THE

# House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

*Wednesday, 18th 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)*; Mr. W. A. CRAWFORD; Hon. M. E. COX, *(Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour)*; Hon. R. G. MAPP, *(Minister of Communications, Works and Housing)*; Mrs. E. E. BOURNE; Hon. D. D. GARNER, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries)*; Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E.; Mr. C. B. SEARLES; and Mr. G. F. 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 confirmation.

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICE

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Address:-

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

TO

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

The House of Assembly desire to thank Your Excellency for the Speech delivered on the occasion of the re-opening of the Legislature for the Legislative Session 1959-60.

The House note with satisfaction the financial stability and economical advancement of the Island and other matters referred to in Your Excellency's Address and beg to assure Your Excellency that all these and other matters submitted to them will be given their careful consideration and support during the Session.

*Mr. SMITH entered the House and took his seat.*

### SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER NO. 5

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before the business of the House is commenced, I beg to move that the Appropriation Bill be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No.5. Perhaps I should make the motion clearer.

I beg to move that the consideration of the Appropriation Bill in all its stages today be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No.5. That would have the effect of our being able to continue, without the moment of interruption, after 9 o'clock, as is provided for under paragraphs 6 to 9 of the Standing Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: As hon. members are aware, Standing Order No.5, paragraph 8 reads as follows:-

"A motion may be made by a Minister, after notice, at the commencement of public business, to the effect that the proceedings on any specified business be exempted from the provisions of this Order, and if such motion is agreed to, the business so specified shall not be interrupted at 8.30 p.m. and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second the motion of the Hon. Leader of the House.

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

### APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume debate on the Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1960. The hon. senior member for St. Philip was addressing the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as I made it clear yesterday, all I propose to do in the course of these remarks is to offer a few brief comments on the Budget Speech itself, and of course, to make a few personal suggestions in addition thereto. I have already referred to the gravity of the local unemployment situation and I have also commented on the absence of any plans for narrowing the gap between exports and imports; I have expressed my opinion with regard to the policy of the Government in connection with the local consumption of rum feeling as I do, that a decrease in the consumption of rum should be welcome regardless of its effects on our economy.

12.25 p.m.

With reference to the remarks made by the Hon Premier with regard to the increase in loans by the Commercial Banks, I said that while the decrease in savings can be related to the increasing unemployment - because people unemployed cannot save money - yet it is of interest to note that the Commercial Banks of this colony are at long last taking the position as businessmen in Barbados, making profits in Barbados and relating it to the relief of the community by making credit more readily available to people who want credit in this island, and there is no reason why this should not be so. Were it not for the fact that the Commercial Banks in the area are now faced with the possibility of competition by a West Indian National State Bank, they might never have been willing to use up more of the profits they make in the area for developing the area.

With regard to leave passages and retirement of Public Servants, I have commented on that already. I will

postpone my remarks on Federation for a more appropriate occasion when we have more time at our disposal. I was making proposals for an extensive water programme and in connection with development reached the point where I was talking about the manufacture in Barbados of flour from imported wheat. I need hardly say that flour is an essential article of diet in this part of the world like many others, and its importation in that state naturally is not as economic as if it were imported in the form of wheat. Moreover the milling of wheat in Barbados or any part of the West Indies must have certain economic effects on the area. If we put down a milling plant here we are going to employ people to run it because it cannot run itself. We should be able to supply flour cheaper than the imported flour, and I am emphasising this matter at this stage, Sir, because the fact that the Deep Water Harbour is nearing completion renders the time appropriate for proper consideration of the matter.

There is no reason why Barbados should sit down and allow a matter like this to be taken up by any other island in the area. We ourselves consume a lot of flour here; our annual consumption is something like 24 million pounds avoirdupois a year which is in the vicinity of 70,000 pounds a day, and I have said that a mill to manufacture flour of even 20,000 pounds or 30,000 pounds a day is an economic proposition. There are milling plants today in the world producing less than half of our daily requirements, so that if the absurd idea is advanced that our consumption is too low, that is the answer to it; and with the possibility of supplying the community with whole wheat flour and using the thrown off refuse for stock feed, it should not be overlooked.

Moreover I want finally to re-emphasise the fact that there is said to be this concerted effort on the part of the West Indian Federal Government and Canadian Government to expand trade relations. Traditionally Canada has supplied our flour; in recent years it has given place to America and in 1956 Canada supplied only one million pounds more than America, and I said that the Canadian authorities, I am sure in the interest of reciprocal trade, would be willing to consider supplying us flour in the form of wheat. For years they have had over 700 million bushels of wheat of which they could not dispose, and if there was a milling plant out here we could have been importing this wheat, relieving them of the surplus, providing a new industry in the country and reducing the cost of the finished product for the community.

To pass on from there, Mr. Speaker, I am proposing at this stage as I began to say yesterday that the Government of this country should embark on an extensive training programme for Nurses. It is no secret that there is at present a world shortage of Nurses. We have facilities here at the General Hospital, at the Health Centres and even at the Parochial Almshouses for training young women in nursing over and above the number required for running the institutions. People are burdening themselves with all sorts of loans to raise money to send their daughters abroad to be trained as Nurses, and we should utilise our facilities here at a moderate cost to the Government by training a few hundred extra Nurses every year in these institutions and having them qualified so that they can find work for themselves outside the island and locally too. As a matter of fact, I am told that even now there is a shortage among the senior staff at the General Hospital. In the neighbouring French and Dutch islands, especially in Curacao and Aruba, and in the United States and Canada and even in England itself, there is this great shortage of nurses, and a sum of money should be allocated specifically for this purpose. The terms and conditions under which these nurses could be trained will be a matter for further consideration, that is to say whether it would be free, whether they should pay a small fee, or whether some remuneration would be paid to them during the term of training. All these things could be discussed, but I want the acceptance of the general proposal that Barbados should embark upon a training scheme for nurses with the available facilities.

12.35 p.m.

I said last night that any *bonafide* nurse could leave this country tomorrow for America under A1 priority within the available quota. The moment she is qualified she comes under A1 priority; therefore, since these opportunities for employment abroad exist, it would be shortsighted on the part of Government not to take the maximum advantage of them. It is not to say that they have not got the experience of people clamouring for qualifications of nurses. Everyone knows that we have got the wherewithal and we might set a commendable example to the West Indies if we were the first to embark on a programme of training nurses in all the parishes of Barbados.

I have also mentioned in connection with the expansion of tourism a hundred percent increase in hotel accommodation by the end of the year and that the Government should provide facilities at the Housecraft Centre for training hotel workers in order to provide sufficient staff for these expanding hotels, guest houses and what not.

Sir, I have one further point on this matter. I noted the other day that the Regional Labour Board at a meeting in Jamaica requested the Federal Government to take up with the American Authorities the question of the farming programme. At this important meeting in Jamaica, the Regional Labour Board had gone very thoroughly into the effect of West Indian Labour in America on a West Indian economy and they rightly concluded that with an expansion in the number of people employed in America from the West Indies, it would be of tremendous economic benefit to the West Indies: and they wrote to the Federal Government asking them to take up the matter at the earliest possible time with the American authorities. As a matter of fact, that was the source of this claim in Bridgetown at a public meeting sometime ago that in the near future the number of workers to the U.S.A. may be increased. It is to be noted that the efforts in this direction came not from the Federal Government or West Indian Governments but from the Regional Labour Board.

Sir, I discovered that there was a tremendous shortage for domestic servants on my visit there on the last occasion and the American authorities were combing the United Kingdom, more especially Scotland, Ireland and Wales for recruits of domestics for the States. I made it my business to go down to Washington to the State Department because I wanted certain information in connection with other matters and I raised with them this question of the need of domestic workers in the States. As a matter of fact, I suggested that domestic servants could be provided from here under similar terms and conditions as farm workers and I was told in reply that it would be rather difficult to keep in touch with them after they were there because the farm labourers had their Regional Liaison Officers and it was easy for the appropriate Immigration American Authorities to keep in touch with West Indian Immigrant labourers through the Liaison Department: but in the case of the West Indian servants who would be spread throughout the entire area, it would be difficult to keep in touch with them; and after they had come in for two or three years, it would almost be impossible to get in touch with them after their contract was expired. That, more than any other factor, would militate against any adoption of a scheme for domestic servants along the lines of a West Indian emigrant labour scheme.

To me, there should be some solution to this and I took the matter up subsequently with an American member of Congress, the Revd. Adam Clayton Powell, who is wellknown in the area for having exceptional interest in West Indian matters. He assured me that he was very interested in the suggestion and that he would purposely raise the matter in Congress. He also suggested that the West Indian Federal Government should be approached and asked to create or establish a similar liaison service specifically for domestic workers as that might be the solution complained of by the State Department Officials and would facilitate keeping in contact with any domestic workers who came in under such a scheme. I am therefore making the suggestion here in the same

way as the Regional Labour Board has called upon the Government to take up with the American authorities the Migrant Farm Workers Scheme with the Barbados Government and call upon the Federal Government to take up with the Washington State Department and other officials the possibility of employment on a large-scale migrant scheme for domestic workers from Barbados and other West Indian Islands to America.

There is no country in Europe from which emigrants are readily allowed into America which can supply even one-quarter of the demands for labour of this type in America and since we have had it in abundant supply here, not that we are ordained by Almighty God to be unskilled workers, but since there is an absence of other gainful opportunities for employment in the area, we have to be satisfied with what we can get and I say with all the earnestness I can command that the possibility in this direction should not be overlooked and that it is an obligation of the Government to bestir itself in this respect.
12.45 p.m.
Now, there are two further points which I want to make. There is the question of the Central Milk Depot and Pasteurisation Plant to which the hon. senior member for Christ Church made reference yesterday. So far as I recollect, the hon. member in commenting adversely on the absence in the Estimates of proposals for the establishment of such a Depot, ventured the suggestion that the possible reasons for the absence of this Depot was that the Government was undertaking this experiment with Pangola grass. That is no excuse. There was a time in this island when we were producing three times as much milk as we are producing now without Pangola Grass; when the proposals first came to the House for the establishment of this Central Milk Depot and Creamery there was no expression that the introduction of this Scheme had to await any further pasturing development. This branch of the Legislature actually agreed with the proposals and they were turned down by the Other Place. In other words, if the Other Place had agreed to the proposals, the Plant would have been established long before anybody heard about any Pangola Grass Scheme. The hon. senior member for Christ Church may have lost sight of that fact and I am reminding the House of it because there cannot be any worthwhile suggestion now that the one thing hinges upon the other.

At the rate at which we are going, in five years' time more than three quarters of the milk consumed in this country will be imported. I checked about a month ago with the Statistical Department on the value of our milk imports and it is amazing to see the extent to which they have risen; that is because of the difficulty attendant upon dairying in Barbados, and the absence of any Central Depot for receiving supplies of milk at any hour of the day. There cannot therefore be any expansion in this direction until attention is paid to providing this long-felt want. Experiments including pasturage, valuable as they may be and advantageous as they will be in the course of time, should not be allowed of necessity to interfere with the proposals of providing a milk pasteurisation plant now. I agree with the hon. senior member for Christ Church that the absence of any such proposals in the current Estimates is a matter for considerable regret.

There was some reference made to an expansion of the cornmeal industry. The reference is fairly vague, and the introductory Speech on the Budget merely said that the Ministry of Agriculture is looking forward some day to be able to produce corn in sufficient quantities and also to provide meal for consumption. When the scheme comes a little nearer to fruition, I propose to have quite a lot to say on it because I think that I have probably devoted more attention to this matter than any other person in this Chamber. As a matter of fact, they very first mill to produce cornmeal in this island was imported by myself, and I remember in one year being bold enough as to buy all the available surplus corn at Lancaster. The Government will find that, in this matter, there are several important factors to be considered. In the first instance, the cornmeal which is very popular here is not pure corn meal in the sense that there is a sort of glutin added to it and our people have grown accustomed to this glutinous cornmeal because when they prepare cou-cou the more glutin there is in the cornmeal, the more sticky the cou-cou is. The hon. junior member for Christ Church will tell the House that the brand of cornmeal most sold on the market, Kelloggs, is higher in glutinous content than the other kind of corn meal which used to be imported. Producing corn is one thing and the process of manufacturing the meal is another; but unless the Government is prepared to spend large sums of money on degerminating the corn, there will be a waste of time. Even if you import kiln-dried corn that is not going to be satisfactory and it has to be faced that the manufacturers of corn meal in degerminating the corn have made more money than they have made out of the corn meal itself. The manufacture of these cereals from the cornmeal germ provides more revenue and is more economical and advantageous than the production of the cornmeal itself. If we are going to undertake the expense locally of degerminating the corn without being able to put to some use the germ which we extract, then it means that we shall not be in a position to compete in price with other cornmeal. That is why all the cornmeal which is processed here has to be sold for stock feed. A very limited quantity is sold because there are a few people who like Indian corn meal, but the most of the corn finds its way to Lancaster and is eventually disposed of for stock feed.
12.55 p.m.
There is not a single Roebuck Street merchant who is going to buy ten bags of locally produced corn meal for storage, because they cannot "keep." The hon. junior member for Christ Church must have had a lot of experience in this respect and would, I am sure, affirm that none of the concerns with which he is associated would dream of storing locally produced corn meal or even locally produced Indian corn meal unless it had previously been degerminated. Apart from that there is also the added factor of trying to get planters in this island to produce more corn; they are not going to do it unless they are compelled by legislation.

In the early days of the War when on the floor of this House I suggested that we should grow more cassava and utilise the cassava flour by mixing it with the flour which was imported the suggestion was greeted with a howl of laughter on all sides of the Chamber. I remember very well that the former Attorney General, Mr. Keith Walcott, said to me: "Well, what next, Crawford?" I have had the satisfaction of seeing within twelve months the same Attorney General come down here with a Resolution for the construction of a factory at Lancaster, but the factory had deteriorated so fast that Mr. Henry Watson from Searles Factory and Mr. Arthur Coppin, the Government Analyst had to run all over the island and pick up pieces of machinery from wherever they could to manufacture cassava flour; but then we had to make the planters grow cassava by way of legislation; they were compelled under emergency powers to plant a certain amount of cassava every year. As planters will know, corn is supposed to take very much more out of the soil than cane or ground provisions; and plantation owners would not have embarked on any cultivation of corn to supply locally greater quantities of corn unless they were compelled to do it by law, so that as I said, while it is of tremendous economical advantage for us to be able to produce our own supply of corn meal, they would not do it unless compelled by law. I think we are the biggest importers of corn meal in the entire area. There is no other country in the West Indies that imports the amount that we do, because here cou-cou is our national dish. I think either St. Kitts or Antigua comes second in the area with regard to imports of corn meal; our imports are far and away ahead of any other island in the area. In the Leewards and Windwards where they have so much more ground provisions - tannias and dasheen - and in British Guiana where there is a big supply of rice, corn meal import is to a minimum; so that everything has to be gained by an investigation into the possibilities of providing locally the corn meal we are now importing. That is not going to be an easy task, and to do it properly and in order for it to be successful, it will entail considerable expenditure: and the Government would

be well advised to consider in the most careful detail all the aspects of its manufacture before committing itself to any half way or untried scheme. It is not as easy as it looks.

So many people have already discussed the transport question that I shall not take up any time on that at all. Only people with holes in their heads cannot see that the Government is guilty of a scandalous waste of public funds on this question of transport, and I for one would prefer to see the enormous sums we are spending on transport being spent on a scheme of social security. As a matter of fact, to introduce a scheme of social security, a contributory scheme contributed to by employers, employees and Government would cost the Government less than we are now throwing away on transport; but it is no use talking about these matters, so I do not propose to waste my time trying to put some sense in their heads.

I certainly want to refer before I sit down to the recent proposal by the Federal Minister of Finance, Mr. Bradshaw, of the possibility of large scale settlement of Barbadians in Dominica. I noticed in the Press about a week or two ago that Mr. Bradshaw said that between 50,000 and 55,000 Barbadians could be settled in Dominica under a proper settlement scheme. Now I suppose that we shall hear a lot of talk about it for another five or six years and then ten years from now an effort might be started in the direction of implementing the proposals; but it seems to me that there is something fundamentally wrong with the people who control the affairs of this area when schemes like this have to be brooded over for so many years before action can be taken.

The Canadian Government only recently gave a substantial sum of money to the Federated West Indies. I for one am totally dissatisfied with the manner in which this gift is being spent. I think the entire $10 million is being spent on communications; the greater part is being spent to provide two steamers and the remainder, so far as I remember, will be used for development of harbours in the area. Communications are important and highly essential but they can be redundant if you have nothing to communicate. One of the main reasons why West Indian steamers plying in the area have been losing money is because there is not sufficient trade in the area to make them pay. Even with the present steamers, I understand that they are bound to lose money this year since British Guiana is no longer a port of call, because the British Guiana Government refused further to participate in the scheme when they were called upon to pay a further increase in the cost of running them. As I said, I personally believe that half of this Canadian gift would have been so well spent on developing an island like Dominica and then by expanding the economy of the West Indian Federal Nation.

1.05 p.m

I sincerely hope that when the American gifts come here this year they will not be frittered away in the same manner. I have suggested to several people in America who have sent things here that efforts should be made by those American friends to adopt friends here and there should be insistence that money should be spent on proper development projects. I cannot imagine that when a gift of $10 million was given to us at the outset of nationhood, the most advantageous way in which to spend it would have been to spend it in communications. I do feel, Mr. Speaker, that since Barbados has most to gain at this stage by the suggested development of Dominica that the Barbados Government should take the lead in calling upon the Federal Government to get busy in this direction. Sir, imagine being able to supply ten thousand or more families right at home in the West Indies who will be engaged in expanding agriculture and other production in the area and who will be living in the area and assisting in development of the area to a considerable extent.

In 1955, when I paid a visit to Dominica with this express purpose in view, I was enthused by all types of people there for the large scale development of the island. The Acting Administrator, was more than interested; the Agricultural Department convened a special meeting to discuss the matter with its members; the new Director of Public Works here, Mr. Grant, who was Director of Public Works there, made special arrangements there for me to see the new road constructed and what not, and I made it my business to come back here and draw to the attention of the Government four years ago what potentialities existed there. But drawing the attention of this Government to matters is like asking a ten-year-old infant to construct a jet airplane. They are either too indifferent, too neglectful or too incompetent to do anything other than to come in here once a year and present the proposals for Public Works Department projects and other things which the Department Heads put in their hands and then during the year to present a number of supplementary estimates for these same Departments. That is not good enough and that is why we have failed to take the lead on employment matters and why we have been relegated to the position which we occupy in Federal matters. If Barbados had taken the lead in the development of the surrounding small islands in the same way that Trinidad said it would do it, Barbados would be the Federal Capital of the West Indies. Trinidad talked about doing something about it but did nothing about it, but merely talking about it gave them the support for the Federal Capital and I say that the slightest demonstration on the part of the Barbados Government in West Indian Colonial matters and in matters affecting West Indian development would have been enough to swing the entire smaller islands behind us and under our leadership because more of those countries are more at heart with us than they are with Trinidad, and placing ourselves in the forefront of emphasising their needs would have meant immediate acceptance on their part in Federal matters in so far as they were concerned. Neither Jamaica nor Trinidad nor British Guiana for that matter was ever bound by such close ties to the Leewards and the Windwards as we are and even although it is a bit late now, it is not too late for Barbados to exert itself in the economic conditions of the surrounding islands, especially when we have something to benefit from it as they are. We have our surplus population and they need it to develop their lands. Right now there is a market of $18 million of foodstuffs which are imported from outside which can be supplied by Dominica.

We import all our frozen beef from Australia and New Zealand at exorbitant prices. How many people can afford to eat beef at 75 cents per pound? With large acres of land lying idle in Dominica only awaiting cultivation, capital outlay and human labour to develop it, should we sit here and say that we are running a Government while we are having West Indians kicked all over England and in the Federation there is a place where we can develop and put many of them to work? We can start a small settlement scheme in Dominica tomorrow; we have men with the calibre to go to Dominica and propose a Settlement Scheme under proper conditions and have people settle there within a short space of time. All the help we need can be had from our own resources or from outside assistance we can get. Canada will help us; Great Britain will help us. We had a Parliamentary Delegation down here at the height of the racial discrimination to West Indian emigrants in England. I was told by both Conservative and Labour Members that the entire British Parliament would willingly support any Scheme for large-scale development of the West Indies Federation and although they had no objection to West Indians coming to Great Britain, yet still they would prefer to have them remaining at home, and then in a statement to the Press, they said that we could press the British Parliament for assistance to settle British West Indians in the West Indies.

1.15 p.m.

(Hon. M. E. COX: You could have brought in an Address).

Mr. CRAWFORD: The ignorance of the hon. member is really unpardonable; that is why we will never get anywhere in this country. You have got to put something to the heads of the members of the Government and you have

to dig a hole in their heads and drive it in before they can understand what you are talking about. The trouble with this country is that we expect people with childlike mentalities to do the jobs of adults. The people who occupy positions of importance in this country are so many degrees below what is needed today that it is a matter of sincere reflection sometimes if democracy is really working in this colony. With a population of a quarter of a million, it is an adverse commentary in this colony that we have not got at least two dozen men here who are capable of carrying the country somewhere. With all our educational facilities, with all the opportunities for personal development and what not, it worries people to think that we are in the position today in which the Civil Servants are running the country. That is a scandal. I have nothing against Civil Servants as Civil Servants, who by the nature of their employment, are not expected to be people of any vision or imagination. A man who goes into the Civil Service reaches a certain standard of education and he feels that his interest is best served by going into the Civil Service and prodding his way along and by process of time he will come to the top or as far as he can get. Few of them ever think of acquitting themselves for positions in the State other than those they will fill by the passing of time. The Civil Servant should be the person to be told what to do; he is given instructions which he has ability to carry out; but the moment you leave it to him to tell the country what is to be done as we have it today, then we must stagnate—and we cannot stagnate for too long. If we are not going forward, then we are going backward. It is a matter for considerable reflection on the part of everybody who is thinking in the interest of this island to see to it that a stop be put to this state of affairs at an early date. That is why we find revolutionary methods resorted to in other countries; I have no fault to find with the revolution in Cuba or in Iraq when a person sees his country retarding and he does something to save the position by force of arms. We are sitting down here with 26,000 people unemployed, with 10% of the population doing nothing but looking for work and thousands of children leaving the schools with nothing to do; there is nothing being done to find employment for them. I tell the members of the Government of the possibilities in Dominica and other people tell them of these possibilities; the Federal Minister of Finance tells them that we can settle 55,000 people in Dominica; I said that we could settle 30,000 people there; and they grin like hyenas! I told them that they could settle 12,000 families which would mean 30,000 people. The Hon. Mr. Bradshaw says 55,000; but instead of paying attention to Hon. Mr. Bradshaw if not to me, the Hon. Leader of the House tells me that I should bring in an Address! Anything I say in this colony now they will laugh at, and ten years from now they will do it; I am accustomed to that. Away back in 1946 when I talked about artificial insemination the hon. member grinned, and that is the same thing he is doing now. I repeat that artificial insemination is what is taking place now. It is a pity that we did not have family planning earlier because we would not have had some of the people whom we have now!

What should be emanating from the Government during this debate is a ready acceptance of the suggestion made by the Federal Minister of Finance; I should like to say that if he is doing nothing more, he is taking his duties seriously. He said that he discussed the matter with 30 people and apparently he ignored the members of the Government because it was a waste of time talking to them. He did not say that St. Lucia or Trinidad or Grenada would benefit from this scheme; he said that Barbados would benefit from it. There are those whose proper place should be in the Mental Hospital, but who find themselves in the Government. Certainly, Sir, none of us would expect at this stage to see this display of asininity in a matter like this.

1.25 p.m.

I am told that a Minister of Government, when presented with proposals for developing Dominica, replied that we would have to wait and see what the British Government would do.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, will the hon. member state who is the Minister?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Whom the cap fits, let him pull the string! Is it not significant that he should ask who is the Minister, in the same way as Judas Iscariot asked Christ who would betray him? He knew what he had done; *(Laughter)* so you also know who said so. We have to wait and see what the British Government will do. We now have a Cabinet and a Prime Minister and we must wait and see what the British Government will do! It is for the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Communications and the proper Heads of Departments in a small delegation to go to Dominica immediately and demonstrate some interest in helping themselves; they are the people who are supposed to benefit from this scheme in another year or two. You will find 10,000 Barbadians coming back from England who have put some money on the Savings Bank which they will draw off in twleve months; yet you will hear someone come in here and say that Government views with concern that withdrawals at the Savings Bank exceed deposits. What else do you expect?

The Dominica Government has spent enormous sums of money with grants from C.D. &W in recent years in opening up the interior of the country. If they ask their own Director of Highways, Mr. Grant, he will tell them that the new roads built in Dominica in the last three years run over 30,000 acres of virgin soil in a colony with a population of about 30,000 people. The other day the Caribbean Commission published a useful leaflet on the fruit and vegetable trade in the area, and you will find that we are importing fruit and vegetables from Hong Kong, Siam, Burma and Holland and cabbage from Denmark, when a country like Dominica with 365 rivers, with water and with good internal communications, is lying there just crying for development. There is no limit to the market for citrus and bananas; it is a wonderful citrus and banana producing country.

I went to British Guiana twice shortly after the Evans Commission reported and I found I did not like the country; it is below sea level, flat, marshy, and it is common to see water running under people's houses because that is how the country is built; but not so with Dominica. They said they were waiting on the British Guiana scheme to send Barbadians down there. The exceptional Barbadian would like British Guiana, but Barbadians would like Dominica because its climate and otherwise more conform with the type of place from which they have come; and therefore, Sir, if it is not expecting the achievement of the impossible, I sincerely hope that in spite of the puerile and fanciful approach of the Government Benches to let us see what the British Government will do, in the very near future something will be attempted. Do not postpone it now because I propose it; but merely because a Federal Minister proposed it you should act to implement his proposals, because in the final analysis that is what they were elected to do and not to oppose suggestions from the Opposition for the progress and advancement of the community.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, we have had some lengthy and detailed speeches made by the members on this side of the House, as is their duty, on this occasion of the Appropriation Bill for 1959-60. It is a great pity that when the hon. member for St Thomas read his Budget Speech, he did not outline the economic background of this country and the Government's proposals in the light of the economic situation with which we are confronted in the detailed, concise and clear manner in which some of the members on this side of the House have dealt with the Budget proposals.

Now, I too want to join with the other hon. members who have observed that we in Barbados are paying an enormously high price for democracy. The situation in this country today is such that it is a matter of considerable surprise to impartial observers, if I may quote the language of a former Prime Minister of Great Britain, that the people exult in a state of degradation and poverty and that they are rich only in that they are satisfied with what they do not have when they have nothing at all. As I said, Sir, I too would like to say that we are paying an extremely high price for democracy; we are paying the price in that we have inefficiency and a complete innocence of

the primary functions of Government. No matter what the political complexion of a Government may be, the primary functions of Government must necessarily remain the same as long as we have the State on the one hand and the people on the other.

1.35 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are paying a very high price for democracy and if there is any clear evidence of the price which we are paying - and young people are paying for the lip service which we pay for democracy from time to time- it is disclosed in the totality of the remarks made by the Hon. Premier in introducing the Appropriation Bill in that there is a complete lack of understanding of these functions which we would expect a Government to be aware of and there is a complete dereliction of the basic problems which confront the majority of the people in this community and a complete omission to mention them, as has already been outlined by the hon. senior member for St. Philip. The basic problems which concern the people of Barbados today are the problem of unemployment, the problem of a shortage of jobs, the problem of a surplus of what has been practically and picturesquely described by a 19th century writer as the industrial reserve army of the unemployed. There is a complete omission to mention any proposal which this Government has for the relief of the high economy in which we are living in Barbados. We are living in a state of emergency in Barbados when we should be doing something to relieve the state of emergency; and if we do not have the combined strength, natural or otherwise, then we should summon strength and help from outside in order to relieve us from that state.

