
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17th March, 1959.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E.; Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. St. A. THORNE; (*Minister of Education*); and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for circulation.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Report of the Irrigation Board for the year 1958.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the following:- Reply to Question No. 1/1959 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy regarding the provision of watches for Policemen.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay Reply to Question No. 8/1959 asked by the hon. senior member for St. James regarding the installation of a Post Box at Thorpes Housing Scheme, St. James.

Also, Reply to Question No. 10/1959 asked by the Hon. Junior member for St. Lucy regarding the number of water mains and standposts erected during 1957 and 1958.

ORAL REPLIES READY

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Question No. 1/1959 asked by the hon. junior member for St. John regarding the staff of postmen in St. George and St. John is now ready.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Question No. 2/1959 asked by the same hon. member, regarding the delay in the construction of the fishing jetty at Consett Bay, St. John is also ready.

MR. HOLDER APPOINTED TO ACT AS CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before you call the first Order of the Day, I beg to move that the hon. senior member for St. James be Chairman for today's Sitting in the absence of the Chairman of Committees.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

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

HOUSE RESUMES DEBATE ON APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the day stands in the name of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. Cummins: Second reading of the Appropriation Bill, 1959-60.

On the last occasion, the hon. senior member for St. George was speaking when the House adjourned.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned I had commended the Government for the action it had taken in relieving taxation and increasing the allowances for children and other measures. There is no doubt that the Government has to be commended. But, Sir, it is with regret that these actions have not been implemented five or ten years ago. It is notable that much of what has been accomplished at this period has been mentioned on more than one occasion on this side of the House.

The main part of my speech today will be on agriculture. I hope, Sir, that I will not have to commend this Government too late when the agricultural system of this island will have eventually broken down. The Sugar Producers' Association are of the opinion that the policy which seems to be inculcated in the minds of this Government and the Governments of the past ten years, is that they expect the sugar industry to be capable of laying an indefinitely increasing number of golden eggs over indefinitely long periods, and that is short-sighted and extremely dangerous to the future of Barbados.

Sir, the last ten years have been almost what I would call unusual years because during that period we have broken record after record mainly through the Good Lord's mercy which sent us favourable weather. But, Sir, these mercies which are bestowed upon Barbados in large amounts have made the Barbadians somewhat complacent and unaware of what is taking place in the outside world.

12.25 p.m.

That complacency has shown itself in the Hon. Premier's speech. In dealing with the sordid situation the Hon. Premier said this:-

"As is well known, Sir, the price for molasses has been reduced, and at this point I will state that the production and sale of molasses to Canada - the country which takes most of our molasses - has been, so to speak, in jeopardy for the past few years."

The Premier went on to say this: "But I do not think there is anything we can do about that; we just

have to accept it." Later on he says: "Their contention is that the molasses from Cuba cost very much less, and, as hon. members know, we have been doing our best in Barbados to decrease the cost of the landed product in Canada."

We have to accept that, and at the best it is not good enough. It is not good enough not only in the light of the syrup situation but also, as I see it, in the light of the sugar situation.

In Cuba, where molasses is cheaper when it reaches Canada than it is from Barbados, what is the situation? The situation is shown very clearly in the last sugar journal which I have here in my hands. It is almost 100% a salute to Cuba; every article is on Cuba and every page holds advertisements of vast organisations existing in Cuba today. In Cuba there are factories one of which is capable of turning out the total sugar production of Barbados. Not only in Cuba is the situation as I have pointed out, but right down here, in British Guiana, Trinidad and Jamaica, advancement has been made in sugar factories; and when we come to other parts of the world like Hawaii, Fiji, Australia and numbers of other countries, Barbados is away behind them. I notice that in the first Five Year Plan the Government considers that a bold plan of development is essential. I am still waiting to see these bold plans. The Government itself time and time again reiterates that we have an increasing population and that we have a one-crop economy and it is particularly on that one-crop economy that I wish to speak today. It is of no use allowing the goose which has been laying the golden eggs for all of these years to suffer from the lack of modern feeding methods, and try to find other geese than the one which we have at the moment, and leave that goose to perish while we attract other geese from all over the world.

There was an enquiry conducted into the sugar industry and with Your Honour's permission, I would like to quote from the Report certain paragraphs which will assist me in my reasoning. The Report states: "The sugar industry of Barbados is of such importance to the economy of this island that any change in the prosperity of the industry will inevitably affect the whole of the population." The changes are not taking place in Barbados; they are taking place in Cuba, Hawaii, Fiji, Australia, India and other parts of the world. In Barbados, I repeat, we are dependent on the Good Lord's mercies and over the years we have become complacent and we are not doing our best; as the Hon. Premier says, we are merely accepting it. Mr. McKenzie goes on to say this:

"The industry of the island does not follow the pattern found in the other sugar producing territories of the West Indies or British Guiana. It is probably unique in that no large companies, financed from outside the island, tend to dominate the industry. It is built up on a large number of small estates owned in the main by residents of Barbados, and managed by owners or local agents who themselves are Barbadians.
12.35 p.m.

The processing side of the industry is carried out by a number of small factories developed by resident owners and shareholders from the old system of very small estate factories of the previous century."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go much further than Mr. McKenzie. The factory situation in this island is not only unique; it is obsolete. It does not compare by any man's measure with sugar factories in the majority of sugar producing parts of the world. There exists in these factories today, Sir, machinery that will date probably in some cases to the 16th or 17th century, and I would not be at all surprised if in some one still found converted windmill equipment.

Mr. McKenzie goes on to say: "Herein lies the strength and the weakness of the industry, its strength in that it is owned and developed in the main by residents of the island, and in times of prosperity, the island benefits as a whole. Its weakness lies in the fact that in

years of depression and difficulty the island has to depend a great deal on its own resources which are so intricately dependent on this its one major industry."

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think the hon. member is aware of the fact that the McKenzie Report is under debate, and I wonder if it would be more appropriate if he brought out those points when the debate is resumed on that particular item.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, I think the hon. member is quite in order to quote any passages relative to the point he is making. I do not think the hon. member is reaching any conclusion from the Report as such but only in as much as it affects his reply to the Budget Speech. In other words he is not primarily engaged in answering the Report; he is only quoting from the Report to show the points necessary to make his reply intelligent and conclusive.

Hon. M. E. COX: As Your Honour pleases.

Mr. DOWDING: I thank Your Honour. It is my opinion, Sir, as I said before, that the weakness lies particularly in the fact that we in this island are not keeping up with the rate of modernisation that is being done in other parts of the world. There is no doubt in my mind that over the years this system and the manner in which these factories have been built up may have been of great benefit and that the people of this island should be given great credit for taking machinery that existed in this island and producing crops that are being produced today. But I hold, Sir, that unless we change this attitude of acceptance and believing that the agricultural industry which is the sugar industry of this island is 100%, the sooner we will be in a better position to ascertain that the economy of Barbados does not go by the board within a matter of 20 years.

Sir, Mr. McKenzie goes on to say: "Dependent on one commodity for its prosperity, it is therefore particularly vulnerable to the exigencies of the world market for this commodity; it therefore looks to the protection offered by the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement and the International Sugar Agreement for its stability."

This, Sir, is another situation in which I would like to cry "beware". There is existing among the public, the sugar producers and the Government, the complacent idea that the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement has solved the problems of the sugar industry in Barbados from now onwards to eternity. That, Sir, is a very wrong conception. If in plain language Cuba can sell their syrup cheaper to Canada, Canada is going to buy it. If Cuba can sell their sugar cheaper to Canada, Canada eventually is going to buy it. Do not let us hide under this Commonwealth idea; let us face facts. No one is going to pay 10¢ for a pound of sugar if he can buy it for 5¢; and those, Sir, are purely imaginary figures. Unless we face this problem, that complacency that Barbados is the highest sugar producing country, that is of sugar per acre - Barbados is blessed by the contents of its soil, its atmosphere and also blessed by the Commonwealth Agreement - and unless we face up to the facts of what is going on around us in the world today, Barbados is going to be left behind shortly.

Mr. Speaker, I have advocated in the beginning of my speech and I shall advocate again that it would be of benefit to members of this Government - taking along with them members of the Opposition - to make inspections of other parts of the world from which we can learn. Recently, Sir, taking a page out of my own notebook, I visited Louisiana and I saw with my own eyes the extent to which mechanisation has gone not only in Louisiana where I saw it first hand, but I was privileged to see it on the films of Hawaii, Cuba and Puerto Rico.
12.45 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, it astounded me and in spite of the fact that I may be decried and my name may be mud in

some sections of this community, I intend as clearly and as forcibly as I can to commend to this Government not to be complacent of the sugar industry of this island.

Sir, way back in 1946, Professor Shephard foresaw the need for mechanisation in the sugar industry and he stated in his Report "so long as the production of canes continues to be performed by manual labour, so long must the standards of living remain at an undesirably low level." He goes on to say: "Labour-saving devices are also labour-serving devices and by increasing the productivity of the worker they enable him to increase his earnings. The rising price of sugar offers a temporary respite but it may be of a shorter duration than is either anticipated or hoped."

One may say that that is perhaps a pessimistic view in the light of the years that have gone between and in the light of modern methods in the sugar industry throughout the world, but I think it is time that Professor Shephard was heeded. I know, Sir, that it is an extremely difficult problem to face in an overpopulated island such as this, but I repeat that my reasoning can only offer this debate or any other debate the view that we must produce sugar cheaply enough to compete with other parts of the world which are producing it; otherwise our sugar industry will be null and void and there will be no employment at that point.

I personally feel that steps can be taken immediately with the existing material and with the existing human material of which we are again blessed with a sufficiency both in numbers and in quality that if the Government produces some bold plan over a period of years whereby the people of this island can be changed from one aspect of cultivation and manufacture to another aspect, it would be much better than to have it overnight.

While I am on that, I must say that it is time that some education be effected to educate the people who are going to be put out of work by the Deep Water Harbour Scheme; and not only should you educate them as to what is going to occur but into the lines, if there is anything available, of what is going to be done and how they are going to live. Sir, that is right upon us now; that is immediate necessity; but I would not like to see the situation in the sugar industry occur over a matter of years when it becomes an absolute and utter necessity because we cannot compete with the rest of the world and then in a matter of a year or two we have to shift over to more modern methods of cultivation and manufacture. I think this Government should tackle this serious question, not only by means suggested by the Hon. Premier that is, by accepting the suggestion, but as has been said in their Five Year Plan, by bold methods.

Mr. Speaker, with Your Honour's permission I have here a West Indian, British Guiana, British Honduras and the Virgin Islands' Report of the Parliamentary Delegation which came here between May and June of 1958. I intend to quote certain paragraphs from this Report in order to try and further build up my argument for immediate attention to be paid to the economy of this island. Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour will remember, this delegation consisted not only as usual of members of the Government but it consisted of three members of the Conservative Party and two members of the Labour Party. It therefore commends itself in that it is a Report of a team working together on a problem from both sides of the Houses of Parliament. Sir, under "Economy and Industry," they state:- "The pace at which the West Indies move to Dominion Status will largely depend on economic progress, bold expansion and diversification. Many islands are almost entirely dependent on one crop."

Mr. Speaker, Barbados is still today utterly dependent on one crop. It seems to me that successful efforts have been made by the Government recently to encourage the Tourist Industry but they are belated and, as far as I am concerned, when one looks at the picture as it is, unsuccessful efforts have been made

towards industry by the Development Board and other Government projects.

12.55 p.m.

The fact remains that this island is entirely dependent upon one crop and in spite of the fact that this island is dependent upon one crop, in 1955, I think it was in the second part of the Government's Five Year Plan, this is what is said:

"The economy of the Island continues to be based on the sugar industry, the chief factor being the size of the crop and the price obtained. It has been estimated by Sir Archibald Cuke that in 1955 the receipts of the industry amounted to \$35 million."

It is not necessary to find out what it was in 1957 but it is very disheartening to find that having regard to what has been allocated for Science and Agriculture throughout the period of the last ten years, the highest amount has been \$732,163. Now, Mr. Speaker, in a few years, we have thrown away and down the drain the sum of \$800,000 on the buses but we cannot afford to expend more in current expenditure than \$719,908 - less this year than what was expended last year. I think that that policy is one to be decried and one which is dangerous to the vast population of this island. I think that when it is considered that agriculture ranks No. 7 in expenditure in the current Estimates, when it is responsible for the economy of this island, that is a matter which should be decried.

The encouragement of other services at the expense of the local industry is another very dangerous procedure. If agriculture is going to be drained to provide every possible incentive, every possible service, social and administrative, education, hospitalisation and other services, if it is to be drained to the degree that it is becoming so low in the list of financial expenditure by the Government, then I think we are forgetting the goose which lays the present golden egg. I do not think that we can carry out any of these amenities - social services, hospitalisation, welfare, education, administration and the highest standard of living which we seek, and rightly so - if we seek these things for the people of this island, it is our bounden duty to ascertain that in seeking a better standard of living, better housing, better roads, better education, better water supply which are all necessary and good things which should be sought after, we do not forget that the outside world is spending millions of dollars on agriculture. The Premier referred to the recession of Barbadians going abroad to help in the harvesting of crops; recessions affect us no doubt, but we have our own particular recession yearly or five yearly or whenever it occurs - we have our recession caused through the lack of rain. Therefore we have not only to contend with recessions in the outside world, but with recessions of our rainfall not being normal in this island. When I see that Barbadians are not getting very much employment in harvesting abroad, this particular article in *Time* drew my attention to one of the reasons why that is so. There is a gentleman of whom there is a photograph playing his organ; he is a small farmer who started not so long ago in the United States of America. Today he has rows of switches, electrical controls and buttons; he gets up and has a hearty breakfast; he goes out and presses the necessary button and the food flows to thousands of beef cattle. He presses another button and the manure is removed and after pressing about ten buttons he goes back inside and starts to play his organ again.

1.05 p.m.

Sir, I use his example to show how fast the world is progressing in agriculture. When he presses a button the feed that goes in front of these animals has been scientifically prepared and contains such items as B.12, antibiotics and, recently, gibberellic acid which add to their growth in periods heretofore unthought of. Not only in such measures as this but he will have large tractors which will reap hundreds of tons of corn and wheat or whatever he is producing on his land. The development, Sir, in corn alone is fantastic in the United States of America, and not only in the United States of America

but as I will soon point out, in places much closer at home, like Jamaica and Puerto Rico.

Years ago I decried the fact that the Department of Agriculture in this island is not fully awake to modern methods, and at the end of my speech, Sir, I hope that the Government will realise that that is so. It is noticeable even in the Report of the Parliamentary Delegation that Jamaica has so far surpassed us that we are left at the starting pole. In 1944 I visited Jamaica and saw the Jamaica Hope Farm. The few animals that I saw at that Farm, their record and their appearance could not in that day compare with anything in Barbados today, Sir, they are way ahead. While I may seem at times to repeat myself, I am repeating the arguments from documents of people who have come to this island, who have made investigations and who have written a Report, or from Government themselves in their own Report. I intend to repeat as many statements as possible to substantiate the fact that agriculture in this island has got to be noticed, expanded and diversified immediately, and money must be provided for that purpose.

"We are in no doubt," these gentlemen go on to say, "that agriculture must always be the main-stay and the section we have devoted to it does show that there is plenty of scope for expansion."

Mr. Speaker, what expansion has there been in agriculture in this country in the past ten years? When I say "expansion" I mean something that has been done that is providing the answer to our problems. At a meeting which I attended and was very pleased to see the Hon. Minister of Social Services and the Hon. Prime Minister of the Federation, it was stated that the rate of expansion of the population at the present moment is eleven persons per day. The Hon. Prime Minister of the Federation during his talk said that by the end of this century - let us say in 40 years - the population of this island will have doubled itself. It is increasing at the rate of 4,700 odd persons per year; but what expansion have we done to feed the 4,000 more mouths in the last 10 years? If it were not for the goose that laid the golden egg, the sugar industry, which is at present due to the Good Lord's blessing and due to the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement and these things, providing for these extra mouths, there is nothing else of any consequence; so when the Minister of Agriculture gets up for the prosecution later on, let him remember what I said. There is nothing of any consequence that has been achieved, and something must be done. You have added a few pigs, a few fowls and planted a few acres of grass and there are one or two tractors, but there should be at least, in my opinion, a dozen tractors. Agriculture which is the main stay of this island, a fact which has been repeated by every person who comes to this island, by the Government and from all sides, is No. 7 on the list for expenditure.

They go on to say "there is need for urgency." Mr. Speaker, it is urgent because the population is increasing at a rate as fast as the increase in output, and this is speaking of the West Indies. How can we look at it when we think of it as Barbados alone?

1.15 p.m.

The urgency in Barbados is past talking about; it is time that action was taken. We do not want to hear about bold plans; we want to hear a definite achievement which is producing food, jobs, money and every thing necessary for the increasing population in this island. It is possible, Sir, to do that. Experts say that it is possible and I have no doubt at all in my mind that it is possible because this island's resources have not yet been tapped because the facilities are not there to give the people the necessary knowledge that they can go ahead. I have said that the Hon. Prime Minister of the Federation has put it at the year 2000 and you and I hope - and I hope you, even if I am not here - that we will be here to see it; and if either one of us are perhaps in later years thinking that we may not see it, the very argument used by the Hon. Premier may prolong, I hope not our agonies, but our wish in seeing that in the next twenty years this island has done something of consequence in its agriculture because by that time if

we are not quite so vigorous in our old years there may be humanitarian methods for keeping us alive by atomic energy. That, Sir, is another problem which we have to face and quite rightly so. Not only is the birth of eleven new babies a day a problem but with modern medicine, the fact is that old people are lasting longer and while they might be able to give further assistance to the economy of this island, yet they will add to our problem.

Mr. Speaker, in the Parliamentary delegation Report, it goes on to say: "Nothing has been done more to improve the prospects of agriculture and to give hope for the future than has the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement."

Again I want to reiterate this point. Do not let us say that because we are under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement that everything is perfect. That is not so. It does not guarantee the price for anything more than one year and it is to be in the light of world conditions. The quota is another problem; but world conditions are what we must face. World conditions will either make us follow them or we must go down. I repeat that we must get away from this complacency. The last ten years we have had good crops, then we have the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement; but we in this island, in my humble opinion, are not taking full consideration of the facts around us and the future that lies before us.

This same Parliamentary Delegation in its report goes on to say "Economic developments in Jamaica are very striking and we were impressed by what we saw particularly by the contribution being made to lessen the impact of purely seasonal employment which has long been a problem."

Mr. Speaker, since when have we got to follow Jamaica? Jamaica follows us; and now we are so far behind that we must follow them. Jamaica's developments are very striking particularly by the contribution being made to lessen the impact of seasonal employment. The amount of talk that has been made by Governments of this island that something should be done to alleviate seasonal employment was so long ago that Jamaica did not even think of it, but today they are far ahead of us. Why? What have they got apart from their natural resources that we have not got? They have, in my humble opinion, the will and where there is a will there is a way, and that has made these possible. The Government of Jamaica has expended large amounts of money on the milk industry and types of agriculture of that sort. Jamaica is so far ahead in grass experimentation that Barbados would have to catch up unless some serious step is taken. The Parliamentary Delegation said that seasonal employment is our main problem. For three or four months people can find work and then the remainder of the year they must be idle. That cannot tend for sound economy and a happy people; therefore it is absolutely necessary that thought be given to changing the old system.

