provide themselves with housing and other things than many of the people in St. Michael. If it is the intention of the Government to have a proper system of housing, they should pay attention to other areas and not think merely in terms of St. Michael; other areas should be looked after as well as the metropolitan parish. What is more, the Government makes many promises; it takes long before it makes these promises and it takes longer before it attempts to implement these promises. It is now over a year since the sum of \$100,000 was allocated to assist Civil Servants with housing loans; since the announcement in that connection was made, it would be surprising to know how many Government servants have been asking honourable members to tell them about this scheme and when it will be implemented, and whom they should see. I refer to people in the lower brackets who are in need of somewhere for them to live. All the money is lying down there, all the workmen are knocking about the island with nothing to do and the Government, with all its brains and ability, still cannot put that machinery into action after nearly two years now.

I am very grateful to see that the parish of St. John has been remembered in a very small way. As I said earlier this session, if the Government does not set about to put up a proper building for a Post Office in St. John so as to protect the property of the public, they may have to compensate some people for their money and other things which pass through the Post Office. I do not believe in having a District Postmaster or Postmistress renting or owning a wooden house and keeping in it valuable documents and monies which might have been sent to people in the parish by their relatives. I am glad to see that provision is made for the erection of a Post Office in St. John, but I should like to remind the Government that some time ago an Address was passed in this House asking for the setting up of a Library and Post Office and Savings Department in that parish. I handled that Address which hon. members agreed to, but nothing has been done along those lines; I am hoping, however, that the provision made for the erection of the Post Office includes the setting up of a Library and Savings Department. It is of no use erecting one thing now and then you have to come back some other time and erect something else; what has been done at Oistins should be done in St. John. There will be a saving in construction if you erect an overall building and set up departments to meet the needs of the parish; I hope that that is the programme intended.

I must emphasize my disappointment and that of the public at not seeing any substantial provision having been made in respect of local food production. I cannot repeat that too often because it is a definite necessity and no Government could turn its face from such a necessity unless it does not know how it should administer the colony; it is as necessary to make sure that your population gets a continuous supply of food as it is necessary to make sure that it maintains good health and gets education and so on. I am hoping—but what is the use of hoping? Because the Government has given the impression that it cannot do anything good unless agitation is carried on for a considerable time and then it will come in a piecemeal way and say; "Well, this is a small provision which I hope will convince you that I have not forgotten you." The honourable Leader of this Chamber gave the impression in Canada that the peasants would be given free pigs and chickens and they would only have to feed them.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of order. I have not said what the hon. member has read into that article; if he reads the article again he will see that that is the writer's comment.

Mr. ALLDER: The whole of Barbados was talking about it; on the next day after the article appeared people said; "I will start and build my pig pen." (Laughter). That is what I took it to mean and I was very elated; I said that after all, the Premier has condescended to give consideration to suggestions which have been made over and over again in and out of this House. The hon. member cannot excuse himself because he has the power and the means to give. (Hon. G. H. ADAMS: 210,000 free pigs?) That is what you said; you were either irresponsible at the time or dishonest in trying to give a wrong impression.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of order. I know that the hon. member cannot help saying certain things; his mastery of the King's English is not sufficient for him to see that the word "dishonest" should not be used. If the hon. member would drop the intellectual books he is reading and read the ordinary books on English Grammar, he would see that there has been an insertion by the particular writer and it does not purport to be a quotation from me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not know whether quotations from newspapers are permissible in this House and I ask the hon. senior member for St. John not to continue with them.

Mr. ALLDER: I should like to say that I am as unable to handle the King's English as the hon. member is to administer a small colony like this. There is a possibility of my overcoming my intellectual difficulty because I am always willing and trying to learn, but the hon. member, because of some mental difficulty, ceases to gather ideas as to the successful running of a colony. The hon. member is responsible for encouraging and assisting the semi-illiterate like himself to be able to express themselves, but he tries to be embarrassing and, shall I say, dirty? He should be a shepherd capable of leading his sheep, those with strong feet as well as those with weak ones, and he should realise that the reason why he is in his position is because my parents out of their slender earnings had to pay money to educate him. If the hon. member had the educational opportunity I had, he would have been in the streets probably with less opportunity than I have. While I do not claim to have the intellectual brilliance of the hon. member, yet I still have my commonsense to be able to read between the lines, and I strive hard to understand what I read. I say that the hon. mem-

ber was dishonest when he said those things—I mean he was dishonest politically. (Hon. G. H. ADAMS: What is the use of answering him?) Was the hon. member dishonest when he said he would nationalise the Electric Company? That has not happened and the hon. member had the wherewithal to nationalise it! Let the hon. member be careful in future; the same thing he disdains is the same thing he has the power to remove. Why should our shepherd who has promised to take us out of the mire and out of our suffering to the promised land, remind us of our suffering? He is ungrateful.

When the honourable member gets up and talks of my incompetence intellectually, I wonder if he thinks that he has done me something. As a matter of fact, his attacks on me only give me more courage.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the honourable member get on with the Estimates?

Mr. ALLDER: I appreciate that I am a little off the mark but you will forgive me. I am saying that members should be allowed to quote from newspapers in this honourable Chamber. I presume when Sir Winston Churchill goes about to make a statement that the whole world becomes interested because it is taken that this statement may mean a whole lot towards the successful living of the people in all parts; therefore, when we read the newspapers and see a statement made by the Leader of this Government, it should be something which could influence a person or his politics; so when the honourable Premier makes a statement such as that, without even attempting to provide something however so small in the Estimates, he is trying to create an impression without the intention of doing the thing suggested. Sir, it is a waste of time in my suggesting to the Government the necessity of its seeing that the least which the people of this colony should suffer from is absence of food to eat. I have seen that in the United States of America which resources are unlimited that the world depends on it for much of its food in so much that its farmers are more wealthy than anywhere else in the world; yet despite all that, the Government of that country still has decided to subsidise those farmers either by buying their surplus stuff, by helping them obtain mechanical implements on easy payment terms, or even in some circumstances to the extent of supplying some of their mechanical implements free of cost. In this small country which has a large unemployed list and an increasing population yearly, this Government only gets up on platforms and talks about the things it can do and intends to do, but gets no further than that. Near to this colony is the sister colony of Trinidad whose wealth is several hundred times greater than this colony's. Trinidad can afford to pay high prices for imported food, yet that colony has allocated \$2,500,000 to the production of locally grown food but this Government has done nothing of the kind. The honourable Premier knows that he should do something about it but he refuses to do anything. Sir, this Government is not serving the people; it is serving big business. It is helping big businesses to make large profits on the importation of valueless food. No policy which would do any harm to the importers here will be introduced by this Government.

Another thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I told the honourable Premier when we were voting money for re-forestation scheme that he should see to it that instead of all casuarina trees being planted that a few breadfruit trees or some productive tree be also planted but that has not been done. I remember very well that the honourable junior member for St. George was one of those honourable members who

spoke very strongly in favour of that point. Instead, this Government is paying 15 cents annually for every mile tree that is grown on estate land and those people are saying that it is more economical for them to pay eight or ten cents for a breadfruit than to plant a breadfruit tree on their estate. Sir, the honourable Premier allows large plantation owners to do as they like with their lands. All this Government is doing is to pay a few inspectors to hunt down a few hawkers that are trying to make a cent off a few bananas. I believe Government harass these few hawkers only for the purpose of raising a little revenue. The honourable Premier would not bring in a bold policy to help the country to go forward simply because it would harm his friends. If it were not for that, the honourable member would do what other progressive countries have been doing long ago. The honourable Premier surrounds himself with supporters who in turn have to depend on big business to give them advice and ideas and so long as Government has to depend on big business for its running, there never will be any progressive recommendation made for the better government of this colony. Sir, why should I, if I am in a position to give you advice, advise you to subsidise the growing of more food crops when I profit by the thousands of bags of potatoes I import? Why should I advise you to get a milk pasteurisation plant and to rear cattle when I profit by the thousands of tins of condensed milk I import? I can make quicker money by importation than by your subsidisation.

I would also like to draw the attention of Government to something which I think is very retrogressive. Our Volunteer Force is now costing us over \$73,000 a year. In peacetime like this and with the law-abiding people as we are, why should we spend \$73,000 on a Volunteer Force? That department is not a productive department. I see that the amount has risen from \$61,000 in 1950-51 to over \$73,000 in the coming year's estimates. Sir, you do not allow departments like that to increase their expenditure every year. I find that many of those non-productive departments are taking up much of our expenditure and are causing social services which are very necessary to suffer. Sir, if the British Government wants us to train our youngsters for the event of war, let it send us down some of its surplus material and some of its financial allocation; we will then be content to supply our manpower free. As I see it, in the next couple years, the Volunteer Force will cost us over \$100,000 and if nothing is done will continue to increase its expenditure. Let it also be borne in mind that all the time that the expenditure goes up on our non-productive departments, our unemployment is also going up as well because the ranks of the population are becoming more congested. You can understand what will be the position in this colony if the Government does not plan ahead. The strong U.S.A. did not wait until yesterday to start planning; the government of that country started planning many years before any of us was born and because of its foresight, it has been able to dominate the world with money and goods. Sir, the poorer a country, the more readily should you plan for the future but the honourable Premier who is the head of this colony, is just drifting and drifting along with the tide so that when the time comes for him to step out of Government, somebody will have trouble to bring it back to its feet.

Sir, I have nothing against the present Head of the Administration; as a matter of fact, it seems to me that of all Heads of the Administration, the present holder is more sociable than any other. I have noticed that contrary to past happenings, coloured

distinguished visitors to the island have been permitted to live at Government House during their short stay in the colony. However, as I have said during my speech on ministerial status, I do not think that we should allow the sociability of the present Head of the Administration to make us over generous with the amount that we allocate to that department to run it. I have noticed that the expenditure on the Head "Governor" is also soaring high. It is now costing us \$41,639 a year. It was considerably less when this Government was run by people who looked like the Head of the Administration and that is the unfortunate thing. When this House discussed ministerial system, I warned the Government that in its consideration of these draft estimates for 1954-55 if the ministers must get entertainment allowance that the Head of the Administration for whom \$4,800 was put down for the same purpose would have to accept a reduced amount because under the new system of government, visitors which the Head of the Administration formerly would have to entertain would now be entertained by the respective Ministers. Sir, I do not think that you should carry the overall cost of entertainment by the government as high as it is. I suggested then that either the entertainment allowance to the Head of the Administration should be reduced by 50 per cent. or that the entertainment allowance to the ministers be not what it is. I notice that no change has been made in either. The Ministers would continue to collect their \$3,000 Hospitality Vote and the Head of the Administration would continue to get his \$4,800 Entertainment Allowance. Again, Sir, I did not expect that the Head of the Administration would continue to draw Travelling Allowance now that he has been given a state car. I consider all those things are wrong. As I have overheard, if we want to realise our true position, let us get a failure in the sugar crop next year. We will then realise whether our position is good or not. I feel that it will be worse if we continue to make such handsome allowances to Departments of Government, particularly those which are not very important as far as increasing the wealth of the community.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I propose, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to deal with this matter from a point of view which I consider anyone should look at it. First of all, I am sorry that the memorandum on the estimates is so brief, my view on this matter being that the memorandum on the estimates should be regarded by the Government as its statement of policy and because of that it is my opinion that it should be so full with the important details that it would not leave much for honourable members to question. In my opinion, if the memorandum were full in detail, it would to a large extent eliminate much of this debate on the second reading. It is five pages on this occasion and the greater part of it is taken up with the breakdown of certain figures and I do not consider that good enough to present to the Legislature especially now that we have this type of government. I hope that in the future some attempt will be made by the Government to produce a memorandum that will be regarded just as that in Great Britain which the Chancellor of the Exchequer presents to the House of Commons and from which the public is given the opportunity of hearing some broad statement of policy. I hope that future memoranda would not be as brief as this which apparently looks as if it were prepared hastily.

Looking at this memorandum I am a bit worried to see so many revotes, some of which very little of the amounts were spent. I hope the responsible ministers for the respective departments would

see to it that the large number of revotes which were evident in this year's Estimates does not recur when this House has to deal with next year's Estimates.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to what I regard as a very serious concern for all of us and not for the Government alone and that is the question of unemployment. I regret to see that there is no positive approach in the Budget to deal with this serious question of unemployment and which is gradually becoming worse through a reduction of employment in a particular phase of employment in the island and also by the return to the colony of many of our workers from Curacao and Aruba. It is common knowledge that in Venezuela they are making all efforts to refine oil and that to a large extent has influenced the return of Barbadian workers in Curacao. We should not look at unemployment as something which is inevitable and something which we should accept with folded arms and with a measure of complacency. We must take a positive approach to the matter otherwise it would become a very serious problem to the community.

The first paragraph of the memorandum on the estimates is stated as follows:—

"The draft estimates for 1954—55 follow broadly the outline of the Five-Year Plan or Development and Taxation. Certain adjustments have, however, been necessary, and the amounts to be charged as advances pending the raising of loans are, so far, not great. This is expedient because the Government is considering plans for financing the construction of the deep water harbour on lines recommended by a committee which recently reported."

I regret Government has made this brief statement on this matter. It merited more thought and it is something on which Government should have given a full statement of what it proposes to do. I understand that there is a report on the deep water harbour before the Legislature as a result of study which a Select Committee gave to the project but the Government did not say, nor is there any indication in these Estimates as to when this project would be started. I feel that Government should have said what it proposes to do in this respect. The Select Committee or the House as a body need not agree with what the Government proposes to do but a statement of policy by the Government on the matter is something which I consider is necessary. I am not aware from this statement in the memorandum that the construction of the Deep Water Harbour is going to be undertaken this year and however you look at this budget, you cannot look at it and say that the Government is preparing to finance the scheme for the construction of a Deep Water Harbour in this financial year because it is not stated. At this stage, I would not comment on the report on the matter by the Select Committee because I happened to be Chairman of the Committee. I am going to leave that to the members of this Assembly to deal with.

There is another statement in this memorandum on the Estimates which to my mind needs clarification. It is contained in paragraph 4 which reads as follows:—

"An important factor which the Government has now to take into consideration is that the price paid by the British Government for sugar exported from the Island has ceased to rise: for the first time for many years it has fallen."

It then goes on to say:—

"It is possible that, in the future, there may have to be some restriction of production, and the crop is, in any event, dependent on the weather."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Government says that there is to be some restriction in the production of sugar, it means that the earning capacity of the workers is going to be contracted, therefore, there is going to be a lowering of the standard of living because you cannot improve the prosperity of the country if the purchasing power of the people is reduced. By that statement, you must look forward to a drop in the prosperity of the people of this country. With the growing reduction in employment opportunities from outside sources, with this statement which means a restriction of employment in the sugar industry, the purchasing power of the community, eventually, would be substantially reduced, therefore a lowering of the standard of living is inevitable. I feel that a statement like that in paragraph 4 should be greatly amplified. Moreover, positive steps should be taken to ameliorate what must be regarded as a very dangerous situation to which this colony is looking forward. I would say, under the circumstances, that we should look at this question scientifically. If you take these statements together, you can clearly see that we are not in for a good time. I do feel that in this year's estimates, it would have been a clearer picture if you had budgeted for a deficit. My reason for saying so is because if those are the conditions which we are about to face, our situation which is also the Government's, is becoming more perilous. Sir, if you are prognosticating certain employment restrictions, I contend that it is a very serious thing in such circumstances to budget for a surplus. Therefore, I maintain that a broad statement of policy should be made on the budget; your memorandum should have been amplified on all those things; it should not be dealing with the revenue and expenditure just head by head.

I am prepared to suggest that in a community like Barbados which is mainly agricultural; where there is seasonal employment and in some cases no employment at all, any Government must take a positive approach to deal with such circumstances. Barbados is like unto the agricultural communities in Latin and South America where agriculture is the mainstay of the number of the people, but in our case, it is worse than theirs because our land for agriculture is reducing gradually. Professor Arthur Lewis has written that the number of unemployed has increased, therefore in order to circumvent that, it means that you have to get an immense increase in production from the land. Under the head of expenditure, Labour Department, there is provision for \$5,000 for an unemployment survey to be undertaken by the University College of the West Indies. Far from it that I should say that that expenditure is of no use because I believe all surveys especially when done by experts can be of use, but I do not think that you need an unemployment survey at the moment because you know that. What I think you really need is a committee comprised of all Barbadians who live in this colony and who have the people at heart to look into the question of finding employment wheresoever it can be found for the unemployed. Some years ago, there was an unemployment committee set up headed by Sir John Saint and that Committee did make certain recommendations, some of which were put into force, but after six years — I think that is the time which has elapsed since that committee has reported — there must have been a change in the situation. As a matter of fact, at

that time some of our people were working overseas, and the molasses industry was not in the same position as it is to-day when we have to bulk ship it. There are really more people unemployed to-day than at that time and we know that and it is true to say that we cannot fold our arms and do nothing about it because an unemployed man or woman even in a normal manner is a very dangerous person. We are acquainted with the maxim that the devil finds work for idle hands to do. I do think that we have enough people in the island with the necessary talent and the interest of the country at heart to make this unemployment survey and to look into our growing unemployment problem. I am sure every member of this House of Assembly meet people every day of the week and every month of the year, who come to them not begging for money but asking whether any help could be given them with a job. Just before I came into this Chamber to-day a woman came to me and asked me if I could help her with a job. She was not begging for money; all that she was doing, as the many others are doing was asking for work to do in order to help herself.

Sir, with that facing me, I cannot blind myself to the fact that we have to make a positive approach to this question of unemployment. We must deal with it in some manner or the other. I feel that the matter is of so much importance to this community at this time that no effort should be lost in setting up a Committee to go into the question. In the budget, provision has been made for employment, but for employment of a non-productive character such as building a school. When you build a school, you provide a social service, so too when you build a hospital. Along with your public works there must be some approach to the building up of productive sources of employment. If I may draw an instance to your notice, I would point to the putting into cultivation of some estates such as are at present lying fallow in St. James though I understand that there is some law suit going on with them. We cannot afford in this small island of 166 square miles and with our redundant population to let any of our land lie fallow. I consider that any land which is allowed to lie fallow should be given serious attention by the Minister of Agriculture and the Government as a whole in order to bring it under cultivation as quickly as possible. I am sure the community will support any measure to bring land under cultivation because not only would it be producing something which is going to be economic but it would be producing something which would provide employment for the people. It is not stated in the budget, but I am hoping a public statement will be made on the working of the Dodds Plantation and other lands at Seawell now that the Government has leased them out in small holdings.

I am making this statement calmly and politely — without any passionate feelings. One of the evils in this community is that the surprising number of economic organisations are not based on a principle from which the workers can get the maximum benefits for what they do. There is no attempt to change the old structure and it seems to me that we are continuing with many things that cannot be regarded as fundamental in a socialist programme, and what are fundamental are postponed or as it seems to me, we will have to wait until Doomsday before we get the benefits from them. As evidence of what I am saying you only have to turn to the Budget and you will see that the financial provision made for financing schemes has broken down. You will find that Government has raised a loan last year and the amount which is now set down for the paying of interest on

the Hospital; we are carrying in our minds that there is the necessity for a proper hospital and also what the policy of the Government is as regards a T.B. Sanatorium. As regards the X-Ray equipment, if that is working overtime, a supplementary estimate should be brought down within the whole framework of the Hospital; that equipment will be taxed more because you have to do a lot of X-Ray photography, and so on. I should like to say that for any sort of tuberculosis campaign to be successful you must have some amount of radiography; I would like to see a comprehensive estimate brought down so that at least we can have some clear idea as to what we are doing. It is a pity that this Resolution was not brought down in such a way that we could see what the Hospital will look like.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Only today the Report of the Hospital planning Committee was laid and when the honourable member reads that, he will see what the Hospital Committee has in mind.

Mr. LEWIS: The plan for the Hospital should not have come down on the very day on which you lay the Estimates. As regards this item "Surgical Instruments and Equipment," that is one in respect of which a vast sum of money is brought down every year. Recently there has been an amalgamation of Surgeries at the Hospital and one of the Surgeries has been dispensed with. To tell me that you have to spend \$34,000 in the course of twelve months in respect of this item, is a serious matter: if there is any major development to be carried out, I feel that it should have been left for the Estimates or for the building plan. To say that you want \$4,200 to add to the \$29,800 already voted—that cannot be any development; certainly in so far as surgical instruments are concerned, you cannot go in for such major replacements every year. Is there any inventory taken of the instruments which you have? Some of the instruments you buy do disappear; I do not know whether they are sewn up in the patients or not, and those patients who have instruments sewn up in them do not come back. This is a vote which should be watched; any major development should be taken as part of a big scheme. We have abandoned one surgery with the amalgamation of two, and there are many people on the waiting list.