I would like to say that I was spared the misfortune of having to listen to the Hon. Premier's speech on the Budget. For that I am eternally thankful, and perhaps I may dilate by saying that I am extremely gratified that contrary to the normal practice the staff of this Hon. House is getting away from ordinary practice and is putting so much extra time in seeing that members are afforded copies of the Budget Speech.

I have spent some time - I have not done it before- trying to really believe if what I read was true and whether any one who was in full possession of his faculties in the 20th century and who was placed at the helm of public affairs should be guilty of such a crass exhibition of ignorance and indifference and apathy and neglect as disclosed by the remarks of the Hon. Premier.

I want to say that it is not the duty of the Opposition to compliment the Government on anything. If we arrive at the stage in this colony when the Members of the Opposition Party who are elected too but happen to be in the minority consider it to be their duty to scratch the backs of members on the other side, I say when we get to that stage we will cease to have democracy at all and the people of the country would be left to the dogs. The duty of the Opposition is to point out the defects and the mistakes made by the Government and to bring with the aid of enlightened members pressure to bear on the Government so that they would correct these defects and mistakes and to keep the Government of the country eternally aware that we are living in a democracy and not in a totalitarian state in which they can literally get away with murder. I do not intend to pay any compliments to the Government on anything that they have said in this Budget, not even on relief of taxation. I will never adopt the attitude that when a Government has its heel in the middle of your neck and it relieves the pressure on your neck a bit, you should break into singing the *Magnificat;* rather should you say "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace." We should not be thankful for small mercies. Let me tell you that every time we pay income tax or do one of these things which human beings do not enjoy or like doing it is an encroachment on the rights of the individual: and if at any time a little of the pressure has been eased or a screw turned in the other direction, I see nothing to be thankful about; I only can see matters which can call for great alarm, if not despondency and despair. If you find that I deal with the Budget proposals of the Hon. Premier in a certain manner, it is only because of the speech which he made or read. I think he is entitled to read it if he has written it himself (it does appear so) but if it is written by somebody else, then it is only a reflection of the low standard of understanding which prevails in the Government Service today. So, Sir, from whichever point of view I look at it, I will have to treat it in the same way in which it is set out.

The first observation which I want to make is this. The Hon. Premier said that it is customary in the first stage to refer to the economic position of the island. It is remarkable that the Premier spoke for such a long time and ended by telling us nothing of the economic state of the island. He told us absolutely nothing. If he thinks he has or the person who wrote the speech thinks that it refers to the economic situation, I advise him to go and read the dictionary and try and get the terms and meanings clear. What he did say or do was to regurgitate a few simple statistics or give a statistical digest: but at no time did they correlate or apply those statistics to the situation and economy of Barbados. When I am saying so I am referring them to the 26,000 people unemployed or who are under employed and the people who are feeling the pinch. There is no correlation of the figures as regards the decrease in the unemployment situation and it is those individuals who have put the Government in power and who have kept its members there.

I want to say this. I have said it before in this House. I do not mind disclosing what our policy is on this side because there is no mystery about it or anything to be withheld; anything which we have in my Party, we will give them. We say the first thing to be done- and if we do not have people of adequate ability then we will have to find people and relegate those people who are in the Civil Service - is to have the economic position of this colony properly outlined, published and circulated at least three months in a booklet or in some other available form which all the people in this Island would be able to understand before we sit on the floor of this House to discuss the Appropriation Bill. We should not be sitting on the floor of this House at the introduction of the Appropriation Bill without it.

1.45 p.m.

It is the first proposal which we should have to implement one of these days. In all other civilised countries - I qualify that and I say in all civilised countries. Let us take the United Kingdom; in the United Kingdom whether they be Conservative or Socialist Governments, they publish the economic survey at least two or three months before the Budget Speech is made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. That is to be sold to members of the general public for a modest sum of 1/- and 1/6 and millions of copies of the economic survey outlining the state of the nation are circulated to the populace of Great Britain; so that when the Budget proposals do come before Parliament people are not taken by surprise. They are told the realities of their economic situation and the Budget proposals are then put in the light of that economic survey which the public already has available for its perusal. But the hon. junior member for St. Thomas comes into the House and says that it is customary to refer to the economic position of the island. I have written out what he said in about six lines, because what he has not said would fill the Carnegie Library, but what he has said could be condensed in about six lines. This is what he has said about the economic situation of the island; he has said that there has been a recession, that there has been an increase in the tourist trade, that there has been further extension of the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement, that there has been a decrease in the price paid for molasses, that the local consumption of rum has decreased and there has been a corresponding or correlative increase in the amount of volume of beer consumed locally, that there has been a fall in the value of exports, that there has been an adverse balance of trade, that there has been a successful loan reflecting the confidence of the investors in Great Britain in the Government of Barbados That is the economic background to which he refers. He has made one reference to the national income

of Barbados and up to now, if you ask him in the quiet and peace of your office, what he meant by the national income - all he said was that it is $100 million; he does not say how the income is distributed but suggested that it was usual to give the economic background. With all due sense of honesty, he did not say that he proposed to give the economic background, neither did he proceed to do it. The idea that you get on the floor of a Parliament such as this and say that you are going to increase income tax this year because we have lost revenue in another direction and sit down - that has not been happening since the days of Mr. Gladstone, and he promised to take off the company income tax within six months but we still have it now. That is not good enough in this year of grace. When you have every single person employed, he has paid some kind of tax in this island and everything the Government does reflects on his personal day to day existence; and you have a Finance Minister coming in here and regurgitating a lot of garbled statistics, which none of them over there understands, which are a padding out of the Memorandum submitted to the Minister by his Assistant Secretary or the Financial Secretary, whom God preserve! That is all I would like to say about him. We have had enough strictures cast in this House on the management of the Financial Department without my reflecting on it.

No one should assume a portfolio in the Government or the mantle of greatness unless he has the physical and mental stature to prevent himself from looking like a clown in a Circus. He should not do it. If people of the same stature and visibility as yourself do not say anything about it, unless you expunge the debates from this House, posterity will look round and ask: "What manner of man is this?"as they did in London when one of the Ministers went up there and made an exhibition of himself in contrast to Mr. Manley.

I want at this stage to say that we all deplore the demise of Mr. "Crab" Nethersole of Jamaica, and perhaps Your Honour would intimate to the House your feelings in this matter. We have Mr. Nethersole and Mr. Sangster, men of two different Parties, but men who have come from the same background as that from which most of us have come. One of them is a member of the legal profession and the other a Solicitor and I believe they were men who were called to office from their private practice in order to render service to the community. Then we have Mr. Munoz Marin of Puerto Rico. Men like Mr. Nethersole and Mr. Sangster have lifted Jamaica from the morass of stagnation to a place in the sun where the Jamaicans are now economically viable and demanding the status of nation-hood for themselves, with more illiteracy than there is in Barbados. Just before the War, Puerto Rico and Jamaica had an illiteracy of 65%; each of them was around that figure in illiteracy. Barbados has about 3% to 7% illiteracy, and Puerto Rico and Jamaica with 65% can now find themselves elevated to status and we are overjoyed, as the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has said, that somebody has designed or condescended to lend us money at the highest rate of interest ever paid in the history of Barbados. If that is not true, my Budget Speech has ended and I will sit down.
1.55 p.m.

The highest rate of interest that was paid by any West Indian Government - gilt edged securities - from the time of the discovery of Christopher Columbus, and they are overjoyed that somebody has condescended when they have given them money below par, overjoyed that they have condescended to lend them money at the highest possible rate of interest in this year of grace 1959! That is not a matter for rejoicing; they should be wringing their hands or each other's necks, not clapping them for joy.

From 1952, Mr. Speaker, on the floor of this House, the hon. member for Christ Church and myself along with some hon. members on this side whose names I cannot at this moment call readily to mind, but certainly on this side of the House , were beseeching the Government to start the Deep Water Harbour project when the rate of interest was only then 4%. I remember standing on the floor of this House and saying that the rate of interest was going to go up. Now, Sir, I could not have any secret from the Chancellor of the Exchequer because Governments have fallen for less than that; Ministers have lost their jobs. Nobody in the Bank of England knows more than 24 hours before, but I said over there on the floor of this House around about February, 1952 that if you did not start now you were going to find that within a couple of months - perhaps eight weeks - that the rate of interest will be jumped and then you would have to sit down and wait another ten or fifteen years for it to come back down. The then Financial Minister got up and asked how I knew more than the Chancellor of the Exchequer and made a lot of silly, stupid irrelevant, unnecessary remarks, and in four weeks after I said that, the Bank rate went up to 4 1/2% and it has been going up ever since; and the hon. member for St. Thomas is gratified and overjoyed now that it has reached its peak or zenith that people are willing to lend us money at the highest possible rate of interest!

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 o'clock p.m. this Sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 p.m.

*On Resumption*

*The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.*

QUESTION TIME

*Question Time was called.*

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

*Private Members' Business was called.*

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House will now revert to Government business.

On the Suspension the hon. junior member for St. John was speaking.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I resume discussion on the Appropriation Bill, I was about to rise when Your Honour called "Private Members' Business." I want to ask leave to give notice of my intention to discuss the Replies to the Oral Answers which were laid in reply to Questions which I asked, and these questions are No. 6/1959 relating to the progress and financing of the Deep Water Harbour Project.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to give notice of his intention to discuss Replies to Questions asked by him, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Mr BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to discuss at a later stage Oral Answers given to Question No. 6/1959 laid by me on the 3rd February, 1959.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on resuming the discussion where I left off on the Appropriation Bill, 1959, I was dealing firstly with the lack of the necessary background information before this Budget was introduced by the hon. member for St. Thomas.

Now at the opening of his remarks, the hon. member for St. Thomas said that he would begin by drawing the attention of the House to the effects of the recession on employment. He said:- "Everybody will remember that there was a recession in England and in the United States of America, in those two places which affect most the economy of the island by way of Barbadian workers emigrating to those two countries." The hon. Minister went on to dilate upon that subject and rather inadvisably in my respectful submission to say that there was a fall in the number of people going to the United Kingdom and the number of workers going to the United States of America.
2.35. p.m.

Now I want you to get this clear. When people are attempting to expound economic theory, they should at least be logical even if they are not scientific. I fail to see how one can attempt to attribute the alleged recession which took place in the United Kingdom and in the United States last year to the decrease in the number of workers migrating to those countries respectively. The decrease in the number of workers going to the United Kingdom is not solely attributable, if attributable at all, to any recession or slump in that country. In so far as the United States of America are concerned the volume of migrant employment from the West Indies or Barbados is affected by a wide variety of factors. Certainly, there were technological changes manifesting themselves in the dropping off in the level of employment in the U.S.A. last year, and any one who took the trouble to enquire would have found out that the unemployment in America was almost entirely restricted to the metal trade, the motor-car industry and those subsidiary industries which are directly or indirectly dependent on the steel and motor-car trades. The level of agricultural output rose to unprecedented heights. The workers who leave the West Indies to go up there under the controlled workers' scheme move up from the South to the North as the year progresses because the harvesting of crops of vegetables - I include tomatoes and peas and all of those other consumer goods - ripen sooner in the South than in the North, and as the snow finally withdraws from the land in the North these workers are able to go up northwards.

I was saying that although there was a deliberate retrenchment in America, it was not a result of the total acreage under agriculture during 1957 and 1958. If that is so one must look for other causes for the decrease in the migrant workers who actually left Barbados during 1957 and 1958 other than the recession in trade. A cursory examination would show that the total number of workers employed in the harvesting of agricultural crops rose rather than fell: but what happened was that a much larger labour force from Puerto Rico was engaged in this particular aspect of the American economy during those two years. Steadily increasing numbers of Puerto Rican workers found themselves in transitory camps harvesting agricultural products and, naturally, the Puerto Ricans have first priority in the American labour market.

When we come to England, let us examine the situation there. We on this side of the House four years ago were the first people to point out that Government should give every encouragement to workers who wanted to migrate to the United Kingdom in the absence of any economic policy dealing with unemployment on the part of the Government of Barbados, and that every encouragement should be given to unemployed people in Barbados who wanted to earn their livelihood in the United Kingdom to migrate there. At first, we were ridiculed. We heard the remarks from the then Minister of Trade, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, that they would have to see what the British Government had to say about it. He seemed to have forgotten that there was an Act of Great Britain whereby all citizens of the British Commonwealth were citizens of Great Britain and that a Barbadian citizen is entitled to enter the United Kingdom without let or hindrance or fear of being deported from there. We pointed out these things. In November, 1954, there were 383 thousand vacancies registered at the Employment Exchanges in the United Kingdom and I pointed out that there was common experience from people who worked in this particular Department of Government and from industrialists that for every vacancy that was actually registered at the Employment Exchanges, you could expect to see three or four jobs wanting people to do them but which were not registered, obviously because the employers had given up in despair of ever getting people to fill those jobs. That is a matter of history: so there were over 1 1/2 million jobs waiting for workers in England. The Jamaicans as far back as 1947 or 1948 started flooding up to England in large numbers because they were not prepared to sit down and die of starvation in their native land. Being more adventurous and progressive, they decided to make their livelihood even in a country whose climate and living conditions were not compatible to their physical comfort. It took the Barbadian workers three or four years after that before the trend commenced here. There is no mention here of anything like that. So incomplete a grasp the Government of this country had on the economic state of the country that they did not realise that over $1 million per year were being spent with foreign sugar firms, money which was a complete loss to this country.

2.45 p.m.

This problem of unemployment is one which affects the economy at all levels. When you have to export people, when the ships take these people in their thousands out of Barbados, they are the general exodus from the privation and want in this colony; and these ships are owned by foreign countries. That is another capital export from Barbados to the tune of over $1 million for every three thousand people who leave this island yearly. No mention has ever been made of that. That is another reason why it is incumbent on an island to provide economic opportunities within the confines of the island. The question of emigration is something over which we have not got any control whatever and it is an intangible matter which any Government who is planning the economy in the interest of the people, would believe to be a major factor of importance. This exodus of people is also a social and financial disinvestment in this particular sense; that when you spend money on children to educate them in the Primary and Elementary Schools of this island, when you provide them during their years of infancy with some level of social services and they go outside of this country to contribute to the wealth and the economy of another country, they become a social disinvestment in so far as the public finance of Barbados is concerned.

On the private plane, the parents of these children have also spent a large number of years in bringing them up; they have also spent money on the education and culture of these children, and then when the time comes that the parent would normally expect that these children would be ploughing back some of the investment - I am not saying that parents necessarily go about bringing up children in a cold-blooded manner of dollars and cents, but we must also enquire into the social disinvestment on the private plane. When parents spend money in educating their children and they come to the age of discretion, all parents would expect them to be ploughing back some of the investment and to help with the support of their younger brethren, or with the support of their aged parents. We have literally to drive them out of this country and the Government is making that one of the main planks of their economy.

The first remark which the Minister of Finance made in opening his Budget Speech was the effect of the falling off of the numbers emigrating to the United Kingdom. In other words, Government is continuing policy of getting rid of the people of Barbados at all costs. I would have thought that any Government which witnessed a decrease in the numbers of migrants out of Barbados would have been in a position and would be proud to say:" We are very glad to see that, because of the opportunities afforded by the deliberate planning of the economy of Barbados, there has not arisen the necessity for so many people to go abroad, because we have absorbed 3,000, 5,000, 6,000 or 7,000 people within the past twelve months by the establishment of these and those industries within the confines of the island of Barbados." That is what I would have been glad to hear. This falling off of the numbers going to the United Kingdom cannot be attributed to any recession in the United Kingdom because I am positive - I make this statement without the slightest fear of contradiction - that out of the 1,242 people who are supposed to have gone to the United Kingdom last year, no more than, let us say, 1,000 of them would have been workers in the true sense of the term. The others would have been students and people of that nature. I am positive that not one of these 1,200 odd persons either studied the *Financial Times* or the *Wall Street Journal* or the financial column in the "Advocate" before coming to the decision to go to the United States of America. I take it that "recession" is a euphemism used in high finance to show a falling off in industrial output; there may be a necessary falling off in the level of unemployment; but "recession", which

is the new euphemism for a slump, can be either of a short or long or permanent duration, and there is no point in the suggestion by anyone that the recession in England or America was anything more than of a temporary duration during the period which we have under survey.

Let us face the facts. Everything in nature, everything in life has a certain degree of periodicity; everything goes in cycles. Business fluctuates in cycles and that is why we have recessions. They may be of a short term or a long term; there are certain technical terms which are attributed to these trade cycles. I do not want to confuse hon. members with the technical aspects of trade cycles. Even on the question of emigration, that usually occurs in waves. There is a sort of unending upward stream of emigration from one part of the world to the other. It is not even like that of any period; it always works in cycles. There is always a certain amount of periodicity even of emigration. You will find that in a country like Barbados you have 26,000 people, let us say, unemployed; out of that number, 10,000 may have the urge to emigrate. It is a question of bearing these ills which you have rather than flying to others you know not of. But the urge to emigrate is not that; there must be a correlative incentive for them to emigrate. There should be a more deliberately planned programme on the part of the Government of the migrating country to take the opportunity of providing employment in the immigrating country. All things being equal, and conditions being available, you will find that 10,000 people will start a search for emgration, and some of them do emigrate.
2.55 p.m.
If they have the urge and there is a correlative incentive on the other side and the inducement is there, not all of those persons will necessarily have the financial means or the other necessary qualifications to migrate; so what would normally happen is that after the first rush has taken place, there must necessarily be a falling off in the number of people who will go, because all the people who wanted to go have gone and were able to go because they had the ready cash in their pockets or the liquidity; that is, they had something to convert into ready cash in order to finance the excursion out of the country.

No Barbadian sits down and studies the *Wall Street Journal* or the *Financial Times* when he makes a decision to pick up bag and baggage and depart from the shores of this country. As far as Barbados is concerned, the recession had nothing to do directly, as far as one could see, with the emigration problem or the propensity to migrate, if I may put it that way. All the people who wanted to migrate would have gone, say, within a given period and then you would get a residual number of potential migrants left back in Barbados who were only mustering the necessary cash in order to get out of here anyhow, to get up and get out of Barbados before they died of starvation, and so the number would necessarily begin to decline after a certain period.

The Minister of Finance has no control over the recession; he does not even have control over the finances of Barbados; so how can he come in here and talk about "due to the recession", because I can give not only one possible explanation but ten possible explanations as to why the numbers have fallen off during the past twelve months. I talked just now of a lot of people in Barbados who are willing to take a risk; there are also large numbers of people in this island who will not take a risk particularly if the social climate in the receiving country is not congenial. The Hon Minister of Finance, Mr. Deputy Speaker, seems to be ashamed, although he was a participant in the act itself, to mention that we had race riots in London last year. Why is he ashamed to mention that? Why should he talk about the recession? There are still more jobs in England than workers and not enough people to fill these jobs, and there has never been a period during the past twelve months in the economic history of Great Britain that that situation did not exist; but in the United Kingdom last year we had some of what is described as unfortunate incidents of the innate manifestation of racial prejudice in that country. I am not saying that we had something which was completely unexpected or completely alien to the British disposition or any of these platitudes that have been bandied around by people who have been trying to water down the disgraceful occurrence which took place in what up to now has been called the Mother Country last year, and naturally the psychological impact of these disturbances and these outbreaks of physical violence and the beating up of Barbadian and West Indian workers, students and other responsible and respectable citizens of these islands must necessarily make the Barbadian who is back here and who would like to get a job in England and who knows that there is a job up there, think twice before he takes the plunge.

Now the hon. member for St. Thomas talks about the recession just as if they do not get the debate of the Barbados House of Assembly, far from the *Financial Times* or the *Wall Street Journal*. Which Barbadian emigrant picks up the *Wall Street Journal*? How many members on that side of the House understand what the Dow Jones Industrial Average is? It is almost a waste of time asking that question because the answer is patent to all the people in Barbados who have heard or read this Budget Speech. When you talk about recession, you should leave it to the financiers but you should not try to contribute the evils which you have visited upon the unsuspecting public of Barbados to some remote cause in England or America that has nothing to do with us.

I would be the last person to deny if you got a falling off in the demand for our products by an importing country due to a recession in that country or a deliberate cutting in the level of consumption in the importing country that it would not affect the balance of payment or the balance of trade in the exporting country which in this particular instance would be Barbados. There could not be an industrial recession when there are still jobs in agriculture and on the railways; and I will tell you this since I am on that: two weeks ago British railways sent down here - the newspapers have said very little about it - to recruit about 50 or 60 people to work on British railways, and these workers, I believe, will be leaving towards the end of this month. They could use 700 now and perhaps in another three months another 700 workers; the Minister of Labour must know that is true. But what is the position? The position is that they have found that the educational standard of the workers from Barbados, particularly those who have been victims of age grouping has fallen off; but they would be willing to have a lot more workers. That shows you what a vicious circle the lack of positive thinking on the part of the Government in all aspects of the conduct of public affairs can have on the well-being of the people, because when they do not pay sufficient attention to the educational standards of the people of Barbados, you get a falling off in the demand for workers from Barbados once the top has been creamed off. Now nobody wants the leaves and the left-overs because the jobs which they are called upon to do up there will call for a certain amount of aptitude and a certain amount of educational background, which say, fifteen years ago, we could have supplied willingly; but now today they say they cannot take more than 60 because their experience now is that if they attempt to recruit more than 60 workers at a time the quality would necessarily suffer. That is a fact. Why has the Minister of Finance not mentioned this? Why blame the technological innovations which have caused from time to time temporary recessions in the United States and the United Kingdom on the ill state of the economy of Barbados? I can prove to him, Sir, that emigration from Barbados was at its height at a time when there was a very severe industrial recession and the industrial demand had fallen off in England, but there was still a high level of employment in the United Kingdom.
3.05 p.m.
The Premier went on to say that the remittances from abroad fell $200,000 at the Post Office. I want to say this. If a $200,000 fall in remittances is a slump, then I would be glad if the Hon. Premier would tell us if we are living in a perpetual state of risk in Barbados. They say that they had a $200,000 fall in remittances and yet they had a budget surplus last year, as far as I remember, of $2 million and for this year they have budgeted for a surplus of $574,000 on the gross national product.

I regard this question of remittances in a small colony

of Barbados, especially in the light of the economic neglect which we have been suffering, to be a very important factor in our national income: but nobody in their right senses would suggest that the Government has been put in a bad position on account of it, because remittances which are intangible and cannot be calculated until they arrive are subject to the whims and fancies of the individuals who send them and the needs of the recipients; therefore, this should not be in any way something to be alarmed about. Why should the Government complain when they have not tried to control the remittances and there is no law governing remittances and there is no economic policy entailed in remittances sent from the United Kingdom or any country into Barbados? Any country which is gearing its financial outlook to the level of remittances which are influenced by so many uncontrollable factors is completely bankrupt of a financial and economic policy. That is my submission.

We want to know in this country about production; we want to know what the Government is doing to increase work for the industrial army of unemployed. What is the Government doing to put more producing power in the pockets of the citizens of Barbados? What steps are being taken, apart from lip service to the Development Board which is managed by incompetence, in order to generate a certain amount of financial dynamism in this country? We want to know of broader plans to prime the economic pump. What long term plans have you got for catering to the 2,000 or 3,000 workers - I understand from one trade union that 4,000 is the correct number but I put it at the conservative level of 2,000 - who would be displaced like the coopers by bulk shipment when the Deep Water Harbour flowers into operation? The Deep Water Harbour project will employ like the St. Lawrence Seaway a limit of labour.

The larger proportion of the capital which we have raised on the London market will never - I say 'will never' advisedly - leave the shores of England. I suppose the Deep Water Harbour will eventually cost us $24 million, and $16 million of that $24 million will never leave the shores of the United Kingdom and this Government knows it. The Deep Water Harbour is not a labour-consuming project as Professor Arthur Lewis suggested we should go in for. All the machinery which we bring down to erect it, we will have to pay the English manufacturers for it and the money we have raised in England is raised for the manufacturers in England and not to pay the workers down here.

On the Unestablished Staff we have 4,610 people who are pensionable plus many others who are directly employed by the Government of Barbados who will be due for pensions when they reach retirement age, and we are paying them out of our annual revenue. If there is the question of paying for labour, we can go on financing the Deep Water Harbour out of the parochial taxes of St. James alone. We can pay for the stone out of the money collected by the Department of Highways. I am not saying it is wrong or right.

You say that you are glad as if you have gone up there and seen the Holy Grave, as it was described by the Leader of the Government Party, that the rich capitalists of England over-subsecibed the loan thereby showing confidence in the Socialist Government of Barbados. That is something which they do not do for the Labour Government of England. This project which is well underway has been financed out of the Barbados Treasury up to now. We owe the people in England a lot of money. Why did you not tell the people that and that you have raised this loan in England to pay them back? Why did you not tell the people of Barbados that you are paying the capitalists of England the highest rate of interest that any colony of the British Empire has ever paid at any time?

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The remarks of the hon. junior member for St. John is not true. There have been three loans which were raised in England at the same rate of interest before the Barbados loan.

Mr. BARROW: That is not a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, ask him to sit down.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Allow me to hear what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is saying.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I consider the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. John rather incorrect when he says that our Deep Water Harbour loan was at a greater rate of interest than any other colony which was loaned money in England.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I made no personal reference to the hon. member and he has no right to stop me.

Mr. STRAUGHN: His remarks are incorrect. The Deep Water Harbour loan which the Barbados Government got, is not the most expensive loan of any colonial government.

Mr. BARROW: In the fulsomeness of his wisdom, in the process of time, the hon. member will be able to show his erudition on financial matters.
3.15 p.m.

I say that we have paid the highest rate of a loan in the history of the Island; I go further and say that we have never paid it before in the history of mankind. (Mr. STRAUGHN: I can give you the figures). I would not need any figures from him because he would not understand them. I would like the hon. member to mention one occasion on which Barbados has paid 6% on any loan and issued that loan at 98.

Mr. STRAUGHN: On a point of order. The Barbados Government has never had a loan before, so that this must be the most expensive one, if it is the first one.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am not here to bandy words with the hon member; if he would peruse the financial report of the Accountant General, he would know how to talk. It is not a matter for general rejoicing because when you examine the situation, you will see that the British investors will be paying back themselves for a debt which has already been incurred in Barbados now. On the 3rd February, 1959, I asked questions relative to the progress and financing of the Deep Water Harbour. You will remember that, Mr. Speaker, and the replies were laid here within the last two weeks. I did not have the date on them, but these are the Replies:

"The expenditure on the construction of the Deep Water Harbour during 1957-58 was $2,257,654 and from 1st April, 1958, to 31st January, 1959, $5,529,824 was spent. The total expenditure to 31st January, 1959 was therefore approximately $7.8 million. Pending the raising of an external loan, the work was financed by advances from surplus balances and from the Revenue Equalisation Fund.

"On 29th January, 1959, a loan of approximately $12,000,000 was raised in London. Further appropriate arrangements for financing the project will be made as the occasion arises, within authorities approved by the Legislature."