Now, Sir, this is where we come to the Barbadian situation. Again I quote from the Report of the Parliamentary Delegation. It states:- "Barbados has a potential industrial corporation, but we sensed less enthusiasm and effort than in the other two territories, namely Jamaica and Trinidad. There is as yet little evidence of progress except for the work on the Deep Water Harbour."

Yes, Sir, we must accept it; there is nothing we can do about it. Here are five people who have come from overseas saying in their Report that Barbados has got an industrial corporation; it is a potential one - but they sensed less enthusiasm and effort. Now, Sir, I wonder where they sensed this less enthusiasm? I can only deduce that they must have had a number of visits of various Government officials and that they were mainly in the company of members of this Hon. House; so I can only deduce the fact that they realised Barbados was less enthusiastic from the fact that it came from our own mouths and from the people around this very table as far as the industrial side was concerned.

I submit, Sir, that one of the reasons for that is the ten years of bountiful crops and the fact that the sugar industry goose has been able as a result to lay sufficient golden eggs; therefore human nature will become complacent and we are not enthusiastic to make the effort. That, Sir, is where our Government must stand or fall. If they allow such things as industrial development in this island to be approached with a sense of *laissez faire*, then it is time that a change, whatever is necessary, is made in order that the future generation of this island may have a prosperous economy. 1.25 p.m.

Sir, if I might step aside for one moment to industries, I have no doubt whatsoever that this island must, in the near future, equip itself in such a way to cultivate and produce sugar that it can compete with Cuba, Puerto Rico, Hawaii and other places. I have no doubt that in consequence some subsidiary employment must be envisaged, some subsidiary industrial scheme must come into force; but up to now, I cannot see any industrial development of any consequence. There is no industrial development in this island of any consequence; nothing has been achieved in the past ten years, nothing that could employ 4,700 people and the extras which are coming in every year in one particular instance. I, personally, believe that by bold efforts some industries could be brought into this island and an effort made to compensate for what must occur and which is occurring with regard to the Deep Water Harbour now; it must occur throughout the sugar industry.

Let us face it, let us educate our people to the fact that unless we accept the modern methods which are being used in competition with us, we must and will of necessity perish in this island. Let us face that; let us tell our people that they must accept it; let us tell them that there is benefit to be derived from the use of modern methods and do not let us hide under any political Party either in one way or in another. The future of this island depends upon the economic progress both of expansion and diversification. To what extent have we been able to diversify in this island? Up to now there is nothing of any consequence; neither in industry nor in agriculture is there anything which can make any thinking person feel that the future of the economy of this island is rosy.

Mr. Speaker, speaking on agriculture, despite the petroleum and bauxite industry of Trinidad and Jamaica respectively, agriculture remains the basis of the economy throughout the Federation and has to make the major contribution toward the attainment of the economic viability necessary for true independence. That is a statement made by these five Parliamentary people. I ask the public not to sit back and say that the United Kingdom will provide. There is the saying that the Lord will provide and that is a very prevalent saying in this island. The Lord will provide if we are willing to help Him, but if we are not willing with our own hands and our ability and ingenuity to help Him we can but fail. Professor Hahn has said: "The propensity to work and not the propensity to spend is the foundation of national income and wealth". If we are not going to work or make a solid foundation, then our national income and wealth must fail.

I think that this is one of the most important parts of this Report by these Parliamentary people. It says this: "The basic problem of increased production can only be mastered by more research - both centrally and on an island-wide basis - provided that the results are implemented by efficient agricultural extension services." 1.35 p.m.

I must commend favourably, and further on in this Report these five gentlemen do also, the merger or whatever one may call it between the University College of the West Indies and the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture in Trinidad. In this Sugar Journal there is "Instrument Training Program for Cuban Sugar Mill Technicians;" and do not let any hon. member get the idea that that has anything to do with high-powered acceleration or anything like that; it is merely for the

teaching of how to use instruments in a factory of sugar production. Page after page you see "New Developments in By-Products", "Processing Hardboard from Bagasse"; "Experimental Program on Sugar Processing". Actually, Sir, there is a miniature factory working to find out methods of making Cuba's syrup as well as their sugar cheaper to Canada. "Cuban Bagasse Products - New Bagasse Board Plant now Operating"; "Biological Control of the Sugarcane Borer in Cuba"; "Cultural Practices in Cuba Sugar Cane Plantations;" "Is Chemical Fertilisation Economical on Cuba Plantations?" Some better method has been found in processing either in the factory or in the field, but we in Barbados are still applying manure fertiliser on the top of the ground and not using any liquid fertilisers. Cuba is producing sugar cheaper in spite of the fact that their sugar per acre is less than our sugar per acre. That, Sir, is the point to be borne in mind. Research is important both centrally and on an island wide basis and I sincerely hope that an effort will be made by this Government to ascertain that whatever can be done on an island wide basis is done. The achievements in the sugar industry in other parts of the world are quite remarkable and unless we copy them we will be out of the running.

Now, Sir, even centrally this Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture combines advance research and a teaching college for 80 students. I hope that as soon as it becomes a faculty of the University College of the West Indies that that 80 students will increase to 800. The need for trained technicians in the sugar industry in Barbados and throughout the West Indies is great. I am doubtful whether in this island among the 27 factories - I believe that one has been started in Black Rock - there are four qualified sugar factory chemists. These conditions cannot portend good for the future.

Now, Sir, I have not been able to find out and I am wondering what amount, if any yearly, or whether any further assistance is going to be given to the Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute. These five gentlemen in their Report said that the Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute started with forty pupils only four years ago and now has sixty. It gives theoretical and practical training in farm management to employees of the Departments of Agriculture of Trinidad and the British Caribbean territories other than Jamaica. But it will need to be able to take 100 students for each twenty-one months course to fill the immediate needs of the Governments interested. Not until that need has been met can the Institute be used as a training establishment for young farmers and boys of secondary school age.

Mr. Speaker, have we not got the will, the experience, the wish or the ability to set up in Barbados a college or an institution for the training of people in agriculture? Have we not got sufficient funds to employ persons to train our boys and girls in agriculture? We are dependent on agriculture, but where today are we training our boys and girls? It would be of some benefit if we could do no more than choose half dozen or a dozen boys and girls from this island and send them overseas to learn dairying, but I personally feel that an organisation within the Department of Agriculture could be set up whereby our people could be taught not only how to do a job but what is the result of doing that job in such and such a way.

In Cuba, Sir, a tractor driver goes through a course; that may seem like something to laugh at by some people, but when you place in the hands of a man \$25,000 or \$100,000 in machinery at one time and he is not trained not only in the mechanics of the equipment but in what results the equipment can achieve by deep ploughing, close ploughing or any other type of ploughing, he then realises when he is taught that it is not just a matter of getting through the work but a matter of achieving more productivity for the island. 1.45 p.m.

Today, Sir, how many of our people know the reason why a cane hole is dug or a drain is dug or land is contoured or anything of that? They know how to do it but ask yourself how many people know why it is done and what are the results obtained. Unless we can teach them, there

are no possible means for ultimate benefits to be obtained and our agriculture will not succeed in feeding 400,000 people by the year 2,000.

Again, I refer to the Report of these five parliamentary delegates and this will conclude my quotation of that Report. It is stated: "We felt able to appreciate the agricultural potential of the West Indies as a whole much better after our visit to Jamaica which epitomises both the problem and the achievements of agriculture in the Federation."

Of Barbados not a word was said by them. There must be some very good reasons. It goes on to say: "the overall picture seems to us distinctly encouraging except in one or two instances. The increase in production so much to be desired is there for the asking if only the will to bring it about can be maintained and the money necessary to back it up can be made available."

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us hope that the will is here. Increased production can be had for the asking and let us hope that when it is realised that agriculture in this island provides—I think it will be almost correct to say—one hundred percent of the economy, let us try to give it somewhat more consideration in the near, near future. Let us, if we can, see the large amount, the millions, that are brought in by agriculture; let us fully realise that money must also be expended in order to keep up with modern day methods.

I am not at all pleased to see that the Head, Agriculture, in the Current Estimates must come after (1) Education, (2) Medical, (3) Police, (4) Pensions, (5) Highways and Transport, (6) Waterworks. I am not one to stint education; I wholeheartedly agree with the policy of spending the most money on education but let some of that money be spent on agricultural education as well. I cannot for one moment even in my faintest imagination think that sensible persons would spend more on Highways and Transport of this island than they would on Agriculture although I know that the parish of St. Thomas happens to be the only parish where they cannot find any more tenantry roads to do and although I know that there is a lot of work to be done in the other parishes. However, I still cannot believe that Agriculture should take second place to Highways and Transport. Now, just in case hon. members think that I am advocating any more to be spent under any of these particular Heads, I am not; I am recommending an increase and an appreciable increase in the amount spent on the agricultural services of this island; so let it not be thought that I am recommending the curtailment of certain other facilities.

I do, however, wholeheartedly agree with the Hon. Premier that one sometimes must become concerned at the rate of increases in these various Departments. I think he said somewhere in his speech that they come to us almost weekly and that almost every week there are requests for an increase in staff, increased accommodation, increased rates of travelling and many other rates of increases. This is what the Hon. Premier said: "I myself have been alarmed at the rapid increase of services due to the increase of staff."

Sir, I think that is a very important point and a point to which you must pay attention. I want to repeat for the sake of all those who are in the Service of this Island that the propensity for work is the most important factor in any business community. I am under the impression that it will be necessary very shortly for this Government to have appointed a similar investigating committee as what they had in the United States of America when it is felt by any hon. member of this House that there is need for investigation into the lack of money in, say, the Fisheries Department or in the Registrar's Office or on any question which concerns the public pocket, and therefore concerning the public wealth and the public health. Such a Committee should be appointed with powers to act in investigating the workings of any Department which is not pulling its weight in this island or in any quasi-department of Government,

whether it is a statutory board or one which is not a statutory board but which has money supplied to it by Government, like the Transport Board or any other department that would call for investigation.

It must be remembered always that everyone wants to live at the expense of the State, but people forget that the State lives at the expense of everyone. That was a statement made by an old 19th century political economist, but we have to inculcate into every part of this island—both those who are in the services and those who are not in the services—that if they want all of these advantages or aids from the State, they must also put their shoulders to the wheel so that the state can achieve the necessary stability and economy whereby we can have what is needed for our people in this island—a modern and higher standard of living.

Now, Sir, I have spoken at length on the sugar industry, the agricultural industry of this island. To summarise my remarks, I think that the agricultural industry of this island must be given quick assistance in order to be able to compete with the modern methods which are being used throughout the world. The present hen which is laying the golden eggs is being fed by all sorts of out-of-date machinery and methods and unless we feed this hen by modern methods, the eggs are going to diminish very rapidly.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 p.m. of the clock, this sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 p.m. of the clock. This sitting now stands suspended.
2.00 p.m.

On re-assembling, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no quorum present and I ask that the bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

QUESTIONS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are two replies to questions ready, questions standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John. I observe that the hon. member is not now in his place.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is there any hon. member who wants to deal with any Item under "Private Members' Business?" (*After a pause*) There being no matter under Private Members' Business to be proceeded with, the House will continue with the consideration of Government Business.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the suspension of the sitting for lunch, the House was debating the motion for the second reading of the Appropriation Bill. The hon. senior member for St. George was speaking

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, - Before the sitting of the House was suspended, I had begun to summarise my remarks on this Bill. I would like to say that my reasoning in this debate has been based on the fact that Barbados must, of necessity, compete with the modern methods in the sugar industry. If we are to maintain our economic position, we must allocate more money to research and this island must face the fact that modern methods must come to the sugar industry very shortly. I would also like to say, or rather I would issue the warning that we must not get into any sense of false security because of the past ten years of the Commonwealth Agreement and because of any other factors which have tended to make the last ten years extremely fruitful.

How are we going to do something in order to ascertain that, as the Government agrees, the officials agree and all of us are agreed that agriculture is our main industry - it is almost our one and only industry - how are we going to ensure that that industry secures for us and our daily increasing population the benefits which we hope to achieve?

2.40 p.m.

I am in whole-hearted agreement, Sir, with the Govern-

ment's statement in the first Five Year Plan that Barbados, like all progressive communities, is endeavouring to achieve improved standards of administration, of education, of hospitalisation and of social services. The one crop economy of this island and the rapidly increasing population present grave difficulties in achieving the higher standards of living which we seek. We have to endeavour to increase the national income by increased productivity of the soil and plants, improved human productivity and the creation of new fields of employment. Up to now, as far as I know, it is almost impossible to get a soil analysis or a leaf analysis done in this island. These two aspects of agriculture are very important services, and up to now after these ten years we have not got that to find out whether our soil or plants are producing more under particular weather conditions.

With respect to improve human productivity, it is important that all persons in this island put their shoulders to the wheel and improve the productivity of the island.

As regards the creation of new fields of employment, I am still waiting to see them, and I repeat that nothing has been done of any consequence which has created new fields of employment. The Development Plan goes on to say: "The foregoing paragraphs summarise, perhaps too briefly, the problem. The solution cannot be complete but the Government considers that a bold plan of development is essential at this stage." I am looking forward to that bold plan in agriculture. "It recognises that the plan will to a great extent depend on the ability of the Government to raise loan funds both in the island and overseas. It is essential, therefore, that the plan should give confidence to investors, otherwise underwriters would not sponsor a loan issue - except perhaps at rates uneconomic to the Government."

I whole-heartedly agree with that, Sir, but I also want something done to ascertain that we can achieve these particular objects, and I am suggesting first of all that it would be advisable for the Minister of Agriculture and the Government to give considerable thought to the appointment of the best man available on agricultural problems for five or ten years, who will have full authority for co-ordinating the schemes in agriculture for this island and whose reference should be particularly noted in the light of modern methods which exist in other parts of the world. It is my opinion that this island which was originally in the forefront of agriculture in the West Indies is now somewhere around the middle; that, Sir, is not a very good situation and I would like to see us take over the lead in this island again. It can only be done, as was said in the Parliamentary Report, by using the necessary funds to get results. I feel, Sir, that a man properly qualified and appointed to the Department of Agriculture of this island with overall responsibility, particularly in the light of modern methods, would be of great benefit to us and to future generations of those children which are being brought into Barbados at the rate of eleven per day. I would like to see created agricultural field or factory scholarships available at any University or as many as practical. I would like to ascertain that in spite of the fact that we have the University College of the West Indies, the need is so immediate that every possible channel is explored in order that in agriculture Barbados has the best available from its own people by the giving of scholarships in agriculture throughout the world.

I would also like to see a local Agricultural Institute set up where the facilities which we have at the moment can be extended to encourage our people to be more agriculturally minded, and see that propaganda is put out by the Government in order that, as seems not to be the case nowadays, a boy or girl will take an interest in an agricultural job. Instead of taking a job in agriculture, they will sooner take a job in Bridgetown. I know, Sir, that there is a number of boys who would be only too glad to get an opportunity to learn something about agriculture. Let us face facts; these people on estates and in factories today have had little or no training whatsoever. A point has been reached where other parts of the world are training their people in all the methods that are applied

in agriculture; so let us not go on perpetuating the system whereby the employed in agriculture are not fully aware of what goes on in agriculture.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I consider this matter of such importance that I recommend to the Government that a commission be set up to go into it and make recommendations as to the future of agriculture in this particular colony, particularly in the light of modern methods. 2.50 p.m.

Whether or not it is advisable in this island to have 27 factories existing at the present moment; whether or not the future of bulk shipment is to be a saving grace of the industry by itself; whether or not mechanical means of cultivation and of harvesting, etc., would not in the long run over a period of years have to be adopted and how we are going to find employment for our people, how we are going through this stage and how many years it would take us to get to the ultimate maximum of our industry as it is in Hawaii today - and the housing situation is in advance of Barbados - this is the time to think about it; do not let us wait. I wish to repeat a point I made. I hope the public will be educated on the Deep Water Harbour and we will not find as has been found in South Africa that the Deep Water Harbour will lay down there for seven years and not be used. I would like our people to be taught and to be made to realise that to exist in this world today we will have to compete with modern methods.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that a great deal of our present problems have been caused by the fact that a number of people both in Government and in public felt certain that oil would be found in this colony. Again that is another step of false security. So far as I know, the equipment is there in the Harbour today and oil has not been found, according to the statement in the Estimates, up to now in commercial quantities. Let us do away with these false securities and concentrate on the present thing which we know about. Let us do everything in our power to ascertain that the one and only industry which we have does not fail.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have spoken somewhat at length on this matter. I apologise to hon. members for having detained them at such length but I do not however apologise for the fact that I have earnestly during the past few days and nights tried to give to this debate an honest, sincere contribution, one which I feel should be wholeheartedly taken by members of the Government and by the public of this island. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have quite a few other things to say but I could not condense such a serious situation as I see it into a shorter time. As I have said, I have burnt the midnight oil on acquiring the facts and studying the picture as regards agriculture. I have spent last year while on my holiday investigating the actual situation in the sugar industry and I feel I can speak with some authority on the matter.

There are few other minor matters on which I would like to say a few words. I would like to warn this Government against industries which are encouraged into this island, and when they come into this island they do whatever they can to fleece the island and then clear out. I hope that some method will be adopted in your Pioneer Industries Act where no one can come to this island and move out owing the Government, local or otherwise, money without ascertaining that by some means or methods those people are called to account. It is one good thing to encourage people here, but it is another one for them to come here and exploit circumstances and leave.

I will also like to say in passing that whatever I have just said on agriculture applies not only to the big agriculturalists, the medium size agriculturalists, but also to the small agriculturalists. The small farmers in this island should be included into an enquiry as has just been done by a noted Barbadian in Trinidad. Their plight is one which I personally feel needs further assistance. The amount of their contribution to the island's effort in sugar production is appreciable and they should be given consideration on any matter concerning the sugar industry. I think it is regrettable that up to now - I hope I am wrong

in this - that the pilot scheme for small farmers cannot pass two tractors for the island. I repeat that every possible encouragement, every possible facility should be put at their disposal and I would like to commend the Government for their propaganda and their effort on co-operatives. A great lot more needs to be done and I would like to commend to the public that those of us who can assist in any way for these co-operative societies to benefit, not only individuals but the whole island, should do so. There is more, in my opinion, that can be done for the small farmers and it should be done. In fact, I feel it must be done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a sum in the Current Estimates for the Barbados Museum and there is a clock in our Lobby which as far as my memory serves me has been showing the time of ten minutes past six for a number of years. I suggest that it would be a good generous offer of Mr. Speaker and this House to present that clock, the face of which is falling off, to the Barbados Museum. I say it in a light mood but I would not be surprised to learn that that clock is an antique worth while preserving in our Museum and, at any rate, it would prevent it from falling to pieces. I think that clock would be a good present for the Barbados Museum. Mr. Deputy Speaker, with these few words which have lasted rather a long time, I close my offering to this debate and I hope that they will be taken as sincerely as they have been given.