The question that Head XXIII (2) stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO RE-COMMIT HEAD XXI

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman.—I ask leave to re-commit Head XXI. In respect of the item "Up-keep of Boat," it appears that this sum of \$1,500 has only been asked for to meet the cost of essential replacements and to keep the Boat running for the remainder of the financial year, in view of the expected visit of Dr. C. F. Hickling, Fisheries Adviser to the Secretary of State. I asked the then hon. Minister of Fisheries whether he knew that this Boat had been tied up and he replied that it was not his duty to find that out; now I am told that because Dr. Hickling is coming down here work on this boat is to be done. That is absolute nonsense.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Is the honourable member asking leave to recommit this Head?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The honourable member has referred to the Minister of Fisheries—

Mr. LEWIS: There was no Minister of Fisheries at that time

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable member want this Head re-committed?

Mr. LEWIS: I have really said what I wanted to say. (Laughter).

Head XXIII (3)—Mental Hospital

Head XXIII (3) — Mental Hospital — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXIII (3) stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Head XXIII—(8) Maternity Hospital

Head XXIII (8)—Maternity Hospital — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXIII (8) stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Head XXV—Public Works.

Head XXV—Public Works—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXV stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Head XXIX—Miscellaneous.

Head XXIX—Miscellaneous—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS: In connection with Item 4, "Refund of Contribution under the Widows and Orphans Pension Act, 1928," I should like to say that as far as I know, there is still a great deal of dissatisfaction existing among the Civil Servants about this matter and I have promised them to take up the matter with the Whitley Council. The Widows and Orphans Pension Act has accumulated money at a very fast rate; people feel that they should not contribute to the Fund, but I consider that whereas in the Five Year Plan it was decided to allocate the sum of \$100,000 for housing, I cannot see why you could not take some of this money from the Widows and Orphans Fund, put it into the Housing Loan Fund and lend it out. That is what I consider should be done and that is what I am reliably told is done in British Guiana; they take money from the Widows and Orphans Fund and put it into the Housing Loan Fund for Officers so as to swell that Fund.

As regards the other item—Item 12 "Compensation under Workmens' Compensation Act," I would like to ask the honourable Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour whether the Government does not think it advisable for the whole framework of this Act to be placed under the aegis of the Labour Department rather than under the administration of the Assistant Court of Appeal. I anticipate the Honourable Premier asking "What will it matter if the same thing is achieved?" But I think it would be better for the Labour Department with the necessary staff to deal with the framework of this Act under which there are a lot of irregularities taking place at present. I know that a lot of people are not contributing anything under the Act and when workmen are injured there is nothing for them to get: I am therefore wondering whether the time has not come for matters under this Act to be dealt with by the Labour Department rather than by the Assistant Court of Appeal.

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

Head XXX—Income Tax And Death Duties

Head XXX—Income Tax and Death Duties—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXX stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Head XXXII—Highways And Transport

Head XXXII—Highways and Transport—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXXII stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Head XXXIV—Government Electric Inspector

Head XXXIV—Government Electric Inspector—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXXIV stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Honestly I would like to know if the Government will make a list of the technical equipment which this Department has in it; this \$710 is either a re-vote or the Government must have the greatest equipment in this office. This is another item which has been ordered in 1952—it is not in the Estimates—and on this occasion it is \$710 for this Department; I hope that a watch is being kept on the technical equipment which is going into this office.

Hon. M. E. COX: The items are: 10 No. 5540 batteries; 10 No. 5360 batteries; 20 No. 230 batteries; 12 No. 4 FH batteries; 8 No. 4 FH2 batteries; total cost, duty free, \$139.75, 2 Hum Metrohms, .15—50 Myohms, 0—20 Ohms total cost, \$250; 1 English Electric Insulation Tester, \$320. Estimated cost, \$709.75, say \$710 (Laughter).

Mr. LEWIS: I do not know if the honourable member has passed his test in Morse or whatever frequency he is operating on now (Laughter) but if the honourable member speaks in a foreign language, he must give the translation for it. If it is a question of batteries, then they are not technical equipment; but I am merely asking the honourable member to keep a watch on this technical equipment. Do not let them carry away a lot of the taxpayers' money because they can charge somebody 5/- or 10/- for a radio and then there is no protection for him. I merely ask that a watch be kept on the technical equipment in this Department; the sum of £300 has already been provided for the purchase of books so as to teach people Morse Code. Do you mean to tell me that you have an Electric Department which is now getting equipment to test lights in order to see if they are giving the proper candle power? I ask the honourable member to keep his eye on this Department and do not let them go on ordering technical equipment; it may be necessary to know the extent to which this Department is getting this equipment. Next year we may have to vote money for equipment which was ordered last year; let us get in the Estimates all the orders which you have outstanding and let us know what the financial position is.

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

Head XXXVIII—Old Age Pensions

Head XXXVIII—Old Age Pensions—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXXVIII stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Head XL—Waterworks.

Head XL—Waterworks—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XL stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolution for \$107,418 was passed.

On a similar motion, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of four Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Honourable C. E. TALMA in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agreed to.

GOVERNMENT SCHOLARSHIPS AND
EXHIBITIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL,
1954

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—To move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Government Scholarships and Exhibitions Act, 1949.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The object of this Bill is to amend the Government Scholarships and Exhibitions Act, 1949, primarily in order to change the nature of the award of Scholarships to the University College of the West Indies, which is already being done in Trinidad and Jamaica. As the University College has pointed out, there may be some hard cases; you give a lumpsum to scholars who go to the College and you might find that there are cases where people need help. The policy has been adopted by Trinidad and Jamaica whereby this money is put into a fund, and we propose to adopt that policy. The Bill also seeks to increase the value of a Barbados Exhibition from \$1,080 to \$1,344 and that the funds voted by the Legislature for the provision of Exhibitions to the University College shall be paid to the Senate of the University College for payment into the Barbados Exhibitions Fund to be administered by the Senate subject to the provisions of the Act. Inasmuch as each colony has representatives on the University Council, each colony can see that its own funds are properly administered in accordance with the provisions of the Act. Some people get extra assistance; if somebody dies, the Fund can be used in respect of somebody else. As it is now proposed, the money will be there in a fund and if a Barbadian dies the Senate may use it on other Barbadians who may need more than \$1,344.

The Bill further seeks to amend the Act to give effect to the recommendations of the Director of Education that the period of "not less than three years immediately preceding the date of the award of a scholarship or exhibition", within which a person, to be eligible for an award should have been receiving his education in this Island, should be extended to a total period of not less than three years within the period of five years immediately preceding the year of the award. A boy may leave school and then later on, sit for an exhibition to the University College of the West Indies and it

might be said that he did not, for the three years immediately preceding his sitting of the examination have his education in the island; he might have his education for three years and no education for six months. The Bill also amends sub-paragraph (1) of paragraph 1 of Part 1 of the Schedule to the Act to provide that the examination, on the results of which the Barbados Scholarship will be awarded, will in future be the Examination for the General Certificate of Education, of the Oxford and Cambridge Schools Examination Board. Although it has been said that the standard of the Scholarship has gone down, on the other hand it does not matter what is the nature of the examination if you have reached a standard similar to that for Scholarships of Oxford and Cambridge. Paragraph 5 of the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill says: "The opportunity has been taken to amend paragraph (1) of Part III of the Schedule to the Act which sets out the value of an Island Scholarship." It has been shown that what we have given to Scholarship winners is not enough. The paragraph goes on to state: "Since 1950, a supplementary provision of \$144 per annum has been made on the Estimates, thus increasing the value of a Scholarship from \$336 to \$480 per annum, and from 1st October, 1953, the fees at Codrington College have been increased to \$576 per annum. This amendment seeks to regularise the position in respect of such Scholarship." The final paragraph of the "Objects and Reasons" says: "In order to make the new provisions applicable to the current academic year, the Bill contains provision seeking to make its operation retrospective to 1st September, 1953."

Although the points which have been made are important, honourable members will see that the Bill is not controversial. There is no harm in the principle of having a sum of money there as long as you do not give this money to the Senate and the island cannot see what is happening. If you have this money and lapses take place, the money is there to be used on other Scholarship winners who may be necessitous and whom the University College feels like helping. Barbados would use its funds for Barbadians and Jamaica would use its funds for Jamaicans: I believe that at one time it was suggested that this money should go into the general University Fund and be used for West Indians, but Barbados said that the Barbados funds should be used for Barbadians only and the University Authorities agreed to that. We can see the virtue in having this Fund because, unlike the things which have happened in the past where the money would go back into the Treasury, this money can be used on other Barbadians. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. LEWIS: I am not opposing this Bill, but I would like to call attention to the fact that this is a question of a new principle of voting money and allowing somebody else to use it very likely at his discretion. This is something new and there cannot be many instances like it provided for in the laws of countries outside Barbados. This Bill has its "Objects and Reasons" set out at some length, and they may be good, but I need some assistance in discussing a Bill of this sort—a Bill of which notice was given last Tuesday and which came into my possession yesterday afternoon. I would appeal to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that if the Government bring in three or four items on one Tuesday and discuss them next Tuesday, that is a good way; but in my opinion, it would be much better to decide what items you are going to deal

with next time and honourable members will know what those items are. The Rules of the House are never observed in the matter of fixing an Order Paper; I am saying that in future legislation should be introduced and the Order Paper decided upon and everybody will know what is going to be dealt with. Any member of the House of Commons knows what is going to be discussed on any day, but the members of the Barbados House of Assembly do not know.

I do not think you could say that a Bill of this nature will have received the consideration which I feel it deserves; there are many members of this House who are University graduates and who are not now in the House, and they might be of assistance to the Government. This is a brand-new principle of voting money and giving somebody else to do as they like with it; we must know something about what we are doing. I think we should spend our funds on our own people and confine these funds to them until we have a Federation working. I am merely saying that the method of doing the business of the House might appeal to the honourable Premier because he feels that we can digest five or six items on the Order Paper in a week; but no time is given to honourable members to digest them.

One honourable member has expressed the hope that he would get the opportunity of speaking on this Bill but he will not be here to speak on it. I repeat; introduce your legislation and fix your Order Paper so that honourable members will know what you want to do. Matters might be before the Executive Committee for months but when honourable members receive Bills on Monday afternoon and they are discussed on Tuesday, that is not fair because members of the Executive Committee had those measures before them and they had expert advice at their disposal.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. member would have made an excellent point if we had a big Order Paper today, but there are only a few items on the Order Paper; however, I would not press this matter if it would not be accepted. I was surprised when I was told that at Oxford and Cambridge 75% of the scholars have Scholarships and Exhibitions on this basis. You ask people about their means; you give a person a scholarship at £50 and you give another person one at £80 because the person who has a scholarship at £80 is the more needy. That is so to such an extent that many poor people are given help on this principle; although it is a new principle, it is not a policy such as you would not accept. I do agree with the honourable member on the point he made about the items on the Order Paper; in future the honourable junior member for St. Thomas will make it known to the House what will be done at such and such a meeting and we will not go outside of what we have fixed except in case of emergency and the House agrees to deal with it.

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

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. LEWIS: The value of an Exhibition is being increased from \$1,080 to \$1,344 and I am wondering if this amount is not to be exceeded, how

will it be varied? Will this amount of \$2,688 be put there to be distributed towards the cost of the two Exhibitions? I cannot see that what the honourable member has said is covered by this Clause; I am asking him to be very careful that this discretion in the amount and value of an Exhibition is not lost by having decided to give two Exhibitions. The Accountant General is being authorised to pay into the Fund the sum of \$2,688 for the provision of two Exhibitions; he cannot give less than \$1,344 for an Exhibition. I do not know what the Senate can do; I think that the honourable member should have put in the round figure of \$1,400 and let the Senate do whatever it likes and not worry us. It has struck me that this money should have been put in round figures and let the Senate know that it is for two scholars.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The University College came to the conclusion that it was reasonable to expect a person to live on \$1,344 per annum and not less unless he had private means. Application has been made to us and we came down here, having been pressed by the College, for an additional year to be given as a post-graduate course. We voted the money but the candidate did not pass so that she could not get that course. The value of an Exhibition as laid down by the University College was originally \$1,080 and now it is \$1,344; but if you had three people whose parents were comparatively well off, the Senate would be entitled to give three Exhibitions each of \$900 but not less than two in a year. If you had two really poor people the Senate could give two Exhibitions and the whole \$2,688 would be spent; if you had four really well off people who preferred to send their children to Canada instead of London or Oxford, those four scholars might get Exhibitions out of this money because their parents could make up the rest of the money; but the University College felt that the sum of \$1,344 was a reasonable sum for any person to live on in normal circumstances.

Mr. LEWIS: If you tell me that one amount is the minimum and the other is the maximum I would understand that. We are not giving more than \$1,344 for each Exhibition; that is what we have here. In so far as this Bill is concerned, if you can guarantee that the minimum number of scholars is two and the maximum amount of money is \$1,344—if that is so—it is quite all right for me; but I feel that if they have a discretion the amount should be made a round figure of \$1,400, and not just \$1,344.

The question that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 4 to 10 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

MARJORIE LEE HAYNES PENSION BILL, 1954

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph: To move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to authorise the payment of a gratuity and pension to Marjorie Lee Haynes.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: As honourable members will see from the "Objects and Reasons", "Mrs.

Marjorie Lee Haynes, recently retired from the post of Inspector of the Department of Income Tax and Death Duties, was employed for a period from the 1st April, 1918, to the 31st October, 1924, in the Colonial Treasurer's Department and resigned her post in that Department on her marriage when she was erroneously given to understand that female officers were required to retire from the public service on marriage. She re-entered the service in 1928 and had continuous service until her retirement on 31st January, 1953. Under the provisions of the Pension Act, 1947 the period served by Mrs. Haynes from April, 1918, to October, 1924, cannot count as pensionable service owing to a break of service between 1924 and 1928 by voluntary resignation. It has been brought to the attention of Government that Mrs. Haynes was under no obligation to retire from the service on marriage and Mrs. Haynes would not have retired in 1924 but for the fact that she was misled into so doing. In the circumstances, it is considered reasonable that Mrs. Haynes' period of service between 1918 and 1924 should be pensionable and this Bill seeks to provide a gratuity and pension in respect of that period of service."

I would like to say this, *prima facie* Mrs. Haynes is not entitled to this pension on this first period of service by voluntary resignation, but that is if you are satisfied that she voluntarily resigned. The Government is satisfied that there was some doubt and that she did not know that she was not obliged to resign. It was said that the late Mr. Lofty made her to understand that she would have to resign on marriage and to support this, she has supplied the Government with a signed affidavit which shows that it was the feeling of schoolmistresses and other females in the Service that they would have to resign from the Service if they got married. If honourable members are satisfied that Mrs. Haynes was labouring under that impression and was told so, then her resignation was not voluntary. For that reason, Government has sent down this Bill. I now beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Sir, If we agree to this Bill today, it means not from the fact that Mrs. Haynes has been able to put in a signed affidavit by someone nor from the fact that she has made out a case, but from the point of view of if the Government is prepared to say that every person who found themselves in similar circumstances as Mrs. Haynes is entitled to pension based on their pre-retirement service. What has happened to Mrs. Haynes is not different to what has happened to Mrs. Skeete. The circumstances are the same, the only difference being that Mrs. Skeete was a former head teacher and Mrs. Haynes was in the Civil Service. But it must be borne in mind that Mrs. Skeete was denied this same right that is now sought for Mrs. Haynes. There are numerous schoolmistresses who resigned on marriage because of the idea that it was illegal to continue in the Service after marriage. It is not stated that this Government is prepared to say to every school-mistress who has retired on the ground, that she was erroneously given to understand that female officers were required to retire from the Service on marriage, that her pre-marriage service with the Government would be made pensionable. That is what the Objects and Reasons to this Bill should say. If the Government is prepared to say that it accepts this case as a precedent and is going to abide by it and that all those people who have left the Service under similar circumstances as Mrs. Haynes will get a pen-

the loan itself is lost because you have started to borrow money before you expend what you have put in a former budget; in other words, the money which you are paying out for interest on the loan is unproductive. It is just as if you went and borrowed money to build a house, but up to a year after you borrowed the money to build the house, you have not started to build it but has started to pay the interest on the money you borrowed. That would mean that the total expenditure of that building is going to be greater on account of the interest which you paid while the money was lying idle. I do not know who is to blame for these financial weaknesses, but you can clearly see them when you examine the Budget and the number of revotes.

I earnestly hope that the Ministers will tackle their jobs seriously and see that the administrative staff carry out their duties as to what is contained in the Five-Year Plan. I am very pleased to see that housing has taken a very important place in the Budget but there is something on it that I will like to point out to the Minister for Housing. Under the Five-Year Plan there is provision for \$500,000 for housing for Civil Servants and \$750,000 for general housing to make a total of \$1,250,000 for housing. Now under Capital Expenditure in the Estimates for this year there is another figure for housing brought about by the Self Help Housing Scheme and the amount under that item is \$4,341,000. Of that amount of money we are this year revoting \$57,000 from the amount we earmarked last year to be spent on it and is making provision for \$63,000 more which would make a total of \$120,000 to meet the cost of further schemes during the coming year. Now you will find that of the provision in the Five-Year Plan for Self Help Housing Schemes we have already spent, roughly speaking, \$210,000 up to the end of the 31st March this year. If you add that figure of \$210,000 with \$120,000 you will find that it is just over \$300,000 and if you subtract that figure from the amount earmarked in the Five-Year Plan it will leave the large amount of \$4,000,000. This means that for the three years of the operation of the Plan you only have spent \$300,000 and would be leaving \$4,000,000 of the amount that you allocated to be spent in the next two years. Why is it that you are so cheeseparing on this question? You should have voted over \$1,000,000 for this type of housing. Again some of this money is bound up in loans.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is not the honourable member going outside of the question of the revenue and expenditure of the colony and dealing with the question of the Labour Welfare Scheme?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Oh no, Mr. Deputy Speaker, all that is contained under capital expenditure. I will ask Government a question on this matter. Can you not say precisely what of this amount will be derived from loans? When you look at the Five-Year Plan you will find \$3,500,000 thrown in from the Labour Welfare Fund into "Available Funds", therefore I am taking an apprehensive view of this expenditure because it does not state how much of the \$4,341,000 is for loans. It does not state that loans would only be up to a certain amount. That is why I have been saying that under certain heads of revenue and expenditure, a progress statement should be prepared and not just an ordinary statement as have been done under housing where it has been stated that \$57,000 has been revoted from the provision of \$69,000 of last year along with a new provision of \$63,000 for this year.

As I have said, I have raised that point to show that I regard housing as so important that you should be prepared to get the maximum benefit out of hous-

ing with the amount of money you have earmarked. We have been fortunate in this colony in that the government has been able to use the Labour Welfare Fund for social schemes and in a way which could be considered as very highly profitable because it has been able to put money on loan for repairs to housing in a revolving fund. However, I would say that the method of earmarking money for housing under the self-help Housing Scheme as is seen on page 128 of the Estimates leaves one in doubt as to how the Government is really proposing to tackle the question. Again I say that I regard housing as very important and because of that Government should let us know what are its plans and policy in that respect. I am going to suggest that the time has come when there should be a Central Committee for housing in this island to incorporate the Housing Board. A Central Committee for housing can go a long way in unifying your plans on housing instead of having all those *ad hoc* measures. It can also accelerate the pace of building schemes to suit the money that is proposed in these Estimates to be spent on housing during the coming year.

I would like the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing to give me some information with respect to the expenditure on the building programme by the Public Works Department. I have added up some figures which come to a total of \$1,361,000 to be spent on public works. By the way, I think any honourable member will realise the time it took for me to go through the Estimates to get those figures and that is why I agree with honourable members who asked for more time to peruse these Estimates. How can you be fair to yourself, the Government, and the constituents you represent if you are not given time to permit you to peruse these Estimates so that you can make certain deductions?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member, but is all that the sum of money to be expended by the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am speaking of all the things that come under capital expenditure in so far as buildings. I want to ask the Minister if he is convinced that with the amount of revotes from last year plus what is voted this year and with the staff available at the Public Works whether that Department can carry out all that work. I regard public works in this direction as one of the means of relieving unemployment. When you build good roads, you ease transportation. When you put up buildings, not only are you providing buildings for social services but at the same time you are providing work for the people.

You will find under Capital Expenditure, the sum of \$405,541 to be expended on capital works for Medical Services, \$417,320 to be expended on buildings for educational purposes, \$124,071 to be expended on the construction of houses — this includes other things as the construction of roads — and there is also another \$120,000 for self help housing. When you add those together, you are providing \$1,260,821 to be spent in that direction. Along with that, there is provision of \$270,000 for the erection of a new Fire Station, \$13,500 for the erection of a new Post Office at St. John, \$29,000 for the erection of Police Stations, \$135,000 for new Government Buildings and \$140,000 for Ministerial Buildings. If you add these to the last amount, you will get a total of \$1,654,361. Now, if you turn from capital expenditure and go through what is to be spent by the Public Works in maintaining elementary schools and

things of that sort, you will find that the expenditure amounts to roughly \$1,754. I would like to see this money spent because there is no point putting it in the Estimates to come back next year and find that you have a surplus, or saying that you did not have the opportunity of spending the money. Of course, I do not mean to say that you should waste it. What I would like to ask is this: Do you have the staff at your disposal to carry out all those erections and repairs in a year? I am no expert on such matters, but I doubt very much that your Public Works can carry out that building programme which is nearly \$2,000,000. I would therefore like to know if you are planning to have these buildings erected by the Public Works Department alone or if some of them will be given out under contract. I would really like to see all this work carried out in view of the unemployment situation. I regard the carrying out of these projects as something which should be given the closest attention.