How are we going to get around that? When I asked my questions, the work was in progress for two years, and the Government had never made any official statement on the financing of the Deep Water Harbour project, as they were forced to do when I asked my questions. They never disclosed to the public of this Island that $7.8 million had been taken out of the Treasury. The harbour was a project which we had advocated for a number of years; as a matter of fact, you will find debates and reports going back to the 1880's or the 1890's about this project; as an election stunt they commenced the project just before the election. They took the Officer administering the Government of this colony, the then Leader of the Government and one or two other people whose names are not worthy of mention, up to England to get money in

1956, and they did not get it; as some other hon. member mentioned, they got bowled out for nought. They thought that they would produce a miracle for the people at election time. I asked them and Professor Beasley advised them to start this project in 1952 when the rate of interest was 4 1/2 %. A Committee sat in connection with this matter and while the Committee was actually sitting, the bank rate went up in a few months' time, and just a few months later it went up again; but they decided to start this project, not because the propitious day had arrived on the London market, but because the election had started and people were told that 6 or 7 million would be employed in the project. Now you have seen the result.

Mr Speaker, there is an old proverb which runs like this: "If you deceive me once, shame on you; if you deceive me twice, shame on me." The people of Barbados apparently have not learned that old proverb yet. People went ahead and repaired their lorries, putting in axles and springs, and sharpened their knives so as to get a slice on the grinding stone. The result is that not even a mason tender is employed down there. It is now past the election situation, and you have something vying with the Empire State Building in its attempt to reach the clouds, mixing concrete. Every single vehicle and railway traction engine is imported from the United Kingdom, and no body builder, platform builder, gate builder, no mechanics or people like that are employed either directly or indirectly, apart from the people who are employed as wage earners within the harbour area itself. No quarry owners have derived any benefit. You have an entirely different picture from that which was presented to the people in 1956. We had the undignified spectacle of the Governor of this colony taking part in an election stunt, going to England in haste to try to raise money, and having started the project, they then had to continue with it, and therefore they depleted the Treasury to the extent of $7.8 million. Undoubtedly, that is a project which can and will be here until the end of time or until Barbados subsides and resumes its former situation in the Atlantic Ocean. That money was taken out of the Revenue Equalisation Fund which is Current Revenue. If you take it out of Current Revenue, or if you take it from this door instead of that door, it does not mean that it is not coming out of the annual income of the taxpayers. They have taken $7.8 million out of the Current Revenue and yet the Premier opens his Budget Speech with a barrage that there are less remittances coming from abroad! These remittances would be something which would find its way into the Treasury by way of postal orders. Is that something about which the Government should be concerned when they have taken $7.8 million out of the Treasury on the Premier's own showing in a Reply given to me on the floor of this House and which he cannot deny now? 3.25 p.m.

You are right in front of the wicket now. Here is an official document of the House; $7.8 million out of Revenue Equalisation Fund and Surplus Balances. Surplus Balances of what? Of taxation? We must be a very healthy colony indeed not to have sent out these 524 people and at the same time we have in Barbados 26,000 people unemployed during crop time in this country. I challenge the financial genius, the man who has elected himself to that role in the Government Party, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, to say that 26,000 people are not unemployed in Barbados in crop time. I want to draw to Your Honour's attention something now which is really an indication that there must be little hope for democracy in Barbados unless we develop the tactics of Mr. Fidel Castro or somebody like that or like Grivas. They are going to go on tempting the people of this island, exploiting them and despising them until one day the whole thing is going to erupt like a volcano.

What I want to draw to Your Honour's attention is this: on the 12th March, 1956, and I checked this and found it is correct - I see that the only literate one over there is making a note of the date; he should call the Clerk and ask him because that date is a significant date - a Report on unemployment and employment in Barbados was laid on the Table of this House; that Report was one which was written by Mr. George Cumper of Cambridge University and of the Institute of Economics and Social Study of the University College of the West Indies over a period of several months during the preceding year, 1955, was dispatched to the Government of Barbados either late in 1955 or early in 1956, and was laid on the Table of this House on 12th March, 1956. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is three years and a week practically that that Report was laid.

Now I do not believe, Sir, in saying things about people who are not here to defend themselves; so I want to say something before the Officer administering the Government of this Colony leaves this island. I have never considered it any part of a person who is exercising the Royal prerogative to distort economic or other facts - I would like to leave it at that - to cover up iniquity and corruption. This idea that a Colonial Governor must keep the Ship of State on even keel even although the Ship is heading for the rocks, and that he should not even pull the helm and try to divert the impending disaster is one to which we cannot subscribe. We have had Colonial Governors in Trinidad and apparently the ones up here subscribe to the same view that their only function now that we are getting constitutional development in Barbados is to keep the Ship of State on even keel, as I said before, at all costs, even at the cost of human lives and suffering, even at the cost of condoning, conniving and covering up corruption, even at the cost of iniquity.

I am almost a Republican by disposition: I am certainly a Nationalist, and I am an anti-Imperialist; but at the same time you must have in every state checks and balances; whether these checks and balances are exercised by your own nationals or by imported officials is irrelevant and is only a question of personalities; but the checks and balances must be there - and not only that, there must be exercised judiciously and honestly. That is what I want to say and I do not want that gentleman to depart from this island feeling that he is the greatest Pro-Consul of all time in our estimation. I want him to know that he has failed lamentably in doing those things that ought to be done and at the same time taking care not to impede the constitutional progress of this island.

Now what is the position? At the opening of this Current Session of the Legislature, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the worthy gentleman informed us that there were no reliable stastistics of unemployment available, but the number registered at the Employment Exchange at 31st December was 1,162 as compared with 2,239 a year ago. During 1958, 1,239 persons were placed in local employment. Anyone who is a stranger coming to Barbados and sitting down in the Other Place listening to this Speech would have come to the conclusion that Barbados has the lowest unemployment figures in the world. Sir William Beveridge in his Report on Social Security and Full Employment said that he considered that between 3% and 4% permanent residual unemployment was considered as a healthy sign of full employment in any free society. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is writing again; he does not even know how to spell "Beveridge"; he thinks it is "Beverage" like a Ju-C or something like that. He makes me laugh with that childish business he gets on with. The quarrel which the Conservatives had with Sir William Beveridge was that 4% was not a good figure for unemployment but that you must have a permanent residual figure of 7%.
3.35 p.m.
It is a concept which is difficult for all to grasp except the financial genius over there, but if you must gain mobility of people, that is to say, people going into households and old age homes, you will find that in a free society four per cent is a very healthy sign. If you go below that, if you have more than 97 per cent of the working age working, this, Sir, is a very unhealthy sign because it means that you are calling out people who are residing in T.B. sanitoriums and the like and they are retiring with the other people.

I do not want to go into any sidetrack between the argument of Sir William Beveridge and the Conservatives but we have this situation here. We do not have any reli-

able information or statistics about our unemployment according to the statement by our Premier. I am saying that is not true because if you have one of the senior and most qualified masters of the University who is a trained economist and if you placed at his disposal trained numerators to carry out a statistical survey at the University College Institute and in that report that gentleman says that it can be taken that 26,000 people in Barbados are permanently unemployed, I say that it is dishonest for anyone having that knowledge to say that there are no reliable statistics about our unemployment. I want to know if that is correct and if what is said here can only be done with the collusion of the Government Department then, Sir, we have a very dangerous inflationary system in Barbados because out of a potential labour force of 110,000 people, we have less than one percent unemployed; therefore, I can now understand what the Hon. Premier means by inflation.

Sir, I will challenge the Government to say why Mr. Cumper's report is not printed. It went to the *Advocate* to be printed the next day after it was laid on the Table of this House and up to now it has not seen the light of day. That is a disreputable and dishonest state of affairs. The members of this House have not been vouchsafed a copy of the Cumper Report and it will not be debated as long as we have these ignoramuses in office and as long as we have people who would condone dishonesty and corruption and whose main concern is to keep the ship of state on an even keel heading straight for disaster. As long as you go over the abyss on an even keel, all is right, it does not matter how many people are unemployed, whether from the captain to the cabin boy is drowned in the swirling water as long as you go down playing "God Save the Queen" on an even keel. It is disgraceful. Let me ask: have you got a copy of the Cumper Report on unemployment? You have not got one but the Governor has seen it. I challenge the Hon. Premier to say that the Governor has not seen it.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I think the hon. member who has just sat down ought to know that the name of the Governor or the office of Governor should not be called into debate.

Mr. BARROW: Which rule says that the office of Governor should not be called into debate? How can we debate the office of Governor then?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The hon. member knows that the Governor has nothing to do with the Cumper Report or any other report. Anyway, Sir, I want to call your attention to that rule. I have been trying to find it and I hope the Clerk will help me to find it relating to irrelevantly calling the Governor's name in a debate.

Mr. BARROW: I suppose he wants to tell you that he does not want me to take the name of the Governor in vain. The Rule says that you should not call the name of the Sovereign irrelevantly. Sir, we have to reply to the Governor's speech. Do you mean to say that we have to say 'the speech made by the gentleman with the long white jacket and a lot of medals'? I am saying that at the time this speech was made, the Governor must have known of that information in the report. I am asking the Governor to explain why the Cumper Report is not published up to now.

It may be that the Premier's dark glasses prevent him from understanding the rules. I am saying that when they say "to me the most important problem is emigration", I have reiterated before and I am reiterating now that the most important problem in Barbados is the problem and the shadow of unemployment which hangs like a penumbra over the lives of the people of this colony, and that when you can have a speech where at the opening of the Legislature a man in a long white jacket with a lot of medals purporting to be the Officer administering the Government is telling you that this is a statement of fact that there are no reliable figures of unemployment, it must be some indictment on the staff of the University College of the West Indies because I say that he knows that there is such information and all of them know that Mr. Cumper says that there are 26,000 people unemployed and I am saying that today the figure is slightly higher. When they say that only 1,000 people were unemployed, they mean according to the figure at the Unemployment Exchange in Queen's Park The workers in Barbados have ceased to go to the Unemployment Exchange to register because they consider it a waste of time. The figure of those who go there and register every month in the hope of getting away is not an indication of the figure of unemployment in this country: it bears no relationship to that at all.

Well, Sir, it is a most surprising thing. Time after time, we have people, whether they be Government officers or otherwise, who insult the people of Barbados and they say things which they know to be flagrantly wrong and misleading and they say such things to cover up so that our problems will be concealed not only from our own eyes but from the eyes of the outside world.
3.45 p.m.

If you do not have the intellectual curiosity to go and probe you will live in a state of complacency in Barbados until you wake up and find that the roof has been removed from over your head.

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

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I come back to this situation which I just want to sum up and leave to hon. members to think about. I hope that Your Honour will be able to make some enquiries into this matter and issue a statement to the House about it. I was saying or I have said that three years ago, on the 12th March, a Report on the unemployment situation was laid on the Table of this House. That was in 1956. There was an election taking place in that year and the Government of Great Britain openly admitted at the time of the laying of the Report of the Royal Commission which investigated the economic plight of this colony, that they could not publish the Report. That is a fact, not a figment of mine. The Government of Great Britain openly issued an official communiqué to the effect that they would not publish the Report of the Royal Commission -- I am referring to the Report of the Royal Commission which was laid on the Table of the House of Commons during the second World War. Their reason for withholding the publication of that Document was that it would have offered aid and comfort to the Axis Powers who would be able to make propaganda which would have had a deleterious effect on the War effort. Probably, it would have caused a lot of rejoicing in the ranks of the King's enemies and probably it would have had an adverse effect on the actual outcome of the War. Are we now confronted with the same situation in Barbados? Is the War over or is it still on? If in 1956, the Government of Barbados found it inconvenient or embarrassing to have the *"Advocate"* execute their contract by publishing that Report so that the members of this House, at least, would have had copies of that Report, is the War still on? The election is over; the Government have won that election and why are they withholding Mr. Cumper's Report from the members of the public and members of this House? It was the Government's duty to allow that Report to be debated on the floor of this House at the earliest possible opportunity since they asked for the investigation, and were the members of the Government under no obligation to publish that Report? Were they not under obligation, after a certain time had elapsed, to make enquiries and find out what had happened to the Report and get it printed and circulated as quickly as possible? These are questions which we, on this side of the House, have been asking for a long period of time and they are questions which I am sure have been operating in the mind of Your Honour for some time. It is not only a question of that Report, but there are some other Reports which have not been published. We know that the printing had broken down at one particular phase and that the printers were behind hand with our legislative debates. We know all of that, but let me remind hon. members of another Report. We have the Report on the St. Lucy's Ves-

try which is a voluminous resume of an investigation which took place in December 1958 and January 1959 - not in 1955 and we are now in March, 1959. There was no elaborate machinery at the disposal of the Commissioner; there was one Secretary, or something like that, and an Assistant. Because there was another election coming on, this time it was the Local Government Election, no time was lost in placing that voluminous Report in the hands of members of this Chamber so that use could be made of it in one way or another on political platforms. In my opinion, this enquiry of local peccadillios or erstwhile Vestry affairs is not a matter of consuming interest to the economy of this island. I say that it is a peccadillio as compared with the crimes of commission committed by the lack of viability on the part of the Government of this island. We were presented with that Report with the utmost despatch and it is an investigation which took a long time and a lot of hard work was put into it; but it was laid on the Table of this House. they did not wait either for the Government Printery or the *Barbados Advocate*; that Report was printed and cyclostyled with the utmost despatch and precision too, in a matter of weeks in this year of Grace, 1959; but as to the Cumper Report, is the War still on? If the British Government would have been embarrassed by the publication of the Report of the Royal Commission during the War, at least the British Government, after the War was over and they had been victorious and triumphant, as my honourable friend the hon. senior member for Christ Church would say, released that Report and in the West Indies, as a result of the release of that Report, every single West Indian Government has based its whole betterment programme, its economic policy, on the recommendations of the Royal Commission.

I find it difficult to reflect back and think of one matter apart from the Democratic League putting forward a programme which has only now come into fruition, there is really not a single thing, which has been done in this or in any other colony, of major importance since the publication of the Royal Commission Report, which does not spring from the recommendations in the Report of the Commission. I would like that challenge to be taken up in this House, in the Press or otherwise, because I would be able to give chapter and verse for it. The temporary inconvenience which was suffered by the people of the West Indies because of the withholding of the Report, had even come to be equated with the overall condition of the survival of democracy as we know it; but there were subsequent benefits which we have derived from the release and publication of that report.

3.55 p.m.

I am sure that every citizen will agree that the overriding consideration of national security was one which justified the withholding of the Report for a certain period of time and for a certain period of time only; that is to say, Sir, in this colony, carrying the analogy to its conclusion, the release of this Report by Mr. George Cumper would have startled the average member of the public into the realisation that we are really living in a state of siege, that we are in a siege economy and that we are in a perpetual state of emergency here in Barbados. That is my thesis; we are in a perpetual state of economic emergency. Who knows what benefits will be derived from the publication of Mr. Cumper's Report if it serves that purpose and no other purpose at all than merely to shock the people of Barbados into their senses and bring the Government to reason? Certainly the Royal Commission did bring the British people to their senses and face to face with their relationship and economic ties with the people in the under-developed territories. We live in a pre-technological society in Barbados; people like to call it "under-developed" but I do not subscribe to that as being the correct terminology we should employ. We do not live in an under-developed society in Barbados, a place with 98,000 acres of arable land out of a total acerage of 106,000 acres and in any one year some 67,000 or 69,000 acres of that are actually under cultivation. We are not an under-developed territory at all; we may be a primary producing country; we may be a pre-technological society, but certainly not an under-developed country; but if we are a pre-technological society, we want to know where we are going from here and the first reserve which we have here in Barbados is the labour factor, an industrial reserve army of 26,000 unemployed people, a grave economic problem in any country which is tantamount to something like 22% permanent unemployment in Barbados in contradistinction to the figure of less than 1% misrepresented in the speech of the Officer administering the Government of this colony. I hope that meets with general approval.

A lot of people leave this island and go away and never return. Some of them return after 40 or 50 years and they at the time of their departure from the colony were so inure to the general state of economic stagnation in Barbados that when they come back here and see a new bus on the road or see that a gutter that was formerly a pot hole has been done after 50 years, they are surprised. If you want any better indication of how people look at us, it is this manifestation of the progress which has been made, when in truth there has been none. When they find certain stores in Broad Street have a coat of paint, they regard it as progress because they never expected to see that. But how high are we setting our targets? I had a discussion with two hon. members in here last night about the question of targets and whether the people of Barbados have set their targets high enough. Are they not contented until the end of time to be the hewers of wood and the drawers of water, living in somebody else's house, sleeping on the floor and bumming a meal here and there? I am telling you that if they had the *aura vitae* - you will forgive me for using a foreign phrase because we are not to debate in a language other than English in this Chamber, but I cannot think of any equivalent word in the English language which would express what I want to bring out - if they had the zest for life that people in Cuba had, they would have dug a deep ditch, blind-folded all of them over there and let them stand over the same ditch, shot them down and covered them with mould. That is the only way, apparently, that you are going to get progress in Barbados.

I am not an advocate of violence but I am saying that if we go on ignoring the plight of the masses of the people in Barbados, something will happen. Do not be misled by their present complacency and acquiesence; it is not a permanent feature of any group of people living in any part of the globe in the history of mankind. There is no such thing as perpetual complacency; it is only a phenomenon; complacency is a phenomenon in human affairs. Batista got away with $5 million a month for five years, that is $300 million, and when the Revolution came in Cuba, it came with such suddenness that every major power in the world was taken by surprise including the Government of America which kept the closest watch over Cuba. I want to warn the local Batistas and save them from themselves. Do not think that giving out a job in Highways and Transport or getting a secretarial job for somebody's child is going to keep you in power until the end of time. What we may find here in Barbados, and I regret to say this, is that there will be no hope for democracy, that such a wreck will be made of the whole thing that the people who come in afterwards and try to mop up will find that it is an irreparable loss to the people of Barbados. I am not being rhetorical or anything like that. I seriously feel these things; I think of it twenty-four hours a day; in my conscious and unconscious hours of sleep that is my foremost thought. How long can you keep back information like that? The whole position is that people have never been accustomed to anything else but unemployment; a record unemployment is the natural state of affairs; and therefore when you get a chance of employment you either find that it is a condition of life which is alien to your disposition, or you sort of reorganise your thinking and your physical exertion to carry out the job and you find that it is congenial to do a job and want to be eternally grateful to somebody who has directly or indirectly placed you in that job. That is what is happening in Barbados; privation and unemployed thousands are the natural state of affairs; and the reason why people have not exhibited any violent reaction to this long era of neglect is because they do not learn anything better

until they go outside of the island, and a few souls may escape from that kind of economic and intellectual bondage ; they may go and improve their minds but realise that there is something wrong without even leaving their homes. You have a Government here, Sir, to give you an illustration, that up to a couple of years ago never thought when they were putting down new houses that they should put water bowl sanitation in them.
4.05 p.m.
They came here a couple of years ago for money to build houses and they never thought of putting water toilets in them. That is the sort of economic policy of the Govern ment - a policy which suits the horse and buggy era. Look at the slums here in Bridgetown. To say that you are building 50 or 100 houses does not disclose what your intentions are towards the removal of slum clearance in Bridgetown.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church in the course of his remarks made an interesting statement as regards Mr. Stevens, Architect and Town Planner, who has been down here for ten months. As a matter of emergency, look at the traffic problem in Barbados! Look at the number of children killed on the sidewalks in Barbados! If I wrote a book on Barbados, I would call it an Island of old pavements , and if I wrote one about the Government, I would call it "Leader Boys". Children are being killed on our streets. The slums in Barbados - Suttle Street, Golden Square, Cats Castle - are classic slums. You will find debates of our Legislature going back in time of history of the Golden Square and of Watkins Alley. The people there will not resent my saying that they are slums; some of the houses there have no sanitation at all. Ask the Churchwarden of St. Michael and he will tell you that there are hundreds of houses there which have no sanitation at all. You have slums right behind your Fire Station in Probyn Street and behind your magnificent Ministerial Buildings. If your were conscious of it, it would make you recognise that they are a threat not only to the security and safety of the buildings on which we have spent the taxpayers' money but also a threat to the community. Look at poor, benighted Castries, St. Lucia, which has been rebuilt! Why cannot you take example?

Sir, unless they deliberately make unprecedented raids on the Public Treasury during the next twelve months, I predict the surplus for this year will be over three million dollars. We have overtaxed the people of Barbados. In our state of emergency we are not budgeting for a deficit as we should do and pay back in 48 years or thereabouts. We never budgeted for a deficit at all. These, in my opinion, are the appropriate days now that there is a sort of steadiness so far as your sugar crop is concerned, that you can afford to say that you are going to deliberately budget for a deficit rather than a surplus. You are gliding on thin ice with not a bit of reason. When your potential revenue is low, you should deliberately set out to budget for a deficit because you may have trouble in raising loans, and so on. In any country like Barbados, you should not say: "we are going to have two or three million dollars over when we get in our revenue this year." You have a surplus of two or three million dollars every year. I wonder what that would represent at a figure of six per cent interest. I wonder for $3 million payment on your national debt, what that would be at interest payment of six percent. If we can have that without taking anything out of the revenue each year and make no contributions to interest payments at all - if we can have a budget surplus of $3 million, we can safely have a national debt of $50 million.

Sir, it would be a surprise to you to know that one of the foremost West Indian financial officials told me some four or five years ago that we were making a lot of sport in Barbados when we say that we hardly had any national debt at that time. It was something like $1,800,000 and our Sinking Fund was to the tune of $6 million or $7 million, when any underdeveloped country should have a national debt of such proportions that they spend 20 percent of their Government's revenue on interest payments. You cannot have progress otherwise. How can the rate of productivity go up unless you are prepared to make investments? I say that 20 percent - that is one-fifth - of your revenue should be spent on interest payments; that is to say, if our budget in Barbados is $21 million, just over $4 million we should be paying out in interest payments. You go on expending your Revenue and Expenditure so that you can get in a surplus of $3 million: and even independently of the consideration of your using your Current Revenue to meet the interest payments on your national debt of $50 million, I see that from your surplus alone, you are duty bound to have a surplus of $3 million.
4.15 p.m

I know that a lot of people are scared and worried about it. Look at the British Government ! Their national debt from the first World War has not yet been liquidated and the people are enjoying a higher standard of living that we have ever aspired to out here. The Germans incurred a national debt of such enormous proportions that it was ridiculous to ask them either to repay it or to pay the interest on it. We are at liberty to take charge, so to speak, of our best human material departing from our shores and we are not making any inducement for our best people to remain in the West Indies. If we, in the West Indies, entered upon the project of the University College of the West Indies from the point of view that it would be naturally a demand and strain on the slender resources of these islands, we would not have got people like Professor Arthur Lewis back here in the West Indies, except on a visit or holiday or if he were coming to Barbados to spend a few weeks' vacation. I predict that, as a result of having at the helm of our foremost educational Institution a man of the calibre of Professor Arthur Lewis, you will see a complete orientation of the functions of the University College. I am not a prophet, but I am giving certain analytical prognostications; there are very often unknown factors in a situation like that, but we can bargain on these things with a high degree of precision. Unless we are prepared to plan our finance in a bold way, we will find that we are inhibited in our outlook all the time, talking about $200,000 in remittances coming back to Barbados and little bagatelles and peccadillios and shibboleths, whatever you choose to call them.

Mr. Speaker, before I leave this question of emigration and the falling off of figures, I want to say in the first place, that that can have but little direct relationship to the economic planning of the country, no more than family planning can have any direct relationship on the planning of our present situation. In the second place, when the remittances fall off by $200,000, our invisible exports from the tourist trade have been increased out of all proportion. As to the people who came from those countries which are supposed to have a recession, one would have thought that if the recession would make any impact effect on the economy of Barbados, it would have been reflected in a falling off of the tourist trade from England and America - a falling off in the number of tourists coming into this country. These are the people who are earning their livelihoods where the recession is taking place; but you have an increase in the number of people coming here. That just shows how you can arrive at a false conclusion when you do not employ intellectual discipline in analysing the financial state of this country. Loose, undisciplined thinking would be the only thing which would produce statements of the kind that have been made here.

I want to say this about the tourist trade. We, in Barbados, have a potential tourist trade available, but which we are ignoring all the time. The conception in Barbados of a tourist is a middle-aged, rich person who comes from Canada or America or England to spend the winter months here. We leave out Venezuela and places like that. Here we have large numbers of West Indian people working in the Civil Service and industry, people who get annual vacations and who are willing to come up here, not in trickles, but they bring their whole families with them; even the stranger within our gates can come to Barbados and rent a house by the seaside, employ domestic assistance in the home and spend periods of time, varying from two weeks to six months. We are not catering to them at all; they cannot go much further than Barbados because their incomes do not afford them the privilege of travelling to England or Canada or the United States of America. The only place to which they can emigrate would be Bar-

bados: but we ignore the virtually inexhaustible potential which we have here. We have one or two second-rate boarding houses to which people will come, but we should now be advertising to West Indians that we welcome them in Barbados. We ignore them and we have done nothing to break down the concept which West Indians have of us that this is a place that when they come here and go to the Cinema they will be debarred from sitting in certain seats, and if they go to a hotel they will be told that they are not serving coloured people, and the barbers will tell them that they do not cut coloured people's hair. All of this business about the amendment to the Shops Act and introducing an anti-discrimination Bill is nonsense, because all that amendment states is that you cannot refuse to serve a man on the ground of his colour, class or religion. That was done because there was a West Indian Conference coming up and we wanted to get the Federal Capital here; but every politician in the West Indies knows that a barber had refused to cut the hair of a distinguished West Indian because he was coloured Let us face realities, let us come down to brass tacks. Bermuda is supposed to be more backward in the field of race relationship than we are; I correct that and I say, not Bermuda, but the Bahamas. The Bahamas have certainly become the most backward place in the West Indies when it comes to constitutional rights and race relationship and yet they have introduced and had successfully passed an anti-discrimination Bill which is really something with teeth in it. On the other hand, this Government will never pass any anti-discrimination Bill and for the *ad hoc* purpose of the Federal Capital Conference they were shameless. All they did was to amend the Shops Act and all it meant was that a barber could not tell the Chief Justice -----

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is straying now.

Mr. BARROW: I am dealing with the tourist trade. I am saying that all the amendment to the Shops Act which we passed did, was to tell the barber that he should not have refused to cut the hair of that Chief Justice, but he should have told him that he had another appointment. 4.25 p.m.
That would be a lawful inconvenience; in other words it drives it underground and does not bring it out in the open.

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that the reason why West Indians do not come to Barbados in droves, because they want somewhere to go, is because we have this unfortunate reputation; and furthermore, there has been no encouragement given to the kind of hotels that would cater to them, not that I consider that West Indians should have a lower grade of hotel. You should invite Mr. Paul Bullen down here to carry out a survey and establish holiday camps not only for other West Indians but for Barbadian workers as well. What do they do with their two weeks' holiday now? They go home and build a fowl coop. If we want to make this place a paradise, let us make it a paradise for Barbadians first and then let anybody else come along. Do not let us make a paradise only for people abroad; let us put up holiday camps for the workers in Barbados and for the other West Indian nationals.

We say that we have the best beaches, but I am not so sure of that. I have seen some as beautiful in Grenada and Antigua to mention only two places, and Grand Anse far surpasses anything I have seen here; and there are no old tins and dead dogs floating around either. If your tourist trade is an invisible export, do not go on catering exclusively to people who are so far removed from you that if the slightest inducement set up by any other competing Government or authority to go somewhere, they are going to disappear overnight. There are places right inside the United States of America and in the Caribbean making a bid now for the American market in the tourist trade. We are near to Venezuela, Brazil, South America, Trinidad and the neighbouring West Indian islands; let us build up our tourist trade from amongst the people who surround us and not compete in it. We are fighting a losing battle with Jamaica, Antigua and Puerto Rico now. Let us have a little self respect. There are people looking like us who have a contribution to make and who would be glad for the arm of hospitality to be extended to them, and we must make it clear to the other West Indian islands that they are welcome here and that any effort to prevent them from enjoying themselves to the fullest will be met with stern measures in retaliation and reprisals, if necessary; but we do not have to resort to reprisals in a democratic society. We have the power in this House and the conscious good will of all the people of this colony to make it impossible for a hostile atmosphere to exist here for West Indian visitors. I will now leave that aspect of the Premier's Speech but no mention was made of this and I think at some time or other mention should be made of it as I have done.