3.00 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the hon. member who has just sat down was speaking, particularly when he dealt with the vicissitudes of the agricultural system of this island, my flesh began to creep, and I wondered how far he would go before he reduced the whole Chamber to tears of self-pity. I was on the point of emptying my pockets and offering him what small change I had, only to see if he were prepared to say that if things were as bad as they were, he would allow Lower Estate to go for a song. He quickly righted the position and said that while he thinks that something is wrong with the agricultural system, it is not so bad or so wrong that it cannot be retrieved. Therefore, we were saved from taking his part of the industry off his hands; but I think that a lot of what he has said requires the strictest and closest attention being paid to it and I hope that the appropriate Minister, if he intervenes in the debate, will take the opportunity of answering some of the problems raised, particularly those which have to do with the cheapening of our cost of production in order to meet competition in sugar and molasses from the neighbouring colonies. I think that that is very important and those who know most about it should expend their energies in doing something about it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this debate on the Budget is one of the most fruitful which we have had in this Assembly, at least since I have been in here. It is the first time that hon. members have had the opportunity, except through the medium of newspapers, to study the speech of the Finance Minister in detail and to make comments on the merits of what has been said, and not otherwise. We have struck a new departure which I hope will continue, now that we have arrived at last at the very sensible conclusion that a Budget Speech should always be made on the second reading of the Appropriation Bill, which is the fit and proper place for it, and not just before the Estimates are dealt with in Committee. I think that all hon. members have really profited by this new experience of being able to read the Speech of the Finance Minister within 24 hours of its delivery and to be able to form their own judgment on the several issues raised in it.

My own impression is that it is a Speech which has been conceived not by politicians but by Civil Servants. Such facts as are found in it, and it does possess a wealth of factual information, are set down in a very cold, unemotional and straightforward way, and no attempt has been made whatever to ascertain the causes of the things complained of, and no conclusions have been drawn from any of the premises which have been laid down. I certainly get the impression that the whole plan of this Speech, and indeed its manner of presentation, belongs rather to peo-

ple who are, by their very nature, far removed from the rough and tumble of political life and who therefore do not very often come up against human nature as it really is. Had it not been so, it would have been very difficult, for instance, to discover why a politician, whether a Minister of Finance or any other officer - should draw the conclusion that he should tax beer merely because people allegedly are not drinking enough rum. That is the most superficial reason which could ever be given for levying a tax that I have ever heard. That is why I say that I believe this Speech is the handiwork of Civil Servants rather than the Cabinet as such.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I read this Speech and I was obliged to read it twice so as to get behind it, two impressions came to mind immediately. One impression was that the Government of Barbados has not yet arrived at the position where it can base its policies on factual information. I got the impression that the members of the Government are still groping in the dark and that opinions and advice given to them are not yet based on ruthless exploration of the facts of the case, but on the prejudices and the personal preferences and ideas of their advisers. Consequently, I was not astonished to see that in one part of his Speech there was a somewhat alarming reference to the falling off during the past year in the value of our exports and the increase of imports over exports and in another part of the Speech reference is made to the advances and loans which increased last year from the commercial banks. I said to myself that if they have got to take two different parts of the same Speech so as to set down what are essentially two sides of the same problem, then the matter under consideration has not been carefully thought out; because I am certain that a very little investigation would show that the reason why the commercial banks, for instance, had faced such a heavy drain on their resources for loans and deposits in the past year was not unconnected with the fact that more money had to be paid for imports, because we were not sending out enough during the year or we were not getting as high a price as we would have liked to have got from the things we sent out; consequently, the drain was accounted for there.

3.10 p.m.

But to set those two facts far apart from each other as if they bore no relation to one another, when in fact, as I said, they are obverse and reverse sides to the same coin, shows how very loose thinking there is on matters of fact, and a little investigation would show quite clearly what the true facts of the matter are.

The second impression I got from my reading of the Premier's Speech was that this Government is still obsessed with the old-fashioned idea that it is the duty of Government to get every possible cent by way of taxation out of the people, and that any concession made to the taxpayer must be made only after a lot of considered hard thinking and not as a generous gesture. I am under the impression from reading it also that they feel that any drop in revenue, no matter what causes it, is something to fear as if it were an epidemic. I cannot explain, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on what other grounds, if not on those, the Government of Barbados would suddenly decide to penalise the people of this island for exercising a preference in favour of beer rather than rum, if it is true. I would have thought myself that before you jumped to the conclusion that more beer was being consumed than rum, you would have had to carry out a very thorough investigation of a statistical nature to find out what basic changes there have been in the drinking preferences or the consumption pattern of ordinary people; what, for instance, may look to be a decided preference or rather an increase in the consumption of beer over rum might not at all be absolute, but may only be relative. For instance, I am not a rum drinker myself to any great extent, but I have certainly undergone a change within recent months so far as my own preference for rum is concerned; I drink now more Mount Gay than I do anything else, and it may well be that there are thousands like myself who have come around to the belief that rum produced in my own constituency is the best of all drinks and they are forsaking other drinks for the one produced in St. Lucy. It may well

be that more Mount Gay is consumed and less of the other brands, and for this reason, since it is certainly a little more expensive than the others, it is possible that persons are forsaking quantity for quality, drinking a little Mount Gay and making it go a long way instead of large quantities of others which they used to drink before. If it is a fact, and you can only know by finding it out, that would account for the relative increase in the overall consumption of rum; but as between one brand of rum and another, you might discover that much more of one brand is being consumed than the other and it might not be that the increase in the consumption of beer means that that is so absolute and so overwhelming; that it may be due to other reasons. It may be due for instance to the fact that many more women than before are now drinking weak alcoholic drinks, and that particularly as regards young women the urge to drink and smoke on a level with the men is now becoming more manifest, and consequently they feel that a beer taken in due season does not harm if taken in moderate quantities; if a relatively large number of persons who never used beer before started to drink it now, then you must expect some relative increase in the consumption of beer. But the Government does not approach a matter like this merely on the basis of the figures it sees before it. The people who compile the Tariff and Excise information are only concerned with bare, dry facts; the Financial Secretary has no part of duty laid upon him to discover why more rum or less rum or more beer or less beer is being consumed. It is the duty of politicians, however, who are supposed in theory, at any rate, to live near and keep close to the people to analyse these various trends and to make figures, however impalatable they may be, bear some relation to the actual likes and dislikes and preferences of human beings. I think, therefore, that the proposal to increase the price of beer by laying on the tax on the ground that more beer is being consumed, is wicked and unwarranted and it strikes in my view at a fundamental democratic principle.

No Government, I do not care what its political complexion may be, has the right to try to inhibit the preferences of people by taxing their likes and dislikes, and I will illustrate that by saying this: we have grown up in a community in which one of the complaints of social welfare workers and people like that has been that the working-classes spend more of their money on rum than they do on anything else; consequently that there has been a regrettable lack of thrift and responsibility among them, and that the crave for drink, particularly for strong drink, was leading our people to ruin. If that is so - and there are many who hold that view - I would have thought that any Government would have welcomed the fact that people were drinking less rum and more beer if only on the ground that the alcoholic content of beer is much less than rum, and consequently the possibility of drunkenness is much less for people who drink beer than for those who drink rum. I would have thought, and any wise person would have done so also, that it was a trend which would have been welcomed; and any Government who saw that trend and found that it was a trend which would last, should make it possible to people to drink not less beer but actually more, since the drinking of beer is less injurious to the human system than the drinking of rum, at least so the people who know tell us.

3.20 p.m.

What you find is something radically different. When people for whatever reason have changed their preference to strong drink and given their preference to mild alcoholic beverages you find that those very people are penalised on the ground that they are not drinking enough of the very thing they say was dangerous to them. Apart from democratic privileges it is also this. No Government, however popular it may be, no matter however favoured it may be, has a right to prescribe to people what they shall or shall not eat or drink except in those rare cases where dangerous drugs and poisons are put up for sale. Where it comes to ordinary items of eating or drinking, it should always be the duty of Government to make them available in abundance and as far as possible in untaxed quantities for public consumption.

I feel strongly on this matter, not only because I believe it is a financial blunder of grave magnitude - and no

doubt the tax will have to be called off pretty soon - but I feel that nobody has the right to impose a tax on me if I wish to drink water or lemonade in preference to ginger beer or mauby. There should be a certain amount of freedom left the individual to accommodate his own taste in eating and drinking. But there is something more than that involved. On the last occasion when this House agreed to the raising of duty on rum which had as its significance the increase in the retail price of a snap of rum, Sir Grantley Adams said when complaints were made about it by the Opposition that the people were not supposed to drink rum because it was a luxury and, secondly, from the Government's point of view if they did not drink any more rum the Government could not collect the increased tax. But suppose it has now happened that the people have not taken him at their word - that could be a reason, I do not know - do you mean to tell me that the Hon. Premier should penalise people to buy the same thing which his predecessor the former Premier said they should not drink? The former Premier said that you should not drink it; now the present Premier is saying that you are not drinking it in sufficient quantities. That is exactly what is happening.

I, Mr. Deputy Speaker, am one of those whom if the choice were mine to see this community free or sober, I should prefer to see it free. I prefer any community to be free than sober because that community will be free in its choice, in its preference in eating and drinking; and if that is so, then its commonsense is bound to assert itself. This Government has no right at all to dictate to the people of this island the lines along which they should eat or drink and certainly it should not at all be inflicted upon the people of this island. I think that is a short-sighted policy and it is going to reflect in this way. You are not going to get the revenue which you think you are going to get. It is the duty of the Opposition Party in this House to make the people see that you are doing it not to get the revenue but for other purposes. When they come to understand that it is an unnecessary tax I am sure that they will stop drinking it.

On the other hand, you may say that the anticipated revenue coming in from the increased tax from beer did not come in and then you will have to do something on rum again. There is one dangerous aspect of this whole matter of the beer tax and it is this. If all that can be said about it by Government was merely that the loss on revenue on rum has got to be made up by the increased revenue on beer, I still disagree with it but I would not be so opposed to it. But the idea that you should couple that with the nonsense that because we are soon to have a beer factory in this island you have got to protect the local beer against the foreign beer when we have not got that local factory yet at all is something which is no argument at all.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to see and hear where I used those words which the hon. member has just spoken.

Mr. TUDOR: I do not know if the hon. member was listening to me; I said the idea that you have coupled one idea with another.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, he has made references which he alleges that I have raised in my speech; and since he has my speech before him I would like to see where I said that one of the reasons for this beer tax was that a new beer factory was soon to be put up here and that I want protection for that factory.

Mr. TUDOR: I have not accused him of saying it *verbatim*, but coupling the idea of the increase with the other idea of the establishment of a new industry is what would make me be inclined to oppose it more. I have not said that he said so directly. Let me go on. You cannot encourage a new industry and justify the encouragement of it, at least in the public's mind if not in your own mind, by reference or by association with a domestic tax put on and imposed on beer.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sorry to rise again. I have never given such an im-

pression and such an impression is erroneous. I never made any reference that this was designed to encourage an industry as he is saying. I am not responsible if what I said has caused that impression to arise in the hon. member's mind; but if he is going to quote me, I hope he will quote me correctly.

Mr. TUDOR: I never thought that this thing would be so serious. The Hon. Premier is making people think that I am on a hot spot. All I am saying is that people who have heard of and experienced the beer tax have also heard that there is going to be a brewery set up here in the near future; and the two ideas, coupled together, would in effect give the impression that the new price at which they are buying their beer may be something to do with the new brewery. That is no quotation of what he said; that is an association of ideas and that is nothing to do with my personal opinion. I am sorry that he does not pay any attention to what arises in people's mind; I thought that would be his main consideration; but if he feels that being Premier exempts him from taking into account people's considerations, it is sufficient that he will know what they think later on.

3.30 p.m.

What I fear is this; whenever this brewery is set up, - and nobody would be against it in principle - the people of this island might well find that whereas they were looking forward to buying a bottle of beer locally produced at the cheapest possible price, in point of fact they might be buying beer at the price at which they are now paying for rum. It is the Premier's duty to separate the two ideas in the mind of the public. It is all right for hon. members of this House who know what the Premier has said or has not said to be clear about it; but people who have to buy beer and the beer factory which is being set up (Hon. M. E. COX: Are you sure that it is not the beer agents?) Well, whoever the beer agents are, they should know the facts of the case. I do not know if the Hon. Minister who made that aside is one of those agents; I myself am not one, and so there cannot be any reference to me.

I think I disagree with every hon. member on this side of the House and probably with some of the members of my own Party in my attitude today as to this question of the Pools. I have never filled out any of these football pool coupon; I do not understand them. They have come home to me and they have all gone into the waste paper basket because I do not understand them. In any case, since I am not the cleverest man, if people want to indulge in a mild form of gambling I do not think that the Government should want to stop it. On this score, I disagree profoundly with the hon. senior member for St. Peter as we have the right to disagree with people; before you pass judgment on anything you have to consider the sort of people who indulge in the particular form of gambling. You have a community which is overwhelmingly poor and some instinct has warned the people of this island that the people here have to work and however much they may try to save, they do not get as much as they should get out of life. That instinct, coupled with the natural gambling instinct of human nature, makes them take a fling wherever they can. Whether on the race pasture or by buying race tickets or anything like that, people do it and I think it is very hard for us to want to inhibit them, not even on the ground that it is a bad thing for them, but on the ground that the pools are entering into competition with the Barbados Turf Club. Because the Government get some revenue from the Turf Club and they are not getting any revenue from the Pools, that has been made the justification for putting on a tax on the Pools in order that what they lose from the Turf Club is made up for by the Pools. That is a bad way to make people pay for innocent pleasures. If it is found that the attention to this pool betting is so great that it is harming the efficiency of people in business houses and of civil servants, if a considerable portion of every day or some days a week are devoted to filling in of these Football Pools and, consequently, a fair day's work is not given for a fair wage which is received, then I would condemn any such practice which allows the people employed to use their employer's time for that purpose. That is reprehensible and it should not be done at all; but it is something far different from the problem as the Government sees it.

If people feel that they are so poor that they can get a little money by investing 25¢ or 50¢, I think that that is an innocent pleasure. The gambling instinct does not affect everybody in the same way. There are members of this House who gamble on their political reputations and lose even in the elections. The gambling instinct varies from person to person, and although, in the case of a politician, losing a gamble can be very depressing, on the other hand, when you play Footballs Pools you can only lose what you have invested. If you invest heavily, then you lose heavily. I think it is an invasion of personal freedom and the preference of individuals to choose in spending their money, to tell them what they should do or what they should not do or to make it appear that you are imposing a tax, not so much because you think that gambling is an evil, but on the ground that this particular form of gambling is rivaling a form of gambling which is an older established type of gambling, and one from which the Government receives revenue. I do not think that it is any part of the Government's duty to defend the Turf Club against competition from the Football Pools. If people feel that they should invest their money in these Pools rather than in Sweep-stake tickets that is the people's affair and no Government has any right to intervene between the people and their choice.

3.40 p.m.

In any case, it shows that the Government really does not know what it is doing if it has to rake in revenue from every little foolish source it can think of. Some sorts of revenue are not worth collecting. I am one of those people who feel that if you are getting \$50,000 in entertainment tax, it is not worth collecting, because you have to set up an administrative machine which will cost you perhaps half of that and that is not a sensible proportion justifiable to the collecting of this tax. Certainly this Government should not appear to hold a brief for the Turf Club in order to prevent the Pools from being practised in Barbados by the people.

I know some members of this House take the view that addiction to this Pool betting causes large sums of money to go out of this island; that is true, but I do not know if I may offend the people by saying that I feel that a Government which can throw away large sums of money of its own should be the last person to want to tell people not to send sums of money out of this island. Government should set an example perhaps in thrift and in careful spending before it attempts to lecture to the people of this island on these matters, and the advice will probably be taken in better heart if people saw a more positive example being set by Government itself. I personally would be inclined to resist and be opposed to any attempt to tax pool betting because I do not think it is big enough, at any rate, yet, for Government to interfere, and I think that if people want to spend their money in a certain way in a democratic society, unless they are spending it on things which are in themselves illegal, you have no right to inhibit or prevent them. I feel very strongly on these two matters. You should not penalise people for drinking beer if that is what they like to drink, nor should you penalise them for small investments of a gambling nature so long as the investment itself has not been declared illegal. Any attempt to do either or both of these things I feel to be an invasion on the liberty of the subject.

When we turn now to other matters in the Budget, I would like to say this with respect to the loan which the Barbados Government has just succeeded in raising in the United Kingdom: I think that it is time that a commonsense view was brought to bear on this matter. I have listened to members of the Government Party and I have read articles in the Government Party's newspaper outlining the point of view that the loan was granted because of the allegedly abounding confidence which the British Government and investors in the United Kingdom have in the Barbados Government, and it has been said of course that had that confidence not existed the loan would not have been granted. I would like to make two comments on that because I see the same sort of thing is repeated word for word almost in the Budget Speech. The first is this, Mr. Speaker; the London Money Market or for that matter any money market in the world works entirely without any sentiment ex-

cept any such sentiment as dictates whether or not an investment is a good one, and therefore the idea that persons lending the Government of Barbados money would be so concerned about the personnel or the ideology of the Barbados Government is absurd on the very face of it, because Governments of all sorts of political complexions from all over the world get money from London, and London investors, so long as the investment itself is a sound one and certain other circumstances are propitious, are prepared to lend their money out whenever they can; but in broad circumstances the popularity of this Government on the London Market has nothing to do with the loan. It simply is that since it is known in England that the greater part of this money was to finance the Harbour project which we now have, the persons in England who are backers of the firm constructing the Harbour wanted their money or at least this portion of it at this particular time and exercised their influence to get it. (Hon. M. E. COX: Hear, Hear!) You might well say "hear, hear", but it is for you to say whether any of it is coming here at all. (Hon. M. E. COX: That is for you to find out.) That is not for me to find out; you used to say we could not raise a cent; so if you have raised a loan you have raised more than you thought you would, and you will not raise another unless Costain wants more money from you; that is when you will get it and not before. (A VOICE: You are hopeless.) I am hopeless and you are desperate.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it should be stated quite fairly that this nonsensical statement that some peculiar confidence rests in them, that people who have never seen them or are aware of their existence should suddenly believe in them as to lend them money - I think it is time to put a stop to that. The facts are that the people whom they owe wanted their money and exerted their influence to get it for them, and it passed from the people who owed it almost straight to the people for whom it is due, and if that is confidence, it is confidence of the investors in Costain to call for money when they want it.