Another point which I think should come under the portfolio of the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour is that of a provision for an unemployment survey which I see in these Estimates. I am wondering, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why is it that a broad statement of policy was not made about what is proposed to be done by that unemployment survey. What do you want to carry out after that? Is the Government in doubt about the unemployment situation or does it want to know the extent of unemployment in each particular trade or occupation of labour? I think it is clearly known that there is only seasonal work in agriculture and in several trades there is under employment. There are also people who only work casually on the water front and on roads. One of the clearest means of knowing that there is seasonal employment is by the large number of domestic servants because domestic work is not a productive unit. To get back to my point, I would say that you can classify these things to find out your true position but it seems to me that a positive approach to deal with the question has not been stated.

I come to another point and this concerns the Minister of Social Services. It is not stated in the budget but because of what I have heard, I would like to know if the Government proposes to withdraw the means of disseminating knowledge to the public by loudspeakers which were rented from Rediffusion, such as that which is placed by the Wharf. It will be remembered that these speakers were provided by Government ever since the beginning of the last World War. I would really like to know the reason why they are to be withdrawn because only a couple of nights ago I heard the Minister of Social Services speaking over Barbados Rediffusion. Is it because the money which was spent on this service is needed to be diverted to another channel? It does not seem to me to be the correct thing to do at this time. Now that you are embarking on Ministerial government, I feel you want this service to disseminate more knowledge among the community, it seems as if the Government is ill advised to withdraw this service.

DINNER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member but it is about a quarter to eight o'clock and I do think in the interest of honourable members that there should be a short adjournment for dinner. As a matter of fact, I think that there should be a regulated time for meals.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I quite agree with you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I hope now that there is a

new form of government, some attempt will be made not only to regulate the hour of adjournment for meals but some positive approach will be made—not in an *ad hoc* manner but in a democratic way—to have regulated the length of a session and things like that. I beg to move at this stage that this House do now adjourn for three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. VAUGHAN seconded the motion which was agreed to and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

RESUMPTION

On re-assembling,

His Honour The SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the honourable junior member for St. Peter was addressing the House.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on the adjournment, I mentioned in my speech what I regarded as certain essential requirements to accelerate the pace of employment and what measures I think should be adopted. I referred to projects in the Budget that were to be carried out by the Public Works Department as well as to some other provisions that were contained in the Five-Year Plan but which had not been stated in precise terms in the Budget. I said and I now repeat again that there should be a statement of policy by the Government so that the public and the Legislature should have an opportunity of discussing those matters. Sir, I feel that all socialist governments all over the world have accepted full employment as their ultimate objective. However, in various territories it is found that full employment is not always possible but in spite of that, unemployment has to be viewed with much disdain. Because of that, if we cannot have a policy of full employment, we should at least have a policy to tackle unemployment and to tackle it in an objective manner.

In these Estimates,—provision is made for the establishment of a Development Board. In the Capital Expenditure, you will find that of the \$1,000,000 which was put in the Five-Year Plan for such purpose that \$250,000 is set down towards making a start in that direction. I must ask what is the policy of the Government to-day in respect of this Development Board. There are Development Boards in Trinidad and Jamaica. So far as Barbados is concerned, there is a document before this House in respect of a report by an Industrial Committee but it is true to say that that document was never made the subject of a debate in this House, therefore, its contents or suggestions have not been ironed out by this House. Here again, I feel that some statement of policy should be made by the Government.

There is a statement in that report which reads as follows:—

“In view of the great value of organised apprenticeship in the building of a force of potential foremen and supervisors, we recommend that attempts should be made by local industrial associations to arrange with similar bodies in the United Kingdom for a number of outstanding West Indian apprentices, at say 18 years of age, to have the opportunity of completing their training in first class United Kingdom factories. Local Governments on their part might assist such a scheme by granting to persons selected financial assistance as necessary.”

This is a very serious statement that has been made in that report and on the question of industrial development, it is common knowledge that you cannot talk of it unless you talk of having an industrial board set up. Again, I say that you have to be in-

telligent in your approach towards these matters. I regard as an intelligent approach to industrial matters your letting the people know precisely what you propose to do. One of the safest means of running a democracy is to take the people into your confidence. Do not regard them as aliens or something apart. You must regard the people as an essential ingredient of the society you represent. It is therefore necessary that your policy should be stated quite clearly and unequivocally so that the Government's position in these matters should be made as clear as daylight.

No matter what may be one's political complexion, I think we all would agree that it is a necessary complement to your agricultural industry to have industrial expansion. I would not go as far as what some honourable members have stated before, but I would say that it is essential that any plan for industrialisation should be along planned and regulated lines, therefore, I wholeheartedly agree with the setting up of an industrial development board. I however hope that in this respect the Government will at an early date make a statement of its policy. Do not let us fool ourselves that the mere fact of having a shirt factory or dressmaking factory is in itself industrial expansion. I do not belong to that school of thought. Again, merely having ten or so people doing something that one can do, does not necessarily mean that you are going to get competition among them. You may find that all are borrowing money to advance their businesses and there is not enough profit in any of them and soon you find them disintegrating one by one. I do feel that it is essential to have some development board but it is my opinion that the board should be composed of people who have a real interest in the colony. I feel that in this island, we have plenty of Barbadians who have the interest of the community at heart. We have enough people here who can be of assistance in any industrial plan.

There is another aspect on which we have to concern ourselves and that is providing employment for the people. This question concerns the Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour. It is true to say that when this honourable member was a back-bencher, he concerned himself much with the question of emigration; and I well remember that at one time he asked questions with respect to employment in our midst. I would suggest to him that emigration is one of the important things with which he should concern himself. It is becoming an international problem and it is so wide in its scope that at the next conference of the International Labour Office, the question will be among the first things to be discussed. I can say that much because your humble servant has been asked to act as an adviser to the United Kingdom Workers Delegation. You will realise that since emigration has reached such a proportion as to be discussed at international level that the matter is of some importance. And it can be seen that it is an international question because almost daily you read of people leaving Germany and going to the Dominion of Canada. You also read of people leaving the United Kingdom and going to Australia as well as large proportions of refugees leaving Europe for the United States of America. In our particular case, we have to explore whatever possibility there is for emigration of our people. I may say that it is unfortunate that on one occasion of emigration of a few of our workers to Surinam, the opportunity fell through, but with this growing population of ours, we cannot shut our eyes to it; we must take positive steps not only to see if we cannot get emigration to the United States of America but elsewhere. Wherever there are opportunities for emigration of our people, we should try to grasp them even though they may be

on a temporary basis. It is true to say that a lot of people, not only here but all over the world, have lost the pioneering spirit. It is due to modern trends and facilities of living.

There is another aspect of this industrial matter which I feel should be taken up by the Government. This Government should look into the question of the shipment of molasses in bulk because more people are going to be unemployed on account of that situation. That is also something on which the Government should have made a statement of policy. A few weeks ago, I asked questions — I am awaiting the answers — with respect to how many persons have been displaced on account of bulk shipment of molasses; what provision is being made to put them in alternative employment, and so on. I will say no more on that at this stage.

During the budget speech by the honourable Premier, mention was made of controls. I have looked at the memorandum on the Five-Year Plan for Development and Taxation and in it, I have seen stated at paragraph 48, the following:—

"The opportunity is taken here to repeat "that the Government is as anxious as the commercial community to remove price controls, "where they serve no useful purpose, and it will "do so progressively as and when it is satisfied "such action would be in the general interests of "the community. The public should be aware "that there is an Advisory Committee representative of all sections of the community who "deal with this matter. Their recommendations "receive the full consideration of Government."

I agree with that statement of policy by the Government in that it will remove controls progressively as and when it is satisfied such action would be in the general interests of the community, but I do not subscribe to the unscientific thought or idea that without any investigation, and on just a vague statement that the price of cabbage is averaging 54 cents per pound, that the question of the retention of price control should be based. It should not be based on such vague generalities. Our economy is based on sugar. You cannot compel a man, nor is there any law to compel any person who has half-acre of land or thereabouts to grow cabbages. Any person who owns a small plot of land uses it in a manner which he thinks would be more advantageous to himself. You cannot force a man if he be a carpenter, mason, tailor or the like, to take his small plot of land and plant it in cabbage or green vegetables, because that type of person might fail in getting the same economic returns as if he had planted that plot in canes which he could send to a factory and get the equivalent in cash. We have to be practical. There is no part of the world which has an economic doctrine which is sound. I feel that there should be some policy of relaxation in the rigidity of price controls. We will have to face certain facts. As a matter of fact, there is no doctrine of price controls that is preached by any Socialist Government in any part of the world. You get price control as a result of shortages in particular commodities due to the exigencies of war but prior to the war, there was no policy — in any Government for that matter — of price controls. You only control monopolies. When commodities are in free supply, price control should go. Let us for a moment analyse the situation here in Barbados with respect to dry goods. In Broad Street sometime last week, the stores were selling shirts at competitive prices. The reason for that is because shirts are no longer in short supply. Government should not worry itself over price control when the goods are no longer in short supply.

Let us now look at the side of agriculture. Unless the Government subsidise agriculture very heavily and give a lot of encouragement to people to plant vegetables, the Minister of Agriculture would find himself in great difficulty if he found himself in a dry area like, say, Below Rock, Christ Church, and he was pressing the people there to plant cabbages or grow vegetables to sell at what they consider would be an uneconomic price. Whenever Government is tackling a problem like that, it must have some definite plan. I quite agree with Government's policy relating to the rearing and increasing of livestock. That was a practical idea, because if you wish to increase your protein diet, you would have to produce livestock so as to make more milk available to the people. As I have said, I do not agree with that vague statement about price controls. It should be a clear statement of what is your policy. If the statement in the Five-Year Plan does not carry out what it means, Government should say so, or if that statement wants amplifying the Government should be at liberty to amplify on it.

I do hope that the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing will be able to tell us at some future date how he proposes to spend that \$1,700,000 or thereabouts that is proposed to be spent on projects during the coming year. As I have said, I doubt whether he has the machinery and the staff to carry out that programme of work. At any rate, I would not like to see any of those items held up and mainly because of the unemployment situation. I would like to tell the Government that before the end of March, there will be more people unemployed on account of the molasses question. Not only coopers, but lightermen, stevedores and some produce porters would also be earning less money as a result. It therefore can be seen that in the coming year the unemployment situation is going to be very precarious indeed. With that facing the Government, its policy should be that wheresoever it can spend a penny to provide employment for the people, it should be spent; therefore, there should not be any revote of what is proposed to be spent during the coming year. We have no social security benefits in this island and one of the dangers of social security benefits in a country as this is the danger which I have enumerated earlier, that is, the question of under employment, no employment at all, and what we call technical unemployment, that is, people unemployed through new techniques. If this Government were to think of providing a Social Security Scheme, it would find itself up against the difficult situation of not having enough people employed to make a substantial contribution to the fund to provide for the people that are out of work or unable to work. The people that are unemployed would eat out more than the employed could provide. As I have said, that is one of the difficulties of providing social security in a place where there is a lot of under-employment and no employment at all. We know from an unemployment survey which was taken a long time ago that nearly all the people that are permanently employed are the people who are employed in the Civil Establishment, the people who work in a supervisory capacity in the various establishments, clerks, and people who are employed in various commercial establishments, like at the Bisuit Factory, printeries and foundries. Take away those people and you leave a mass of under-employed people and many more that are unemployed to deal with. In the agricultural field, you have workers who for the most part are only allowed to work three man-days per week. Many work for less than 150 man-days a year. This was borne out by the Holidays with Pay Act. You will see from the figures that were compiled some time ago that at

its peak, the number of unemployed rises to something between 22,000 and 23,000 in a year and at its lowest ebb it is something between 7,000, 8,000 and 10,000. From these figures, you will see one of the weaknesses of the Social Security Plan.

I also want to point out something with regard to the working of the Workmen's Compensation Act. I think the Government will be well advised at this stage to look into the working of that Act and see whether it would not need revision in light of prevailing circumstances. By that I mean that the Act was passed in 1943—eleven years ago—and it is common knowledge that since that time thousands of dollars which are paid into insurance companies for insurance against accidents to workmen, are leaving this island and going overseas. As far as I have been made to understand, the benefits paid out for accidents amount to only 12 to 15 per cent. of the money paid in. I feel that a Committee should be appointed to look into this matter because I believe that this money that is going overseas can be harnessed locally either to give better benefits to the workers by stepping up the rates on premiums to people or by the setting up of some scheme other than workmen's compensation to give added profits to the workers. The Workmen's Compensation Act did not come into force two or three weeks after it was passed. It took about two years before it was put into force. I would therefore like to see a Committee appointed to go into this matter.

Sir, you can clearly see—and it is my duty not only as a politician or as a member of this Assembly or because of my work, but as a citizen of this community—that it is my duty to pay serious attention to the very vital problems that affect the well being of this community as a whole. I consider what I have just said with regard to the investigation into the working of the Workmen's Compensation Act as very important to our social security benefit. What I am asking Government to do is to investigate how much money is being paid out as premiums for workmen's compensation; how much of that amount is paid out in benefits to workers; how much is sent abroad; and the possibilities of putting it to better use. Bear in mind, we have to harness every cent we have in this community. With regard to Old Age Pensions, I would not ask the Government to increase it at present.

Another aspect of this matter is that Mr. A. F. Wells and his wife came to the West Indies including this colony on a visit and carried out an investigation into the working of friendly societies and from the investigation which they carried out, they submitted a report. We need not be afraid to hurt our friends. Let us get to the roots of the problems that are confronting us. If we are asking for unemployment insurance and all of those social security schemes, let us see that the money which the worker earns is spent in a manner to give him more social security. Let us have a say in how it should be used. I would therefore urge that the Government make a statement of policy on the Wells' Report on Friendly Societies. Government should state positively how it feels over this report. It is of no use to invite these experts to make reports and then pigeon-hole them. Government should let the people who made this report see that it regarded it by making some statement of policy on it and that would also let the public be aware of how Government feels as regards to that report. Mr. and Mrs. Wells also reported on friendly societies in Trinidad and Jamaica and I understand that the report was made public in Trinidad, but no action has been taken about it here. Mr. Speaker, whether I am regarded as a rebel or a wrecker, I still feel that I owe a contribution to

the community in which I was born, therefore, I feel it is my duty as long as I am in this Chamber to speak on the problems which I think confront the community. No matter what are my deficiencies, I know that my integrity and my sincerity are not any of my failings. I feel what I have said is in the interest of the community and I know that nothing will prevent me in the future from saying what I have said today.

Mr. SMITH: I think I should say something on behalf of the people of St. Joseph. We have heard quite a lot relative to the Budget Speech, the Estimates and so on. I would like to say that, as far as I can see, the Estimates have been prepared in accordance with the Five Year Plan with which we have agreed.

I will begin by raising my old question—the question as to District “F” Police Station. I can remember saying last year that if you cannot carry water to the Station, you should carry the Station to the water. Water is very essential; the District “F” Police Station is on a first-class site and I would like to go there tomorrow if you give me the water. I understand that it will cost a handsome amount of money to carry the water to the Station and it would appear to me that it will cost just as much to carry the water there as it will cost to change the site of this Station. However, it is left to the Government to do what is necessary.

I can remember, too, that last year I asked a question relative to the transport of corpses in the parish. For this purpose an old lorry is used and I am sure that the lorries used by the Scavenging Department are better than that one. I think the person who is responsible for the transport of corpses will have to get something more modern for carrying corpses along the streets. I can tell whenever a corpse is being carried along the street because the sound of the lorry is like that of the trucks of the old days conveying syrup. I was in a part of St. Joseph on one day when this particular ambulance turned up for a corpse and there was only one policeman to lift that corpse into the van; this vehicle is high and the policeman had to go around begging people for a lift with the corpse. The authorities should give that policeman some assistance and not leave him to walk about asking for a lift with a corpse. That is something which the Government should consider; after all, it is a human being who has died and some consideration should be given to this matter. I asked a question in this connection last year but I have not been given any answer to it as yet.

As regards the question of loans to workers other than sugar workers, I was looking through the Estimates but I have not seen any provision made for them and there are other schemes which should have been included. There are people other than sugar workers, who are in need of houses but they are not in a position to buy them. The sugar workers are already well provided for; as far as you can go in the country you will see more new houses than old ones. I think the time has come when people other than sugar workers should be assisted; I do not know if any amount is included for assisting these people but the question is; when are you going to start with these houses? There are some people who live in such houses that I would not put an expensive cow in one of them; there are some people who get pensions from the Poor Law Board but who really have nowhere to live. There is the Almshouse, but some people would rather die on the highway than go into that Institution. The honourable member on my left has just referred to the

St. Andrew's Almshouse; well, I saw the honourable senior member for St. Andrew with some spoons in here, which I would not give my labourers to use in dropping manure. I am asking the Government to start with the housing programme as soon as possible.

I see in these Estimates that there are a lot of re-votes and I take it that these re-votes are in respect of money which has been voted from year to year. I am asking that when these buildings are to be erected, the Colonial Engineer be asked to draw plans and call for tenders. There are a lot of people who would be only too glad to get work and the way in which work is being done is a matter of one man getting the lion's share and the others getting nothing. I think we should call in contractors and get more work done; we are travelling too slow although the money is there and if I had to build even a small 10 x 8 house I would call in a contractor to build it. Lately I was seeing after the building of a house, not my own, and I tried to cheapen the cost by giving the work to a contractor. Workmen will trick you but when you engage a contractor they have to work. I think that if the Government would invite tenders and call in contractors they would get some good work done. If you have a proper plan your building will be erected properly, but you should not wait for any particular individual; there is a lot of unemployment of all classes in this country. I do not know if the proposition I have put forward was made in the Executive Committee and the advice was not taken; the best thing to do with these “boys” in the Executive Committee is to throw them out and bring them back in (Laughter).

As regards Parris Village, I want to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that the people in that district are drinking water out of a hole and it is time that something be done to help those people, either by carrying water to those people or carrying them to the water. It is difficult to carry the water to the people and if the Government is continuing to spend money at the Bay Estate and Goodland I hope they will also spend some money in St. Joseph. I hope that the honourable Minister for Communications is doing his best to prevent people from telling him that they are always spending money in St. Michael; it is time that he thinks seriously about these people in Parris Village. We have passed from trash houses to board and shingled houses; therefore let us pass from the water hole to the standpipe. Something must be done in this matter; we must go forward and upward. I would mention here that the other night I wanted to get a telephone message; I went to the Police Sub-station and I could not see to get in the building because there was just a little lantern there. It is time that electricity be installed at this Station; you do not see lamps of that type even on donkey carts now. It is my job to draw these matters to the attention of the Ministers.

I was born and bred in St. Joseph and I did not know Blackman's Tenantry until about five years ago. I did not know that people were living there so that I could have canvassed there; I do not know if my colleague knows that tenantry at all. It is time that we should have water installed up there. Long ago I took the Minister in charge of this particular matter up there and it was the question of money, but now the Five Year Plan has provided the money. I understand that it is a question of getting the pipes and after getting the pipes there must be the supply of water. In this Tenantry people have to walk for about two miles in order to

get water and I do not think they can cook clean food. I am sure that the people up there get money more quickly than they get water.

In the Estimates I see that provision has been made for a school in St. Joseph; that is set out on page 130 of the Estimates under the Head "Capital Expenditure, but I do not know if this "Western" school is a girls' school or a boys' school. I know that the Boys' School is situated in the graveyard and it does not suit any person to live there. The Headmaster is living at that School and you will be surprised to know that if a handkerchief drops from the Headmaster it will drop straight into the graveyard, and if he should forget to close the door leading from the School into his quarters, the children can look all through the bedroom. I am told that if scrubbing is being done at top, the water drops into the drawingroom; that is not good enough for a Headmaster; he should not be surprised or feel ashamed if anybody called him a "duppy" because he lives in the graveyard. That building does not even suit the children; one morning a mother was carrying one of her children up the stairs and the child would not go up there because the school is situated in the graveyard. I hope that this provision of \$848,000 in the Five Year Plan will remedy this state of affairs; this School should be used for storing the tools of the grave diggers.