When we come to the question of molasses, this is a very vexed question. I am dealing with the Budget Speech as the Premier went along. In dealing with the exports from this colony, he demonstrated two things. It did not call for any great deal of wisdom or powers of analysis, but he said that our visible exports had fallen during the previous year by some $10 million. Now, Sir, the Premier also drew attention to the falling off in the price of molasses and he stated that the production and sale of molasses to Canada has been, so to speak, in jeopardy for the past few years, and in the same strain he also discussed the question of fancy molasses and said that the Canadians were mixing our Barbados fancy molasses with the molasses from Cuba and other hard currency sources. We cannot stop them from doing that, but I would like to know this: we just had a Canadian Trade Commission down here; there must be a certain amount of reciprocity when it comes to trade. We have no reciprocity with South Africa at all. We import goods to the value of $350,000 from South Africa largely through one agent and in one year South Africa spent $1.84 with Barbados, and I have heard of no imports into South Africa from Barbados since. I believe that that $1.84 must have been for a new issue of stamps, but that appeared in the Trade figures at a time when we spent $350,000 with South Africa, they spent $1.84 with us. I have never heard the Premier allude in any way to the trade of South Africa, but I remember the first political meeting in which I took part to boycott South African goods and I have not heard anything about it since. Next I saw a peculiar advertisement in the newspapers and I suppose the Rippy-Can-Chief decided that the boycott would not have been a good thing. But let us look at Canada. Since 1920 we have had Canadian Trade Agreements. Canada is really making a non-technical infringement on our trade markets; they are using our fancy molasses which in my opinion is a separate and distinct product. You cannot classify Barbados fancy molasses with any other kind of molasses, fancy molasses or otherwise, because we have product differentiation; you may be selling the same thing, but it has achieved such a significance of its own that you do not compare it with any other similar product. Let me give you an illustration; in Barbados we have a non-alcoholic beverage known as sweet-drink, a beverage that the hon junior member for St. Joseph knows about. This beverage comes in a variety of trade names. Coca Cola is really a non-alcoholic beverage, but it is now regarded because of high pressure advertisement and the cultivation of the taste to the consumer as a separate and distinct commodity from any other sweet-drink in Barbados; so the case with Coca Cola and these other sweet drinks is similar to that of Barbados Fancy Molasses. Over the years Barbados' Fancy Molasses was differentiated from the product of any other kind of fancy molasses produced in any part of the world, but one heard during the course of this debate that they are diluting Barbados' Fancy Molasses. What is Government doing about that? There was a Trade Commission to Barbados within the past few weeks and I have seen no pronouncement in the Press about any bargaining going on with Barbados and the Canadian Trade Commission. I am not saying that it did not take place, but surely if it did take place it would be a matter of some interest to the citizens of Barbados. I did not hear that any terms were put forward. That Commission must have had some kind of official or semi-official status. The danger of this whole thing apparently seems to be that we may possibly get third-hand a few of the exhibits of the Canadian Trade Fair which were recently in the neighbouring colony of Trinidad, but I have not heard that any protest has been made to that

Trade Commission, whatever its status may be, about the quality of the salt fish that is sent down from Canada to Barbados, nor have I heard of any reprisals being suggested by the Government of Barbados that if they continue to dilute our molasses and not maintain it before the Canadian consumer as the same product of a high quality that we have gained the reputation for during all of these years that we have had trade between the two countries we will stop importing their salt fish.
4.35 p.m.
Nobody can tell me here now that any great hardship will be suffered by the people of this Island if the refuse that comes down here from Canada in the form of salt fish is stopped. The authority I think for this was the former Leader of the Government Party who inside of this House and on public platforms both here and in Trinidad has told the populace time and time again that the people in Canada told him that in Nova Scotia, the main source of export of salt fish in Canada, there are four qualities of salt fish. The first quality goes to the U.S.A., the second goes to Italy and other European countries; Trinidad and Jamaica; and the third quality is used for manure and fertilisers; and the fourth quality is called Barbados salt fish and comes to these shores. I am asking hon. members to get up and deny that the Prime Minister of the West Indies got up in this House and on public platforms here and in Trinidad and said so. He is supposed to be a responsible politician and I have never heard the Canadian Trade Commissioner in Trinidad deny it.

We have a fish industry which we are trying to foster and we have had a Canadian Trade Mission here and I have never heard one representation about what they are doing with our Barbadian molasses and about the quota of salted fish that comes down here. If they will not give us certain concessions in the Canadian market, let us do as Mr. Will Isaacs did in Jamaica; let us get their salt fish freezed. When Mr Will Isaacs did that and the Canadians threw up their arms and were annoyed, then Mr. Will Isaacs was able to get better salt fish in Jamaica. Do you mean to say that all you did was to go to their cocktail party? The people came down here and spent a few days and you have not heard the Hon. Minister of Trade - I am not saying that he did not do it - say that "you are doing this to our molasses, well, what are we going to do with your salt fish." I did not see any reference to any reprisals for what they were doing to our molasses. I see no mention of the poor quality of salt fish that our stomachs have to suffer here. We all eat salt fish; we have acquired the taste. Eating salt fish is a habit deeply imbued in the Barbadian nature. Do you mean to say that they buy our molasses just to take it and mix it with the molasses from Cuba to give the Cuba molasses a better taste? According to the Hon. Premier, he said: "I am told that most of the molasses Canada imports comes from Cuba." If you are in charge of a Government, you must be hard. If you do not have any glove to beat the other man, well then you have to keep quiet: but if you have a big glove to beat him, well then, do not come in here and tell the Legislature that "I do not think there is anything we can do about it." Do you mean to say that we are doormats for the rest of the world? The philosophy of acceptance is what has got them inhibited like a tied-foot fowl that even when it is released continues to walk around in a circle. We have a certain amount of political emancipation but we have not got a lot in our intellectual calibre in the chambers of Government. We will have to accept it. His action could not be mine if I were in his position. He had an excellent opportunity before the Budget Speech to get together and say: "What you people in Canada are going to do about this?" and if they did not give a satisfactory answer, for the Minister of Trade to tell the Canadian delegation that we intend to impose a total ban on Canadian salt fish because we have deep sea fish around here.

That is the Hon. Premier all over. He has injected the whole of his lifeless personality into this Budget Speech waiting for the *rigor mortis* to set in. You are dead already and you are only waiting to stiffen up before they put you in the trunk. I can describe his Budget Speech in no better terms. He says: "Their contention is that the molasses from Cuba costs 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."

I want to say this I remember when molasses was supposed to be not shipped in bulk, and soon after the pronouncement was made that molasses was to be shipped in bulk, that Sir John Saint, Sir John Chandler and the then Premier of Barbados went up to Canada on a Mission. That was in 1953 and the outcome of that excursion was that molasses was shipped in bulk soon after and as a result all the coopers working in the molasses industry were thrown out of jobs. Some are still out of work. They were sacrificed on the altar of expediency on the ground that Barbados could only compete with Cuba in the Canadian market if it shipped molasses in bulk because producers from all parts of the world, like Cuba, were shipping molasses in bulk.
4.45 p.m.

Do you mean to say that these men have been sacrificed in confusion? Do you mean to say that the Government knew, all the time that they were throwing these coopers to the wolves, that that would not solve the problem? Why did the Government not do something else with the molasses? They either knew or did not know, but they knew it, because the Premier comes along and says this: "We have been doing our best in Barbados to decrease the cost of the landed product in Canada. We have even had to adopt this bulk shipping which in the very beginning we thought we would have been able to ignore and brush aside; but the people who buy our molasses would only have it that way - in bulk shipment - and we already know of the effect which this bulk shipment has had on the economy of Barbados. As I said, there is nothing we can do about it, and we have to accept it."

That is in a Budget Speech. I have never thought that I would live to see the day in Barbados when you would get an appeal of *misericordia* coming from a Minister of Finance on matters which vitally affect the economy of the Island and they have done nothing about it at all. Their explanation for their non-activity is that "there is nothing we can do about it, and we have to accept it." There is only one thing in Barbados about which they can do nothing, and it is this: they cannot do anything about the increase of population in Barbados, thank God. That is the only thing that they are trying to do something about. Thank God, they cannot interfere or do anything to affect the number of children who will be born in the next fifteen years. All the women who are capable of bearing children from now until 1975 have already been born. I will tell the hon. member, all things being equal, how many babies will be born, family planning or no family planning, unless we are prepared to put a policeman in every bed. The only thing about which we cannot do anything in Barbados is the propensity of people to procreate, - and that is the only thing on which the members of the Government are focussing their attention. They tell the people of Barbados that their economic plight is not due to the fact that they have not successfully planned the economy of this island in order to provide profitable employment for the people who want a job; they are telling them that their economic plight is due to the fact that our poor, benighted people should stop having too many children and they are being pushed into this embarrassing position of unemployment by having too many children. I have written and talked about and studied this topic so much that I would not nauseate hon. members by a repetition of these arguments; all we are witnessing in Barbados, as manifested in the Government of this colony, is a research of something called Malthusianism in the nineteenth century, and all of them over there are Malthusians. That whole debate took place in the United Kingdom something like 130 years ago and it has been settled and consigned to its proper place in history, a debate on increasing population and the iron law of wages and so on. These were the problems which our Statesmen and Politicians settled in England 130 years ago, but the members of the Government are now coming into the limelight and they are dazzled by these old-fashioned methods which people have rejected and put aside hundreds of years ago. Coming from the dim recesses of the primaeval slime from the point of view of constitutional development, they

have to get on dry land first; they do not profit from the experience of people who have been living in the daylight for centuries and aeons of time and they have to grope their way, developed as they are. Dazzled as their vision is, they have to grope their way through the jungle of undergrowth to philosophical thought before they can do anything for the people. Instead of washing their faces, taking a good bath and seeing what is going on in the world of daylight, they grope through the primaeval forest. I am not reflecting on the personal habits of members of the Government over there; anything like that would be accidental; I am merely being allegorical because it is the only way to make my ideas impinge themselves on the consciousness of members on the other side. If we did not do something to correct population problems, we would have pestilence, famine and things of that sort. All of that has been debated in the history of Europe; I only pity them for their lack of hindsight and far less, their foresight. That is a very bad situation to foist upon the people of Barbados. It was because of Ricardo Maltheus and people like that and their old-fashioned economies that Karl Marx came into power. Karl Marx said that the people cannot be increased unless you have pestilence and famine, and the population has to be disseminated periodically so that we have a revitalisation of the life of the community. If that is taking place, let us look around and see what is happening now. You do not apply these things to the "haves" but to those who have not. My advice to the "have-nots" is that if they are to be sterilized or they will be weeded out by pestilence or something like that, we had better start now to expropriate the expropriators. The Government members are preaching a very dangerous philosophy in Barbados; you are telling people that they are having too many children and the people are not going to accept that. You are telling the people of this country that is not your fault, but it is their fault.

4.55 p.m

You are telling them "no" it is their fault because they are getting in their houses and having too many children on Saturday nights. You are not telling the Englishmen that. You do not have to tell a man to plan his family if you put money in his pocket: what is needed is a certain amount of stability. You want to get people in such an economic position that they will have legal family relationships. A man cannot afford to go and get married if he does not know if he is going to have a job next week; that is the whole trouble in this country and you all know that you are preaching the same kind of dangerous propaganda that Dr. Maltheus did in the 19th Century and created Karl Marx. I am warning you; it is the same kind of nonsense that Dr. Maltheus tried to inculcate into the minds of the working-class. They did not do it for the top of the economic ladder; this is an indoctrination which is entirely restricted to the working-class people who put them in the House of Assembly. They are having too many children. It is the one thing that I am warning you which you cannot do anything about, thank God. There will not only be 250 thousand people you will have to support, but 400,000 people; Barbadians will have to look forward to supporting 400,000 people in the very foreseeable and near future, and certainly within our active life-time, not when we are retired and watching from the side-lines.

Why focus your attention now on matters for which only the divine authority can legislate? Why not tackle things which you can control, that is, the level of employment in the country, and let the other things take care of themselves? The population of Great Britain rose during 1850 to 1950 from something like 11 million to 55 million; the population of Barbados in the same time rose from 80,000 to 220,000; look at the difference in the rate of growth! The population in England multiplied itself three or four times and ours rose by 1% or 1.5% in the same period of time over a hundred years. Soon we will be dead like the dodo if we go on at this rate. Any anthropologist can tell you that Barbados has the lowest rate of population growth in the British Empire, but you need somebody from away to tell you what I have been telling you all along. Somebody will get an award or a medal for Family Planning, not for fighting for King and country or for inventing some new antibiotic which is helpful to mankind, and for giving the official stamp of approval to the only Government in the Caribbean which at present is misguided enough to let it be part and parcel of their official economic policy. What is their economic policy about Family Planning? Is it just because somebody is in a high position in the social world tells you that Family Planning is a good thing that you will clutch like a drowning man at a straw rather than face the issues confronting the Government of Barbados today?

Mr. Speaker, unless we seriously appraise our situation, we will always go off on these wild goose chases or barking up the wrong tree, if you feel like calling it that. One description which I think Mr. Winston Churchill - my colleague reminded me about it yesterday - made is about a man who goes to buy a bone. The hon. member for St. Thomas goes to buy a bone in the morning from the butcher's shop and spends the rest of the day looking for a dog to give it to when he has maybe a thousand dogs in his backyard starving and hungry. That is the only way I can describe his economic policy.

Now, when we come to this question of the consumption of rum, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Thomas has said that the consumption of rum has fallen off. I thought that the natural thing he would go on to say was "Thank God from whom all blessings flow." If the consumption of rum in Barbados has fallen off, unless you are a cold-blooded capitalist interested in making money at any cost, at the cost of the health of the community, you could never view this with alarm; it is nothing to view with alarm because it can be an indication of several things, and I will give you an example. It can be an indication that the price of rum is too high. There is a certain formula which is used when a financier, especially a Government financier, is thinking about imposing taxation on a particular commodity, especially where that commodity is a consumer good; the first thing he does is to spend a couple of hours working out what we call the elasticity of demand; it is a very simple formula. If the price of rum is $2 a bottle - and when I say the "price" I mean the duty - and you are getting $100,000 in revenue from that rum and you want to raise more taxation and consider that alcoholic spirits including rum is a fit commodity on which to impose a new tariff, what you would do is this: you would draw up a series of rates from past experience and plot your points, that is, when the revenue from rum was $8000 instead of $100,000, the consumption of rum was so many gallons, and you work it out and go back and then draw your curve and know what kind of duty to put on. It is very simple because it depends on the elasticity of demand for the particular product and whether there was anything to substitute for that product. I am sorry I cannot go into that now, but that it what I thought they would do in any Financial Department. They have a Statistical Department to help them and give the figures, and all they have to do is to make the graph and calculate with mathematical exactitude if you impose a certain amount of duty how much revenue you would get, because you would know that if you put on that duty there would be a falling off in the consumption of rum A lowering in the duty will lead to an increase in the consumption, but an increase of duty invariably leads to a decrease in consumption. That is simple; it is one of the elementary things that any economist learns before he begins to sit an examination; before you can get in a College, you have to convince them that you understand something like that, far less when you are a Minister of Finance.

5.05 p.m.

I wonder if any of the Government Ministers knew what is elasticity of demand when they put on this duty a couple of years ago because if it had a high elasticity, it would mean that the sky would almost be the limit: but if it were not highly elastic, well then, the contrary would be the case. Therefore, the fall in the consumption of rum in Barbados over the past year can be due to a multiplicity of factors. It is not an alarming fall. It is not anything about which we should be despondent; it is something about which we should be very glad. It may be an indication to the Government that they have not reached the limit of excise and any full imposition of the tax will lead to a falling off in revenue which would be from the Government's point of view an unsatisfactory state of affairs.

The Government has said that there has been an increase in the consumption of beer. That is an increase without economic theory. Their view is that if you have something which is a substitute and that substitute is lower in price, if the other commodity is more heavily taxed so that the price is increased, the people would stop using that commodity and use the substitute. That is to say, if you have blue soap and you put a tax on blue soap and if you have "Tide" and you do not put a tax on "Tide" that the people will use the "Tide" more. Before you increase the excise duty on beer or any other duty, you must be aware of the elasticity of demand for the particular product on which you wish to increase the price but there is no mention of that here. What the Hon. Premier said was this. He said that he did not know whether it is that people are drinking more beer and less rum but that is something for speculation. Now, Sir, you have a Statistical Department. There has been a falling off in the consumption of rum. You know how much beer is imported in the colony? Up to now the Minister of Finance cannot tell us if the people are drinking more beer and less rum. Are they using it for medicinal or surgical purposes? This whole Budget Speech is sort of riddled with inconsistencies and lack of ordinary powers of analysis.

What I want to say is this. The Hon. Premier does not know if the people are drinking more beer and less rum. Does he consider the drinking of alcoholic beverages a disrespect for the people of this country? We know the reason for this and if you look carefully in these Budget proposals, you will find unwittingly that they disclosed the reason. I exercise my prerogative in here to the full and, therefore, I can make a full, frank disclosure if they did not choose to make it. I met a shopkeeper today and he told me that the tax is so severe that they, the shopkeepers, have decided to ease back and do not pass on the full burden to the consumer because they want to ease the pressure there. Two lots of people are suffering from this tax, the little retailer and the consumer. A lot of small shopkeepers have to employ shopattendants and keep their shops opened on 8% whereas the wholesalers get up to 30%. The man who is doing the selling has to live on a 8% margin of profit. That man realises that he cannot pass on the full impact of this new tax to the consumer: so he is coming down off his small profit in order to share part of the burden with the consumer. Of course, they do it for self-preservation and not because they can afford to do it; so you are really hurting the small man again. Do not think when you put a tax on beer that the people in the Bridgetown Club only drink beer. The man working in the field in Coffee Gully and in Sweet Bottom, they all drink beer. Even the people employed by the hon. senior member for St. George can afford to buy a bottle of beer in crop time; only in the hard time they cannot afford to do it. It is their prerogative. Do not believe that you are hitting any of the big clubs. Let me ask you: how much revenue you hope to raise by this?

Sir, as a matter of fact, the Government does not really say that they hope to raise additional revenue by this. What I would like to say is that what they may very well find out is that since it is the small man who is now drinking beer, as he is entitled to, this new imposition of tax may cause him to shift from beer to falernum or to mauby which will be a good thing because he will think twice before he pays six or eight cents more for his bottle of beer and he may not go back to buy a snap of rum. You are increasing the purchasing power on the masses and you cannot go on making impositions on them all the time.

What we suspect over here, to tell you the truth, is that this imposition of tax was the prerequisite for the promise made to some brewery who, I understand, is carrying on business in British Guiana and the local agents as I understand, are Messrs. S. P. Musson and Co. It is rather coincidental that at the time you are contemplating the putting up of a brewery you are imposing what amounts to a prohibitive tariff on beer coming from outside.

5.15 p.m.

That is tantamount to a protectionist tariff on the beer coming from outside and you are doing that because you do not want to do it in the form of a tariff concession to the new industry because you thought you would get away better with it by doing it this way. We may well find that the new distillery may be able to produce beer to be sold at the same price at which beer was formerly sold before the introduction of the Budget; but they want the whole hog. When capitalists find that there is a Socialist Government in power, they do not take any chances in the open market; they do not believe in free enterprise. If you have any doubt that the capitalists and Conservatives do not believe in free enterprise, look at the amount of protectionist policies which they have inveigled the Labour Government to carry out! Look at the exemptions from Customs Tariff! Examine their duties on shirts and tax free concessions - is it free enterprise in which they believe? You have people who are wringing every possible concession out of the Government and they usually succeed in doing it in the name of employment, but the Labour Government does not consider that at all. These people do not tell you how many people they will employ or what is the increase in the flow of employment as a result of their individual undertakings.

Let me give you an example. We have a monopoly here now - the Roberts Manufacturing Co., They get all their machinery in tax free or duty free; they get their profits at every intermediate stage. I will go into the Court and prove that although the Roberts Manufacturing Company are guaranteed 5%, when you examine the business transactions of their Directors you will find that they rake off profits at every quarter. They get so much for storing drums on their premises and when you add up the profits they come to something like 30% or 40%. That is the sort of hypocrisy we have between the Government and business relations today. I challenge them to write a letter to the Press to let me examine their books; I have seen them already. The Managing Director has allowed me to see their books as a result of something that I said in this House. During the week of the Local Government Elections, the price of Glow Spread Margarine went from 69¢ to 72¢ and that same combine was selling their commodities cheaper outside of Barbados than in Barbados where they were manufactured. One of the Directors admitted to me that that is true, but we have the hon. junior member for St. Thomas saying that he could not disclose the figures of cost of production because they had promised to make some investigation. Anything pertaining to the economic life of the community is supposed to be a secret, but I go to the Head of the spring, not to the foot. You can curse and abuse and recriminate and do what you like from the depths of your ignorance and neglect; that is a matter of supreme indifference to me, but I tell them over and over again that we suspect that this new tax on beer is a concession which is being made to the new brewery. If it is not so, then I say that it is a remarkable coincidence that in the same Budget Speech they should announce and defend a new brewery in Barbados or a brewery for the first time, and also an increase between six and eight cents on the beer which is consumed by the working-class man in this island.

What amount of tax do you hope to gain by that? Are you going to receive more than $534,000 by this new imposition? If a bottle of beer costs about 30 cents in the past it will now cost 36 cents, let us say, because the retailer is sharing some of the burden and cutting down his profits instead of passing on the whole burden of the tax to the consumers. That represents at least 20% in the price of beer. If the wages of the agricultural worker in this year had been increased by 20% - the price of Glow Spread Margarine has gone from 69¢ to 72¢, and that is a 20% increase; the price of shirts went up a long time ago, and that of condensed milk and everything else has gone up. You are raking off money in respect of customs and collecting it again in the form of additional duties. Have the wages of the underprivileged people of this island been increased by 20%? I say no. I have something in front of me which hon members have seen and read, and that is the combined Customs Tariff List. You will be surprised to know the number of essential commodities on which we have to pay customs duty. I also have a list of the things which I think should not be subject to taxation, but from the time you open the Trade Classification List and the combined Customs Tariff List, you will find that meat and pork are

subject to duty; you have poultry, bacon and ham subject to duty; beef, veal, canned meat, milk including buttermilk and other kinds of milk are all subject to duty. Condensed milk coming from Commonwealth sources is not subject to duty but it is subject to duty as coming from non-Commonwealth countries.

5.25 p.m.

There are so many essential items that you have to put duty on some of them - *ad valorem* duty that is - according to the C.I.F. value of the commodity and some specific duty. On 100 lbs. of beef you put 42¢ from a preferential source and 84¢ from a non-preferential source; and you go down the list like that, and when you come to bacon you put 1¢ or a penny duty on it; milk 10% and 20% *ad valorem* duty. I have drawn up a list of the commodities free from duty and most of them you will find have come from an imperial source where the imperial preference operates or from hard currency areas, and like a lot of our essential foodstuff they are subject to duty; so rather than draw up a list of items subject to duty, I have drawn up the items not subject to duty. On pickled pork you pay 76¢ per 100 lbs. from non-preferential sources; poultry; evaporated or condensed milk $1 from non-preferential sources; there is no duty on eggs because we produce eggs locally; frozen fish; on shrimps you pay 12¢ per bushel from non-preferential sources; rice 24¢ per 100 lbs; oats 18¢ and flour 48¢ per 100 lbs.

Now the hon. senior member for St. Philip pointed out only last night that over 11 million pounds of flour are imported from non-preferential sources only and that the figure is rising year by year, that we only import from Canada 10 million pounds, from France some 600,000 pounds, and from the United States 11 million pounds; so from the United States and Canada we import a total of 21 million pounds of flour into this country. You would be surprised to know that we pay 48¢ duty on flour from non-preferential sources. Coconuts, fresh fruit, lime juice and animal feeds are not subject to duty yet. On fertilisers you pay $2 a ton from a non-preferential source. There is a large range of commodities therefore which are essential foodstuffs which is subject to duty, and it means that the ordinary man in the street, the minute he opens his mouth and starts to eat, is subscribing towards the large customs revenue that you derive in this colony from year to year.

Way back in 1907 the Liberal Government was agitating in England for the removal of import duties on food. There are few countries in the world today except where the commodities are competing with their indigenous products that would impose duty on foodstuffs consumed by the people in the country; but what we find in Barbados strangely enough is that the things that we do not tax are those things which we can produce ourselves and are producing; that is a fantastic state of affairs because one would normally expect in order to protect local industries such as our dairy industry and so on, poultry industry, egg industry and our fish industry that we would have imposed duties on the importation of these commodities both from preferential and non preferential sources. In some cases there is no duty on the things we produce locally to keep out the imports from foreign countries and so to encourage people in Barbados. It is just like the controls which we have on fresh fish. We strangle the economic development of our industry by having unrealistic price controls on fish; similarly on locally produced beef we have unrealistic controls imposed, whereas with imported beef now, the sky is the limit. How then are we going to encourage our agricultural industry and our animal husbandry if we do not protect the industries which we have by imposing differential if not prohibitive tariffs on the imports of these commodities from both preferential and non-preferential sources?

Now, Sir, I have heard a lot of talk about GATT. In the last two years the latest magic word which the Government has is GATT, but I would like particularly the Minister of Trade to go back and look at the history of the General Agreement of Trade and Tariff which first met, as far as I remember, in Plymouth or Torquay way back in the late 40's, and see that after GATT was operating for five years every member country complained that they doubted very much GATT would be workable because Great Britain and America were honouring the terms of GATT more in the breach than in the observance and that their delegates unashamedly got up and said it was all very well to get around a table and hammer out a general policy towards which they were striving. I remember the United Kingdom delegate said that Great Britain did not consider herself bound by the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs in so far as the Commonwealth was concerned. We get the feeling in Barbados that we have something to subscribe to GATT; I give my legal opinion free that nobody can lock us up. We are not bound by anything that the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs put up in the sense that nobody can lock us up or put us in Court when it is known that Great Britain and America themselves have broken the conditions of the general agreement much more than they have observed and honoured its Clauses. These are startling facts of international trade, and you cannot get away from that. It is nothing I am inventing; it is something I am saying with a full sense of responsibility. If you have to put 8¢ on beer as the case may be, what is the point of going into the country districts like Martins Bay or College Bottom and telling the people about GATT? They would tell you to get out.

5.35 p.m.

I am saying for the last and final time that the United Kingdom Government has really never considered itself bound by that. Why do we in Barbados use this sort of formality? Why is it that with the bad economic policies of this Government, our policies in these instances are always circumscribed by agreements made by other countries?