Now, I do not know why in a Budget Speech it should have been so very relevant for the Minister of Finance to launch into the highly controversial field of Civil Servant retirement. I know of course that superficially there is a connection between the age of retirement and the amount Government spends in the service every year, but I do not think that Government is wise to bring this matter up here, because it is a matter which takes some considerable thinking over. For instance, if you decide to take back the retiring age of Civil Servants to 65, you are by that very stroke of policy holding back the promotion and appointments of younger people, and you will have to balance two things, whether by saving on pensions you are not losing on energy and efficiency lower down. You cannot decide immediately with a stroke of policy to do that. There are great issues involved and it might not work out as easily as they think, because you go to the length of instituting costly schemes of training for Civil Servants; you institute Devonshire courses and every year you take a dozen people and send them out on study leave, the purpose and object of which are to fit them for immediate promotion in very responsible administrative positions. If therefore you change your whole policy, instead of allowing people to come out at 55 and make them come out at 65, it means that your promotions are going to be bottled off lower down, frustration and discontent will breed and you may then be faced with whole-sale desertion from your Civil Service probably to others.

3.50 p.m.

Of course, naturally, if this particular proposal is uniform all over the other islands, there is nothing much which Civil Servants can do about it other than get out of it altogether.

I think the reaction is this. If you agree that people should have more leisure and have more of it in a community and you reached the conclusion that an efficiently run Public Service can justify retirement at 50 or 55, you have no right now on grounds of expectation that life is longer and that people are healthy enough to make them work until 65 - and it is this attitude that you find running through the Premier's Speech - that people must be penal-

ised because they manage to be in good health until they are 70. I cannot understand it. I think a progressive thinking Government would welcome the fact that public servants should retire at an age when they are still reasonably vigorous. You are now saying that you envisage the time when you can keep your Civil Servants on until they are 65; but other people are looking forward to the day when other persons not employed in the Government Service will get their old age pensions at a rather much less age than they get it now. I certainly have been emphasizing more often than not that it is a great discrepancy that the people in the Public Service can go out on pension at 60 and other persons have to work until they are 68 before they can qualify for Old Age Pension. If Government has its way and would take this retirement age to 65, it would not view with any favour the receiving age for Old Age Pension at any age lower than what it is now. The one answer which they would put up against it is: why should we reduce it when we have just carried up our retiring age for our officers and servants in the Service. Sir, that is something which you must take into account and I say that it is no argument, if people are living longer, that the retiring age should be carried up.

There is the admission made in another part of the Hon. Premier's Speech that the pensions are inadequate and, consequently, persons who retire even at 55 have to seek money to augment their pensions. Here again, because a public servant retires at 55 and is in health good enough for his seeking another job is no argument that he should wait until he is 65. To keep him working ten years longer does not necessarily do him a favour, but in the long run it can help him; because the longer you keep him, the more Leave Passages you will have to find for him and the more emoluments you will have to give him because he would be there long enough to witness several increases of salary. More increases of salary would mean more increases of pensions; so I cannot see Government is looking at it from a commonsense point of view.

The Hon. Premier said that the use of antibiotics has caused the span of life to be longer. How relevant is that to this argument? The whole argument is giving a portion of importance to the expectation of life. I well know the Hon. Premier at his age would be inclined to make out a good case where he saw a man of 70 living an active life and I do know that is argument which would be grasped with both hands by the hon. junior member for St. James; and I do know that it pleases everybody to know that they are at an age which they can still do an active job of work; but that is no argument for making Civil Servants stay on in your employ until they are 65. There are many young people who want employment and you are training them for that. It is those people whom you really have got to please.

One other point, Mr. Speaker, and it is this. I wish to quote from page 10 of the Premier's Speech. It is stated: "Unfortunately for us, the financial year of the Federal Government is the calendar year and in our case, our financial year is from the 1st April to the 31st March in the next year; so when the Federation makes its mandatory levy, it does not correspond with our financial year and because of that, it may appear as if we are paying more than we ought to, but it is taken back in the following year when the figures can be adjusted."

That is explanatory. I do not think it is so unfortunate that the financial year of the Federation should cover a different period than ours. It just happens to be a fact. What I wish to say about this matter is that I have not yet noticed the Government of Barbados making any pronouncement about the level of Federal expenditure; and this House of Assembly has got a duty laid on it, at any rate, if it can do nothing more, to air its views even if it can do nothing about it immediately. Hon. members are not treated to the fullest information both as to the nature and the scope of the Federal expenditure and we hear a lot of unnecessary views which if they are true will not please the taxpayers of this island. The latest bit of nonsense to come from Trinidad is that the Prime Minister of the Federation cannot live in the house which we bought for him for \$50,000 and that the Federal Government has decided to purchase

a piece of land to construct a building which is to be known as the Prime Minister's residence and that the proposed new residence would cost a quarter million dollars.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of Barbados did not join the Federation in order to gratify the whims and fancies of the Federal Government.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, what has that got to do with it?

Mr. TUDOR: I can speak as I like, Mr. Speaker, I wonder that you allowed me to be interrupted. I do not think the people of this island have any right to have burdens placed on them by the Federal Government in which they participate when those burdens are part of their own taxation to their Government, because it is the Government of Barbados which collects from the people of this island and passes it on to the Federation.

4.00 p.m.

This House of Assembly without any difference of Party or political opinion, should have strong views to pass on Federal expenditure particularly when this expenditure appears to be extravagant. In this island you are asking people to "make do" on what little they have. You have just thrown away a \$1/4 million in the Transport Board last year but you cannot find any money to put into other things. We are not getting any help with our social services and at the same time we are paying an increased mandatory levy when we have no say in the spending of it but only hear that our contributions are going in expenditure which we do not consider to be necessary. I think that this House of Assembly ought to be able to say this to the Federal Government every year: "We reserve the right, we are very critical over that expenditure because we deny ourselves a lot of things in Barbados so as to keep the Federation going." Any Government which takes its responsibility seriously will speak to the Federal Government in the strongest possible terms.

Mr. Speaker, the announcement from the Minister of Finance that Building Societies are going to be encouraged so that the housing of the people may proceed with great rapidity is welcome; but, as I see it, that announcement itself is an admission, a belated admission, that the Housing Authority of this island is not re-housing and cannot rehouse the entire population in the shortest possible time. The Housing Authority has a valuable service to perform as it is doing, but there are areas of activity in housing which, as this Speech envisages, should be opened up to all other forms of enterprise. I hope that while that is a welcome sign, the Government will see that proper safeguards are used. We do not want Building Societies set up and then house and property values skyrocket in price because a lot of sharks operate in a slick and clever manner at the expense of persons who really want to be housed. I do not think it is enough for the Government to leave the matter at that, but they should introduce the necessary legislation to control the establishment and operation of such building societies as now exist or as may be set up in future. If that is done, I think that the operation of these societies with the Housing Authority sharing the work of both elements, ought to go much further in re-housing the population than the Housing Authority can go at the moment. As I have said, very strict supervision is needed; otherwise complaints will come in very soon that people are being robbed.

Mr. Speaker, I return briefly to a point on which I touched earlier, that is, the partial loss of revenue from certain sources of which the Finance Minister complained in his Speech. I want to draw to the attention of the Government something which they might well have overlooked - that is, the number of amendments to the Customs Tariff Act which we have passed in the last three or four years, which are probably more than twenty; and while some of these amendments have been purely administrative amendments, the overwhelming majority have resulted in a loss of revenue because they have allowed raw materials and other things to come in duty free for various industries. I have always taken the view that the time has come when the whole Customs Tariff problem will have to be reviewed and the whole Act amended or repealed and a comprehensive

Customs Tariff Act introduced. I warn the Government of this matter because I feel that each amendment to the Act, while it may look small in its consequence, when we add them altogether, there must be a considerable loss of revenue from which this island is suffering on account of these accumulated amendments. When a large number of goods, materials, machinery, instruments and other things come in duty free - I am not saying that there is no justification for some of them coming in duty free - you are losing revenue and you are probably getting now an unnecessary complaining about it because it will be some years before the incentive legislation ceases to take effect. If you understand that you are losing revenue then you should not complain about it; if, for years, this loss of revenue reaches proportions which are too great, it would be as well for us to keep a yearly, continual check in order to see that these amendments to the Act do not defeat the very purpose for which the Government has established them. I think that we will probably lose about \$50,000 in revenue, probably more, in the operation of these Acts and we cannot continue to introduce these amendments in a piecemeal way as soon as some scheme is put up about allowing these items to come in free. A new comprehensive Customs Tariff Act should be introduced and passed in this House setting out clearly the circumstances under which these concessions are to be given in the future.

I do not think we should come in here every three months with amendments to the Act. You have a mass of Bills which give concessions to industries and you do not know what revenue you are losing in this way. I hope that the Government will pay attention to this matter and make the necessary adjustments.

In conclusion, I should like to say that this is a very unsatisfactory Budget; I do not see anything in it to feel congratulatory about.

4.10 p.m.

I think it is time now that we are almost half-way through the Session that Government said quite plainly what it proposes to do about all these issues which from time to time are being raised by the Opposition. I do not think that I can congratulate them, Mr. Speaker, on realising a surplus of \$2 1/2 million or \$3 million when I have always been asking them to give an immediate increase in old age pensions. I think that as soon as you see yourself heading for a surplus and you understand, Mr. Speaker, that you have taken more from the people in taxation than you need have taken, one of the first things you could do is to expend and expand on social services, and you should give priority to those social services where a minimum grant of cash money could help most. Every time you get Government paying more money the cost of living has risen, and they stop short at that admission without making the further admission that there are people in this community who do need more monetary assistance, and I am never tired of making a plea for the Old Age Pensioners of this island. There are other people who need it too, but the Old Age Pensioners need it more than most, and you have to be very hard-hearted not to see, Mr. Speaker, that if in 1956 you admitted that when you gave \$1.80 per week it was not as much as you wanted to give, because you could not do better at the time, do you want to tell me that three years from then you could not see that a better case be made out for the increase now?

This money which they have accumulated in surpluses is the people's money. I could take the Minister of Social Services and the Premier - and I think they had better let me take them because I could not guarantee their safety otherwise - to my constituency to show them old Rhoda Franklyn from Crab Hill, an old age pensioner who is 90 years old; she has nothing more to exist on than what they give her and she told me the other day that it is true she has not got as long to live as she has lived before, but she would still like to be able to buy half pint of milk every day to drink from now until she dies. That touches you somewhere, Mr. Speaker, and I cannot see how they can say that they cannot find money to do these very necessary things when they can justify an expenditure of public funds as they have at the Transport Board. After all, old Rhoda Franklyn is not asking for charity, for the very money she is asking for is hers because she has

been eating and drinking all her 90 years and some of the customs duties they have collected have come out of her; so she is only asking - and there are thousands like her - for a little of what they have contributed. Do you mean you cannot afford to give them some of their own money? They would prefer to see it in their own stomachs than thrown down the drain somewhere else.

I think it is time that the social services, especially those which require cash grants for their running and benefits, should be attended to; and when you have a community such as ours and you decide to regard one section of the community by raising the income tax exemptions, you should reward the other side by leaving some money with them too, because raising the allowances for children of parents whose incomes are on this level means in fact helping those in the incomes of \$300, \$500 or \$600. What about those whose income is \$1.80 per week? If you are giving benefits and relief to one section of the community, you should balance the thing by giving equal, similar or comparable relief to the other section; that is how I feel about it, and you therefore cannot ask me to congratulate a Government which piles up a surplus from money taken from the people in taxation over and above what you needed. I do not think that there is any reason for congratulation, and once again I make a plea for the increase in old age pensions in this financial year that is coming. Do not make these people wait until 1961 when you want the votes of those who have survived; give it to them now; and if you want their votes in 1961, give them another increase then, because I think you will be doing them more justice.

It is an old story in this House that your own employees are dissatisfied with the wages which you pay to them, and the Minister of Trade Industry and Labour is never tired of sounding the trumpet that Government is a better employer than anybody else, and he is always ready to quote facts and figures to prove it. If you are a better employer you should show it beyond a shadow of a doubt. Do not let your own employees have to badger you about raising wages and giving them this and that. You should not wait for the Opposition Party or your back-benchers to tell you what to do, so that if you find yourself with a surplus, get ahead with the job of giving increases to the people who need them most; do not wait to be urged and pressed. I am not one of those people who would let our case go by default because whenever they do it, wherever my voice will reach I will remind the people that it was this side of the House which caused it to be done. They should not wait for us to press them; they should anticipate the Opposition by doing these things.

The Local Government Elections are now over and I cannot be accused now of making an electioneering speech. There is no election in the offing as far as I know; there is a bye-election that has nothing to do with me, so I cannot be accused of making an electioneering speech. I really do make a sincere and genuine plea for you to take some of the money and share it among the people, and I think you will find it an advantage. If you give the old people more money and expand these necessary social services, Mr. Speaker, you will have less money to waste, and you will have to be more careful about getting money because they will get into the habit of spending it to good purposes and will therefore always want more to spend on these purposes; but because you do not give it to the right people, you must accumulate enough of it to waste. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the money which is thrown away, say, in the Transport Board, would stop when Government knows that there is no more money to be spent in that direction. You ought to have a sense of priority and a sense of gratitude to the people, and I think the Party in power which is now rejoicing over 27 out of 48 seats, in a Local Government Election should be so bursting with gratitude and feel so generously inclined towards the people, that it ought to be chasing down the old age pensioners of this island and pelting them with dollar notes saying 'I thank you, I thank you.'

4.20 p.m.

Far from that, you are taking it away from them. You are taking away an extra eight cents for the very bottle of stout that somebody will give them to drink.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I must commend the Hon. Premier to some extent in having made such an informative and comprehensive speech on the Budget and I must say that I appreciate it even more, thanks to the services of the Clerk of our House and his staff and to you, Mr. Speaker, for having actually seen to it that extra work was put in so that we could secure copies of the speech at such short notice and time. It is for that reason that I am in a position to commend the Premier, who is Minister of Finance, in that reading his speech was more illuminating than having listened to it. The substance of his speech is commendable and I say it with all sincerity. In reality, I regard this budget speech as being more informative and comprehensive and containing much more detail than many former budget speeches I have listened to by the present Prime Minister of the West Indies and for that reason, I am making a special note of it.

Now, I am very satisfied with many of the proposals by the Hon. Premier and many of his summaries and so on; but with respect to the proposed tariff increase on beer, I certainly, like my colleague who has just sat down, feel that it is a wrong method of approach and it may be that it was not the Premier's desire to protect the locally manufactured beer when that company does come into operation but his desire to see that more rum is sold locally, as he has said. I feel that is a very clumsy way of doing it and it would have come with better grace to allow the local beer factory to come here first and then see what can be done to protect the local beer factory. The protection would not be against rum but so far against the imported beer. I therefore regard his proposals in so far as increasing the tariff on beer as being clumsy and I certainly do not commend him for that.

I feel that the Premier's proposals in so far as granting concessions in income tax rates and in the allowances are steps in the right direction. As the Hon. Premier himself observed, he said: "We cannot go to the same extent as is being done in the other places." (He is referring to Trinidad, British Guiana and Jamaica and other colonies in the Caribbean.) - but we have struck a middle course and I am sure the amendments which we are about to make will bring some relief to parents so far as the education of their children is concerned."

We all have copies of this speech and it does not necessitate my reading it to any great extent at this stage. The proposals contained in his speech in so far as granting greater allowances to children between the ages of twelve and sixteen for their education and reducing the rates of taxable income not exceeding the first \$6000 as appears in his speech are good in themselves and a move in the right direction; but when one considers the fact that this is the first time a realistic approach has been made to this question of income tax - and when I say realistic approach, I refer to the fact that the Income Tax Act was first instituted in this island in 1921 and the rates are laid ever since this every year - but when you compare the rate in 1921 with the rate today in 1959, you will see that the rate - and when I say the rate, I mean also the allowances - in the case of a single man or a married man as the case may be are not sufficiently far-reaching because the cost of living has increased so immensely and by so many hundreds of percentages since 1921 that the whole question of income tax should be revised on a comprehensive basis. Of course, this is a step in the right direction and I welcome it because it shows that our present Premier is not adopting any obstinate methods in so far as reasonable methods are concerned. When I say obstinate methods, I have in mind the attitude adopted by his predecessor in office.

This is a realistic approach to the problem and one which is on sound grounds and I am supporting his proposals; but I am saying that the proposals do not go far enough because when you consider that income tax was first introduced in 1921 and you compare the rates then with the rates now and the allowances then with the allowances as they stand today, you will see that instead of granting the average single man an allowance in the first place of \$960 as it is and \$1,400 in the case of a married couple (in case both

are working, their incomes are added together) the time in my opinion has come when a more realistic approach should be made to this problem altogether because the grant of such allowances is preposterous, to say the least. The time has come when allowances more in keeping with realities should be granted and when I say realities one has to bear in mind the actual high cost of living today. To expect an average single man to live on less than \$100 or to grant him allowances on less than \$1.00 in my view is unreasonable.

4.30 p.m.

I am therefore suggesting that the Premier should take up this matter and appoint a Committee of so-called experts, or if you have not got any one competent here to tackle this question of income tax on a proper level, secure the services of a competent economist or financial expert, someone who understands the rates which are prevailing in these places. You should obtain the services of someone who understands economics generally, one who is competent to deal with this matter, and have a revision made of this Income Tax Act in order to grant some measure of relief to the average inhabitant of this island. I am sure that if you were to go into the high cost of living, if you were to go into the matter carefully, you will see that my proposals are not far wrong, because the Premier himself said that he is striking a middle course; he is not even striking a middle course, because he is making a start in approaching this problem and he is doing it very guardedly. He wants to make sure that the revenue is not affected to any great extent and I quite agree with him. In the absence of proper assistance, the Premier is probably correct in adopting this attitude. While allowances have been increased in the case of children and the rate has been increased in so far as the first six thousand dollars of taxable income is concerned, bringing us into line with Trinidad mainly and some of the other colonies generally, yet I did not hear the Premier refer to any provision which he contemplates making in so far as companies, I mean small companies, are concerned. The rate at present is 40% of the profits and if you are a Labour Government and you are encouraging thrift and industry among small or big businessmen, and quite naturally we will be interested in both big and small businessmen, I would have thought that some concessions would be granted to the small companies whose profits do not exceed, say \$20,000 a year. I would have thought that the Premier and his Cabinet would have considered the case of the small companies whose profits do not exceed \$20,000 and have the rate reduced proportionately in keeping with the reduction granted to individuals. Therefore, instead of a small company whose profits do not exceed \$20,000 or thereabout, having to pay a large rate of 40%, there should be a reduction in their case of about 25% or 30% as the Cabinet may seem fit; a 20% may seem to be inadequate. I hope that the Premier will take a note of what I am saying and see that the necessary adjustment is made in so far as the small companies are concerned.

We have been trying to build up the tourist trade and to grant concessions here and there. The Premier referred to those Acts which have been passed and which we consider as incentive legislation to encourage industry; and I must say that the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour has done his part of the work and his Ministry has really done some constructive work during the past year, perhaps more than the rest of the Cabinet. That is my view. I feel that the passing of these Acts has been sound and good and such Acts will have the result of bringing Barbados into line with other colonies. That is reflected in the Speech made by the Premier in which he said that over \$10 million have been spent by tourists in this island, tourists numbering about 25,000 who visited Barbados within the last year.