Inasmuch as the Government is trying to get more money, they can get more money if they will just amend the Liquor Licence Act. As the Act stands at present, you have clubs which do not pay one cent and if the Government would amend the Act setting out that the people who carry on these clubs must pay the same licence as anybody else, they would collect a few thousand dollars more. I know that somebody wanted to sell liquor at a place where entertainment was carried on and he was told that that could not be done; he turned the place into a club and sold more rum than if he had bought a liquor licence. I always heard that the boys fought because they could not get good rum at the clubs since it was cheap; nowadays they have J & R and they can drink until morning and they are still safe. (Laughter). At these clubs you may get a policeman disguising himself and buying a "snap" or getting somebody to do it for him, and then every thing is carried away. That is not fair; I think the people who carry on these clubs should be asked to buy a licence just like anybody else.

In connection with the East Coast Road, I think that road is badly needed. Joes River estate has gone out of commission and this road would be a first-class road for the transportation of the crop. Whatever might have been the hindrance to constructing this road before should be cleared up and the people be given this road; in the construction of this road employment would be found for the unemployed and you would also have some money going into the Treasury. I am sure that everybody would benefit from this project being carried out: I am sure that if the tourists just drove along that road once they would always want to drive along there.

Relative to the insurance of fishing-boats, I received at my office yesterday a letter which reads as follows:

2nd March, 1954.

Dear Mr. Smith,

Thanks for your letter. I have instructed the Clerk to put your item *re* parish roads on the agenda for the next meeting of the Vestry, which is being called for next Monday.

I, too, would ask you to do a favour to me and to the fishermen. Will you please take up with the

Fisheries Officer and the appropriate Minister the matter of Insurance of fishing boats? A boat sank and was lost off the coast of Bathsheba this morning; it was not insured. In talking with the men they told me why many of the boats are not insured; they seem to have real grievances in matters of valuation, coverage and premiums. I would like you to come down to Bathsheba and talk with the men yourself. You will then see what their troubles are and you will be able to take the matter up on their behalf.

With inadequate or unfavourable insurance security the men are forced to go around begging for help when they are overtaken with a calamity like this one today. This begging is degrading to the unfortunate men as well as disagreeable to others.

Yours sincerely,

L. C. MALLALIEU,

Rector.

That is the position; when a fisherman loses his boat he has to go all over the island begging for money so as to replace his boat; if he is a hard drinker and he collects a few cents, it will take some years before he can buy another boat. The rates charged for the insurance of fishing-boats have turned back the fishermen from insuring their boats, I feel that these fishermen should be covered by insurance; you are compelling owners of motor vehicles to be insured by a Third Party system and I feel that there should be some legislation to have fishermen insured if not their boats. The Insurance Companies should be told that they cannot have the lion's share off every item; if you get a little from this and a little from that you can put things together and you will still gain. I have taken up this matter with the Minister for Fisheries; we must call upon the Insurance Companies and if they do not come to the rescue of the fishermen, we, as a Government, will have to use our own insurance.

Last week a man did a job for me and I called him into the office afterwards; he told me what he charged for the job and I told him that I did not know anything about the job but I felt he had charged too much money. He was asking for \$10 but he eventually took \$9. I think we will have to approach the Insurance Companies in respect of these fishing boats; I will eat every fish that is brought in, but I would not go two feet into the water for the fish. We should help these fishermen and do not let them go hat in hand for donations when their boats are lost. I saw someone refuse to give a donation to a fisherman who had lost his boat; that person said that he had to buy the fish too dear. I know that a fisherman lost his life and his wife only got 80 cents per week for the children; we could not do anything more for her, but if that fisherman's life had been insured his wife would have got some kind of assistance until the children reached maturity when they could work. The letter I read came to me from Rev Mallalieu as to the plight of fishermen; I am warning the Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries to work quickly so that at the end of the next two years the whole of Barbados will be able to say: "Worthy, we will return you without any kind of trouble; we have given you the ammunition and now you must do the job." Now that I have a Minister who will sit in his office and discuss matters with me, I sincerely hope that these things will be remedied. I do not expect things to be done overnight, but something must be done.

As regards Third Party Insurance in respect of buses, I said I did not think that the rates would be too high, but I was told yesterday that the rate for the first 20 passengers would be \$1.20 per year and for each additional one the rate would be \$3.50. I

do not know if that is too dear, but I feel it is too dear and I hope the hon. Minister will see about it before it becomes law. The Insurance Companies are a fraternity unto themselves; it is not a question of leaving this Insurance Company and going to another which will be cheaper, because it will be the same thing. I could talk all these things in an office but this is the place where we should air our grievances and represent the people; in this place I am talking to everybody and they are hearing, otherwise I will have to go to five different offices. I know I will be accused of vote-catching but if you are not a politician you cannot come in here.

Mr. Speaker I see, that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew is quite ready to speak and therefore I will sit down now; but I am appealing to the Ministers to do as much work as they possibly can and get as much of this money spent as they possibly can; they must not let the money lapse so that it will have to be re-voted again next year. Let them call for tenders and get the work done.

Mrs. BOURNE: The hon. member who has just sat down has prevented all of us from going to sleep. We have heard quite a lot in connection with the Budget; I will begin with the question of unemployment. As I see it, unemployment is on the increase; the population of this island is increasing every day on the average of 11 per day, and we are already an over-populated island. What I feel is that we should have some sort of birth control or some practice which will help to hinder the increase of the population. As regards the Clergy, they are definitely against the practice of birth control; I feel that they should be kept out of this matter and the way to keep them out is to bring about a gradual disendowment of the Church — I mean the Anglican Church. I feel that most of the other religious bodies like the Seventh Day Adventists and others, do much better work or just as good work as the Anglican Clergy, and this \$95,000 which is spent on the Clergy should be given in grants-in-aid to the Seventh Day Adventists. I see that money is granted to the Wesleyan and other Churches, but we can take that money and use it in building some of the schools, more particularly, the technical schools. When the children leave the schools, what are they going to do? They will all want to go into some clerical office, but they should be taught to use their hands. Nowadays it is difficult to get a proper carpenter or mason.

As regards the Old Age Pension, some people feel that the amount of this pension should be increased. I am not prepared to say whether it should be increased or not, but I feel that if the retiring age for Government servants is 55 years — if you can ask people to retire at that age — you should also be able to give people Old Age Pensions at that age. I am told the Civil Servants have earned their pension; well, there should be some means of bringing about some system of social security for those people who have given all their service to the planters and people of that sort. The planters and such people should make some provision for their employees from whom they have benefited either directly or indirectly. It is not only the people who reach the age for getting Old Age Pensions who should be considered; you have people who are invalids and people who were born blind and I feel that they should be helped as well.

In connection with District Markets, I feel it is time that we have these Markets; some time ago somebody said that the fish should be canned, but I do not think that there is any great surplus of fish; I think it is a question of the distribution.

Sometimes in St. Andrew we do not see any fish, so that if you have a proper marketing of fish you will find that there are not enough fish to be canned. Do not tell me that the few fish that are brought in here could not be consumed by all these people in this island. I have discussed this matter with the hon. Minister for Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries and he tells me that the Government is thinking of a scheme along that line.

On the question of the District Agricultural Stations, one of the biggest grievances which is taking place at these Stations is the rearing of pigs; you have a small number of pigs at these Stations and they are sent to one of the Stations and sold by auction. It is only the people with money in their pockets who can get these pigs. Again I have discussed this matter with the hon. Minister for Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries and he hopes to discontinue that practice. As the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said, my constituents are looking forward to hearing me say something about these matters. The hon. Minister, I repeat, has assured me that this practice of selling these pigs at auction will be stopped.

Another question is that of the duty which is paid on goods sent down by people's relatives in America and other places. I have heard of a case where a table-cloth had been sent by a relative to somebody who was getting married here, and she had to pay \$13 so as to get that table-cloth. I doubt whether that person would have had to pay that amount for a table-cloth if she had bought it here; I hope the appropriate Minister will go into this matter and relieve the suffering of the people.

The hon. Premier mentioned something about extending the Alleyne School but since no provision has been made for the extension of this School in these Estimates, I hope that arrangements will be made for the provision of a School bus to take the children to the secondary schools where many of them have gone. I have gone into this matter with the Director of Highways and Transport and since then I have been told that a School bus runs on Tuesdays and Thursdays. That is not good enough because the children have to go to school five days a week; I understand that there are about 70 children who travel to the secondary schools.

I was impressed on paying a visit to Speights-town to find that newspapers could be made into basins; I never knew that that could be done. The Centre down there seems to be doing very good work; perhaps it would be a good thing if the public could have a demonstration or let the nurses go into people's homes and demonstrate the making of basins out of newspapers. I think that that would help to keep down the cost of living.

As far as education is concerned, I see that we are spending quite a large sum of money there. What I feel is that although we are having so much talk about Federation and the free movement of the people, the number of children from the Caribbean area should be limited. If we cannot afford to have our children educated in the schools, I feel that the number of children from the Caribbean area should be limited.

Another matter which has been brought to my notice is that the Rectors are given power to report on schoolteachers. The schoolteachers do not think that that is fair because the Rectors are not in the schools and I do not know that they can give very accurate reports. I have been told that there are some bad practices going on in some of the schools; each school is given a grant in respect of nutrition and I understand that some of the teachers, instead

of distributing the milk to the children, are taking it to their homes and putting it to their own use. Some of the children do not take the milk and biscuits; I have also been told that for three or four weeks the children who take the milk do not get any. If that is so, I am wondering if the person who has the contract for supplying the milk still draws the same amount of money as if he had supplied the milk for that same period.

I have also been told that there was a cricket match taking place at the Training School and because the ball entered the Principal's house he stopped the teachers from playing cricket. That is a matter which I would like the hon. Minister for Education to deal with because that is something which should not be continued. I have also been told that the amount which is taken out of the teachers' money for meals has been increased; at first it was \$30 then it went up to \$35 and now it is \$40. The teachers complain that they get the food in such a small quantity that they had to have it supplied from their homes. I was present on one occasion when a dish of macaroni was served and it was nothing but weevils. That is not good enough.

Like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who said that he is interested in the construction of the East Coast Road, I feel that if that road were constructed it would be an asset to the island; it would help to bring back into cultivation land which is now lying fallow. Meat is scarce, so is fish and if that road were constructed people could take an easy ride up the line and perhaps they would be able to get more fish.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph asked a question relative to the registration of births and deaths being done at the Police Sub-station at Belleplaine for the benefit of the people there. I do not know if the hon. member wants to represent my constituency, but I want to go a little further; I would ask the Government not only to consider the registration of births and deaths being done at this Sub-station, but also the trial of cases for the benefit of the people at Belleplaine instead of their having to go to District "F" Police Station on two days a week.

As regards the question of electricity, since 1948 the Electric Company came down to St. Andrew and it is shameful to think that they just put down poles and took them back up. It took two weeks to provide the recent illumination in Bridgetown but in St. Andrew and other parts of Barbados you cannot see your fingers except you use a bottle lamp! I am hoping that the Government will nationalise the Electric Company. I understand that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew tabled an Address relative to the nationalisation of electricity and in a few weeks' time he had electricity at Parks. (Laughter). The electric mains are bordering St. Andrew from St. Joseph and St. Peter and it is just a question of extending the mains down the hills. Seeing the electric poles put down, some people wired their houses and bought refrigerators, and those who used batteries got rid of them in the hope of getting electricity; but now there is no electricity and people have sold their refrigerators. A refrigerator is necessary especially in an area where you cannot get fish plentifully.

In connection with the District Libraries, I was asked by the Librarian at the Community Hall in St. Andrew whether the Government would consider giving her a small fee so as to help her. I thought I could mention the matter here.

As far as I can see the position, there is a difficult task ahead of the Ministers and I would rather not have the salary than be in their position. If you

go through Trafalgar Street and see the boys coming from Harrison College, you ask yourself; where is the appropriate Minister going to get employment for these boys? The task will be a very difficult one indeed and the prospects of emigration do not seem to be very rosy at all. I repeat that we should have some sort of birth control in this island.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I am not accustomed to entering a debate at this late hour and some of the points I would have made have already been made. In Great Britain a Budget Speech is the elucidation of economic and social policy by the Government in power, and that is what I expected from the new Cabinet. Modern taxation is mainly the means of the re-distribution of income and the Budget should give a clear indication of the re-distribution of income among the population. The imposition of taxation is amply justified if the main purpose of it is the re-distribution of income among the people; that has been accepted by the British public. The wealthy classes are mainly satisfied with 40% or over of their incomes being paid to the Government because they have accepted the modern theory that want should not exist in the community along with wealth and that sickness should not be the burden of the individual, so that in every Budget taxation policy substantially covers welfare services. Food subsidies amount to 12% per week per family, several thousand houses are built annually, there are hospital services, the greatest medical care, the most expensive medicines and drugs—all of that the citizen is entitled to free of charge because of the contribution to taxation.

Now Mr. Speaker, our redistribution of wealth is mainly concentrated in a few Heads, the provision of Old Age Pensions, Subsidisation, Medical Services—all of that is justifiable and the Government could only be criticised for not spending more on these things; but when it comes to high taxation being paid by the salaried classes, it is unfair not to consider the medical expenses which are often incurred by the middle-class families; it is unfair not to consider a reduction of such expenses through the assessment of income tax. It is unfair as compared with the British system where a man, regardless of his social or financial position, is entitled to the best surgical and medical care in time of sickness, because it is readily considered that he contributed substantially to the taxation which is collected so as to afford these services. I feel that the average middle-class family here should either be granted relief from such medical expenses as they may incur, or, alternatively, the surgical and medical treatment at the Hospital should be free to them. We should follow the United Kingdom in granting free medical services to the average middle-class families who contribute substantially to the taxation in the colony; we have had many a complaint from the average salaried family where the medical and surgical expenses by those families reduced their income and caused embarrassment where the education of a child is concerned. I throw out the suggestion to the Government that they must consider the medical and surgical expenses of middle-class families in any assessment of income tax.

When it comes to the question of unemployment I will quote some figures in respect of a small dependent territory as we happen to be. We have a population of 210,000 and an average of about 70,000 or one-third of the population is employable. An average of 10% of that 70,000 or 7,000 are continuously employed and about twice that number are only partially employed for about 30 hours a week. When we can collect surplus balances over a period of years until the sum of \$81½ million has accumulated

in the Treasury, that is nothing at all over which this Government should boast; I think it shows a very incompetent fiscal administration of the colony and perhaps the worst record for the entire Caribbean. In a colony like this with so many wants, so much poverty and so much absence of essential services you cannot boast of having a surplus of over \$8 million; it shows maladministration of the revenue which has been collected. I have stressed it before and I will emphasize it again that in this accumulation of surpluses the Government has only robbed the community of \$8½ million; I put it as bluntly as that. If the Government had collected this money and used it for the many essential purposes which they could find, we could not speak of them as having robbed the community; to collect \$8½ million in taxation and put in a Reserve Fund is definitely doing a disservice to the community. If this money had been left in the hands of the taxpayers, they would certainly have used it in one way or the other towards the reduction of unemployment; the only justifiable reason for the collection of this money was if the Government was going to re-distribute it in social ways among the classes who are so direly in need of it. When you have failed to do that you have robbed the community of money; I am not saying that to impose high taxation is a wrong policy, but it is definitely a wrong policy if you collect taxation as a surplus and least of all should it be indulged in by a Socialist regime. Surplus and taxation have a vital relationship; if you are collecting money for a social use, that is all well and good, otherwise the money should be left in the hands of the taxpayers who can use it for investment.

I do not agree with spending these large sums of money on Capital Expenditure; I think that Capital Expenditure should be met from loan funds, especially in a community like this because you can undertake loans. It is bad financing to establish capital development out of current revenue; that development should be taken from loan funds. The hon. Premier spoke haltingly and gave the impression that he was in doubt that they would collect the necessary loan for financing the Deep Water Harbour; but I do not see why he should have expressed any doubt about that at all. The British Government should be approached for this loan and I think the hon. Premier should have enough influence or enough friends at court, to use his popular phrase, to acquire this loan for this necessary development. That is one way in which at least for a few years, they will absorb some of the unemployment in this island.

I do not agree with those who think that subsidisation should be abolished; subsidisation of essential footstuffs is one of the commendable ways for the re-distribution of income, which is the main purpose or should be the main purpose of high taxation; but I agree that the Government is subsidising the wrong things. We should have a comprehensive scheme for subsidising the dairy industry in this colony; milk, which is an essential food the lack of which might be the cause of our high infant mortality, should be so subsidised that it could be sold at one-half the price at which it is now being sold, so that mothers and children can get that food which is so essential to the life and health of both of them.

As to our agricultural policy. I do not like to use phrases, but for the love of heaven, do not let the Government use arable estates for any cane cultivation; let them use these estates for the production of articles to be used locally as an addition to the food supply of the colony. Let them use one of the largest estates for the dairy industry exclusively; let them get a New Zealander out here and let him manage

one of these estates as an exclusive dairy farm for the purpose of having dairying as a secondary industry to sugar cane. I do not have much hope of industrialisation as a means of reducing employment; from my reading of the scientific development of agriculture, I have hope that if an agricultural policy is pursued to that purpose, the production of the colony would be almost doubled from dairying. Let us embark on the dairy industry so that the importation of items such as table butter, condensed and powdered milk, will be considerably reduced. If it will not be unnecessary to import them, and there you have a means of providing employment for people even greater than that afforded by the sugar industry because employment will be provided all the year round. That will bring about a great reduction of unemployment.

I appreciate the grant of money for carrying out an unemployment survey, only if that survey will help us with the specific categories of unemployment. The Blood Committee on Unemployment was appointed some time ago and the findings of that Committee provide a sound foundation on which the Cabinet should proceed to lessen this evil problem. They need not wait to see if it is absolutely necessary to have this unemployment survey.

I cannot refrain from making reference to two and three persons having to occupy a single bed at the Hospital when there is a surplus of \$8½ million in the Treasury; there is no excuse for any such state of affairs existing. I am glad to see that a substantial amount of money has been granted for medical services and there may be some capital development scheme taking place, but the entire amount of money should be spent without any capital development. This state of affairs of having two and three people occupying one bed should only exist in a place where there is chronic destitution; in parts of India and Africa where there is such destitution, there may be some justification for such poor hospital services, but there is no justification for putting two and three people in one bed in the Hospital in Barbados. That is a condemnation of the Medical Department of the Government; now that there is a Cabinet system where individual Ministers are responsible for their Departments, the blame for anything like this existing for very much longer will rest squarely on the shoulders of the Minister of Health.

There is a lot of opposition to our educational policy; I am convinced that this colony is spending twice as much on education as the value it gets for it. The result of our education will be tested in the streets; how many useful citizens do we produce in this colony? We still meet people who are the cause of several illegitimate families; we want responsible citizens and if education is worth its name we will produce thereby responsible citizens from every angle. I think that that is the least observable result of our educational system.

To return to our agricultural policy, I have heard much complaint to the Minister for Agriculture about the lack of quality in our animal feed. I am not competent to judge the correctness of this or not; the Minister for Agriculture should investigate these complaints and see if people are getting value for the money they are paying for animal feed, because the development of livestock is an important means of assisting unemployment.

Sir, I began by talking of the surplus and I am now asking Government to consider it as its duty to get rid of, as far as possible, the surplus which is being accumulated. I have already condemned Government for setting up the Revenue Equalisation Fund and I have on many occasions pointed out

that in an underdeveloped community such as this, we cannot afford to pick up money and invest it abroad. It is high time that that policy should stop. As I have said, Government is not a private business, therefore, it should not act as if it were one in its fiscal policy. Government has means of annexing its revenue by the instrument of taxation; no business firm has that means; it just has to depend on its sales. A business firm may advertise its wares, but advertisement is in itself an expense; advertising does not always mean the inevitability of rising sales.

I am convinced that the days when our crop was restricted to less than 150,000 tons are passed, therefore this squeamish way of collecting taxation as if next year may be so poor that you must put up for a rainy day is wrong. High taxation is only justified and has only been accepted by the people who have to pay for it if the policy of the Government is redistribution of wealth. It is justifiable in England. I make this quotation: "It can truly be said that poverty in the acute sense in which it was known to many of the other generations, some of whom are still alive, is all but non-existent in Great Britain to-day. Improvements in the social services are always possible but it does appear at first sight as if the machinery which is required for the alleviating of sickness and want has now been completed." This machinery is high taxation. Sir, I was opposed to the plan for higher taxation in this colony when we discussed the Five-Year Plan and at that time I predicted that as a result of the taxation plans that we would have got this great surplus of \$1,600,000. I maintain that we have no right collecting it unless we are prepared to fall in line with the machinery which I referred to as obtaining in the United Kingdom, that is the machinery which means the redistribution of the wealth of the community.