Mr. Speaker, the next thing that I find worthy of mention is the question of the falling off of domestic exports. Now the total value of domestic exports according to the summary and the memorandum on the Estimates, as represented by the Hon. Premier, is that in 1958, our exports were $35.4 million as compared with $45.5 million in 1957, while on the other hand the total value of imports exceeded that of our exports by $33.25 million as compared with $18.5 million in 1957 which means an increase of $16.2 million in the visible balance of trade - which is an adverse balance of trade, I presume. That means that the total value of our imports exceeded that of our exports by $33.25 million as compared with $18.5 million in 1957. As I have said earlier, that is an adverse balance in our visible trade. One therefore would have expected that after the Hon. Premier had made that pronouncement the hon. member would have gone on to say what was the balance of payments. I am talking of balance of payments now. I normally would have expected him to explain the balance of payments position. Invisible balance of trade is not in itself the all important thing. You may find that they imported a lot of capital goods here duty free. You may find that equipment came in here for the Deep Water Harbour which may necessarily have been imported duty free and as it was unproductive equipment it did not form part and parcel of the day to day economy of Barbados. You may also find that the sugar factories also imported machinery which came into the island duty free. You will have to take all these things into consideration in arriving at your balance of payments position. We may have an invisible balance of trade and when it comes to the balance of payments position, that is to say, remittances from abroad, remittances from the Tourist Board, duty payments, debenture payments and all of that, when you take all of that into consideration, you will find that our balance of payments is nothing to be alarmed about. Here was the Hon. Minister of Finance making an excursion into the realm of high finance and you would have thought that he would have made certain pronouncements after making certain statements, but what has he told us? Nothing. All he said was that our imports were so much and that the total value of our imports exceeded that of our exports by $33.25 million in 1958 as compared with $18.5 million in 1957. That is an alarming state of affairs if you take it on face value. Up to now I do not know what the position is, but I certainly feel that the public of Barbados must be given some explanation as to what the Government intends to do with this invisible adverse balance. Where is the rest of the money coming from? That is what I want to know. You would have thought that the Hon. Premier would have correlated the whole thing and told you that they had made up

the deficit by borrowing $50 million from the external amounts the colony has in the Sinking Fund and Government Securities. But nothing at all has been told you.

The Hon. Premier went on to say: "Sir, I would like you to know that our Savings Bank is going strong and in a healthy condition." He is speaking now as a nurse and not a financier. You are dealing now with international trade and financial relationships with the outside world and he has come to a full stop when he told you that our imports exceeded by $33.25 million our exports and left you in the rain. That means that we bought $33.25 million more worth in goods, debts and services than we supplied to other people. That is a lot of money. Where is it coming from? There is no mention of that at all. We do not set high enough standards in public life and you get a man who is supposed to be the Finance Minister coming in this House and making statements to confuse the general public when he himself does not know what is going to be done about them. That is the position and there is nothing we can do about it; therefore, we have to accept it. Is that a Budget Speech?

Mr. Speaker, I would wear myself out going through in detail all the deficiencies of the statements made by the Hon Premier. There are statements which can only put the public of Barbados in a state of mental confusion and distress. The only thing that is worthwhile to publish is that the Government of Barbados is making some concession in so far as income tax is concerned and which I would tell you something about in a short moment.

The Hon. Premier went on to say that in 1958, withdrawals from the Government Savings Bank exceeded ordinary deposits by $230,954. What conclusions are we supposed to draw from that? He goes on to say that at the same time, savings in the commercial banks rose by $1 million and loans and advances by the Banks rose by $7 million. He goes on to say that he does not know much about figures but he does not think that 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 probably that some of our people are getting further into debt by having loans and advances on the Banks. A bigger conglomeration and bunch of nonsense I am yet to hear or read. This speech is painful.
5.45 p.m.
It is a painful experience - it is one of excruciating pain and humiliation. Mr. Speaker, I am humiliated to think that in 1959, I, as a citizen of Barbados and the other citizens of Barbados, should be presided over by such a big bunch of maniacs, mental incompetents and moral bankrupts. Never in the history of this island have I known the people of this island to be subjected to such economic .....

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. I object to the hon. member saying that Ministers are moral bankrupts.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the hon. member say that? He never mentioned any Minister; he never even mentioned the Government.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I presume he is referring to his being presided over by other people!

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not here to say whom the hon. member means. Whenever the hon. member reflects on the Standing Orders of this House I will tell him that he must be cautious; but as far as such statements are concerned, they mean nothing to me.

Mr. BARROW: I consider that the people of Barbados are very unfortunate to have such a collection of financial geniuses at the head of this colony; I hope that that meets with the approval of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. These must be financial and economic theories of the 31st Century and if they are now propounding them, I can only regard them as a bunch of financial geniuses. I say that it is a matter of great concern and humiliation to me to sit down here and know that the most important public figure in the island of Barbados can give voice to a pronouncement such as this; and in the year of Grace, 1959, in the 20th Century, our good people, like Mr. Nethersole, are taken away from us, Sir! It is the closest time that I have ever come to tears that I can remember. Good people like Mr. Nethersole are taken away and the West Indies are deprived of their services and we are left with a bunch of humbugs to afflict the people of this island.

Now the hon. junior member for St. Thomas said this - the Hon. Minister of Finance said this:-

"At the same time savings in the commercial banks rose by a million dollars and loans and advances by the banks rose by seven million dollars. I do not know much about figures, but I do not think that it reflects sound business when savings rise by a million dollars and loans and advances by the banks over the same period rise by seven million dollars."

There again, the hon. junior member for St Thomas is showing his abysmal ignorance of the theory and practice of banking, because a loan and an advance on the bank could not rise unless the savings rise. It stands to reason that the banks do not earn the money, as you know. A bank is not an issuing concern; it can only issue money when it has the money. A bank does not lend out the exact amount of money which it has at its disposal; it lends out ten times the amount of money deposited with it, because most of the payments are transfer payments made by way of cheques from one person to another. A person goes into the bank and pays a vendor or whatever debt he is paying, so that the vendor deposits the money into the bank or keeps it at home. The banks lend out the depositors' money and they cannot lend out $7 million unless they have a proportionate amount of deposits placed in the bank in order to afford them the privilege of making loans. That is one of the elementary principles of banking.

Let us look at the Financial Statement - well, this Financial Statement which I have here is one which does not carry the deposits and loans and advances on the commercial banks; but let us look at the figures mentioned by the Minister of Finance. This is what he says:-

"I do not know much about figures, but I do not think that it reflects sound business when savings rise by a million dollars and loans and advances by the banks over the same period rise by seven million dollars. It shows that probably some of our people are getting further in debt by having loans and advances on the banks."

The Finance Minister is looking at this matter as if somebody says: "Lend me five dollars, I want to go to the Exhibition," and then a man lends another five dollars never to give back. Business does not operate in that way at all. The higher the level of borrowing is an indication of several things which may be very healthy signs in an economy such as ours. I am sure that there is a high level of business activity going on in this country. The fact that you have $7 million out in loans and advances made by the banks in Bridgetown - the commercial banks in Barbados do not lend out money on mortgages. They will lend out $60 at the most for three months but all of these are short-term loans and advances and they are what we call money "on call" on short notice; it is money which you can get by ringing up Mr. So and So and saying: "Your draft is due, come in and pay." There is nothing to be alarmed about; it all shows that there is an increase in the level of business activity in Barbados, and that is a cause for rejoicing, not a cause for regret. We have in Barbados free elementary education, first class first grade schools, Codrington College, the Extramural Department, good looking teachers and dumb Finance Ministers. That is what we have in Barbados.
5.55 p.m.
When the level of business activity in Barbados increases in 1959 as it does from year to year, look around and see the reason. There are short term advances and everything runs at a particular time of the year, sugar crop and things like that, before the money is advanced to the factories; but none is a mortgage for twenty years; none is money never to come back. It is not a case for alarm

and for the Finance Minister to come here and say that some of our people are getting further in debt. How many Civil Servants are included in that $7 million? How many are men with snow-ball carts, and how many small shop-keepers? The most one of these would get is £50 for his wife to have an operation and somebody has to "back" the loan for three months and then you pay back at 6%. That is nothing to be alarmed about. This $7 million would go to estates not to buy the estates but to sort of turn over the working capital - short term money and money on call at short notice, not long term advances; we do not do that in Barbados. We do not have any industrial advances as such that would help build societies and that kind of thing, and there again it is a complete misinterpretation and lack of comprehension of the economic situation in the island.

I am not standing up here for four hours to show people that I know something of economics; I only have to bring my certificates to show that; I do not have to talk for four hours to prove that; you stop proving that when you pass the examination; but I am showing the complete lack of understanding of the economic plight of the people of Barbados on the part of the Minister of Finance. $7million in loans for advances is a normal increase especially when deposits increase, and deposits can only increase as a result as a rule on the part of the people who invest money and the people who save money and have the propensity to save. There may be increases in the margin in the propensity to save as distinct from the propensity to consume, because people are not sure of the state of the economy and are more prepared to get a lower rate of interest in the Commercial Banks by putting that $7million there than risking that money with the Government of Barbados that is now priding itself on raising a loan overseas. People on the spot may have apprehensions for the people to whom you owe all this money; they are anxious to get paid back, so if you give them 6% on issue at 98, they would take that up. Who else would be foolish enough to do it? It is really pathetic; it makes me feel very sad and despondent.

The hon. member went on to say "There was a large Government expenditure on development in 1958. I do not know if I need recount the schemes which are well known to us; but there is chiefly the Deep Water Harbour, and most of the funds for these ventures had to come from borrowing, and borrowing can only come from savings. Therefore if the savings decrease there might be some difficulty in facilitating the borrowers. At the same time it is better to borrow from our own savings and for that reason we are continuing to raise money by the issue of debentures locally."

Now Sir, I am not going to spend a long time on this, but I want to say this: there again is a profound lack of understanding of the elementary principles of financing. Some gentleman once said during the Napoleonic War that the absence of a Field Marshal - my colleague on my right has just reminded me it was the Margrave of Baden - from the battle field was worth the lives of 15,000 soldiers of his in the Army. I would say that the absence of the life of the hon. member for St. Thomas from this country would be worth the taxpayers of this island $20 million in any one year, and probably the lives of about 15,000 young children as well. We are paying too high a price for democracy in this country. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has rightly said - and I am inclined to agree with him - this kind of situation in Barbados makes you believe in the Law of the open trench and the firing squad, the only way to settle a matter one time. It drives people to this situation of despair when you get a Minister of Finance getting up and telling you this, when he should be complimenting the business houses on the high level of economic activity in the island about short term advances, perhaps sixty different advances for importing a few motor cars.

The hon. member goes on to say "it is better to borrow from our own savings and for that reason we are continuing to raise money by the issue of debentures locally."

If you examine the financial statement of Barbados, you will see that we have got an enormous quantity of money invested in countries overseas; we have a Sinking Fund of over $2 million and the net Public Debt in Barbados at the 31st January according to this Financial Statement was in the vicinity of $3 1/2 million, and the total Special Funds were over $7 million. You will find that quite a large amount of our surplus balances was invested in countries overseas. If you are going to invest Government Funds overseas at a very low rate of interest, say between 3% and 4 1/2% it is better that you should spend that money inside of Barbados instead of having to go on the London money market and borrow money at 6% or 6 1/2% or whatever percent it works out to; but if you are indulging in capital outlay in a pre-technological society which is on the threshold of industrial expansion (as it should be because we have reached our geographical and scientific boundaries so far as agriculture is concerned) only somebody who has just comedown from the hills like Rip Van Winkle from a sleep of 40 or 50 years would suggest in this modern age that it is better for us in a place like Barbados to take up our savings and expand any governing sector of the economy rather than borrow money from outside. You have to pay interest anyhow and the sounder principle on which you should proceed is to get as much capital from outside to prime the economic pump.
6.05 p.m.

It is very simple, Sir. You have income and you have savings as well as you have investments and expenditure. If your income is $700 million a year as the Hon. Premier says it is and the gross national product at factory cost is $100 million, and out of $100 million you save $10 million, that is to say, the people do not spend $10 million and they spend $90 million, not all of which would be spent in the colony, that takes care of the whole cake. You have saved $10 million; that is to say, you have it either in an old stocking or in your mattress or you have put it on a commercial bank and you have spent $90 million making up $100 million as he says. Investments now are a different thing altogether, because the people who save are not the same people who invest. Professor Caine pointed out this. He was one of the foundation members of the International Monetary Agreement. He said that the people who save were not necessarily the people who invested. I do not want to go into any ramifications on this matter but there are a lot of people who save money for the purpose of saving money and that is the policy which this Government is doing when they take it away from the people and shove it in Rhodesia and New Zealand. When a person saves money, he is not necessarily performing a service to this community because we have no investments over here to take care of the ever-increasing rate of population and to give us the high rate of productivity and to replace the capital used, such as machinery. If the savings of this community fell into the wrong hands, if the savings are merely put on the banks of this country or kept in old stockings or in mattresses, in every year you must get a decrease in the volume of productivity of the country. The gross national income would not fall but it would not increase. That is simple; I do not see anything complicated about it.

This is the snag which we are running into. If therefore people are saving 10% of the gross national product, we cannot control that nor can you encourage them not to send it overseas; therefore, I say that the first thing which we should introduce in this colony is a restriction on the exports of capital out of the island. Our money going now to Trinidad is sent back here for Barbados to get 90% on it. Your Honour should know about these things. A lot of wealthy investors in Barbados and savers who make so much money that they cannot use it at all are sending their money to New Zealand and Canada and there is no restriction on that at all. In England you have a restriction on capital exports. You cannot send out capital without the sanction of the British Treasury. They also have a Capital Issues Committee which has to approve

of every legal industrial loan over a certain amount and any loan of a substantial proportion which may be raised in the London money market. We have none of these things. All our surplus either finds its way in the coffers of the commercial banks and lies dormant there to be used by the banks or, alternatively, is exported to countries overseas to build up the economy of those countries. As long as we have this process going on, it may be a good thing to say that we should borrow money within, but in a country that is building up its resources and investing in capital projects it should always try to bring money in from outside. The whole of the Argentine, the whole of the U.S.A. were built with British capital, and so too the Canadian railways. Therefore, it is not always better to spend your own savings than somebody else's. You see, those countries were expanding at an explosive and dynamic rate; therefore, they said that it was better for them to get capital from outside. The only people who are scared of having foreign investments in their country is this Barbados and those people who subscribe to the totalitarian concepts prevailing in Eastern Europe. They are the only people who are running on a revenue without foreign investments and our Minister of Finance has now joined the happy band.

Now, on the other side of the picture I will give you one situation. Let us say the savings are at the rate of 10% of the gross national product and it was not invested in Barbados. Another situation exists in this Island, if not all of the other Islands in the way of incentive to the people who are building and buying houses as well as in other different ways, such as the promoting of industries and so on. If the Government then is going to insist on the raising of all the capital for investments in capital projects locally, the Government may well find that it is robbing a private sector of economy in order to cater to the Government's sector of the economy and you may be depriving people by offering a more attractive rate of interest; and because you are the Government the taxpayers will expect that they will get their money back more readily than they would get it from an individual borrower, whether he be mortgagor or otherwise. It seems then that you will very well find that there will be a flow of capital from the private sector over to the Government sector of the economy and that is all you will be accomplishing.

Barbados has $110 million invested overseas on private and Government accounts. We should not be a capital exporting country; we should be a capital importing country. It is true to say that owing to the financial policy of the Government its investments are only worth 60% of their value when they were bought. The rate of interest goes up and you suffer a capital loss. Barbados has lost a substantial sum of money because of the Government's shortsighted policy on investments. Anyhow, let us leave that aside. That is well known. To have a Financial Minister to come into a Chamber to speak to people who are supposed to be intelligent and say that it is better to borrow from our savings and for that reason we are continuing to raise money by the issues of debentures locally, I do not know what to say.

6.15 p.m

How can you increase the greatest national product if you are going to do like the mythical animal, that is, to live by something on its own tail all the time? In other words, they are doing one another's washing. Is that economy? I do your washing and you do mine. The economy may be buoyant, but anything which is buoyant is only bobbing up and down in the ocean; it is nothing progressive. All of us may be moving up and down and doing our washing. Is it better to use our own savings than to borrow money from outside? That is absolutely ridiculous; the only way to cure that is the policy of the open trench. How are we going to rid Barbados of this incubus? How are we going to rid the people of Barbados of people who think along these lines? Mr. Speaker, we are paying too high a price for democracy.

When the Hon. Minister comes to the Electric Supply Corporation he said with pride that they had to facilitate their borrowing by allowing an increased rate of interest. I do not want to deal with that, because I think that the Electric Company will have to be dealt with unless they intend to give the taxpayers of this island an Electric Service in the very near future at a reasonable tariff. Now that they have the money, I want to see what they are going to do. I am only saying that this question of the rate of interest, and so on, has been dealt with by myself and other hon. members on previous occasions and therefore I have no intention of detaining the House by repeating all that has been said, and said so effectively, on former occasions.

On the question of the loan, I think that the hon senior member for St. Peter and the hon. junior member for Christ Church have already effectively broken the bubble of over-confidence which seems to be at present prevailing on the Ministerial Benches. I do not want to say anything more on that, because I have never been able to see that it is any source of credit or self-gratification for a Government to raise a loan on the London Market at 6% for carrying out a project which should have been started at the time when the rate of interest was 4% or 4 1/2%. This Government has issued a loan at two below par, at 98 in fact, and I do not consider that to be any cause of self-congratulation at all. The Minister, with some sense of pride, says this:-

"I do not want to say it boastfully, but we do know that in a minute that loan was over-subscribed by about twenty times, and that would only come as a result of confidence in the Barbados Government. '

Mr. Speaker, have you ever heard such a bunch of nonsense? Ask him what he means by saying that the loan was over-subscribed by about twenty times. Does he mean to say that he would have £45 million in his hands? And then he has to hand back about $200,000 to the lenders and say to them: "Thank you, we do not need so much?" Every Colonial Government issue is backed by the British Treasury. The Hon. Minister of Finance told us that six months ago they had the trouble but they could not raise the money. They sent up the then Minister of Finance, the Governor and the Financial Secretary, all at the same time - a barrage of financial ability, I suppose in their own context, and they did not raise one cent, due to respect or a lack of respect in the integrity of the Government of Barbados and cheap political propaganda. Why was it that when the Officer Administering the Government of this colony, the then Premier and the Financial Secretary went up to England in 1956, they got bowled out for nought. Every one knows that capital is available at certain times but at other times it is not; at one time the British Government will issue loans and at other times they will not. They may use the Bank of England in order to turn on economic pressure and sound a warning, or they may use the British Government to do it or the Clearing House indirectly to do it, or they may use the Colonial Office to say that they are not encouraging investment at this time. I want to say that it is a good thing that they raised the money because the work on the Deep Water Harbour would have been stopped for a couple of weeks and they know that too. If you have confessed in answer to me that you have taken $7.8 million out of the Treasury and you are only borrowing $12 million, it is only $4 million floating in the air and you owe Messrs. Costain more than that. You are taking $7.8 million out of the taxpayers of Barbados, the people whom you will be deluding all the time. The British Budget is a normal Budget every year and they can budget for a surplus of $70 million. If we are a part of the British Commonwealth of Nations, I would like to say and I believe that the progressive element in the present Labour Party has something like this under consideration, and I am sure that some hon. members on this side of the House will agree with me. Why does not the Imperial Government set up a fund of three or four million pounds for Colonial development? But every Colonial Government has the humiliation of going to the Crown Agents for the Colonies, the people who place orders with the underwriters, and they have to pay them commission.

6.25 p.m.

The Colonial Office and the Crown Agents compete with the underwriters; they tell the public about the commission they pay them; that is their business; but why

should we be operating through these agencies and going on competing in the open market and sometimes getting bowled out for nought or getting over-subscribed? It is humiliating to a country that is progressing towards the state of nationhood to resort to that sort of thing, and I am saying that the British Government should set aside a Fund - we had a thing called Joint Colonial Fund which has nothing to do with it - like the Marshall Aid or Colombo Plan from which their Colonial territories can go and borrow or put forward propositions. We are not begging for anything. The British Government can budget for $1,200 million if they want to; they can budget for a surplus of $1,200 million any year they want to or sometimes £400 million - $1,920 million. They can set aside $50 million or $100 million in any one year without feeling the pinch and say this is the fund from which colonial institutions can borrow. After all, I think it was the famous Sir William Morris in the 19th century with Ruskin and those people who said that the British Empire was a gigantic system of out-door relief for the British middle classes. We are relieving the middle classes and absolving the British Government from the responsibility of providing for a large army of people who would otherwise be ememployed. No Governor of Barbaodos has ever been paid by the British Treasury; they have been paid by the taxpayers of Barbados. It is a gigantic system of outdoor relief for them; therefore if we are keeping some of their otherwise unemployed people employed, it is no more than they can do: they can have a Colombo Plan for the West Indies. Why should we be humiliated by a Finance Minister and Premier of Barbados fooling over figures which he does not understand and saying how thankful he is that these rich capitalists in England have confidence in them and in Barbados? That sort of thing is abject, undignified and humiliating. He is thankful that the rich capitalists have loaned this money, but when Jagan started in British Guiana, they got $90 million; is it an indication that they like Communism? I do not understand that logic at all. Mr. Churchill said about Barbadians that they are so firm in their degradation and they are rich only in that they have nothing and do not want anything. General Smuts said in 1944 that the people down here, referring to us, have the patience of jackasses; they must have the patience of jackasses if they have jackasses ruling them, because it is only a jackass that will put up with a jackass. Look at you all now talking about confidence! Imagine the Finance Minister, the Premier ,saying that the rich capitalists have confidence in the Government of Barbados and that is why the loan was over-subscribed. A loan is either subscribed or is not subscribed; some loans do not reach anything at all. We had bad financial advice and we had to wait from 1952 until 1959 to pay the highest rate of interest we possibly could, and you are saying that it is a mark of confidence. In other words, if you go to a money-lender and tell him that you only want the money until Friday morning and he charges you 10%, if you wanted $10 and he tells you to bring back $15 Friday morning, a matter of only two days from the date of borrowing, you will call in all the Reporters from the Barbados Advocate and tell them "look, I was in a jam and this money-lender is a good fellow, he is not making money out of me, he has confidence in me and will lend me $10 provided I pay him $15 Friday morning. He has a lot of respect for me, you know". You will mortgage your bicycle and motor-car for the $15 as a little side thing or as collateral but you will get back the motor-car and the bicycle on Friday morning when you carry the $15.

That is the type of illogical propaganda they get on with, but the people of Barbados are going to wake up. You should be apologising to the people of Barbados for not starting the Deep Water Harbour when the hon. member for Christ Church, the hon. senior member for St. Philip, myself and others begged you to start the project as the nucleus around which all the energy should revolve for the industrial expansion and the linch-pin of the Development Programme at the time of the first Five Year Plan. In 1952 the rate of interest was 4% and the Deep Water Harbour would have been built for $16 million or $17 million. You did not start in 1948 after the Ritchie Report; you waited until the rich capitalists could get a little richer and the highest possible interest and say these men like you so much that they are prepared to lend you money provided you pay it back in 1971 and pay 6%. You did not have the courage to go to the London market at par. Do you think if you offered 4% that you would have got it? Their willingness to subscribe was due to the sacrifice you were prepared to impose on the necks of the people of Barbados, not only of this generation but of future generations as well. You put that in your pipe and smoke it; all of you who need to read may run. You sacrificed the future generations of Barbados on the altar of your incompetence.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not relating to the Budget which is the matter for consideration at this stage.

Mr BARROW:The people of Barbados have been sacrificed on the alter of incompetence and ignorance; that is all it is and they are leaning over backwards feeling pleased that the rich capitalists in England look upon us as good behaved people, when Jagan who was turning British Guiana up-side-down got $93 million even at the time of taking away the Constitution, a situation to which Barbados has not yet been introduced but which may very well occur if we have a continuance of this kind of thing. We may find ourselves bankrupt.
6.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, eventually the Hon. Premier said that he had dealt with the little subject of the Appropriation Bill. Anyhow, a lot of the other things on which he touched can be dealt with in the Committee stage much better than in the second reading speech.

I will only like to say this on the question of the Football Pools. A lot of discussion has taken place during the course of this budget debate on the Football Pools. What I have to say about Football Pools is really another way of saying something that I have stated already. I would have expected the Hon. Premier to say what was the weekly amount of money going out of this country as a result of the operation of the Football Pools because surely that would affect the economy of the Island. I do not know if this increase from $35.5 million in the balance of trade has anything to do with it because that has not been clarified by the Minister of Finance: but we in Barbados are interested to know what is the effect on our economy of this amount of money which is going overseas as a result of the operation of the Football Pools and that is what I want to know. At least we can say of the Barbados Turf Club that not only do they keep money inside of Barbados but in actual practice they bring in money from outside. Everybody knows that people in Trinidad, British Guiana and the neighbouring colonies buy tickets from the Barbados Turf Club and that is an invisible export. When it comes to the Football Pools - I am not a moralist on the grounds that betting is good or bad; I have no strong views on it - we have to be careful how we go about this business of betting tax. Either ban the export of capital from Barbados and say that there should be some kind of restriction on all capital going out of Barbados - but that is merely stopping holes, and corking up the seams whereby our economic substance is leaking away. We should say whether or not we are going to have a total ban except in certain circumstances to be approved by the Financial Committee on the export of capital from Barbados. I am not in favour of witch-hunting in so far as Football Pools are concerned. The people of Barbados are switching over from what they call investments in Sweepstake tickets and doing what they choose to call investment in Football Pools, and a lot of them seem to derive more satisfaction from that kind of betting than from the wild speculation that is entailed in the Barbados Turf Club Sweepstake tickets. Mr. Churchill tried to put on a betting tax but it was a miserable failure; so you have got to be very careful how you go about this thing because you are in the position where one can send money direct to Littlewoods, Vernons and the other Football Pools Agencies without going through the local agencies at all. I cannot remember the exact figure but my recollection is that the British Government makes something like £1 1/2 million out of the operation of the Football Pools. It fluctuates, depending on the season.

We have to be very careful here in Barbados that we do not join in the hue and cry and go witch-hunting after the Football Pools and allow other forms of gambling which are not bringing in the same volume of revenue. We must watch our capital on the one hand and at the same time watch the receipts from the Post Office and put any restrictions which we want to put on.

This is a note of warning which I am issuing to the Hon. Premier. What I suspect is that we have a local Football Pool agency and what they want to do is to have a certain amount of protection for this particular agency to the derilection of the other agencies which give more satisfaction. It is remarkable that, like the soap and the detergents, the stock feed and the margarine, all of these things are operated by a narrow group of people and we find indications of possible economic sanctions being imposed when we know that a certain private firm is interested in such a restriction.

I do know that the members of the Barbados Turf Club are a bit alarmed at the falling off in receipts from the sale of their tickets. I would like the Government to get together with the Committee of the Barbados Turf Club and ask them to disclose how much undistributed moneys lie in the hands of the Barbados Turf Club. I want to know that. I feel that this money has been collected from people island wide and that the Barbados Turf Club has no moral or legal right to this money more than the Government and that after, say, two years, any unclaimed money should be turned over to the Government of Barbados and then the Government of Barbados should give an undertaking to the Barbados Turf Club that if the person with the correct ticket number turns up that the money would be paid over to the person. Let us suppose that it is the prize money of $50,000 and six, seven or ten years hence somebody comes forward to claim the money, all that is necessary is that Government will pay it back. In 90% of the cases, you do not get anybody claiming that money after one year. The Government can take that money and use it for things just as the building of the new General Hospital. We might even consider whether we should not run a national lottery at some time. There is no point of speculating at this juncture today on it. I do not think we should jump into it now because we do not have the personnel nor the Civil Servants who are capable of following the implications of such problems as would arise out of a measure such as that. I am only speculating on it.

6.45 p.m.