Although I compliment the hon. senior member for St. George when he spoke on matters agricultural, expert as he is and a plantation owner at that, when he said that agriculture was the only industry in Barbados, he seemed to have forgotten that over \$10 million were spent by tourists who numbered roughly 25,000. Ten million dollars is a substantial sum and of that \$10 million a great percentage was received from the hard currency areas, in other words, U.S. Dollars. That is not an amount to be ignored and I only mentioned that in passing. I am hoping that while

it is a fact that it is the Government's policy to encourage industry, to build up the tourist industry, to insist in the establishment of minor industries as set out by the Premier in securing an expert from U.S.A., and having regard to the loan which has been made to the Tourist Development Board I am hoping that the Premier will see to it that there is a proper reduction in the rate to be accorded to small companies to serve as an inducement and an incentive in the establishment not only of small companies but of many industries as he has proposed.

I do not care to reiterate any of the points which have been covered by previous speakers because it was not my intention merely to make a lengthy speech or even to have spoken at all; but any gaps which have been created by previous speakers I shall attempt to fill in.

4.40 p.m.

Before I forget, Sir, I shall deal in the first place - regardless of who likes it - with one or two grave omissions affecting my constituency, and the first is the establishment of a secondary modern school for the parish of Christ Church irrespective of the site. If the question of site comes up, I would suggest that Maxwell Hill, Pilgrim Road or Below the Rock would be suitable, but as hon. members will remember this had already been included in the Estimates for last year. Provision had been made for the construction of a secondary modern school at Rendezvous, Christ Church, which is near to Worthing View, and I do not know whether it was abandoned or deferred. I got the impression that it was deferred; in other words, it was abandoned in so far as Rendezvous being a proper site for the construction of a secondary modern school for Christ Church was concerned, and I agreed with the Hon. Premier who was then, I think, Minister of Education when he abandoned that particular scheme because I did not consider Rendezvous sufficiently densely populated to serve the needs of the parish, and it was then that I suggested, if hon. members will remember, that a more central site could be selected, and suggested then that Maxwell Hill, Pilgrim Road or Below the Rock in the Silver Sands area would be considered more suitable; but in these Estimates no provision has been made at all. It has not only been abandoned as far as the particular site is concerned; it has been abandoned *in toto*. That is not a satisfactory state of affairs because Christ Church, despite the fact that the Barbados Labour Party has no representative there now, is the second largest and second most thickly populated parish in the island, and when you compare Christ Church with the other parishes which have the facilities of a secondary modern school, you will see that it is grossly unfair, not to me, but to the children of Christ Church that they have not got a secondary modern school in such a well developed parish. Some people may say that I am parochial, but I represent Christ Church, and when you compare parish to parish, with the exception of St. Michael, it is the most developed. It may appear spiteful that there is no secondary modern school in Christ Church, but provision has been made years ago and it was deferred from time to time and now it has been struck off altogether. That is not being fair to the people of the island generally because there is no knowing when people will move from St. Michael to Christ Church. You find people coming from St. Andrew and other parts of the island to the more commodious quarters and more harmonious relationship in Christ Church and establishing their homes; so it may be establishing a petty policy to the people concerned in that their relatives may suffer from not having facilities of that nature there.

The second matter to which I want to refer - and I am still being parochial - is the omission under Capital Expenditure for the construction and setting up of a proper Playing Field and Social Centre for Christ Church. As you drive around the island you find Social Centres and Playing Fields in many parishes, but for some reason or other you find that Christ Church which is the second largest, populated and built-up Parish - which in time will be the most developed of all - has no Social Centre. I am not referring to the little thing at Sargeants Village; that is just a gesture on the outskirts of Christ Church. I do not regard Sargeants Village as being Christ Church. (A VOICE: Don't you get votes up there?) I get votes all round. I am thinking of the people of Christ Church who live in Below the Rock, St.

Patricks and places like that who are far removed from that little gesture at Sargeants Village which certainly does not serve the needs of the parish. I would like to see some provision made for the establishment of a Social Centre and Playing Field for the parish. The Premier and the other Ministers who were here in the last Labour Government would know that provision had been made for the establishment for a Social Centre and a Playing Field in Christ Church just above the Christ Church Almshouse and that negotiations had been entered into with the owner of the land and all the necessary Government paraphernalia and unnecessary detail in my opinion in some cases had been gone through for the purchasing of this particular parcel of land, but it was owing to the sad tragedy, if I may put it that way, of Hurricane "Janet" when it struck at the time in September, 1955 when we were just about to launch the whole plan, that it fell through owing to the rehabilitation of the Housing Programme.

Those are two of the burning questions which will have to be solved sooner or later, and whether they are solved in this Session or else, the time will come when these two amenities will be provided for the parish of Christ Church.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the Estimates I see no special provision made in dealing with agriculture for the Central Milk Plant. It seems as though the present Minister has abandoned the scheme altogether or it may be that he has to experiment on his grassland development first and then embark on this Central Milk Plant. That is very noticeable because provision had been made even though it might have been just a small vote, and I was wondering whether the Minister has abandoned the scheme altogether or whether it is too early a stage and that he has to see after the development of Pangola grass of which he has told us. 4.50 p.m.

Now, it is a good thing to be introducing Pangola grass and in reality it is a scheme which can be expedited because Pangola grass has been tested in many other West Indian Islands and in Puerto Rico where I had the opportunity of seeing it being grown. I can say that were it not for the short-sighted policy adopted in the past we might have had Pangola grass established here already as well as a central milk plant and many other things functioning. I want to tell the Hon. Cabinet and the Hon. Minister of Agriculture in particular that I too had the opportunity of inspecting Pangola grass and Mr. Rose the then expert had intended to implement that scheme here but for some reason or the other, Mr. Rose's suggestion was not taken into account and after he got something more lucrative to do and feeling his services would be more appreciated in that place, he left and that is the reason why we did not get the Pangola grass scheme and other agricultural schemes before. I am not an expert and I have to rely on them to get things done. I understand them and I can explain them to anyone. Again, I am not an expert; therefore I could not get the milk pasteurisation plant plan moving. Sir, I thought I would mention these things. It may be that other hon. members would not know about them unless I explain it. In 1955 I had the opportunity of visiting Puerto Rico as a delegate, which was a trip given to me by the former Premier. I had the opportunity of seeing for myself. As a matter of fact, it so happened that although the Premier and I were to be the delegates it so turned out that I was the sole delegate because the former Premier was too busy to attend the Conference; therefore I had the opportunity of visiting various agricultural projects and the pangola grass scheme was thoroughly explained to us. We saw how it was planted in a large scale way and we also saw the poultry and the cattle industry.

I will tell the Hon. Minister of Agriculture that unless he secures assistance and the appointment of an expert to advise on the establishment of the milk pasteurisation plant or depot as well as on the question of the development of pangola grass lands and the implementation of such schemes as he has in mind and which we all wish him success so as to produce cattle for beef purposes, he will never get them done. A lot of his hopes would be dashed to the ground by certain people. He will

find that all of them will be just pilot schemes as the tractor scheme for peasants. He will find that after five years the pangola grass scheme will be just a pilot scheme because any scheme which will be productive is seldom encouraged by people put in high up places. I realise that that is a damaging remark, but I say it.

However, Sir, I wish the Hon. Minister of Agriculture success in the planting of pangola grass and in the bull industry as a whole. I am wondering, now that Dominica is part of the Federation and has so much waste land which is not under cultivation, whether that island could be included in part of our scheme for furthering the dairy industry. With the opening up of Dominica it might be wise for the Hon. Minister of Agriculture to go there with one or two of his experts - and I do not mean experts who could be stumbling blocks but those who would be of assistance - and explore the place and make representations with the proper authorities for the purchasing of ten thousand acres of land with the view to the planting of Pangola grass down there on a big scale so that you can have about 100,000 heads of cattle. I do not remember the proportion of heads of cattle to the acre but I know it is a large proportion. Probably the hon. senior member for St. George would be able to correct me on that. However it is not a question of one acre of land to one cow. I am throwing out this suggestion to the Minister and the Cabinet. We have a large redundant population and a great mass of unemployment. Let us ignore completely any figures given as to our employment when we listened to a speech in the Other Place not long ago because that is no indication as regards the mass of unemployment in this island. Do not let us fool ourselves that there is very little unemployment in Barbados. If you believe that, you are only living in a fool's paradise. Our people are born in poverty and because of that they can exist on very little. On top of that, they are a very law-abiding and decent people, so like that we fool ourselves that there is little or no unemployment here. But if we are to solve the unemployment problem, we have to adopt a bold policy and there is no reason why a place like Dominica cannot be looked to especially now we have the dairy industry at heart. There are communications between the islands more easily now. I am not suggesting that Pangola grass should not be grown here; but with our arable acres in sugar which is a more profitable commodity to produce than cattle rearing and with very little land available for a dairy industry on a big scale, I am suggesting that you can implement it here on a little scale, but on a bigger scale if you can get land in Dominica to help with this scheme. You will find that the dairy industry would develop to a fairly substantial scale and would more than relieve all unemployment and will provide the essential commodity of cheap milk and cheap milk products. Therefore that is food for thought to which the appropriate Minister will do well to pay some attention. 5.00 p.m.

Again I remind him that if he intends to put into execution any programme for the establishment of a central milk plant he will naturally have to visit Puerto Rico or Jamaica and get an expert from there. There are experts who have the "know-how" in these matters. It will be necessary for him not only to visit these places but to take along one of his competent experts with him and first and foremost secure the services of a whole-time expert from abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I also note in the omissions Capital Expenditure for the establishment of a central workshop for the fishing industry, for repairing the powered launches owned by fishermen. I think that the time has come when we should have a central workshop which would repair the powered boats on a cheaper basis than obtains at the present time and not leave the whole scheme, now that these boats have passed the 400 mark, on such a flimsy basis. By that I mean that the fishermen should not be left to the mercy of the big workshops in Bridgetown. It should be possible to set up a central workshop where major repairs of powered boats could be undertaken by Government mechanics, and that calls

for an increase in the staff of Marine Mechanics. The time has come when the staff of Marine Mechanics should be increased so as to grant a cheaper and quicker service to the fishermen. Fisheries should be encouraged on a big scale; the time has come when fisheries development or the fishing industry should be regarded as our third basic industry; I refer to the sugar industry as our first and foremost industry, the tourist industry as our second industry and the fishing industry as our third. Barbados is fortunate in having a superabundance of fish around its shores and if we are to utilise the opportunities granted by nature, and if we are to find employment of a lucrative nature for the vast army of unemployed people, then I think the time is come when we should have an expert, a competent expert, on fisheries secured, whether he be from Newfoundland or any other part of Canada. I repeat that we need a competent expert on fisheries development.

It is true that our Fisheries Officer does his best and he should be complimented, but he needs further assistance; if we have over 300 powered boats in the water and the scheme is going ahead progressively, fisheries should be embarked upon on a big scale. I am thinking that the Government, having received the necessary advice from the expert, will be working subject to the advice of the expert; what is occupying my mind is that fisheries should be developed by deep-sea fishing experts. I am speaking of the purchase of trawlers and of the establishment of fishery co-operatives. I am thinking of the time when the average middle class man, the man who has attended Combermere School or Harrison College, would enter fisheries on a big scale. If the Government were to purchase trawlers and rent them out to cooperative societies where fisheries are concerned, it may be possible, subject to the advice of the expert and with the development of the cold storage plant of which we have been talking for years to develop the industry on a big scale. I must say that I am astounded to see that the establishment of this plant has not actually become an accomplished fact as yet. During my tenure of office, all the details had been worked out on paper and many experts had come out here and given advice, and I was under the impression that the order had been placed with or made by the Crown Agents. In the case of the British Manufacturers, they naturally do not build cold storage plants for fish until the order has been placed. When an order has been placed and 35% or 40% of the money has been paid down then the manufacturers will send out their staff to build the plant. That is how the British system works. When that instalment has been paid they have enough money to start the Plant and that entails an unnecessary amount of delay.

I would be glad if the Minister of Agriculture would correct me if I am wrong; I would be glad for the correction as to whether an order has been placed for the purchase of this fish and meat cold storage plant or not. I see that the Minister has included in the Estimates, in connection with the meat and fish depot, the sum of \$780,000. The amount of \$1 million has been allocated to this Depot in the Five Year Plan and the expenditure in 1957-58 amounted to \$6,410.

It may be that the order will soon be placed, but I am saying that the two schemes are to be implemented in order that the fishing industry may be developed on a proper and big basis. I am submitting that a scheme such as the one which I have just enunciated should be examined and the appointment made of an expert in deep-sea fishing and in connection with the use of trawlers.

There is no point catching a lot of fish and having a surplus if the fishermen will be deprived of selling them, and, in the case of a glut, not receiving remunerative prices for their catch; so it is for that reason that the Government will have to see after the establishment of this Fish Cold Storage or Meat and Fish Depot as it is called here, on a proper basis. In order not to poison anybody you will have to appoint an expert who knows what he is about and who will not endanger the lives of thousands of people in Barbados or cause the public generally to lose confi-

dence in the scheme. It is for that reason that you will have to be very careful and not quibble over \$400 or \$500 in appointing a competent person, because the policy in the past has been to quibble over \$400 or \$500 and throw away \$5,000. I am saying, Sir, that in a scheme of this magnitude which will in time be our third major industry - and which is that already - an up-to-date Fish Cold Storage Plant with a competent expert from one of the big countries, a man who has had practical experience and is qualified not only on paper, should be established. He might be appointed as manager or engineer to the plant for at least the first three or four years of the existence of this plant, or perhaps you might have two persons, a manager and an engineer. During the initial period of three or four years our local men could be trained to carry on; we could always have a deputy manager and an assistant engineer or assistant engineers who would learn and then they could complete their courses abroad, but at the outset we need two competent men to see after the establishment of this Cold Storage and the economics of the fishing industry.

If you are going to develop the fishing industry, you must have two things going hand in hand. You must have greater facilities for the fishermen, a greater system in providing engines for their boats, cheaper initial costs in the securing of the engines, better and cheaper assistance in the repair of their engines, and also a guaranteed price for the fish which they catch. As I said just now, if we embark on deep sea fishing and establish a Fisheries Co-operative among the ones who may be drafted from even different strata - I refer to the ones who may be more able to see eye to eye with each other and approach things on a more reasonable basis, because if you have a Co-operative Society running at all you must have full co-operation or else the whole scheme will be a failure - I envisage further development of the fishing industry in the manner which I have merely given a rough outline of, but which on the appointment of an expert on fisheries from one of the big countries, with the Minister and the Cabinet can be examined and the correct proposals, recommendations and the necessary guidance and assistance given.

Now I must touch on the tractor scheme. The tractor service was a pilot scheme in the first instance. What I want to ask the Minister now is whether a pilot scheme goes on *in perpetuum* or if it is going to remain a pilot scheme for the first three years and then embarked upon, according to this, on a bigger scale. In 1955-60 the sum of \$15,000 was earmarked for this smallholders tractor service; expenditure in 1957-58 was \$40,311, in the Approved Estimates and Supplementary Estimates for 1958-59 \$8,000 was expended and the estimated expenditure from 1st April, 1955 to the 31st March, 1959 was \$56,515. Now the new provision in these Estimates is for \$5,000. I am wondering, Sir, if this is probably the last year of the pilot scheme, but I am suggesting that this Pilot Scheme has lasted too long.

It is very difficult, as the Minister would know, for peasants to secure the services of tractors in ploughing their land and the cost is exorbitant if not making it very impossible. The smallholders tractor service has proved a success; it has proved a success although I know the difficulty that is experienced in securing tractor drivers, and it is done on such a small basis, being a pilot scheme in the first instance, that very often for weeks when the scheme should be actually on the way the services of a tractor driver cannot be obtained, and it means that the persons are deprived of the assistance which we are willing to give them for having their land ploughed. My contention, Sir, is that the Pilot Scheme has proved so successful that it should no longer remain a Pilot Scheme but should be put on a proper basis so that the peasants island-wide will have the use not only of two tractors but probably of about a dozen. You may have two tractors for each parish, but certainly not two for the entire island; but as long as that conservative policy is adopted by conservative Heads of Departments, you will find that a lot of schemes which we have in mind beneficial to the poorer classes and to the peasants are not actually implemented. The whole thing is a fiasco.

5.10 p.m.

That is my opinion now because enough time has passed. The scheme has been proven to be a success but it goes on as a pilot scheme from year to year and it is merely depriving the peasants of the assistance which we of the Legislature intended that they should have. When I say we, I mean those of us who are labour inclined. I am appealing to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture not to be misled by any conservative advice no matter at what level he has got it. I have the opportunity to speak now; I have been deprived of it many years ago. Do not be misled by any conservative bogey plan because I can tell the Hon. Minister that certain Government Heads go out of their way to mislead Ministers and to see that schemes which are of benefit to the poorer classes are not implemented. This is one of those schemes. It needs no argument. We have a pilot scheme to assist peasants in ploughing their land mechanically; in other words, you have tractors to help them; but from 1955, and even earlier, up to 1959 you have only two tractors for the entire island. I say that for the benefit of my detractors and I am trying to convince them that I am on good grounds and when I say my detractors, I mean those hon. members on the back benches. We have had only two tractors in a pilot scheme which has been going on for over the last five years. If hon. members will understand the working of a Five-Year Plan, one scheme works into the other. The next Five-Year Plan will be from 1960-65, the one previous to this was in 1951-55 and the one we are in now is 1955-60. This scheme which was to assist presumably the peasants is just a fiasco. In the first two years it was a pilot scheme in order to study it, but all of that is past because we see that it is definitely needed in the community to assist peasants in ploughing their land and in order to make such land as productive as plantation land. The argument against the division of land in lots is that when you divide land into lots and you give it to peasants it does not bear as plantation land does. This reminds me, now that I am speaking of the division of land, to ask a question about the division of land at Six Cross Roads by the Government and how the scheme is getting on.

If you give a cheap tractor service and put it at the disposal of peasants, instead of having two tractors for the entire island - you should have two for each parish - well then, the peasants' land or the land belonging to small holders will be as productive as plantation land. And if you also assist the peasants in securing foreign manures cheaply as well as with other facilities which they need, there is no reason why small holdings of land will be less productive than plantation land. If you deprive them of these facilities your argument will hold good.