Sir, our housing conditions in the country districts are deplorable. I was literally appalled to see the houses which were in existence in Welch Village, St. John. As a matter of fact, when I first saw them, I felt I was a stranger in my own country. We can substantially redistribute the wealth of the country by spending more on housing needs. We can also spend more on our medical services. I do hope that the Government would reconsider its budget along those lines. The budget by the Government should spell its social policy. If Government's budget is one of high taxation, it should mean an alleviation of sickness and want and unless it has that meaning under the present regime, the colony would be better if it were without high taxation.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that I should have to speak at this late hour—it is going on to midnight—particularly after almost twelve hours' sitting but I do want to express my views on the budget, therefore, I must content myself with speaking at this late hour. I do not believe any Trade Unionist would be in agreement with sitting for these long hours as we are doing now. Sir, there has been much talk in partly all of the speeches by honourable members about a healthy budget, buoyant finances, and of all the things that go to make one feel easy when he thinks of the position of the country financially, however, I must confess that I am afraid that this period of unequalled prosperity which we are enjoying at the present can only be regarded as a pointer to a period of recession. I think this country like all the other countries has reached the apex of inflation. I must further confess it is my belief that inflation with which we are catching up is not caused by any design of our own or any wrong decision of Government or even private enterprise. Its cause is something over which we have no control. We must face the

fact that we are up against a period of recession, therefore, to think in terms of our having achieved something by accumulating a surplus of \$8,000,000 over the past few years and to beat our chests and laud ourselves over it is not a wise thing at this time; in truth and fact, we can be heading into danger from this apex of prosperity. Make no mistake about it, it is very apparent that inflation has caught up with us, and if you take a glance at the big manufacturing countries on the continent you will see that the same thing is happening in those countries.

As I have said, a recession in trade is on and we are going to see a break in ours. This is not said with any intention to scare anybody into closing up like a four o'clock flower but I do want to warn against the impending situation. We must face facts. We have just seen the end of the Korean War and there is no doubt about it, that war has had a tremendous effect on the West Indies in one way or another. Added to that, it does appear as if there is savage competition among a lot of manufacturing centres and because many of them are in difficulties, they are disposing of their manufactured products at cheap prices. Indeed, Sir, much has been said about the finances of the colony, but if you had noticed carefully, you would have noticed that in all those speeches, there was that persistent ring of caution, if not fear. Two or three years ago when the opportunities were really ripe for Government to increase taxation, I think you will remember that I was rather exhaustive in criticising the Government for not getting in money when it was easily available. Sir to gloat over the fact that we have been blessed with a surplus of \$8,000,000 is really nothing in itself to be happy about; least of all now that there is a Socialist Government in power. Money has its value only in its usage and there is so much to be done by this Government that even if it were a good thing to build up a large surplus, the question would be whether it would be a good thing for this Government to have a surplus of \$8,000,000.

What I am worrying about is if the Government is really aware of what is taking place in the world and is trying to find out how it is going to affect us. I think that the trend in the present world conditions will call for a great amount of executive ability to combat with the changing circumstances.

I agree that these estimates were more or less handled by the old Executive Committee. Now that we have with us a Government with Ministers who will be responsible to the people for the running of the Government, we expect that the financial affairs of the colony will be handled much better than they were in recent years. The question of planning for the future is something that is also worrying me.

It is hinted in the Memorandum to the Estimates that there is likely to be some curtailment in the production of sugar. I see no reason why there should be any fear in that respect. The answer to that question can be found in the intensification of our agricultural system. There is no doubt about it, we can find ways and means to utilise our land to better advantage. As I see it, we are at present importing a lot of corn meal and I feel that we could grow more corn over here to prevent our importing so much of that commodity. I feel that we can grow as much corn to serve our requirements if we just subject ourselves to a change in our agricultural system. It is true to say that the corn which we grow locally is not advantageous to manufacture in corn meal because of the high percentage of oil that is in it but that can be overcome

by separation. We have the cassava factory which would be able to grind our corn into meal for us and it is only short of a bit of equipment that would be necessary to separate the oil but that can be obtained in a matter of weeks. That oil would not be wasted; as a matter of fact, corn oil is equal to olive oil which is used as a salad and it is much better than the edible oil which we now use for cooking. I can tell you that our imported corn meal is only the residue from corn. I think it is known that in large countries, they take the best of the corn for making corn flakes and such niceties and I believe we can even go as far as obtaining machinery to do this because a lot of it is sold over here. I am therefore asking the Minister of Agriculture to make some notes on this. I will also be happy to discuss my ideas on this matter with him.

There are also prospects of our establishing a milk scheme which would benefit everybody. I am not going as far as to say that we need that large highfalutin scheme of a milk pasteurization plant but I feel that Government should form a cooperative bringing in all the peasants with their few heads of cattle and if that is done we can get enough milk to go a long way in supplying our wants. If Government can form that cooperative, I do not think that we would need that milk pasteurization plant for another sixty years; all that we would need is the Batch type of milk pasteurization which is the type of plant that is now used in Jamaica and other small countries. I do not believe we are fully aware of the importance of our establishing a milk scheme along such lines as I have suggested. It would need Government's cooperation and the reason why we find it difficult to establish the scheme is because we have some big people in the business who for petty reasons do not want the peasant to share in the profits. Jamaica used to import 400 tons of powdered milk a year but since the Nestles Company were brought into that country, not only are they producing sufficient milk for local requirements, but they are also producing sufficient to export 200 tons of powdered milk. Of course, this does not mean that Barbados is in a similar position as this colony. In the first place, we have nothing of the pasture land which Jamaica has for the rearing of cattle. We can however improve our cattle, as we are doing, and here I must pause to say that in this respect we have our Veterinary Officer, Dr. Proverbs, doing a magnificent job.

What alarms me is when I look around and see the pieces of land here and there that are lying fallow. I think it is criminal in this small island to allow land to lie fallow. I say this from the depths of my heart. It is not the amount of money that Government has at its control; it is exactly what you succeed in doing with it. A government can have a lot of money, but it can throw it away in a lot of wild cat schemes.

Another thing, Sir, is that as the result of the rains last year we had sweet potatoes in excess, and so much so, that some were exported. The question is: can we afford to export to Trinidad our sweet potatoes at a price of 4½ cents per pound when we are buying animal feed at 14½ cents per pound? We have the Cassava Factory which I think can help us in producing a balanced animal feed, but it is a question of knowing the technical know-how. I think what this Government wants, more than anything else, is a perfect understanding of the possibilities of this country. What we want is drive, grit and blood—and the people with the know-how. If we appoint the right people to the Development Board and get people to tell us how best we can start with our milk scheme, and

things of that sort, I am sure that in two years' time, you will be surprised to see the changed outlook of the country. As I was saying, we must also pay some attention to our production of a suitable animal feed. We should be able to produce a good enough feed for animals at about 5½ cents per pound or at the most, half of the price of the imported stuff.

I think it is very fortunate that we have established a wax factory. I say that with some feeling, presumption and strength on my part. It brings to my mind a talk which I had — a talk with Sir John Saint while we were in Jamaica about an idea which I had in mind about filter press mud. I told him that I felt that filter press mud which was being thrown away contained about 20 to 30 per cent of crude protein, which if given to pigs in combination with other food stuffs would fatten and grow them to market size in six months. We talked the whole thing over and he suggested he would make an experiment of it. Sir John too was worrying over what could be done to cheapen the cost of animal feed. Recently — I think it was a Sunday morning—Sir John Saint telephoned me and told me that he had made an experiment of what I had told him and had found out that I was right. He said that he had managed to raise a pig in six months to give him 180 pounds of pork from the experiment. As a matter of fact, that morning he was making ham from one of the legs. Sir John himself never believed up to then that there was so much food value in filter press mud. If I may digress, I would say that this country like most countries in the world is mainly agricultural, but we must bear in mind that everything comes from the good earth which is still anxious to serve us if we develop it. If we fail to develop it, of course, it is going to run away in grass because mother nature makes her own provision to take care of the animals.

Getting back to the question of producing potatoes, it is a fact that the big plantations can produce an abundance of vegetables. They can produce more than what they do now even under the present conditions. But, here again, it is a question of planters looking back at statistics. They reason this way: I will only plant five acres in vegetables this year because last year, I had difficulty in selling what was produced from ten acres. If Government could present those people with a marketing scheme which would take care of the vegetables they produce and would guarantee them with a reasonable price for it, I am sure that within the next five or six years they could produce as much potatoes and corn as to serve our requirements. Government, could by foresight, take the corn and send it to its factory to produce a corn meal everybody would appreciate. As I have said already, it would only need a little more equipment at the Cassava Factory to manufacture this meal and the equipment could be bought from Canada at the present time. I am saying that we can produce a better type cornmeal than we import at present; it is only a question of our applying ourselves to it. I hope the Minister of Agriculture would take notes on these things and give them a trial.

Mr. Speaker, we have never had any trouble with our public debt nor need we fear over it. As a matter of fact, of the outstanding loans which we have at the moment, half can be made recoverable by the Sinking Fund. What we must be aware of, as I have said in my opening remarks, is that the continent is producing bigger and better than before and we must see how that situation is going to affect not only ourselves but the West Indies as a whole. I believe Government is aware of its responsibility in this respect. I can point to something which is in the air now. If you look into the stores both in Broad and

Swan Streets, you will see a single commodity of the same quality at different prices at each store. As soon as you see that, you can interpret what is happening. As soon as you find the people in commerce talking about "A Sale Now On," and "15% Reduction on all goods," you know that they are carrying high-priced stocks and that the markets are changing.

I would just like to make a point or two with respect to the Deep Water Harbour Scheme. In a small under-developed country like Barbados, I consider it is a wicked thing to get local loans on large projects such as Deep Water Harbour Scheme. I think it would be a far better thing to let money lenders from the Mother Country lend the money for this venture so that local individuals can lend for the country's expansion. I see that the figure given for the Deep Water Harbour Scheme is \$20,000,000. Not only will it be the largest amount of money that this Government ever borrowed but it is about five times as much as what it was estimated to cost when the scheme was reported on. However, I do not think that the amount is too much to borrow. If you are thinking in terms of a surplus of \$8,000,000, then there is validity of your borrowing \$20,000,000. Again, you must bear in mind that the Harbour Scheme eventually would pay for itself. I feel that this colony can pay back that \$20,000,000 in 15 or 20 years without feeling it. As I examine the scheme, I estimate that \$12,000,000 of the amount will be spent in the country over the five years that it will take to construct. I also visualise that the engineers will be able to build it in piers which could harbour about three ships, so that you will be able to use parts of it as they are finished before the whole scheme is completed. Again, I would say that \$20,000,000 is not beyond our resources to borrow. We must look at it in accordance with our budget of \$12,000,000 to-day. We must also bear in mind that right now St. Lucia is being used as an unloading centre, but you can imagine what would happen if we produce a deep water harbour which will be the first port of call in these parts from the Atlantic. This is a case which I think you need not brood over the possibilities. It will be profitable and believe me, Sir, it is necessary.

My last word to the Government is with respect to its policy on the purchase of sugar for local consumption. I think it was recklessness and abject carelessness on the part of Government when it decided to buy sugar for local consumption on the U.K. quota price. Last year it was bought at that price and the lowest grade was subsidised. Now, while that was being done, the "free sugar" was sold at a price far beneath that which the Government bought theirs to supply the very people who produced it. Let me warn the Government if it decides that its allocation of sugar for local consumption should be bought on the same basis as the last price obtained for it in the U.K. market, it cannot hope of getting any reduction in the cost of living for the people. Sir, you cannot talk about reducing the cost of living unless you talk of reducing the price of locally grown produce first. If you reduce your price on sugar sold locally, that is, if you allow the people to buy it at the same price that it is sold in open market, you will be giving an immense saving to the average man. The ordinary individual has not the opportunity of buying the best grade refined sugar produced locally for his own use far less the imported high grade refined sugar. I think it is unfortunate that the individual who helps to produce the sugar should be given the lowest grade of sugar, but even if that is so, he should be given it as cheaply as possible.

I do hope the Government would go into this question. I consider that one of the vital things in this community is to see that sugar is sold to the people at the cheapest price possible.

Sir, when the House goes into Committee on the various heads of expenditure, I will have something more to say. I will only just say now in passing that I hope Government will attempt some little scheme whereby small producers can come together. I know that they are aware of the necessity for getting together and are now willing and anxious so to do but would like this Government to create the instrument of co-operation and put it over to them. As I have said, if you create a co-operative among these small producers, you will be able to produce an animal feed at a cheaper price than that imported. You will be surprised to see that you will be able to keep your existing Cassava Factory working 24 hours every day. I will ask Government to be aware of its responsibility in this matter; act now; do not wait for the storm to crack.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, it is getting on to Friday morning and on account of that, I do not think any honourable member should indulge in any more long speeches and, as a matter of fact, if one or two points which I regard as important had not escaped attention and which I feel should be adequately emphasized, I would not have considered it necessary for me to rise to my feet. In considering the Colonial Estimates, one naturally reviews the whole situation of the colony and the financial aspects of it, but I will leave that to the many financiers who are around this horse-shoe table. There are, however, other matters which have not received attention and I will say a word or two on them in order to draw Government's attention to them.

Now, Sir, the question which I think is inextricably bound up with the Estimates is the question of the administration of justice. It is dealt with under specific heads with which one would be able to deal with item by item when the occasion arises, but with regard to the general policy on that question one must ask the Government, or to be more emphatic, the Minister responsible for that part of the Government's policy, what is Government's attitude to the continuance of acting judiciary appointments? What I must stress in doing so is that in any civilised community nothing is of greater importance than the administration of justice in a proper and impartial manner. That could never be said to be the case in this colony to-day. One of the lamentable things which occurs in this respect is the inexplicable delay in the appointment of a most competent and senior judiciary officer. Even apart from that the question of the incidence of acting appointments is far too many. There are to-day, not less than three persons who are acting as Magistrates and for quite a time. That should not be so. There are many people who are interested in judiciary appointments other than those who are on the Bench. As it is, one cannot but question the policy of the continuing of acting judiciary appointments indefinitely, and particularly because in the case of acting appointments, there is greater cost for travelling than in respect of a person who is appointed to a magistracy. In the interest of justice, I must implore the honourable Minister in charge to remember the Courts where he once had to work and take the necessary action to see that this deplorable state of affairs does not continue any longer. Sir, unless people feel that they can go into Her Majesty's Courts and get British justice, it is impossible to get a contented and happy community. They cannot feel that way now about our Courts of justice for reasons which

are obvious and which I would not repeat on this historic night.

Sir, mention has been made of the Ecclesiastical Establishment and it is a source of grave concern to me when one continues to see under this Head—Ecclesiastical—the sum of \$111,000 of which \$100,000 is expended on the establishment known as the Anglican Church. Sir, even up to this day there are certain branches of the Anglican Church which are behaving in a manner other than the teachings of their creed; in a manner similar to the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa which has reached low water mark in the British Empire. When one considers that \$101,520 is expended in respect of the Anglican Church in this community, of which the bulk seems to go to the Vicars who collect the tidy sum of \$60,480, and the next highest amount of \$25,200 to the Rectors, one must wonder when we have one of these rectors—the Rector of St. George—actually racially discriminating in the reception into his Church between the space of two or three days of persons of two different colours who sought to become members of that Church and the Anglican Establishment. It is well known that recently that Rector had confirmation services held for three white ladies on one day and for coloured persons on another day—two separate days in one week. Sir, the Anglican Church is supported out of the taxpayers money and the taxpayers of this colony are of every colour. Although the Anglican Church is alleged to be the Church of God whose teaching is to bring all persons into its fold without any discrimination, we find racial discrimination happening in the Anglican Church in Barbados and yet we are asked to continue to contribute to that institution. Should we continue to give tribute to an institution which refuses to turn its head against racial prejudice? Should we continue to contribute to an institution which says that there must be one reception into its fold for people who are born of Barbadian plantocracy and another reception for Barbadians born of lowly birth? Sir, what has appeared in the public Press has not even been contradicted by the Rector of St. George. Therefore, it must be taken as true. As I have said, this is a matter for the Cabinet which is now comprised of Ministers to consider. I will ask that they give consideration before the preparation of next year's estimates to the essential matter of the dis-endowment and disestablishment of the Anglican Church. I will go as far as to state that it should not be too gradual; it should be something which should come about in the lifetime of the oldest of us in this Chamber. It is unfair for us to continue to contribute to an institution which not only displays racial discrimination but which is also a burden on those persons who are of other denominational persuasion and who of necessity must contribute to the upkeep of their denomination.

Again, Sir, I am dealing with matters of general policy. Now that the Government, which is comprised of fellow West Indians like ourselves, and has a deciding voice untrammelled by the voice of the imported officials, I think the Minister in charge of the Police Department might well do a little research as far back as the year of the publication of Superintendent Calver's report so as to remind himself of the emphasis that was placed by the investigating officer upon the non-military character of the Police Force. One cannot forget that report when one looks at the Estimates and sees the amount for arms and ammunition and things of that kind. Superintendent Calver recommended certain things which this colony should adopt with regard to its Police Force and I consider that one of the most important recommendations in his report, and which is the most essential, is that we

should depart from the long established practice of associating a military character to our Police Force not only of the military titles which certain of the Officers very much like, but of the soldiery usage of the Force. I think we all would like to have a Police Force which is non-military particularly in view of the fact that we have the Barbados Regiment. Arms and ammunition should predominantly be a matter for the Barbados Regiment; we should like to see that item less and less a matter for the Police Department. We should like to see the amount of \$2,880 for arms and ammunition which we have to consider later on under the Head,—Police,—form part of another amount of \$5,000 for a similar purpose under the Head,—Barbados Regiment. Although it may be all well and good that I should refer to this matter, perhaps I need not worry myself with it too much because, there may be, when the new Commissioner of Police whom I am convinced, has an unusually honest appearance for a Police Officer, who bears a surname which is renowned in this Chamber and who comes here under favourable and fortunate auspices, takes up his duties in full a marked improvement in the running of the Force by his seeing to it that it is established on the civil basis which has been recommended as essential for its good running.

Another matter in regard to general policy to which I would now refer is the question of casual labour in the Public Works, Waterworks and H. & T. Departments. This matter is the subject of remarks every now and then in this House. The question of policy concerns either the honourable Minister in charge of Labour or his colleague, the Minister in charge of Public Works. I have always contended and put up for consideration to those honourable members that just as private employers in Bridgetown—and you cannot find any worse than them—give half-days when there is cricket or races without any deduction from pay to their employees, Government should do no less than they. After all, employees are human beings and it is a fact that the quality or quantity of work which you can get from them when happenings such as cricket is taking place is negligible. Everyone of them concentrates by the nearest radio over what is taking place and it would be kinder if you gave them the half-day off. Those employees would come back the next day not only blessing the Government but exercising themselves in almost super-human fashion to show their appreciation. I would exhort officials of the local Trade Union to join with me in this campaign or crusade to get time off for these casual labourers of Government without any reduction from their pay. Mr. Speaker, if the merchants of Bridgetown did not feel that they were getting returns from their employees when they gave such half-holidays, they would not allow their employers a half-second off. These merchants and private employers do see a corresponding improvement in the working of their employers in appreciation of the magnanimous attitude towards them. Let this Government which represents the people give a similar benefit.

Another matter of general policy which I commend to the consideration of Government and for which they have twelve months to consider, is the question of equal pay for male and female teachers. I would really like Government to consider this matter before the next Estimates so that equal pay for each could be set down in them. It does not matter if there is any precedent for it. I am always concerned with principles. Establishing a precedent is nothing wrong; especially when you are establishing a good precedent. I do hope the honourable senior member for St. Michael and the honourable senior

member for St. Thomas, behind the closed doors of the Cabinet, would do as they used to do before, but even with greater zeal, more emphasis, more vehemence and increased enthusiasm in the cause of equal pay for women as for men who are employed in the Government Service and especially should this be so in the one thing for which they cannot even be suggested that there is a difference, that is in the Teaching Service. I hope we will see the results in this respect with the presentation of the next annual Budget.

Now, Sir, there has been a certain amount of recognition by the payment of legislators a few years ago and the modest increase which was put on a short while ago, of the service one renders to one's country in these hard times. I feel if we accept that as a right principle, there is no justification for not applying it in the case of jurors. In looking at the Colonial Estimates one is reminded only too forcibly that jurors at the Court of Grand Sessions receive the same sum of \$1.54 per day in this year of grace as they received in the year 1891. Like legislators they are doing a public duty but while they are doing so, their time is being used up and in consequence, their families are deprived of their earning capacity between one to six weeks through their inability to pursue their normal vocations. Having recognised the principle in respect of payment of legislators for the public service they render, one should also recognise the principle of adequate pay for jurors who sit in judgment on their fellowmen so that his pocket should not be empty when he has to make decisions. Some of these jurors have to pay as much as 52c. per day for bus-fare to and from their homes. That leaves them with only \$1.02 and if a juror is not empanelled he has to get some lunch out of that. You can see what remains to serve his family. Sir, it is no use for us to be like ostriches burying our heads in the sand; we should look at this matter from a logical point of view. I do admit that it is an honour to be summoned as a juror but we must not look at it only in this manner. While it is a grand thing to be honoured by being the Lord Bishop of Barbados or Governor and Commander-in-Chief of Barbados and to be so titled, these are not honorary posts, nor do their holders get nominal pay; individuals holding those posts get enough to have their minds relieved of the worry of finances so that they can perform their duties with a clear head and honest heart. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that one's financial worries should not be burdensome when one is trying to unravel difficult problems in the administration of criminal justice. I trust this matter which has been a matter of long delayed action will be the subject of some consideration between now and the presentation of the next Colonial Estimates.