I would like to see the Government get together with the aid of the Turf Club and find out how much unclaimed money is there. Suppose it is only $100,000; I think the Government and the people of Barbados have a greater legal and moral right to that money than the Committee of the Turf Club. I would claim that money if they are not using it, in default of the Government calling for it. We have as part of the law of this land the law of Escheat under which a man's whole property is forfeited because of bad family connections and things of that kind; if you can escheat a man's property in such circumstances, then if a person does not claim his earnings, it should fall to the use and benefit of the people of Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, when we come to education, I do not want to say much about that, because we have debated it on several occasions. Whenever an occasion does arise, education is discussed by members of this House. Education is something with which we are deeply concerned and something over which we are very unhappy. We are glad to see that the Supernumerary Teachers have at last been drafted into the full-time service, but in making a cursory inspection of the Establishment, I believe that we have something like nearly 130 schools in this island and I do not think that we have more than 1,200 teachers on the Staff. I would like to know what provision is the Government making now to replace some schools by larger ones in order to provide accommodation for the increasing numbers of children who are demanding a secondary education. Bound up with that problem, is this problem; I have nothing against these private secondary schools because I think they are performing a useful service in the community; they are really doing the work of the Government because it is one of the functions of the Government to provide education at all levels for those people who can benefit from it. We have, however, the startling development in the past few years of schools mushrooming all over the metropolitan and suburban districts of this island. If the Government did something about providing facilities for secondary education itself, more than it is doing at present - you cannot say that you are controlling the pattern of education for the citizenry of this country if you are only supervising the education say, at a secondary level, of one-third or one-fifth of the school population. Therefore, it means that there are taxpayers in this island whose children may not be getting the full advantage from the investment and the claim which their parents may be making on these private schools; and the Government is doing nothing on its side even to inspect the conditions under which these children have to work, whether they are overcrowded, whether there are any hazards or whether the standard and the quality of teaching in these schools are satisfactory. That is something which we, on this side of the House, feel has to be done, even if you offend certain people. I am not saying that the standards in these schools are low or that the schools are necessarily overcrowded; but I suspect that many of these schools are terribly overcrowded and that they are being carried on in buildings which were probably made to accommodate 30 or 40 people, whereas there is an intake of 300 or 400. That is a serious situation to continue from day to day; it is not a satisfactory state of affairs. I want to commend the people who have the enterprise to start and carry on these schools: but at the same time, we are only going to wake up to the problem when we have a fire taking place and somebody's children are burnt to death. Then you will see letters appearing in the Press and the Government will say: "We intended to do something." In the case of the Lancaster accident, they had to wait until a lorry laden with agricultural labourers went down the gully before they decided to put up a guard wall. Have we got to wait for another Lancaster disaster in one of our schools before anything is done? I feel convinced that on one of these days something approximating to a disaster will take place and then the Government will be shocked into their senses.

I say that there should be an investigation carried out into the conditions under which these schools are being carried on. In addition to that, I would like to know what is being done about St. Patricks' School; there you have over 900 children who are being looked after by a private agency and unfortunately Mother Alphonsa met with an accident and the whole school has had to be closed down. There has not been any sort of help forthcoming from the Government to keeping these children out of mischief or to finding alternative accomodation for them; they are entitled to better consideration than that. It is not that other people do not pay taxes; I was born in the Church but it does not necessarily mean that I am a good Christian or a good Church goer; at the same time I do not see why the Government should not supply an adequate staff at the Roman Catholic School and help the children out of their present difficulty. Whether the Hon. Minister of Education is in the safety of his bed now or wherever he is, he should wake up to this matter; you have over 900 children who are deprived of an education and a hot meal - something which the Government has not done for the children in their own schools. In the Government schools children are given milk and biscuits. That is an abnormal state of affairs and I hope that, by the time the next term opens, some provision will have been made with respect to the pupils of this school. We have an Address tabled by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy asking the Government to do something about this situation. I hope the Government will wake up to the gravity of the situation and do something about it in the very near future.

As regards the general educational policy, I would only like to say that we are prepared to give the new Minister of Education a chance. We do not want to be unduly critical of him until he shows abundantly that he has been cast in the same mould as the other members of the Government.

6.55 p.m.

We are giving him a chance to prove his worth and if we

are not critical at this stage, it is because we want to give him a chance to catch himself, but we are warning him that it is time for him to become alive to the responsibilities which now lie at his threshold.

Now, Sir, I understand that in so far as the pensioners are concerned, the Government wants to bring Barbados back to the stage where the period of retirement is 65 years. That is not a matter of policy in so far as this Party is concerned. We have different views on this particular subject and we have agreed that we can disagree on this because it is a matter for the individual to say what effect he thinks it will have on the economy of this island. It is a matter which I would ask the Government to consider very carefully. The hon. senior member for St. Lucy said that it might have the effect of keeping a lot of younger Civil Servants out of the chances of promotion, but my experience in looking around at the Civil Service is that although people have retired at 55 and 60, they have invariably been brought back to act, drawing their pensions and the full salary attached to the post, so that the young Civil Servants do not get a chance anyhow. There are several Departments in Government where people have been brought back to act on contract and this is particularly so in the teaching profession, and in places like the Control Board and Currency Board. We find that the high eschelons almost starve the retiring members of the Service; so we may well find that the younger members in the Civil Service are not getting a fair break anyhow, and it could be much of a muchness if we revert to the former position. Like most members of my Party, I have an open mind on the subject.

In so far as the Federal Government is concerned, I want to say this: I do not want to reflect on a vote of the House. If we do not have employment in this country, I do not think a single member of this House would subscribe to the view that we should have any Army for ceremonial parades, because I do not think they could perform any proper function.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think any member should reflect upon that.

Mr. BARROW: I am not reflecting.

## SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7 p.m. o'clock, this Sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m.

*On Resumption*

*The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.*

## RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY RE DEATH OF THE HON. NOEL NEWTON NETHERSOLE

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I propose to ask leave of the House to introduce and pass a Resolution of condolence to the family of the Late Minister of Finance, Mr. Noel Newton Nethersole.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to pass a Resolution of condolence to the family of the late Minister of Finance of Jamaica, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

*There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister.*

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, no doubt as happened in Jamaica, I think I can say that it came as a shock to us in this island when we learned of the sudden death of the late Minister of Finance, Mr. Nethersole.

I cannot say, Sir, that I was very well acquainted with the gentleman but I had met him on one or two occasions and must confess that he was a very charming man, and as we have all read and seen from time to time, he was a very strong pillar of the People's National Party and of the people of Jamaica as a whole. Mr. Nethersole has no doubt done a considerably good job on behalf of the people of Jamaica and that work would have had some influence on the West Indian nation as a whole, even though to a lesser degree than perhaps in Jamaica.

I understand, Sir, that he was a lover of sports and he contributed greatly to that end of social life not only in Jamaica but in the West Indies as a whole. The Resolution is being drafted and I would like to say the Government of Barbados would like to express to the appropriate people, presumably the Government of Jamaica and the family of the gentleman in particular, its deepest regret and sincere condolence at the passing of this distinguished son of West Indian soil.

7.50 p.m.

I shall like to say, Sir, that the passing of this gentleman has no doubt robbed us of a great man, and the West Indies are the poorer as a result of his passing. It is a debt which we all have to pay sooner or later whether we be rich or poor. The one consolation, I believe, if there is anything known after we leave this earth, is that Mr. Nethersole would be happy to know that he has done much to improve and advance the progress of Jamaica and the underprivileged in particular.

Sir, I beg to move that the following Resolution do now pass;

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House of Assembly place on record its sincere regret at the passing of the Honourable Noel Newton Nethersole late Minister of Finance of the Jamaica House of Representatives;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to his relatives."

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in this transitional stage through which the West Indies is passing, we can ill afford to lose the services of people like the late Noel Newton Nethersole. His contribution to the progress of the new West Indian nation will remain as a shining example for many years to come. There is no doubt about it that he has been the main architect of the economic advancement of Jamaica within the last few years and the services which he has rendered were made not only to Jamaica but the entire West Indian Federation.

It is commonly known throughout the area that the proposals for a West Indian State Bank sprang from his own fertile brain, and, more than that, he has been labouring within the last few years to have the Jamaica currency tied to American currency rather than sterling since convinced as he was that Jamaica was part of the North American continent, in financial matters its currency should be more closely related to the currency of North America.

Perhaps his most outstanding achievement in recent times has been the raising of a loan in America - the very first raised for a considerable amount of money in America by any British Colonial Government - at a very low rate of interest. For instance, we have to pay 6 1/8 % on loans raised in England but the late Hon. Noel Nethersole was able to break new ground and obtain a loan for Jamaica at something like 4% or 4 1/2%, thus setting an example which the other members of the West Indies would eventually try to follow. In this and many other directions he made his contribution towards life in the West Indies and West Indians taking their rightful place in the Commonwealth of progressive nations.

When the history of this period comes to be written, I have no doubt that his name will occupy a very honourable place. It has not been given to many men at important periods in the national history to render a vital service such as the late Hon. Noel Nethersole rendered for his country and it is fitting to recall that Jamaica at this time can provide a man of his calibre - one of the many in Jamaica - who is capable of demonstrating to the entire world that in this area, we can produce our own national leaders that can take their place alongside any of those of more advanced and more matured countries.

Fortunately in Jamaica, although the Hon. Mr. Nethersole's passing would be widely regretted, there are many

others to take his place: because if there is one thing present in Jamaica today, it is a wealth of national talent and a wealth of patriotic citizens who are dedicated to the task of making their country a great island.

It is therefore greatly to be desired that we in smaller islands will take pattern from the intense dedication and the profound devotion to homeland, by which men of his calibre have set so shining an example; and if the lessons to be learnt from his life and his contribution are not lost on his passing in the other parts of the West Indies, well then, his life will be by no means in vain. I agree that the West Indies are unfortunately the poorer by his passing and, therefore, we of this Honourable House join with the utmost sincerity in expressing our deep condolence to the bereaved family and in joining our hands across the seas with the Jamaicans who today are mourning his passing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let us all stand and bow our heads in assent to the question for the passing of the Resolution and as a mark of respect to his passing.

*The House rose and bowed their heads for one minute.*

## HOUSE RESUMES CONSIDERATION OF APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959-60

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the suspension of the sitting, the hon. junior member for St. John was addressing the Chair.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the suspension of the debate, I was speaking on the question of education in this country and I was enjoining the Government to take some steps to have adequate supervision and inspection carried out at all of the voluntary private secondary schools which exist in this country. Now, I pass on to another aspect of the Budget Speech which was made by the Hon. Premier and this is dealing with the amount which is voted under the Head - Subsidies and Grants and Miscellaneous - for the training of public officers which will be found on page ten of the Budget Speech.
8.00 p.m.

"There is an increased amount", the hon. junior member for St. Thomas said "and that is due to the additional or doubled contribution to the Training Fund and the increase in the vote for acting allowances and the payment of substitutes. As you know, Sir, we are endeavouring to have our officers properly trained so that they will be of better service to the community."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this: we have a Director of Training here in Barbados and various disbursements have been made to the junior branches of the Civil Service for Correspondence Courses and matters of that kind. A survey was recently carried out by the Extra Mural Department of the U.C.W.I. to find out how many people were interested in training for degree courses for the London University in the Arts, Science, Medicine, Economics and Law and quite a very heartening response has been forthcoming in that approximately 140 or 150 people who were members of the Government Service predominantly, came forward as willing candidates for these Courses. There is a problem especially with adult education in Barbados. We have the Evening Institute which caters to people who are interested in vocational training rather than in formal education. Courses have been conducted in mechanical engineering, under the supervision of the Dean of Studies, Mr. Denton Sayers. The last figures I had disclosed that about 150 people had taken the City and Guilds Examination and most of them were successful. Over 90% migrated out of the country in order to find profitable employment abroad. That is a very distressing state of affairs, because it means that we are investing money in the training and education of people of this island and now they are turning their abilities and talents into productive employment outside the confines of this colony. What I want to draw to Your Honour's attention is this; out of the 140 people who applied to undertake the Courses at the Extramural Department of the U.C.W.I., over one hundred of them were members of the Civil Service, which shows that there is considerable potential in the Civil Service of people who have the basic qualifications for benefiting from a University Course but who, through economic circumstances, are unable to leave the colony or to get a grant from the Government so as to further their studies. Within the last twelve months we have read and heard of the establishment in Trinidad of a University or Polytechnic to take Taxi drivers, Artisans, Civil Servants, School teachers and members of the community of the neighbouring colonies who are unable to travel abroad to Canada or the United States or the United Kingdom to take advantage of formal adult education at University level, but who will be able to benefit from facilities placed at their disposal. I have never heard the Barbados Government express the least desire in this direction, but it is the policy of the Party to which I have the honour to belong, to establish a Polytechnic so that this increase of people will be able to take advantage of adult education and be able to qualify and equip themselves for better jobs and to improve their economic status. As far as the Extramural Department of the University College is concerned - we have not established a Polytechnic such as Trinidad has done; they have appointed a Principal and they have gone a long way towards the successful establishment of a Polytechnic in Trinidad, and we should have a Polytechnic here as well, catering to people at economic and industrial level. Here you have 140 people in Barbados with the basic qualifications for University entrance but who do not have the financial resources to go abroad and further their studies. There has been an encouraging response from persons qualified to undertake the teaching of these classes, but the Extramural Department of the University College has not been able to begin operations because of the shortage of finance. I have examined the figures which have been presented by the Minister of Education in respect of the proposed course of studies or courses of study for the 140 people of this island, who want to better their economic status in their jobs and in the colony in general.

It would only take a matter of $1,000, as far as I can understand and see, to underwrite partially the cost of such courses of study. The Government has a vested interest in this matter because they have people who are trained in economics, people who are trained in law, in administration, in accountancy and we have teachers who have the basic qualification of an Arts Degree which would necessarily lead to an increased standard of efficiency in the Government Service in all branches which I have enumerated.
8.10 p.m.

I do not want to say too much at this stage because I believe the matter has been put before the Minister of Education, but I hope that the Government of Barbados is not going to lag too far behind the Government of Trinidad in assisting these members of the Civil Service and other people outside of the Civil Service who want to improve their knowledge and efficiency in their jobs. I do not consider that $1,000 or $2,000 is an exorbitant figure when one equates it to the increased standard of efficiency which we hope will be necessarily derived from the successful completion of courses. I very much regret that the Minister of Education is not in his place because perhaps he would have been able to make a statement to the members of the House on this particular aspect of our educational programme, but I would like to see a polytechnic institution established in Barbados along the lines of the Regent Street Polytechnic which was established by, I think it was, Lord Hailsham, which many West Indians have been able to attend and derive benefit from the academic and other courses which were run there - courses varying from architecture right down to zoology and including all the intermediate stages of the Arts, Law, Engineering, Medicine and everything else.

It seems to me that a colony like Barbados, isolated as we are from the major centres of learning not only in the highly developed countries, but isolated even from our own local centre, that is, the University College of the West Indies, could do well to emulate the example set by Mr. Eric Williams in Trinidad in establishing

a polytechnic here in Barbados. We in Barbados have a larger potential student body than any other island in the wide area of the West Indies. I regret very much that there has been no mention of this aspect of our educational problem in the Budget Speech and I hope that that is a difficulty which will be rectified between now and the introduction of the next Budget.

When we come to the Department of Science and Agriculture, that Department in Barbados has a history, a past history of which any Government Department in any country ought to be ashamed. I very much regret, however, that the Department of Science and Agriculture is regarded not only by the planters of Barbados but by the people who are in charge of the Department and by the Ministers of Government as a necessary appendage to the planting community of this island. Barbados is phenomenal in the respect that whereas in other countries throughout the Commonwealth you will find that the research - take Jamaica for instance - investigation and the necessary scientific inquiries in agriculture are always made at the expense of the industry itself, for peculiar historical reasons here in Barbados all the research has been done by a Department of Government, and the planting community has always been absolved from the responsibility of looking after their own research, setting up a Research Department and paying a research staff. My conception of a Department of Agriculture run by a Government transcends the mere idea of research on behalf of the sugar industry.

I think that long before now, Sir, attention ought to have been devoted to the production of animal fodder. Up to now the matter is still in its idealistic or embryonic stage. We have not progressed to a state of fluctuation where the ordinary peasant in Barbados - whether it be in St. Philip, St. John or St. Lucy, the three most forward peasant parishes in the island - would be able to derive any kind of benefit from the researches other than in sugar cane breeding in the Department of Science and Agriculture. The planting community in Barbados is a very fortunate group of people, because they have had their research done by Government; all of their problems about pests and control of pests have been handled in the first instance by Government; they have had subsidies to look for pests and they have had every possible encouragement; and the normal everyday expenses which the industry would incur to keep itself alive have not been the liability of the planting community of this island. I am not criticising that in any way; I think it is probably the salvation of the island in a lot of respects; but let us take the control of the "love-vine." We have love-vine which is rampant in the metropolitan parishes of this island and in the rural parishes. I called a planter one day and showed him some love-vine and he did not know what it was; he thought it was some kind of flower, so that although he had been planting for 20 years and had love-vine growing on his plantation which I showed to him, the Department of Agriculture, although we have an Act making it a criminal offence to have love-vine growing on your land, had done absolutely nothing to solve the problem of love-vine either by sending up to the United States of America or some other source where the facilities exist for research to develop a specific kind of weedicide, if you feel like calling it that, or some kind of resistant to the love-vine which would impede and strangle its growth. Up to now the Department has done absolutely nothing about that.

The Department also has irrigation under its control. I do not think that one single member of this House - and we live in the eleven parishes - can show one single spot where the Department has put into operation any large-scale irrigation scheme for sugar cane in this island. What they have done is this: they have given loans and aided small people - which is a good thing in its way - who have kitchen gardens to put in over-head irrigation; they have also assisted with aluminium pipes especially in certain parts of the parish of St. Philip for large scale peasants, and people who are growing canes on a relatively small scale have been assisted with surface level irrigation by helping them to purchase these pipes for which, I believe, they have to refund the loan.

I have here a Minute from the Director of Agriculture saying that in his opinion irrigation could increase the sugar production of this island by 5,000 tons and he was very conservative in his estimate; but even if the estimate was 5,000 over-all during the course of one year at a rate of $200 a ton, you would very well see we would be getting an addition in revenue of $1 million from that. I want to read, Sir, from the Minute written by the Director of Agriculture; this Minute was written to a Committee on over population in Barbados, one of their pet subjects, and the Director of Agriculture said this:

"In my opinion it would be unwise to assume that the sugar production could be increased through irrigation by more than 20,000 tons in any one year. Moreover, I wish to stress that no one can estimate with any degree of certainty in our present state of knowledge what maximum additional quantity of sugar could be produced in any one year as a result of irrigation, and the figure may well prove to be nearer 5,000 tons than 20,000. A great deal of information is required as to the quantity of water available for use in agricultural production, as to the cost of applying it, and as to the most efficient method of applying it. This information must become available in due course through the activities of the Water Board and the Department of Science and Agriculture."

8.20 p.m.

That memorandum was written as long ago as 1952. This is 1959, seven years after. Suppose now we had the inevitable Biblical spectacle of seven lean years and seven fat years, surely the time would have arrived by now for the Director of Agriculture who is the same person who wrote this Report to give the Government of this country some reliable statistics on the effect of irrigation on the agriculture in this Island. We have none. I do not know if the Minister has any, but he certainly has not brought into this House that, as a result of irrigation, sugar has come up to the expectations of the Director of Agriculture and is now in the region of 5,000 or 10,000 tons. Those two figures were the two limits which were imposed by the Director of Agriculture in his memorandum. We would like to know these things because they effect the economy of the Island, but we were not given the information.

As far as the planting of Pangola grass is concerned, I am not going to say anything on that subject because I want to see its effect first: so I will give the Hon. Minister of Agriculture a chance with that. Pangola grass does not grow overnight, although there is the saying that the horse is starving while the grass is growing. I will give the Minister a chance although I know that so far as that Department is concerned, this step is a rather belated one.

In so far as the Fisheries Department is concerned, we are not entirely satisfied with the operation of that Department. We are not satisfied with the lack of distributive facilities. We are not satisfied with the organisation for the marketing of fish in the island and we are not satisfied with the manner in which owners of fishing boats and particularly the fishermen are treated. The question of insurance of fishing boats is also a very vexed problem and members of the Government should at some stage investigate the possibility of insurance by the Government for this matter just as in the case of workmen's compensation they have taken upon themselves to act as insurers for those people who work in the Government service; therefore, in so far as the insurance of fishing boats is concerned, they can take that on their part.

As far as the Fire Brigade is concerned, the hon. senior member for St. Philip, the hon. senior member for Christ Church and myself sat on a Committee some years ago to look into the question of the location of the Fire Brigade Stations and that was some time before the Fire Station in Probyn Street was built. At that time we made a firm recommendation to the Government that there should be at least three Fire Stations instead of two in the rural areas and one large Fire Station in Bridgetown. That was the majority decision of the Select Committee

which was appointed to investigate this problem and in the face of that recommendation, the Government elected to put one Fire Station in Probyn Street rather than at least three Fire Stations at suitable intervals and localities in the Island of Barbados.

Now, they want to put one at Worthing which was one of the sites recommended by us three or four years ago, and they also want to put one in the Holetown area. Because of that, there would be no Fire Stations for the Eastern parishes of the Island; they will have to be catered for by the Fire Service from Bridgetown. That is another illustration of the lack of truth of the democratic process by the Government of this colony. If they had taken the advice of the Select Committee which was appointed to go into this problem and had any respect for the majority ruling of that Committee, we would have been saved this unnecessary expenditure at this time; but it is our common experience that the Government feels that if they implement some of the proposals made by members on this side of the House, someone will steal the credit from them and they would not be able to indulge in the cheap politics which they so often indulge in to the public from time to time. That is a matter for them.

I say this. It is a severe strain on the Christian conscience to have to deal with people who have no moral criteria by which to guide them in public life, and people who have no sense of shame. There was a gentleman at Codrington College called Professor Dunlop and his one catch-word was *"aidos"*, that is to say, you should have a sense of shame. The opposite to "sense of shame" which is so characteristic of our public life is *"hubris"*. When it comes to a sense of shame, they have none; tney will do the exact opposite to what they were doing or asking to be done the day before or the month or year before, the day after or the month after or the year after: so it is very difficult to pin down people like them. It is hard to know by what motives they are activated.

Sir, I only mentioned that in connection with the Fire Station to show that this is something which could have been implemented a long time ago if it were not for the overwhelming ignorance of the members of the Government Party.

When I go on to housing, the Hon. Premier in his Budget Speech said that the allocation in the Development Plan for 1955-60 is $2,522,000 and the estimated expenditur e from the 1st April, 1955 to 31st March, 1959 is $2,081,919. Provision in the Estimates for 1959-60 is $417,396 which will make the total estimated expenditure from 1st April,1955 to the 31st March, 1960, $2,499,315.

Hon. members will also notice that for the Five Year period $500,000 will be spent by the Development Board other than the $1million which was allocated to the Board.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will appreciate that this is not merely an attempt on my part to criticise the Government, but that we know that they are not capable of anything better than what they have manifested in this speech. If you have a sense of shame you should have a knowledge of your own limitation and the only people who do not have a knowledge of the limitations of the Ministers are the Ministers themselves. Everybody else is conscious of their limitations. I, myself, am conscious of my limitations.

When it comes to housing, I would like to know this: there have been Civil Servants running around for the last two years trying to get housing loans.

8.30 p.m.

Let me go back to the Estimates. In 1953 you will find that money was voted for Civil Servants' Housing Loans and you will also find that for three or four years nothing was done. Last year we had a surplus of $2 million, and now the Civil Servants' Housing Loans have been put under the aegis and jurisdiction of the Barbados Housing Authority. There is a lot of unsatisfactory machinations involved in the granting of loans to Civil Servants and other people in respect of housing. Some of the people have been waiting for two or three years for loans - Civil Servants, Policemen - classified servants have been waiting for loans and all they can hear is that the Government is talking to the banks. What is happening to the money is the Treasury, which we voted? We notice that the people in the higher levels of the Civil Service have been able to get loans, but the Police Constables and the Teachers and people like that have been left derelict all the time. Now the Government members are playing capitalist, you may say, and they want to increase the interest rate to 4 1/2%. The Government finds money for the relief of the housing shortage in Barbados; when you want money for Civil Service personnel to build houses you are relieving the Government of the responsibility of providing houses in a different sector because you are allowing people to go ahead on their own initiative to erect houses so as to relieve the housing shortage. There are thousands of people who have put in applications for loans and they have not been given any satisfactory explanations as to why they have not got their loans. Once people get that conviction, you have the Devil's job to get it out of their heads - the conviction that certain people are being granted priority where these loans are concerned and that if you buy a house from Mr. "A" instead of buying it from Mr. "B" you have a better chance of getting a loan.

You have Golden Square and Cats Castle in the metropolitan district and they are areas which are in need of serious planning and slum clearance.

To go on from the housing aspects to the water supplies, our only quarrel with the Government is that the plans for the extension of the water service are not imaginative enough. No provision has been made for loans to householders who want to install the water service but who have not got the funds with which to do so, and this will apply *mutatis mutandis* to the Electric Supply Corporation as well. I have already mentioned that I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. junior member for Christ Church when he said that the Town Planning Officer should present regulations so as to prevent people from encroaching too near the highway, and that there should be a minimum distance beyond which nobody would be allowed to erect guard-walls or anything of that kind. As an interim measure, Town Planning Legislation should be brought into force or some emergency legislation, to prevent building within two or three feet of the highway. From the general aspect of town planning, we, in our Party, would like to see certain immediate projects carried out which would have not only the effect of beautifying the city area but also of creating employment for the vast number of people who want jobs and who do not have them. In the first place, we would like to see the Constitution River, from the Old Bridge right up to Halls Road and Martindales Road, properly drained and cleared and pleasure boats put there in for the old and young of St. Michael. Delamere Land is now up for sale and that is one of the areas which caused this Government to spend a lot of money in 1948 at the time of the flood disaster. That area is unsuitable for the building of any major development project and the Government should take over this land and clear the area and develop it into open spaces or, alternatively, have an attachment area for the parish of St. Michael.

On the question of Beach Preservation, I have never seen any Report from the so-called Beach Committee, but nothing has been done to protect the coast-line from the open gusts by wind and tide. I would like to see the land at Needham's Point used as an area for development and groynes should be built in the sea for the protection of Needham's Point. I am not only showing the defects in the financial policy of the Government but I am also mentioning for posterity the measures which should be undertaken.

I have already spoken of the subvention to the U.C.W.I. Extramural Department. The Government has gone ahead with the purchase of a piece of land at the Library going up to Mahogany Lane and I say that they should purchase the whole block from Sobers Lane right down to the north

western boundary of the Library in Mahogany Lane. They should acquire the whole area.
8.40 p.m.

It is a narrow street; the buildings are old ones and should not cost Government much money. Land in Bridgetown is becoming very scarce and Government ought to put up a theatre in that area, and by that I mean a Civic Theatre. We used to have Carnegie Hall in the olden days; that is being used as a Juvenile Library and I think Government ought to consider the proposal not of one building in Mahogany Lane to extend the facilities of the Public Library, but the whole block of three or four buildings and demolish them so that proper planning could be made of that district. That too is bound to come up in the question of town planning and traffic which I have mentioned before.

I want to say something which is probably going to cause a lot of alarm in Barbados, and I am saying it with a due sense of responsibility. I now refer to page 22 of the Budget Speech made by the Hon. Minister of Finance in which he said "I also quoted figures to show an increase in the use of beer. It is proposed that in order to offset this difference the general tariff duty on beer should be one dollar and twenty cents per liquid wine gallon and the preferential duty should be one dollar and thirteen cents. This will maintain, Sir, the existing margin of preference. Before we come to this conclusion, Sir, we have to refer this matter - in order that we might not contravene the provisions of GATT and the Canadian-West Indies Trade - to GATT and to Canada and get their agreement for this introduction."