I wonder how many peasants the Minister has called in and discussed with them the planting of pangola grass and passed on the scheme to them as he has done to the plantation owners? Has he seen to it or has he issued special instructions to his advisers, whether the Director of Agriculture or the Deputy Director of Agriculture who is seeing after the scheme of pangola grass, to see that the peasants are also given the facility of planting this pangola grass? I know that the plantation owners will have it and plant it on trial in their fields but I am saying that peasants can also be instructed in the scheme and have it on trial in their lands.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore the fact that this tractor pilot scheme should be continuing still as a pilot scheme. I feel the time has passed for it to be a pilot scheme; it should be put on a sound basis. You have a large number of peasants, thousands of them, who only own a quarter of an acre of land. There is a big army of peasants island-wide who are looking forward to this tractor service and who have made applications for it in advance but who have been deprived of it. If I am wrong, the Minister may correct me. I know that was the condition which I left. The time has come when the Minister having a greater know-how of matters agricultural, he being himself a planter or big time peasant, if you care to call him that, with fifty or sixty acres of land, should see to it that this scheme for assisting peasants in having their own

land ploughed and cultivated like that of the plantation system should be made available to all peasants island-wide. Those facilities should have been given to the peasants long time ago. Is the Hon. Minister allowing himself to be hoodwinked and fooled around by conservative advice? Is he allowing himself to be turned around on a matter like this? If he is, he is not trying to develop a healthy peasantry or trying to develop the agricultural resources of this island.

Sir, I would just reiterate briefly what I am asking the Hon. Minister of Agriculture to pay great attention to: (1) the implementation of the tractor scheme on a big scale; (2) the introduction of the Pangola grass scheme to the peasants; and (3) the easy access of cattle to them. In other words, the purchase of cattle in bulk by Government and releasing them to the peasants on an instalment basis, say, that a peasant will have about two to three years to pay for a cow.

Mr. Speaker, there is no provision made in the Capital Estimates under Education for the establishment of a new secondary school for St. Michael to be run along the same lines as Combermere School.
5.20 p.m.

We are allowing ourselves to believe that because 50 years ago we had Harrison College - I should like the Premier to listen carefully to what I am saying now - where favoured few met, having a certain pigmentation - because we had Harrison College, Queens' College, Combermere and now we have St. Michael's Girls' School, because we have these schools in St. Michael, we are allowing ourselves to believe that we have adequate accommodation for our boys and girls today. Nothing could be more farcical than that; the population, as outlined by one of the previous speakers and which is well known, has increased by 4,700 every year; that has been going on for the last ten or fifteen years and a Labour Government which has the interest presumably of a particular class of persons at heart and of the island generally, is allowing itself to be fooled into believing that because we have these schools, we have ample accommodation for the children of today. Nothing could be more wrong than that. Owing to the fact that money is available from all classes today more so than it was ten or fifteen years ago, thanks to the Trade Union and the Labour Movement and not merely to Sir Grantley Adams - everything is attributed to him - but to all those who have contributed to this position - owing to that fact thousands of young children are now seeking entrance to these secondary schools. In order to try not to prevent these children from getting the benefit of a secondary education, the parents are sending them to these secondary modern schools which, in many cases is not the desire of the parents, but due to the lack of accommodation in these four schools in the St. Michael area which I have already mentioned. Many a child is turned aside to these Secondary Modern Schools despite the wishes of their parents; I say that the time has come when the Government, just as they have established Combermere School after a lot of twisting and disappointment and throwing away a lot of money down the drain through no fault of the present Government, should realise that we need two more Secondary Schools built in St. Michael, whether you put them one at the Garrison and the other at Black Rock or Cave Hill, but not necessarily in the heart of Bridgetown. The time has come when we need two more Secondary Schools so as not to prevent the average parent from carrying out his ambition towards his children.

It is wrong in a democracy to deny the wishes of parents in respect of their children. You talk about freedom from this, that and the other, but you have no freedom to go to the Secondary Schools; what we really have is the freedom of a legacy of ignorance. The average child is being denied the opportunity of attending the Secondary Schools, while Barbados prides and boasts of being the most advanced colony educationally; but if it claims to be an advanced colony, the time has come when the number of secondary schools and the places needed in these schools should be increased. There is no excuse for 700 children sitting an entrance examination to Comber-

mere School when there are only 60 places available; that is not good enough. I am referring to the Government aided schools; it is not good enough to have so many children sitting an entrance examination and then they are told that there are only so many places. I advise the Hon. Minister of Education strongly that if he wants to leave his name with the people of Barbados in the matter of Education, the time has come for him to establish two more secondary schools. He should erect a secondary school in St. Philip which is a big parish; nowadays children are forced to leave St. Philip and come down to the Foundation School or down to the City. If you were to grant greater facilities for at least one-half of the population of this colony, you would place these secondary schools more on the outskirts of St. Michael proper. 5.30 p.m.

I know that my colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Philip, has been pressing for a secondary school for his parish for a number of years and has not yet been successful in securing his desire. Whether you place one boys' school in St. Philip or whether you place both Secondary Schools in St. Michael, the fact remains that with a better system of transportation and a more improved and accurate system of accounting at the Transport Board, and with the construction of two secondary schools, it would not be possible to hear parents complaining as they do so frequently. I receive numerous complaints from time to time from parents whose children have been turned aside - prospective pupils or applicants for these schools who have not been granted places. That is not good enough, Sir; at least we should provide enough accommodation for secondary education in this island, and not try to divert the average pupil who might not be desirous at all to attending a secondary modern school because the merits of a secondary modern school are yet left to be seen. I would like the Minister one of these days to explain how these modern secondary schools are run; that is, how well or otherwise they are getting on.

Now the Premier did touch on the question of the establishment of Building Societies. That is a very welcome innovation and I wish it every success, and I hope that Government will assist in the manner which they have outlined in reduced rates and so on. Over and above this establishment of Building Societies, I must say, Sir, that we now have the services of a Town Planning Officer; he has been appointed and has taken office for a few months.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. BRYAN took the Chair as Acting DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, at this point I was touching on the recent appointment of the Town Planning Officer who has been appointed at a rather late stage of our development; and I know that his job is a tedious and difficult one in that the streets of this island have not been controlled or laid out according to any plan whatever. For that reason roads today are springing up wherever tracks existed in the past; so there is no question of planning as far as Bridgetown or the suburbs are concerned. The Town Planning Officer, with the bad road construction in the past, with little or no sidewalks and with slum areas around the town and even in the suburbs and country districts, has a very herculean task to perform, and for that reason my sympathy goes out to him in that we cannot expect any remarkable results overnight or even in the first two or three years. The most the Town Planning Officer will be expected to do would be to assist in the planning of new areas, and the removal of the whole slum areas, provided the necessary funds are forthcoming, and I feel that the time has come when the Housing Authority or the Mayor - whoever he may be - and the Municipality, with a proper housing system for slum clearance will have to secure funds whether they be from the Labour Welfare Fund or Price Stabilisation Fund - although I know the Government is afraid to touch those Funds; but you have to touch those Funds sooner or later - that \$12 million or \$13 million which is lying idle while people are living in huts and being deprived of the ordinary amenities and facilities of life. Some of these people are the ones who created the wealth of this country and who through their industry and hard work created

this money which is lying idle at Barclays Bank. The time will come when that money will have to be spent; that money should be embarked upon and utilised for the benefit of the people of Barbados who are living in little huts which have been assessed for taxation under the Local Government Act. The time has come when that fund should be secured, whether it be from Labour Welfare Funds or Price Stabilisation Funds or whatever reserves you have lying idle, because the reason why Barbados did not receive any further assistance in the Hurricane, - and this is not disclosing any secret - was because Barbados has vast resources lying idle. Barbados may have about \$13 million in the till and about \$120 million lying around if added up; there is a lot of money lying idle and that is why Barbados got \$50,000 whereas Grenada got over \$2 million after the hurricane. That is the reason too why Barbados got its loan because they know that Barbados has a lot of reserve funds lying all around, and that is the reason why the name of Barbados is good; there is a lot of money knocking around right in the Crown Agents' Office. I would like people to understand that that is a true state of affairs and that there is a lot of money in the Revenue Equalisation Fund for investment abroad at a low rate of interest, three percent, 3 1/2% or 4%, but under Government's bad system of financing they will borrow \$10 million to finance the Deep Water Harbour Scheme at probably 6% or more. That is a bad system of financing and bad economics, and the quicker we stop doing things of that sort the better for all concerned.

I am saying, Sir, that the appointment of a Town Planning Officer is a move in the right direction, but to expect the impossible from him in the first year or two is expecting too much, because we will have to have a proper road system with side walks and slum clearance, and in this work he will probably be helped by the City Mayor and the Municipality, and failing the Mayor the Housing Authority, because the Municipality will have power to embark on housing projects and clearing slum areas, and I am hoping that the Mayor will not be any pussy-footed type of man who does not understand the realms of true hard politics and the necessities of the people of Barbados. I am hoping that he will be a type of man who can get work done quickly and who has a constructive approach to the wants of the people of this country, and who above all is a humanitarian. If the slum clearance scheme is too big a scheme for the Housing Authority, by all means let the Mayor and his Municipality get on with the spectacular work right away by earmarking money to him and to his municipality for clearing the slums in the first two or three years. 5.40 p.m.

Well, of course, the question is whether it is a conservative set-up or a semi-conservative set-up.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was hoping like my hon. friend, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, to see some substantial increase in the Estimates for old age pensioners. To grant an allowance of \$1.80 a week to maintain life and limb of the average old person of 68 years and upwards who has worked from the cradle to the grave in this island and has given of his best years in building up the economy of Barbados is an insult and is taking a mean advantage of the poor and decrepit person who is not in a position to fight back and say anything on his own behalf.

The time has come when you should make some sort of decent gesture to them. What can \$1.80 purchase today? In the case of condensed milk you have to pay 30 cents for a tin. It means that you will only be able to buy one tin of milk, a few pints of rice and not even a bit of salt fish to eat with it. How can you live on that? We would expect that Ministers of the Government who are labour inclined and who say that they have the poor at heart would do something about this. I would say that the time has come when old age pensioners should get at least \$3.00 per week. Round it off and give them \$3.00 if we want to act as human beings. We can afford it because when you have a surplus of \$2 million or \$3 million at the end of the year, you surely can give your pensioners an increase to that amount. Nowadays, you have a P.A.Y.E. system which holds everybody. If you

have a surplus each year of \$2 million or \$3 million, why could you not give a little increase to these destitute poor people who have given of their best from the cradle to the grave and who are just given a pittance- which is an insult-of only \$1.80 per week? There is no justification whatsoever in your coming here and running some monkey story trying to convince people that you cannot afford it or your saying that the Financial Secretary worked out this or that and you find you cannot afford it. I can tell you that you can afford it without examining the figures. They are old people who are looking like us and not like the hon. junior member for St. James although I am not one who likes to stress colour.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as far as the Government pensioners are concerned, I think the Hon. Premier and his Cabinet are fully convinced - and he gave some assurance to that effect - that their case needs to be looked into. However, I am bringing it to his attention now because this is the appropriate time. He should see to it that something is done quietly for those Government pensioners who are receiving less than \$200 a month. I am not talking of the pensioners who are receiving \$400 per month. Such a pensioner should be able to work out his budget on that basis. I am speaking of the pensioner who is in receipt of less than \$200 a month, whether he be a policeman, postman or teacher, although I may say that there are some teachers who seem to need no assistance because they are the most pigheaded and silly persons we have in the community. They would not even vote. However, I am speaking of employees generally in the Civil Service, whether they be white-collared workers or cantonniers or members of the Water Works Department. I refer to those workers of the Casual and Unestablished Staff. We have to see that the Premier keeps his word and do something in a short time for them. In any salary revision you do not start from the top and come down. In other words, I want to tell the Hon. Premier who is the Minister of Finance not to allow the Financial Secretary or any of those bigger officials, like the Chief Secretary, to decide first of all on increments for the senior officials and then when it comes to the consideration of the people in the lower brackets you add up to see how much it would cost you and then you say: "it has cost so much, I can spend only \$5,000 more on that, let me divide that between the other thousands of people." In any revision of salaries, start from the bottom and go up, so that you can be assured that the ones who get \$13 or \$14 per week will be treated first because the cost of essential commodities is identically the same for the cantonniers as it is for the Financial Secretary and the Chief Secretary. Let me say that I do not have any grouse at all for the Financial Secretary; as a matter of fact, he is probably the most decent of them all. The same thing can be said of the Chief Secretary. These people in the lower brackets have to keep life and limb together and perhaps they have a wife and family. Many of them have a lot of little children. You should see to it what is the minimum it takes to maintain the average family, that is a husband and wife and three or four children, and then fix their wages on that basis. See to it that the ones in the lower brackets, the ones who are the most oppressed and forgotten, are given something reasonable. To pay anybody less than \$20 a week today whether he is a cantonnier or a labourer is taking a mean advantage of him.

5.50 p.m.

I am imploring the Government not to be fooled again; when the question of salary revision comes up again, let them start from the casual employees up, and unless these employees get about \$25 a week they are not doing anything. The Government must not start with people at the top, whether it be the Financial Secretary or the Commissioner of Police, and give them \$200 a month more. On the last occasion, some officials received an increase of \$200 a month. The Hon. Minister might say that I was a party to that; but what I was rather a party to was to see that the people in the lower brackets got more money. After the Government gave away all the money to the officials at the top, then they said that there was not enough money to pay the rank and file of the unestablished Staff and the hardworking people in the Civil

Service. That is the wrong approach to the matter; I feel that if I had kept that to myself I would be stifling my conscience and I would not feel very happy. There is no point in revising salaries and when it is all done only one Section has benefited and the people who are in dire need have not actually been assisted; that has happened too often. Unless we do some plain talking here and now we will find that the same thing will happen all over again. I am hoping that the Premier and his Ministers will take note of what I have just said; if they need the assistance of the Opposition in arranging proper salaries and wages we are free to grant it to them, free, gratis and for nothing.

I want to commend the Premier for having brought forward certain proposed alterations in the P.A.Y.E. system. I see that the Premier is willing to listen to constructive criticism and I have seen that exhibited in many places in the Budget Speech. I am commending the Premier for that, and I am saying that on more than one occasion, not only myself - for I had a very prominent part in it - but all of us in the Opposition condemned the P.A.Y.E. system in so far as agricultural workers are concerned; I include the hon. senior member for St. Peter who is very intimately connected with more than one third of the population. That system is working a hardship on the agricultural workers in the community because when they earn a little money in the crop season and then in the off or the hard season when there is no money for deduction purposes, these workers are in a quandary in getting back their money. They should not have been taxed in the first instance. The Premier has made reference in his Speech to certain amendments in the operation of the system. This is what the Premier said:-

"The operation of the P.A.Y.E. system of income tax collection instituted since April 1957 has proved of great benefit, but the Commissioner of Inland Revenue is devising a system which will obviate the collection of trivial amounts of taxes; where the tax is considered trivial - I have in mind people who are employed only for a certain portion of the year, about five or six months and who pay income tax on that amount, but in the later part of the year when they do not work at all, or when they work and the income has considerably decreased, the overall picture for the year will make the tax very small.

We are receiving complaints as to taxes of a trivial amount, and then you have to send these people notices for refunds. The system which the Commissioner is devising will obviate that and the necessity of keeping accounts for trivial amounts. I think that in this way the complaints against the present system will be reduced." That is very sound. I commend the Premier very much indeed for this portion of his speech and for the assurance he has granted there I hope that he will issue the necessary directives and see that they are carried out by the appropriate officer so that in the case of domestic servants or artisans this matter of taxation does not arise. These people work for two or three days a week; they may work for 8 weeks or four months in the course of a year. Whether they be domestic workers or hotel workers or the vast army of agricultural workers who are the backbone of the economy of this country, - we are saying that the time has come when directives of a specific nature should be issued to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue with regard to people who we know are not liable to taxation. I am glad to see that the Premier has made that intimation and I hope he will have it implemented on a proper basis.

6.00 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are many other points on which I can probably touch, but our Party is comprised of so many prominent orators, if I may be excused in saying so, that I have to leave room for my senior colleagues to tread on and I will close at this stage.

Mr CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I imagine that there must be a lot of anxiety on the opposite side of the House as to when these speeches are likely to be

finished since I imagine time is running out, and therefore I propose to confine my remarks merely to a few comments on the introductory Speech to the Budget. I shall take them in order as they appear in the Speech itself.

Now the Premier began by drawing attention to the House to the effect of the recession on employment and the noteworthy thing about that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that he meant a recession in England and America. He wanted to draw attention to the effect of that recession on Barbados in the sense that since there was a recession in these places, emigration possibilities would be decreased and there would be an increase in the unemployment in Barbados. Even allowing, Sir, for the fact that he made these comments within the context of the economic position of the island, it is obviously absurd when you are talking about unemployment in Barbados to think of unemployment in Barbados only in terms of the effect on unemployment here by a recession outside. The figures he gave with regard to the difference in emigration between last year and this year are merely 583; 583 people less emigrated last year than the year before. That number in the context of the unemployment in this island is infinitesimal to the total unemployment figures in Barbados, and although the Government has had within its hands for now something like three years a comprehensive and exhaustive report on unemployment, it has never published it. We know, however, that the figures of unemployment are now something like 26,000, almost ten percent of the entire population - and these are the figures in crop time when the maximum number of people is being employed locally, so that the Government is talking about a mere 583 people who did not go abroad in one year as compared with the entire problem of unemployment.

In England where the unemployment is 1% and where it is 2% in America, the administration visualises all sorts of national disasters, but here we are faced with a 10% employment picture and all the Premier refers to in this context is the fact that 583 people less in one year emigrated than in another, and no where in the entire budget is there any indication at all that the Government seriously proposes to tackle this question of finding more work for the people of this island.

Before the Deep Water Harbour started, they trumpeted largely the potentialities of this scheme for employing people. I know from replies to questions tabled here asked by the hon. junior member for St. John that up to January this year only 505 people found employment at the Deep Water Harbour; there were 541 and of the 541, 36 were expatriates employed there in expert capacities, so that this scheme, propagandised to be this tremendous employment potential, has not scratched even the surface of unemployment in Barbados. If any where in the Budget there were proposals for large scale employment of a proportion of this unemployed population, Sir, we should be able to view the situation with more satisfaction; but the prospect therefore is that rather than decreasing, the unemployment figures will rise, and rise to a point at which alarm is bound to give way to something more serious.

What amazes me, Sir, is that the Government should appear to be surprised that there has been a decrease in the savings of people as evidenced by the Annual Report of the Government Savings Bank. The Premier said on pages 4 and 5 of this Budget Speech that the Savings Bank is going strong and in a healthy condition but that withdrawals in 1958 exceeded ordinary deposits by \$230,954; in the previous year deposits had exceeded withdrawals by \$1,111,600. Well now, obviously people that are unemployed cannot save money. If your unemployment is increasing, and if you are failing to provide domestic employment possibilities and therefore people are not working, they cannot go on saving money. To the contrary, many of them who may have had some savings would have to go and withdraw those savings in order to live. If you are unemployed you cannot have any money; and therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it should be obvious even to this

Government that since it cannot decide with any justification that public confidence in the Government Savings Bank has decreased - I do not think that we can say it has, I have heard no rumour to this effect - if people were losing confidence in the Savings Bank, that might be one answer to the fact that there was this big difference. If there was a loss of public confidence, well then, you would not have to search for the reasons why withdrawals exceed deposits; but since, as far as we know, public confidence remains at the same level, obviously the answer is to be found in the fact that people are not working and cannot save money and those that have saving deposits must withdraw in order to live. The answer, if you want the Savings Bank to function at the level it has been functioning in the past, is to try to provide more employment for people, because if they are working they would not have to rely on utilising their savings in order to live. 6.10 p.m.