Our educational establishment is a matter to which I shall make some reference. I will remind honourable members of this House and particularly honourable members of the Cabinet, that the electorate expected and still expect and will continue to expect so long as the present Labour Party is in power, that they will hear something and see some fruit in connection with which so much mention was made and so much publicity was given—social services and education—during the last election campaign and which endeared the Party's policy to such a considerable number of the electorate. Let us not forget that the people who put the Labour Party here, had in their minds among other things and were looking forward to it—the carrying out of the Party's promise as expressed in the publication "Labour Marches On"—the provision of a hot mid-day meal free to those Elementary School children who are unable to pay for it, and to the extent of

the Government's financial ability to do so. I submit that it is the duty of the Government to make at least a token provision in this respect. Let it not be said that at election time we promised everything but we have not put it into execution. I repeat that some move should be made to provide the children of the Elementary Schools who are unable to pay for it, a free, hot mid-day meal and to the full extent of the Government's financial ability to do so; that will enable us to reap greater benefits from our educational outlay.

What benefit do the children derive from attending the schools in the afternoon with their stomachs empty?—Absolutely none. We should not let it be said that we put forward a policy for the purpose of getting votes, but after three years or so we have not even made a beginning with a token scheme. I submit that between now and next year it is the duty of the Government to do the maximum they can in order to satisfy the public. Let us not forget that in addition to the policy we put forward of providing a free, hot mid-day meal for those children who are unable to pay for it and to the extent of the Government's financial ability to do so, we also expressed our belief in the policy of giving free secondary education in this colony, again in accordance with the colony's financial ability to give it. We are all looking forward to the next Colonial Estimates to see Government proposals in respect of free secondary education; we do not expect that all secondary education will be free or that every child in the Elementary Schools will be given a free, hot mid-day meal, but we expect that a start will be made in this direction. Any start, except a false start, is essential.

I cannot help referring to the question of the establishment of a Government Printery. As we look at these Estimates we see that we are voting \$90,000 this year for Government printing; last year the amount voted was \$84,000, in the year before that it was \$83,961 and in the year before that it was \$70,993, and this expenditure does not include stationery. Is it not apparent how heavily we are carrying on a form of subsidisation there? We are subsidising a private Company there and we are obviously that private Company's best customer. I feel that it would not be beyond the resources and ability of the present Cabinet to initiate the necessary steps for the establishment of a Government Printery.

A Government Printery is like the Deep Water Harbour; what we regard as small islands we will find a Government Printery in practically each of them. The people from those islands are amazed when they come here and we tell them that there is no such thing as a Government Printery in this island; people from other colonies are amazed when they come to Barbados and find that the steamer is far out in the harbour and they have to get a boat so as to come ashore. You will find a Deep Water Harbour in places such as St. Lucia, Grenada, Curacao, Aruba and Trinidad—places which we on many occasions describe as being backward in many respects; we are on a par with St. Vincent when it comes to a Deep Water Harbour. St. Vincent, Dominica and Montserrat are in the same position where a Deep Water Harbour is concerned, but it seems as if in Barbados a move is being made along Sir Douglas Ritchie's recommendation. The Ministers will spend some sleepless nights until they can find a solution to the matters which I have mentioned; I think I have covered most of the ground which has not been sufficiently covered in my opinion and it is sufficiently early in the morning to give other honourable members an opportunity to expatiate on the Budget.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I suggest that if there is any other honourable member who wants to speak he should speak now.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: At this hour of the morning I am not accustomed to be awake and it is unfair to ask honourable members to make speeches now. After all that has been said there is very little I had to say and I did not intend to say anything at all; but if it is thought that I should say a few words, I am quite willing to do so. I would like to say that never before in this Chamber have I heard such bitter speeches as those which were made from this side of the horse-shoe, and we have seen the Ministers all above the Premier sitting silently, hearing suggestions made and doing nothing. Obviously the reason is that they have not been sufficiently long in their saddle as to be able to ride the horse successfully, and they wait for a call before they rise to their feet. One has heard speeches from over here and, as somebody has expressed it, with doctrine from the Executive, they seem to become better than before. We can appreciate a speech such as that the honourable junior member for St. Peter has made, and he is not singular in that respect.

We have heard what will often be the case in Budget Speeches, just a dry set of figures thrown at our heads, figures which you could obtain to a large extent by looking through this big white book, and we have not been given any further explanation of policy in truth and in fact than what you could read in the Five Year Plan; and you were reminded that the Five Year Plan made it unnecessary for a Budget Speech to be made. What we were waiting to hear was the answer to the policy which is advanced and which is to be pursued in respect of the subjects for which Ministers were appointed and if they would have the right to dictate policy. They were bankrupt a month ago and we had hoped that they would not be bankrupt today; today you have heard suggestions from the backbenchers and suggestions from over here.

I will begin on this note. We find that the Administrator of this colony has refused to name the Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition, and we, from time to time, refer to the Leader of the Opposition. If there is no Opposition then there is really no Party system; if there is a Party system it admits of a strange form of Party system. I suggest that if the Head of the Administration finds either that there is no Party system or that there is an Opposition, he should say so. I am not concerned with any leadership of the Opposition; I can afford to bring to the notice of the Premier that he should decide whether there is an Opposition or not. The peculiar thing about it is that they pay a man money to occupy the position of Leader of the Opposition at such a figure that no man who had been successful in life, would be able to accept the position and do the job, as it should be done, properly. Anyone who knows about Party Government would think that the Leader of the Opposition would have to be paid more than \$40 more than the ordinary member of the House and he would have to occupy an office near the Parliament Buildings where he could conduct business in opposition to the Government. If he must do this work properly he must have an office to do work which seems to require five men on the opposite side to do. Whether they are having a Ministerial system or a Party system or not, they will find men in this Assembly willing to do what they feel should be done for the good of the country.

We have been told that we have the conduct of our affairs in our own hands: I have said that, irrespective of the difference which I may feel from per-

sons of a different political persuasion, I would sooner have the fate of Barbados in the hands of a fellow Barbadian than in the hands of another person even although I may think that the Barbadian does not possess the integrity for holding the position he occupies; I believe that we would sooner be in the hands of our own people than in the hands of people who are "ships passing in the night." But these things do not really belong to this Budget.

If this budget which has been presented to us suffers from anything, it suffers from an abundance of caution; we may laugh at each other making speeches, but they are all good humour. The visions of the honourable junior member for St. George may not be as practical as he thinks, but they show the quality which is to be put into the Government. We now have five honourable members who are being paid proper salaries and who will have all the time at their disposal to serve the colony; I hope it is not true that they indulge in their callings and draw the salaries which we have awarded them definitely on the understanding that they would devote their whole time to the business of this island.

Be that as it may, when one takes up the Budget and has a chance of going through it, one could not accuse the Premier of being a Socialist. He may have called himself a Socialist but he was born a Liberal, reared a Liberal and he practised as a Liberal and if he has Communistic dogmas to present to the people so as to get elected, that is recognised as one of the tricks of the trade which are not dishonourable. This Budget has no smell of Socialism in it; this is the Budget of a sensible, reasonable man facing a situation with a one-crop economy and keeping money for a rainy day, as the Premier said himself and I said myself as Attorney General acting for the Government. I would think that the Premier could have risked more on the new system which is obtaining now that he has as advisers probably the three most brilliant conservative men in the island it is possible to have, and you can almost smell their wisdom in some of the things which have been done. As a matter of fact, when the Premier was presenting the figures, he seemed to have been looking over his left shoulder to see whom he regarded as being his financial adviser in Executive Committee whom we regard as a brilliant man. The Estimates show what is done in presenting a Company's balance sheet and I smell the hand of an auditor in them; there is the putting away of sums of money into a fund which will be available in case of crisis, collecting taxation and only fulfilling some of the promises made to the colony in the Estimates and finishing up year after year with \$1½ million more.

I am not altogether blaming the honourable member because he has said that he is going to enjoy a life-long holding of the Premiership. (Honourable G. H. ADAMS: I said nothing of that sort). I heard that or its equivalent. It is well that the honourable member should keep some of these funds for the reasons as he has stated in paragraph 4 of the Memorandum on the Estimates, and we know that there are five different matters which may affect the island's future economy—reduction in the sugar export trade, decrease in the price, the necessity for the restriction of the production of sugar—we passed an Act to that effect in 1940—the fourth matter is that the crop is dependent upon the weather in any event and the fifth is that although the Government has at once taken steps to fight the mealy bug pest the danger has not yet been overcome. We know that the crop this year is expected to be somewhere in the vicinity of 180,000 tons; of that amount 132,000 tons are expected to be sold at the rate which

is allowed to people in the Empire who belong to the equivalent of a pool, 10,000 tons for local consumption, 4,000 tons for confectionery, 19,000 tons will be sold in the free market, 12,000 tons will be in respect of fancy molasses and we will have 4,000 tons without any market at all. I see that there was a surplus of 36,000 tons which has not been sold in Jamaica; I take it that these facts are well known to the Government and therefore they are telling us in advance that the results of their having to bring down the production will definitely mean that the income of the country itself will be correspondingly reduced by that amount of money which would have come in from the sale of sugar abroad; there will therefore be less money in circulation. The result will be that we will find ourselves with a much smaller income because one must remember that if the price of sugar drops there will be a drop off the profit entirely.

Any drop in the price of sugar will not affect the income which the Government will receive this year because income tax this year is calculated on last year's profits; but if the cane grower receives a dollar less for every ton of canes this year, you will see that there will be less money in circulation and next year the Government will receive less income tax. If it is so that the land is producing more than before, the Minister of Agriculture will be faced with the position that every 100 or 200 acres less will produce just as much cane as before, and if he is not allowed to produce 180,000 tons because he is called upon to limit the amount of sugar produced, he will be looking for some scheme to deal with the land of which he has to make some use. In the result one will find that the country might well be losing a large amount of income tax, there will be even a larger amount of money not going into circulation and the result will be lack of money with even more unemployment.

If I venture a prophesy I hope the honourable junior member for St. George will forgive me if I turn out to be wrong; we should normally expect that the sugar crops of the world will reach a state of over-production by next year. In 1946 I ventured that opinion to my friends and I ventured the opinion on the basis that history usually repeats itself. In 1918 the first World War came to an end and by 1930 with sugar being produced all over the world, Barbados was in a crisis and we were getting \$1.60 for 100 lbs. of sugar instead of 10 cents a pound. I believe that the same thing is beginning to happen again. This is almost a defence of the Government; sugar is being over-produced throughout the world and we have no hope of being able to produce the full limit of what we can produce by increased production per acre, but we are likely to find ourselves being compelled to reduce our quota and throw on the market something which we cannot sell at all. If that is so, and it appears to be so, we have got to realise that we have to set about doing something now. I have always agreed that we should get to work on the Deep Water Harbour sooner than soon because that will furnish us with employment and will help us over a period and we can find out how we can carry on, in case we have to carry on, with our one-crop economy. If the burden is not too heavy for us to bear, one can only hope that the Government will be able to get this money on the market because I have a feeling that money is getting hard to get every day and we want \$20 million for the project of the Deep Water Harbour.

On the other side of the picture, England can only pay this fancy price for sugar as long as she can reserve this market to herself and sell her goods

here. If England finds difficulty from the financial end, obviously we will meet not merely with a reduction in production but a very severe reduction in price. That has happened before and it will happen again. I can say that in 1930 in the midst of a crisis for the first time I was concerned with the Government, the British Government refused to help us in any way unless we could reckon with the \$100 thousand which we had saved, in the event of a hurricane, in a special fund. I admit that England's conscience is a little clearer today, but if she finds that Japan, Germany and other countries can sell us goods at a cheaper price—

At this stage Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the Chairman of Committees took the Chair.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that if England finds that countries such as Japan, Germany and others can sell us goods at a price which is much cheaper than hers and she can find any excuse or reason for pinning us down to buying her expensive goods, she will have no option but to reduce the price of sugar: history is repeating itself. You will see that the result will be that we will get a much lower price for sugar than what we are getting now. Those are things which the Government has probably taken into account; those are things which I have noted have been put in that paragraph of the Memorandum. These things were not explained in full to us and we did not expect the Premier to do that; we expected and hoped that the Ministers concerned, having heard the speeches from over here, would have done their best to help us as to what they thought the policy was. To throw all the burden on the Premier is inconsistent with their position and that is asking too much of any one man. I appreciate the fact that the Ministers have not been sufficiently long in their position, but we are faced with the situation that our birth rate is high, and it has been put to me that with the new drugs births are even more likely to take place because disease which used to cause death is cured; therefore we have our population increasing at a high rate and we have no prospect of a rosy future.

I cannot express the position as well as the honourable junior member for St. Peter has done; he obviously had the opportunity of learning things which I have not had the opportunity of learning. However, I would like to stress the problem as he has put it to the Government; what are they going to do when these things overtake them? The sum of \$8 million being in the Treasury cannot save them with the expenditure which they have heaped up and with which the colony is now saddled in the face of lower production and unemployment which is getting worse and worse. Many years ago it was mentioned to me by the then junior member for St. Philip (Mr. Smith) in this House and afterwards I was persuaded he was right—then it was mentioned to me by the late Dr. O'Neale that our real and only trouble in Barbados was unemployment. We have people who are willing to work anywhere in the world and we could easily institute systems of training which would fit them for anywhere in the world; but as has been mentioned by more than one speaker, if Curacao is sending back our workers, if they are not wanted in England and other places and only a few can go to Canada and the United States, what are we going to do? Every year we see Harrison College, Combermere, Lodge School and the Elementary Schools turning out children by the thousands and we have to find work for them: There is the question of the tourist industry to be encouraged and it is for the Ministers to tell us what can be done in this matter because how they will face up to these things and do not wait until the position gets worse.

Years ago we tried out settlement at Vieux Fort as an experiment because it was stated that we were losing the pioneering spirit, and then we had a long Report on the mission to British Honduras. We have either got to find some place to which we can emigrate people or develop Boards or Companies which will try to find somewhere for people to live, and that is a short-term policy. As a long-term policy—the only one of which I can think—is that the knowledge of birth control should be brought home to people. When we had to deal with venereal disease, we approached the problem and we stamped it out. In 1931 I managed to get the Governor to set up a Committee to study the question as to whether or not it was possible to bring home the knowledge of birth control to the people of this colony. Two or three doctors and three laymen were appointed to see whether that was possible; one doctor from the Other Place was opposed to it and the minute paper in connection with this matter disappeared and has never been found. I asked for it time after time; I do know that some of the doctors and laymen were in favour of this matter. It has always seemed strange that those of us who have education, manage to limit our families and those of us who do not have that education have unlimited families: the answer seems to be that some of us carry sufficient knowledge as to be able to keep down our families to the number we can support and not have them up to the “fives” or the “tens”. Perhaps a Committee could be set up to see about this matter again. No one requires any compulsion; I only suggest that this knowledge should be put within the grasp of the poor people and facilities should be provided for the setting up of clinics where teaching and instruction could be given, otherwise, I myself, do not know what we are going to do. I know that there are many people who are against this instruction being given; the Roman Catholic Church tells you that you should do what apparently the Priests are supposed to do. It will not work and never will work if it is not practical.

The hour is very late but there are two pages of the Estimates which I would like to draw to the attention of honourable members, because this is a matter which should be looked at. On these pages honourable members will see “Liabilities” on one side and “Assets” on the other; they will see the Revenue Equalisation Fund Account for 1951–52 and for 1952–53 and above that they will see funds amounting to \$3,115,401 which can be utilised. Under the heading “Liabilities” they will see a total sum of \$13,103,610. On the “Assets” side honourable members will see “Cash on Deposit Account Barclay’s Bank” \$3,250,000, and “Cash on Current Account Barclays Bank” and other Banks amounting to \$2,006,494, “Due by Crown Agents”, \$3,848,427, “Advances”, \$660,339, “Investments” amounting to \$1,814,878. Honourable members will see where the funds are because it has been drawn to their attention that there are local funds available for different purposes. The policy for sometime in the past has been that you deal with matters of capital expenditure from current revenue, and this year the sum of \$250,000 is to be contributed, the principle being that every year the present generation must contribute to some of the capital works, whereas capital works should be dealt with by means of loans. Honourable members will see that there has been an advance of general revenue which will be paid back if the loan is acquired.

As a matter of business I do not expect that the Government will be acquiring loans when they have a big surplus balance because that would be bad business. There is nothing in the world to pre-

vent the Government from using their own surplus balance for doing what is to be done and only obtaining loan funds when the market is suitable; you use your surplus balance and get loans at the most advantageous times. The Government will have to watch the expenditure for the ten-year period 1943–1953; if honourable members pass over the first two pages of the Estimates they will see that the total expenditure from 1943–44 was \$4,194,090 and the total expenditure from 1952–53 was \$11,423,910; they will see that in some years the expenditure goes up half a million dollars and sometimes it goes up a million dollars. We have heard the statement made by the Government and we appreciate the fact that they not only have to watch expenditure, but that they are going to increase it, and if there is a fall in the production of sugar they will have to meet that expenditure because retrenchment is one of the most difficult things known to the Government. The expenditure would be due to the Government increasing the number of posts and jobs whether or not it is expected the money could have been saved. The cost of living has gone up because we have to pay Civil Servants an increased amount of money; on the other hand we have to remember that we have a one-crop industry. The surrounding colonies have started industries; we are not likely to start the same industries and then have no market for the sale of the goods. We will therefore be confined to the tourist industry and the sugar industry.

We heard a lot about the dairy industry; Mr. Wakefield of the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation suggested a milk industry and a changed system of farming so that we would not have to rely on sugar alone. When Mr. Wakefield was here, I remember some of his advice to me then; it was that we would have to remember that in the not distant future the quantity of sugar which used to be produced might be reduced and that is apparently becoming true. We have been able to produce as much as 187,000 tons a few years ago; now the production is 180,000 tons and we seem to be getting back to what Mr. Wakefield told us. We are going to be thrown back on the tourist industry; I take a great deal of interest in the Tourist Board; I am one of the few surviving people who started with the Publicity Committee. I take interest in it because when it was started I thought we would be foolish if we did not put money in it. We hope not only to get the B.O.A.C. lines coming here, but also the American lines; if we have not got the hotels we will get them if the demand is great enough.

There is one other point which I would like to draw to the attention of honourable members. I have not heard anybody refer to it but if honourable members look at page 164 of the Estimates they will see what I term as the hidden losses. They will see “Investments at 31st December, 1953”, and the Special Funds show a net depreciation of \$92,637. The investments in respect of the Sinking Fund show a net depreciation of \$94,567 and the investment in connection with the Barbados Savings Bank shows a depreciation of \$1,112,392. The Government Savings Bank is guaranteed by the Government; somebody asked me earlier to explain what is meant by this depreciation, but it is plain what it means. The cost of the investments in the Crown Agents’ hands, which are the securities from which we pay persons who deposit their money in the Bank, is \$12,926,601; these securities are probably easily available because the Directors of the Bank carry out a regular examination of the position. I do not know what the position is now, and I suppose the Premier could probably tell me off-hand; but here what costs the Bank roughly \$13 million is worth

\$11,814,209. The Government guarantees the funds in the Bank and they have to set aside the equivalent amount of money to some suspense account to meet any loss in case the Government finds itself in a position not to be able to meet the demands for the money which is invested and which has accumulated to \$12,926,601. If this were an ordinary Bank and the balance sheet showed a loss like this, that would be a loss to the Bank; but in respect of this Bank the funds are guaranteed by the Government.

There were other things which I wanted to say something about, but they have been largely dealt with by other honourable members; there is therefore no necessity for me to say anything at all after listening to the speeches of those honourable members. It would have been very interesting for us to have been able to digest more of the figures and appendices which were given us. The Government is in the position where it is being asked not to accumulate these balances and it is also in the position that it knows it may have to face a bad market; they have a reserve but they may find that they have to retrench at a time when it may be difficult to do so. The Government has always promised to do more than it has done; I think it is a false policy to set out that they are going to do something unless they can do it. The only case in which the Head of a Department has showed his initiative in spending the money allocated to the Department is the Head of the Waterworks Department; although we were told that the demands of the different Departments were great and they were scaled down to a certain figure to give no one more than the amount which was set aside in the Five Year Plan, we find that one Department which has managed to complete much more of its work than it was scheduled to complete within two years, has been treated preferentially to the other Departments. That is definitely against what we were told in the Five Year Plan and what will appear in the Plan if you read it. I think that as compared with the rest of the world, the one thing in respect of which we can hold our head up is the water supply and it is better than before. It is a complete error of judgment to spend more money than was allocated to a satisfactory Department as compared with other parts of the world, and to omit to do that which we know we should try to do now that we have the money. I need not press that matter. I should like to ask what is the use of telling us that you are making provision for 600 houses and all you are doing is playing with a difficult problem?