That is utter nonsense as I have said before, as if we in Barbados have to submit something to Canada before! What sort of constitutional development do we have? Nobody can put us in the International Court if we decided, like the British Government and the United States Governments have done, to depart from the strict provisions of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs. But what I want to draw to the attention of the Government is this: among the mercantile community of this island it is a matter of common knowledge that certain people were stock-piling beer before the Budget Speech was introduced. Now that is a very serious statement to make, and I make it with a full sense of responsibility. Somebody closely connected with the Government Party placed orders through a certain merchant long before the Budget was introduced on the floor of this House. I see the member for St. Thomas smiling the contented smile of the Cheshire cat after it had eaten the canary. I am saying that someone connected with the Government Party placed orders through a merchant for unprecedented supplies of beer.

Now, Sir, I invite the members of the Government to deny that and to get up and say I am making a false statement. I invite them to set up a Committee of Enquiry on a Budget leak now. There was a Budget leak through some person connected with the Government Party. I can call his name if I have to give testimony before a Commission; I am not going to give it here now because I would like everything to be proved and let people feel that I am not using any privilege. There was an unprecedented supply of beer ordered by someone connected with the Government Party long before the hon. member for St. Thomas introduced the Budget proposals in this House. It is a remarkable coincidence. Governments have fallen in the United Kingdom for less than that and Ministers have lost their jobs. Dr. Dalton in all innocence a couple of minutes before he went to deliver his Budget Speech in the House of Commons - I cannot remember the exact year but it was somewhere around 1948 or 1950 - just happened to mention on his way into the Chamber "Well, it looks as if we are going to have to pay a little more for beer or cigarettes" and he went straight in the House and delivered his Budget Speech - a matter of minutes if not seconds - and he had to resign. That shows a high standard of public morality existing between political Parties in England. I wish we had the same standard of moral probity in the conduct of public affairs here in Barbados, because when that kind of thing can take place, there can be no end of the corruption which can ensue if this is condoned and allowed to fester, develop and grow in a community such as this. I am making that remark that it is a matter of public and general knowledge in the mercantile community that that did take place.

*Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.*

Mr. Speaker, "our duty on beer has always been very low" says the hon. member for St. Thomas. "At the moment it is 28¢ preferential and 35¢ general per wine gallon." He goes on to say that they are going to increase from 28¢ to $1.20 per liquid gallon; not from 28¢ to 48¢, but to $1.20; and the preferential should be $1.13. All of a sudden when we are getting a brewery in Barbados for the first time, they say now that they recognise our duty on beer is low. Here is the Government deploring the falling off in the consumption in the volume of rum and at the same time imposing such a prohibitive tariff on the beer which a poor man drinks that I anticipate that there will be a commensurate falling off in beer in the next twelve months. Where is the elasticity of demand which prompted the members of the Government to indulge in this new bit of extravagance on its part?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member has dilated on that already.

Mr. BARROW: I was dealing with the Speech chronologically and I have now come back to the actual details on that, but I will not worry to distress Your Honour any more on this matter. The hon. member for St. Thomas went on to say "There is the possibility of beer being manufactured here. It is an industry which was started here some years ago, but that did not last very long for one reason or another. Assuming the local production is supplied, if and when it comes, 7% of the mark-up from revenue and excise on beer and stout will be effected by this which will be approximately $217,000 per annum as compared with $170,000 now, and the price of beer may be increased by about 5¢ or 6¢ per bottle. It is expected that the locally brewed beer, if and when we do have it, will be sold at more than 25¢ a bottle."

Now, Sir, it is abundantly clear that if beer is now going to be in the realm of 30¢ or 36¢ a bottle and they want to sell the locally produced commodity at 25¢ a bottle, the sole *rationale* of this new imposition is that this is a concession which has been exacted by the proposed brewery so as to have a protective tariff on imported beer coming into this island.
8.50 p.m.
That is all I see to it. I see indeed no financial justification other than protection for a new industry. Whether that industry deserves protection in a very moot point.

Mr. Speaker, the last aspect of the Budget Speech by the Hon. Premier which I want to deal with is that relating to Income Tax concessions which will be made this year. There are concessions which he says will cost us in the vicinity of $173,000 and he goes on to say that "no account has been taken of those reductions which I now propose in the Estimates."

I think it is only fair that the Hon. Premier should have stated, which he did not, what is the estimated revenue from income tax that is expected to be raised this year. Although you have made concessions to people which will cost you in the vicinity of $173,000, it does appear as if you can break even.

The people who are in the $2,000 a year bracket will not be taxable and if they are in $300 or $400 a month bracket and have children at the University they will also benefit. But if a man is in the $300 or $400 a month bracket with no children at the Universities, you have not made any concession to him. You are not making any concessions to the people in the middle income group.

I know that any concession of income tax is always welcomed by the populace and I am not disputing that at all: but you have omitted to mention that the dragnet under

the P.A.Y.E. system is better than what you had before and is causing a greater collection of income tax. You have people, who never knew anything of the Income Tax Department before, having to go there now and make objections. You have people working in sugar factories and on sugar plantations roped in under the new dragnet and as a result you expect to collect another $1 million, and you want to give publicity to the fact that a man who is working for $5,000 a year will get off $18, when the year comes by your new concessions. Personally, I would like to be in that category. You save $18 on $5,000 net income, that is to say, after you have taken out losses, depreciation, cost of travelling or children allowances if you have all of them and you still have $5,000 left over.

I am saying, let us see this thing in its right perspective. It is all right to throw out a few figures which the hon. junior member for St. Thomas professes he does not understand. I am saying that the $173,000 would practically give us free secondary education, and I say that if you had to keep on the tax to give us that, the people in Barbados would appreciate that much more and would be loud in their praises to the Government.

The little concession which has been made to a man giving him an allowance of $420 a month if he has a child at the University is nothing in comparison with what is given to the man working for the same money in the neighbouring colonies like Trinidad. If you allow them off $420 which means only $16, $18 or $20 in tax, that is not going to be any inducement to people to send their children to Universities. All of these things which you have brought down to give to people do not add up to too much and they do not benefit the masses of people in this country. Have you told the waterfront workers that you are still going to keep your feet in their necks? Tell them all of that. Tell them if they are working for $5,000 in a year and they have all the deductions for themselves and for each child that all that you are relieving them off is only to the extent of $18. What kind of concession is that? Do you think that means a difference between starvation and enough to eat to people in that income? Personally, they are the people who are the least deserving of my sympathy. People who are working for that money do not vote for me anyhow. If I thought they deserved it, I would say "yes." However, when you consider the concessions which have been made to people lower down the scale, those concessions are right and in order but they are nothing to be proud about because in the totality you are raking in more income that you ever did in the history of Barbados. You should now come and say that you are giving a tax holiday.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is the appropriate moment for me to summarise the opposition's view on the Budget Speech which has been made by the Hon. Premier. I refer to the views of my Party which is the Official Opposition. The Budget Speech is a masterpiece of ineptitude. It is something which all true Barbadians feel ashamed of. I have said it before that I feel humiliated to think that in 1959 we have people in the Government of this Island who would put up such an exhibition to the outside world of their incompetence and of their neglect and ignorance. It is our policy - and we hope that the Government will still take or borrow the policy from us - that there should be a proper economic survey of the resources and national income and expenditure of the Island in contradistinction to the mere Government's revenue and expenditure of this Island and that that should be published at least a month or two before the budget is introduced. That is the first thing.

Secondly, Sir, we say that you should adopt a much firmer attitude in your relationship with the Canadian Government in so far as our trade is concerned. As regards the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement we say that that has not been renewed for another year; the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement which was made a long time ago was extended until 1961. The terms of agreement were revised late last year but they were not renewed at all. We say that when it comes to the question of the national income we are not satisfied that $435 per year per capita is a satisfactory state of affairs in this year of grace 1959 and that every effort should be made to increase the national income by industrialisation and otherwise. We say further that something should be done, not only to increase the number of secondary schools, but that something should also be done to supervise and to control the growth of private secondary schools in this island. We say also that in so far as the Tourist Industry is concerned, we think by legislation or by syndication on the part of the people of Barbados, fostered by the Government of Barbados, we should do everything to encourage other West Indians to come to Barbados and to enjoy the facilities which Almighty God has been pleased to put at our disposal.

9.00 p.m.

We say that we should have a Polytechnic here in order to provide for those members of the Civil Service and other persons who are unable to afford the luxury of University or technical education in a foreign country. We also say that in so far as the imposition of the new tariff on beer is concerned, we are not convinced either of its efficacy or its expediency at this particular juncture in our economic history. As far as water services, slum clearance and electricity are concerned, these services are now inadequate and a more sustained effort should be made to acquire Golden Square, Cats Castle in the metropolitan area and to provide for the proper planning of the streets of Bridgetown and that the Government should acquire Delamere Land which is now up for sale, and there should be a clearance and improvement of the Constitution River and a proper aqueduct made coming down to the Careenage.

In so far as emigration is concerned, that is not anything which we regard as a necessary lynch-pin to the economy of a country which is to be economically viable. The Government should foster the agricultural importation from the U.S. Department of a hybrid type of corn for the development of the poultry industry and we should have as soon as possible a Central Dairy and Creamery established in Barbados. These are the broad outlines of the things which we put forward to be dealt with more thoroughly by the Finance Minister.

There is only one other matter, that is, the Civil Servants' Housing Loan, and we want the Government to do something so as to relieve the Civil Servants. Then there is the question of potential revenue, apart from the question of the Cumper Report which I hope Your Honour will investigate. After three years we have no copies of this Report available to members of the Legislature. We say that the whole economic policy of the Government of Barbados should be centred around the relief of the 26,000 unemployed people in Barbados and this consideration should be transcendental to all others. There is one source of revenue which we have not investigated and that is revenue from Messrs. Cable and Wireless. We get a tax on cables from Miami to Barbados, on inward and outward traffic, a total of $100 a year, representing a tax of one cent on each cable which goes in every direction; if there are 10,000 cables coming from Miami to Barbados in twelve months and the tax is only one cent - there should be a tax of ten cents on every cable going through Barbados and we are the centre of communications for the Western Hemisphere. We are the main exchange service for the Pacific and the Far East. Every inter-continental cable apart from Newfoundland comes through Barbados; if on every cable message which comes through Barbados every week we had a tax of ten cents, we would have about $500,000 in revenue when the year comes around. Messrs. Cable and Wireless do not pay any taxes; neither the manager nor any of his underlings pays any parochial taxes or any kind of taxes to the Government and only now have they opened their doors to a few coloured stenographers in there. Do you think that they could pull up all the cables before they paid the tax? Countries all over the world would be paying us ten cents per cable because that would be a necessary part of the operation. We have a gold mine on our doorstep and we do not realise it; it is a fact that for all of these years the cables have been paid for over and over again. They have had the monopoly on the traffic which comes in and goes out of Barbados because cables which pass through Barbados are more than those which pass through any

other station in the Western Hemisphere. We do not put a ten cents tax on a cable which goes to Southampton, but in Barbados the Australians use our cable facilities and they do not pay any tax. I will repeat that we get no taxes from the Cable Office; do the people of Barbados know that? The Government will hit the small man in St. Andrew because he did not vote for their candidate, and they will hit the small man in St. Philip and St. John by putting an increase of six or eight cents on the beer; but they have Cable and Wireless lying down there. I have finished, Sir.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that at this late stage I should want to inflict this House with a very long speech. Contrary to expectations, I am going to be very short because most of us have listened to very sound economic theories propounded by the hon. member who has just sat down, and I feel that this hon. Chamber at this time will not be willing to listen with any rapt attention to any more theories; therefore, I propose to deal only with one or two items on which I feel very nearly and dearly. There are some omissions in the Budget Speech to which I am going to make reference, omissions of which I am nearly at a loss to understand why the Government did not make any mention. Some of my hon. friends may not agree with me, but there are some of the statements made in the Speech of the Minister of Finance which have caused me to think as to what is the position with the Government today.

9.10 p.m.

I begin first on one of the utterances by the Premier - and I was so amused at it that I noted it - that most of these funds had to come from borrowing, and borrowing can only come from savings. I hope the hon. member did not make a mistake when he said that, because I feel that that was an utterance which one would have thought would only come from a Conservative Party. I am in agreement with it although some members may not be. It is what I have preached all the time; but unlike some of us on this side, the whole idea was to soak and destroy the rich, and attempts have been made at that. Although you still have the power to attempt to do that, you have to take the middle course. I am in agreement with the proposal that you can only borrow from somebody who had the opportunity to save.

Looking right through the Budget, Sir, that is one part where I am in entire agreement with the Government, and if that is to be their policy throughout this year, I cannot be vexed. Whatever you do, you must realise that somebody must save money, and where there are companies or individuals, an opportunity should be given to have a reserve; otherwise the Government like other people cannot borrow money; because if you make an attempt to distribute everything in this country into equal shares, before you finish some of us will have more than the others because all of us are not endowed with the same business acumen and the know-how of keeping money. Some people get money-which is one thing, but they do not know how to save it - which is another thing.

As you will observe, Mr. Speaker, this is a long Budget Speech and I was very surprised because I was not here when the Minister of Finance delivered it. It is his first Budget Speech and I was surprised when I read it because it is not like him to be very long-winded on any of his speeches. There are a few things, however, which I will mention, and I will deal first of all with the allowances for children. If you accept the criticisms which I am offering it is a matter for you, and if you don't, I do not care.

I am among those people who will benefit from these allowances, but I want to say here and now that I condemn them. Let me read this section. "Now the present allowance is $270 a year and it is proposed that there should be an increased allowance for children of over 12 years of age. Where the child is over 12 years and under 16 years and is receiving full-time instruction as a student at a secondary school or similar educational establishments, the allowance will be increased to $360 a year."

If that is socialism, well, God help all Socialists! I am not a socialist, and this is the sort of thing you would have thought the greatest die-hard Conservative would have brought in. I am condemning it because I feel that if you are going to do that, you should do it right through. Why pick people out? You are a Socialist Government and you are saying that if a man is in position to send his children to secondary schools and they are over 12 years and under 16 years he will get an increase in allowance, but if you are not in a position to send them to secondary schools you cannot get the allowance. That is the type of Socialism you can fool people with. He goes on to say "where the child has attained the age of 16 and is receiving full-time instruction at a University College, a secondary school or a similar educational establishment within the island, the allowance will be $420 and if it is receiving that education outside the island the allowance will be $600."

I believe that if Government knew that my children were receiving instruction outside of the island, they would cut this out because I do not think this is the type of legislation they should pass. If children can get into Government secondary schools, Government will pay the fee for them to take the School Certificate at Ordinary and Advanced Levels, but the parents of those children who cannot get into these schools must pay for them to take the same certificates. As far as this part of the Budget Speech is concerned, the allowance for everybody will be $270, but it takes a man more, according to this Government, to keep a child who is not at a secondary school than what they are allowing. This is even in my opinion more die-hard than the Walcott or Wilkinson Budget could ever be, and I do not agree with it. The Hon. Premier is saying that this allowance will be applicable only where a child is between 12 and 16 years while children must enter schools between the ages of 8 1/2 and 9 and pay fees.

The thing that interested me most in this Budget is the absence of any change at all in the ages for old age pensioners. I have been always advocating from the floor of this House for the reduction of the ages of persons who must receive old age pension. So often we have heard on the floor of this House that we are following the customs and what is being done in England. Eight or ten years ago when I raised this question of reducing the age, Government thought it was better to increase by a pittance the amount which the pensioners got and I was invited to attend a meeting and was told that the age in England was 68 and Barbados would follow that age. I wonder if the Hon. Premier would tell this House whether the age is still 68? I believe he must know because Mr. Chinn, Social Welfare Adviser to the Colonial Office who was recently here, must have told them that the age was changed to 65 for men and 60 for women, and I am surprised at the absence of any mention being made in the Speech of the Hon. Minister of Finance that the Government is following suit in changing the ages. I feel that the ages should be reduced.

I believe that no one knows beter than the Minister of Finance because of his profession that people who reach the age of 65 in England draw pension; and if this is so, what about the people in Barbados whose duties are more onerous and laborious in the type of work which they have to perform? I am really surprised at the absence of any recommendation or any suggestion of an increase in our Estimates or in the Budget Speech for any amount which would include a number of persons in this country at 65.

9.20 p.m.

I believe myself that the Hon. Minister of Finance must have heard it from Mr. Chinn.

One other thing which I am greatly alarmed that there is an absence of is to find that no provision is made in the Estimates for Government to provide free milk at any of the clinics for under-nourished children up to five years. You cannot argue that you supply at the schools Klim milk and biscuits. I think I should say this. Quite recently when Mr. Chinn, Social Adviser to the Colonial Office was here, it was recommended that he should visit the St. Michael Board of Poor Law Guardians: and for best reasons known to themselves, members of the

Government cut that out of the programme; but I made it my business to invite him to come and see for himself rather than that things should be told to him. I am going to quote exactly what he said. He said that Barbados was the only country which he had gone to in which he found the Government Clinics were not providing free milk for undernourished children. Mr. Chinn said so to me in the presence of about seven people. I think that this gentleman must have discussed it with the Hon. Minister of Health and that is why I say that I am very much surprised that there is no provision at all for this free milk to be distributed to under-nourished children.

Sir, those are the two main things which interest me. I do not want to inflict you with any long speech now; I prefer to allow my remarks on other things to remain until we are dealing with the various Heads of Expenditure.

If I may repeat: the two main things which I am concerned about are (1) for years I have been asking the Government to reduce the qualifying age for old age pension. I have told Government that if they do not see fit to carry the qualifying age for a woman to 60 years, they should make it 63: but they continue to keep it at 68 years. In England today, the qualifying age is 65 years for a man and 60 years for a woman.

I wonder whether the Government would even now re-consider their stand and say that it is time to reduce the age that at least a woman can draw old age pension anything between 60 and 65 years. If they do not want to carry it to 60 years, I am sure that all of us, even the backbenchers, would appreciate your carrying it to anything between 60 and 65 years for a woman even though men are only allowed to qualify at 65 years. Mr. Speaker, you have experienced in your capacity as schoolmaster and trade unionist that there are few people, women especially, who after they have reached the age of 65 years are able to do any more agricultural work. As a matter of fact, few women are really employed any more on plantations to do agricultural work even as farmers at 65 years. I cannot understand why hon. members of the Government who pretend to be Socialists should delay the reduction in this qualifying age when three or four years ago in England a Conservative Government did actually reduce the age from 68 years to 60 and 65. Just fancy this Socialist Government in power would find ways and means to spend money and would spend it on themselves, giving themselves handsome salaries and yet would forget that these old people are the people who gave all their blood and their sweat in the years past for the good of this country: and with all that, this Government forgets to include them in any budget and makes no preparations in any Estimates, not even in the Estimates for 1959-60, to include these people.

Sir, I do not think it is too late for them to do that.

The next thing is the provision for free milk for under-nourished children under five years at clinics. I would have thought that I would have seen provision for it in these Estimates.

I do not mind at this moment even if the amount for an old age pensioner remains at $1.80; you should at once reduce the qualifying age. Sir, you know as well as I do that there are hundreds and hundreds of people, 98% of these old people, who at one time or the other of their life were agricultural labourers. They have passed through the stage of the 1914-18 World War and they cannot any longer work.

Sir, I hope what I have said on this matter would be taken in good faith. I can only say that it must have been an omission on the part of the Government and that it was not done intentionally. If Government wants to say that they purposely omitted to make provision for free milk for under-nourished children under five years, well, I should like to know the reason. On the other hand, the Hon. Premier intimated a short while ago after inquiries were made that steps would soon be taken to acquire the milk which investigations were made about from U.N.I.C.E.F. The Hon. Premier sometime ago intimated that steps would be taken to acquire that milk. He said that he wanted to assure the House that everything was being done to acquire that milk.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to ask the hon. member when and where I gave that assurance. I cannot remember ever giving that assurance.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is the Hon. Premier saying that he never gave that assurance? I did not know that the hon. member was losing his memory. The hon. member gave an assurance about this question. He said that everything was being done to expedite the matter. Is the hon. member saying that nothing was done to expedite the matter? Does the Hon. Premier mean to say that after he got all the statistics on this matter they have done absolutely nothing about it? He said at the time that he wanted to assure us that they were doing everything to expedite the matter and he hoped to give us information soon. Does he mean to say that you gave us the information but he did not intend to do anything? Anyway, I am going to leave it at that. I am sure that there are hon. members in here who would remember his saying that. The one thing that matters on which I want to take the Hon. Premier up on is this. I can take a lot of capital out of it that he either said he did not say so and then that he had no intention of expediting the question of free milk which was offered to this country. It can only mean one of those two things.

The one other question which I want to speak about is the question of beer drinking as against rum drinking. To be honest with you, Sir, I drink neither today. Of course, it is not by my wish, but it is because I cannot drink any. 9.30 p.m.

I should just like to say this to the hon. member. The hon junior member for St. John made a serious charge on the floor of this House when he said that there was a leakage in the Budget. I see that hon. members looked listened and laughed; the members of the Government looked at this side and said nothing. That is all I have to say about that. I will not accuse anybody of any dishonest practice unless I can prove it; until a thing happens, it is not so. What guarantee has the Hon. Minister of Finance that whereas less rum was consumed, more whisky was not being consumed? On the other hand, it is a good thing that I am not a Socialist; if I were a Socialist in here, when I finished with the hon. member and with this Speech he would hide his head in rum, because I would make every shareholder in the Rum Refinery know that such a Speech was made in here. However I smiled; the non-drinking of more rum by the people interests the Government. I have travelled to the United States of America and Canada and I see people hold bottles of beer, corned beef, sandwiches and eat lunch. The hon. member goes to a "singing" today. (Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I was never in it.) Well, the Hon. Premier says that he was never in it. The standard of living has improved so much today that people who would normally drink rum will drink beer. We have got the experience of seeing and meeting people and knowing their habits. This idea of putting a tax on beer in order to see if you can get people to drink more rum is absurd; I believe that you would have some faith in medical men if they said that too much alcohol is being consumed in the world, but the hon. member, who is not only the Minister of Finance but also a medical man, makes a Speech of this sort and he says: "We will put a tax on beer."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: May I correct the hon. member? Is putting this tax on beer asking people to drink more rum? It does not matter whether they drink more rum or not; if the hon. member does not know, let me inform him that there is a certain amount of revenue derived from the drinking of rum. I am not concerned with how much people drink as rum; I am concerned with the excise. Let the hon. member get it out of his head that I am asking people to drink more rum instead of more beer. I prefer to drink beer than rum.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member said that the Government receives a certain amount of money from the

drinking of rum; the Government is not concerned as to whether you drink more rum, the Government is concerned with the money. I should like to say that you must be interested in the amount of rum which is drunk so as to get more money; therefore, you are interested in the people drinking rum. This is what the hon. member said:

"In 1957, we imported 358,772 gallons of beer, the F.O.B. value being $684,726. In 1958, 370,901 gallons were imported to the value of $714,477 F.O.B. I do not know whether it is that apparently the people are drinking more beer and less rum, but it is something for further consideration and some step will have to be taken to offset it."

To offset what? The drinking of gasolene? No, the drinking of rum. In other words, it has been brought to your notice that in these two years, more beer has been imported and you take it that the beer has been consumed. The Premier says: "I do not know whether it is that apparently the people are drinking more beer and less rum, but it is something for further consideration and some step will have to be taken to offset it."

I want to say that you ought to be glad to see that people are drinking more beer than rum. You do not have any shares in the Rum Refinery, so what nonsense are you talking? If you are going to offset something, which is the drinking of rum, it means that you are going to get more people to revert to drinking more rum and less beer.
9.40 p.m.
How are you going to urge people to go back to drinking more rum and less beer? The Minister may not consider it but I look at it as a question of the standard of living. The hon. member has had an opportunity of going to the Continent and I am sure he found people in England drinking a lot of beer because they could afford it. As the standard of living goes up in this country, the ordinary man decides that he will have a bottle of beer. In America you will see a man drinking a cold bottle of beer. Here in Barbados at dances, singings and sprees much more beer is consumed than rum, so what is wrong with that? As soon as the standard of living goes up people feel that they are entitled to the better things of life. People have decided that it is better to drink beer because they feel more refreshed than if they drink too much alcohol, but the Premier thinks that something will have to be done to offset it. If he had merely given the facts and figures as they appeared or as they were given to him, it would have been all well and good. If it is true that people are drinking more beer than rum, your only interest in getting more money should be to encourage people to drink more beer, but the Hon. Premier has said that they will have to do something to offset the decrease which they have had in the consumption of rum.

There is another part of the Speech dealing with the question of tourism. I do not think that anybody in Barbados will disagree with me that at long last we have got Government to come around to our way of looking at this whole question of tourism, because we believe that although they are some ten years late, it shows from the increased number as quoted here that in 1958 there were 24,945 tourists arriving in the island as against 23,773 in 1957, an increase of 1,172, which shows that if the members of the Government had not been so narrow-minded and prejudiced and were more awakened to their responsibility, what could have been done and how far we could have been with tourism in this country in the last ten years when they came into power. They gave no support to those members of my Party when we were pressing for development in the industry or even when Sir Alfred Savage urged that we should do something to develop tourism because it was the only other natural industry beside sugar; but at long last I am very glad to see that they have done something and they have acknowledged that for years and years the West Indian Prime Minister fought us over there and his echoes went behind him "we do not want tourism to put money in these men's pockets"; like a bunch of sheep they followed Sir Grantley blindly; but today they have come with a bold face and told us that the receipts of hard currency from these tourists were the same as in 1957 being the equivalent of $5.8 million, but the total tourist receipts rose and were estimated in the vicinity of $10 million in 1958. That is something that we of the Conservative opposition should be proud of, and the people of Barbados should know that it took them ten years to come to our point of view; and now they are boasting and telling you what tourism has done when we had been knocking at their doors to do it.

As far as I am concerned, I am entirely in agreement with taxing the Football Pools. I see no reason why Government should delay in this matter and as a matter of fact, legislation should have been passed ever since they saw what was happening. But I would not tax it for the reason given by the hon. member. The hon. member made an unfortunate remark which I believe he did in good faith by differentiating between the Football Pools and the Turf Club. It is a matter of indifference to me - and it should be to him - whether the Turf Club drops. The reason for this drop is because in Trinidad there are races more frequently than in Barbados and that is where you are going to get a drop at the Turf Club; I agree that you should tax the Football Pools because they are carrying a tremendous lot of money out of this country and I think we should get something from it. People have the urge for gambling but I suppose the legal luminaries in England and in Barbados may not call it gambling. When there was the Missing Ball, you had legal opinion in England which said it was not gambling; it was a question of chance or a game of skill. Whatever it is we do not know, but we do know that human nature is such that they will take a chance of getting something for nothing, and I am in agreement that there should be this taxing of the Football Pools. I feel myself that it should not be beyond Government to find means of taxing them. If, as I have been hearing, some very big sums are coming in, we should find some means of getting our share out of the people who run the games.