It is not without significance that the same level by which the savings in the Government's Savings Bank dropped, they rose to the level of loans in the Commercial Banks and the comment which the Hon. Premier drew from that is this. He says: "I do not know much about figures but I do not think it reflects sound business when savings rise by \$1 million and loans and advances by the Banks over the same period rise by \$7 million. It shows that probably some of our people are getting further in debt by having loans and advances on the Banks."

Well now, it all boils down to the same thing. If people are not working, they have to borrow money or they have to withdraw their savings, and the fact that commercial banks have increased their loans to local people, while it is something to be deplored, on the one hand it may be that people are borrowing money because they are not working or in debt and it means that they are mortgaging their security with very little chance of paying off their loans unless they have employment; while on the other hand, it is a matter for satisfaction to know that the commercial banks are beginning to make more of the money they are making in the colony available to the people of the colony. May be, the threat of a National State Bank has awakened Barclays Bank, the Canadian Bank of Commerce, the Royal Bank of Canada and the Bank of Nova Scotia to the fact that since they are making enormous profits in the island, some of the profits they make should be made available to the people. The one purpose of these Banks is to make enormous profits out of this island. It is not easy for people to understand how in a small island like this, with a quarter million people, with three foreign banks already here, there would be sufficient business for the fourth to come in; but the fact is that it is good business. The figures are so good that these foreign banks make enormous profits in the island and the profits they make are sent outside to develop other countries and the local business people have enormous difficulties in endeavouring to raise capital here to develop the island. Therefore, when I saw that last year for the first time there was the sign of the big commercial banks advancing more credit to local people I welcomed it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the reservation that I do hope that the people who are borrowing this money now will be able to repay it and that they have not put themselves in debt and mortgaged their security merely in order to provide for life from day to day. So long as they put these loans to development and expanding purposes and are making capital developments which they hope will give them profits in the long run, it is all for the good of the Commercial Banks to plough back in Barbados some of the profits they are making in Barbados.

Well now, with regard to the remarks by the Hon. Premier on tourism, let us say briefly that revenue from tourism has risen to \$10 million in a single year in spite of the present Government because we do not build tourism over-night and the Government for years has been the biggest obstacle in the way of local tourist development. We have now reached a point where the income from tourism is \$10 million because a number of far-sighted people who, despite the lack of encouragement and the open opposition of this Government, have for years endeavoured

to bring to this country some of the benefits of tourism. However, do not let us feel that \$10 million is by any means complete. The figure last year for Jamaica is close on \$40 million and \$10 million for us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is less than one-half in my opinion of what this country can expect from this source if and when the development of our tourist potential has reached its maximum.

Now to offset the consumption of rum and the loss of revenue in consequence, the Government has decided to increase the tax on beer. In so far as I am concerned, I do not think that the reduction in the consumption of rum is a matter which any Government in any part of the world should bemoan. The Premier in his Budget Speech reflecting the policy of the Government in this matter spoke with the utmost regret that the consumption of rum had fallen off. I think he ought to welcome it; he ought to be glad it has fallen off; he ought to have been happy in the interest of the health of this country that it has fallen off. I would have thought that the Hon. Premier as a doctor would decry anything that leads to deteriorating standards of health. To look at it from a humanitarian point of view, the Government should do all it can to discourage the consumption of rum. In America at the beginning of the present century the country under President Wilson - I do not remember his name; somebody has said it was Hoover - introduced prohibition because he thought it would be of assistance in promoting the health of the community. Subsequent Governments of that country have had to remove prohibition because of the large quantities of improper immatured liquor which the public in large quantities consumed although they could not get it legally; but Your Honour would also recall that in India the very first thing they did after they became a republic was to introduce prohibition.

6.20 p.m.

I feel that while it is true that, as housekeepers, the Government must take note of any decrease in the budget from this source, the correct approach to the question is not to bemoan this fact and try to get more money from alcoholic beverages; but to think of other sources for getting this money. What is really happening in this country is that people have found themselves with a little more money and the average frequenter of the rum shop or pub regards it as a matter of financial prestige to be able to call for a bottle of beer rather than call for a snap of rum. He believes that when he calls for a bottle of beer he is demonstrating the fact that he has more money in his pocket; therefore, as the occasion arises, people would be prone to drink beer more so than rum. If the Government think that by increasing the taxation on beer they will offset the excise duty on rum, they are living in a fool's paradise. What will happen is that the people will drink less beer. In the country districts, beer cost 38 cents per ten ounce bottle and, obviously, a bottle of beer is beyond the purchasing power of any but the foolhardy few of the people who frequent rum shops. I am not a prophet, but I am willing to bet that the revenue from beer this year will be less than it was last year, because less beer will be consumed. People cannot afford to pay 38 cents for beer and 44 cents for stout. The figures show that there need not be any cause for alarm over the fact that the consumption of rum has fallen off and that we will collect less money from it; we will collect more from customs and income tax as the figures rise and we can afford to ignore a drop in revenue from rum. There is no specially laid down figure ordained by Divinity or some overriding power as to the amount of revenue which we must collect from rum, and I, for one, am of the opinion that the figures of revenue from the consumption of alcoholic beverages in this country, either of rum or of beer, will continue to decrease. I am sure that it is more in the interest of the health of the community that less alcohol should be consumed, and, to put it very mildly, I am amazed to think that a Government, with a physician at its head, should speak in such bemoaning terms of the fact that less alcohol is being consumed in the community. The Premier of all people should welcome that fact, if he has any interest in the people of this island.

That will just give you an idea as to the manner in which the Government looks at matters. The Premier dealt with the matter of rum and beer. He says that there

is a fall in the value of exports and there is therefore a large adverse balance of visible trade. He went on to say that our exports in 1958 were \$35.4 million as compared with \$45.5 million in 1957. In other words, in one single year the difference between exports and imports has dropped by \$10 million, but nowhere at all in the Budget is there any proposal for bridging that widening gap between exports and imports. Certainly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is a matter of infinitely more grave concern and we should view with the utmost consideration this widening of the gap between our exports and imports. Even the Government must realise that if this situation is allowed to continue unchecked, the country is heading for trade bankruptcy. You can only have a healthy economy when the value of your exports is at least at par with the value of your imports, although, obviously, the desirable situation is that your exports should exceed the imports. Apparently, it is a matter of no concern to this Government that there is this large adverse balance of visible trade. The figures are supplied to the Premier by the Financial Secretary as a matter of course, and I imagine that this Speech made by the Premier was compiled, and it is obvious that it was compiled, from information supplied by the various Departmental Heads. These Departmental Heads send in their information and the Premier comes here and presents these Reports as a Budget Speech. When the Financial Secretary gave the Premier these facts and figures the duty of the Financial Secretary ended there; he was merely obligated to give to the Government an accurate Report as to the financial position of the island in this respect. When he says to the Cabinet: "Look here, there is an adverse visible trade balance," it is the duty of the Government then to formulate plans to replace this balance. But nowhere along the line, either in the Budget Speech or in the Estimates themselves, is there any definite, determined effort to reduce this trade balance; therefore, we will see next year, unless a miracle takes place, that this gap will be further widened and it will go on to widen except we are fortunate enough to have events moving so much in our favour that, without any effort on our part, the situation will redress itself.

6.30 p.m.

That of course is possible, but in these matters you cannot afford to leave everything to chance.

The comments in this Speech with regard to development present a pretty appropriate picture of what I call Government's approach to this question in general. In talking about development, this is what the Premier said: "There was a large Government expenditure on development in 1958." And he goes on to talk about public works schemes which included the Deep Water Harbour. Well now, in advanced countries today, when Government talk about development plans they do not mean public works projects. In other words, the developments we went through last year are primarily public works projects which in themselves will never produce any revenue; they represent capital expenditure which every year will call for more capital expenditure in order to maintain them. The Deep Water Harbour itself will not in the foreseeable future be a revenue producing concern; it is too much in debt; and the same Government by its reactionary policy has so destroyed Bridgetown as a popular port of call for steamships that unless a miracle occurs, even with the Deep Water Harbour there will be a long time before the \$20 million or \$30 million we are spending on the Deep Water Harbour can be repaid with interest and leave something for us by way of revenue. When they talk about development in terms of public works projects which they are undertaking, it is merely exhibiting their 18th Century approach to the question of running a Government. Even in the other West Indian islands like Jamaica, Trinidad and British Guiana, to say nothing at all about Puerto Rico, when they talk about development they mean development in the sense of economic expansion, and in the sense of economic investment - industrial expansion which is going to expand in time the national income by providing more revenue; and it is an anachronism in the present state of the West Indies' constitutional position to have a Government in one of the most advanced units of the Federation which cannot appreciate the difference between development of public works and development calculated to expand

industrial income. It is as if we are insisting in this island in remaining in the horse and buggy days when the other countries are thinking in terms of jet aeroplanes. We have to thank fortune for the expansion in the national income within the last ten years more than we have to thank any efforts on the part of the Government. It is purely by accident that the national income has expanded to the point at which it is, and we are now discussing a \$21 million budget rather than a \$10 million. Left to them and their bankruptcy of policy and lack of initiative Barbados would not have a bigger budget today than St. Lucia, and I for one deplore the fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that people outside of this country reading the Budget Speech of a country which boasts of having a Premier and which obviously must occupy a certain constitutional position should have a Premier that thinks of development in terms of public works.

Now a lot of hullabaloo has been raised about the fact that we raised a loan in England a few weeks ago within a fairly short time. During the last campaign for Local Government, more than one speaker on Government platforms tried to fool the public that this was some special demonstration of confidence in the Barbados Government, and the Premier himself repeated this folly in his Budget Speech. Politics is not a subject for parrots, and certainly a lot of these statements which are made by unthinking people should be examined before they are repeated; and therefore, Sir, in order to have the record straight, it is appropriate to read the London Newspaper comment on this Barbados loan and its raising. The day after the loan was subscribed, the *Daily Telegraph* of London in reference to it contributed its success mainly to its terms. It said it was nicely pitched; we were offering 6% for stock at 98 1/2 and redeemable in 1971 to 1983, and it went further and said that this loan was placed only after loans had been placed for Grenada, Antigua and St. Lucia which were just as successful. They said: - "The loan which will help to finance the Deep Water Harbour at Bridgetown, follows three recent placings for the West Indies totalling £1,000, 000 in the London Market. These were Grenada, Antigua and St. Lucia."

The *Financial Times* reported that this loan was the first gilt-edged public issue for less than £3 million since April, 1957. In other words, in a market anxious for loans there have been no gilt-edged public issue for less than £3 million since April, 1957. The *Times* added that it seemed fairly clear that the decision to bring out this issue had been greatly influenced by the good market that had developed on the recent placings for Grenada, Antigua and St. Lucia, all of which quickly moved to a premium over their placing price.

In other words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Barbados Government through its agents in London, of course, took advantage of the favourable position.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

Sir, I was talking of the Barbados loan on which the Government was patting themselves on the back and trying to make the public believe that it was subscribed because of some special confidence on the part of the British investor to this country. Nothing could be further from the truth. As I have said, the *Financial Times* and the *Daily Telegraph* show that fairly clear.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to Rule 26 - not that it matters to me - that the hon. member is reading from a Newspaper. I do so in order to maintain the Rules of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Minister saying that the hon. senior member for St. Philip is reading something from a newspaper?

Hon. M. E. COX: Yes. From the *London Telegraph*.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order No. 26 reads as follows:-

"A member shall not read his speech, but he may read extracts from books or papers other than news-

papers in support of his argument, and may refresh his memory by reference to notes."

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Hon. Minister has said that an hon. member must not read his speech. But imagine! The Hon. senior member for St. Michael came in here with his speech written out!

Mr. SPEAKER: The exception to your reading from a newspaper is made as far as the Minister is concerned.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What am I to understand, Mr. Speaker? Does that mean as regards speaking or reading on the subject? Surely I am allowed to quote?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Rule says that you must not read from newspapers. I will read it again.

"A member shall not read his speech, but he may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument, and may refresh his memory by reference to notes."

Mr. CRAWFORD: All I am doing is to refresh my memory by reference to notes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do hope that those notes are not printed newspapers.

Mr. CRAWFORD: However, Sir, it does not make any difference at all. The point is this, Mr. Speaker, The Government does not want this appearing in print. That was a nice propaganda pill by them and they do not want the bubble burst. The placing of the Barbados loan followed placings for little places like Antigua and St. Lucia all of which places plan their Budget for grants-in-aids. We have places like those getting loans and Barbados getting one after them. In other words, not only the terms of the loan but the timing of the loan, according to the *Daily Telegraph* and the *London Financial Times*, were both nicely pitched. The financiers there took advantage of the fact that this happened to be the very first gilt-edged public loan placed in the London market under three million pounds since April 1957. The hon. junior member for St. John has on more than one occasion drawn attention to the domestic rulings with regard to the colony's loans which have been current in the last twelve or eighteen months and we all know of the experience and the history of Jamaica trying to raise loans in London at this time. Therefore, if we sat down and waited patiently until the market was favourable, that was all right and you could have said so; but it is nonsense to say anything about the confidence on the part of the investors in London in the Barbados Government. All the three London newspapers - the *London Telegraph*, the *Financial Times* and the *London Times* in their reference to this loan never said one word about any special confidence on the part of investors in London in the Barbados Government. If the position was based on that they would have said so. They made it perfectly clear that the loan was over-subscribed in the shortest possible time. Our experience was nothing more than the experience of St. Lucia and Antigua because they raised money in London under similar terms.

It must be gilt-edged at 6% interest and added to that they got another 1 1/2% for depreciation on their money. Do you want anything more gilt edged than that? As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, even the smaller colonies who cannot balance their budget had the same thing because the redemption of the loan is backed by the British Treasury.

Now, Sir, to pass on from there, Government now intends to consider the retirement age in the Public Service because, as it says, elsewhere in the West Indies consideration is being given to this matter. Sir, when the age for retirement in the Public Service was reduced in this Chamber to 50 or 55 years, compulsory at 60 years, I was the only man in this Chamber to oppose it. They did it in spite of all precedent to the contrary. The files in this country are replete with instances in

which the Colonial Office had asked the Government for years for a lowering in the age of retirement and in conformity with the age at which retirement took place in British Guiana, Jamaica, Trinidad and other African colonies. It had always been opposed by this Government on the ground that our climatic conditions and hope of expectancy of life could not be compared with unhealthy colonies like the Gold Coast and other colonies which were afflicted with malaria and such diseases.
6.50 p.m.

Barbados is itself a health resort, and all down through the years all the Conservative Governments have refused to accede to the requests of the Colonial Office to bring the retiring age of Barbadians in line with that of some of the other colonies. When it was done here, I opposed it; I said that it was a farcical step to take and it was a nonsensical thing to have done, and it has taken the Government a number of years of squandering money in this manner, to come to the conclusion that they cannot afford to take such a step. Similarly, with the matter of leave passages; week after week I told them in here that we cannot afford to grant these leave passages, but they had their special friends whom they wanted to go to England and there was a clique of officials in this island, as there still is, who - if they tell the members of the Government to go and jump in a well at Dunscombe Plantation, they will do it. My voice was heard in this Chamber protesting in the most loud, long and vehement terms against the introduction of leave passages in this island. The amount spent on leave passages last year represents a substantial expenditure for a colony like this, which cannot afford the basic necessities of life for its people. But after this squandermania, they have come to the conclusion that we cannot afford this early retirement age because of the excuse of the advent of new drugs as an aid to the expectancy of life. They feel that the age of compulsory retirement should now be restored to 65 years; I have never agreed to its being lowered.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7 p.m. of the clock, this sitting stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. of the clock. This sitting now stands suspended.
7.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: On the suspension of the sitting, the hon. senior member for St. Philip was addressing the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I had got to the point where I was referring to the remarks of the hon. introducer of the Budget with reference to the retiring age of public servants and with reference to the retention of the system of leave passages.
7.50 p.m.

It would of course take up too much time to quote from some of my own remarks in this Chamber on the lowering of the retirement age in the public service and also on the reduction in Barbados of leave passages; both are rather alike in the case of the retirement age as in the case of the leave passages, although these matters have been stoutly and strenuously resisted by the past Conservative Governments in Barbados. They have withstood all the pressure from the Colonial Office all down through the years to provide these considerations for public servants in Barbados.

I remember on many occasions having heard a former Attorney General in this Chamber who is still alive, Mr. Keith Walcott, explain in here that the Colonial Office had been repeatedly suggesting to them to afford leave passages on the same basis as existed in some of the African colonies and they refused to do it. Similarly they refused to allow the retirement age which was legally permissible in colonies with inferior health conditions to Barbados; and now, Mr. Speaker, this 38 cents-a-bottle-of-beer Government which has been squandering public funds head over heels is now coming to its senses and wants to retrench in these two directions. The amount allocated for leave passages in this year's Estimates

is \$75,000. People leave all over the West Indies, Central America, South America and North America, for that matter - to enjoy our splendid health facilities, and we foolishly allow the same retirement age and the same vacation facilities as colonies in which the average expectancy of robust service is infinitely lower than ours. Through this reckless expenditure of public funds, Mr. Speaker, we have reached a point where in the opinion of the present Government the average worker in this country must pay 38¢ for a single ten-ounce bottle of beer. There is wide-spread talk of this scandalous position all over the island, because the fantastic excuse that it is expected that one of these days a Brewery will be started here and that the price of locally produced beer will be very much cheaper will only hold water when the Brewery starts to function.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, earlier this evening I had to correct a former speaker, a member of his Party. It was never said by me or anybody else that the question of the increased duty on beer bore any relation to any expected brewery being placed in Barbados; so I just want the hon. member to know that it was not said by me or anybody else. I gave positive reasons for it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not know who could have said it, whether it was a spokesman of the Government. It is now public property that a British Guiana Brewery Firm, Banks Beer, has been negotiating with the Government here to open a brewery here.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order, it is public property that Banks Beer is treating to come here and open a brewery.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is public property that a firm has been negotiating with Government to establish a brewery here, but it is not true to say that it is public property that Banks Beer is coming here! That even makes the position worse. If the decision to increase the retail price of beer to the present rate was due to the fact that the Government expects that sooner or later beer would be locally produced which would be sold more cheaply, the only complaint you could have with the Government for this additional tax would be the question of time. One could say that the Government should have waited until the local brewery was established before introducing the increased taxation; but if as the Premier says, the additional increase on beer is not in any way conditioned by the expectancy of a local brewery, then the position is even worse because it means the Government rationally thinks that the average Barbadian can afford to pay 38¢ for a bottle of beer; but whether or not you get a local brewery, 38¢ is beyond the capacity of the average working-class man who can buy.