I feel that so far as we are concerned, whether there is an Opposition or not, it makes no difference; we prefer our own people to rule Barbados even although it is said that they have some rebels in their ranks. Now that there has been committed to individuals the care of certain Departments it is the prerogative and right and duty of the backbenchers to get them down to it; that is why we asked for whole-time services of our Ministers and that is what we expect and hope to get. We have had to listen to figures thrown at our heads with only a little bit of policy and we are merely told that taxation is the same as it was last year; the Premier computed the whole thing as being the same as last year and he read the Memorandum on the Estimates on that basis. I repeat: now that you have the money which you may never have in your life again if my prognostications are correct, for Heaven's sake do what you can do now. I have been guilty of saying that I would sooner see a man take sand from one part of the beach and carry it to another part and bring

it back than see him idle; no one knows how much a shilling earns if you keep it running. You get nowhere if you sit down and look at figures or look at money.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: When the honourable member who has just sat down forgets his age and experience, he makes a mess of things; but when he is natural and draws on his ability, age and experience, he delivers a fine speech. The honourable member was playing politics when he first got up, following the honourable junior member for St. Peter; if he continues along that line, he may get the honourable junior member for St. Peter in his Party, but he will be an unfortunate bedfellow.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: On a point of order. When I want preaching from the honourable member, I will come to you, Sir, for a death certificate.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If the honourable member means political death, he can get a certificate from me. The honourable member started off by just repeating some remarks of some honourable members with less experience than himself, those who are playing politics, and described the Budget as a conservative one; he then spoke of the excessive caution of the Government and proceeded with the lamentations of Jeremiah. I have not heard any other member telling us of the gloominess with which the future faces us; his lamentations are the complete answer to the suggestion that we should spend more money and we are Conservatives and not Socialists. I will have to speak now for about twenty minutes or half an hour whereas I only intended to speak for about ten minutes.

Broadly speaking, the honourable member's accusation is that this Budget is not a Socialist one and that we are too cautious; I do not see the matter in any of the gloomy terms in which the honourable member has spoken. The honourable member's lamentations are also the complete answer to the honourable junior member for St. John who constantly suggests that the Revenue Equalisation Fund should never have been there. As the honourable junior member for St. James has argued, what is \$8 million in the Treasury if the price of sugar goes down and we get a drought? When you think of the necessity of borrowing money you will see that, viewed from a strict point of view, we will have to do some begging.

There is a general rule that a colony should have in reserve at least enough for six months which, in our case, will be \$7 million; so that while it is true from one angle that our finances are buoyant, from another angle, however much it might appear to some people that our revenue is so good that there is nobody who would not think that we can raise this money, I am hoping that with the presentation of our case to the Colonial Office and the Crown Agents for a loan or grant or both in respect of the Deep Water Harbour—I am hoping that with my persuasion we will be able to raise this loan. It is true that we have got over one hurdle in respect of the B.U.O.C., but we have the prognostications of the honourable junior member for St. James as to the attitude of Great Britain to the colonies and her own taxpayers.

I have to digress so as to answer sneers and I am sorry for that for the reason that I will incidentally be disclosing something which has happened or not happened in Executive Committee. I have not had a minute's conversation with Honourable H. A. Cuke as regards this Budget: no auditor has prepared this Budget for me. Neither of two honourable Members as distinct from officials attended a single meeting of the Estimates Committee: the stu-

pid sneers which we have heard are characteristic of some people who think that other people cannot think for themselves.

We are a Socialist Party however much the honourable junior member for St. James talks about my having been born a Liberal. I was a Liberal until I reached the stage where I found that there was no room in this world for a Liberal Party although there is an abundance of room for liberalism. If the honourable member and other people are banking on my being a Liberal they are riding for a fall; Sir Stafford Cripps was very cautious in his Budgets in the last days but nobody could really say that he was a Liberal or Conservative as I am accused of being at times. To face realities and put your country above a mere repetition of Socialist slogans, is no reason to suppose that you have deserted Socialist principles.

The honourable junior member for Christ Church spoke about a threat being made to the merchants. It is our duty to see that price controls are kept on. It is specifically set out in the Five Year Plan that we are as anxious as the commercial community to remove price controls where they serve no useful purpose. This is what we said in the Five Year Plan:

"The opportunity is taken here to repeat that the Government is as anxious as the commercial community to remove price controls, where they serve no useful purpose, and it will do so progressively as and when it is satisfied such action would be in the general interests of the community"

What is the use of having price control on a Rolls Royce? It might be useful to have price control on tomatoes. Why tell the Government that competition will bring down prices? If competition is going to bring down prices, prices will drop now and the Government will be informed that competition is bringing down prices. Why tell us that because goods are in good supply competition will bring down prices? And as regards "sales" they were taking place in Broad Street from the time that Adam was a boy.

I know when I first started to go to England that I never bought as much as three handkerchiefs there; I did all my buying in Barbados; now, I know it is cheaper to buy in London than in Bridgetown. I am of the opinion that merchants in Broad Street will have to make large reductions in their prices because other people are coming in with cheaper textiles. It is known that Trinidadians paid six cents for shark when it was controlled, and the week after it was decontrolled it went up from six cents to thirty-six cents. All over the world it has happened. It has happened in the U.S.A. and in New Zealand. Sir, I am going to make what can be termed a plain statement by this Government. As far as price controls are concerned, for the good of the colony, we are going to keep them on, not only until the item is said not to be in short supply, but until we are satisfied that it is in open market and we are going to put any commodity back under price control if we see that after it has been decontrolled the price goes up.

I have been taken to task in my speech for having no policy. As Your Honour has often said, "adversity is a great corrective." Apparently, the honourable junior member for St. Peter has learned nothing at all for all of those years he was a member of the Government, because he has mentioned that you should set out a policy in a budget speech. I made the point very clear before the Ministerial System began that I intended to adopt as

near as possible the system of Great Britain. The honourable junior member for St. James has chronologically followed the honourable junior member for St. Peter. The honourable junior member for St. Peter said that the policy of the Government should be declared and the honourable junior member for St. James actually repeated it in the same way by saying: "You lack policy." Sir, no Chancellor of the Exchequer ever put general policy in a budget speech because it is not the practice. What the Chancellor of the Exchequer does and what has not been done until this year here is what Governor Bushe had intimated and that is—and it is only fair—that you should let the people know what the taxation is going to be. What I promise to do,—I have to put it that way—when we are putting forward the Budget (technically it is still called the Barbados Colonial Estimates) we will follow as closely as possible the English practice. If honourable members take the trouble of reading the little book on Parliamentary Procedure which I have just quoted, they will see that the consideration of the financial statement for the year is the most important thing of the finances of the Ways and Means Committee. In this colony the equivalent is our Committee of Supply. The statement is made when the Minister of Food has finished estimating and usually after some progress is made in providing feeding grants to the Army, Navy and Air Force. That is the normal thing to be done in England, otherwise you could not run the Army, Navy and Air Force. After that is done, they then put forward the ordinary Budget. Let me repeat that in that statement there is not one word of policy; it is barely a presentation of Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure and with the information which we are telling you as from this year, that is, what taxation is going to be. We are saying what the rates of income tax and company tax should be, therefore, everybody will know, as is known in England when the Budget is presented, what their taxation should be.

There is no new policy. The policy has been enunciated in the Five-Year Plan. Even if it were customary to set out policy,—I have already stated that it would not be necessary for me to do so—the whole of the Caribbean Area, and I would almost go as far as to say the whole world, knows what is enunciated in the Five-year Plan is our policy. We hammered that out then and as somebody has said, there were some first-class speeches made by honourable members from all around the table on its discussion. Whether we agreed in whole or in part as the Electors Association Opposition did, or whether you differed from it for the most part as one or two members may have done, at any rate, it can be said that we hammered it out and we set out our policy on this, that and the other thing. We set out our policy of development and taxation and in it we said that we would confine our capital expenditure to \$10,000,000 for the first three years. We did everything in the Five-Year Plan. We said what would be our priorities for the next five years. We said that while we did not intend to spend one-fifth of the total expenditure each year, we would endeavour not to do more than would enable us to spread the expenditure over the period of five years. We stated what we expected we would collect from taxation by entertainment tax, by the addition on the rum and tobacco tax, and so on, as well as on miscellaneous fees. What is contained in the Five-Year Plan has been our policy.

Sir, last year, I spoke for exactly a half an hour on the Budget. I told honourable members

then that there was practical nothing new I could say as the Budget was based on the Five Year Plan which was discussed only a few months previously. All I said then was: "These are the things which are going to be done." Probably, had not for the fact that Ministerial Status had recently started, I would never have spoken at greater length than I did last year. Some honourable member has said that what the Premier said was what we knew; he has told us nothing that we did not know. I only ask: What is the Budget but a mass of figures? No matter how eloquent a Chancellor of the Exchequer may be, whenever he is presenting a budget, he can only give you a mass of figures. Not even the eloquence of the late Sir Stafford Cripps or Sir John Simon who were Chancellors of the Exchequer made the Budget anything more than a dreary set of figures. Sir, our policy,—the Labour Party's—has been set out in our manifesto. The Conservatives know it only too well because they have copied it line by line.

(A VOICE: We wrote ours first. Can't you remember that you begged me for a copy and paid a sixpence for it?)

Sir, we wrote our policy in 1940, and again in 1944 and 1946. The one which we wrote in 1948 was merely a bringing together of what we had previously written because of it being election time. Of course, we omitted what we had achieved. We set out in that manifesto our policy of controlling the Upper House, about what we intended to do with the Peasants' Loan Bank and such other things. All those things were discussed again completely in 1952 when we discussed the Five Year Plan. We were already proceeding with the first instalment and since then, we came down with the second instalment of the Five Year Plan, and this is now our third instalment. I therefore cannot understand some honourable members now saying: "Where are your politics?" That to me is childish politics.

Before I go into one or two other points made, I will touch on the statement by the honourable junior member for St. James when he speaks about the other four ministers remaining silent. I am sure that the honourable member must have gone into the House of Commons and listened to a budget speech. Cabinet Ministers do not speak on the Budget; they only speak when a matter comes up afterwards dealing with their departments. As a matter of fact, two of our ministers have only now come into the Government—the honourable senior member for St. Thomas and the honourable senior member for Christ Church. They came in when the Estimates were practically finished and there may be points on which they may well have to be briefed; but I hope you will not be surprised when I tell you that on the question of unemployment, in the short time that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas was Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, he has done a lot for the coopers and more than other people have done for them. I will deal with that more specifically later. Allow me just to say as I have said in public recently that I am perfectly prepared to hold out the olive branch to anybody and to work in co-operation with anybody who would work for the good of the country but even if Government allows a charge to go unanswered, do not take tolerance for weakness. Let me say again that the four Ministers like Ministers of the Cabinet will remain silent until they are dealing their departments. When it comes to the set of estimates which should be handled by the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour and by the Minister of Agriculture, lands and Fisheries, it may be that points may arise about which they have not the background

knowledge like the three of us who have been members of the Government before and one of us may have to answer such points. That is the answer to the four Ministers being silent.

Now the honourable junior member for St. James for some reason or other when he was making his speech was not his natural self. He began by making a fine speech.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Certain things are etiquette but is what the honourable Premier saying etiquette? He is talking about my being not my natural self. Are these not comments which are unparliamentary? If my arguments did not appeal to him he is entitled to say so. But he is not entitled to talk of me as if he were God Almighty.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable member is really not himself. He is thinking of himself being a god. That is the trouble.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I certainly object to your remarks.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable junior member for St. James when he spoke out of the abundance of his experience in having to introduce Estimates made a fine speech but when he was merely playing politics he said things that on sober reflection he would not say because he would think they were not worthy of him. The honourable member spoke of the Leader of the Opposition not existing and of not advising the Governor on it. The honourable member knows that the Bushe Experiment only went a little way of introducing a Ministerial System. He knows that, because he was in here before the introduction; as a matter of fact, he was the cause of it. Following the English conventions, as the honourable member knows, it is the duty of the Officer Administering the Government to send for the person who in his opinion appears best able to command a majority in the House and to ask him in effect to form a Cabinet. That is the Bushe Experiment. That is the initiation of the Ministerial System. Now what is the initiation of a Ministerial System such as we have, what is the position of the Governor sending for the person who in his opinion would be performing the function of Leader of the Opposition? Let me say: you can hardly imagine in any function of that sort—although it is one of my duties as Premier to advise the Governor—that I can advise him. In a matter of that sort the Governor must use his own eyes if the objects are there or his own judgment. It must be remembered that where there is a party organisation there may be times when the existence of parties is clearly defined and that must have something to do with the Governor appointing a Leader of the Opposition. It may be all well and good when there is only a two-party system that you can spot who is the Leader of the Opposition, but then there may be occasions when they may be three, four or five parties and that can cause a difficulty in finding the Leader of the Opposition. I will refresh the memory of the honourable junior member for St. James by reading something on it from May's Parliamentary Procedure, although the honourable member must have read it already. It reads as follows:—

"Just as the seating of members in the House of Commons is arranged on the basis of a single clear-cut division between Government and Opposition, so many other matters, and in particular the arrangement and conduct of business, have long been based on this principle. The normal condition for the working of this arrangement is the division of the House between two great parties, but the fact that there may be several separately organised parties, supporting or opposing the Government, merely complicates the working of these

"arrangements and does not destroy their efficiency."

It goes on to say:—

"The predominant share of the Government in controlling and arranging the time and business of the House is now recognised by the standing orders. But the fact that the Government is supported by a party or combination of parties and opposed by another party or combination of parties, and that the machinery evolved by these parties performs important functions in the working of procedure, is disregarded by the standing orders and has indeed been ignored in earlier editions of this work. Since in a later chapter these functions will be described in some detail, it will not be out of place here, to give a brief account of the organisation of parties, so far as it exists within the House itself, prefacing that account by a statement of the changes which the recognition of the existence of parties has effected in the old-fashioned procedure of the House of Commons."

"The practice or ancient usage of the House of Commons was developed during a period when the relation between the Commons and the Government was that between a fairly homogeneous body with a developed corporate sense and an external and not always friendly authority".

"The results of this condition, which continued to affect procedure long after the change to Cabinet government had been made, were:—

"(1) All Members were treated as on the same footing in respect of the business introduced by them, precedence between their orders and motions being dependent on the order in which they had been handed in or passed a particular stage, and business introduced by the Government being long refused any special priority".

"(2) The principle on which time was arranged was a division of the week between motion days and order days, i.e. days on which new business and business which had made some progress, respectively, was taken".

"(3) In order to prevent business being passed through so rapidly as to take possible opponents by surprise, Members had to rely upon their own powers of attention. The numbers of stages and questions on bills and other business were accordingly multiplied to what now seems an inordinate extent."

In short, that means that members had to sit in the House continuously, and could not go home before midnight. It goes on to say:—

"When government came to be associated with a party organisation inside the House opposed by another party, all this was changed. The control of the time of the House and the arrangement of business came to be dependent on the will of the Government and the old arrangement of notice days and order days practically disappeared. Similarly, the multiplication of stages and questions on business became unnecessary, even in the interest of Members who opposed such business, and these were drastically reduced. For the party organisations undertook the duty of watching the progress of business, and informed Members in advance when the taking of a decision was to be expected."

I now come to the position of the "Official Opposition." This is how it reads:—

"The importance of the Opposition in the system of parliamentary government, although it has only recently found its way into formal treatises, has long received practical recognition in the procedure of Parliament. Even before the first Reform Act the phrase "His Majesty's Opposition" had been coined—it is said, by John Cam Hobhouse. Statutory recognition has been accorded through the grant of a salary of £2,000 a year to the Leader of the Opposition. The prevalence (on the whole) of the two-party system has usually obviated any uncertainty as to which party has the right to be called the "Official Opposition"; it is the largest minority party which is prepared, in the event of the resignation of the Government, to assume office. The leader of the Opposition and his principal colleagues form a group, popularly known as the "Shadow Cabinet", each member of which contributes expert knowledge gained, for the most part, by official experience to the task of directing criticism of government policy from the point of view of a party which is bidding for the support of the nation. Since the strength of modern party discipline makes a Ministry largely invulnerable to direct attack in the House of Commons, the criticism of the Opposition is primarily directed towards the electorate, with a view to the next election or with the aim of influencing government policy through the pressure of public opinion. The Opposition has a recognised right to all the facilities needed for this purpose—full information about every department of public affairs, adequate publicity through the daily publication of the reports of debates, and certain rights of initiative in the choice of subjects of criticism. With regard to the last-mentioned right, the procedure of the House provides (as will be seen later) technical forms in which the subject of debate is left to the discretion of the House, and this discretion is conventionally exercised by the Opposition. Among such forms are motions of censure, the Address in reply to the King's Speech and, providing opportunities throughout the Session, the functions connected with the granting of supply. For the Opposition, regarded as a parliamentary institution, it may be claimed that no better system has yet been devised for ensuring that the indispensable function of criticism shall be effectively co-ordinated and exercised in a constructive and responsible spirit."

Now I am asking the honourable member to take all this as very important. The privilege is usually on both sides. Obviously it is not really a question of which party has the right to be called the official opposition; it is the largest minority party which is prepared in the event of the resignation of the Government to assume office. Everybody knows my feeling as regards the honourable junior member for Christ Church, but in his wildest moment, could he in the event of the resignation of this Government assume the task of forming a Government? What is the point then of saying we have not appointed a Leader of the Opposition? Why not take the trouble to get the facts right instead of attacking the Government or the Head of the Executive for not doing the very thing that should not be done? Owing to the state of uncertainty of parties in this colony, if this Government were to resign it might be the rebels which the honourable member does not think exist.

who might get together to form a party. When I say this Labour Government will not die so long as the people around me are alive, have I overstated it? When will the Electors' Association ever run this country again? Let me say again, to find a Leader of the Opposition is entirely a matter for His Excellency the Governor and as I have said it may be difficult, almost impossible, to find a Leader of the Opposition in the present state of the parties which are in this House.

I do not know if the honourable member does not follow the working of constitutional conventions. It is not for me to advise the Governor unless he asks for advice. He naturally goes to his constitutional adviser, the Attorney General, if he wants advice. If we may compare small things with great, certainly it is necessary to have a Leader of the Opposition nowadays in England, but this was not always so. It is necessary if Sir Winston Churchill and his Government step down from the Government of Great Britain that the Government of Great Britain in relation with the rest of the world must be carried on and in order that they should not necessarily be any hiatus in foreign policy and in matters about which they may completely agree affecting the community in the United Kingdom, it is absolutely essential to have a Leader of the Opposition. With regard to our constitution having a Leader of the Opposition it may be very important in the case of this Government resigning or in case of a delegation going away where he had to appear with somebody, that we clearly identify who should be recognised as the person who would take my place, but I repeat you must either have a clear majority group among the opposition or there must only be two recognised parties. I repeat, how can you spot a Leader of the Opposition when in the minority there may be Independents, Christian Socialists and Communists. You cannot but say they are all in the Opposition. As you look over to that side of the table, how can you say which of the Independents, which of the Electors' Association or of the Congress Party can form a Government if this Government is defeated? I have spoken at some length on this point but I have done so because it may be taken that this suggestion of some unnecessary if not wrongful delay in the Head of the Executive not designating a Leader of the Opposition is an authoritative pronouncement coming as it were from the honourable junior member for St. James who is an ex-Attorney General. Bear in mind that I speak for myself and from my knowledge of the English constitutional practice; I am not the Governor's legal adviser.

I have come to realise that my greatest fault in life is shrugging my shoulders and thinking it does not matter when people libel me. I realise now it is a fault and that it is my duty now that there is ministerial government not to let people malign the Government without replying and showing the real truth. I do not intend to speak at any great length, but I must speak on another point and that is the question of loans. Again, I must address my remarks to honourable members all around this table because in this matter we are all Barbadians.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Will the honourable Premier allow me to have a look at 'May's'? I just want to read that paragraph on largest minority group. Has the honourable Premier read it right?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable junior member for St. James has the effrontery to get up and ask me if I read it right. That is police court style.

It is surely a dishonest statement when the Editor of the Observer in his newspaper suggests that the largest minority group should be the one from which the Leader of the Opposition should come instead of stating clearly that he should be prepared to assume the Government if the Government of the day goes out of power. The Editor of that newspaper takes pride in publishing half statements. There may be another group from which a person can be found to form a coalition and so run the Government.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—Have you heard the word which the honourable Premier has used? Are you allowing him to stay there and say that?