I do not think I am going to say much more than this, because I will keep my remarks for the various Heads when we come to them. There are a tremendous lot of expressions in the Budget Speech with which I agree, and there are those with which I definitely disagree. I know that there are some strong-headed, pig-headed people in Government; (A VOICE: This Government?) That is a matter for you. There are some people in Government who feel that they cannot take one suggestion from their opponents, but I listened to the hon. junior member for St. John and I do not think that members of the Government can disagree that he made some sound and constructive criticism, and I think that whatever else they might think, he has made suggestions worthy of consideration and they should not merely sit down and decide that because they come from the hon. member for St. John they are not worthy of consideration. There are some very sound suggestions and they should take them into consideration because any suggestion which can come from your Opposition showing where you can collect revenue without being a burden on the masses is very worthy of consideration. I think the Premier should give very careful consideration to the suggestion about Cable and Wireless. It is to my mind a sound suggestion. You should not let any dislike or prejudice mar you from saying it is a worthy suggestion on which you can work.

Finally, there are a lot of things with which I do not agree, and I hope that the Minister of Finance will give some consideration before the Estimates are finished to the suggestion as to what it would cost to reduce the age of pensioners from 68 to 65 years and how many people it would bring in for the Financial Year 1959-60, and if you do not want to carry it to what it is in England, you should at least bring the age to 65 years for men and 63 years for women. Those of us who contribute taxes would be more willing to pay if we realised that people who gave of their best to the industries of this island can now at 63 and 65 years draw a pension. We would be glad to pay our taxes for that rather than for a tremendous lot of things for which we are paying.
9.50 p.m.

Your Honour, we should not reflect on a vote of this House but I am telling you that I would prefer to pay the

tax so that some person at 65 years can draw a pension now. I would prefer to know that my taxes along with other peoples were going to give 5,000 people more old age pensions than to see the nonsense which they are carrying on now. You say that you are raising an army for the West Indies. That is absolute nonsense. What can an army do in a place like the West Indies today? It is just a luxury which poor people have to bear. Would I contribute to a Federation to run an army as against an Air Force? What you can run an army to keep off, you can take volunteers and Policemen to do the same thing.

You say that we should not reflect on a vote of the House but this is what the Hon. Premier said in his Budget Speech. He mentioned that the increase in the vote of Federation was to pay our dues at mandatory level. I am saying that I am very dissatisfied with that and I know that Your Honour, too, would be more satisfied to know that 400 people in St. Peter at the age of 65 years were drawing a pension than to know that you are paying more money to carry on this nonsense of having an army for the Federation. Then again, I must contribute money to pay all those high fantastic salaries to people in the Federal Government. I think it is nothing short of robbery. The people in the West Indies are fleeced.

I feel that the Hon. Premier as soon as possible should cause an investigation to be made and if it is correct that in England they have reduced the age whereby a woman can draw old age pension at 60 years, then we should at once reduce ours. Do you think we have any right still going on to say that a man at 68 years and a woman at 68 years are only entitled to old age pension when they reach that age after working so hard in the fields of this country? Mr. Speaker, I will reserve what I have to say on the various heads until when we are dealing with them.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, like the hon. senior member for the City, I can promise you and other hon. members that I certainly will not be here until a late hour. I would be closer to eight minutes in my speech. May be, the hon. junior member for St. John saw in the records that the hon. senior member for the City had the record for speaking for seven hours in this House and he certainly wanted to take that record away from him.

Sir, I have five points of general comment on the Budget Speech. First of all, I notice in general that the standard of debate on it was very high and I do not think that even some of the latest speeches have been able to lower the standard very much. It is unfortunate that the Official Opposition has not been able to agree on their points. I say that because I noticed that the hon. junior member for St. John said that he was summarising the points for his Party but from what I have noticed, three members of that Party said that they found something proper to commend in the Budget Speech. Two of them found nothing to commend. The hon. junior member for St. John started off by saying that there was nothing at all in the Budget Speech to commend but he did end up by saying that he was glad that something is done for the teachers and something was done for the agricultural community which was a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the hon. junior member for St. John is not in his place. It is also unfortunate that his long speech to us was not convincing; as a matter of fact, it was more confusing.

In general, Sir, there has been some talk in the Chamber about development. I notice that there have been hon. members who have made a study of the Budget Speech since they got it in their hands and as a result have given some good discourses, some on the development of agriculture, some on the water question and some of the development of the tourist industry. I would like to say that one of the things which should be concentrated on is the development of the resources which we have in our people. That may sound strange to hon. members but I believe our biggest problem in Barbados is not as much political as it is sociological.

I am commending to my Government that we pay very careful attention to increasing and expanding the social services. By that I mean social services in all its forms including education in every aspect. I consider that when it comes to the social services, the Hon. Minister of Social Services and the Hon. Minister of Education should be working very closely together. What I fear is that there is a spectre which is haunting this country of declining, twisted and in some cases non-existent standards. We are losing the standards which we set ourselves both in the line of education and in the line of social services and even in the line of conduct in Parliamentary affairs. And if we do not pay attention to the development of our people on a broad adult educational programme, making sure that nobody is left out, and that you include and invite the work and co-operation of all the bodies in this Island like the Trade Union Movement and the Association and make sure that we have a bold policy in this line, we may find that when it comes to our developing agriculture that the people who have to do something with this development are not sufficiently or efficiently trained.

The development of people and of social services are things which take a long time and you do not see the effects of that in the same way as you see a new hotel going up.

As I have said, Sir, our people happen to be our most natural resource. Our economy is limited and with an economy which is as limited as ours, it is necessary for our Government to proceed in these development projects with caution and with care. Let us not do our work with trepidation; let us be sure that we build in our social services as we are in our projects, such as tourism and such things. We have our people to invest in and we better invest in them quickly so that in later years they would be to our benefit. The most startling thing to find out is not that we are suffering from unemployment and under-employment but to find out that a vast number of our people are not only unemployed but unemployable just because we have failed with the passing of the years to develop our people. It is no particular Government's fault. We must take the bull by the horn. We must see that the standards and productivity of the people are so high that they can take advantage of any development project which you have at home or anywhere else. Sir, I intend to lay stress on the development of our people as the number one priority of this Island.

10.00 p.m.

We must see to it that the standards and productivity of the people themselves are so raised that they can take advantage of any other development project which we may happen to have either in this Island or in the West Indies. Of all the development that we have talked about, I intend to lay stress on the development of our people as an A1 priority. I ask the Government to see to it not only that they continue the social services and the educational policy but to extend it and go about it boldly and resolutely. The future lies in the better development of the people themselves.

I notice that the Government will be bringing down legislation as to illegitimate children as far as income tax concessions are concerned. Financially speaking, as far as the Inland Revenue Department is concerned, that is probably a wise step; but any legislation like that would affect at least 61% of the children of Barbados. When I was a Welfare Officer, I remember that I did a little research on illegitimacy in Barbados; I used the vital statistics for 1955 and the illegitimacy rate was 61%. If we bring down legislation which we feel will affect the rebates and concessions which people get for maintaining illegitimate children, let us remember that that legislation will have effect on the children and the parents have to maintain those children. The Inland Revenue Officer will feel that this is something into which we must look and we want to look into it carefully. Our illegitimacy rate is not as high as that of Jamaica, and it may startle us to know that the illegitimacy rate in England is 5%.

The training of organisations is associated with the development of social services and education. I have listen-

ed to speeches lasting for two hours, six hours and otherwise and I have found that hardly any member of the Legislature in here and on political platforms outside, has been able to say anything adverse about the policy of the Government as such; they have always tried to pick holes in the administration as such. I know that the Premier has mentioned that we have to be very careful that we do not have a top-heavy administration; that is all wise and correct but we must be careful and be sure that what administration we have in our hands is so efficiently carried out that there will be no justification for attacking the administration so as to get at our policy as such. What we have to be careful about in the Government today is not necessarily our policy.

I hope that the Director of Training, a gentleman whom I have met and I consider to be a man of some ability and he is quite a genial personality - I hope that he will soon be relieved of the massive job of looking into the organisation of our various departments and he will soon be all free to put into operation his scheme of training as he has recommended to the Government. He is working on the organisation of the Departments, but I hope that he will soon be able to get along with the administrative problems, of which we are so much in need of tackling. I do not think that this is an original suggestion but even although we do not want to have a top-heavy administration I would like to feel that some attention is paid to the co-ordination and planning of uniformity of Government. We have quite a number of very big projects on which we are working - projects like the Deep Water Harbour, Waterworks Extension, Housing, Highways, Development Board and so on; but especially in respect of Soil Conservation, Public Works, Highways and Transport and Waterworks, do I think it is absolutely necessary that these projects be carried out under a comprehensive scheme and that there will be co-ordination between the various Departments of Government so as to avoid the unwieldy situation where the Department of Highways and Transport fixes a road and then the Waterworks Department digs up that road or the work of Soil Conservation pushes everything away. If you have a co-ordination scheme of carrying out these projects, you will have made your plans well in advance and you will therefore be saving any additional cost of administration which we know that we can ill afford to bear and carry.

I notice that there are going to be some concessions as far as insurances are concerned and I am quite certain that this will be just another encouragement for our people to become more insurance conscious. I am sure that the step with regard to these concessions for insurance is just a step which the Government would be carrying out as we are thinking in terms of insurance and national security schemes. These are things which must be looked into very seriously; we will also want to be careful that there are quite a number of insurance companies operating in Barbados and whose profits go very far overseas. We want to see if we can get some of the insurance money in Barbados by having an insurance scheme of our own. Those are the five main points which I would like to contribute to this debate and I would like to say that when we go into Committee on the Estimates there will be more time for detailed consideration. I conclude by saying that something has been attempted and something has been done.

10.10 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, at this late hour I shall not be long because the members who spoke and made certain criticisms and strictures on the Ministry of which I am in charge are not in their places and even though I would have to say something in their absence, I regret it because they are not here to reply to me or get up and object; but I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without referring to some of the criticisms they made during the course of the discussion on this debate of the Budget.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church said in the course of his remarks that the largest hotel proprietors of this island who owned approximately 50% of the hotel industry were not represented on the Tourist Board although representation was made to the Ministry concerned. Now, Sir, I would like to explain that one because I noted some time ago in the "Bajan" Mr. Hunte wrote that the Goddards Hotels were not represented, and referred to the Goddards as the chief opponents of the Government Party in the House of Assembly. He therefore gave the indication or the slant that it was because of the fact that the hon. junior member for Christ Church was in the opposite camp that he was deliberately left out from this selection to the Tourist Board. I would like to say here and now that I have never regarded the appointment as a political appointment, neither have I regarded the hon. junior member for Christ Church as any serious threat to this Government. As a matter of fact, had it not been for his puppets and his touts he would be useless in a political battle such as the ones that go on from time to time; so again I would like him to know, if he thinks he was not appointed because he is our political opponent, that I do not regard him as any serious threat to the Government. The position is that we appointed to that Board the President and Vice-President of the Hotel Association of which the Goddards are members, and I presume that they had a hand in appointing the President and Vice-President, and I do not think that the Hotel Industry could be better represented than by the President and Vice-President of the Association. When it comes therefore to the point of nominating somebody merely because the individual may have had a large interest in the Association, that to me did not count; as I said, it was the representation which I regarded as sufficient and adequate in that we appointed the President and Vice-President of that Organisation; so I hope that the gentleman will remove from his mind completely any idea that he was not selected because he might be an opponent of the Government. I will go further and say that in these cases, as you will appreciate, when we ask for nominees, we get a large number. We ask all the people concerned but they do not submit one name and say: 'let us have this individual;' they submit a large number of names and the onus is on us to select one from the number sent to us.

I think the hon. senior member for St. Peter as usual also made a similar mistake and criticised the Ministry or the Government for not appointing a Trade Unionist to the Barbados Development Board, and referred to it as "spite". I am sorry he is not here because I am sure that as far as I am concerned, I do not regard him as any threat to me, and I would be the last person to attempt to spite a Trade Unionist when I regard the Trade Union as part and parcel of the Barbados Labour Party and vice versa, irrespective of the fact that the same hon. member has for a long time been trying to drive a wedge between the Labour Party and the Union. I am conscious of the fact and satisfied that the majority of Unionists are not going to follow him in destroying the Labour Party which did so much for them in the days long before we had a Trade Union. When the hon. member talks about "spite" he should recall that in so far as these Boards are concerned, with the exception of the Development Board and the Natural Gas Corporation, there is not a Board to which this Government has not appointed a member of the Trade Union, and it was only a matter of time that somebody has not been appointed to the Development Board and the Natural Gas Corporation. When the time comes somebody will be appointed to these two Boards.

Now, Sir, I think that is about all that was said that need any reply. The hon. senior member for St. Philip in his usual manner of talking about emigration and so on told this House that trained nurses had absolutely no difficulty in getting employment in the United States of America or in Canada. I know, Sir, that that is misleading, and he also said at one time these people did not even come under the quota and that as long as they were trained nurses they automatically got a visa and could leave the island. I know that was a misleading statement and I heard the member trying to correct him, after I understood the hon. senior member for St. Peter had put him on his feet after the House adjourned last night. This is the exercise that goes on in the case of a nurse or qualified person who wants to go to the States; an application is made by the prospective employee to the Attorney General of the United States of America; the Attorney General investigates whether the application is *bona fide* and whether there

is need for special skill; then if the Attorney General is satisfied, the person concerned is granted preference out of the annual quota of 100 persons given to us from each of the West Indian islands. That is how a person or trained nurse can get out, but I know for a fact that up to last year two qualified nurses that took a vacation in the States would have been glad to remain, but they just could not get a permanent visa to do so.
10.20 p.m.

Of course, we are so acquainted with the misleading statements which the hon. member makes in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in here now and I will ask the Hon. Minister to desist from saying anything objectionable about him in his absence.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I know that I am at a disadvantage because he is not in here now. I want to say this. Mr. Owen Rowe who is the Student Liaison Officer in Canada came down here and we had a long discussion with him. Perhaps I should read part of what was said at that time. This is what Mr. Rowe wrote: "While I was in Barbados I had a lengthy interview with the Minister of Labour and the Labour Commissioner who expressed a keen interest in the setting up in Barbados in due course of the necessary screening machinery and special arrangements were worked out with the Canadian Government whereby Barbadian Student Nurses trained in Canada upon graduation would be permitted by the Immigration Department to remain in Canada to accept employment in this field."

Now, Sir, before that was done, this is what Mr. Rowe wrote us, saying that since he went up the one important observation which he made was that there was not the pressing need for Nurses and Nursing assistants. That was of the 26th June, 1958. I will read you a letter of a later date which was written in February this year. It says: what has happened is that a number of people from Europe have become interested in courses. In addition West Indian girls were just applying for admission for the courses in view of getting work in Canada. In view of these circumstances, the colleges were more inclined to give interviews to applicants on the spot and who could appear for personal interview. He then goes on to explain that because of the fact that they are Europeans, they were more readily given the opportunity to do nursing in Canadian Hospitals than West Indians.

Now, I am sure all of us has read and seen the pronouncement by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration quite recently. This is what the Minister said. He explained that persons who were in Canada could apply up to March this year for permanent settlement in that country. We felt very happy when we saw it and immediately we wrote to the Trade Commissioner in Canada in order to have him to verify the statement which was made by the Minister. This is what came back to us and it was written on the 15th September, 1958. It says here that "many West Indians have unfortunately misinterpreted an announcement of the Immigration Department, misconstruing it to mean that any application for landing status received prior to 1st March, 1959 would be favourably considered. My understanding is that application for landing emigrants there will be continued to be dealt with on the same basis as before, which means that unless the applicant has very close relatives already landed in Canada there would be some doubt as to whether he would be admissible as a permanent resident." That is what came back to us as a result of our investigation. A little later, that is on the 27th February, 1959, this is what we got again. Let me say this first. As has been pointed out on many occasions, my predecessor in office, the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works, and Housing, made a thorough survey of emigration- I would say a world survey. He even surveyed a famous place like Brazil where the hon. senior member for St. Philip said that 10,000 people from here would be able to go. We have it on record where Brazil wrote us in reply to a questionnaire telling us that they did not want any negroes there.

This is what was written us from Canada:
"I cannot emphasise too strongly enough what a great burden to the staff of the Nursing Citizen School it is to have to acknowledge the flood of applications being received from West Indians. This office has been asked to do all in their means to discourage applications because of the fact that an ample number of candidates are available from Canadian residents. Moreover, in all fairness to the West Indians who may be successful in gaining admission, they should be advised that as there is a great uncertainty of their having employment as Nurses upon graduation, it does not justify the cost of passage to Canada and tuition fees".

As I have said, that is the letter which we got on the 27th February, 1959 and there are a few more which I can quote. I just want to say this and this is another passage from a letter: "it is very clear that fewer and fewer West Indians are going to be accepted for Nurses in training in Canadian Schools." As a matter of fact, the Student Liaison Officer has been asked by officials of these Schools to do all he can to discourage the overwhelmingly large number of West Indians who are applying.

Then the letter goes on to show you that the chances of nurses getting employment there are actually nil. Sir, to hear the hon. senior member for St. Philip get on his feet and trying to impress not so much the House but the gallery-which is purely cheap politics-and trying to make the public believe that here is a golden opportunity for a lot of people to get out of this island but this Government is doing nothing, you would think that is so; but in truth and fact there is a substantial sum of money put there to lend to anybody who can find work outside of this island, and what is more, we have been doing that since 1955 and we are only too glad to help people to get out of the island.

Sir, in the light of what I have read, the statements by the hon. senior member for St. Philip are misleading and without any foundation whatsoever.

Now, Sir we have this nonsense by the same hon. member that we should get wheat here and establish wheat mills. That also was investigated by us and I can tell you that the Canadians view with disfavour any question of establishing any wheat mill in the West Indies. I remember well between 1949 and 1950 when molasses was canned here and sent to Canada that we were told in no uncertain manner that if we persisted in doing that we would lose our whole molasses trade. I think I am correct in saying that Messrs. Munroe and Co., were the persons who used to can this molasses and send it to Newfoundland for sale and in turn they got down salt fish from there. We had to refuse much against our will Messrs. Munroe from exporting molasses in tins because we were threatened with the complete annihilation of the industry if we allowed molasses to go in these cans to Canada. A similar thing would happen in the case of flour.
10.30 p.m.
It is not as easy as they were saying to establish a plant here to supply Barbados with flour, and it is not as economical as they will have people to believe. When you compare the amount of American flour which we purchase as against the Canadian flour - that also is something which we have discussed in Canada. I have discussed it with the Minister of Trade and his Deputy and the position is that the Canadian flour is much more expensive than the American flour, the latter being heavily subsidised. Therefore the major part of our importation of flour which used to come from Canada now comes from the *United States of* America because of the price. Anybody who is abreast of the times knows that there is a cold war going on between Canada and the United States of America on the same question of the dumping of flour in the West Indies. It is a question of cost; and therefore when hon. members talk about purchasing 700 million bushels of flour because they have it there and do not know what to do with it - I have not heard greater nonsense than that. That is why it would be better for them to manufacture it and we would purchase from Canada first because they purchase our products, rather than from America.

The hon. junior member for St. John said that we were recruiting 50 people for the British Railways but

that there was room for 700 people. Of course, I am accustomed to hearing him and I know him well. However, inasmuch as he is not here now, I will leave what I wanted to say about him until I meet him on another occasion. He said that the only reason why there was no recruitment of any more than fifty people for the British railways was because of educational policy; that these people could not measure up to the educational requirements of the British Railways. The truth is that 30 people were required for the British Railways and 30 for the London Transport Executive - 60 people in all. I should like to say that there is no dearth of recruits in this island, least of all, from an educational point of view. Some time ago the British Railways asked us for four messengers and we sent them four people to work as messengers. They did not have a secondary education and they were so good that they were promoted immediately to clerks. When the hon. member tried to decry these people and to use as something against us that the educational policy of the Government prevented these authorities from recruiting these 700 people, I say that that remark is grossly misleading, because the authorities asked for 60 people. The recruitment of these people stopped because of a bus strike in England which lasted for twelve weeks and after that, the London Transport Executive took a number of buses off the road, therefore there were less buses running; at the same time, we had the race riots and the unemployment situation rose considerably. At one time I think the unemployment figures were something like 250,000 and the latest figures were something like 700,000. There are many Englishmen who do not relish that type of work but who at the time, were forced to do it because of the unemployment situation, and therefore they kept out many West Indians. I discussed the matter with the authorities last year and I appealed to them to help us at the earliest opportunity, as soon as things returned to normalcy. This is the first lot of workers for which they have called since that bus strike in England took place. I have every reason to believe that they will call for more people. The authorities have told me in no uncertain manner that the quality of our people is first class and they insist that they get that quality all the time. For an hon. member to say that these people are not being recruited because they do not have the educational standard is something which is not in our interest, to put it very mildly, but something of which this island cannot feel proud, when we have the best educational system in the West Indies.

I do not know if the Premier wants to reply, but I do not want to intrude on his reserve. I heard the economist saying that we should budget for a deficit. I would like to know what kind of Government will do that.

10.40 p.m.

I would like to know, Sir, what type of Government would in the same year that it is trying to raise a loan show the world that it is too poor to balance its Budget. It is the height of nonsense. The hon. member also went on to deal with the importation of beef and said that the price of local beef was fixed but as far as the price of imported beef was concerned, the sky was the limit. That is also misleading. The price of all meat is controlled and the price of the local meat is geared to the price of the foreign meat. If meat is 60¢ a pound today, and meat comes from foreign sources to be sold at 66¢, local meat goes up to the same price, so I want to assure the House that at no time the marginal profit is increased. If it costs them more to purchase it and they are getting 4¢ a pound on it, if it cost 40¢ to get it here and they make 4¢ a pound and then it goes to 50¢ the next month, they are going to get the same 4¢.

One last point, Sir, the member referred to our capital investment and said it was worth 60% of the value, but as soon as he whispered to the hon. senior member for Christ Church next to him he said that he would not worry with that then; but if you look in the Estimates you will see again how misleading that was, and no doubt those persons who would not have had the opportunity of seeing it may be inclined to believe that it was right. The position is this and it can be found on page 168 of the Estimates; we have $20 million invested and it is depreciated by 2%, therefore if you were to sell you would get $2 million less, and that is what he said is 60% of the value. The $20 million is depreciated by $2 million and he said it is depreciated by 60% therefore you lose 40%, so $2 million is 40% of $20 million. That is what the economist told this House just now according to his figures, and that is the type of representation people get at times from people like him. I have heard the bogus economist who flirts with M.A's on the last occasion when the Budget was being discussed suggesting that we should have recalled our money then. I never heard more economic nonsense - the Minister of Agriculture calls it economic heresy - than that. You sell at a time when you are losing money and when money is depreciating while all people who have anything to sell do so when it is at par or bringing a premium! That was the bogus advice given to the Government by the bogus economist that we have around here.

Sir, that is all I should like to say at this stage. I regret the hon. junior member for St. John was not here because we listened to what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph amply called a harangue, diatribe, opprobrium and all those things from him which is apparently part of his nature.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply on the Appropriation Bill, and that it be an instruction while in Committee of Supply to consider the Draft Estimates.

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

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

10.50 p.m.

*Head 1 - Governor - was called.*

HEAD 1 - GOVERNOR

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the sum of $20,692 be voted under Head 1.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: I am sorry I was not here to hear all that was said by the hon. senior member for St. Michael. However, I will reply to him when we come to deal with the appropriate Item. He made several remarks about my trying to drive a wedge between the Union and the Labour Party. I want him to understand that when I speak on matters, I speak in the way I feel about them. As I have said, I will be able to deal with him because there is a Head under the Estimates which would give me that scope. I want him to understand that my public life has never been subjected to any enquiry and if I were in his position I would hold my head in shame.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. member. We are dealing with Head 1 - Governor.

Hon. M. E. COX: You are lucky not to be behind prison bars for carrying away the Union money.

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot accuse me of carrying away money from the Union. Look how many times you came and drew money from the Union and could not prove what you wanted it for. I am not going to stand here and let you accuse me of carrying away money from the Union.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: You sit there and hear him talking about my carrying away money from the Union and you are telling me you are speaking to the hon. member. What more can he say of me? If he were here by the hon. member on my right he would see what he would have got from me for saying that.

Mr. Chairman, you sit there and allow those people to say whatever they like. Do not speak to me. If you were outside you would not be speaking to me. Speak to him. What right has he to say that I carried away money from the Union?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Peter again. Let us proceed now with Head 1.

Mr. WALCOTT: Challenge him now to bring anything to prove that I carried away money from the Union.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I repeat, let us proceed with Head 1.

Mr. WALCOTT: So far as I am concerned, I can lose this seat under any condition but not under the condition of carrying away money from the Union. So far as I am concerned, you can appeal to me as much as you like but your appeal does not make any difference to me. The hon. member has accused me of carrying away money from the Union. He had better watch his step. He is always accusing people of theft.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. Peter take his seat. I am ruling now that the hon. senior member for St. Peter go on with Head 1. We are having no more of that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, dealing with Head 1, Governor, I think we must give serious attention to the changed developments which have taken place throughout the West Indies and give closer consideration to the question of whether there is the necessity for the continuation of Governorships and the like in the West Indies in view of what is now taking place. *(Loud Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. Peter take his seat. I am appealing to other hon. members of the Committee to stop the loud asides and let us get on with Head 1, which deals with the Governor.

Mr. WALCOTT: As I was saying, Sir, a changed situation is taking place in the West Indies and it requires a sort of reorientation in so far as these various Governorships collate to the situation in the area. On the remarks and statements which I have been reading in the Press and studying the situation that exists now with what existed three years ago, I do not see the necessity for Barbados to have a Governor for Jamaica to have a Governor, for Trinidad to have a Governor, for the Leeward Islands to have a Governor and for the Windward Islands to have a Governor. These several colonies are not in the same position as they used to be and I feel without in any way being personal to the present incumbent but speaking purely on a matter of principle, since we have Cabinet System which puts more power in the hands of the elected members, the original functions of Governor no longer exist and now the Governor is only regarded as a constitutional monarch. Because of that I am wondering if we need the expensive trappings that go with that office which the old system required. With the new change, I think you are reaching the stage of gradually negativing the requirements of a Governor in the present form.

I say that not because the amount of money that is voted on the Head is a large amount. As a matter of fact, $55,000 is a trivial amount of money but I feel that we can review this situation in the light of the changed conditions that are taking place in the West Indies. I hope on the next occasion of the Council of Ministers, or whatever particular body it is in the Federation that deals with this matter, that some serious consideration would be given to these things. The whole functions of the Governor today, apart from being Head of the Civil Service, are more or less ceremonial because so far as things affecting the colony, the Governor cannot act in a positive way. It has been mooted - and I agree with them - that the occasion is not necessarily one for all these sort of things and that what is needed is a sort of Governor-General for the whole area. It seems to me that the functions which are now being performed by the Governor without any injury to that office can be performed by the Chief Secretary: so I think that we can have a revamping of our constitution to suit present trends.

11.00 p.m.

I hope that when the time comes that the present Head of the Administration retires, they will not be too anxious to appoint a substantive person, until such time as the Powers-that-be have the opportunity to review this matter. I have no objection to the money being voted here, but I take this opportunity to express that view because it is the opinion which I have held from the time when we had these changes in the Constitution. I hope that further changes will take place so as to make the post of Governor of this colony redundant. As the position is now, for practical purposes, the post is redundant but we maintain it just as a relic of the past. Can you afford to have these relics when we need money for other major developments?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member, I would just like to say that the whole matter is under review at the present moment. We all realise that with the coming into being of Federation and of Dominion Status, the whole matter will have to be changed.

*The question that the sum of $20,692 under Head 1 - Governor - stand part of the schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

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

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

*The question was put and agreed to.*

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

## ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday next, the 19th instant, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*The question that this House do now adjourn until Thursday next, the 19th instant, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.*

11.05 p.m.