If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, the Government is completely out of touch with the earning capacity and the buying capacity of the public. If 38¢ for a bottle of beer is the normal thing in their opinion, then in their opinion, Mr. Speaker, the earnings of the working-class in this colony must be four times more than what it really is, because in countries where the actual earnings of the worker are five or six times the actual earnings of the worker in Barbados, you can buy a bottle of beer for half of what they propose to charge or what the position of the new duty makes it imperative should be charged. Anyhow, Sir, what I was saying is that a 38 cents-a-bottle-of-beer Government has now proposed to spend \$75,000 this year on leave passages with the comment, not until now realised, that the country cannot afford to continue this abnormally early public retirement age and this enormous annual expenditure of leave passages for public servants. I need say no more about this other than to say I am personally gratified to be able to recall that although I stood alone, I was most strenuous in my decision to have these two proposals dealt with by the House.

8.00 p.m.

Members of the House whether they agreed with or accepted that - it does not matter to me; but it gives a certain amount of personal satisfaction to me to know that in

so relatively short a space of time, as in so many other things, they have had to reverse their thinking and to come around to my way of thinking.

Now the introductory Budget Speech refers to Education, and says the increase is small due to the employing of a few more teachers and increments in their salaries. The hon. senior member for Christ Church has already dilated on the importance of providing more secondary school accommodation and the more appropriate time for extensive remarks under this Head will come when we come to deal with the Head itself and, therefore, we need not take up too much time on it at this stage; but I certainly want to refer in passing to the amount we are spending on the U.C.W.I. and to tell the Hon. Minister of Education who is now representing the Colony on the University Board that the University is not paying its appropriate part in the development of the West Indian nation. Even in the most recent Report, mistakenly referred to as the Cato Report, it has not paid appropriate attention to the potentiality which exists for the University to play its utmost part in the development of the nation. To put it briefly, it is almost useless to have an educated person to serve a population of 3,000,000 if the maximum number of students in that University at any year is only 600. Sometime late last year, I made it my business to interest myself in higher education in Puerto Rico when I was there and to discover the part Universities were playing in contributing to the national life of the colony. So far as I can remember, there is one large University and two small ones there but in a population of less than 2,000,000 these three Universities were catering to something like 29,000 students. There is a small one run by the Roman Catholic church, and I do not know who runs the other small one; but between the three of them there is an enrolment of 29,000 students. The University of the West Indies caters to three million people and it has less than 600 students.

In my opinion, it is all well and good to talk about high university standards and compare the U.C.W.I. with Oxford and Cambridge, London and other well established universities; but those areas which those universities serve are fundamentally different from ours. If we are to build a nation which is just emerging, our university education must be proportionately extended to have an impact on a larger section of the community. If the maximum number of students at our one university in any one year is 600, can any one understand the length of time it will take for this university to play a real vital part in the development of the West Indian nation?

I personally do not agree that we should slavishly keep the standards of centuries old universities in countries which are far different from ours in the building of our university. In other words, what is good enough for Oxford and Manchester and the London universities is not good enough for an emerging people; therefore the Minister of Education will be well advised in my opinion to consider ways and means, in so far as this colony is concerned, of seeing that the facilities at the U.C.W.I. be either made available to a greater number of students from Barbados or to have more places here for children to be educated at secondary grammar school level.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church has drawn appropriate attention to more facilities for grammar schools here and, therefore, on this side of the table we need not pay more attention to that aspect of the matter; but certainly what he said about secondary grammar school accommodation is equally applicable, even of course under a different syllabus, to our university level of education.

8.10 p.m.

As regards the water supplies, the estimated expenditure for the coming year is \$350,000 and the Premier said that that was a slight increase in the expenditure in respect of water supplies over the amount which was originally allocated. In this matter of the extension of the water supplies, in my opinion there has been the lack of foresight and vision on the part of the Government. There can hardly be any item of more importance to the community

than water, and more than once from this side of the Table this afternoon, reference has been made to the amount of money available to the Government locally for essential development purposes. Again it is with a feeling of satisfaction that I can refer to the fact that from my earliest days in this House, I have tried to emphasise the necessity for the extension of the water supply and the time has come when the Government should tackle this matter with infinitely more vigour than they are doing at present.

When you come to the extension of the water supply you will not only have increasing expenditure but increasing revenue. When we began to expand the water supply in the first Five Year Plan, we were collecting about \$200,000 a year from the Waterworks Department and even from the limited expenditure we collected about \$600,000 a year. If you refer to the Estimates, you will see from the estimated revenue from water, that it is three times as much as it was less than ten years ago; that means that the extension of the water supply is offset by increased revenue. At the rate at which the Government is going, it will take another 20 years or more to make water available to every district in Barbados that should have it. Since this country has been so blessed by nature as to have the most abundant water supply in the area, the Government should take full advantage of it and make these resources available to every member of the community at the earliest possible date. Many people who know, and those who are not prone to forget, know that there is no other country in the Caribbean with the resources of water which we have. Last year we had a drought and I remember distinctly that in the months of January, February and March people were still watering their gardens with public water supply; I also remember that the Superintendent of the Waterworks Department issued a Circular asking people to be careful in the use of water, but he did not ban the use of it. At the same time in Florida people were drinking water brought to them by steamer; we experienced the same drought but we were watering our gardens with the public water supply. I feel that a Government which has been elected by the people in the manner in which this Government has been elected, should pursue a much bolder policy with regard to making water available to everybody. We should take up \$2 million from any of the funds in the sugar industry and in two years' time, under a big programme, we should sink the necessary wells, put down the necessary pumps and bring the water to the surface and make it available to everybody. When you put down a water main in any area the people will tap the water for which they have to pay. This is something which is revenue-producing. I should like to say that the question of supplying water to people should not be in any Five Year Plan; we should not be allocating a million dollars to be spent over five years for the purpose of making water available to the people of this island; that demonstrates the bankruptcy of ideas and, more important, it means that we do not appreciate either the need or the importance of this item in respect of which we should do better.

The estimated revenue this year in respect of Waterworks is \$640,765; last year it was \$596,565. This is almost like selling food; water is an essential commodity for every person in this community and you can afford to spend money on it. When you expend money on a highway or on tenantry roads, that is capital expenditure and you have to go on *in perpetuum* to levy taxation so as to maintain these roads; but in the case of water, it is a different matter. Especially in view of the high incidence of unemployment and the necessity for providing work for people in this island, I should like to counsel the Government that no more advantageous programme could be embarked upon than the immediate effort to make sure that water is available in every nook and cranny of the island of Barbados. This programme of putting down two stand-posts every year in the various parishes and a small expenditure of funds in the Waterworks Department every year should come to an end.

8.20 p.m.

If you want to change the entire concept, let us regard selling water as Government business, because when you do that, although it may appear to be mercenary, you are at the same time providing the public with a much needed

amenity. Even here in St. Michael in many districts - Bank Hall, Bush Hall and Carrington's Village - water is not as available as it should be, and in many of the rural areas people are still walking a mile to a standpost. I have said on the floor of this House repeatedly and I repeat it again tonight that in the parish of St. Michael itself, there should not be any standposts at all. Port-of-Spain has not got our water resources; almost every member around this Table must have been in a House or hotel at some time or another in a bath-room lathered with soap and no water, and yet in spite of that there is not a single standpost in Port-of-Spain for the simple reason that the City Fathers of Port-of-Spain from time to time have seen to it that every district in the Trinidad Capital has water in every house, even although the resources and the supplies are not there. We all know the scandal of the Caura Dam; you are not allowed to build a house in Port-of-Spain unless you put in water; we have the resources here but merely because we cannot get a Government with the humanitarian and imaginative outlook to go out and do these things, you still have throughout the island a growing need for water. An end should be put to that; and, in spite of the fact that the Government has already said there has been a slight increase in water expenditure, the question of supplying water in this island should be tackled with a view that in two years water will be available to every householder in every part of Barbados.

Now a little earlier, Sir, I referred to the fact that on the question of development, the Premier referred to the Deep Water Harbour. That, in the Government's repertoire of Capital Projects is the show-piece; so to speak, the *piece de resistance*. We are all in this country more or less anxious to see the Deep Water Harbour finished. All the agitation and all the opposition on it is now a thing of the past, and this generation expects to see it an accomplished fact. I commented earlier that the Government in its mistaken policy regards expenditure on Capital Works as development; it is of course a sort of development but not the only sort of development which this country needs.

Some years ago on the floor of this House I tabled a Memorandum proposing that we in Barbados should embark on the manufacturing of flour from imported wheat. I have not made any reference to it for a number of years, probably six or seven years, for the simple reason that after investigating the matter outside of this island, I felt that the more appropriate time to consider it would be during and after the construction of the Deep Water Harbour, because if the wheat for the manufacture were to be economical and come in bulk, the cheapest way to bring in wheat in bulk is to have a Deep Water Harbour with unloading facilities at the port. Now that the erection of the Deep Water Harbour is on the way to become an accomplished fact, I want to refer to this project again, and I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I intend this to be the first of a number of industrial development projects which I intend to advance for the consideration of the Government, and then it is for them to do what they like.

We on this side of the House are frequent in our criticisms of the Government for its negative approach to the question of industrial developments in Barbados. Right now the appropriate Minister shelters behind the fact that the Industrial Development Board has been established and likes to say that responsibility for industrial development is a matter for that Board, which of course is fantastic. Now, Sir, in 1950, that is nine years ago, I suggested that we should consider manufacturing flour in this island from imported wheat and I pointed out in the Memorandum which I tabled that our consumption of flour annually was then over 22,000 pounds. Well now, it is in the vicinity of 30 million pounds and it is economic to put down a flour mill to produce even as low as 30,000 pounds of flour a day. In 1953 Haiti put down a flour mill and manufactured flour from imported wheat, and the average consumption of flour in Haiti is less than it is in Barbados. There is no reason why some island in the West Indies should not manufacture flour in the area to supply the entire area; it would be cheaper to import the wheat in bulk and manufacture it than to import the flour.

8.30 p.m.

As a matter of fact, it is noteworthy that in recent years Canada who used to be our major supplier of flour is now losing place to the U.S.A. where it is known that the U.S.A. subsidises flour. Up to a year ago, Canada had something like seven million bushels of wheat which they could not sell at all. We are talking of increasing trade between Canada and the West Indies and we know that Canada is anxious to regain some of the flour market which they have lost to America. Well then, one of the best methods of approach for a betterment in Canadian-West Indian trade is to ask Canada to sell us some of their surplus wheat and let us manufacture the flour down here. If we do not do it, some other island will do it. Trinidad will do it. We now have a Deep Water Harbour and we have facilities for wheat to be brought ashore in bulk without having to bring it across in lighters. The Government of Barbados would be answerable to future generations if we allow the opportunity to pass unnoticed. It is the height of neglect on the part of Government to accept the findings of a Development Board whose members are appointed by the Government without any regard to qualification for being put on the Board, and then they only put their friends on the industrial concerns. That is all they do. You will find in one or two cases, purely by accident, some of their friends can make a contribution to the Board; but by and large, the people they put there can make no contribution to the successful operation of the Board. Sir, especially now that we have the emphasis on the manufacture of poultry and animal feeds locally by a private enterprise, it would be even more advantageous to have flour processed here because you will get the wheat shreds and what not, and the refuse, for inclusion in the manufacture of animal feed.

In the memorandum which I tabled here in 1950, I stated that the manufacture of flour from wheat in Barbados would make available different grades of super quality flour including wheat flour, and that you will also get the bran for feeding cattle and pigs.

If the Government makes enquiry, they will discover two things. They will discover that last year the U.S.A. sent us eight million pounds of flour and Canada only sent us six million pounds more than that, and the year before the difference was only one million pounds in favour of Canada; the figures are, we got eleven million pounds from Canada and ten millions pounds avoirdupois from the U.S.A.

I said earlier that traditionally Canada is the supplier of the Barbadian flour market; but as the supplier of the West Indian flour, Canada is losing its place to America and the Government of Barbados will discover that this is taking place. Our consumption is thirty million pounds a year and if the Government makes enquiries to the appropriate sources, they will be told that even to manufacture as low as thirty thousand pounds a day, you can put down a flour mill which will make money; so you can see that I am not merely suggesting to them to import wheat and manufacture flour here for the fun of doing it. (A VOICE: Who would supply the wheat?)

The Hon. Minister of Trade asks who would supply the wheat. As a matter of fact, I just told him, if he were listening, that for years the biggest headache facing the Canadian Government is to dispose of 700 millions bushels of wheat and that is the biggest headache facing the Canadian Government tonight. (Laughter) Sir, imagine people laugh and do not know what they are laughing about. If I think I would say here something that one of them could really laugh at, I would really jump in the Careenage and stay there.

Their approach to the Canadian Government should be this: since you are losing the flour market to the West Indies, send us the wheat. And for that matter we can get wheat from either America or Canada. It is so easy; it is almost like giving candy to a child. I just told them that America has to subsidise flour in order to get a market for it. If this Government sit down in their innocence and allow the opportunity to pass, they will wake up one of these mornings to find that another West Indian colony has

embarked on this programme. Of that I am absolutely sure, because in 1950 after I tabled this memorandum here, the following year in Trinidad, Mr. Albert Gomes who was then running the Government said that he did not see any reason why Trinidad should not take steps in this direction and when I made further enquiries about it from people who would know, they told me that the correct time to push this programme in Barbados was after it had a Deep Water Harbour. In other words, the wheat must come in bulk; therefore having said what I have said now, I have discharged my responsibility in the matter. I may say this. When I say that Canada has several hundreds bushels of wheat in store, I want to say she does not have it now; she had it for years but could not dispense with it.
8.40 p.m.

Anybody who wants to question that, does not know what he is talking about. I will go a little further; earlier the Government talked about the increase in revenue from tourism which is now \$10 million a year. What I think we will have to do in this country in the near future as tourism continues, is to provide facilities for the training of hotel workers. There has been large-scale borrowing by hotel and guest house owners for extending the hotel accommodation and by the end of this year, that is to say, by the beginning of the next tourist season, there shall be double the number of hotel rooms available in this colony, and these hotels will need staffs. Some of the best hotels all over the world claim that the only way in which you should run a hotel - at least it is the policy of the Hilton group of hotels - is that you should have an employee for every guest. As a matter of fact, in some of the bigger hotels, hotels with six hundred rooms catering to twelve hundred guests, those hotels would employ a staff of fifteen hundred people. The average is even more than one employee to one guest, but the minimum number of employees in a well-run hotel is an employee to every guest. The number of employees should approximate the number of guests to whom we are catering. The Government should consider adding facilities to the House-Craft Centre for the purpose of training a certain number of people every year for hotel work. This does not require any highly specialised training and for a small expenditure of money, the Government could provide training facilities for those who want to take advantages of them. While I am on this question of training, Mr. Speaker, I want to throw out the suggestion that the Government should provide additional facilities, or it should embark on a programme for the training of nurses in this colony. The facilities offered by the General Hospital and perhaps the District Hospitals as well as the Parochial Almshouses could be utilised for carrying out a training programme for nurses.

On this side of the House, during the debate on the Budget, there has been a special emphasis laid on the increasing number of the unemployed people in this island; but does the Government know that there is, at the moment, a worse shortage of nurses? People are leaving this country with money which the Government has been compelled by the Opposition to lend them to go abroad to study nursing, and people are also using their own funds to go abroad as State Nurses. There is a shortage of nurses - qualified nurses are not even available today. As a matter of fact, so great is the shortage of nurses that in America even under the quota allowed by the McCarran Act, nurses have priority. Any nurse, any qualified nurse in Barbados has priority to go to America under the quota restrictions; so long as she is qualified, she can go. The hon. member pretends to be amused but what surprises me is, not the number of things which he knows but the number of things which he does not know. (Hon. M. E. COX: How long ago?) Do not ask me; ask the American Consul. I repeat that any qualified nurse or any qualified teacher, for that matter, can go to America tonight or tomorrow morning with priority. The hon. member on my right (Mr. Barrow) says that a nurse has not got to be under the quota.
8.50 p.m.

I am told by the hon. member that she can go on priority outside the quota. I do not endorse that at all, but if the hon. member has more recent information than I have, then he can say it when he gets up to talk; but my information is that so long as you are a qualified nurse you are entitled

to enter America with priority over and above any other applicant with a visa, and even the messenger at the Consulate would tell any hon. member so if he asked. (A VOICE: Joke!) It grieves me to think that people who do not know anything at all can get up and contradict things that people know; it is exasperating that a member should parade his ignorance in this fashion. When I get up here and say something, I know what I am talking about. It is all well and good for people when at home or when meeting with one another to talk ignorance, but when they hear other people talking they should keep quiet. It is the height of absurdity for him to contradict me.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that any qualified nurse or even a teacher for that matter has priority under the quota for entry into America or any part of the world, and therefore if this Government is interested in finding employment for people outside, we should allocate a certain amount of funds from the revenue of this island for a training programme for nurses. Nurses leave who cannot find work here and go to Aruba and Curacao and get \$300 or \$400 a month. When we said on the floor of the House that you should lend money to people to go to England and study or find work, the Government's reaction was that they could not lend money to every Tom, Dick and Harry; but they had to eat their words in six months, and I am telling them now that they will have to provide a training scheme for Nurses in this country; and in the same way they are prepared to do other things, they will have to be prepared to do this too because the entire world wants Nurses and we have facilities at the Almshouses and the Hospital to train Nurses over and above the number we can utilise and they can find work outside.

Mr. Speaker, since it is five minutes to nine, I am reminded that under the Rules I must make a motion that further debate on this matter be postponed.

I beg to move that further debate on this matter be postponed.

Mr. BARROW: I beg to second that.

The question that further debate be now postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Wednesday 18th at 12 noon.

Mr. WALCOTT: The 18th of what? April next year?

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Wednesday 18th March at 12 noon. I thought that the hon. member would have known that the Estimates have to be finished before the end of March each year, being a one-time member of Government.

We propose in addition to the Appropriation Bill to deal with Orders Nos. 7 and 8, the Bill to amend the Public Health Act and the Bill to amend the Public Assistance Act tomorrow. I promise the House to get all the relevant information to rebut the misleading statements made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip who spoke just now.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member cannot interrupt me while I am speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am speaking on a point of order; don't you know that when I get up you have to sit down?

Mr. SPEAKER: A member may be interrupted on a point of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I expect, Mr. Speaker, that anybody can get up in here and call another member's statements

misleading, but he must say what the misleading statements were.

Hon. M. E. COX: I said I would do so tomorrow.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion, I heard the Minister in moving the adjournment inform the House of what he intends to do tomorrow. What I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention is that the Order Paper is fixed, and if the debate is adjourned and we are going to meet tomorrow, he cannot get up and say what he

is going to do tomorrow because the debate has been postponed and I take it that that is where we should continue tomorrow. I just want to get these things straight.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a matter of the Rules, it is a matter for the feeling of the House tomorrow.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Wednesday 18th March, at 12 noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.55 p.m.