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: What particular word? If the honourable member is taking exception to any remarks made by the honourable Premier, would he refresh my memory with the remarks?

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Did he say I was dishonest? I heard the word dishonest.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: What I said with regard to the honourable member was that he had the effrontery to ask me if I read it right. What I said about dishonesty was with reference to the Editor of the *Observer*.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: When the honourable member used the word 'dishonesty' in his remarks, I understood him as making reference to the remarks I made as a whole.

His Honour THE SPEAKER: The remarks about dishonesty as were made by the honourable Premier, were made in connection with a newspaper editor and not with any reference to the honourable junior member for St. James. That has been reported to me officially.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: As I was saying before being interrupted, we have to consider the financial position of the island very carefully. If it appears as if I am holding back anything or being careful about what I am saying, it is because certain things cause me not to say much and because there are still some secret despatches on the matter.

The British Government has told us; "Do not come and ask for this, that and the other until you have taxed certain things." At one time, it was told to us that our income tax was too low, but certainly it has been pushed up until it can be said that it is the highest in the Caribbean Area. As a matter of fact, in some brackets,—one at least—it is higher than that in Great Britain. We can now go to Colonial Office and say that we have taxed ourselves as much as we can tax ourselves and there can be no excuse for not granting us a loan. We are happy to be able to say that both our customs and income tax have yielded more than we expected. I may say that on that point, the hon. senior member for St. Philip is playing it up more than it is, but it is excusable to say so before you have all the facts and the information. I wish I could tell the honourable member something now because I can see that his arguments are laughable through his not having all of the facts. I do not mean that in any sneering way, but you have to pity a man who is sincere in his point of view but because his arguments are based on imperfect information, he is wrong in what he is saying. Sir, we can go to Colonial Office now and say that as far as our taxation is concerned, it is the highest in the area and that we have done our best to raise money. We can also ask the Colonial Office to look at our public debt and this, that and the other, and to say that if we raise loans, it is because we are looking forward to each for some particular purpose and owing to the way we conduct our finances, we

can pay back the money. We have done all that because if British money lenders were to investigate, they will be able to say that it is safe to lend us money. Because of all that, what is the good of the honourable junior member for the City saying that we are borrowing money at $4\frac{1}{2}\%$ and sending away five million dollars to get $2\frac{1}{2}\%$ on it. There are reasons why individuals, companies, firms or governments sometimes think that it is essential and better to use overdrafts than to use their cash which they have in the bank. I do ask honourable members to believe that it is with careful examination that this Government has gone into its financial position and that it is the Government's determination to go ahead as early as possible with the Deep Water Harbour scheme, not only from a long term point of view, but also from a short term point of view as it should provide work possibly for five years for persons who are out of employment.

As I have said, I have endeavoured all my life and certainly recently with greater care than before to hold out the olive branch though I would much rather fight. I accept Polonius' advice:

"Beware of entrance to a quarrel; but being in, Bear't that the opposed may beware of thee;" but if that man starts first, I am not going to be the one to cry: "Kamerad." There are times when personal inclinations must be subordinated to the good of the community and especially believing as I do that a Socialist Government is the only salvation for Barbados if not for the whole Caribbean area, and believing also that my fellow Ministers have the will, the ability and the determination to do a good day's work and to pull their weight, restrain myself.

Here I digress to say that the honourable junior member for St. James said that we are doing something wrong if we practice at our professions while we are members of the Government. What is there to prevent me from writing out a legal opinion at night after working at my office in the day? There is no such convention. To give the impression that this Government is about to do or has done something wrong, especially coming from an ex-Attorney General, is bad. If I may give another instance, suppose one of us were an architect, what is there to prevent that member from drafting a plan and getting some money for it? The only thing that prevents a barrister from practising in the courts and being a Chancellor of the Exchequer is because of his inability to find time to do both things. According to the hon. member, I am doing things which I ought not to be doing. He says that I should be spending twenty-four hours a day in my job as Minister of the Crown. Such a statement as this is absolutely untrue. I am told that I have not chucked up my practice. I am merely giving it as hearsay, but at least I have heard of one Premier who practises as a surgeon when he has the time. So long as a thing is not inconsistent with your duty to the community, you can do it. It may not be wise to sit up at nights and do things because you may not be fit for work on the morrow; therefore very often, you do not find time to do that work. To say that you are doing this, that and the other is just poor, petty politics that you are throwing at the Government.

I am sorry the honourable senior member for St. Philip is not in his place. The honourable member began to attack this Government by saying that Government had it in its power or that I had it in my power, not to allow the British Government to keep on its currency restrictions. The honourable member, to bolster up his "high-falutin" ideas in his newspaper, probably thinking nobody

reads it, gives these most preposterous untruths. He said that Barbados was getting a smaller percentage of her dollar earnings allocated to her than other West Indian territories. This is not true. There was a time when she was getting more dollar allocations than she had earned. He says that a casual look at our figures will show that our allocations were the least in the Caribbean. It is however not true to say that Barbados made thirteen million dollars in 1952. Barbados in 1952 the year which the honourable member was speaking of, had around \$7,230,000 and spent \$6,900,000 or 95% of what it earned and in 1953, it had \$7,329,000 and was allowed to spend \$6,818,000 or just over 90 per cent. Those are the facts. It does not matter to the honourable member what he says or publishes so long as he can hit at me. Sir this matter of the financial position of Barbados should be kept miles and miles above petty politics. Honourable members owe a duty to the community, above their party, to examine proposals and to give of their best judgment and advice to the Government whether they are in the Government or not in order that we, as Barbadians, may keep Barbados above water and where it has been for so many years, that is, outside of the ring of those who go asking the Colonial Office for money every now and then.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Can the honourable member give us the breakdown of the figures in the two or three ways that the dollars are earned. I do know that they are earned from the tourist industry, the molasses industry and from rum. Has the honourable member the breakdown?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I cannot give the honourable member that breakdown now as I have not those figures now. I did see the figures in the breakdown when they were secret and I can promise the honourable member to give them to him later. At the time when I saw them that way, the various colonies were clamouring for all the dollars they earned. British Guiana would have got twice as much as any other colony let alone Malaya. As a matter of fact, those two colonies practically earned all the dollars in the Commonwealth. I promise the hon. member that I will give him that analysis. Those figures are no more secret because I have seen them published in English financial papers.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: The reason why I would like to get the breakdown is because I think the tourist industry has earned the greater part of those figures. I think the figure is put at something like three million dollars.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Let me tell the honourable member that some dollars are also earned by invisible exports.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I do know that some are earned from invisible exports, but I am thinking that the honourable member must have the figures that are earned from the tourist industry over the last few years.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The last thing which I will deal with—not with any pleasure, because I still prefer to have people telling me that I am foolish than to be the reverse—is with what the honourable junior member for St. Peter, referred to with respect to the coopers and the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board. The honourable member is red hot from this Government and it is noticeable how he is fleeing from place to place in this Chamber recently. I do apologise for making this statement, but the honourable member is like Mahomet's coffin floating between heaven and earth. The honourable member says that he does not know what is the policy of the Government in respect

to unemployment; he wants to know what has the Government done with the molasses levy; what has the Government done with regard to the question of the unemployment of coopers and what they should get out of the molasses levy; what is to be done with those workers who have to look for alternative employment. I would just like to say that the honourable member is in the happy position of being a member of the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board and as a member of that Board, it is his duty along with the other members appointed to that Board to make regulations with respect to the molasses levy.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of correction, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member makes that statement and knows that what he has said is not true. The honourable member should be the last man to get up and make that statement. I pointed to that question in a general way in my remarks this afternoon. As a matter of fact, I have given notice of questions in the normal way to get replies from the Minister in charge in respect to those questions.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: Is the honourable member saying that he is not still a member of the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I was appointed a member of that Board owing to my position when I was a member of the Government. The honourable senior member for St. Thomas is holding that portfolio now. The honourable Premier knows that it is not a question of my resignation from that Board. Owing to the position which I occupied when I was a member of the Government, I was a member of that Board. Let the honourable member say something different from that.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Sir, as recently as August 11, last year, we took out of the hands of the Legislature the right to make regulations and things of that sort to deal with fancy molasses and everything connected with it and put them into the hands of the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board of which the honourable junior member for St. Peter is a member. Let the honourable member read the section of the Act.

The Section reads as follows:—

Without prejudice to the generality of subsection (4) of this section, Regulations made under this section may make provision in respect of the following matters—

- (a) the securing of alternative employment for labour displaced by bulk shipment of fancy molasses;
- (b) the payment of interest and depreciation on capital involved in providing bulk storage in this Island or elsewhere;
- (c) the fixing of the price of fancy molasses and any subsequent adjustment in relation to the price of sugar;
- (d) for preventing fluctuations in the price of fancy molasses owing to minimum crops.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I gave notice of questions to the Executive with respect to what the honourable Premier is referring to now. The honourable member is saying that I made a speech on it just now. That is not so. I have given notice of questions to the Minister in charge with respect to what the honourable member is referring to now.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The honourable junior member for St. Peter is saying that he has not made reference to that in his speech and that he has asked questions to the responsible minister on it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: That is so, Sir.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, The honourable junior member for St. Peter on the floor of the House got up in that corner not very long ago and asked the Government what was it doing about implementing some relief for coopers who have been put out of work as a result of bulk shipment.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The honourable member has that right.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Of course the honourable member has that right. All I am asking the House to say is, if it is my duty to do something and I fail to do it, who should be blamed? The honourable member is a member of a Board whose duty it is to make regulations in order to assist the coopers. That is all I got up to say. What has the Government to do with it? Read the Act.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, when I made my speech in here just now on the Colonial Estimates for the coming financial year, I made a broad speech as regards to what is the policy of the Government with respect to the Budget. All I would say is that the honourable member cannot help what he is doing; the honourable member is free to do it; the honourable member cannot be loyal. The honourable member has done sufficient to me that if God had him to judge—

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: When Mr. Speaker stands, all honourable members must sit. The honourable Premier will proceed.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, let us see what are the regulations as regards to the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board. Let us go back into the history of that Board. I will not say much on it, but we had representations by merchants sometime in 1950 or 1951 with regard to the inevitability of shipping fancy molasses to Canada in bulk. A delegation consisting of Sir John Saint, Mr. J. D. Chandler and I was sent to Canada to enquire into it and a report was submitted to the Government. It is almost unnecessary for me to say what was contained in the Report because all honourable members should be fully aware of it, but the Committee did say that there was not sufficient evidence to show that we would have to give up shipment of fancy molasses in puncheons immediately but that we might have to within three years. That was in 1951. The Committee did see that bulk shipment was inevitable and the Government prepared the House in advance for the inevitability of bulk shipment. The Government could see that it was coming. It was more than talk. The honourable junior member for St. Peter who was a member of the Government at that time, in his position as General Secretary of the Workers Union, put the matter to the Union and went as far as to persuade the union to accept the change. Both he and I pointed out that coopers would be helped to get a different job. We pointed out that in the interest of the island we would still have to go on and sell our fancy molasses. In the meantime, the Executive saw the necessity of having a law so that we would be able to redeem our promises, to keep the industry alive, to save Barbados and to assist coopers.

Sir, I have already told this House how a big molasses dealer in Canada spoke to me when I was there and offered to help coopers here when bulk shipment occurred. He told me: "I have lost \$20,000 this year by taking your fancy molasses in puncheons. I know your difficulties with the coopers. I am not harping on my losses but I can find some work up here in Canada for some of those displaced coopers. We knew this bulk shipment of fancy molasses was bound to take place and to expedite things we came to the House and put the right of operating the molasses

levy and supervising and overhauling the regulations of marketing and exporting fancy molasses into the hands of the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board because we thought that would be wise and would prevent wasting time.

The Government came down to the Legislature with a Bill to do all that and this House passed it. It is true that the honourable junior member for St. Lucy and the honourable senior member for St. John did object strongly about giving up of the privileges of this House. The Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Act was amended by deleting Section 2 which says:

"The Board shall consist of the Director of Agriculture and seven other members appointed in the manner following, that is to say, one member by the Governor, two members by the Legislative Council, and four members by the House of Assembly."

In its place, the following was substituted:—

"The Board shall consist of the Director of Agriculture and seven other members appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

Section (3) of the principal Act was also deleted and the following was substituted:—

"The members of the Board appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall hold office for a period of five years from their appointments:

Provided that—

(a) a member at any time by notice in writing to the Governor-in-Executive Committee resign his office;

(b) the Governor-in-Executive Committee may declare the office of any member vacant on the ground that he is from any just cause unfit to continue in office."

Sub-sections (10), (11), (12) and (13) of the principal Act were also deleted and the following substituted:—

"(10). Any vacancy caused by death, resignation or otherwise shall be filled by the Governor-in-Executive Committee but the member so appointed shall hold office so long as the member whose office is vacant would have held office.

"(11). If during any period any member of the Board is unable, owing to his absence from the Island, or to illness, or to any other cause, to perform his duties or discharge his functions as a member of the Board, the Governor-in-Executive Committee may appoint a temporary member for the period during which such member is so disabled."

It goes on further to say:—

4. Section seven of the Principal Act is hereby amended by deleting the words "with the approval of the two Houses of the Legislature" occurring therein.

5. (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of the principal Act, there shall be raised on all fancy molasses produced in this Island during each crop year a levy at such rate as the Board with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall fix in respect of each crop year.

(2) Every producer of fancy molasses shall pay a levy imposed under the provisions of the preceding subsection to the Board not later than the thirty-first day of July in the year in which such fancy molasses was manufactured.

(3) All moneys received by the Board under the provisions of this section shall be paid by the Board into any one of the Banks operating in this Island to the credit of a special account and the moneys so paid shall form a Fund (hereinafter called the Fancy Molasses Industry Fund).

(4) It shall be the duty of the Board to provide out of the said Fancy Molasses Industry Fund for the expenses incurred in carrying out the provisions of this section of this Act, and otherwise to administer the said Fund for the purposes and in the manner prescribed by Regulations made by the Board.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Where is the point of explanation, Mr. Speaker? The honourable member is quoting me as if I made a speech with regard to the Fancy Molasses Industry and coopers only. I said in my speech that the question of unemployment should be taken into consideration and mentioned generally the reduction in employment of people who were in the Fancy Molasses Industry. I do not think when I made my speech, Your Honour was in the Chair. I pointed out that already coopers in the industry were laid off and by their losing their jobs, it was going to aggravate the situation more. What the honourable Premier is dealing with specifically in reply to me is something which I gave notice of in questions to the Executive. I have not made reference to that specifically in my speech. I may say that the honourable Premier knows very well that I am only a member of the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board and that I was only appointed because of my being a member of Government and having to deal with agriculture. The honourable member knows that there are other Boards of which I became a member owing to my being a member of the Government then, but that I will have to relinquish such membership now owing to the fact that I am no longer a member of Government.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: What I gather from the honourable junior member for St. Peter—I was not in the Chair when he made his speech—is that only a portion of his speech was with regard to the prevailing conditions in the Molasses Industry and how it was affecting coopers. What the honourable member wants to make clear is that on the question of the Fancy Molasses Industry, he has already normally asked questions in this House to which he wants answers from the honourable minister in charge. I should therefore like the honourable Premier to restrict his reply to anything which may have developed out of the speech of the honourable junior member for St. Peter, but the questions that the honourable member has asked should not be replied to now by the honourable Premier but by the honourable Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour, at the appropriate time.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable junior member for St. Peter made reference to this matter and said: "I have asked questions about it" and that the Government should go into it or words to that effect. Certainly, Sir, if the honourable member made reference to it in his speech, I am entitled to reply to the matter in the light of its true position. That is all I am trying to do.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: I do think the honourable Premier is over arguing on this matter. There are questions to the Executive on this matter by the honourable junior member for St. Peter, and those questions should be answered by the honourable Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour. I do not think the House should be burdened with having those questions gone into at this time; the answers to them should be given at the appropriate time by the Minister in charge.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Sir, not long ago, I mentioned to this House that I was not dealing with that matter now, so it is not a question of my wishing that the matter should be gone into now.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Surely the honourable junior member for St. Peter or any other member of this House can rightly take the

Government to task about any matter in the interest of the community. The honourable junior member for St. Peter in his speech told the Government about the possibility of more unemployment facing the community and in doing so, made reference to this question of the coopers being laid off. Surely, if the honourable member made reference to coopers, I am entitled to say what the alternative work for coopers would be. Surely I am entitled to say that with respect to the coopers, Government has enacted a law to the effect of putting the onus on the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board to find work for them and to do that Government has given that Board a fund to work. Surely, Sir, when attacks are made on the Government concerning the fact that there is a lot of unemployment, for instance, like the coopers, and especially when the *Advocate* newspaper shows them getting a dole, I am entitled on behalf of the Government to say that the matter is being taken care of by the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board of which the honourable junior member for St. Peter is a member. I am entitled to remind the House that the Government foresaw what was going to happen to coopers and acted five months ago—in August last year—by bringing down a Bill which this Legislature passed and which has as one of its objects the giving of assistance to coopers. Government in that Bill said to the Fancy Molasses Board: You must make a cess on the Fancy Molasses Industry; you must pay that money into a fund; you must make regulations for the securing of alternative employment for the coopers who would be displaced as a result of bulk shipment of molasses; and you are allowed, free from legislative interference, to make legislation and to say how that money should be spent. I have been at pains to point out to this House that in respect of the matters (a), (b), (c), and (d), with which the Board was to make regulations what purposely was set down in (a) was not set down as (b) or (c) or (d) because it was to precede all other things.

This is what the sections says:—

“Without prejudice to the generality of sub-section (4) of this section, Regulations made under this section may make provision in respect of the following matters—

- (a) the securing of alternative employment for labour displaced by bulk shipment of fancy molasses;

Please note that the very first thing which that Board was called on to do is to secure employment for displaced labour which means that the very first thing to do was to find work for the coopers. The section goes on to state:—

- “(b) the payment of interest and depreciation on capital involved in providing bulk storage in this Island or elsewhere;
- (c) the fixing of the price of fancy molasses and any subsequent adjustment in relation to the price of sugar;
- (d) for preventing fluctuations in the price of fancy molasses owing to minimum crops.”

Sir, as can be seen, the Legislature completely gave up all its powers and its rights on the question of making regulations in this matter to the Executive Committee in order that things may be expeditiously gone into by the Fancy Molasses Board. The honourable junior member for St. Peter may remember that it was clearly pointed out that the question of unemployment was to take priority above all other things.

I am a changed man in the sense that I am not listening to attacks on Government without replying to them, so if any hon. member wishes to make attacks on this Government, it is his duty to get his facts accurately. I am sorry that this debate which should have been factual, dealing as it is with the financial position of the colony, should have reached this stage. God help us if we do not have a sense of humour at times. I made some reference to the Opposition when I said that the Government was not learning anything from it, and I imagined when I said so that the honourable gentlemen on that side of the table would have been wreathed in smiles to see that I was only poking fun at some of them. Let me tell those honourable members that regularly on the Order Paper of the Executive Committee is a report of the criticisms of the Opposition in this House from the point of view of every honourable member. There is no question at all of this Government ignoring the views of the Opposition; but it must be borne in mind that on some questions, the Government of necessity must have more facts to form its judgment than honourable members both those who belong to the Government Party and those outside of the Government Party. Sir, I promise members of this House that the members of this Government will be very careful, though we are still Socialists, to maintain a constant watchfulness over the finances of this colony. Of course, we must do all we can to get work for our people. We must get jobs for them and seek out all avenues for emigration, but while we intend to do all that, we shall not do it by running the country into bankruptcy or spending all on Pension Acts. I have no fear that as long as this Government retains its policy, it will remain in power during the lifetime of all of us.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to make an explanation as to my membership on certain Boards. Just as I was a member of the Irrigation Board by virtue of my being a member of the Executive Committee, I was made a member of the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board. I regard my membership on those Boards purely on account of the position in which I was placed while I was a member of the Executive Committee. I do not regard my membership on those Boards as anything personal. Now I am no longer a member of the Executive Committee, I consider that I am no longer a member of those Boards. The honourable Premier knows that I have been appointed as a member of those Boards because I was dealing with agriculture while I was on the Executive and my membership on those Boards had nothing to do with my position in the Workers' Union. Similarly, because I used to deal with trade as a member of the Executive, I was appointed a member of the Control Board. I was asked to attend a meeting of that Board recently and I informed the Secretary that I no longer considered myself a member of that Board owing to my resignation from the Executive Committee.

The question that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Colonial Estimates, 1954-55 was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to ask the House at this time of the morning, after such a long sitting, to begin consideration on the separate Heads of Expenditure. I now beg that

you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until next Tuesday, 9th March, 1954, at 12 (noon.)

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.